

Volume III
No. 14



Wednesday
26th October, 1966

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

OFFICIAL REPORT

THIRD SESSION OF THE SECOND PARLIAMENT
OF MALAYSIA

CONTENTS

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 2389]

EXEMPTED BUSINESS (MOTION) [Col. 2477]

BILLS:

The Royal Malaysia Police (Amendment) Bill [Col. 2422]

The Development Funds Bill [Col. 2435]

The Currency Laws (Amendment) Bill [Col. 2448]

The Customs (Amendment) Bill [Col. 2451]

The Treasury Bills (Local) (Amendment) Bill [Col. 2484]

**The Consolidated Fund (Expenditure on Account) Bill
[Col. 2489]**

The Municipal (Amendment) Bill [Col. 2490]

The Standards Bill [Col. 2494]

ADJOURNMENT SPEECH:

**Kesulitan dan Kesusahan Pekerja² di-Pelabohan Pulau
Pinang [Col. 2508]**

MALAYSIA

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

Official Report

Third Session of the Second Dewan Ra'ayat

Wednesday, 26th October, 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 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 Finance, TUAN TAN SIEW SIN, J.P. (Melaka Tengah).
- .. the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, TAN SRI V. T. SAMBANTHAN, P.M.N. (Sungei Siput).
- .. 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 Welfare Services, TUAN HAJI ABDUL HAMID KHAN BIN HAJI SAKHAWAT ALI KHAN, J.M.N., J.P. (Batang Padang).
- .. the Minister for Local Government and Housing, TUAN KHAW KAI-BOH, P.J.K. (Ulu Selangor).
- .. the Minister for Sarawak Affairs, DATO' TEMENGGONG JUGAH ANAK BARIENG, P.M.N., P.D.K. (Sarawak).
- .. 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 Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives, TUAN HAJI MOHD. GHAZALI BIN HAJI JAWI (Ulu Perak).
- „ 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 Assistant Minister of Finance, DR NG KAM POH, J.P. (Teluk Anson).
- „ 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).
- „ 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).
- „ WAN ABDUL RAHMAN BIN DATU TUANKU BUJANG, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAJI TALIB, P.J.K. (Kuantan).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDUL RASHID BIN HAJI JAIS (Sabah).
- „ TUAN ABDUL RAZAK BIN HAJI HUSSIN (Lipis).
- „ TUAN ABDUL SAMAD BIN GUL AHMAD MIANJI (Pasir Mas Hulu).
- „ Y.A.M. TUNKU ABDULLAH IBNI AL-MARHUM 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).
- „ TUAN ABU BAKAR BIN HAMZAH (Bachok).
- „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN ABDULLAH (Kelantan Hilir).
- „ TUAN AHMAD BIN ARSHAD, A.M.N. (Muar Utara).
- „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN SA'AID, J.P. (Seberang Utara).
- „ PUAN AJIBAH BINTI ABOL (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Muar Dalam).
- „ PENGARAH BANYANG ANAK JANTING, P.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN CHAN CHONG WEN, A.M.N. (Kluang Selatan).
- „ TUAN CHAN SIANG SUN, P.J.K. (Bentong).
- „ TUAN CHEW BIOW CHUON (Bruas).
- „ TUAN CHIA CHIN SHIN, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN FRANCIS CHIA NYUK TONG (Sabah).
- „ TUAN CHIN FOON (Ulu Kinta).
- „ TUAN EDWIN ANAK TANGKUN (Sarawak).

- The Honourable TUAN SYED ESA BIN ALWEE, J.M.N., S.M.J., P.I.S.
(Batu Pahat Dalam).
- „ DATIN HAJAH FATIMAH BINTI HAJI ABDUL MAJID
(Johor Bahru Timor).
- „ TAN SRI FATIMAH BINTI HAJI HASHIM, P.M.N.
(Jitra-Padang Terap).
- „ TUAN S. FAZUL RAHMAN, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ DATU GANIE GILONG, P.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).
- „ TUAN GANING BIN JANGKAT (Sabah).
- „ TUAN GEH CHONG KEAT, K.M.N. (Penang Utara).
- „ TUAN HANAFI BIN MOHD. YUNUS, A.M.N., J.P. (Kulim Utara).
- „ TUAN HANAFIAH BIN HUSSAIN, A.M.N. (Jerai).
- „ TUAN HARUN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N., J.P. (Baling).
- „ WAN HASSAN BIN WAN DAUD (Tumpat).
- „ TUAN STANLEY HO NGUN KHIU, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ 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
(Kota Bharu Hulu).
- „ TUAN IKHWAN ZAINI (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN ISMAIL BIN IDRIS (Penang Selatan).
- „ TAN SRI SYED JA'AFAR BIN HASAN ALBAR, P.M.N.
(Johore Tenggara).
- „ TUAN KADAM ANAK KIAI (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN KAM WOON WAH, J.P. (Sitiawan).
- „ TUAN KHOO PENG LOONG (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN EDMUND LANGGU ANAK SAGA (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN LEE SECK FUN, K.M.N. (Tanjong Malim).
- „ TUAN AMADEUS MATHEW LEONG, A.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).
- „ DATO' LING BENG SIEW, P.N.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ 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 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).
- „ TUAN MOHD. ARIF SALLEH, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ DATO' MOHAMED ASRI BIN HAJI MUDA, S.P.M.K. (Pasir Puteh).
- „ ORANG TUA MOHAMMAD DARA BIN LANGPAD (Sabah).
- „ TUAN MOHD. DAUD BIN ABDUL SAMAD (Besut).
- „ TUAN MOHD. TAHIR BIN ABDUL MAJID, S.M.S., P.J.K.
(Kuala Langat).

- The Honourable TUAN MOHAMED YUSOF BIN MAHMUD, A.M.N. (Temerloh).
- „ TUAN MOHD. ZAHIR BIN HAJI ISMAIL, J.M.N. (Sungei Patani).
- „ WAN MOKHTAR BIN AHMAD (Kemaman).
- „ TUAN HAJI MOKHTAR BIN HAJI ISMAIL (Perlis Selatan).
- „ TUAN MUHAMMAD FAKHRUDDIN BIN HAJI ABDULLAH (Pasar Mas Hilir).
- „ TUAN HAJI MUHAMMAD SU'AUT BIN HAJI MUHD. TAHIR, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ TUN MUSTAPHA BIN DATU HARUN, S.M.N. (Sabah).
- „ DATO' HAJI MUSTAFA BIN HAJI ABDUL JABAR, D.P.M.S., A.M.N., J.P. (Sabak Bernam).
- „ 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 Bharu Hilir).
- „ TUAN NG FAH YAM (Batu Gajah).
- „ TUAN ONG KEE HUI (Sarawak).
- „ 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 RAHMAT BIN HAJI DAUD, A.M.N. (Johor Bahru Barat).
- „ TUAN RAMLI BIN OMAR (Krian Darat).
- „ 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 SANDOM ANAK NYUAK (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN SEAH TENG NGIAB, P.I.S. (Muar Pantai).
- „ TUAN D. R. SEENIVASAGAM (Ipoh).
- „ TUAN SIM BOON LIANG, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN SIOW LOONG HIN, P.J.K. (Seremban Barat).
- „ TUAN SENAWI BIN ISMAIL, P.J.K. (Seberang Selatan).
- „ TUAN SNG CHIN JOO (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN SOH AH TECK (Batu Pahat).
- „ TUAN SULAIMAN BIN ALI (Dungun).
- „ TUAN SULAIMAN BIN HAJI TAIB (Krian Laut).
- „ PENGIRAN TAHIR PETRA (Sabah).
- „ TUAN TAJUDDIN BIN ALI, P.J.K. (Larut Utara).
- „ TUAN TAI KUAN YANG (Kulim Bandar Bharu).
- „ TUAN TAMA WENG TINGGANG WAN (Sarawak).
- „ DR TAN CHEE KHOON (Batu).
- „ TUAN TAN CHENG BEE, J.P. (Bagan).
- „ TUAN TAN TOH HONG (Bukit Bintang).
- „ TUAN TAN TSAK YU (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN TOH THEAM HOCK (Kampar).

The Honourable TUAN YEH PAO TZE (Sabah).

„ TUAN STEPHEN YONG KUET TZE (Sarawak).

„ TUAN HAJI ZAKARIA BIN HAJI MOHD. TAIB, P.J.K. (Langat).

ABSENT:

The Honourable the Minister of Education, TUAN MOHAMED KHIR JOHARI (Kedah Tengah).

„ the Minister for Sabah Affairs, TUN DATU MUSTAPHA BIN DATU HARUN, S.M.N., P.D.K. (Sabah).

„ TUAN LEE SIOK YEW, A.M.N., P.J.K., Assistant Minister (Sepang).

„ DATO' ABDULLAH BIN ABDULRAHMAN, S.M.T., Dato' Bijaya di-Raja (Kuala Trengganu Selatan).

„ 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).

„ TUAN CHAN SEONG YOON (Setapak).

„ TUAN CHEN WING SUM (Damansara).

„ TUAN D. A. DAGO ANAK RANDAN *alias* DAGOK ANAK RANDEN (Sarawak).

„ TUAN C. V. DEVAN NAIR (Bungsar).

„ TUAN HAJI HAMZAH BIN ALANG, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Kapar).

„ PENGHULU JINGGUT ANAK ATTAN, Q.M.C., A.B.S. (Sarawak).

„ TUAN THOMAS KANA (Sarawak).

„ TUAN LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).

„ TUAN PETER LO SU YIN (Sabah).

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

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

„ TUAN TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Melaka).

„ TUAN TIAH ENG BEE (Kluang Utara).

PRAYERS

(Mr Speaker *in the Chair*)

ORAL ANSWERS TO
QUESTIONS

FREE PORT STATUS OF
PENANG

1. Dr Lim Chong Eu (Tanjong) asks the Prime Minister to state:

(a) in view of the prevailing uncertainty amongst the traders in Penang with regard to the resumption of trade between the

Island of Penang and North Indonesia, what the Central Government's policy is with regard to the present "free port" status of the Island of Penang;

(b) whether he will assure this House that there will be no change in the "free port" status without first consulting the wishes of the people in the Island of Penang; and

(c) how the Government proposes to ascertain the wishes of the people in the Island of Penang.

The Prime Minister: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member is aware that there is a Bill before this House to amend the Customs Ordinance, 1952, so as to enable the relevant authority to impose duties where it is found necessary, where the need arises, speedily and expeditiously. According to the Minister of Finance, this Bill is absolutely necessary as a time saving factor. This is to allow the authority to impose the tax without having come to this Parliament for the authority to do so.

It must be appreciated too that there are so many industries here that are producing goods in this country which it is the intention of this Government to encourage, and, with these manufactured goods produced locally, the revenue of the Government also rises. So, if Penang were allowed to import goods that are manufactured in this country without payment of tax, it would provide an unfair competition to the goods produced here. Therefore, we feel that Penang citizens have to shoulder the responsibility as good citizens, as well as the profit. There are so many things that have to be done in Penang; many millions of dollars have to be spent there for the various purposes; and one of them is in respect of education. The Honourable Member is aware that the University College is being built in Penang, and the Central Government has to run it, staff it and to build it. Therefore, it is necessary for Penang to have to shoulder a little bit of the burden of taxation.

As to part (b) of the question, it is the intention of the Central Government to consult the State Government on matters which affect the State, and taxation is one of these matters.

As to part (c) of the question, the Government proposes to ascertain the views or the wishes of the Penang people through the Penang Government. That is the rule we practice here and that rule we will follow.

TRADE MISSION TO MOSCOW

2. Dr Tan Chee Khoon (Batu) asks the Minister of Foreign Affairs what

has been achieved by the recent trade mission to Moscow. Is he aware that our Anti-Communist stand will do such trade missions no good. Will the Prime Minister now consider sending a similar trade mission to the Peoples' Republic of China.

The Prime Minister: Sir, there are two questions in this particular one: No. (1)—according to the Honourable Member—is why did we send the delegation to Russia when it is known that we are anti-Communist; No. (2)—this is quite the opposite—is when are we sending another delegation to China? Sir, I do not know what is working in the Honourable Member's mind. In one case he asks, why did we send a delegation to Russia; and in the other case he asks, when are we going to send a delegation to China? However, my answer is that the object of sending this delegation to Russia is to investigate the possibilities of purchases of Soviet goods. The Malaysian Government and trading representatives now have a better and clearer idea of what the market prospects are for a number of Malaysian exports to the U.S.S.R., and also the prices, terms and availability of Soviet goods of interest to the Malaysian market. The first hand knowledge derived from this visit would serve as a sound basis for developing closer and more beneficial trade relations between Malaysia and the Soviet Union.

As to our background, which the Honourable Member referred to as being anti-Communist, I think Russia is well aware about that, and at the same time Russian authorities and officials accorded our delegations a very cordial welcome and that shows that they are not so particular about our stand. It is not correct for the Honourable Member to surmise, therefore, because of our anti-Communist stand there was no point of our going to Russia and this visit we made to Russia has brought good.

As I said just now, he contradicted himself and asked when we are going to China. Well, as China's attitude towards us changes, our attitude towards China will also change, and if it is

evident to us that China will change, or has changed, or is changing its attitude towards us, we will be very glad to send a delegation there. On the other hand, we would not prevent any private business from sending representatives to China to assess the needs of the Chinese market for our goods or the needs of our markets for Chinese goods everybody knows, our market is swamped with Chinese goods today.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: The Honourable Minister for Foreign Affairs is a little unkind. If there is any confusion, the confusion lies in his mind and in those of his Ministry. I am all for the sending of trade missions, whether it is to U.S.S.R., to China, or to Timbuctoo. If it can earn us foreign exchange, I am all for sending these missions. I am not against their sending. I am a little worried, Mr Speaker, Sir, that the continuous anti-Communist stand spouted by Members sitting opposite me, and Members outside this House, will mar our chances of establishing trade relations with whatever country—communist, capitalist, or neutral.

Now, the question which I wish to ask is this, Mr Speaker, Sir. Just now the Honourable Minister for Foreign Affairs has stated that he will consider allowing private trade missions to the Peoples' Republic of China. I take it that this stand is a departure from established practice. I take it that the Foreign Minister and the Minister of Commerce and Industry recognises the vast potential there. If the rubber for the rubber shoes that the Chinese in Mainland China wear comes from this country, then we need not have to wait with a bowl in hand in Washington and elsewhere to sell our rubber. Mr Speaker, Sir, the question which I wish to pose is this: will the Honourable Minister for Foreign Affairs consider allowing those who do not come within the category of traders but who may be good ambassadors of this country to visit mainland China and, perhaps, do some propaganda (*Laughter*) for this country and promote trade relations for this country?

The Prime Minister: It is not correct for the Honourable Member to say that we had not sent a private dele-

gation to China. We had. A team made up of tradesmen, in particular rubber traders, went on a visit to China about two or three years back. On his question whether we would agree to people outside the commercial line, outside the business houses, going there, it depends on who are going (*Laughter*): if they are members of the Alliance Party, I say, they will be good ambassadors, but he has to convince me that his Party would make a good ambassador for us. All the time that we have heard, all that we have found out from them, is that they have been shouting anti-Malaysian slogan, been decrying this Government's policies and carrying out propaganda to overthrow this Government by force of arms; and if he suggests that people of that type would make good ambassadors for Malaysia, I think he had better tell it to the marines—not me (*Laughter*).

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: On a point of clarification, Mr Speaker, Sir, the Prime Minister has unfortunately tarred my whole party. If I may remind the Honourable Prime Minister, in Malaysia Hall in London when I stood up to defend the Malaysian Government I got into trouble with my Party for defending the Malaysian Government (*Laughter*). So at least there is one member of my Party who, perhaps, does not come within the category that the Honourable Prime Minister spoke of.

The Prime Minister: That was among the people of Malaysia, but it is a different tale, a different thing, as regards what he has to do in China. This was among Malaysian students in London, and he did good work there. Thank you very much. (*Laughter*).

KERUGIAN MALAYSIA DAN NEGARA² COMMONWEALTH DENGAN SEBAB KONFRONTASI INDONESIA TERHADAP MALAYSIA

3. Tuan Ahmad bin Arshad (Muar Utara) bertanya kepada Menteri Luar Negeri, sejak di-lancarkan konfrontasi Indonesia terhadap Malaysia:

(a) berapa-kah jumlah kerugian yang di-taksirkan mengikut mata

wang Malaysia yang di-alami oleh Malaysia dan negara² Commonwealth yang terlibat bagi mempertahankan Malaysia; dan

- (b) terangkan juga dengan berasing²an berapa jumlah bilangan tentera² Malaysia dan tentera² Commonwealth serta juga orang² 'awam yang telah tertawan, terkorban dan terchedera.

Perdana Menteri: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soalan (a) terlampau panjang dan banyak kesulitannya. Nombor satu, berapa-kah jumlah kerugian yang di-taksirkan mengikut mata wang Malaysia yang di-alami oleh Malaysia dan negara² Commonwealth yang terlibat bagi mempertahankan Malaysia. Ini tidak dapat hendak di-ketahui kerana perbelanjaan ada-lah dua bahagian. Terhadap Malaysia, perbelanjaan nombor satu ia-lah kerugian dalam perdagangan antara Indonesia dengan Malaysia dalam tiga tahun tentu-lah beribu million. Nombor dua, terhadap perbelanjaan peperangan yang di-tanggung oleh Malaysia dan negara² Commonwealth. Jadi ini pun dalam masa tiga tahun belaja beribu million juga; tetapi hendak di-tetapkan dengan tetap berapa banyak di-belanjakan tidak dapat hendak di-buat.

Soalan (b) terangkan juga dengan berasing²an berapa jumlah bilangan tentera² Malaysia dan tentera² Commonwealth yang telah chedera dalam peperangan itu—ini dapat-lah saya beri tahu. Tentera Commonwealth yang terbunuh 64 orang, yang terchedera 128 orang. Termasuk dalam yang chedera itu dan yang terbunuh itu sa-orang yang terbunuh di-Singapura, dan yang terchedera, termasuk tujuh di-Singapura—ini dalam bilangan Commonwealth, 64 terbunuh 128 terchedera. Pasokan Keselamatan Malaysia yang terbunuh 47 orang dan yang terchedera 53 orang. Orang² 'awam yang terbunuh 36 orang, tertawan 4 orang dan yang terchedera termasuk 32 orang daripada yang chedera di-Singapura—53 orang.

Tuan Ahmad bin Arshad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soalan tambahan. Ber-

hubung dengan orang² 'awam yang terchedera itu, saya na' bangkitkan—ada-kah warith orang² ini atau orang 'awam yang terchedera itu dapat sagu hati daripada Kerajaan kita. Sa-kiranya dapat, wang dari mana kita bagikan.

Perdana Menteri: Orang² yang mati terbunuh dalam medan peperangan dan orang² yang terchedera dalam medan peperangan dapat sagu hati daripada kutipan Defence Fund. Ini di-beri \$2,000 sa-orang yang terbunuh kepada warith-nya, dan \$1,000 kepada yang terchedera. Jadi, orang² 'awam jika nampak-nya berkaitan dengan hal perjuangan itu, di-beri juga pertolongan. Tetapi di-atas 36 orang yang terchedera itu—32 terchedera di-Singapura, jadi 4 orang terchedera di-sini—saya ta' dapat na' cerita ada-kah di-beri sagu hati atau tidak kerana saya ta' sangka na' dapat soalan yang sa-umpama ini di-keluarkan.

Wan Hassan bin Wan Daud (Tumpat): Ada-kah orang² 'awam yang telah di-tawan itu telah di-bebaskan atau pun belum di-bebaskan lagi?

Perdana Menteri: Orang yang di-tawan itu—3 orang di-Malaysia Timor: siasatan di-atas orang itu sedang di-jalankan hari ini dan belum lagi dapat khabaran; lagi sa-orang itu saya pun ta' tahu di-mana berangkali di-sana juga, tidak dapat khabaran juga. Tetapi hal ini pegawai kita yang ada di-Indonesia telah pun bekerjasama dengan pihak Indonesia untuk menyiasat lagi dan belum dapat lagi keputusan.

BANTUAN TENTERA WATANIAH DALAM PROJEK² PEMBANGUNAN LUAR BANDAR

4. Tuan Ahmad bin Arshad bertanya kepada Menteri Pertahanan:

(a) berapa kali-kah Tentera Wataniah telah membantu dalam projek² Pembangunan Luar Bandar dan dalam bidang perkhidmatan apakah bantuan² tersebut telah di-beri;

(b) sama ada mereka di-bayar apa² elau daripada Kumpulan Wang Pembangunan Negara dan Luar Bandar; dan

(c) sama ada bantuan yang suchi ini akan di-perluas lagi kepada lain² bidang perkhidmatan, mithal-nya dalam bidang ugama, pelajaran dewasa dan perkhidmatan kesihatan.

Menteri Pertahanan (Tun Haji Abdul Razak): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sahingga hari ini Tentera Wataniah telah membantu dalam projek² Pembangunan Luar Bandar sa-banyak 33 kali. Bantuan² itu di-beri bagi membena jambatan² kayu dan jambatan Bailey (Bailey bridge), membena dan membaiki jalan enam kaki atau jeep track, dan membena tempat bekalan ayer. Bantuan² ini ada-lah sa-benar-nya dibuat sa-bagai latehan² kerja dan dijalankan dalam masa yang di-untokkan bagi latehan, dan askar² yang berkenaan itu mendapat gaji tentera yang tertentu dan tidak mendapat apa² elaun yang luar daripada itu. Bidang² bantuan itu tidak-lah akan di-luaskan oleh kerana, saperti saya kata tadi, bantuan itu telah di-beri dalam bidang latehan Tentera Wataniah itu.

Tuan Ahmad bin Arshad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soalan tambahan atas jawapan yang di-beri oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Pertahanan tadi, Saya chuma ingin tahu perkhidmatan yang suchi ini ada-kah di-arah oleh Kementerian Pertahanan atau pun dikehendaki oleh masyarakat di-tempat itu melalu² Pembangunan Luar Bandar Daerah?

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: Bantuan ini di-beri dengan persetujuan daripada Kementerian Pertahanan sa-lepas mendapat permintaan atau pun chadangan daripada pehak yang berkenaan, sama ada Jawatan-kuasa Kemajuan Daerah atau pun Kerajaan Negeri.

EXPANSION OF THE MALAYSIAN ARMED FORCES

5. Tuan Ong Kee Hui (Sarawak) (*under S.O. 24 (2)*) asks the Minister of Defence, in view of his statement in Penang, as reported in *Straits Times* of September 3, "that with the restoration of peace with Indonesia, the Government has no intention to make any substantial increase in the strength

of the armed forces", whether it is still the intention of the Government to double the Malaysian Army to nearly 20 battalions as announced by the Prime Minister in July this year.

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: It has always been the policy of the Government to raise adequate Armed Forces for the Defence of our land and the protection of our shores; and with this objective in view, the Government has approved an expansion plan of our Armed Forces. Confrontation has given urgency to the implementation of this plan, and the restoration of peace likewise will not materially affect the ultimate expansion. When the Prime Minister made his statement in July, he was only referring to the overall strength of the fighting units in the Malaysian Army. When I said that the Government had no intention of making any substantial increase in the strength of our Armed Forces, I meant that we will only increase the strength of our Armed Forces to an extent sufficient for the defence of our land against internal subversion and external infiltration and the protection of our shores and we will not go beyond this limit.

Tuan Ong Kee Hui: Sir, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister of Defence, how the withdrawal of Commonwealth forces from East Malaysia affect the situation.

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: The withdrawal of the Commonwealth forces from East Malaysia will mean that we will have to send more troops to East Malaysia, and we are now doing that.

Tuan Ong Kee Hui: Sir, would the Honourable the Minister of Defence consider, in expansion of the Malaysian forces, recruitment in East Malaysia?

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: Mr Speaker, Sir, that is being done now and will continue to be done. Recruitment to our Armed Forces will be open to all citizens of our country, whether they are from the East Malaysia or West Malaysia.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: What efforts has the Ministry of Defence taken to train the indigenous people, or the people from Eastern Malaysia for the officer corps of our Armed Forces?

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: Efforts are being made to train them in all our training units here, and I would like to state that at the moment we have 4 battalions of the Malaysian Rangers and the majority of the men of this regiment come from Eastern Malaysia.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Can the Honourable Minister of Defence inform this House, very roughly, how many of the people from Eastern Malaysia are being trained in the F.M.C. for future careers in the Army?

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: I must have notice for this question. I have not got the exact figures but, as I have said, we will train as many suitable men as we can find, because it is our intention to recruit for our Armed Forces citizens of this country from all parts of our country.

GAJI GURU PELAJARAN DEWASA

6. Tuan Haji Abdul Samad bin Gul Ahmad Mianji (Pasar Mas Hulu) bertanya kepada Menteri Pembangunan Negara dan Luar Bandar berapa banyak gaji yang lazimnya di-bayar kepada sa-orang guru pelajaran dewasa.

The Assistant Minister of National and Rural Development (Tuan Sulaiman bin Bulon): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bagi pengetahuan Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Pasir Mas Ulu, saya sukachita menyatakan bahawa guru² pelajaran dewasa tidak bergaji. Tetapi mereka chuma di-bayar elaun mengajar sa-banyak \$4 bagi satu² jam ia mengajar di-kelas² dewasa. Guru Pelajaran Dewasa menerima gaji kurang.

7. Tuan Abdul Samad bin Gul Ahmad Mianji bertanya kepada Menteri Pembangunan Negara dan Luar Bandar jika dia sedar ada berlaku guru² pelajaran dewasa menerima gaji yang

kurang dan gaji itu tidak pula di-bayar tiap² bulan.

Tuan Sulaiman bin Bulon: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-tahu saya tidak ada berlaku perkara yang saperti itu. Harus juga soalan ini di-bawa oleh Yang Berhormat itu dengan berasaskan pendapatnya bahawa guru² kelas dewasa itu di-beri gaji. Sunggoh pun demikian sukachita saya menyatakan bahawa elaun yang di-bayar kepada guru² pelajaran dewasa ada-lah bergantung di-atas jumlah masa dan bilangan kelas² yang di-ajar oleh mereka itu. Ini ada-lah bermakna bahawa jumlah² elaun bagi guru² itu pada tiap² bulan tidak-lah tetap, kerana mereka di-bayar mengikut masa, jumlah jam mereka mengajar di-dalam satu² bulan itu.

Tuan Abdul Samad bin Gul Ahmad Mianji: Soalan tambahan. Ada didapati berlaku kejadian di-kawasan saya di-mana sa-orang guru dewasa tidak menerima elaun—kalau ini dinamakan elaun—dia tidak menerima elaun itu tiap² bulan, dia terima dua bulan sa-kali baharu dia terima elaun itu. Ada berlaku kejadian itu di-Pasir Mas.

Tuan Sulaiman bin Bulon: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau sa-kira-nya berlaku, patut-lah perkara itu dirujukkan kepada Kementerian saya supaya boleh di-siasat, dan boleh jadi dua bulan sa-kali di-bayar itu ia-lah mengikut masa yang dia mengajar dan mengikut kelas yang di-ajar-nya, dan kalau dua bulan sa-kali di-bayar tidak-lah pula kita tidak membayar gaji kepada guru² itu.

Tuan Wan Hassan bin Wan Daud: Soalan tambahan. Ada-kah jumlah masa itu di-hadkan kepada sa-orang guru itu sa-bulan berapa² jam, umpama-nya, begitu juga jumlah kelas di-hadkan kepada sa-orang guru, umpama-nya 3 atau 4 kelas?

Tuan Sulaiman bin Bulon: Ya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Dalam satu minggu di-hadkan sa-kurang²-nya 3 kali atau 3 jam, dan sa-orang guru itu di-hadkan mengajar dalam 4 kelas satu orang.

EXEMPTION OF FINGER PRINTING OF OFFENDERS UNDER MINOR TRAFFIC OFFENCES

8. Tuan Chia Chin Shin (Sarawak) asks the Minister of Home Affairs to state whether Government will consider exempting persons convicted under minor traffic offences from finger prints taken even though there is provision in the law for any person who has been convicted of an offence punishable by a fine of or exceeding one hundred dollars in view of public opinion.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Tun Dr Ismail): The law on the registration of criminals is about to be revised. The exclusion of minor traffic offences for the purpose of taking finger prints will be considered in the Draft Bill when it is presented to the House.

AHLI² PARTI POLITIK MENJALANKAN GERAKAN² ME-MECHAH-BELAHKAN ORANG² KAMPONG

9. Tuan Sulaiman bin Haji Taib (Krian Laut) bertanya kepada Menteri Hal Ehwal Dalam Negeri ada-kah Kerajaan sedar ia-itu ada ahli² dan penganut² sa-buah parti politik di-dalam negeri ini sedang menjalankan pulau memulau di-kalangan masyarakat kampung dengan tujuan hendak mempertahankan dan meluaskan pengaruh siasah mereka dan telah menimbulkan perpechahan, pehak memihak dan pergadahan di-kampung², terutama sa-kali di-Krian Laut, dan jika sedar, apa-kah tindakan yang telah di-ambil oleh Kerajaan bagi menghapuskan gerakan ini.

Tun Dr Ismail: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Kerajaan memang-lah sedar bahawa pernah terjadi di-masa² yang lalu, terutama-nya di-kalangan orang² kampung Malaysia Barat, terdapat ahli² politik yang membiarkan diri mereka di-pengarohi oleh aliran politik dalam hubungan kemasyarakatan mereka dengan orang² ramai.

Walau bagaimana pun, sa-takat ini belum lagi terdapat bukti² yang menunjukkan bahawa ada parti² politik tertentu yang menjalankan penindasan ka-atas orang² kampung. Dalam hal ini

Kerajaan, masa yang sudah, telah mengambil tindakan yang tegas ka-atas pelampau² yang menjalankan penindasan dan pechah-belah di-kalangan ra'ayat dan Kerajaan akan terus menerus mengambil tindakan untuk memelihara Perlembagaan sa-berapa yang terdaya.

IMPORT AND EXPORT TRADE THROUGH SINGAPORE

10. Dr Tan Chee Khoon asks the Minister of Finance to clarify his statement that the "time is coming when my country will no longer do its export and import trade through neighbouring Singapore".

The Minister of Finance (Tuan Tan Siew Sin): Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not think that the Honourable Member has quoted me strictly accurately. What I said was that the time was coming when Malaysia could handle more and more of its own trade. There is nothing extraordinary about this statement. Every self-respecting and independent country in the world and every loyal citizen of such a country—I repeat that the operative word is "loyal"—would like to see that such a country handle more and more of its own trade through its own ports. The situation which has arisen now, whereby nearly 40 per cent of our trade is handled by a port in a foreign country is clearly a relic of the colonial past, when the ruling power treated the whole area as one economic unit and ruled it as one unit, in spite of the legal fiction of separate political administrations. As a result, the financial and commercial centre of the former Federation of Malaya, and now Malaysia, was and still is situated outside our own shores. I am only suggesting that the present status clearly cannot continue forever as a result of the inexorable logic of circumstances. For example, I do not think that we or anyone else affected, should feel resentful if Indonesia were to decide that as time goes on her own ports should handle more and more of her own trade rather than allow such trade to pass through Penang,

Port Swettenham or other non-Indonesian ports. In fact, we should regard it as a natural and inevitable development, if we have any sense at all.

There are also economic consequences to the proposition that we should handle more of our own trade; such a move would clearly mean more employment opportunities for our own people, particularly as one of our most important tasks in the future will be to ensure employment opportunities for our rapidly growing population. I hope Honourable Members opposite will agree that my first duty is to Malaysia and not to a foreign port (*Applause*). I hope Honourable Members opposite will also agree that, if I have to choose between Penang, Port Swettenham and/or other Malaysian ports on the one hand and a foreign port on the other, there is no dispute as to where the choice should lie. There may be room for disagreement as to the methods to be adopted and in regard to the pace of change, but I suggest that there is no room for argument, assuming of course, that we are loyal citizens of this country and I should emphasise again in the strongest possible term that the operative word is "loyal" as to what the ultimate objective must be. In fact, I always assumed that this was a self-evident truth. What I said in Washington should have caused no more surprise than if I have said that the sun will rise tomorrow morning. If the moment of truth has not arrived for certain Honourable Members of the Opposition, I suggest that it is clear where their real sympathies lie and we, on this side of the House, should be grateful that at last they have betrayed their true feelings.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: It is the habit of the Ministers sitting opposite us in this House, and not only sitting opposite of this House but outside this House, to label us on this side of the House as being disloyal, and that loyalty is the prerogative of those sitting opposite me and not we on this side of the House (*Interruption*). Mr Speaker, Sir, the Member for Johor Tenggara wants to muzzle me,

while I am trying to clarify. The Minister has made a long speech instead of giving me a short reply. He should have brought the Minister to task. (*Interruption*).

Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not wish to have any *tukar fikiran* with him—*tukar fikiran* with the Minister of Finance. Mr Speaker, Sir, if I may make another comment, I entirely agree with the Minister that we should take care to see that our ports are utilised to the maximum extent, that we should see to it that more and more of our exports and imports are diverted through our own ports. (*Interruption*).

Mr Speaker: I am still waiting for your supplementary question. (*Laughter*).

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Yes, I am coming to it now, Mr Speaker, Sir, the question that I wish to pose to the Minister is this: the apprehension not only in my own mind but also in the minds of the business circle—and here I do not speak for the business circle—is the pace of the diversion that the country or the Minister may order. Is he aware that port facilities are not built overnight? Is he also aware that trading connections are also not built overnight? Is he also aware that it may well take a generation or more to establish trading links and port facilities, in order to see that our exports and imports go out and come in through our own ports?

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, I can assure the Honourable Member opposite and all others, who may have apprehensions on this score, that in making any changes the Government will take all relevant factors into consideration.

Dr Lim Chong Eu (Tanjong): Mr Speaker, Sir, I fully appreciate the attempt by the Honourable Minister of Finance to try and define the word "loyalty" in general terms, particularly when he refers to other ports in relation to national ports. However, this particular question refers to the Port of Singapore, and in view of the

fact that the Government chooses on one day to include loyalty to mean Singapore and the next day change it to mean not including Singapore, and on a further day to tell us that at some subsequent date there may be a reunification of the two areas, how in the wide world does the Honourable Minister of Finance choose so precisely to define this term "loyalty"?

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Following on what the Honourable Member for Tanjong has said, is the Honourable Minister of Finance aware that none other than the Honourable Prime Minister of this country, after passing a night or after partaking of a hearty meal with a Minister in a foreign land, spouted out, "We will work harmoniously together". Is that in consonance with this implied threat that has been uttered by the Honourable Minister of Finance?

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, there is nothing incompatible between the statement of the Honourable Prime Minister that it is our intention to co-operate to the maximum possible extent with Singapore and my statement that we should try to handle more and more of our own trade. I think the two are entirely separate issues. I cannot understand why the Honourable Member is so concerned about Singapore.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: On a point of clarification, since the Honourable Minister of Finance has invited me—my record in this House when the Singaporeans were in this House stands that I have in no uncertain term consistently attacked the representatives of the P.A.P. in this House. (*Applause*) (*Laughter*) (SEVERAL HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Shame!).

Mr Speaker, Sir, the question I wish to pose is this: how does the statement made by the Honourable Minister of Finance just now tally or add up with what he told Patrick Kellien some time ago that "a Customs Order on a piece of paper will do the trick". How do these two statements add up?

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, I was only stating a fact, but it is of course an entirely different matter whether it is necessary to do what may have to be done.

SURVEY OF GOVERNMENT REVENUES AND EXPENDITURE

11. Tuan Ong Kee Hui (*under S.O. 24 (2)*) asks the Minister of Finance to state, in view of the steep decline in the price of rubber and its far-reaching adverse effects on the economy of Malaysia, whether he would consider as a matter of urgency an immediate survey of government revenues and expenditure with a view to curbing extravagance in the dispensation of public funds.

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, in my reply to the question by the same Honourable Member—not the Honourable Member who posed the question but the Honourable Member in whose name the question is put at a meeting of this House in March this year, on the subject of our economy drive, I explained in some detail the measures that had been taken to reduce public expenditure. I do not wish to waste the time of this House by repeating what I said then, except to say that in so far as the Treasury is concerned, the economy drive is a continuing process. It never stops though we may not say much about it in public. The question of an immediate survey does not, therefore, arise because both public revenue and public expenditure are constantly under review in the Treasury.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Does this economy drive extend to—I will not talk about orbital missions by Ministers—Members of Parliament travelling abroad? Mr Speaker, Sir, I refer in particular to two Members of Parliament who were recalled to this country for the "Black Day" in this country, when the Constitution was changed on September 19th. These people came back at C.P.A. expence. Subsequently, two of them were allowed to go back to Canada—one landed in hospital. How does this tally with

the assurance given by the Honourable Minister of Finance?

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, we clearly had to have some senior Members of Parliament at important functions. That was the sole reason why we allowed them to go back. We clearly could not leave the field to his colleague who would then lead our delegation, in view of the fact that its more senior members would have to be in this House itself.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Is the Honourable Minister of Finance aware that, when Dr Adam Malik and the Deputy Prime Minister returned from Jakarta, this Government declared a holiday for Selangor. Was he aware that in declaring that holiday the Governments—Federal and State—and Municipality had to pay overtime, perhaps, to the tune of \$0.5 million. Is that in consonance with this economy drive that we should waste \$0.5 million? I hope the Minister will not talk with his tongue in his cheek.

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, I would suggest that that was a small price to pay for the ending of confrontation. (*Applause*) (*Laughter*).

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: It may be a small price to pay for the ending of confrontation. But, Mr Speaker, Sir, \$0.5 million is a big sum of money, I can assure the Honourable Minister of Finance, particularly to the ra'ayat in this country.

Mr Speaker: I must say that I have been very lenient to the Honourable Member in not putting his supplementary question. (*Laughter*). You are not supposed to answer back!

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Sir, will the Honourable Minister of Finance clarify whether the ending of confrontation was effected by the declaration of a public holiday in Selangor, or was it effected by the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister going to Bangkok?

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, you cannot prevent the people of this country expressing their joy.

AUTOMATIC TELEPHONE EXCHANGES FOR MUKAH, DALAT AND BALINGIAN DISTRICTS, SARAWAK

12. Tuan Sim Boon Liang (Sarawak): asks the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications to state:

- (a) when will an Automatic Exchange for Telephones in Mukah, Dalat and Balingian Districts be installed;
- (b) why there are delays in trunk calls between Mukah, Dalat, Sibü, Balingian and Kuching; and
- (c) whether Government will put more lines in the area to cater adequately with the number of telephone calls.

The Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications (Tan Sri V. T. Sambanthan): Mr Speaker, Sir, the conversion of manually operated exchanges to automatic working is dependent on economic considerations such as whether the existing manually operated exchange equipment can be extended economically and efficiently. Manual exchanges will, therefore, be converted to automatic working only when it is economical to do so, as otherwise there will be wastage of public funds. In the case of Balingian, work is going ahead to phase in with improvements currently being undertaken there to provide better quality junctions between Bintulu, Balingian and Mukah. It is hoped that work at Balingian will be completed in 1967.

In the case of Mukah and Dalat telephone exchanges, it is hoped to convert them to automatic working during the First Malaysia Plan.

With regard to question (b), it is appreciated that there are delays on trunk calls between the places mentioned by the Honourable Member. These delays occurred during certain peak periods due to the shortage of lines between the places concerned. The Government has already provided a sum of \$795,000 this year for the provision of additional trunk lines between telephone exchanges in Sarawak. A nine channel radio link was provided recently between Sibü and

Mukah, and a further nine channel link is being provided between Balingian and Bintulu. Next year we shall be providing additional funds amounting to nearly \$900,000 for further improvement of trunk communication in Sarawak. I must, however, point out to the Honourable Member that telecommunication equipment takes time to obtain and install.

NEGARA² YANG MEMESAN BUKU² BAHASA KEBANGSAAN DARI DEWAN BAHASA DAN PUSTAKA BAGI UNIVERSITI DAN YAYASAN² PENGAJIAN TINGGI

13. Tuan Ahmad bin Arshad bertanya kepada Menteri Pelajaran:

- (a) berapa bilangan dan apa nama negara² yang telah memesan buku² Bahasa Kebangsaan dari Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka untuk penggunaan di-Universiti² dan Yayasan² Pengajian Tinggi;
- (b) sama ada buku² tersebut telah di-hantar atas dasar bertukar² atau dengan di-jual.

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Tuan Senu bin Abdul Rahman): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tidak kurang daripada 12 buah negara² luar telah memesan buku² bahasa kebangsaan daripada Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka dan di-antara negara² tersebut ia-lah Arab Saudi, Republic Arab Bersatu, Australia, Amerika, Korea Selatan, Jepun, Filipina, New Zealand, Thailand, United Kingdom, Holland dan Russia.

Di-Amerika sahaja enam buah universiti dan sa-buah perpustakaan, ia-itu Library of Congress telah memesan buku² bahasa kebangsaan daripada Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Di-Australia lima buah, di-Jepun dua buah, di-Philipina dua buah dan lain² negara masing² sa-buah.

Russia telah memesan buku² bahasa kebangsaan melalui sa-buah negeri Eropah. Sa-bahagian daripada buku² ini di-jual dan sa-bahagian daripadanya ia-lah di-beri atas dasar bertukar².

Tuan Ahmad bin Arshad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soalan tambahan atas jawapan yang telah di-beri oleh Pemangku Menteri Pelajaran tadi. Dapat-kah Kementerian ini menyatakan kepada saya dan juga kepada Dewan ini bahawa di-antara tujuan dan maksud mustahak-nya negara² itu menggunakan buku² kita itu, apa mustahak-nya yang mereka hendak menggunakan buku² kita?

Tuan Senu bin Abdul Rahman: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jawapan-nya saya rasa sangat senang dengan kerana negara² yang tersebut memang memerlukan mengetahui bahasa² asing dan dengan memesan buku² daripada Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka dan dengan kita pula memberi buku² yang tersebut ada-lah daripada jalan meluaskan lagi bahasa kita ini di-pengetahuan penduduk² di-seluruh dunia.

KEMAJUAN BAHASA KEBANGSAAN DI-SABAH

14. Pengiran Tahir Petra (Sabah) bertanya kepada Menteri Pelajaran:

- (a) bagaimana-kah pandangan-nya terhadap kemajuan Bahasa Kebangsaan di-Sabah semenjak negeri itu mengadakan sambutan Minggu Bahasa Kebangsaan-nya yang pertama beberapa bulan yang lalu; dan ada-kah kemungkinan bagi Bahasa Kebangsaan menjadi Bahasa Rasmi yang tunggal di-Sabah dalam tahun 1973; ia-itu sa-sudah 10 tahun Sabah Merdeka menerusi Malaysia; dan
- (b) sama ada beliau menyambut baik usul yang di-kemukakan di-dalam Majlis Dewan Ra'ayat, meminta Kerajaan menubuhkan sa-buah chawangan Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka di-Malaysia Timor, dan jika ya, nyatakan sama ada chawangan itu akan ditubuhkan di-Sabah atau di-Sarawak, dan juga nyatakan langkah² yang Kerajaan berchandang hendak ambil di-Sabah sa-belum chawangan tersebut ditubuhkan.

Tuan Senu bin Abdul Rahman: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Kementerian Pelajaran

merasa sangat puas hati dengan kejayaan pelancharan Minggu Bahasa Kebangsaan yang pertama di-Sabah. Saya yakin bahawa Kerajaan Sabah akan memperhebatkan lagi kempen bahasa kebangsaan dari sa-masa kamasama sa-bagaimana yang di-lakukan di-Malaysia Barat dan dengan chara yang demikian, tiap² orang warga negara Sabah akan menyedari peri mustahak-nya mempelajari bahasa kebangsaan yang akan menjadi bahasa rasmi di-Sabah dalam tahun 1973 sabagaimana yang terkanun dalam Perlembagaan Persekutuan.

Dengan kerjasama dan perasaan ta'at setia dari tiap² warga negara, saya perchaya bahasa kebangsaan dapat di-jadikan bahasa rasmi bukan sahaja di-Sabah tetapi juga di-seluruh Malaysia sa-belum tahun 1973.

Saya suka membetulkan perchakapan Ahli Yang Berhormat berkenaan dengan kenyataan-nya tentang ada-nya usul untuk menubuhkan satu chawangan Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka di-Malaysia Timor. Perkara ini sa-mata² di-timbulkan oleh salah sa-orang Ahli Yang Berhormat apabila Dewan ini membinchangkan Rang Undang² Pindaan Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka. Saya bersetuju bahawa satu chawangan Dewan Bahasa hendak-lah di-tubuhkan di-Malaysia Timor untuk memajukan perkembangan bahasa kebangsaan dan kesusteraan dan menjalankan tugas²-nya sa-bagaimana yang terkandung dalam Undang² Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka. Walau bagaimana pun, Kerajaan Pusat hendak-lah membinchangkan perkara ini dahulu dengan Kerajaan Negeri Sabah dan Sarawak mengenai kemungkinan untuk menubuhkan satu chawangan Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka di-Malaysia Timor.

Masaalah tapak chawangan Dewan tersebut, jika dan bila chadangan ini di-timbangan, terpaksa juga di-binchangkan dan di-persetujui lebeh dahulu.

PEMBENAAN SEKOLAH MENENGAH RENDAH KEBANGSAAN DI-SUNGAI BESAR, SABAK BERNAM

15. Dato' Haji Mustapha bin Haji Abdul Jabar (Sabak Bernam) bertanya

kapada Menteri Pelajaran sama ada beliau sedar ia-itu mustahak di-dirikan sa-buah Sekolah Menengah Rendah Kebangsaan di-Sungai Besar, untuk mengatasi kesulitan² yang di-alami oleh 296 orang murid² sekolah menengah, yang pada masa ini menumpang sa-chara sementara di-Sekolah Kebangsaan, Sungai Haji Dorani, Parit 9, dan di-Sekolah Ugama, Sungai Besar; jika sedar, sama ada Kementerian Pelajaran akan mendirikan sa-buah Sekolah Menengah Rendah Kebangsaan di-Sungai Besar, dalam tahun 1967.

Tuan Senu bin Abdul Rahman: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Kementerian Pelajaran memang sedar tentang perlu-nya di-dirikan sa-buah Sekolah Menengah Rendah di-Sungai Besar. Rancangan² telah sedia untuk pembenaan sekolah saperti itu dan ada-lah di-harap sekolah itu akan dapat di-siapkan dalam tahun 1967.

PENUNTUT² MELAYU YANG BERHENTI DARI SEKOLAH MENENGAH GERSIK, JOHOR

16. Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah (Bachok) bertanya kapada Menteri Pelajaran apa-kah langkah² yang telah di-ambil atau yang akan di-ambil oleh Kementerian beliau berkenaan dengan 60 orang penuntut² Melayu yang telah berhenti daripada Sekolah Menengah Gersik, Johor, baharu² ini; dan adakah Kementerian Pelajaran ada apa² bukti tentang wujud-nya "Kempen Jahiliah" yang menegah pelajar² menuntut di-Sekolah Menengah Rendah Kerajaan.

Tuan Senu bin Abdul Rahman: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bagi sementara waktu ini Jabatan Pelajaran Johor sedang menchari satu tempat yang sesuai untuk menampung 40 orang murid² yang tidak dapat berulang alek ka-Gersik. Jabatan itu telah juga memberi dan akan terus memberi bantuan kapada murid² yang memohon tukar sekolah berhampiran dengan rumah masing² dan lagi Kementerian sedang mengkaji kemungkinan membena sa-buah lagi Sekolah Menengah Rendah di-kawasan, atau pun berhampiran

dengan kawasan di-mana murid² itu tinggal.

Berkenaan bahagian kedua soalan itu, Kementerian tidak sedar tentang apa yang di-katakan "Kempen Jahiliah" yang menggagalkan kemasokan murid² ka-Sekolah² Menengah Rendah Kerajaan di-Johor.

Tuan Abdul Samad bin Gul Ahmad Mianji: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soalan tambahan. Dalam lawatan Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran ka-Kelantan lebeh kurang tiga bulan dahulu, beliau telah mengadakan satu rapat umum di-Pasir Puteh dan telah membidas pemimpin² politik sa-tengah²-nya daripada negeri Kelantan mengadakan, menjalankan, Kempen Jahiliah menyekat anak² Melayu daripada negeri Kelantan untuk menyambong pelajaran-nya ka-sekolah² menengah. Inilah yang di-kemukakan soalan ini. Jadi, kalau-lah jawapan Yang Berhormat Pemangku Menteri Pelajaran ini mengatakan Kerajaan tidak sedar atas masaalah ini, apa-kah patut sa-orang Menteri Pelajaran dengan tidak sedar, atau pun dengan sa-chara yang tidak betul, menudoh pehak Kerajaan Negeri Kelantan ini mengadakan Kempen Jahiliah bagi menyekat anak² Melayu bagi menyambong pelajaran-nya ka-sekolah menengah ini.

Tuan Senu bin Abdul Rahman: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, barangkali soalan ini di-dalam pengetahuan Menteri Pelajaran sendiri, dan saya di-sini chuma sa-bagai pemangku sahaja.

KEMAJUAN MEMBENA SEKOLAH² MENENGAH UGAMA

17. Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah bertanya kepada Menteri Pelajaran apa-kah kemajuan yang telah di-chapai oleh Kementerian beliau dalam usaha hendak membena Sekolah² Menengah Ugama, yang kelak akan menjadi tangga asas kepada penubohan sa-buah Universiti Islam di-negeri kita ini.

Tuan Senu bin Abdul Rahman: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Kementerian saya sekarang sedang mengadakan perbin-

changan dengan pehak berkuasa Negeri bagi mendapatkan persetujuan mereka kepada chadangan Kementerian untuk mengambil aleh sa-buah sekolah ugama ra'ayat tiap² Negeri untuk di-jadikan chontoh Sekolah Menengah Kebangsaan yang mengutamakan pengajian ugama Islam.

Pada peringkat ini terlalu awal bagi saya menyatakan sama ada chara ini akan membawa kepada penubohan sa-buah Universiti Islam.

TAWARAN PERKHIDMATAN SUKARELA DARIPADA GURU² WANITA DARI HAWAII DAN TAHITI

18. Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah bertanya kepada Menteri Pelajaran apa-kah langkah² yang telah di-ambil oleh Kementerian beliau, hingga sekarang, sa-bagai menyahut tawaran daripada guru² wanita dari Pulau Hawaii dan Pulau Tahiti yang ingin berkhidmat di-Malaysia sa-chara sukarela.

Tuan Senu bin Abdul Rahman: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Kementerian Pelajaran tidak mengetahui tentang tawaran ini, tetapi jika Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Bachok ada menerima tawaran dari guru² perempuan itu boleh-lah dia memberi tahu Kementerian Pelajaran (*Ketawa*).

MEDICAL AND HOUSING FACILITIES FOR TEACHERS IN SARAWAK

19. Tuan Sim Boon Liang (Sarawak) asks the Minister of Education whether the Government will consider providing medical and housing facilities to all teachers in Sarawak either in Government, Local Councils, or other Aided Schools, and if not, will the Minister state the reasons for not providing such facilities.

Tuan Senu bin Abdul Rahman: Mr Speaker, Sir, as this subject is within the jurisdiction of the Sarawak Government, I regret that I am not in a position to reply to this question.

**KERETA² AMBULAN UNTUK
PUSAT² KESIHATAN DI-SELANGOR
DAN LANGKAH² DI-AMBIL
UNTOK MEMBAIKI
KERETA² AMBULAN YANG
BUROK DI-SABAK BERNAM**

20. Dato' Haji Mustapha bin Abdul Jabar bertanya kepada Menteri Kesihatan:

- (a) berapa jumlah bilangan kereta² ambulan yang di-untokkan bagi Pusat² Kesihatan di-Selangor, pada tahun 1964, 1965 dan 1966, dan siapa-kah yang bertanggung-jawab dalam membahagikan kereta² ambulan itu;
- (b) sama ada Kementerian tersebut sedar bahawa kereta² ambulan di-Sabak Bernam ada-lah didalam keadaan yang burok, dan selalu terpaksa di-hantar ka-wokshop² di-Klang, Kuala Lumpur dan Telok Anson untok di-baiki, dengan itu menyebabkan kesusahan² besar kapada orang² sakit yang berkehendakkan rawatan segera di-rumah² sakit di-Klang dan di-Kuala Lumpur; jika sedar, nyatakan langkah² yang telah di-ambil oleh Kementerian untok mengatasi kesulitan² ini.

Menteri Kesihatan (Tuan Bahaman bin Samsudin): (a) Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kereta² ambulan, biasa-nya, tidak di-simpan di-Pusat² Kesihatan tetapi di-rumah² sakit. Ketua Pegawai Perubatan dan Kesihatan Negeri adalah bertanggung-jawab untok membahagikan kereta² ambulan itu didalam negeri-nya mengikut keperluan di-tempat² itu. Ada juga lain² kereta saperti Land Rover yang di-berikan kapada Pusat² Kesihatan untok di-gunakan terutama sa-kali membawa kakitangan² menjalankan tugas-nya ka-kawasan². Kereta itu ada-lah di-lengkapi sa-chukup-nya untok membawa orang² sakit ka-rumah² sakit di-waktu kechemasan.

(b) Saya sedar bahawa kereta² ambulan di-Sabak Bernam ada-lah dalam keadaan burok dan selalu hendak di-perbetulkan. Tetapi semantara itu sa-buah kereta dari Klang telah di-hantar ka-Sabak Bernam untok

di-gunakan. Kementerian ini sekarang sedang menimbangkan untok meng-ganti kereta² yang telah tua itu.

**EMPLOYMENT OF GRADUATES
WHO PASSED THE SOCIETY OF
RADIOGRAPHERS EXAMINA-
TION BY GOVERNMENT**

21. Dr Tan Chee Khoon asks the Minister of Health the reason why the first batch of eleven graduates who passed the Society of Radiographers Examination have not found employment with the Government as yet. If there are no vacancies what then is the justification for starting such a course and for continuing to train two further batches of trainees numbering 25 in all. Is the Minister aware that Dr Omar bin Din is reported to have stated in the *Straits Times* of 30th September, 1966, that his Department alone needed another 24 radiographers in addition to the existing staff and that the East Coast was in "dire need" of radiographers. If so, why are these 11 trained radiographers not employed.

Tuan Bahaman bin Shamsudin: Mr Speaker, Sir, the proper Scheme of Service for directly recruited Radiographers was not finalised until recently. Hence, the first batch of 11 graduates have not found employment in the Ministry. The Public Services Commission have now advertised for such Radiographers and an interview will be held soon to select the suitable candidates.

There are vacancies to absorb these graduates. Those who will be successful in future training programmes, will also be employed because of the expanding Radiographers Service.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: May I ask the Minister of Health, why in starting a training scheme, a School of Radiography, in this country, he has not thought it fit to draw up a Scheme of Service for these people? I believe there is already in existence a Scheme of Service for Radiographers. Can the Honourable Minister tell us the difference between the old scheme and the scheme mentioned by him just now?

Tuan Bahaman bin Samsudin: The Old Scheme of Service started with a salary of \$452 which is a rather high starting salary for Radiographers, and the new scheme is different from the old one. The old scheme was actually meant for European officers, and the present one is meant for our local officers.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Can the Honourable Minister of Health tell us what is the new Scheme of Service that he now talks about which is before the Public Services Commission?

Tuan Bahaman bin Samsudin: I cannot give the Honourable Member the Scheme of Service offhand because I have not got it here with me.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: It is incredible, Sir. I had filed this question and the Minister should have thought that I would be asking supplementary questions on this. I entirely agree with the Minister that the old salary is far too high and is a relic of the colonial days, where a Radiographer after two years training gets \$452 and it consists of only four or five years' timescale. However, I would be very grateful if the Minister will give an indication as to what is the proposed timescale, because it really is of utmost importance not only to those who have graduated but to all those who are under training and those who may be thinking in terms of getting such training. I can assure the Minister that at least one person who joined the school got out of it in double quick time and went for another interview where I was present.

Tuan Bahaman bin Samsudin: I will let him have the new Scheme of Service, Sir. I do not have it here now.

PROPOSED HOSPITAL IN MUKAH, SARAWAK

22. Tuan Sim Boon Liang asks the Minister of Health to state what is the cause of the delay in the construction of the proposed Hospital in Mukah (for the need of 40,000 people in the District) where the suitable site of land for the Hospital is available now and when will the work start.

Tuan Bahaman bin Samsudin: Mr Speaker, Sir, the cause for the delay is non-availability of funds in 1966 and 1967. The construction of this Hospital is now scheduled to start in 1968.

(Answers to Oral Questions not taken as Question Time was up, are given below):

EXPORT AND IMPORT STATISTICS FOR 1965, SARAWAK

23. Tuan Chia Chin Shin asks the Minister of Commerce and Industry to state the figures for the year 1965 for Sarawak in respect of the following:

- (a) Gross Exports at f.o.b. value;
- (b) Gross Imports at c.i.f. value;
- (c) Balance of Trade.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Dr Lim Swee Aun): The 1965 Trade Figures for Sarawak are as follows:

(a) Gross Exports at f.o.b. value	...	\$433,699,071
(b) Gross Imports at c.i.f. value	...	484,861,272
(c) Balance of Trade		51,162,201

PREFERENCE FOR TRADERS IN PENANG IN NORMALISATION OF TRADE BETWEEN PENANG AND NORTH INDONESIA

24. Dr Lim Chong Eu asks the Minister of Commerce and Industry to assure this House that he will take necessary steps to ensure that the traders in Penang, who have previously engaged in trade between the Island of Penang and North Indonesia and who in consequence to confrontation have suffered serious hardship during the period of confrontation, will be given preference in the "normalisation" of this traditional trade.

Dr Lim Swee Aun: The normalisation of trade relations between Malaysia and Indonesia is at present being negotiated. Although the broad principle relating to normalisation has been agreed to, several working details have yet to be discussed and worked

out. Until these details are known it is too early to have a clear picture of what form of trading there will be in the future.

However, I can assure the Honourable Member that I will always bear in mind the interests of *bona fide* traditional barter traders.

**PORT LABOUR BOARD SCHEME—
ASSISTANCE FOR DISCONTEN-
TED PORT LABOURERS IN
PENANG**

25. Dr Lim Chong Eu asks the Minister of Labour if he is aware that there is an increasing undercurrent of discontent amongst the port labourers in Penang since the introduction of the Port Labour Board Scheme, and if so, whether he will inform this House what steps he proposes to take to ensure that:

- (a) those who have been out of work by the scheme will be given suitable employment elsewhere;
- (b) those who are dissatisfied with the conditions of service in the scheme can effectively seek redress; and
- (c) all those workers will be encouraged to form a trade union as soon as possible.

The Minister of Labour (Tuan V. Manickavasagam): I am aware that there has been some discontent among some workers on the introduction of the scheme of registration of stevedoring employers and workers in Penang. The Port Labour Board which recommended these measures, and I personally have looked into the complaints of most of those who are dissatisfied and where possible all necessary action has been taken.

In discussing this question, Sir, I feel that I must recapitulate here the basic reasons for the establishment of the Port Labour Board in Penang. The Government, after considerable examination and study, came to the conclusion that the casual nature of the employment of workers in Penang Port, the method of their employment and the multiplicity of both port employers and port workers posed problems not only

affecting the standard of living of the workers and their conditions of employment but also the long term efficiency of the Port itself. The Port Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act passed by Parliament last year empowered the establishment of a Board which could study the activity of the Port and take steps to ensure that a regular and sufficient supply of labour is available for the efficient performance of Port work.

In short, a scheme of decasualisation of Port Labour had to be introduced and this clearly meant, as was, in fact, stated in this House when the Bill was moved, that the persons who depended entirely on the port work for their livelihood will be given preference for Port work as compared to those who sought work very casually in the Port to supplement their earnings elsewhere.

The Board has now after studying the rate and volume of work in the Port, decided that only 1,326 stevedores are required to meet the demands of the Port and has registered this number of stevedores. I am satisfied that, as far as possible, every endeavour has been made to register all those who depend on the Port for their entire livelihood and that the large majority of those not registered have only a very casual link with employment in the Port. The Board is keeping the size of the register under review and no doubt if the activity of the Port can justify the registration of more stevedores, the Board is duty bound to register such additional number of persons. The exercise in the Port of Penang boils down to simply this proposition whether the people who turn to the Port in their off-hours for supplementary employment should be permitted to prejudice the status, security of employment and livelihood of the many who have only the Port to seek their livelihood. The answer, I think, is obvious!

I can assure the House and the Honourable Member that every endeavour will be made to meet the needs of the genuine full-time port worker who has been displaced as a result of the registration scheme.

The Board itself is a tripartite body and the workers' representatives on it could raise any matter affecting them at its meetings. Conditions of employment, such as wages, hours of work, overtime, etc., are studied by the Wages Council which has been established in Penang and this Council, like the Board, is a tripartite body, and the present conditions affecting registered workers have, in fact, been proposed and agreed to by the workers' representatives on the Council. They could always suggest any changes, where they consider these necessary.

I am afraid that neither the Board nor the Government can sponsor the formation of a trade union for these workers. I can state here, however, that one of the objects in the registration scheme and the operation of the Wages Council is that the workers concerned will be enabled to get together in appropriate organisations to further protect and promote their well-being.

**LEGISLATION TO PROTECT
LABOUR IN THE RUBBER
PLANTING INDUSTRY BE-
CAUSE OF FRAGMENTATION
OF ESTATES**

26. Tuan C. V. Devan Nair (Bungsar) asks the Minister of Labour:

(a) if his Ministry can offer an estimate of the loss of employment as well as the adverse effects on conditions of employment in the nation's rubber plantations as a consequence of the sub-division and fragmentation of estates, and if not,

(b) whether his Ministry would undertake an immediate survey with the collaboration of the N.U.P.W. and All-Malayan Estates Staff Union of the problems of labour arising from the sub-division and fragmentation of estates, with a view to recommending suitable legislation to protect the interest of labour.

Tuan V. Manickavasagam: I am not able to offer any reliable estimate of the loss of employment or effects on

conditions of employment in rubber estates as a consequence of the sub-division of such estates. These figures are not available.

The Government is, as promised in Command Paper No. 29 of 1963, keeping the rate and effects of sub-division of estates under review and appropriate action will be considered if such is found necessary.

In the circumstances, the need does not arise for collaboration with unions on this study, though any action to be taken subsequently may be discussed with them.

BILLS

**THE ROYAL MALAYSIA POLICE
(AMENDMENT) BILL, 1966**

Second Reading

**The Minister of Home Affairs and
Minister of Justice (Tun Dr Ismail):**

Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to amend the Royal Malaysia Police Act, 1963, to vest the control of components in the States of Malaya in the Inspector-General of Police and provide for the appointment of a Deputy Inspector-General of Police and for other matters connected therewith" be read a second time.

Sir, for some time, particularly after the formation of Malaysia, it has become apparent that, in the interests of the efficient administration of the Police Force and at the same time to make the best use of the services of senior police officers, the existing Headquarters of the States of Malaya component Royal Malaysia Police should be amalgamated with the Headquarters of the Inspector-General, Royal Malaysia Police. Broadly speaking, the reorganisation of the Royal Malaysia Police Force sets out to achieve greater efficiency in the service through expeditious links in the chain of command from the Inspector-General of Police to officers in charge of Police Districts and also in the reverse traffic, so that important problems emanating from Districts

will receive the attention of the Inspector-General's Headquarters in the shortest possible time. The exercise also envisages the posting of sufficiently senior Police officers at component and district levels so that problems of lesser importance can be decided on the spot. To enable the proposal to be implemented, the following actions have, among others, been made:

- (a) The post of Commissioner of Police, States of Malaya component Royal Malaysia Police, has been abolished.
- (b) The Chief Police Officers of the 10 Police Contingents in the States of Malaya now come directly under the command of the Inspector-General, Royal Malaysia Police.
- (c) The creation of the post of Deputy Inspector-General of Police, who will assist the Inspector-General of Police in the performance of his duties.

The Bill, therefore, seeks to amend the Royal Malaysia Police Act, 1963, to vest the control of components in the States of Malaya in the Inspector-General of Police and to provide for the appointment of a Deputy Inspector-General of Police. Opportunity is also taken in this Bill to delete from the said Act references to Singapore.

Sir, I beg to move.

The Minister of Finance (Tuan Tan Siew Sin): Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, I notice that this Bill seeks to harmonise the top leadership of the Police to provide for an Inspector-General of Police and a Deputy Inspector-General of Police and there are other categories of Police officers—Commissioner of Police and the like. I take it that the I.G.P., the Deputy I.G.P., the Commissioner of Police and all those in the hierarchy of the Police are there to see to the security, peace, and harmony of this country, particularly at this time of stress.

Mr Speaker, Sir, with your kind indulgence, may I say that it is the

duty of the top hierarchy of the Police to see that not only the peace, security, and harmony of this country are not impaired but also to see that those working under them do not go on a rampage, as this country has seen in the last few days. Sir, I refer particularly to the acts of subordinate officers in the Police Force who are under the direct control of the I.G.P. and the Deputy I.G.P. Now, one can understand that in a situation like this, they should be particularly concerned over the security of a very important personage that is going to come to this country. But, Mr Speaker, Sir, this important personage, namely, President Johnson

Tun Dr Ismail: Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of order—I am not averse to the debate which the Honourable Member sought yesterday, but I think it is also my duty to point out that under the Standing Orders, whenever he speaks on a matter, he must be relevant to the subject under discussion. Now, the Bill that I have brought before the House is an Act to amend the structure of the Police Force and it has nothing to do with the functions at all. I would like to bring this to your notice, Sir, and I think the Honourable Member is irrelevant.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, as I have pointed out just now, this Bill seeks, as the Minister has stated, to amend the structure of the Police Force, the I.G.P., the Deputy I.G.P., the Commissioner of Police and the like. I wish to point out to this House about the responsibility of these people. If we cannot talk about the responsibility of these people, how they should go about their jobs, what are we here for, Mr Speaker, Sir? Consequently, I crave your kind indulgence to mention about those, who are a little lower down in the hierarchy of the Police Force, who are directly under the control of the I.G.P., the Deputy I.G.P. and the like. I shall be grateful, Mr Speaker, Sir, if you will allow me to comment a little on it. I am not going to go on at great length on this, but I would be failing in my

duty if I do not comment on the subordinate officers of the Police Force in the last few days.

Mr Speaker: Yes, if you wish to comment on it in passing, I can allow you.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, I shall be very brief on them. This country has seen the subordinate officers of the Police Force going to the party premises of the Labour Party of Malaya and taking away everything without a "by your leave". Sir, as I have pointed out, there have been banners saying, "Johnson Go Home", and the Police have gone there without a word to anybody; they just go there, and they tore out the banners and just walked away. Now, Sir, one does not associate representatives of the law with lawless acts. I do not know on what authority the Police have to go on a rampage like this. If the Police do things like this, are they law unto themselves, or are they there to enforce the law? I have been told on good legal advice that these acts of the subordinate officers of the Police Force in taking away the banners is illegal, and we shall probe this matter a little further. I can understand the concern of the Police in wanting to take all measures to protect

Mr Speaker: I must point out that I do not see that this has anything to do with the Bill in question. The Bill is to amend the structure of the Police Force.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Yes, Mr Speaker, Sir, the Bill is to amend, as you have mentioned, the structure of the Police Force.

Mr Speaker: Yes. If you confine yourself to mentioning, only in passing, those points which you have mentioned, I can allow them. But if you go on to make a speech and think like that, I think I have to stop you.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: I shall be brief. I shall end up, Mr Speaker, Sir, by saying that all law abiding citizens in this country can understand the top hierarchy of the Police in wanting to

secure peace, harmony, and security for our foreign visitors. On the other hand, one cannot tolerate the Police subordinate officers taking law into their own hands, and I commend this, Mr Speaker, Sir, to the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs, who is incidentally also the Minister of Justice, and let there be justice to all in this country, irrespective of race, colour, or creed or rank.

Tuan D. R. Seenivasagam (Ipoh): Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise to say a few words on this Bill, and some of the provisions of this Bill empower the Inspector-General to carry out duties which so far the Commissioner of Police has been carrying out. Now, it is, therefore, necessary in this debate to discuss whether the Commissioner of Police has been carrying out his duties properly and whether those duties should be transferred to the Inspector-General of Police—and I can only do that, Mr Speaker, Sir, by giving a few examples and warning this House of the danger of such a transfer of powers in the circumstances of present-day Malaysia.

Mr Speaker, Sir, whether the Commissioner of Police has so far been enforcing the law, or delegating his powers properly to subordinate officers, becomes very important and material when we see that those powers are to be transferred as envisaged by this Bill into the hands of the Inspector-General of Police. I would have thought that a more appropriate Bill would have been one to curb the powers of the Commissioner of Police to lawful acts, and thereafter pass those lawful acts to the Inspector-General of Police; but I notice that there are no Clauses here curbing the powers of the Commissioner of Police and thereafter passing them to the Inspector-General of Police.

Mr Speaker, Sir, that comes into great significance within the last few weeks, and a transfer of these powers shows us how easily those powers can be abused. Mr Speaker, Sir, the visit of President Johnson is material only in this sense that it has given this country an opportunity to know how far the powers of the Commissioner of

Police—and when I say “Commissioner of Police”, I do not mean him personally, but I mean the Commissioner of Police as a legal being—and the powers delegated by him to the other officers can be abused.

Mr Speaker, Sir, President Johnson's visit here may be hailed by a large section of the population. There may be a small section or a considerable section which does not hail his visit. The important point, as far as this Bill is concerned in relation to President Johnson's visit here, is this: that the Police are the executive powers to deal with the security situation in this country. How has the Commissioner dealt with it? And now we are asked to pass this power to the Inspector-General with an all-embracing authority over Malaysia.

Mr Speaker, Sir, it is an unlawful act on the part of the Police to enter private property and seize anything from private property, unless they are so authorised by law. Sir, unless the Government, or the Commissioner of Police, who, hereafter this Bill, will be the Inspector-General of Police, has the audacity to tell us that the words “Johnson Go Back” or “Johnson Go Home” are subversive to Malaysia, or likely to cause a breach of the peace in Malaysia, then I say that they had no legal authority to remove those banners. We are asked to pass this Bill to enable the Inspector-General to do the same thing that the Commissioner of Police has been doing in the last few days. I say it is wrong to transfer those powers, because they have been exercised unlawfully, they have been exercised ruthlessly, and to add to that, Mr Speaker, Sir, throughout the history of Malaysia in the last few years, what has the Commissioner of Police done? He has constantly violated the fundamental rights of the citizens of this country; peaceful demonstrations have been broken up, peaceful demonstrations have been needled and pinned, so that they would go out of hand, so that the Police could use their batons and violence on the peaceful demonstrators. The Commissioner of Police is supposed to preserve democracy in this country. If

he acts in a manner which destroys democracy, if he acts as, I would say, ruthless men under his command, then I say the powers vested in him should be taken away from him and not transferred to another person who may exercise them very ruthlessly.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the visit of President Johnson has also disclosed to this House and to the world that the Government does not believe in democracy. How can then we pass these powers to the Inspector-General of Police? Only yesterday, the Honourable Prime Minister told us that, according to the newspapers, that he will not allow demonstrations during this period, or in fact any period. Is that democracy? Is that what America stands for, the great United States of America and their President? Mr Speaker, Sir, under those circumstances I cannot support this Bill, and further I will go on and say that, in view of the denial of democratic rights to express sentiments peacefully and in an orderly manner to President Johnson, my Party has decided that in the interest of the people, whatever our personal feelings maybe, that we shall boycott all functions in honour of President Johnson, not as a sign of disrespect to the great President but as a sign of protest against the denial of fundamental rights to the people of Malaysia in this country.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah:
Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dengan izin tuan, saya masok champor berchakap sadikit berkenaan dengan Rang Undang² Pindaan kepada Rang Undang² Polis di-Raja Malaysia. Saya mendapat faham daripada keterangan mengapa Rang Undang² di-kemukakan ia-lah yang nyata-nya kepada kita hendak membuang perkataan “Singapura” itu daripada Undang² ini kerana “Singapura” sudah keluar daripada Malaysia. Dan yang kedua, hendak mengadakan jawatan baru kepada D.I.G.P. (Deputy Inspector-General of Police). Tetapi dalam Clause 2 (b) kita dapati pembahagian tugas ia-itu bagi negeri² di-Malaya kita letakkan tugas itu kuasa-nya dibawah I.G.P. dan kalau I.G.P. tak

ada kita serahkan kepada D.I.G.P. Tetapi kepada component yang lain seperti Sabah dan Sarawak kita serahkan kepada Commissioner, kalau saya tidak silap faham begitu.

Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya hairan mengapa perbezaan negeri² component di-dalam Sabah dan Sarawak di-serahkan kepada Commissioner of Police dan di-negeri² di-Malaya di-serahkan kepada I.G.P. atau pun D.I.G.P.-nya. Kerana, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau-lah jawatan ini jawatan dalam Polis, I.G.P., D.I.G.P., Commissioner, Assistant Commissioner, A.S.P. dan bermacham², maka tidak-lah mustahak kita hendak meletakkan kuasa itu kepada satu² pegawai yang tertentu, di-sebutkan nama-nya sebab jawatan di-dalam Polis itu boleh di-pegang oleh siapa sa-kali pun mithal-nya O.C.P.D. ada yang pangkat A.S.P. boleh jadi O.C.P.D., dan pangkat Senior Inspector pun boleh jadi O.C.P.D. dan boleh menentukan kuasa di-component lain, Sabah dan Sarawak, kepada Commissioner—saya tidak dapat significance mengapa di-tegas begitu. Kalau-lah oleh kerana di-Sabah dan Sarawak itu pada masa ini jawatan itu disebut sa-bagai jawatan Commissioner tidak I.G.P., Sabah dan Sarawak sudah masuk di-dalam Malaysia dan jawatan itu tidak mesti di-kekalkan lagi sa-bagai lama. Kalau perkataan “Commissioner” itu maseh hendak digunakan lagi sa-bagai mana sekarang ini, maka itu ada-lah sudah luar biasa yang tidak mesti di-tentukan identity atau pun peribadi di-Sabah dan Sarawak itu.

Kita sa-mata² menyerahkan kuasa kepada Polis di-bawah I.G.P. tetapi bagi Sabah dan Sarawak itu, oleh kerana Deputy I.G.P.-nya tidak ada dalam Malaysia ini hanya ada sa-orang sahaja, maka kita boleh-lah bagi delegated power kepada pegawai yang lebih rendah lagi, Commissioner-kah atau Assistant Commissioner-kah di-bawah itu tidak payah di-sebut di-dalam Undang² ini hendak meletakkan kepada Commissioner yang tertentu.

Jadi, di-situ-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya nampak barangkali Rang

Undang² ini di-kemukakan oleh kerana keadaan di-Sabah dan Sarawak itu berjalan sa-bagai lama dan Kerajaan Pusat kita ini tidak sanggup hendak mengubah keadaan itu. Padahal masaalah Polis dan urusan Polis semua-nya di-bawah Kerajaan Federal. Jadi, itu-lah Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya nampak dan saya mintalah Menteri ini menerangkan mengapa yang mesti di-pisahkan (a) dengan (b) sa-bagaimana dalam Clause 2 ini:

- (a) in respect of the State of Malaya be vested in the Inspector-General of Police;
- (b) pula di-dalam Commissioner of Police.

Dua jawatan itu tidak lain, jawatan Polis juga. Jadi, saya nampak barangkali ada sa-suatu yang Menteri kita tidak mahu terangkan di-sini patut-lah di-terangkan di-sini patut-lah di-terangkan supaya orang lain tidak-lah teraba² sahaja.

Tun Dr Ismail: Mr Speaker, Sir, both the Honourable Member for Batu and Honourable Member for Ipoh have made observations and they have said that the Police are performing illegal acts; also, according to the Member for Ipoh, he opposed the transfer of powers from the Commissioner of Police to the Deputy Inspector-General and to the Inspector-General of Police. Now, Sir, although these two gentlemen made this opposition, they belong to two different political parties with different backgrounds.

Dr Tan Chee Khoo: Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification—both are freedom loving parties.

Tun Dr Ismail: That depends on the interpretation of the words “freedom loving” by the members of these parties. Of course, we have heard nowadays how the word “democracy” has been interpreted in various ways.

Now, Sir, subject to correction, I do not think I have ever heard either of the two Members condemning Communism in this House. Sir, the very essence of the threat to the security

to this country as is mentioned in the White Paper, which has just been published, comes from militant Communists trying to destroy democracy in this country. I have repeatedly said in this House in respect of Members of the Opposition Parties that they are exercising their rights, but all I ask of them is that they should also exercise their responsibilities when the threat to the security of this country has been clearly put to them, according to what is written in the White Paper. We have published White Paper time and again, and they are results of research done over a number of months time-consuming efforts. These White Papers are verified from captured documents and all the time the White Papers stress the danger of Communism to this country. Genuine political parties have been allowed to function and never have we accused political parties in any one of the White Paper, except that we have mentioned certain political parties, like the Labour Front, who associate with and, make use of the Communists in order to further their political aims.

The Honourable Member for Batu himself knows that what the communists are doing to his Party. He himself said in this House that if we persecute the moderates in his party, it will be left to the Communists and the pro-Communists. I have said in this House—although jokingly sometimes but it contains a lot of truth—that I am trying to help him to build a real socialist party in this country. After all, in any democracy, we would like to see opposition, an alternate Government in this country, but we do not and shall not allow ourselves to be defeated, if they want to make use of the Communists. Let us be quite clear on that fact.

Now, Sir, why are these strict security precautions taken? To ensure security in respect of the visit of the President of the United States to Malaysia. These security measures are mainly aimed against these Communists. Now, Sir, the Labour Party, the Party Ra'ayat of Malaya, we know their records; we know who controls those

parties, and we will never allow those parties to make any demonstration, because we know that they cannot control those demonstration. Many a time in this country, when there was a demonstration by the Labour Party it always ended up in a riot; the riot was not done by the moderate members, not by the Honourable Member himself, but it happened because the moderates would not control the pro-Communists in the party.

Now, Sir, the Honourable Member for Ipoh, I have never said that the People's Progressive Party, whatever their faults, so far had been tainted by the communists. All that we ask of the Honourable Member for Ipoh, since he represents the P.P.P. in this House, is that if he wants to make a protest against the visit of President Johnson, he could come and discuss with me and the Police as to how we can try to adapt things, because all what we are trying to do is to see to it that Communists do not exploit the situation created by the political parties. We have read in other countries of demonstrations against President Johnson; we believe in democracy; and as far as possible we are prepared to do that. However, we must, first of all, know the record of the party concerned, and that is why all this time I have asked the Honourable Member for Batu to help the Government to cleanse his party of the pro-Communists, and the Communists. It may be an uphill battle for him to build a Labour Party in this country, but with the record of the present Labour Party, and the publication of the recent White Paper.

Tuan D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification—I am much obliged to the Honourable Minister and I shall certainly get in touch with him to organise a P.P.P. demonstration, if allowed. *(Laughter)*.

Tun Dr Ismail: Let us come together, and we will try to discuss how far we can accommodate him. But I would like the Honourable Member to know that we will discuss with him all the

security precautions to be taken, and we do not want, as you sit next to the Honourable Member for Batu, you to be made use of by your Labour friend. (*Laughter*). The Honourable Member may laugh but he knows for himself what is going on in his party. In fact, deep in his heart now, he would like to do what I told him to do. (*Laughter*). We know the record of the Communists trying to make use of the Labour Party and the Party Ra'ayat, and I also know that there are moderates like himself in that Party. All we are trying to do is to try to help the moderates like the Honourable Member there, so that we can have a genuine Socialist Party in this country.

Now, Sir, I come back to the argument that these acts are illegal. Sir, the Police, the Commissioner, I.G.P., if their acts are illegal they can be prosecuted—they are not above the law. What is interesting is that they say that the Commissioner, the I.G.P., Deputy I.G.P. do these illegal acts and in the same breath they say that these powers are going to be transferred from the Commissioner to the I.G.P. and the Deputy I.G.P.—I cannot understand. If the power is vested in these two people, how can they be illegal when these powers are passed by Parliament? I am not a learned member but the Honourable Member can always challenge the act of the Inspector-General of Police and any policeman, or even the Minister, in the court which he knows that he can do. So, I think I have made the position quite clear on the question of this boycott. The main danger in the Communists. We are not against the political parties but if for example, you have a good record and start condemning the Communists, as we have been doing here that the Communists are trying to threaten the independence of our country, then at least we have a record that you are not going to associate with the Communists. But you have not done this; you have never condemned the Communists.

Tuan D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarifica-

tion—does this mean that if we, the P.P.P., associate with the Labour Party we will have a black mark? (*Laughter*).

Tun Dr Ismail: Sir, the Honourable Member is a learned lawyer and the other Honourable Member is a doctor, but there is such a thing as contagion. With constant association you can get it and it is showing symptoms now in the Honourable Member for Batu himself and that is why I am trying to rescue him before he gets really sick.

Berkenaan dengan tegoran daripada Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bachok, ia-itu hendak membuang perkataan "Singapura", Ahli Yang Berhormat itu, kalau dia telah menjalankan kewajipan-nya membaca Undang² yang telah di-luluskan oleh Parlimen ini, dia tentu-lah tahu dalam Malaysia dahulu perkataan "Singapura" termasuk di-dalam Undang² Polis. Jadi, sekarang bila saya hendak mengadakan pindaan ini, jadi kita mengambil peluang-lah di-keluarkan perkataan "Singapura" itu.

Dan yang kedua di-atas tegoran atas jawatan baharu. Ini memang-lah jawatan baharu ia-itu Inspector-General of Police dan Deputy Inspector-General of Police. Tujuan-nya ia-lah supaya memberi kuasa kepada I.G.P. itu supaya dia boleh berkuasa terus kepada kaki-tangan ahli² polis di-Malaysia Timor. Pada masa yang telah lepas kita ada Commissioner of Police, Malaya, jadi ma'ana-nya jikalau I.G.P. hendak memberi satu perintah terpaksa-lah melalui Commissioner of Police, Malaya. Jadi kita fikirkan ia-itu pekerjaan pentadbiran polis ini boleh berjalan dengan lichen jikalau kita beri kuasa kepada I.G.P. dan D.I.G.P. berkuasa terus kepada C.P.O. dan lain² pegawai polis. Dan perkara ini kita tentu-lah hendak meminda sa-tapak ka-setapak dan bukan-lah saya hendak melindungi ini.

Saya akan membentangkan kepada Parlimen ini satu Police Bill akan datang dalam mana banyak lagi pindaan susunan polis ini akan dilakukan ia-itu akan meliputi Sabah dan Sarawak. Chuma pada masa ini

kita berkehendakkan di-sini supaya boleh memperkemaskan lagi pekerjaan yang akan di-jalankan oleh polis. Itulah tujuan pindaan yang di-datangkan pada hari ini. Ini chuma sedikit sahaja pada pindaan yang akan di-lakukan supaya akan melichinkan dan mem-baguskan lagi pekerjaan polis dalam negeri ini.

Question put, and agreed to.

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

House resolves itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr Speaker *in the Chair*)

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

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

Sitting suspended at 11.45 a.m.

Sitting resumed at 12.15 p.m.

(Mr Deputy Speaker *in the Chair*)

THE DEVELOPMENT FUNDS BILL, 1966

Second Reading

The Minister of Finance (Tuan Tan Siew Sin): Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "An Act to amend and consolidate the law relating to the Development Fund of the Federation and to make provision relating to financial procedure with respect to the Development Funds of the States" be read a second time.

The purpose of the Bill which is now before the House is to consolidate and amend the existing law relating to the Development Fund. The Bill also deals with financial procedure in order to standardise the operation, management and control of the Development Funds of the States. As Honourable Members are aware, many of the States have their own Development Fund Enactments setting out the financial procedure for their respective Development Funds, but it should be noted that

this is a subject within the Federal legislative list, and to the extent that existing State Development Fund laws prescribe financial procedure, such laws may be regarded as void. Thus with effect from the date on which this Bill becomes law, all States will operate their Development Funds in accordance with it, and all States which have their own Development Fund laws will have to repeal them.

Part II of the Bill sets out the procedure in regard to the Federal Development Fund and Part III applies the provisions of Part II to the Development Funds of the States to the extent that they relate to matters within the State legislative list. The provisions of the present Bill are generally similar to those in the existing Federal Development Fund Ordinance, 1958, as amended from time to time except that the sources of income of the Development Fund have been enlarged to include moneys received by the Government by way of grants or gifts for the purposes of the Fund and also proceeds from the sale or realisation of assests which were originally financed from the Development Fund. The purposes for which money from the Fund may be expended have also been widened to cater for projects which are not at present permissible under the existing law, such as the construction of playing fields and investment in business undertakings. I shall, in fact, be proposing an amendment to the Schedule to this Act in the Committee stage in order to allow two more classes of projects to be included for financing from the Development Fund, namely, agricultural marketing and family planning, and notice that this amendment has, I believe, already been circulated to Honourable Members in the form of an amendment slip.

One feature of the existing Development Fund Ordinance which is not included in the present Bill is the provision for revote. As Honourable Members are aware, under existing legislation, if the financial provision for a particular project is not fully

spent by the end of the year, the unspent balance may be revoted in the ensuing year by direction of the Minister of Finance in the case of Federal Development Estimates, or by the Menteri Besar or Chief Minister, as the case may be, in the case of State Development Estimates, without further legislative authority. This provision has been deleted from the present Bill as it is not considered to be in conformity with the concept of "annuality" on which Government expenditure has hitherto been based. The revote procedure could also lead to loss of financial control by the Legislature as large sums of money can be revoted without the Legislature being made aware of it and the current year's estimates can become unreliable as a result. The Contingencies Reserve provision under Clause 6 can be used if it becomes necessary to provide funds speedily for any particular project.

The existing Development Fund Ordinance, 1958, makes no provision for interim or provisional estimates in case the main estimates have not been approved by the Dewan Ra'ayat at the commencement of the financial year as will be the case in respect of the 1967 Development Estimates. To cater for this eventuality, a provision has been included in Clause 4 (5) to enable the Government to present provisional estimates pending the passing of the main estimates.

This Bill has been referred to the States and to the National Finance Council and they have given their blessing to the Bill, except on the question of the revote provision which some States have felt should be retained, but for reasons already explained, the Federal Government does not consider this desirable.

Sir, I beg to move.

The Minister of Transport (Tan Sri Haji Sardon bin Haji Jubir): Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Tuan Edmund Langgu anak Saga (Sarawak): Mr Speaker, Sir, this Bill sets out to establish the Development Fund on a proper basis and make

provision relating to the control, management and financial procedure with respect to the Development Funds of the States in Malaysia.

Sir, there is, however, no guarantee that the Development Fund, under the control of the Government, will be fairly distributed. I would like to draw the attention of this House to the great dissatisfaction by the Dayaks in Sarawak by the turning down of the request made by the Dayak community for assistance to build the Rumah Dayaks in Kuching, the State Capital. The President of the Dayak Union has approached the Tunku himself during his visit to Sarawak, when he went there to lay the foundation of the Masjid Besar in Kuching. Mr Speaker, Sir, I have been informed by the President of the Sarawak Dayak Union that he had approached the Honourable Prime Minister himself during his visit to Sarawak asking him whether this Union could get any financial assistance from the Federal Government for building a headquarters in Kuching, the State Capital, as I have said. According to the information I got from this Union, the Honourable Prime Minister explained to this President concerned that he would assist this Union to build its building together with a Swimming Pool if the building could be shared by all sorts of *bumiputras* or natives. Are Dayaks not *bumiputras*? "Natives" in Malaya applies to the Malays particularly, whereas "natives" in Sarawak applies to all indigenous races in the State. No one can deny that these races are having different cultures

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not think the Honourable Member is strictly in order in bringing up this matter. This particular project could be referred to in a debate on the Development Estimates, but not on this Bill, in my submission.

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: We are now debating the Development Fund (Amendment) Bill, and as mentioned by the Minister of Finance just now, you can bring up this matter when we debate the Development Estimate.

Tuan Edmund Langgu anak Saga:

In that case, I shall deliver my speech when that comes up.

Tuan Ong Kee Hui (Sarawak): Mr Speaker, Sir, first of all, I think when the Honourable Minister of Finance pulled up my friend from Sarawak, I feel that he should have been given the opportunity. The Honourable Minister of Finance said we are not supposed to debate this matter as we are now debating the Development Fund because that could take place at the Budget Session. However, this is a matter of some urgency, and that is why the Honourable Member from Sarawak has brought this up at this stage.

Anyway, in regard to this particular Bill, Sir, if I understand the Honourable Minister of Finance correctly, it seeks to consolidate all the laws relating to the Development Fund of the Federation and would, therefore, incorporate in it control of the State Funds. I wonder how this reconciles with the very special position enjoyed by the Borneo States with regard to the control of their finance and development funds. Perhaps, he would clarify this. I was in the lobby when he made his introductory speech and so I may not have heard him correctly. If that is the position, obviously it would create quite a lot of furor in the Borneo States because this is something on which they feel strongly about—control on development and finance.

The other important point is that this Bill seeks to consolidate the laws relating to the Development Fund of the Federation and, as stated in the Objects and Reasons of the Bill, . . . “it makes provision relating to the control, management and financial procedure with respect to Development Funds of the States in Malaysia.” If that is so, it is something we would on this side of the House, perhaps, welcome because we have from time to time brought up in this House our concern over the fact that Ministers when they are travelling in or visiting various States in Malaysia, Federal Ministers, for instance, have the habit of giving

out large sums of money on an *ad hoc* basis wherever they go when there is an appeal made to them. State Ministers also have the same habit of going round the country and making *ad hoc* donations or in agreeing to certain requests on an *ad hoc* basis. I wonder how this particular Bill would affect this aspect of expenditure from the Development Fund. Obviously, it could make nonsense of control, and this House has been asked from time to time to vote various sums of money and if Ministers are in a position to expend sums of money in this manner, obviously control by the House is very much nullified and I hope therefore the Honourable Minister of Finance will explain to us how he proposes to curb this habit of the Ministers, whether Federal or State Ministers, of behaving in the manner of a “Father Christmas” making donations here and there out of the development funds.

These are the two main points I have on this particular Bill, and I would appreciate clarification from the Honourable Minister of Finance on these two points.

Tuan Stephen Yong Kuet Tze (Sarawak): Mr Speaker, Sir, I hope very much that this Bill would, firstly, not operate against the letter of the Inter-Governmental Committee Report with regard to the control of development funds of the States of Sarawak and Sabah, and, secondly, that it would remove some of the very obvious shortcomings to be found. Complaints have been made before of the lack of development funds to the States of Sarawak and Sabah, but the Honourable Minister of Finance has told the House several times that in fact funds were made available. That might be so, Sir, but the complaint was not so much of funds not being made available but not being made available at the right time. We know that in any of the projects, a scheme has to be worked out, and I have been told that sometimes the funds were not made available at the time required, and sometimes the funds came too late, with the result that the scheme has to be shelved for a time, resulting in loss

of efficiency and also of some wastage. Now, if this Bill would remedy those defects, I would welcome it but, again, I would not know whether the Bill would, in fact, achieve that end.

The other matter which I would like to bring to the notice of the Minister is whether this Bill would also achieve the purpose of really placing the proper priority on the development projects in these States. My Honourable colleague has mentioned about on-the-spot donations being made. I think I am right in saying that these on-the-spot donations can never fit in with the list of priority which has been worked out, and although politically it may be a very good thing for the Government, I do not think it would be the right thing, where public funds are concerned, when you do not really adhere to the list of priority of projects.

We know now that our development funds are limited and, therefore, the Government must make use of it in the best way possible and here, I think this practice must stop—as my Honourable colleague has said, the Ministers prone to doing so be curbed in their propensity of giving away public funds. These are matters in respect of which we would like to have explanations and an assurance from the Minister that this Bill would remedy the defects which I have mentioned.

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Mr Speaker, Sir, if I understand the Bill correctly, the purpose is to consolidate the legislative procedure and management of these funds, so that the Central legislation and the State legislation will, in so far as possible, coincide. However, Sir, I would like clearly to ask the Honourable Minister of Finance for clarification over a statement, I think, which he himself made during the debate over the Five-Year Malaysia Plan, and that is to say whilst development, the initiative for development, must come centrally, the Central Government also would like to see development initiated by the States themselves. Sir, there may be instances where State development may proceed slightly off tangent from that of the Central Government Development Plan, and, if I may, I

would like to cite two possible instances—I said two possible instances on the basis that these instances have been raised by the Opposition in the State Assembly in Penang but the State Government in Penang being a complete stooge to the Central Government and in complete compliance to the Central Government has got no policy of its own development. Sir, for example, this long talk of the Penang Hill Road is a development project which, properly speaking, should be considered, and this House has been told so, as a State development project. I agree with the Honourable Minister of Finance that the legislation, as to how such a development project and the funds associated with that development project should be consolidated in a manner similar to that of the Central Government, is a good thing. However, will this allow for the flexibility of the State Government to proceed on a development, which is essential to the State on a basis, which is not directly under the provisions of the Consolidated Fund.

Another project, Sir, which is of fairly great importance, I think, to the State of Penang is the question of the reclamation of the foreshore. The reclamation project, Sir

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to impress upon Honourable Members opposite that this is not a debate on the Development Estimates, and so I do not think Honourable Members opposite are in order to bring up projects.

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Sir, I completely understand that fact. I am only citing these two examples not on a question of bringing up a question of project, but I am citing these projects in that they are not likely to come in under a Central Government project, or the Central Government Development Fund, in which case the State might want to conceivably develop along lines which are slightly independent, autonomous, of the Central Government, in which case we all hope that the State legislation of the funds will follow the Consolidated Fund Bill provisions.

However, will the Consolidated Fund Bill provisions allow flexibility whereby the State can initiate autonomous, independent, development, which is important to the State but may not be considered important to the Central Government—and such projects, as I explained, one was the Hill Road and the other is the reclamation of the foreshore reclamation in Penang. The foreshore reclamation, Sir, has got three aspects which concerned the Central Government a great deal: one is the question of the possible extension of The Customs Area in Penang Island, about which we will have more brushes later on in this House; the second is the question of the provision for potential industrial development sites in the Island of Penang in exchange for our loss of our free port status; and the third is the question of development of new housing along the foreshore of the State of Penang. Such projects, Sir, would concern the State far more than the Central Government, in which case the State on its own initiative must find means of creating development funds in the State for projects which may not be in accordance, or find priority, with the Central Government. Under these conditions, will the legislation permit of a flexibility, whereby the State control of its own development funds will not be contrary to the provisions of this Consolidated Bill. This is the clarification which I seek from the Honourable Minister of Finance.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah:

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya juga merasa bimbang dalam Rang Undang² ini sabagaimana perasaan bimbang telah dibayangkan oleh Yang Berhormat Ahli daripada Tanjong. Meski pun kita faham bahawa tujuan yang nyata didalam Kenyataan Penerangan Rang Undang² ini ia-lah hendak menyatukan procedure kewangan (fund) bagi Development atau pun Pembangunan bagi negeri² mengikut saluran Federal, tetapi ada satu perkara yang kita patut ingat ia-itu Negeri (State) patutlah di-beri kebebasan yang lebeh luas untuk menjalankan projek² pembangunan (development project)-nya sendiri.

Ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bukan bererti saya bimbang di-negeri Kelantan ini akan tersekat, pada masa ini pun tidak ada apa² sekatan, tetapi dengan procedure yang baharu ini boleh jadi chara² pembayaran itu akan melibatkan sa-tengah² peratoran yang baharu ini boleh menyekat sa-chara tidak langsung (indirectly) kepada pembangunan² yang hendak di-buat oleh negeri itu sa-bagai satu badan yang autonomous. Ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bukan sahaja merugikan negeri itu sendiri tetapi merugikan Kerajaan Pusat juga. Sebab Kerajaan Pusat tentu-lah suka melihat tiap² negeri itu dapat menchari, menambah kewangannya pada tiap² tahun dan juga dapat melakukan perojek² pembangunannya sendiri. Dan dengan yang demikian dapat mengurangkan bebanan Kerajaan Federal dan tidak banyak kita mengambil wang fund federal sendiri. Tetapi dengan chara kita menyerahkan kuasa ini kepada Menteri Kewangan yang membuat segala peratoran—arrangement—bagitu bagini, saya tidak fikir yang Menteri kita, walau bagaimana dia ikhlas sa-kali pun, saya tidak fikir dia dapat control pegawai² yang di-bawah-nya daripada menyalahgunakan peratoran² yang umum di-dalam Bill ini.

Ini sudah berlaku, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau sa-bagaimana benar apa yang di-katakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Tanjong itu kalau di-Pulau Pinang sendiri boleh berlaku perkara ini, saya fikir di-negeri Kelantan pun akan boleh berlaku juga sebab berlaku-nya di-Pulau Pinang itu lebeh ringan lagi kerana Pulau Pinang itu di-kontrol oleh Alliance sendiri. Ini sudah ada bokti²-nya.

Memang benar bahawa projek development ini patut-lah kita mendapat arahan daripada Federal, tetapi sabagaimana juga alasan-nya yang dikemukakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Tanjong tadi ia-itu tiap² negeri dia mempunyai kepentingan-nya sendiri, dia memandang keadaan² di-negeri²-nya sendiri bukan sahaja sakadar hendak berlawan dengan negeri lain atau pun dengan Federal, tetapi dia memandang perojek² itu boleh

menambah kemasokan kewangan-nya dan dengan demikian tidak-lah selalu dia meminta² daripada Menteri Kewangan duit tambahan dalam tiap² tahun.

Itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kesemua-nya ini kita serahkan kepada Menteri Kewangan, dan Menteri Kewangan membuat peratoran² memberi bantuan atau pun di-beri grant kepada State membuat development, tetapi masalah-nya bukan masalah procedure Kewangan tetapi masalah development itu sendiri yang akan terlibat-nya ia-lah perojek² development itu sendiri, bukan masalah procedure-nya—procedure itu sa-mata² kita hendak menjaga kewangan supaya jangan kita belanja boros atau pun jangan di-salah gunakan perbelanjaan itu, itu tidak-lah besar di-dalam masalah development fund ini, tetapi yang besar-nya ia-lah procedure ini akan memberi kesan kepada perojek² development yang akan di-jalankan oleh negeri² itu sendiri, dan di-dalam ini kita tidak nampak satu fasal atau pun satu Clause sa-kali pun yang menunjukkan bahawa negeri itu di-galakkan mengadakan perojek-nya sendiri. Apa yang ada ia-lah satu table atau satu senarai kerja² urusan development yang akan terlibat di-dalam development Federal.

Jadi, saya rasa, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-lagi Kerajaan Pusat tidak dapat menunjukkan di-dalam Rang Undang² ini apa-kah perojek² yang sa-patut-nya dapat di-lakukan oleh negeri itu sendiri dengan tidak di-sekat oleh Federal, saya rasa amat-lah sempit untok negeri itu hendak melakukan development kerana kalau kita tengok di-sini ia-itu di-dalam Clause 14 kita dapati daripada A sampai kepada U-nya, kalau di-tambah sedikit lagi terus balek Z boleh pergi, kita nampak semua-nya ini perkara² yang kita puji patut di-lakukan oleh Federal tetapi habis di-rintis-nya tidak banyak yang tinggal kepada State. Jadi, sa-olah² State itu tidak boleh menjalankan development-nya sendiri walau pun Kerajaan Negeri ikhlas hendak tolong Kerajaan Federal di-situ. Agak-nya ini-lah akibat-nya pergaduhan di-antara apa yang di-katakan pergaduhan—what has been said—pergaduhan

di-antara Menteri Besar, Johor, dengan Menteri Kewangan kita sa-hingga Menteri Besar, Johor, di-katakan dalam surat khabar sudah menuduh Kerajaan Federal mengambil segala Fund negeri itu kesemua-nya dan meminta balek pula duit itu dan menegah segala perojek² yang hendak berjalan.

Saya tidak tahu-lah perojek rumah yang besar yang masok di-dalam *Utusan Melayu* itu development-kah atau pun Menteri kita sokong itu, saya tidak tahu, tetapi itu-lah perkara yang sudah berlaku dan saya rasa Menteri kita patut-lah memberi penerangan kepada Dewan ini supaya Bill ini tidak-lah jadi was² kepada pehak² yang hendak berchakap di-dalam Dewan ini.

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, it is a pity that Honourable Members opposite love to speak on a matter even when they are completely empty-headed and without even bothering to do their home work to repair the defect. I can forgive them for the first omission because, obviously, it is not their fault, but at least they could try to repair the omission by studying the legislation before speaking on it. If all the Honourable Members opposite who have spoken, had taken the trouble to read Part III of the Bill carefully, and study at the same time also the Second Schedule to the Bill, they will have discovered for themselves, without going into that long rigmarole, that there is no question here that the Federal Government is controlling State money. All that this Bill seeks to do is to lay down the procedure for the spending of Federal money. The States can do what they like, provided they have got the money, but obviously it is only right that Federal money should be under Federal control. It is as simple as that.

I should also add that this Bill has been before the National Finance Council. As I stated in my speech when introducing this Bill, it has been approved by the National Finance Council, which consists of the Menteri² Besar and Chief Ministers of all the States with their financial advisers. Apart from the deletion of the provision regarding re-votes, in so far as

that point is concerned, a number of State Governments have felt that this should be retained but, as I have explained, the Federal Government does not consider this desirable. Apart from that rather minor provisions, this Bill as a whole has been approved by the State Governments. One or two Honourable Members referred to the need to curb on-the-spot grants, which they allege have been made by my colleagues both at Federal and State levels; I think "on-the-spot grant" is not a correct description of such grants, because these grants had all been processed and carefully considered, and before the announcements were made we were satisfied that there was good reason to make those grants.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Untuk penjelasan, ia-itu pehak Pembangkang sudah membaca Part III ini dan bagitu juga Schedule yang kedua itu, dan dapat tahu juga bahawa Bill ini pernah di-binchangkan di-dalam Finance Council. Tetapi yang menjadi masalah di-sini bukan-lah masalah *procedure* kewangan itu—masalah perkara² yang hendak terlibat berkenaan dengan *development* itu sendiri; dua tiga kali tadi saya sudah stress benda itu, bukan berkenaan dengan *procedure* itu. Walau pun kita katakan kita menerusi Menteri Besar sa-bagaimana di-dalam Schedule yang kedua, tetapi itu samata² berkenaan dengan *procedure* kewangan.

Berkenaan dengan *development* ini, apa yang di-sebutkan *grant on the spot* ini, itu satu chara *development* yang memberi kesan kepada *development* ini dan Menteri sendiri pun mengatakan kerja yang sa-macam itu memuaskannya hati dan ta'rif itu tidak betul bagitu. Jadi itu-lah chara² yang boleh di-lakukan yang Menteri ini akan membenarkan pegawai² yang di-bawahnya hendak melakukan, itu yang saya minta penjelasan tadi.

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not think the Honourable Member, who has just spoken, understands the meaning of this Bill. This Bill deals entirely with *procedure* and not with the allocation of funds.

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 14 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

First Schedule.

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Chairman, Sir, I would like to propose an amendment to paragraph 1 of the First Schedule. The amendment has already been circulated to Honourable Members and reads as follows:

In the First Schedule to the above Bill insert the following immediately after sub-paragraph (u) of paragraph 1—

- “(v) agricultural marketing;
- (w) family planning”.

Amendment put, and agreed to.

First Schedule. as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Second Schedule ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Third Schedule ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported with amendment: read a third time and passed.

THE CURRENCY LAWS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1966

Second Reading

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled “an Act to amend the Currency Act, 1960, of the States of Malaya and the Currency Ordinance, 1960, of Sabah and Sarawak be read a second time.

As Honourable Members are aware, under the terms of the Currency Agreement, 1960, entered into by the Governments of the then Federation of Malaya, Singapore, Sabah, Sarawak, and Brunei the authority to issue

currencies is vested in the Board of Commissioners of Currency. In preparation for the assumption by Bank Negara of currency issuing functions in Malaysia, the Government with the approval of this House lodged notice on 12th December, 1964, of its intention to replace the Currency Board by Bank Negara Malaysia as our currency issuing authority, in accordance with the provisions of Clause 17 (1) of the Currency Agreement, 1960. This notice of replacement became effective eighteen months after it had been lodged with the Currency Board, i.e., on 12th June, 1966, when it was originally thought that Bank Negara would be in a position to issue Malaysian currency.

As Honourable Members are also aware, events leading to the separation of Singapore made it impossible for this target date to be achieved. There is provision in the Currency Agreement, however, for the Currency Board to continue to issue currency, after the expiry of the eighteen months' notice of replacement, for a further period of six months, i.e., up to 12th December, 1966, with the agreement of the participating Governments under Clause 18 (a) of the Currency Agreement. Owing to the recent negotiations with Singapore over a common currency, all the participating Governments have agreed that Clause 18 (a) of the Currency Agreement should be amended to allow the Currency Board to continue to issue currency in Malaysia, Singapore and Brunei for an additional period of six months after 12th December, 1966, which means that the Currency Board will continue to issue currency until 12th June, 1967. Bank Negara Malaysia will assume currency issuing functions for Malaysia after that date.

The Bill before this House accordingly seeks to give legal effect to the agreement already reached between Malaysia, Singapore, and Brunei for the Currency Board to continue its currency issuing functions for a further period of six months after 12th December, 1966.

Sir, I beg to move.

The Assistant Minister of Finance (Dr Ng Kam Poh): Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Pada pendapat saya, Rang Undang² ini tidak-lah mustahak sangat di-bahathkan kerana tidak ada perkara baharu sa-kadarkan sa-mata² hendak meminta kebenaran daripada Rumah ini. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Menteri kita tidak-lah menerangkan dengan memuaskan mengapa yang kita hendak menambah lagi sa-tengah tahun itu; sa-patut-nya walau pun enam bulan ka-hadapan kita hendak tambahkan boleh jadi dari segi teknik dia itu, tetapi patut-lah di-terangkan. Sa-mata² di-sini menyebutkan hendak tambah lagi masa itu supaya Board of Currency boleh menyambungkan lagi. Ada-kah sebab² Bank Negara kita tidak selesai lagi kerja²-nya patut mengambil alih perkara ini dengan chepat?

Dr Ng Kam Poh: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untuk penjelasan—Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Bachok jikalau dia ada mendengar ucapan Menteri Kewangan, beliau ada berkata oleh sebab *Agreement* ini di-antara Singapura, Borneo dan Malaysia boleh ditamatkan pada bulan Disember oleh sebab itu kita meminta agreement lain yang boleh menjadikan enam bulan lebeh.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau sa-kira-nya boleh di-tamatkan bagitu, saya tidak fikir sebab² boleh di-tamatkan, kalau tidak selesai boleh di-sambungkan lagi. Jadi erti-nya, kalau sa-kira-nya betul benda itu boleh di-selesaikan

Dr Ng Kam Poh: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, itu sudah selesai—agreement sudah di-buat dengan Brunei, Singapura dan Malaysia.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Selesai—itu-lah yang saya hendak tahu apa mustahak-nya yang hendak di-sambong enam bulan itu lagi; apa mustahak-nya; itu yang saya tanya, sadikit sangat.

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member who spoke last, I think, refuses to understand. I have tried to explain, not only on this occasion but on previous occasions, that we have had to extend the currency issuing functions of the Currency Board to June, 1967, in order to allow us time to negotiate with Singapore, in view of the fact that it takes a year, or very nearly a year, to get the notes ready, and that is why we have had this period of about a year, otherwise I agree we could have issued currency by the 12th December, 1966.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Terima kaseh, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Jadi benda itu tidak selesai lagi-lah.

Question put, and agreed to.

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

House immediately resolves 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.

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

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: The House is adjourned till 4 p.m.

Sitting suspended at 1 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 4 p.m.

(Mr Deputy Speaker *in the Chair*)

THE CUSTOMS (AMENDMENT) BILL

Third Reading

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to amend the Customs Ordinance, 1952" be now read a second time.

Under the existing provisions of the Customs Ordinance, 1952, the goods that attract import duty when imported into Penang Island are specifically

listed and are presently limited to intoxicating liquor, tobacco, petroleum and motor vehicle tyres and tubes as set out in section 143 (a) of the Ordinance. An amendment to the Ordinance is thus required on every occasion that it is found necessary to add to this list either for revenue or protective purposes.

Honourable Members will be aware that such a procedure is both tedious and cumbersome as speed and secrecy are essential where the imposition of customs duties is concerned, if there is not to be widespread evasion. This important consideration applies equally to Penang as it does to all other customs areas in Malaysia.

In these circumstances, it is considered prudent and desirable that the Customs Ordinance, 1952, should be amended *vis-a-vis* its application to Penang so as to enable the Minister of Finance to fix customs duties on any other goods which may from time to time be specified by order published in the *Gazette*.

In seeking to adopt this procedure, the Government is doing no more than to follow the procedure applicable to other customs areas. Honourable Members will note that under section 10 (1) of the Customs Ordinance, 1952, enabling powers already exist whereby the Minister of Finance may, by order published in the *Gazette*, fix the customs duties to be levied on any goods imported into, or exported from West Malaysia. In short, once the proposed amendments to the Customs Ordinance, 1952, have been effected by the Bill before this House, it will be possible for the same administrative procedure to be followed in respect of Penang, as for the other Principal Customs Areas where the imposition of customs duties is concerned.

I should like to stress that these proposed amendments are designed to provide the Minister of Finance with enabling powers to fix such customs duties on Penang Island expeditiously should the need arise. It does not mean that the present free port status of Penang Island is *ipso facto* abolished by the proposed amendments to the

Ordinance. I should also mention that the Chief Minister of Penang is aware that this Bill is being presented to Parliament.

Sir, I beg to move.

Tan Sri Haji Sardon bin Haji Jubir:
Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Mr Speaker, Sir, this morning, when I asked the Honourable Prime Minister a question over the free port status of Penang, the Honourable Prime Minister replied in a very long and circuitous manner, referring in fact to this particular Bill, which has just been moved by the Honourable Minister of Finance. It is quite clear, Sir, that there is a very direct relationship between this Bill to amend the Customs Ordinance of 1952 and the free port status of Penang Island.

Sir, in moving this Bill, the Honourable Minister of Finance has said very succinctly that the passage of this Bill through this House does not *ipso facto* take away the free port status of Penang. However, Sir, he himself, I am sure, quite appreciates the fact that *de jure* it places the free port status of Penang well within the powers of his almighty pen—the pen which he referred to during his elections campaign.

Sir, I would like this House to understand that even the framing of this Bill refers to many anachronisms and refers to many factors which may not be clear to the Members of this House, nor in fact will it be clear to the rest of the citizens in Malaysia.

Sir, the Port of Penang, or the free port of Penang which is of such importance to the people living in Penang Island, is in actual fact contained within an area which now consists of Penang Island and an area which is now demarcated on the mainland—Province Wellesley—as the Customs Area.

Sir, I believe that even the term contained in Clause 2, referring to section 143 (1) (a) in fact, refers to Penang Island, or to the port area of

Penang, and not to the State of Penang because, as everyone knows, that part of Penang, which is outside the port area of Penang, is at present within the Principal Customs Area and is already paying all the import duties which the rest of mainland Malaysia is paying today. So, Sir, the contention of the question of the free port status of Penang is a matter concerning the people living in Penang State as a whole and, naturally, in particular the people living in Penang Island, because the problem that is posed is whether the whole of Penang island, as it is today, should remain a free port, or in fact a short-listed port, or in fact, whether the Government shall at some later date impose a Customs Area on the Island of Penang to delimit the area of the free port.

Sir, it is well understood both by the people living in Penang as well as the Central Government that ever since the formation of the Federation of Malaya, which preceded the formation of Malaysia, the rights of the people living in the Island of Penang should be respected with regard to the rights which they have enjoyed from the time that Penang was established, and that the free port status of Penang Island should remain. As a matter of fact, Sir, there never was any concrete suggestion put forward to solve the problem of the incorporation of Penang Island into the Principal Customs Area, or the delimitation of a small Customs Area within the Penang Island; and the matter became a matter of political importance which led to the Honourable Prime Minister himself declaring that the free port status of the Penang Island would not be removed or changed, without consulting the wishes of the people of Penang. Today we heard, earlier this morning, the Honourable Prime Minister suggesting that consultation of the wishes of the people of Penang means consulting the Penang State Government. This factor is again re-affirmed during the speech of the Minister of Finance, namely, that the decision of Government to move this Bill today is with the knowledge of the Chief Minister of Penang.

Sir, these facts are very important to the people of Penang, and I would like to indicate just how important and how strongly we feel over this matter.

Sir, as we all know, the Federation consists of a voluntary aggregation of sovereign States. The powers of the Federal Government exist only in so long as the various sovereign States agree to abide to the giving to the Federal Government certain powers. We have seen, during the course of the last year in particular, that the Central Government has, by amendments to the Constitution by retrospective legislation and other legislations, increasingly arrogated more and more powers to itself at the expense of the States and at the expense of the people in the States. Sir, this is a situation which naturally creates increased tension between the people living within the States and the people controlling the Federal Government. It is sure that this nation (Malaysia) since its growth inculcates amongst the people in all the various constituent States the concept of nationhood, but it is also true that by tradition large numbers of citizens of the various States have a very strong affinity and a very strong local loyalty to their States. This State loyalty in the case of the Federation of Malaysia carries with it unique implications, because above the two-House Legislature, we have also a Council of Rulers, and we still have written into the Constitution the rights and positions of the Rulers of the various States. So, State loyalty is not a matter which can be easily dismissed.

In the case of Penang, State loyalties are very, very great. In the case of Penang, too, the attitude towards the Central Government, ever since the formation of Malaysia, has been one which has been recently described very succinctly by the Mentri Besar of Johore: namely, the State's economy is increasingly being absorbed by the Central Government to the extent that the State Government is no longer able to administer to its own needs. Sir, Penang is a small State and Penang Island itself is so small and we have no other means of revenue except the port. How much the Central Govern-

ment absorbs through the port of Penang, how much revenue the Central Government takes in, via the port of Penang, neither the Central Government, nor the State Government, has ever been able to tell us in actual terms. How much the Central Government takes from the State, particularly from the Island of Penang, in terms of revenue, income tax and otherwise, is also a measure which has never been computed satisfactorily to the State of Penang by the State Government.

In view of the fact that the Island is so small and there has been in the course of the 150 years or so, an increasing growth of population in Penang—we now have about 350,000 souls living in the Island of Penang—there is naturally a very great concern over this question of the freeport status of Penang, or over the question of the development of the port of Penang and the future of the port of Penang. It is because of this emotional local State feeling, it is because of the uncertainty which has prevailed over how this question of the free port status of Penang is to be resolved, it is because the people of Penang in their striving towards economic development, that they realise that the Central Government must really put in more efforts into the State development, particularly Penang Island development—and here I would like to refer to what the Honourable Prime Minister now rightfully says, “You will soon be getting a University College”: talks have been going on for five years and, I think, for the next five years, we will still not see a University College. At one time, Sir, we were told about a tunnel, then we were told about a bridge: all these cock-and-bull stories have emanated from prominent persons in the Alliance Government, so much so that the people of Penang simply do not trust and do not believe whatever promises the Central Government makes with regard to development, potential future development, in the State of Penang and particularly in the Island of Penang. It is with these three underlying factors I say that the feeling of

the people in the Island of Penang and in particular the people living within my constituency, which covers the port area of Penang itself, is very, very high against the implementation of this Bill.

Sir, rightly or wrongly, whether it is a fact that the Minister of Finance will exercise the powers that are given to him with the usual care and caution that he normally does, or whether he does it in a more arrogant manner as one would expect during election campaigns, when he goes in and tries to browbeat those who oppose him and haggle him, whether he tries at the stroke of a pen to do away with the free port status of the Island of Penang, all these remain to be seen. All that I can say, Sir, is that no matter how you write this Bill—at this present moment, in spite of the fact that the Chief Minister of Penang is aware that this Bill is going through, in spite of the fact that the Chief Minister is aware and presumably his Executive Council is also aware, Sir—I say that the passage of this Bill will not be welcomed by the people in the Island of Penang. I say, Sir, that there will be very strong opposition to this Bill, there will be very great suspicion that this Bill means the *de jure* abrogation of the free port status of the Island of Penang and that this Bill, in fact, will limit whatever possibility the Island of Penang may have in its bargaining with the Central Government for a better development prospect in the future. At the present moment they have nothing and this Bill confirms in its final act that the joining of the State of Penang with the rest of the Federation has meant that the Central Government has steadily put its hands into the State of Penang, which at one time was classified as one of the “have” States, and made it into its present state as one of the definitely “have-not” States.

Sir, the Honourable Minister of Finance in his tour abroad created this wonderful concept of Malaysia being the richest of the poorest developing countries. Penang at one time was envied, rightly or wrongly, as one of the richer “have” States. Today, it is

not even the richer of the “have-not” States. It is definitely one of the really “have been done in” States, and this Customs Bill is another of the Bills, another of the methods, whereby the trust and the faith of the people in the Island of Penang and in the State of Penang will become less towards the Central Government.

Sir, I say that the repercussion to the passage of this Customs (Amendment) Bill is a very major one. The Honourable Minister has indicated that, although it has specific reference to Penang, the Principal Ordinance itself in actual fact carries implications for the rest of Malaysia. I ask the Honourable Members representing their constituents in the other States in Malaysia to appreciate the fact that the economy of the Federation, the wealth of the Federation, the revenue of the Federation, which the Minister of Finance so blithely dispenses, and sometimes cynically and sarcastically towards the Opposition, tries to control and curb is there only because the States have contributed that amount of money to the coffers of the Federal Government; and if the Federal Government finds, as in this particular case, that it must put its fingers into the till now to take more from the Island of Penang, I ask the rest of the States, who have not got ports as yet, to be sympathetic to us, because one day the Government will go to you and put its fingers into your tin tax, into your State reserve tax, forest tax, in order to get more money for the Federation.

Sir, I ask the Honourable Members of the House seriously to consider the sentiments that are involved in the passage of this Bill and, in so doing, I would like to end up by just saying this. All these years the Minister of Finance has been able to well control the situation in Penang. This question of smuggling too in the State of Penang has been sometimes brushed lightly aside by him. I remember my Honourable friend, sitting opposite me, from Penang Utara, sometimes referring to the inland revenue problem in the Island of Penang, and we were assured by the Central Government

that enough equipment, enough people, enough manpower, enough know-how, are there to control the smuggling in the Island of Penang. We were told during various debates that the major area of smuggling and the largest loss from smuggling comes not from the Straits of Penang but up in the borders of Thailand and ourselves. Therefore, Sir, if the Central Government, or the Minister of Finance has up to now—from 1952 to this date, in the last fourteen to fifteen years—been able effectively to achieve what he wants to do with regard to the free port of Penang Island, I do not understand why at this time, just now, he should choose so to exercise his right to move this Bill.

Sir, I would ask the Honourable Minister of Finance to give an assurance that with the passage of this Bill, which I am sure all the *wayang kulit* Members will support, he will in all honesty and in all sincerity exercise the powers that are now conferred upon him in the spirit, which he has maintained in his speech when introducing this Bill. Otherwise, Sir, the repercussions politically and emotionally in the State of Penang will be such that unless immediate economic benefits come from the Minister of Commerce and Industry, who is sitting behind him, the State of Penang may well find itself in strong opposition against the Central Government.

Tuan Geh Chong Keat (Penang Utara): Mr Speaker, Sir, it is very difficult for me as a Member of the Alliance, sitting on the governing Party's side, to speak and express my personal opinion and the opinion of the public against this Bill. However, knowing the Minister of Finance as I know him (*Laughter*) for all these seven years, I have to request for his patience.

Sir, when this Bill was introduced by the Honourable Minister of Finance, he mentioned that he had made the Chief Minister aware of this Bill. What I am in doubt is this: have the Chief Minister of Penang, in particular, and the Members of the Executive Council of the State of Penang given their

blessings for the approval of this Bill? For years, the Chief Minister of Penang has made certain statements which are in conflict with the statement of the Minister of Finance. Therefore, if the Chief Minister and the Government of the State of Penang have agreed to the passing of this Bill and handing over the powers to the Minister of Finance, that will be another side of the question and will be between the State Government and the Central Government. Sir, what I wish to stress is that Penang Island was assured that it would not precipitatedly be forced to join the Malaysian Customs Union, whenever it comes into actual operation in the near future and until the people themselves ask for entry. Perhaps, the term "in the near future" has been interpreted as from today and upon the passing of this Bill.

Sir, we have quite often heard that the Honourable Minister of Finance and the Honourable Minister of Commerce and Industry speaking on harmonization of industrialisation, harmonization of Customs Union and harmonization of progress. But as years go on, in spite of the promises, as I said in Parliament, there was a pattern of restrictions—by the imposition of certain measures—and a pattern of the strangulation of Penang State, and forcing and dividing the feelings of the residents of Penang Island, making the traders and businessmen change their views whenever they come along to ask through the Ministers, or sometimes through me, for the release or for special conditions for exemption of goods with certificate of origin indicating that those goods are being made in Penang—in spite of the fact that those goods and the raw materials of those goods when imported into the mainland are actually exempted from customs duty.

Sir, the Minister of Finance spoke on the problems of collecting duties. Sir, collecting duties is one thing and moral obligation is another. If it is because of collecting revenue to forsake the promise, then there is a big

gap between these two issues. However, Sir, the people of Penang have indicated in no uncertain terms that Penang's free port status must not be abandoned to conform to any changes and revisions, which Singapore had deemed fit to agree in facilitating the implementation of the merger of Malaysia: in other words, Singapore had something to bargain and she hoped to gain from that bargain, whereas in the case of Penang it was thrown in as part of the bargain without any advantages to the party concerned. I have previously stated in Parliament that whatever arrangements mooted and ultimately agreed to between Britain, Singapore and Malaya, at the time of negotiations were in progress in London for solving specifically Singapore's problem of safeguarding her free port status, these should not be regarded as a suitable solution to be applied to the Island of Penang.

Sir, there is not the least doubt that an overwhelming majority of the population of Penang Island of every category (the businessmen, the traders, the clerks, the workers, the hoteliers, the hawkers and the people in the professional fields) if they had their way, or if they were asked to express their opinion, would affirm unequivocally that they want their port to remain as it is, in accordance with the policy maintained by the former regime and thereafter upheld by our own elected Government since it came into power in 1957. Therefore, Sir, it is all wrong to say that the people of Penang were being pampered in the old days and are expecting to continue to be pampered. The Penang free port was created, designed, to contribute towards better trade facilities as an entreport trade centre for the progress of the hinterland, and judging by the marked progress of Kedah State and the other neighbouring States, Sir, it really had achieved that purpose. It had, in fact, Sir, served this State well with the present day's marked progress, which has forged ahead by means of the development planning of our present Alliance Government.

Now, with our national planning and design if Penang is to serve as a tourist centre of attraction to the Malaysian soil, it is a case which the Treasury and the Honourable Minister of Finance must think in terms, not of the duties collected or to be collected, but of progress of the State as a whole. The free port status has been in existence not for sentimental reasons but for reasons based on an economic practice. Penang is ideally sited and has been an entreport trade centre to serve the hinterland, and I am sure it will continue to serve the hinterland for years to come, the pattern of operation and trade of which is rather complex and the free port status is vital.

Sir, Penang Island has not been prepared for the common market. There is no industry of any significance on the Island, except the numerous small factories which need Federal Government's financial assistance for a well planned start in the industrial sector. We, in Penang Island, really need generous financial help in order to industrialise and develop to attract the tourist trade with a road up the Penang Hill, a Convention Hall, a road linking the West Coast to the East Coast and a University. Of course, the fundamental requirement would be for a bridge to be constructed and thus there may be a great prospect of Penang retaining her position as a major port to attract more industries to the Island itself: this would help to ease the unemployment problem and boost the Island's economy as the cost time and inconvenience involved to ferry goods from Penang Island to the mainland has not attracted any solid investment to the Island.

Sir, at one time we understood that it was put to the State Government as how best the State of Penang was to develop: (i) shall Penang give up her free port status and enjoy the industrialisation on the Island itself, or (ii) retain the free port status and develop on tourism, giving industrialisation planning to the mainland? Therefore, a decision was made and that gave birth to the Mak Mandin Scheme. Even that took the State

Government approximately five years before it became almost a reality.

Sir, the common market would be welcomed, as the advantages to be gained would outweigh the disadvantages of the loss of the free port status—there will be more trade flowing in and more employment for the residents of the Island. In fact, I was trying to find out whether, in the statement of the Honourable Minister of Finance, he would give us a list of the advantages which would outweigh the disadvantages of Penang Island losing her free port status. Perhaps, the Honourable Minister of Finance was on the safe side in omitting to mention these advantages, if Penang Island should come into the Principal Customs Area. Perhaps, he feels that his good intentions might have been misunderstood by the people. As I said, Sir, with all his good intentions, if he were to make it clear what are the advantages, I am sure the people of the Island of Penang would have a chance to understand the benefits of surrendering the free port status which would help them to offset the higher cost of living.

Sir, I would like to remind the Honourable Minister of Finance that both the Federal and State Authorities have a duty and obligation to the enfranchised populace or masses in the Island of Penang. There was clearly an irrevocable pledge that Penang would not lose its free port status—this undertaking came from our leaders and was repeated during the National and State Elections. Therefore, Sir, as a Party man, I have to remind my leaders of the Party Manifesto, of what they say, of what they wrote and which we repeated through our responsible representatives, it is also customary for the governing party to confirm their manifesto after a successful election. Sir, it may sound that I am trying to be difficult, but I feel it duty bound to my constituents to present their case and to remind my national leaders of our pledge and problems, and for this reason I have been resisting the force to draw Penang Island into the Principal Customs Area.

Sir, I must also emphasise that to solve the question of the free port status of Penang Island, there must not be a challenge but rather in the approach there must be emphasis on Government's positive actions in positive economic planning and development on the Island itself which will guarantee the economic well being of the Islanders; also the Central Government should indicate how fast it can implement and accomplish: (i) the immediate need of establishing industries by giving financial assistance to Penang Island to put it on a proper scale of industrialisation; (ii) positive economic planning and development to meet the needs of the Island and policies designed to raise the living standard of the residents of the Island to gain employment, economic, social and cultural progress.

Sir, I hope the Honourable Minister of Finance would not take it as an impertinence for me to suggest that under clause 143 (ii)—“any goods which the Minister of Finance may from time to time declare by order published in the *Gazette*;”—after the words “Minister of Finance” to include the words “in concurrence with the State Government of Penang”. Sir, this is not a case of mistrust, it is the case of harmony (*Laughter*) and relationship between the State Government and the Central Government—and perhaps this will form a better understanding. Perhaps, as the Honourable Minister of Finance has said, the Chief Minister of Penang is aware of this, but we the Members of Parliament, representing the Island of Penang have found that the Chief Minister of Penang has changed his view, and was not very happy about that. Therefore, we, sitting in this Parliament, must emphasise this, otherwise it will be a case of where the Minister of Finance will say, “The Chief Minister of Penang agreed to it” and the Chief Minister of Penang will say, “Well, I did not agree and the Members of Parliament from the Island of Penang voted with you”—in other words, we supported it whereas the Chief Minister of Penang did not agree with it. Since the Honourable Minister of

Finance has stated it clearly that the Bill was with the knowledge of the Chief Minister of Penang, I request for that statement to be clarified.

Sir, in conclusion, we appreciate, and must console ourselves with the latest reassurance of our beloved Perdana Menteri, Yang Teramat Mulia Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra Al-Haj, that the people of Penang Island need not fear about their free port status. I quote: "I have promised that I would see that Penang remains a free port and that promise still holds good". As I said at many parliamentary sessions during my seven years in office, we do not try to resist the Government, we will be too glad to give Government assistance, but we only request, "Give us a chance to survive, give us more attention; we, in Penang Island, have seen the marked progress on the other side of the channel, and we also would like to feel that we are part of Malaysia and are in fact part of the nation." Therefore, we endorse our faith in our national leader and the Prime Minister of Malaysia, Yang Teramat Mulia Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra Al-Haj. Thank you.

Dr Mahathir bin Mohamad: Mr Speaker, Sir, I believe this Bill is designed to enable the Government to overcome certain anachronisms in the law regarding the practice of imposing new taxes. While talking about anachronisms, I would like to remind the Honourable Members from Penang that free ports in themselves are anachronisms. If you look into the history of free ports, you will find that invariably they are small places—small areas of land—acquired by previous imperialist minded nations, and having acquired these rather small places, the first thing that they usually set out to do was to draw trade to that area by announcing that they would not tax any goods or any business that was done in that area. In this way, these small areas benefited and prospered. But every time that they prospered, it is well to remember that the territories, which are adjoining to these areas, have to pay for it.

This is, of course, completely different from what the Member for Penang Utara said just now. The people in Kedah, for example, are not prospering simply because there is a free port next door. (*Laughter*). In any case, Sir, the first intention in having a free port is to draw trade and commerce to a certain area, but ever since the mobility of goods and all that have increased with modern transportation, it is found that free ports do not attract trade any more. It is more the services that the free ports offer that will attract trade. For example, if Indonesia does business with Penang, it is not because that it is a free port area, but it is because Penang offers the facilities which they do not have elsewhere. In fact, when Indonesia thought that it was the free port status which brought trade to Penang, when confrontation started, they started their own free port but it was found that just by declaring an area a free port did not achieve the things that was intended to be achieved. In fact, the free port did not prosper at all, and it is in fact the same with Penang ever since the last decade. Sir, we can see that, because Penang people are so bound to this idea that their prosperity must be related to the free port status, they are quite incapable of thinking of other means of achieving prosperity, and they are forever complaining about any attempt to remove their free port status. Because of this bogging down in their ideas, it is found that Penang has not prospered during the last decade. If Penang does not prosper any more because it is a free port, it is about time that we consider doing away with the free port status and bringing Penang into the Principal Customs Area. If we continue to keep Penang as a free port, we are not contributing towards its prosperity, but what we are actually doing is to subsidise the people of Penang at the expense of the people on the mainland.

Now, if I buy a pair of shoes in Penang and carry it across the Strait, I will have to pay 40 per cent tax. What this means is that a dollar in Penang is actually worth \$1.40. So my earning is actually less than the

earning of the people of Penang in that, although the figures might be the same, the buying power of the dollar is definitely more in Penang than it is in Kedah—and because of this Kedah has lost a lot: for example, there are quite a number of millionaires, who have made a lot of money in Kedah; they all build their houses in Penang and they carry over all the money they made in Kedah to Penang to spend (*Laughter*), because quite naturally they can buy more things in Penang and enjoy the good things in life. In this way, the people of Penang achieve a slightly higher standard of living although their actual income might be, in terms of figures, the same as those on the mainland. So, I would disagree with the Member just now, when he said that the standard of living in Penang is low as it is in fact higher. If we say that the people in Penang earn \$100 per month and the people in Kedah also earn

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman: I hope the Honourable Member would refer to Penang as the “Island of Penang”; if he mentions the State of Penang, that means it applies to the Province Wellesley people as well (*Laughter*).

Dr Mahathir bin Mohamad: I am sorry, Mr Speaker, Sir, but this is the general tendency among the people, who come from the Island of Penang; they could not think of Penang State as Penang Island and the mainland; and so having followed their argument, I fell into the same way of defining Penang as the Island of Penang, but actually when I am speaking about this, I mean the Island of Penang.

If the representatives of Penang could only think of themselves as a State, which is an island and a section of the mainland, then they would not be so much bothered about their free port status. But they are always thinking of themselves as Penang first, Bagan or Province second, with the State of Penang and Malaysia coming last in their minds all the time. So, if we keep on having a free port in Penang, it will mean that we, on the

mainland, would be subsidising the people of Penang, and I think this is grossly unfair to the people of the mainland.

It is about time we do a little bit of rethinking about these things. I do agree that if we want to have a lot of tourist trade in Penang, we should have shops which sell goods which are duty free, but then we can always do this by giving tourists tax-free concessions at certain specified shops. This is being done in Japan and in other countries, and I do not see why it cannot be done in the case of Penang, and in this way we can still keep on drawing tourists to Penang. In any case, I do not see why Penang should have an extra draw where tourists are concerned. Kedah too would like to have a lot of tourists coming to Kedah, and if we can extend these tax-free shops not only to Penang but also to Alor Star, I am quite sure that the people, who come to Malaya, would also visit Kedah instead of going to Penang alone because I am quite sure we have got quite a lot of things to show in Kedah which Penang does not have (*Laughter*). So, because of all these reasons and because of the fact that invariably I suffer every time I go to Penang, in that I have to pay taxes on two or three shirts that I have to buy and a pair of shoes, tax on which is 40 per cent, I feel that now that the Minister of Finance is given enabling powers, he should be liberal in the use of these powers.

Thank you, Sir.

Tuan Ismail bin Idris (Pulau Pinang Selatan): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-kejap tadi saudara saya dari Alor Star telah mengatakan bahawa kekayaan daripada Kedah di-bawa ka-Pulau Pinang (*Ketawa*). Bagi pehak Pulau Pinang memang menyokong dan suka supaya banyak lagi kekayaan² bukan sahaja daripada Kedah, di-luar² negeri daripada Malaya ini juga boleh di-bawa ka-Pulau Pinang. Itu memang-lah niat kita sunggoh².

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berbalek ka-pada soal Pulau Pinang itu sa-bagai

kawasan bebas, saya ingat soal itu tidak-lah boleh di-bangkitkan lagi kerana walau bagaimana, pun telah di-bangkitkan oleh wakil² di-dalam Pulau itu, maka akhir-nya tidak berjaya juga dan Parlimen ini telah meluluskan Pulau Pinang itu di-masokkan di-dalam custom Area. Apa yang berbangkit hari ini ia-lah soal berkenaan dengan pindaan kepada Rang Undang² ini yang membolehkan atau di-beri kuasa penuh kepada Menteri Kewangan dengan sa-chara "with the stroke of the pen" dapat mengubahkan, dapat mengenakan chukai² kepada barang² yang pada hari ini maseh tidak kena chukai. Ini-lah yang di-runsingkan, yang di-takutkan oleh ra'ayat jelata di-pulau itu.

Kita di-Pulau Pinang, ra'ayat² Pulau Pinang juga, sa-bagaimana kata saudara saya tadi ada-lah sa-bahagian daripada Malaysia dan kita juga suka sama² dengan Malaysia tetapi di-dalam soal ini, di-dalam soal hendak mengenakan chukai ini suka-lah saya hendak menyatakan bahawa Pulau Pinang telah pun berada di-dalam keadaan yang sa-macam ini telah berkurun², telah beberapa lama yang mereka menghadapi soal ini. Jadi, dengan adanya pindaan ini maka harus dengan serta-merta apakala di-fikirkan oleh Menteri, ini sain sahaja barang itu, barang itu, dengan serta-merta dikenakan chukai.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka hendak membangkitkan ucapan Yang Teramat Mulia Tunku di-Pulau Pinang baru² ini. Yang Teramat Mulia berkata dalam tahun 1967 bahasa kebangsaan akan di-jadikan bahasa rasmi dan bahasa yang tunggal di-dalam negeri ini, tetapi bahasa Inggeris akan di-gunakan juga. Itu kata dia. Baginilah juga keadaan-nya dalam soal mengenakan chukai² di-Pulau itu. Pulau itu memang, macam saya katakan tadi, sudah berkurun² berjalan dengan tidak kena bayar apa². Kalau perkara ini dapat di-lambat² kan sedikit dengan syarat kalau-lah Menteri kita ini dapat menolong menutupkan atau pun menampungkan apa yang hendak di-ambil itu dapat di-tampungkan balek supaya keadaan lubang itu dapat di-penoh

balek. Itu soal yang berbangkit hari ini kalau Menteri itu dapat menolong—itu sahaja soal-nya. Soal orang Pulau Pinang kata tidak mahu itu, saya ingat tidak boleh berbangkit tidak akan berbangkit sama sa-kali, hanya soal bagaimana hendak menampung, apa Menteri kita ambil di-Pulau Pinang itu maka hendak-lah di-tampungkan balek, hendak di-tambuskan balek lubang itu, apa yang hendak di-jalankan itu-lah sahaja yang ra'ayat Pulau Pinang ini berkehendakkan supaya dapat pengakuan daripada Menteri kita.

Saya ada beberapa perkara untuk mengshorkan di-sini kepada Yang Berhormat Menteri sa-telah empat perkara yang telah di-kenakan chukai di-Pulau Pinang itu sa-bagaimana yang tersebut di-dalam Bill ini keadaan penganggoran makin sa-hari sa-makin bertambah. Ini yang susah kita, bukan keadaan penganggoran itu kurang, dengan ada-nya chukai² di-kenakan empat perkara itu, ini pula hendak di-kenakan chukai beberapa barang lagi. Ini yang merunsingkan Wakil² Ra'ayat terutama sa-kali. Di-mana kita hendak menolong ra'ayat jelata terutama sa-kali orang² yang tidak ada kerja ini, hendak mengurangkan daripada penganggoran, kalau tidak dapat pertolongan daripada Pusat umpamanya sa-bagai bapa kita.

Kita telah berkali² meminta perhatian pehak Kerajaan Pusat ia-itu perlancongan ada-lah satu perkara yang wajib, yang patut di-beri perhatian berat oleh Kerajaan Pusat. Inilah satu²-nya chara bagi menampung keadaan yang harus akan berlaku di-Pulau Pinang sa-kira-nya chukai² ini di-kenakan dan barang² chukai di-kenakan di-Pulau Pinang. Itu satu.

Yang kedua-nya harus Menteri kita mengetahu² bahawa sa-bagai sa-buah Pulau yang tidak ada hubungan-nya dengan tanah besar kita ini, ada-lah lagi satu merumitkan kedudukan Pulau Pinang. Maka oleh yang demikian tidak-kah ada satu shor atau chadangan atau fikiran daripada Kerajaan Pusat supaya dapat menghubungkan pulau itu ini dengan tanah besar kita. Ini satu keuntongan sa-kira-nya dapat di-jalankan, dapat di-ikhtiarkan

oleh Kerajaan Pusat. Maka saya rasa kedudukan Pulau Pinang dari segi ekonomi tidak-lah begitu rumit pada masa akan datang. Begitu juga hari ini kita di-fahamkan beberapa banyak di-antara ra'ayat jelata hari ini di-tanah besar ini di-beri peluang untuk bekerja di-luar negeri umpama-nya di-Sabah dan di-Sarawak.

Saya suka hendak bertanya Menteri Buroh hari ini tidak-kah dia teringat atau terfikir supaya memberi peluang kepada ra'ayat jelata di-Pulau Pinang sana supaya bersama² di-beri kepada ra'ayat di-Pulau itu boleh bekerja, di-beri peluang bekerja sa-bagai buroh atau sa-bagai-nya di-Sabah atau di-Sarawak. Ini juga dapat menolong ra'ayat jelata yang sedang menganggor hari ini mudah²an mereka dapat men-chari sa-suap nasi untuk famili mereka.

Dengan perkara² yang sa-macam ini-lah yang merunsingkan ra'ayat jelata yang mereka hari ini sedang menghadapi anchaman² yang sa-macam ini. Maka oleh yang demikian saya juga, sa-bagai wakil ra'ayat di-Pulau itu, suka-lah hendak merayu kepada Menteri kita ini di-dalam mengenakan chukai² ini hendak-lah beliau berfikir sa-belum hendak mementukan sa-suatu dengan Kerajaan Negeri Pulau Pinang mudah²an ada ikhtiar² dapat di-berikan kepada Kerajaan Pusat ini bagaimana chara² hendak mengenakan itu supaya tidak akan menjadi perbalahan antara Kerajaan Pusat dan Kerajaan Negeri.

Ini-lah perkara-nya yang patut di-ambil pertimbangan oleh Menteri supaya perbalahan tidak lagi akan berlaku di-antara ra'ayat di-Pulau Pinang dengan Kerajaan Pusat, dan saya berseru-lah kepada Wakil² Ra'ayat di-dalam seluruh Malaysia ini supaya bertimbang rasa kepada ra'ayat Pulau Pinang yang mempunyai lebeh kurang 300 ribu nyawa hari ini, mudah²an dengan pertimbangan yang saksama oleh Wakil² Ra'ayat seluruh Malaysia ini dapat-lah menolong memikrkan bagaimana Bill ini dapat di-perbaiki supaya keadaan di-sana lebeh baik lagi.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Sa'aid (Seberang Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua,

saya ingin mengambil bahagian sedikit untuk menyokong Bill yang di-bentangkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan. Sebab saya duduk di-Seberang Prai, Seberang Prai adalah sa-bahagian daripada negeri Pulau Pinang. Jadi, malang-nya saya duduk sa-belah sana jadi tidak dapat-lah keistimewaan dengan barang² murah yang mana rakan² saya duduk di-Pulau Pinang sendiri telah pun dapat kemudahan² yang istimewa. Sebab pun saya menyokong Bill ini ia-lah bagaimana yang di-sebutkan oleh Yang Berhormat akan di-kenakan chukai kepada barang² dari sa-masa ka-samasa yang beliau sendiri memikrkan patut di-kenakan chukai.

Sa-lain daripada empat benda² yang sudah pun di-kenakan chukai, saya menyokong Bill ini berdasarkan di-atas ke'adilan. Sa-banyak 350,000 penduduk² di-Pulau Pinang mendapat keistimewaan tetapi di-Seberang Prai 250,000 duduk dalam satu negeri tidak mendapat keistimewaan. Kalau di-bandingkan pula dengan penduduk² di-Malaysia ini atau di-tanah besar—tanah Malaya ini yang sa-ramai 7 juta orang, 350,000 mendapat keistimewaan. Jadi, dari segi ke'adilan tentu sa-kali tidak patut, sebab kalau ada di-buat apa² perkara, banyak wakil² kita dan orang ramai membangkang, perkara itu tidak 'adil, perkara ini tidak 'adil. Jadi untuk ke'adilan biar-lah kita sama² menerima sedikit beban untuk hendak bayar chukai menyokong Kerajaan kita supaya dapat Kerajaan kita buat lagi banyak ranchangan² untuk kemudahan bagi ra'ayat jelata kita.

Sa-belum tahun 1935, kalau tidak silap saya, pelabohan bebas yang di-maksudkan ia-lah termasuk Seberang Prai juga, kerana di-tiap² jalan di-sempadan² di-Seberang Prai dahulu di-adakan Pegawai² Kastam. Sa-lepas daripada itu chuma Pulau Pinang sahaja kami di-Seberang Prai terlepas. Jadi, kalau sudah di-ambil hak istimewa daripada Seberang Prai pada tahun 1935 dahulu, maka tidak ada menjadi kesulitan yang besar untuk hendak mengenakan chukai barang² yang masok ka-Pelabohan Pulau Pinang dari sa-masa ka-samasa. Dan dengan chara yang demikian dapat-lah

Kerajaan negeri Pulau Pinang sendiri membuat ranchangan² untuk perusahaan² di-pulau itu sendiri. Kerana jikalau ada perusahaan² yang didirikan di-Pulau Pinang itu sendiri maka dapat-lah memberi peluang kepada pekerja²—kapada orang² yang menganggor yang tidak ada kerja. Sa-lagi barang² buatan daripada negeri kita sendiri tidak dapat kawalan daripada pehak Kerajaan Pusat, sa-lama itu-lah factory² tidak akan di-dirikan di-Pulau Pinang itu sendiri. Dengan sa-chara memberi kuasa kapada Yang Berhormat Menteri mengenakan chukai “at source” sa-bagaimana minyak petrol, tembakau dan lain², maka dapat-lah di-timbangkan supaya diadakan beberapa banyak factory di-Pulau Pinang sendiri supaya memberi kemudahan yang besar kapada orang di-sana mendapatkan kerja.

Perkara yang rumit dan menjadi kesusahan kapada orang² lalu lintas atau yang menumpang ferry daripada Seberang Prai ka-Pulau Pinang dan daripada Pulau Pinang ka-Seberang Prai, manakala orang sana datang ka-ferry di-sebelah sini ka-Pengkalan Sultan Abdul Halim, ada Pegawai² Kastam memeriksa motokar dan juga barang² mereka itu—ini satu perkara yang chukup susah bagi penumpang². Tambahan pula pada tahun 1968 ini Station Keretapi akan datang di-Pengkalan Sultan Abdul Halim nanti beribu² lagi penumpang² keretapi yang hendak datang daripada Pulau Pinang ka-seluruh Tanah Melayu ini akan mendapat kesusahan. Jadi sa-kira-nya dapat di-kenakan chukai kapada barang² yang selalu-nya orang gemar melarikan chukai² itu, maka merengankan Pegawai² Kastam juga menyenangkan penumpang² ferry dan lain² lagi. Jadi, sa-bagaimana yang di-sebutkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat wakil Tanjong yang mengatakan harus penduduk² di-Pulau Pinang kata-nya tidak akan berasa ta’at sa-penoh-nya kapada Kerajaan Pusat atau pun kapada Menteri. Jadi perkara itu tidak benar, kerana orang yang dudok di-Seberang Prai memang-lah sedia ta’at kami tidak mendapat keistimewaan, chuma orang² di-Pulau Pinang barangkali berasa tidak puas hati. Itu terulang-

lah kapada orang² yang dudok di-Pulau itu sendiri memikirkan masalah mereka sendiri.

Perkara yang rumit juga yang dialami oleh pengeluar atau pembuat barang² ia-itu sa-bagaimana pembuat gaharu, kain baju dan juga perkara yang kechil² manakala mereka itu buat perusahaan yang kechil² di-Pulau Pinang hendak bawa mari di-Seberang Prai, di-kenakan chukai. Jadi kebanyakan orang yang membuat home industry ini atau pun perusahaan sendiri—di-rumah-nya sendiri—ini terpaksa mari ka-Seberang Prai kerana hendak mengelakkan daripada kena chukai. Jikalau perkara ini dapat dimasokkan ka-dalam perkara kena bayar chukai, maka banyak lagi home-made goods—barang buatan sendiri ini di-adakan di-Pulau Pinang, manakala mereka keluarkan di-sini tidak payah lagi kena chukai. Jadi akan menggalakkan banyak lagi perusahaan² kechil di-Pulau Pinang itu sendiri. Ini akan memberi satu keuntungan yang besar bagi penduduk² dalam Pulau itu mengadakan perusahaan² kechil sendiri.

Jikalau hendak katakan dengan adanya pelabohan bebas ini pehak kedai² atau pehak perniaga² kechil—akan rugi, jadi saya tidak percaya, kerana orang yang berniaga jikalau barang itu harga \$3 kalau sudah kena chukai dia boleh naik \$3.50 dia mesti jual mendapat untong juga, walau macham mana pun dia mesti mendapat untong. Jadi perkara ini tidak terlibat kapada orang² perniaga yang kechil². Jadi di-atas alasan ini-lah saya salah sa-orang daripada ahli Dewan Perniagaan Melayu Pulau Pinang, Dewan Perniagaan Melayu Pulau Pinang sendiri menyokong dasar Kerajaan supaya menjadikan Pulau Pinang itu masok dalam Kawasan Kastam. Jadi, di-atas kajian yang sa-macham ini, maka saya menyokong Bill ini dan saya harap akan di-laksanakan dengan sa-berapa elok-nya. Terima kaseh.

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: The sitting is suspended for 10 minutes.

Sitting suspended at 5.20 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 5.48 p.m.

(Mr Speaker in the Chair)

**THE CUTSOMS (AMENDMENT)
BILL**

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Mr Speaker: Before we resume debate on this Bill, would those Honourable Members who wish to speak on this Bill, if they do not mind, please stand up so as to indicate the number of Honourable Members who wish to speak.

(Dr Tan Chee Khoon and Tuan Ong Kee Hui stood up).

As far as I can see, there are only two more. It has been a very long drawn out debate on this Bill. *(To Dr Tan Chee Khoon)* Would you like to speak first?

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, this House, I believe, is debating the question of the free port status of Penang and I see there, literally, is a free for all, and this, Mr Speaker, Sir, is very refreshing not only to us on this side of the House but indeed to the whole country because this is what democracy should be, that there should be an element of dissent within, I would not say monolithic, because it is always fragmenting but the huge majority that the Alliance Party enjoys. For once, Sir, I think this House has refreshing sight of an Honourable Member from Pulau Pinang almost inciting the rest of his comrades to revolt against the Minister of Finance. This, Mr Speaker, Sir, is all to the good, and I hope that the Chief Whip or the Assistant Whip will not take him to task, because these are but some of the mechanics of democracy that we should be educated in—and we still have to be educated in.

Mr Speaker, Sir, my Party, the Labour Party of Malaya, has through its representatives in Penang stated in no uncertain terms that they are for the preservation of the free Port status of

Penang. Here I am not seeking to argue for a retention of the free Port status, because, no doubt, the Member for Tanjong has eloquently stated the case for the retention of the free Port status. What I wish to stress a little is on the constitutional angle.

The Prime Minister at question time this morning stated that this Bill that is now before this House is not an erosion of the free port status, that he would leave it to the Minister for Finance to put up the case, and that the people of Penang would be consulted by the elected government of the day in Penang. Mr Speaker, Sir, we all know that Penang came into the Federation of Malaya then on the very specific condition of the retention of their free Port status and any violation of that agreement is an act of bad faith on the part of the Central Government. Further, the Prime Minister stated that the wishes of the people would be consulted through their elected government of the day. Again, this is a violation of that pledge, because I believe that in 1964 the free port status of Penang was not an election issue and consequently I think it would be wrong on the part of either the Prime Minister or the Minister for Finance—who has just come back—to say that, “Oh, we have consulted the people of Penang, because we have consulted the government of the day there and the Chief Minister, and he has agreed to whatever measures that we may impose to erode away the free port status of Penang.” Mr Speaker, Sir, I bring these few points from the constitutional angle, because this country has seen the erosion of more and more of the sanctity of the Constitution. More and more do we see the Constitution being flouted by the ruling party and this is but one more example. I do hope that not only this House but the whole country will realise that if this process of erosion goes on, then there will be very little sanctity, very little protection that has been guaranteed in the Constitution left with us. Thank you.

EXEMPTED BUSINESS

(MOTION)

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker Sir, I beg to move,

That the House shall not rise until after the completion of all business on the Order Paper for today and that at its rising the House be adjourned *sine die*.

The purpose for this motion, Sir, is self-explanatory. It is clear that if we were to sit a little while longer we can finish all the business on the Order Paper and the intention of this motion is to enable us to finish all the business for today, so that we do not have to meet again tomorrow morning.

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

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That the House shall not rise until after the completion of all business on the Order Paper for today and that at its rising the House be adjourned *sine die*.

THE CUSTOMS (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Tuan Ong Kee Hui and Tuan Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: rise.

Mr Speaker: (To Tuan Abu Bakar bin Hamzah). Tadi tidak ada hendak berchakap lagi, dia yang bangun tadi, 2 orang sahaja hendak berchakap lagi, dia dengan Member dari Batu. Saya tidak beri.

Tuan Ong Kee Hui (Sarawak): Mr Speaker, Sir, I shall be very brief. It had not been my intention to speak because not only am I not a Penang "kite" but because the case for Penang has been so eloquently put forward by these three speakers—the Honourable Member for Tanjong, the Honourable Member for Pulau Pinang Utara and I think also the Honourable Member from Kulim Utara, but hearing what some other Members have had to say I felt that I ought to put in a word in support of my friends from Penang.

Whatever the merits or the demerits of the maintenance of the free port status of Penang, I think it is a matter for very careful consideration, perhaps by economic experts. I think the important point is that the maintenance of the Free Port Status of Penang is one of the pledges given to the people there and, as such, should be carefully considered by Government in any measure which will in any way interfere with that status, unless it is the wishes of the people to do that, and I think the Government with all its apparatus should be able to convince the people that it is ultimately in their best interests that some other arrangements should be made with regard to the port and the future development of Penang Island itself. Coming as I do, Sir, from a State where there are also safeguards and guarantees embodied in the Constitution, I naturally view with alarm any attempt by the Government to interfere with State rights which belong to any State in the Federation and, therefore, I rise, Sir, to put in a word in support for the people of Penang, who, through their elected representatives, seem to object very strongly to this measure. I have no doubt that our turn will come next, because, although we have not got a free port, we also have certain safeguards in the Constitution and one of these I think concerns the imposition of Customs duty. The Finance Minister, maybe in the next Budget Session, in the interest of harmonisation may put forward measures which will affect us and we will then, I suppose, appeal to our friends in Penang to back us on that occasion. That is all I have to say, Sir. I think the important point is not whether the maintenance of the free port status is possible or desirable, but the point is, I think, that such changes which are desirable or which the Government thinks feasible should be done with the agreement of the people concerned. The Honourable the Prime Minister has already given assurance on this point and, in fact, has pledged that the people would be consulted. How the people would be consulted is another matter—whether talking to the Chief Minister of Penang is sufficient or whether there

should be an election on that issue or even a referendum. Sir, I most strongly support our friends from Penang.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah:
Rises.

Mr Speaker: Pendekkan saja, banyak telah berchakap.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah:
Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya dalam Dewan ini kadang² menyokong Kerajaan dan ini giliran saya pula menyokong penoh Kerajaan mengemukakan Rang Undang² ini. Oleh kerana, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada satu segi, memang baik Pulau Pinang itu menjadi pelabohan bebas, dia memberi keuntongan kepada ra'ayat negara kita di-sana dan mereka mendapat mata pencharian dengan jalan bekerja, oleh kerana barang² yang masok di-situ tidak di-kenakan chukai.

Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, terkadang²-nya kemudahan yang di-beri itu menimbulkan kesusahan. Akibat daripada status atau pun taraf pelabohan bebas ini dengan sendiri-nya timbul usaha² dan kegiatan² penyeludupan, ia-itu smuggling, berlaku terlampau banyak kerana ada-nya taraf pelabohan yang bebas itu. Jadi berapa banyak-lah pegawai² kita yang kena bunoh, pegawai² kastam dan tenaga² yang kita tumpukan ia-lah sa-mata² hendak menjaga smuggling atau penyeludupan yang berlaku antara Pulau Pinang yang di-katakan mempunyai taraf pelabohan bebas itu dengan Tanah Besar Malaya ini. Disamping penyeludupan itu boleh pula berlaku, tidak mustahil berlaku, orang² jahat yang menyamarkan diri sa-bagai penyeludup² barang, tetapi orang ini amat berbahaya. Apa yang kita boleh buat ia-lah menangkap mereka itu dan menudoh di-bawah kesalahan penyeludupan, pada hal mungkin mereka itu boleh jadi membuat kerja² yang lain.

Saya ingat, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-belum konfrantasi, banyak orang² luar kena tangkap, bila di-soal dalam mahkamah dia kata dia membawa barang masok smuggling, dia membawa benda lain. Jadi benda ini, sahabat saya dari Tanjong ini tidak

cherita langsung perkara² yang macham ini. Apa yang dia nampak ia-lah untong status pelabohan yang bebas—itu saja. Bagitu juga sahabat saya daripada Batu, dia berchakap dari segi Perlembagaan, hendak menolong Pulau Pinang dan sahabat² di-Pulau Pinang; tetapi waktu Kelantan berbalah dengan Kerajaan Pusat tentang pembentokan Malaysia, sahabat saya dari Batu diam membatu langsung dan dia tidak berchakap pun (*Ketawa*) dari segi Perlembagaan! Sa-patut-nya kalau dia ikhlas dia tidak peduli Pulau Pinang atau pun Kelantan, dia mesti membela. Boleh jadi-lah Kelantan dia tidak ada harapan, parti dia di-sana tidak ada harapan, Pulau Pinang dia nampak cherah maka dia membela pada hari ini.

Ada pun orang yang hendak membangkang Rang Undang² ini, saya nampak, presume-lah, saya tidak tahu yang sa-benar-nya, saya nampak bukan-lah hendak menjaga sangat kesenangan orang² Pulau Pinang itu, tetapi orang ini berchakap dengan speaking ini the language of smugglers. Jadi dia orang chuba hendak membela penyeludup² itu. Jadi dengan sa-chara tidak langsung, kita sudah lihat ada kaitan-nya, saya sebutkan kalau saya ta' betul boleh di-perbetulkan, ia-itu sa-orang Ahli Yang Berhormat kita dari Pulau Pinang telah kena pukul hari itu kerana dia berchakap berkenaan dengan smuggling. Tidak-lah smuggling barang Pulau Pinang, tetapi akibat daripada dia berchakap atas hal smuggling, banyak Ahli² kita kena marah oleh ra'ayat dan ada yang kena pukul. Jadi penyakit smuggling ini sudah menjadi satu fact, tidak menjadi satu khayal lagi dengan terbukti-nya sa-orang Ahli kita sudah kena pukul. Jadi sa-lagi Pulau Pinang ini menjadi taraf pelabohan bebas, sa-lama itu-lah smuggling ini berlaku dan sa-lama itu-lah perkara² yang tidak baik timbul.

Pada hal, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, apabila kita mengubah sedikit sa-banyak di-sini, chukai dengan sendiri-nya bertambah bagi negara kita. Kalau taraf itu sa-mata² taraf pelabohan bebas kita harap chukai yang kita hendak dapat itu ia-lah apabila barang

itu di-bawa masuk kepada mainland. Saya menyangka-lah, meramalkan, bahawa yang kita dapat kutip cukai barangkali dalam 40 per cent sahaja daripada barang yang masuk ke-mainland, 60 lagi melalui smuggling dan saya berasa Yang Berhormat Menteri Perdagangan dan Perusahaan pun sokong saya dalam perkara ini, saya rasa begitu.

Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, nyata-lah kita sekarang ini hendak menyamakan kedudukan ra'ayat² kita dan hendak menyelaraskan peluang pencharian kita dengan tidak membezakan State² yang lain termasuk Pulau Pinang. Ada pun masalah Yang Teramat Mulia Perdana Menteri mengaku memberi jaminan hendak menjaga taraf pelabohan ini, Ahli² Yang Berhormat dari Batu dan dari Tanjong, kalau kita hendak kata orang ini tidak begitu cherdek pun ta' boleh, orang ini marah, tetapi dia orang ini selalu perchaya kepada Ketua² Perikatan. Memang kita ta' boleh perchaya Tunku berchakap begitu, tetapi orang ini maseh perchaya lagi.

Saya, walau Kerajaan Perikatan bagi jaminan, bagaimana sa-kali pun, saya menghormati sa-bagai satu chakap, saya ta' perchaya (*Ketawa*) tetapi orang² ini perchaya lagi. Jadi dua tiga kali-lah mereka ini ta' mahu cherdek, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Jadi saya rasa saya menyokong-lah Kerajaan dalam perkara ini dengan syarat kita mintalah apabila Rang Undang² ini berjalan, kita mintalah Menteri Kewangan kita Yang Berhormat chuba menyatakan pada tiap² tahun atau pun enam bulan sa-kali perbedzaan cukai yang kita dapat daripada Pulau Pinang itu sa-kira-nya chara yang sa-macam ini tidak berubah dan tidak menguntongkan dan macham lama juga, di-masa itu kita kembali-lah balek taraf pelabohan ini saperti yang di-minta oleh Ahli dari Tanjong itu (*Ketawa*).

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Dr Lim Swee Aun): Mr Speaker, Sir, several Honourable Members, who have spoken on this Bill, have shown concern that the introduction of this Bill would take away the free port status of Penang and would

add to their economic difficulties. Sir, the Honourable Member for Tanjong has very clearly stated that the population of Penang has rapidly grown and that today it is about 350,000 and the Honourable Member for Pulau Pinang Selatan has said that the unemployment is so great that it would be a great relief, if some of the unemployed could be sent to Kuching as labour. Sir, the economic situation of Penang is grave and, I think, one of the reasons why the economic situation has gone down, besides the issue of confrontation and the loss of entrepot trade, is because of her inability to uphold and protect the industries and factories existing in Penang. That is why, Sir, the Honourable Member for Penang Utara has often come to see me with other Members of Parliament too, including the Member of Parliament for Dato Kramat, to ask the Central Government if it were possible to exempt some made-in-Penang goods from import duty when sent into the mainland.

Sir, with the rapid industrialisation of Malaysia, with many factories being set up in the mainland, the Principal Customs Area, and the policy of protection, it is natural that protective duties would be introduced and these protective duties cannot be introduced in the free port of Penang, thus resulting in existing factories in Penang Island being unable to compete by having to climb the tariff barrier when they export their goods to the mainland. As a result of this, Sir, many factories, and I am told that there are about 700 small factories in Penang, are today suffering—to give an example, Sir, before, soya bean sauce could be imported into the mainland free from the factories in Penang Island, but now because of protection there is this difficulty; then, again, there is the famous one of the bean curd sticks; the other examples are that there are many factories producing metal window grills and expanded metal doors, which were made in Penang, sent to the mainland duty free, but with the setting up of similar factories in the mainland and protection, these factories in Penang have lost their

business. They are given one of two choices, either to close down, which means added unemployment, lowering the economic situation of Penang, or to shift some of their factories on to Mak Mandin on the mainland. Sir, the fact that Mak Mandin has been a great success is because of the protection that these factories get. Then again, Sir, Penang Island has lost several big factories simply because these factories cannot get protection. I have been asked several times by intending industrialists whether or not I can give a guarantee to them that they can always get duty free import of their goods made in Penang into the mainland, if they set up their factory in Penang. Sir, I have told them that this assurance cannot be given by the Central Government because if a similar factory is set up in the mainland and asks for protection, then the Penang factory would be at a disadvantage. For that reason, Sir, several factories have not gone to Penang, although they intended to go to Penang. So the effect of this Bill, giving powers to the Minister of Finance, would mainly be for the imposition of protective duties; and as protective duties have to be put in a hurry, and must be done quickly so as to prevent stock piling, doing away with this cumbersome process of having to come to Parliament to get permission for every item is, in fact, meant to help the people of Penang to improve their economy. That, Sir, is the main reason why this House has been asked to approve this Bill.

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, I have very little to add to the remarks which have been made by my Honourable friend, the Minister of Commerce and Industry, except to make one point which I think is of some significance to this debate. Many Honourable Members, who have expressed their uneasiness over this Bill, have based their fears on the assumption that the free port status is gone. I think these fears are epitomised in the observations of the Honourable Member for Tanjong, who speaks of this Bill as taking away *de jure* the free port status of Penang. I do not think that

is true at all. As the Honourable Member himself knows, Sir, that would mean legislating for the abolition of the free port status of Penang and that is precisely what we are not doing in this instance. He, I take it, accepts as valid the reaffirmation of the undertaking previously given by the Honourable the Prime Minister, repeated this morning, and I would draw the attention of the Honourable Members who have expressed fears this afternoon to that reaffirmation. In view of that, I think the fears which have been expressed this afternoon do not really arise.

Question put, and agreed to.

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

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr Speaker *in the Chair*)

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

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

THE TREASURY BILLS (LOCAL) (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intitled "an Act to amend the Treasury Bills (Local) Ordinance, 1946" be read a second time.

Honourable Members will recall that in May last year Parliament approved an amendment to the Treasury Bills (Local) Ordinance, 1946, in order that the amount of the Treasury Bills which could be issued and outstanding at any one time could be raised from the then statutory limit of \$300 million to \$600 million. This was done to meet the liquidity requirements of commercial banks and the anticipated increase in the sale of Treasury Bills throughout Malaysia. Bank Negara has reported that recent trends in the sale of Treasury Bills have made it clear that

the present statutory limit of \$600 million needs to be further increased. If the present rate at which these Bills are being taken up by banks is maintained, then the limit of \$600 million should be reached fairly quickly. The amount issued as on 15th October, 1966, for instance, was \$541 million. It is desirable, in these circumstances to increase the statutory limit to enable banks to hold more Treasury Bills, so that funds in the domestic market may be tapped. The Bill before this House seeks to raise the limit from \$600 million to \$1,000 million.

Sir, I beg to move.

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

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Minister of Finance, in his very brief introduction of the Bill, has asked for the increase of Treasury Bills from \$600 million to \$1,000 million, and I can understand his being very brief because, I think, most of us at the end of a very tiring day want to go home.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I wish to bring this to the notice of the Minister of Finance not that he does not know it; he knows it; the Press knows it; and those in banking circles know it; but however, Mr Speaker, Sir, very often what is happening in this country, the man-in-the-street does not know and he comes to know of it only through a foreign source. Mr Speaker, Sir, the Minister of Finance is very fond of quoting the journal known as the *Economist*. With your kind indulgence, Mr Speaker, Sir, may I quote the latest issue of the *Economist* of the 22nd to 28th October, 1966? Mr Speaker, Sir, I shall try to read a few of the relevant parts of this brief article that appeared in the *Economist* that has to do with banking practice in this country and I shall then comment a little

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: May I rise on a point of order? What has that got to do with the debate?

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: It has got something to do with the debate—because the Minister of Finance wants

to increase the Treasury Bills put in the banks so it has got to do with banking practice. This House and this country must know what has gone wrong in one direction to merit the attention of what the Minister calls a reputable journal like the *Economist*.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the article here is captioned "*Malaysian Banking—Breath of Unease*", and I will quote:

"Malaysia's business community is concerned about reports that some of the indigenous banks are being pushed into taking on too much unsuitable business. By the end of last year banks registered in Malaysia, most of them set up by Chinese businessmen in the past ten years, had over 50 per cent of all bank deposits. But, as in other ex-colonies, foreign (particularly British) banks have kept the lion's share of good commercial business. In Malaysia the local banks, with the important exception of the Overseas-Chinese Banking Corporation, have therefore been left with the up-country branch business and with the less reliable, if more exciting, company financing. They have also been exposed to political pressure to take on business that looked, to outside eyes, unsuitably speculative. Partly this was because, with an industrial and investment boom gathering pace over the past few years, the government was keen to increase the number of all-Malaysian ventures. But not all of them looked particularly sound. Bank Negara, Malaysia's central bank, observed tartly in its last report that it was encouraging the banks 'to give preference to loans intended for productive rather than speculative purposes.'

A certain amount of uneasiness has been building up over the past few months in Kuala Lumpur and Singapore. A fortnight ago the M\$5 shares of Malayan Banking fell to M\$8.50 against M\$12 six weeks before. Malayan Banking is the biggest of the indigenous banks set up in the last decade, with around 30 per cent of local bank deposits, and as a Malay rather than Chinese concern, is particularly identified with the *bumiputras*, the Malayan sons of the soil. Last week its shares recovered to M\$9. The central bank's figures show that the indigenous banks' overall liquidity position is perfectly sound. Even so, businessmen have been pressing the Bank Negara and the government to investigate the banks' position, but the affair has so been kept out of the press."

Mr Speaker, as I said, things that are happening in this country regarding banking practices and quite a lot of other things, we in this country do not know and we get to know of these things only through a foreign source. I challenge the Minister to say that this is a non-reputable journal or that this

is a sensational report from the *Economist*. The only thing that I find fault with this report is that it calls the Malayan Banking Limited indigenous and "is particularly identified with the *bumiputras*, the Malayan sons of the soil." I, for one, find that the only inaccuracy in this report is that bit concerning the *bumiputras*. It is well-known that this Bank is mainly Chinese.

Mr Speaker, Sir, if I may comment a little on this, it is well-known that the Malayan Banking Limited literally supports UMNO on its shoulders; if you go to where I practice a few yards away, Malayan Banking Limited holds UMNO Headquarters on its shoulders; if you go to Kajang, Malayan Banking Limited holds UMNO on its shoulders; if you go to Kuala Trengganu, the new building there, Malayan Banking Limited holds UMNO on its shoulders. These are the three places where I know Malayan Banking Limited supports UMNO on its shoulders. Consequently if Malayan Banking Limited were to collapse, it is safe to say that it will affect the finances of UMNO and this country to a great extent.

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, it is no secret that all is not well with Malayan Banking Limited. It has extended its tentacles so widely and so hurriedly that possibly a good deal of its operations have gone out of joint.

Mr Speaker: I should like to know what has that got to do with this Bill?

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, it has got to do with this Bill because Treasury Bills are channelled through the various banks.

Mr Speaker: Yes, I think you have mentioned about Malayan Banking Limited in passing. That should be sufficient.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Except, Mr Speaker, Sir, that I wish to point out to this House and, through the Press, to the people of this country that the Minister of Finance should exercise greater care with Treasury Bills that are channelled through the banks. That is my justification for speaking on this.

Mr Speaker, Sir, if I may comment on this: I will not take long. It is true that the directors of Malayan Banking Limited have been at loggerheads—and I stand corrected if I am wrong. It is also true that a good deal of business of the Malayan Banking Limited has been speculative and this has caused concern to Bank Negara, and no doubt must have caused much concern to the Minister of Finance. Mr Speaker, Sir, I would commend to the Minister of Finance, and through him to Bank Negara, that Bank Negara should exercise greater care over the sharp practices of some of the banks in this country. Thank you.

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, as I tried to point out, the article which the Honourable Member for Batu read out to this House is, strictly speaking, not relevant to the subject matter of this debate. However, as he has raised this matter, I hope you will permit me to reply to what he has said. He himself admits that that article contains at least one serious mis-statement of fact, and that is the assertion that this bank is run by Malays when all of us, including the Honourable Member for Batu, know that it is an overwhelmingly Chinese bank.

A second very grave mis-statement of fact is that the commercial banks in this country are subject to political pressures. I can say here and now, Sir, that this is the most vicious lie that has ever been uttered. Nothing is further from the truth. I can say categorically that neither Bank Negara, nor the Treasury, has ever put any pressure on any commercial bank in this country to favour, or not to favour, any particular political party, or to favour, or not to favour, any business project or any institution or individual.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: On a point of clarification, Mr Speaker, Sir, if the Minister will allow me—is it not a fact that most of the directors of Malayan Banking Limited are either members of the Alliance Party or have connections with the Alliance Party?

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: It may, Mr Speaker, Sir, be true that one or two

members are connected, or are sympathetic towards the aims and objectives of the Alliance Party, but that is an entirely a different matter from saying that the Government, through the Treasury or through Bank Negara, puts political pressure on them. Those are two entirely separate issues, and I say again that that statement is a vicious lie!

Question put, and agreed to.

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

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr Speaker *in the Chair*)

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

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

THE CONSOLIDATED FUND (EXPENDITURE ON ACCOUNT) BILL

Second Reading

The Assistant Minister of Finance (Dr Ng Kam Poh): Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to apply a sum out of the Consolidated Fund to the service of the year ending on the thirty-first day of December, 1967" be now read a second time.

In accordance with the practice, which has been followed for the past few years, this Bill is proposed in order to provide transitional authority for Government expenditure for the first three months of 1967, as the annual Supply Bill for 1967 will not have passed through both Houses and received the Royal Assent by the beginning of the new financial year. This arrangement is in accordance with Article 102A of the Constitution.

The Bill which is now before the House, therefore, provides for the issue from the Consolidated Fund of a sum of \$456,699,600 which is calculated to provide for the service of Government

for the first three months of the new year, as it is anticipated that the Supply Bill will have become law by then. The Schedule to the Bill sets out the appropriations for the various individual services for this period.

Sir, I beg to move.

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

Mr Speaker: In accordance with Standing Order 68A, there is no debate on this Bill.

Question put, and agreed to.

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

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr Speaker *in the Chair*)

Clauses 1 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 MUNICIPAL (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Tuan Khaw-Kai Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill entitled "an Act to amend the Municipal Ordinance" be now read a second time.

Sir, the Bill is a simple and straight forward one which seeks to amend section 29 of the Municipal Ordinance to enable Municipalities to expend monies for promoting the use of the National Language and also to expend monies or making payments to any philanthropic, religious, educational or other similar institutions. No payment, however, will be made to any member of the staff in connection with or for passing a National Language examination.

I might also add that the suggestion to amend the Municipal Ordinance

accordingly was originally made by the Consultative Committee of Municipal Corporations in December, 1964, and since then they had been pressing for it.

As required under Article 95A of the Malaysian Constitution, the Bill has also 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, I would like to congratulate the Minister for Local Government and Housing in bringing this Bill before this House, in particular, in the Explanatory Statement where it says, "to enable the Municipality to expend monies or making payments to any philanthropic, religious, educational or other similar institutions". Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, a few years ago, when I was the President of the Kuala Lumpur Book Club—and I hope the Minister will regard the Kuala Lumpur Book Club as an educational institution—we did make an application to the Municipality then for a grant for a very worthwhile cause, because we were almost subsidising the students of this capital city of Kuala Lumpur into becoming members; they were paying, I think a paltry dollar per quarter, and we felt that the Municipality should help us to provide such facilities not only by way of lending them books, but also by way of enabling them to go and work in an airconditioned research room comfort and other reading space in the Kuala Lumpur Book Club. I do hope that, with the passage of this Bill, the Kuala Lumpur Book Club, if and when it makes an application—I know the Municipality of Kuala Lumpur is hard pressed—the Pesurohjaya, Ibu Kota, will consider our request sympathetically.

Mr Speaker, Sir, it is a crying shame that Kuala Lumpur, and capital city of Malaysia, has no public library. We have been talking for donkeys years about a National Library and that looks like a pipe dream. The Selangor State

Legislative Assembly, of which I am also a Member, Mr Speaker, Sir, has accepted in principle the setting up of a library, but we all know how the wheels of Government machinery grind ever so slowly. We have now, in this capital city, a Book Club that has been in existence for more than 30 years, and it caters mainly for the growing population of this capital city, namely, the school children. Consequently, I, for one, am very glad that this Bill is before this House and, when we pass it, as I said, if and when we encounter difficulties with the Pesurohjaya, Ibu Kota, may we appeal then over his head to the Minister for Local Government and Housing. Thank you.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya juga turut memberi tahniah dan terima kasih kepada Yang Berhormat Menteri yang mengemukakan Rang Undang² ini. Salah satu daripada-nya yang menarek perhatian saya ia-lah di-dalam keterangan di-bawah, ia-itu bahagian (b) yang membolehkan Municipality membelanjakan bagi mengadakan bangunan² yang berchorak ugama dan berchorak pelajaran, bagitu juga berkenaan dengan philanthropy.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya rasa kalau-lah tujuan ini betul² hendak dilaksanakan dan terlaksana, maka akan berlaku-lah satu perubahan dalam masyarakat kita dari segi akhlak—ia-itu di-dalam bandar² yang besar, kita dapati yang banyak-nya ia-lah panggong wayang, di-tempat² yang masyarakat kita menchari masa lapang dan keseronokan—tetapi terlalu kurang tempat² yang mengasoh jiwa dan rohani. Jadi, dengan ada-nya Bill ini dan kita luluskan, maka saya berharap supaya institution yang sa-macham ini dapat berjalan di-samping institution² yang berchorak tempat² hiburan.

Berkenaan dengan (a), Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-itu membolehkan Municipality ini membelanjakan berkenaan dengan National Language. Saya chubana' kaitkan, kalau ta' betul Tuan boleh tegor saya; ia-itu saya berharap di-dalam chara² membelanjakan berkenaan dengan bahasa kebangsaan ini biar-lah

dengan sempurna dan jujur bukan-lah pula sa-mata² hendak mengadakan papan² pertanda tetapi biar-lah pelaksanaan itu untuk betul² kita hendak menggunakan bahasa kebangsaan dan jangan di-salah-gunakan duit itu. Satu, apa kita panggil photostat, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada pada saya salah satu daripada Pejabat Kerajaan atau pun yang semi-Kerajaan telah melantek beberapa orang menjadi berbagai² jawatan dengan kuat-kuasa menggunakan wang sa-olah² kuat-kuasa yang di-beri kepada Municipality di-dalam Rang Undang² ini juga. Dan lantekan itu di-buat betul² mengikut fikiran-nya sendiri dan saya dapat tahu ketua Jabatan itu tidak tahu langsung perkara² ini dan copy ini loose copy—tidak ada nombor, begitu bagini, letter-head-nya dia pakai hak Kerajaan. Kemudian daripada itu, pada tarikh yang di-katakan hendak ada perjumpaan itu, meeting itu yang sa-benar-nya saya dapat tahu tidak berlaku meeting itu.

Kalau begitu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak hendak berchakap di-atas perkara ini, tetapi kaitan dengan menggunakan wang untuk bahasa kebangsaan itu—ia-itu segala perbelanjaan di-tanggung oleh Kerajaan Pusat, erti-nya di-tanggung oleh pehak yang menjemput, sedang perkara itu tidak berlaku. Dan saya bimbang walau pun meeting itu tidak berlaku, wang-nya keluar juga. Saya tidak mahu cherita daripada mana surat ini tetapi kalau Kerajaan chabar saya, saya boleh berchakap bukan sahaja di-dalam Dewan tetapi di-luar Dewan pun saya berani berchakap—chuma saya tidak mahu sebut di-mana department-nya dan apa kertas-nya.

Jadi, ini-lah yang saya harap, chara² yang baik yang sa-macam ini tidak di-salah-gunakan oleh pegawai²—saya tidak katakan Kerajaan dan Menteri. Itu sahaja, Tuan Yang di-Petua. Terima kaseh.

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to thank the Honourable Member for Batu for his kind sentiments, which are rare and far between. With regard to the application from the Book Club for assistance,

I have little doubt that the Federal Capital Commissioner will give it his due consideration in due course.

With regard to the Honourable Member for Bachok, try as I did, I must frankly confess I could not understand what he was talking about all the time, except that he was saying something about a piece of paper which has something to do with Bahasa Kebangsaan. At any rate, with regard to his compliments, I thank him for saying them.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tadi mengemukakan beberapa perkara, Menteri ta' jawab itu.

Mr Speaker: Itu-lah, perkara yang senang jangan di-bagi susah—pusing sana, pusing sini (*Ketawa*).

Question put, and agreed to.

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

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr Speaker in the Chair)

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

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

THE STANDARDS BILL

Second Reading

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Dr Lim Swee Aun): Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that the Standards Bill be now read a second time.

With the rapid industrialisation that is taking place in Malaysia, it is important that the quality of our products must satisfy the consumers both at home and abroad. There must, therefore, be a body with legal powers—

- (1) to lay down the standards of products, processes and practices in Malaysia;

- (2) to promote standardisation in industry and commerce;
- (3) to promote industrial efficiency development; and
- (4) to promote public and industrial welfare, health and safety.

Sir, this Bill seeks to establish such a body which will be called the Standards Institution of Malaysia. The governing body of the Institution will be a Council whose membership is drawn from Government, the professional bodies, commerce and industry, consumers and labour. The day-to-day running of the Institution, however, will be in the charge of an Executive Committee appointed by the Council.

Several technical committees will be set up to study and recommend to the Council what standards should be adopted. Once adopted by the Council, and with the consent of the Minister, copyrights for such standard specifications can be applied for and be in force for 50 years. The Council may apply to the Registrar of Trade Marks for the registration of any mark as a certification trade mark. Any person may apply to the Council to use this standard mark in connection with any product, process or practice. The Council may grant an yearly licence to use this standard mark, if it is satisfied that the product, process or practice conforms with the Council's standard specification. It may also suspend or revoke any licence so granted. However, any person who makes any statement or representation, or uses any mark which is likely to convey that any commodity, process, or practice complies with the standard specifications when it does not, shall be guilty of an offence and shall be liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding \$10,000 and in the case of a continuing offence a further fine not exceeding \$100 for every day on which the offence is continued.

The Yang di-Pertuan Agong may make rules requiring any department of the Government or any public corporation, to recognise and make use of standard specifications in the exercise of his functions and may prohibit in any matter affecting the safety,

health or welfare of the public, the import, manufacture, sale or use of any particular article, if it does not conform with a particular standard specification.

The Institution will be financed mainly from an annual Government grant. However, it will be earning money through the sale of standard specifications and the use of its standards mark. Another source of revenue to the Standards Institution will be fees from membership of the Institution from trade and Industrial organisations and other relevant bodies, which will need to become members of the Standards Institution of Malaysia. It may receive donations and may, with the approval of the Treasury, borrow money. Proper accounts will be kept, audited and laid before Parliament every year.

Further details of the Bill may be found in the Explanatory Statement attached to it.

Sir, I beg to move.

The Minister of Labour (Tuan V. Manickavasagam): Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, it is not often that I agree wholeheartedly with the Government, but in this case, I agree wholeheartedly with the Minister of Commerce and Industry and, in particular, with this Standards Bill that he has laid before this House.

Mr Speaker, Sir, this Bill is long overdue. Actually, for the benefit of those who have embarked on industrialisation and who are about to embark on industrialisation, this Bill is vitally necessary more particularly when one hears the Minister of Commerce and Industry saying that the local consumers are very choosy and brand-conscious; so, if we have a Standards Bill, we can tell the consumers, "Look here, these things conform to accepted international standards", and it will make it very much easier to sell them to the local consumers. Equally important, Mr Speaker, Sir, is that when you go on an export market, we can tell them, "Look here, these standards that we

have adopted are no less vigorous than that of the B.S.S., for example". I hope, when this Bill comes into operation, the standards that we will adopt will be no less vigorous than those of internationally accepted standards for the various commodities that we will be manufacturing.

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, my only regret is that we see on this side of the House that there are a very few people present. We received this Bill yesterday, and consequently this Bill is a very important Bill, Mr Speaker, Sir, not for me, but it is a very important Bill for the industrialists in this country and, properly speaking, this Bill should be in their hands as well, so that they can study the implications and, perhaps, make recommendations to the Minister. I hope that in future, whether it is the Minister of Commerce and Industry, or any other Minister, they will give not only us in this side of the House but also those outside this House, the people directly concerned, some time to study a Bill of this nature. Right now, I do not think any of the manufacturers in this country have had a look at this Bill and, as I said, the Minister must have noticed me looking very carefully at this Bill right now. I have had very little opportunity last night or during the day to look at this very important Bill.

The only thing that I wish to commend to the Minister, Mr Speaker, Sir, is in regard to the composition of the Council. Now, Sir, I bring this to the notice of the House, because on another occasion when we were debating the Tunku Abdul Rahman Foundation Trust Bill, I did bring up to the notice of this House that in the composition of the trustees of that Trust, the Government would, we hoped, see to it that people from all walks of life would be appointed to such a body—and I see the Minister of Lands and Mines down here and it was he who introduced that Bill. Since then, the composition of that Trust or the membership of that Trust Foundation has been published and, as one looks at it, it is almost completely composed of either out-

right UMNO and Alliance members, or people who are closely connected with the ruling party. Now, this, Mr Speaker, Sir, is a tragic thing in this country, because in the case of that Trust Fund, at that time I said that it should have the support from all sections of the community. Now, the very fact that you have made it almost an Alliance Trust Fund, you will find that people, like me, would not want to contribute to it and would say, "Why should I throw my money down the drain there?" But if it were composed of people, with a very few Alliance members if you must, people who have nothing to do with politics, people who can contribute eminently to the administration of such a fund, then you will have a wider support.

Mr Speaker, Sir, if you will look at the various people, who are to become members of the Standards Council, you will see that it is heavily loaded with Government nominees. Perhaps, that may be advisable—I do not know, but only time will tell. It is also loaded heavily with representatives of capital and that, perhaps, is also a necessary thing since this S.I.M. is to decide on whether their products should be given the label of conformity standards or should not be.

Mr Speaker, Sir, if you will look at the other composition—it is on page 4, Clause 6 (1) (n)—you will see that the Minister of Labour has one lonely representative to appoint. Bearing in mind that the wealth of the capitalists in this country is generated by the sweat, tears and the toil of labour, one would have thought that the Minister of Labour would have fought for more representatives of labour in such a Council. The, Clause 6 (1) (o) says, "one member appointed by the Minister to represent consumer organisations". Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, it is true that the consumer organisation in this country is a flop, but that is no excuse for the Minister to ignore the consumer in this country for, after all, it is consumer who matters in this country: if he does not want to buy your locally manufactured goods, no amount of yelling in the press, or in

the House, by the Minister of Commerce and Industry, will persuade the consumers to buy the locally manufactured goods.

The other thing is that, Mr Speaker, Sir, Clause 6 (1) (*p*) says "two members appointed by the Minister who shall be persons who by reason of their eminence in public life or otherwise appear to the Minister to be suitably qualified for membership". Mr Speaker, Sir, this to me, again, is very sad because the Minister has only judged two people "who by reason of their eminence in public life" Is the Minister trying to tell us in this House that there are only two people in the whole of Malaysia who by reason of their eminence in public life can contribute, to the working of such a Council? One would have thought that the Minister would like to rope in many more people of this calibre to a Council like this, because they can contribute—to give an example to the Minister, in the University, you have a whole heap of people who can usefully contribute to such a Council. They have people who are well versed in the letters, in the professions and yet you only limit to two people from that category. Now, I would appeal to the Minister for Commerce and Industry since, by tabling this Bill only yesterday, virtually he has prevented any one of us in this side of the House to propose any amendment to this Bill; consequently I would appeal to him to give due weight to what I have said to increase the representation by the Minister of Labour to increase the consumer representative from one and, most important still, to increase these members appointed by the Minister, who shall be persons who by reasons of their eminence in public life—this is the category that I would appeal to the Minister and I think a number of ten is not too small. Of course, from these people who have distinguished themselves in all walks of life—the Minister can get funds and a wealth of know-how who can usefully contribute to the well being of this S.I.M., particularly as we are launching into an uncharted sea.

Mr Speaker, Sir, there is finally one point of clarification that I wish to seek from the Minister and that is on page 1, such Clause 3 (*a*) which says, "appoint industry standards committees to advise the Council on questions of standardization as they affect particular industries". I take it that the Minister is thinking in terms of appointing various committees for the various industries. This is a thing that is little ambiguous to me at least, and I for one will be very glad for a clarification from the Minister.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah:

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dengan izin tuan, saya turut berchakap sedikit dalam Rang Undang² ini. Memanglah sudah sampai masa-nya kita mengemukakan Rang Undang² yang sa-macham ini supaya barang² pengeluaran dalam negara kita ini dapat di-ketahui mutu-nya yang sa-benar sama ada dari segi perniagaan biasa mahu pun dari segi undang² ia-itu legal power, kuasa undang², untuk menentukan mutu satu² barang itu amat-lah mustahak di-dalam sa-sabuah negara.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dengan tertuboh-nya Council ini atau pun badan ini dengan tugas²-nya yang empat ia itu (*a*), (*b*), (*c*) dan (*d*) saperti mana dalam Clause (3), dapat-lah kita mengawal barang² kita daripada kenyataan² yang palsu. Erti-nya kalau kita hendak mengirim keluar, kita hendak export barang² kita, dapat-lah kita tentukan barang² itu daripada jenis (*a*) atau pun (*b*) atau pun (*c*). Dan dengan demikian orang² yang hendak membeli daripada luar negeri pun dapat-lah tahu kedudukan mutu atau pun quality barang itu sendiri.

Sa-lain daripada itu, kita juga dapat mengawal barang² yang masuk ia-itu kita tahu quality barang² yang masuk, sama ada barang² itu baik betul atau pun merbahaya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam tugas (*b*) ia-itu dalam Clause (3), membuat undang² menentukan standard untuk hendak menjaga mutu barang² yang di-keluarkan di-dalam negeri ini atau pun di-bawa masuk; bagitu juga dalam (*d*) to

promote public and industrial welfare, health and safety.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tugas ini saya teringat ada beberapa mithal yang baik-nya. Tetapi dukachita kerana Rang Undang² ini di-beri kelmarin tidak sempat orang hendak mempelajari dengan elok. Saya pun tidak tahu mengapa Rang Undang² ini di-beri mengejut bagitu, padahal bulan yang sudah, saya ada membacha dalam surat khabar *Malay Mail*, kalau tidak salah saya, ia-itu Yang Berhormat Menteri kita ada mencheritakan kepada orang ramai, kepada public, ia-itu ada satu undang² yang di-namakan Hire Purchase meminta fikiran orang ramai dan orang² yang berkenaan.

Jadi kalau undang² sa-macham itu sudah ada dan pernah di-ishtiharkan di-dalam surat khabar, bagaimana Rang Undang² ini di-beri kelmarin baharu hendak di-sembyikan atau pun ada sa-suatu perkara yang meng-untongkan Menteri itu? Tidak patut di-buat bagitu. Jadi saya suka hendak menarek perhatian, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berkenaan dengan (d) tadi dan saya perchaya benda ini sudah ada dalam fikiran Menteri yang berkenaan ia-itu kita hendak menjaga kesihatan dan juga hendak menjaga barang² yang di-bawa masuk ka-dalam negeri ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Yang Berhormat Menteri Perdagangan kita sa-orang doctor dan dia tahu berkenaan medicine chukup baik. Boleh jadi termasuk di-dalam ingatan-nya ia-itu barang² yang di-bawa masuk ka-dalam negara kita ada satu benda yang saya bagi sa-bagai mithal, yang tidak di-peduli oleh negeri kita, oleh Menteri kita, boleh jadi kerana tidak ada Rang Undang² yang saperti ini ia-itu ubat nyamok (mosquito coil). Ubat nyamok ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-bawa masuk ka-sini standard-nya kita tidak tahu baik-kah atau pun tidak baik dan ini saya telah membacha dalam satu majallah, tidak sempat saya membawa majallah itu di-sini sebab Rang Undang² ini saya baru tahu kelmarin ia-itu ubat yang sa-macham itu bahaya.

Ada dua jenis, kata-nya, di-bawa masuk daripada negeri China Komunis dan lagi satu daripada Hong Kong. Ada yang di-tiru di-buat di-negara kita ini. Jadi saya tidak ingat dengan tepat-nya ada-kah yang di-bawa masuk itu atau yang di-buat di-dalam negara kita ini memberi bahaya. Tetapi sa-orang doctor juga, sa-orang Senator kita, saya tidak ingat nama-nya, dia sudah bawa barang itu dan sudah membuat analisa sa-chara sendiri. Dia dapati barang ini bahaya dan dia sudah hantar kepada Ministry dan Menteri kita diam sahaja tidak ambil tahu sama ada Menteri Perdagangan atau Menteri Kesihatan.

Jadi dengan ada Rang Undang² ini saya suka menghidupkan barang itu balek. Tetapi yang paling memalukan negara kita, saya lupa, kalau tidak betul Menteri boleh betulkan—Menteri Perdagangan-kah atau Kesihatan-kah. Dia menjawab kepada Senator kita itu “Why you worry? Ada berapa ribu orang sudah mati kerana ubat itu?” Itu bukan satu jawapan di-dalam Parlimen.

Dr Lim Swee Aun: Mr Speaker, which Minister?

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya lupa Menteri mana. Tetapi wording itu boleh kita tengok dalam Hansard. Ada bagitu. Banyak lagi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perkara² yang bersangkutan-paut dengan Rang Undang² ini tetapi tidak sempat kita hendak membahathkan atau pun hendak mengemukakan pendapat² kerana Rang Undang² ini terlalu tergesa² di-beri.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-samping kita suka hendak menentukan standard barang² kita sama ada yang di-bawa masuk atau pun yang kita sendiri produce di-sini, saya rasa hairan di-dalam Rang Undang² ini ia-itu yang ada-nya ia-lah tugas² badan ini dan kuasa²-nya. Tetapi tidak ada langsung pertolongan, provision, di-dalam ini yang menolong pehak² perusahaan yang kechil yang tidak layak menjadi keluarga di-dalam perusahaan² besar yang sampai standard-nya tidak ada pertolongan. Jadi dengan demikian,

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ini sudah menjadi satu monopolistik bil ia-itu dia boleh mengadakan satu kaum perusahaan yang standard barang²-nya tinggi yang perusahaan-nya not up to the standard, dengan sendiri-nya akan mati di-dalam negara kita.

Jadi tidak berlaku-lah apa yang di-katakan rapid industrialisation sabagaimana Menteri kita sebut tadi. Jadi ini bukan-lah hendak menolong dia punya rapidity itu, tetapi hendak mematikan lagi. Ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya nampak ini boleh jadi satu chara-lah yang biasa di-jalankan oleh Kerajaan kita ini yang tidak ada pun peruntokan atau pun satu provision yang hendak menolong perusahaan² kecil.

Sa-patut-nya di-dalam keanggotaan yang di-sebutkan entah berapa banyak yang Menteri itu hendak lantek. Ini perkara yang industry yang Menteri itu hendak lantek, saya ta' tahu apa tujuan-nya.

Sa-patut-nya tiap² orang yang mengadakan perusahaan yang berdaftar, yang ber-register supaya dia itu di-jemput menjadi member di-dalam ini supaya dia dapat di-kaji perusahaan²-nya itu sama ada barang² keluarannya itu dapat di-bawa kepada standard yang di-kehendaki, tetapi tidak di-sebutkan di-dalam ini. Boleh jadi ada Clause²-nya umum yang Menteri kita akan kata ini sudah di-masokkan di-situ. Tentu-lah dia jawab bagitu.

Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita nampak sekarang ini chara yang samacham ini tidak dapat menolong perusahaan² yang kecil, malah dengan sendiri-nya barang² yang tidak sampai kepada standard, tetapi sudah runner-up, yang dekat² dengan sendiri-nya sudah jatuh, sebab dia tidak mempunyai trade mark, dan dia tidak ada legal pengakuan A-kah, B-kah. Jadi bila orang tanya company mana? Company Abu Bakar Hamzah. Kamu dapat A-kah? Ada-kah legal benda itu? Tidak ada. Jadi, dengan sendiri-nya barang² itu sudah turun.

Dan lagi satu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pengakuan legal terhadap barang ini sama juga dengan pengakuan legal

terhadap doctor² atau pun guru². Orang yang tidak menjadi guru, mithal-nya, ada lagi lebeh baik daripada guru² Kerajaan, tetapi oleh kerana dia bukan guru Kerajaan, maka kuasa-nya tidak ada.

Jadi, bagini-lah juga dengan perusahaan kita ini kalau orang² itu tidak di-jemput sama lebeh ramai, maka perusahaan² kecil itu akan mati. Kalau tidak perchaya, kita tunggu-lah hal perkara ini. Yang pelek-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Bill ini sa-patut-nya tidak-lah di-susahkan sangat oleh Kementerian kita. Kementerian Perdagangan boleh mengemukakan satu Rang Undang², tetapi mutu-nya, nature—hakikat, atau pun arrangement-nya, segala kuasa-nya perkara² yang tersebut di-dalam ini, sa-patut-nya kita serahkan kepada gulongan yang di-namakan *entrepreneurs*—tidak kita buat sendiri. Jadi, orang ini yang lebeh ada kaitan, lebeh concern dengan perkara² yang sa-macham ini—bukan Kementerian kita.

Jadi, ini Kementerian kita sudah hendak menjalankan guided democracy, guided economy, erti-nya dia hendak membuat sendiri, pada hal dahulu dalam Budget meeting Menteri kita juga kata benda ini kita akan serahkan kepada *entrepreneurs*.

Pada hari ini, Menteri kita membuat bagini. Saya tidak nampak provision di-sini di-beri banyak pada pehak² *entrepreneurs* ia-itu orang² yang di-lantek oleh Menteri ini, Menteri ini, Menteri Education pun ada, barangkali text book, kok buku pun ada yang hendak di-beri sampai kepada standard-nya beri tinggi supaya jangan di-serahkan kepada press lain, tetapi di-serahkan kepada perchetakan Far East, mithal-nya. Jadi, kita tidak beri peluang kepada *entrepreneurs* di-dalam negara kita ini. Jadi, itu-lah benda² yang saya minta jaminan daripada Menteri kita ini dan meminta jawapan. Jangan-lah dia diam sahaja. Itu satu pukulan yang hebat kepada saya sa-bagaimana yang berlaku tadi.

Dr Lim Swee Aun: Mr Speaker, Sir, I must thank both speakers for supporting this Bill, and it is regretted

that this Bill should have been taken so soon—the Bill was scheduled to be the last one on the agenda. The House was supposed to meet till Friday, but because the Opposition benchers have allowed all the other Bills to go through so fast, they had not got the time to study this Bill in more detail.

Sir, the Honourable Member for Batu has raised the point about the composition of the Council. We have tried to bring in as wide a representation as possible, not only from the Government but also from the different professions, commerce, industry, consumer and labour. The point here is that this is quite a technical body, and it is not a question that just because you do not have more consumers, the standards will not be accepted. I would like to make it very clear here that there will be very many more sub-committees called Technical Committees appointed by the Council and they can appoint members, who are not on the Council, but people outside, to become members of these Technical Committees. This is where we draw on the brains of the country on a voluntary basis to come and take part in studying and working out the different standards. As pointed out by the Honourable Member in regard to Clause 12 (3) (a), there will be committees to appoint industries standard committees. Now, these committees will be broken up for the different industries like engineering, medical, food, wood and things like that; and then, again, there will be sub-committees to study particular items. The important part comes when these committees make their recommendations for their standard specifications. The widest publicity will then be given to all concerned what those specifications are, and every manufacturer and every consumer, not only in this country but also abroad, would have the opportunity of studying these specifications. It is only after a thorough examination that the Council will then, when it is satisfied, adopt the specifications. So that safeguard is there.

This Bill is a general enabling Bill and very much unlike the Hire Pur-

chase Bill which effects everybody straightaway. That was why I welcomed views of those concerned. The regulations and rules will be made later; hence there was not this necessity to give such a long delay on this.

The Honourable Member for Bachok raised the point about the import of mosquito coils, which were claimed to be dangerous and sub-standard. There is already an existing law—Powers are already given to the Ministry of Health to ban any imports effecting health, if the Minister is satisfied that there is danger. In this particular case brought up by the Honourable Senator Dato' Dr Cheah Toon Lok who claimed that D.D.T. was used in the mosquito coils made by Communist China and, therefore, is a danger to the public health here, there was a meeting held between him and, on my introduction, the experts, the chemists, and the others in the Ministry of Health, but they were not certain whether D.D.T. was definitely a poison when inhaled. However, as a precaution, the Ministry of Health has already put in a ban, subject to further studies on the import of mosquito coils to see if the content of D.D.T. is high.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: On a point of clarification, Mr Speaker, Sir, since the Honourable Minister of Commerce and Industry and I are both medical men, and we speak the same language, is he not aware that—and it is regrettable that the Ministry of Health is not aware—the Medical Journals have stated in several articles in no uncertain terms that the use of D.D.T. is detrimental to health, amongst other things it causes hepatitis and the like; and the Senator Dato' Dr Cheah, who is also a medical man, has made an intensive study of it, and he has undoubtedly briefed the Honourable Minister for Commerce and Industry on the deleterious effect of D.D.T. on health; and finally the Ministry of Health knows, and the Minister of Commerce and Industry knows, that Singapore has banned the mosquito coils that contain D.D.T.

Dr Lim Swee Aun: We accept that D.D.T. is a poison, and we also know

that D.D.T. is being sprayed on the walls of houses as a preventive measure against malaria. The question here is whether burning of mosquito coils containing D.D.T. would be dangerous to health. So, unless the Ministry of Health is satisfied that there is danger, then the law does not allow them to prevent the importation of such materials which, however, as I said, have already been banned, pending further investigation.

Now the Honourable Member for Bachok has stated that he regrets that there is no provision for this Bill to help small industries, or the small factories, to attain standards. Sir, the whole object of this exercise, the whole purpose of this Bill, is to get a legal body to define standards; it is not its job to tell you how to do it. However, in defining standards for a particular product, it would encourage the small man and the big man to produce goods up to that standard if he wants sales, if he wants to satisfy the market, otherwise as the Honourable Member has said, the consumer would not buy. Indirectly, it is promoting the improvement in quality of our local products. The question of who should assist the small factories to improve the standards is another question. It does not come within the province of the Standards Institution of Malaya. It should come within the small industries technical service bodies. Now, this is another subject, and my Ministry is looking into the question of setting up a small Industries Technical Service to help the smaller factories to improve the quality of their product. In point of fact, the National Productivity Centre is also indirectly helping such factories to improve their production, and if factories do not reach the standards specified and accepted later, well, their sales naturally will go down.

Question put, and agreed to.

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

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr Speaker *in the Chair*)

Clauses 1 to 29 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported without amendments; read the third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

(Motion)

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Sir, I beg to move that the House do now adjourn.

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

ADJOURNMENT SPEECH

KESULITAN DAN KESUSAHAN PEKERJA² DI-PELABOHAN PULAU PINANG

Tuan Ismail bin Idris (Penang Selatan): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-bagaimana yang telah di-siarkan di-dalam akhbar², telah pun di-suarakan, beberapa perasaan ta' puas hati terhadap pekerja² yang bekerja di-dalam pelabohan Pulau Pinang. Apakala kuat-kuasa satu perkara peratoran yang telah di-kuat-kuasakan pada 1hb Oktober, 1966, itu, ada-lah di-dapati sungutan² daripada pekerja² dan juga sungutan² daripada crang² yang telah tidak di-benarkan bekerja di-pelabohan itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, suka-lah saya hendak menyatakan di-sini ia-itu sebelum peratoran² ini di-kuat-kuasakan maka pekerja² yang bekerja di-pelabohan Pulau Pinang itu ada-lah bekerja di-bawah arahan majikan²-nya sendiri, dan ada kala-nya di-antara pekerja² yang bilangan-nya di-antara 2,500 sa-hingga 2,800 orang itu ada yang bekerja di-antara 10 hingga 12 hari pada sa-bulan, dengan mendapat gaji atau elaun di-antara \$40 dan \$60; dan ada pula di-antara mereka itu yang bekerja lebeh lama, lebeh jauh, dan mendapat pendapatan lebeh kurang di-antara \$180 hingga \$200, ini di-sebabkan oleh pekerjaan overtime atau pun bekerja lebehmasa. Sunggoh pun bagitu ada di-dapati kebaikan² yang berlaku, umpama-nya, apakala

buroh² itu bekerja di-dalam sa-buah kapal dan apakala barang² itu sudah di-punggah habis maka pekerja² itu tidak-lah di-benarkan lagi bekerja mengikut apa yang sedang di-jalankan mengikut atoran undang² baharu ini.

Umpama-nya apakala mereka itu bekerja dan menghabiskan punggahan mereka tersebut, bererti di-benarkan pulang mendapat gaji atau pun elaun yang sa-chukup-nya. Tetapi mengikut kuat-kuasa atoran yang sedang berjalan ini, tiap² sa-orang pekerja itu hendak-lah bekerja sa-kurang²-nya lapan jam sama ada punggahan² itu habis atau tidak, mereka hendak-lah menunggu sa-hingga lapan jam. Ini menunjukkan perbezaan di-antara pekerja² yang bekerja sa-belum di-kuat-kuasakan peratoran ini dan apakala kuat-kuasa ini di-jalankan.

Apabila kuat-kuasa ini di-jalankan semenjak 1hb Oktober, maka buroh² ini atau pekerja² ini telah pun menjalankan pendaftaran dari hari ini ada-lah di-ketahui mengikut jawapan yang telah di-beri oleh Menteri Buroh kepada soal yang di-kemukakan oleh Wakil Tanjong sa-banyak 1,326 sahaja. Maka yang sa-lebeh-nya yang saya katakan tadi dari 2,500 orang itu apakala di-tolak 1,326 maka lebeh kurang 1,174 orang lagi maseh menganggor. Ini ada-lah daripada sebab² yang hasil peratoran yang di-buat pada 1 haribulan Oktober ini.

Di-dalam pendaftaran buroh ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya telah di-fahamkan ada di-antara buroh² yang di-daftarkan dalam 1,326 ini terdiri daripada buroh² yang sedang atau pun telah ada mempunyai pekerjaan—sa-bahagian kecil mereka itu ada mempunyai pekerjaan. Ini ada-lah lagi satu kesusahan untok hendak mengambil orang² yang sedang menganggor hari ini.

Lagi satu perkara yang menyusah dan tidak menyenangkan hati orang² di-sana kerana di-dapati sa-bahagian daripada orang² yang berdaftar hari ini ia-lah orang² yang bukan warga negara negeri ini. Saya tidak-lah lagi hendak membangkang daripada pengambilan orang² yang bukan warga negara jika sa-kira-nya tidak ada

langsung warga negara negeri ini yang mahu bekerja.

Tetapi hari ini saperti mana yang saya sebutkan tadi, maseh ada lagi 1,360 yang pada masa dahulu bekerja sa-bagai buroh kasar hari ini tidak mempunyai kerja sama sa-kali. Maka oleh yang demikian saya rasa tidak-lah adil bagi orang² yang bertanggung-jawab mengambil orang² ini sa-belum warga negara ini di-beri kerja.

Kita ambil ingatan hari ini, di-Singapura tidak di-benarkan orang² yang bukan warga negara bekerja di-dalam negeri Singapura tetapi kita mempunyai ra'ayat yang bagini banyak, yang mempunyai ra'ayat tidak ada kerja bagini banyak, kita ketepikan orang² yang sa-macham ini. Maka oleh yang demikian ini-lah satu sungatan yang paling rumit dan beberapa pekerja² dan society² di-sana sudah membuat bantahan² terhadap perjalanan yang di-jalankan oleh atoran dan peratoran ini.

Dalam soal orang² yang sedang bekerja pula, saya kata tadi, mengikut atoran ini di-bahagi kepada tiga bahagian ia-itu orang² yang bekerja dari pukul 8 sa-hingga 6 petang, orang² yang bekerja dari pukul 6 sa-hingga pukul 3 pagi dan orang² yang bekerja dari pukul 3 pagi sa-hingga pukul 8 pagi—tiga tingkatan. Orang² yang bekerja di-waktu pukul 6 petang sa-hingga pukul 3 pagi ada-lah susah yang mereka itu, apakala pukul 3 pagi sudah habis kerja mereka naik kadar, mereka naik dan berjalan pulang. Boleh jadi di-antara mereka itu ada yang tinggal lima enam batu jauh daripada tempat ia bekerja. Maka oleh yang demikian ini ada-lah satu kesusahan pada mereka itu. Tetapi pada masa dahulu mereka itu ada-lah di-benarkan supaya tinggal di-rumah di-dalam satu kawasan yang di-khaskan oleh majikan, tetapi hari ini perkara itu tidak berlaku dan kuat-kuasa ini di-jalankan.

Oleh itu supaya orang yang bertanggung-jawab dalam hal ini dapat menyiasat satu atoran supaya melihat atau menasihatkan majikan² ini menolong orang² buroh² kasar itu jangan

mendapat begitu susah di-dalam keadaan menjalankan urusan masing².

Satu lagi perkara yang saya suka mengingatkan di-sini, walau pun atoran telah ada di-dalam atoran² baharu di-jalankan kuat-kuasa-nya itu tetapi di-waktu pukul 3 pagi sa-hingga jam 7 pagi itu, tidak sama sa-kali di-benarkan bekerja. Saya tidak tahu apa sebab-nya, satu peratoran memberi wang lebeh \$5 lebeh, maka dengan sebab itu-lah saya rasa agent² tidak mahu mengeluarkan wang yang samacham itu. Itu saya tidak tahu, boleh jadi. Oleh itu saya meminta-lah supaya Menteri yang bertanggung-jawab supaya dapat berunding dengan pehak yang tertentu supaya perkara ini dapat di-selesaikan.

Hari ini saya meminta lagi sa-kali supaya Menteri, apakala hendak menubuhkan satu² badan, umpama-nya, saya meminta-lah supaya dia dapat menolong memikirkan bersama² dan berunding bersama² dengan pehak Kerajaan Negeri. Saya di-fahamkan dengan tertuboh-nya Labour Board ini dan perlantekan Ahli²-nya, tidak langsung berunding dengan pehak Kerajaan Negeri. Oleh sebab memandang kapada satu pengertian dan satu kebaikan bersama di-antara pehak Kerajaan Pusat dan pehak Kerajaan Negeri, saya harap-lah pada masa hadapan supaya dapat berunding bersama² diantara kedua pehak ini. Itu-lah rayuan saya yang saya minta ini bukan hanya rayuan² saya, tetapi ia-lah juga rayuan dari penduduk² yang bekerja yang meminta saya bawakan ka-dalam Majlis ini.

Tuan V. Manickavasagam: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Yang Berhormat Ahli daripada Pulau Pinang Selatan, dalam ucapan-nya, ada menyentoh kesulitan² dan kesusahan buroh² di-Pulau Pinang, terutama sa-kali tentang penganggoran oleh beberapa pekerja pelabohan. Saya telah beberapa kali menerangkan dalam persidangan ini tentang tujuan dan kehendak² ranchangan perburohan pelabohan tersebut.

Untuk mengulangi keterangan saya dahulu, kita dapati bertambah ramai bilangan majikan dan buroh di-Pelabo-

han Pulau Pinang. Chara bekerja dan pekerja sambilan yang berlebehan atau casual labour, menimbulkan beberapa kesulitan. Bukan sahaja kecekapan bekerja dan kemajuan di-pelabohan tersebut dalam jangka panjang-nya akan terancham oleh ada-nya kesulitan² ini, juga buroh² tersebut tidak ada jaminan bekerja, tidak ada pendapatan yang tetap, tidak ada perlindungan dari Undang² Buroh seperti E.P.F. dan Workmen's Compensation. Kerana sebab² ini-lah maka Kerajaan telah menubuhkan Lembaga Perburohan di-Pelabohan Pulau Pinang.

Kewajipan yang penting bagi Lembaga tersebut ia-lah untuk menentukan ia-itu tenaga manusia sa-chukup-nya sentiasa ada di-dapati terus-menerus bagi melichinkan kerja² di-Pelabohan tersebut. Tugas yang mustahak Lembaga tersebut ia-lah untuk menetapkan chara bekerja—decasualise—di-Pelabohan tersebut dan ini berma'ana bahawa mereka² yang bergantung kapada kerja² di-Pelabohan untuk sara hidup mereka, akan di-beri keutamaan untuk pendaftaran di-bandingkan dengan mereka yang bekerja di-Pelabohan hanya sambilan sahaja untuk menambah sara hidup mereka yang tetap dengan bekerja di-tempat lain.

Ranchangan Pendaftaran Buroh stevedore telah di-lancharkan awal bulan ini sa-lepas satu penyiasatan yang lama dan teliti tentang kegiatan² di-Pelabohan itu.

Lembaga tersebut berpendapat bahawa jumlah sa-banyak 1,326 buroh stevedores ada-lah cukup untuk memenohi kehendak² di-dalam pekerjaan di-pelabohan tersebut dan jumlah ini telah di-daftarkan. Ada di-katakan bahawa beribu² buroh telah hilang pekerjaan mereka sa-bagai akibat ranchangan ini. Ini tidak benar, pertama-nya penyiasatan ka-atas majikan² di-pelabohan tersebut menunjukkan hanya 1,200 buroh stevedores telah bekerja dalam tempoh 18 bulan yang lalu.

Kedua-nya, saya sendiri telah menyiasat daftar berkenaan dengan hal ini dan saya berpuas hati bahawa sa-jumlah besar dari mereka yang tidak

di-daftarkan itu hanya berkaitan sedikit sahaja dengan kerja² di-pelabohan, bekerja satu atau dua hari dalam sabulan. Lembaga tersebut telah diminta memberi pertolongan kepada mereka yang sa-sungguh-nya perlu pertolongan. Pada fikiran saya adal ah adil jikalau mereka yang bekerja sabagai buroh sambilan tidak mengganggu ketetapan dan jaminan sara hidup mereka yang bergantung kepada pekerjaan di-pelabohan sa-mata² untuk kehidupan mereka. Ini-lah sa-benar-nya tujuan Undang² itu dan telah diterangkan apabila saya membawa undang² itu ka-Dewan ini dahulu.

Tidak-lah benar saperti apa yang dikatakan oleh Yang Berhormat tadi bahawa buroh yang bukan warga negara telah di-beri keutamaan dalam rancangan pendaftaran ini—ini tidak benar. Sa-bagaimana yang telah saya katakan, mereka² yang bergantung pada pekerjaan di-pelabohan untuk sara hidup, telah di-beri keutamaan dan jumlah ini mungkin termasuk beberapa orang yang bukan warga negara. Kerajaan tidak bersetuju hendak memberhentikan sa-siapa yang bekerja di-pelabohan pada masa ini yang bukan warga negara dari pekerjaan mereka, tetapi jika pekerja² baru di-kehendaki pada masa hadapan warga negara akan di-beri keutamaan.

Bila melancharkan rancangan baru bagi pendaftaran stevedores, beberapa perubahan terpaksa di-buat mengenai chara pekerjaan di-pelabohan lain hanya sedikit sahaja mengenai chara bekerja. Sudah terang bahawa jika kita mahu kemajuan dan mengadakan perlindungan² bagi menjamin bahawa buroh² mendapat perhatian yang adil, sa-bilangan chara² lama yang kolot terpaksa di-buang. Saya fikir bila buroh² tersebut sudah biasa dengan perburohan ini, kebaikan-nya akan tercapai dan tidak ada apa² kesulitan akan di-alami.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli Yang Berhormat juga ada mengatakan kita tidak ada berunding dengan Kerajaan Negeri. Ini tidak betul. Saya sendiri semua ahli² Executive Council di-Pulau Pinang tahun dahulu, dan ada memberi keterangan dengan chukup kepada ahli² itu. Dan juga pada minggu yang lalu saya ada berjumpa ahli² EXCO di-Pulau Pinang dan saya sukachita memberitahu kepada Dewan ini bahawa ahli² itu telah berpuas hati. Terima kaseh.

Mr Speaker: The House is adjourned *sine die*.

Adjourned at 7.45 p.m.