



PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

DEWAN RA'AYAT (HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

OFFICIAL REPORT

THIRD SESSION OF THE SECOND PARLIAMENT OF MALAYSIA

CONTENTS

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH [Col. 997]

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR SPEAKER:

Welcome to the Honourable Tun Datu Mustapha bin Datu Harun
[Col. 998]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 999]

ADJOURNMENT *SINE DIE* (Motion) [Col. 1032]

BILLS:

The Societies (Amendment) Bill [Col. 1032]

The Employees Provident Fund (Amendment) Bill [Col. 1034]

The Loan (International Tin Buffer Stock) Bill [Col. 1036]

The Exchange Control (Amendment) Bill [Col. 1038]

The External Loans (Amendment) Bill [Col. 1043]

The Extended Credit Bill [Col. 1047]

The Asian Development Bank Bill [Col. 1049]

The Loan (Local) (Amendment) Bill [Col. 1054]

The Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka (Amendment) Bill [Col. 1060]

The Midwives Bill [Col. 1066]

The Local Government Elections (Amendment) Bill (Col. 1078)

The Control of Rent (Amendment) Bill [Col. 1080]

The Continental Shelf Bill [Col. 1106]

The Petroleum Mining Bill [Col. 1108]

ADJOURNMENT SPEECH—

Exemption of Toll on Motor Cycles (Slim River/Tanjong Malim)
[Col. 1111.]

MALAYSIA
DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)
Official Report

Third Session of the Second Dewan Ra'ayat

Tuesday, 21st June, 1966

The House met at 10 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 Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Defence, 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 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 of Labour, TUAN V. MANICKAVASAGAM, J.M.N., P.J.K. (Klang).
- „ the Minister of Information and Broadcasting and Minister of Culture, Youth and Sports, TUAN SENU BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Kubang Pasu Barat).
- „ the Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives, TUAN HAJI MOHAMED GHAZALI BIN HAJI JAWI (Ulu Perak).
- „ the Minister of Lands and Mines, TUAN ABDUL-RAHMAN BIN YA'KUB (Sarawak).
- „ the Assistant Minister of National and Rural Development, TUAN SULAIMAN BIN BULON, P.J.K., (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 Honourable the Assistant Minister of Education, TUAN LEE SIOK YEW, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Sepang).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Finance, DR NG KAM POH, J.P. (Telok Anson).
- „ the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, TUAN IBRAHIM BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Seberang Tengah).
- „ the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour, TUAN LEE SAN CHOON, K.M.N. (Segamat Selatan).
- „ the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, TUAN ALI BIN HAJI AHMAD (Pontian Selatan).
- „ the Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister, TUAN CHEN WING SUM (Damansara).
- „ TUAN ABDUL GHANI BIN ISHAK, A.M.N. (Melaka Utara).
- „ TUAN ABDUL KARIM BIN ABU, A.M.N. (Melaka Selatan).
- „ WAN ABDUL KADIR BIN ISMAIL, P.P.T. (Kuala Trengganu Utara).
- „ TUAN 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 HAJI 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).
- „ DR AWANG BIN HASSAN, S.M.J. (Muar Selatan).
- „ TUAN AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Muar Dalam).
- „ TUAN JONATHAN BANGAU ANAK RENANG, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ PENGARAH BANYANG ANAK JANTING, P.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN CHAN CHONG WEN, A.M.N. (Kluang Selatan).
- „ TUAN CHAN SEONG YOON (Setapak).
- „ TUAN CHAN SIANG SUN, P.J.K. (Bentong).
- „ TUAN CHEW BIOW CHUON (Bruas).
- „ TUAN FRANCIS CHIA NYUK TONG (Sabah).
- „ TUAN CHIN FOON (Ulu Kinta).
- „ TUAN C. V. DEVAN NAIR (Bungsar).
- „ TUAN D. A. DAGO ANAK RANDAN *alias* DAGOK ANAK RANDEN (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN SYED ESA BIN ALWEE, J.M.N., S.M.J., P.I.S. (Batu Pahat Dalam).
- „ DATIN HAJJAH FATIMAH BINTI HAJI ABDUL MAJID (Johor Bahru Timor).

- The Honourable TAN SRI FATIMAH BINTI HAJI HASHIM, P.M.N.
(Jitra-Padang Terap).
- „ TUAN GANING BIN JANGKAT (Sabah).
- „ TUAN GEH CHONG KEAT, K.M.N. (Penang Utara).
- „ TUAN HAJI HAMZAH BIN ALANG, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Kapar).
- „ TUAN 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 ISMAIL BIN IDRIS (Penang Selatan).
- „ TAN SRI SYED JA'AFAR BIN HASAN ALBAR, P.M.N.
(Johor Tenggara).
- „ PENGHULU JINGGUT ANAK ATTAN, Q.M.C., A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN KAM WOON WAH, J.P. (Sitiawan).
- „ TUAN THOMAS KANA (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN LEE SECK FUN, K.M.N. (Tanjong Malim).
- „ TUAN AMADEUS MATHEW LEONG, A.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).
- „ DR MAHATHIR BIN MOHAMAD (Kota Star Selatan).
- „ TUAN T. MAHIMA SINGH, J.P. (Port Dickson).
- „ DATO' DR HAJI MEGAT KHAS, D.P.M.P., J.P., P.J.K.
(Kuala Kangsar).
- „ DATO' MOHAMED ASRI BIN HAJI MUDA, S.P.M.K.
(Pasir Puteh).
- „ TUAN MOHD. DAUD BIN ABDUL SAMAD (Besut).
- „ TUAN MOHAMED IDRIS BIN MATSIL, J.M.N., P.J.K., J.P.
(Jelebu-Jempol).
- „ TUAN MOHD. TAHIR BIN ABDUL MAJID, S.M.S., P.J.K.
(Kuala Langat).
- „ TUAN MOHAMED YUSOF BIN MAHMUD, A.M.N. (Temerloh).
- „ TUAN MOHD. ZAHIR BIN HAJI ISMAIL, J.M.N. (Sungai Patani).
- „ WAN MOKHTAR BIN AHMAD (Kemaman).
- „ TUAN HAJI MOKHTAR BIN HAJI ISMAIL (Perlis Selatan).
- „ TUAN MUHAMMAD FAKHRUDDIN BIN HAJI ABDULLAH
(Pasir Mas Hilir).
- „ TUAN HAJI MUHAMMAD SU'AUT BIN HAJI MUHD. TAHIR,
A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ TUN MUSTAPHA BIN DATU HARUN, S.M.N. (Sarawak).
- „ DATO' HAJI MUSTAPHA BIN HAJI ABDUL JABAR, D.P.M.S.,
A.M.N., J.P. (Sabak Bernam).
- „ TUAN MUSTAPHA BIN AHMAD (Tanah Merah).

- The Honourable **TUAN NG FAH YAM** (Batu Gajah).
- „ **TUAN HAJI OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH** (Hilir Perak).
- „ **TUAN OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N.** (Perlis Utara).
- „ **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 SIOW LOONG HIN, P.J.K.** (Seremban Barat).
- „ **TUAN SENAWI BIN ISMAIL, P.J.K.** (Seberang Selatan).
- „ **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).
- „ **DR TAN CHEE KOON** (Batu).
- „ **TUAN TAN CHENG BEE, J.P.** (Bagan).
- „ **TUAN TAN TOH HONG** (Bukit Bintang).
- „ **TUAN TIAH ENG BEE** (Kluang Utara).
- „ **TUAN HAJI ZAKARIA BIN HAJI MOHD. TAIB, P.J.K.** (Langat).

ABSENT:

- The Honourable the Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs,
Y.T.M. TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN PUTRA AL-HAJ, K.O.M.
(Kuala Kedah).
- „ the Minister of Education, **TUAN MOHAMED KHIR JOHARI**
(Kedah Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Commerce and Industry, **DR LIM SWEE AUN,**
J.P. (Larut Selatan).
- „ the Minister for Sarawak Affairs, **TAN SRI TEMENGGONG**
JUGAH ANAK BARIENG, P.M.N., P.D.K. (Sarawak).
- „ the Assistant Minister without Portfolio, **TUAN HAJI ABDUL**
KHALID BIN AWANG OSMAN (Kota Star Utara).
- „ **WAN ABDUL RAHMAN BIN DATU TUANKU BUJANG, A.B.S.**
(Sarawak).
- „ **TUAN ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAJI TALIB, P.J.K.** (Kuantan).
- „ **DATO' ABDULLAH BIN ABDULRAHMAN, Dato' Bijaya di-Raja**
(Kuala Trengganu Selatan).
- „ **O. K. K. DATU ALIUDDIN BIN DATU HARUN, P.D.K.** (Sabah).
- „ **TUAN CHIA CHIN SHIN, A.B.S.** (Sarawak).
- „ **TUAN EDWIN ANAK TANGKUN** (Sarawak).
- „ **TUAN S. FAZUL RAHMAN, A.D.K.** (Sabah).

- The Honourable DATU GANIE GILONG, P.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).
- „ TUAN IKHWAN ZAINI (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN KADAM ANAK KIAI (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN KHOO PENG LOONG (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN EDMUND LANGGU ANAK SAGA (Sarawak).
- „ DATO' LING BENG SIEW, P.N.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ DR LIM CHONG EU (Tanjong).
- „ TUAN LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).
- „ TUAN LIM PEE HUNG, P.J.K. (Alor Star).
- „ TUAN PETER LO SU YIN (Sabah).
- „ TUAN C. JOHN ONDU MAJAKIL (Sabah).
- „ TUAN JOSEPH DAVID MANJAJI (Sabah).
- „ TUAN MOHD. ARIF SALLEH, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ ORANG TUA MOHAMMAD DARA BIN LANGPAD (Sabah).
- „ 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 ONG KEE HUI (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN QUEK KAI DONG, J.P. (Seremban Timor).
- „ DATO' S. P. SEENIVASAGAM, D.P.M.P., P.M.P., J.P. (Menglembu).
- „ TUAN SIM BOON LIANG, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN SNG CHIN JOO (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN TAMA WENG TINGGANG WAN (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Melaka).
- „ TUAN TAN TSAK YU (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN TOH THEAM HOCK (Kampar).
- „ TUAN YEH PAO TZE (Sabah).
- „ TUAN STEPHEN YONG KUET TZE (Sarawak).

PRAYERS

(Mr Speaker *in the Chair*)

(Attention drawn to there being no quorum: Division bell rung and count taken: there still being no quorum, sitting suspended.)

Sitting suspended at 10.05 a.m.

Sitting resumed at 10.15 a.m.

(Mr Speaker *in the Chair*)

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

The following Member made and subscribed the Affirmation required by law:

Tun Datu Mustapha bin Datu Harun.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY

MR SPEAKER

WELCOME TO THE HONOURABLE TUN DATU MUSTAPHA BIN DATU HARUN

Mr Speaker: Ahli² Yang Berhormat, saya suka mengambil peluang mengucapkan selamat datang kepada Ahli baharu ka-Majlis ini ia-itu Yang Berhormat Tun Datu Mustapha bin Datu Harun dan juga mengucapkan tahniah kepada beliau kerana telah dipilih oleh Dewan Perwakilan Sabah dalam meshuarat yang telah di-adakan pada 17hb Jun, 1966 menjadi Ahli Dewan ini menggantikan Dato' Khoo Siak Chew yang telah berhenti daripada Ahli Majlis ini. (*Tepok*).

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

RANCHANGAN PERUMAHAN, PEGAWAI² KERAJAAN— RUMAH² PANGSA

1. Tuan Ramli bin Omar (Krian Darat) bertanya kepada Perdana Menteri, memandang kepada kekurangan Rumah² Kerajaan dan juga kerana Kerajaan telah membelanjakan banyak wang untuk ranchangan perumahan Pegawai² Kerajaan, ada-kah Kerajaan berchadang hendak mendirikan rumah² pangsa pula bagi semua pegawai² Kerajaan.

Timbalan Perdana Menteri (Tun Haji Abdul Razak): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada masa yang sudah, Kerajaan tiada banyak mendirikan rumah² pangsa bagi pegawai² Kerajaan oleh kerana di-dapati rumah pangsa ini tidak di-sukai oleh sa-bilangan besar daripada pegawai² Kerajaan. Walau pun begitu Kerajaan telah dan sedang mendirikan rumah² murah, termasuk rumah² pangsa, bagi di-jual kepada orang ramai termasuk pegawai² Kerajaan. Kerajaan sekarang ini sedang mengkaji satu dasar perumahan yang baharu ia-itu dasar menggalakkan pegawai² Kerajaan memiliki rumah sendiri. Apabila dasar ini telah dipersetujui dan di-laksanakan, maka tidak-lah perlu bagi Kerajaan mendirikan banyak rumah² Kerajaan untuk pegawai² Kerajaan.

MEMBESARKAN ANGKATAN BERSENJATA MALAYSIA

2. Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah (Bachok) bertanya kepada Menteri Pertahanan jika konfrantasi Indonesia tamat ada-kah Kerajaan akan meneruskan langkah membesarkan Angkatan Bersenjata-nya, dan jika ya, adakah Kerajaan akan menghantar pemuda² ka-Indonesia untuk mendapat latehan tentera.

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ranchangan bagi membesarkan Angkatan Tentera kita bukan-lah sa-mata² di-maksudkan bagi menentang konfrantasi Indonesia tetapi untuk mempertahankan negara kita, Malay-

sia. Tambahan pula dasar kita ia-lah supaya negara kita ada mempunyai tentera² yang lengkap untuk mempertahankan negara kita dengan kekuatan kita sendiri. Berkenaan dengan chadangan hendak menghantar pemuda² ka-Indonesia untuk mendapat latehan tentera, dasar kita ia-lah hendak menghantar orang mengambil latehan tentera di-mana² juga negeri yang di-fikirkan patut dan menasabah, tetapi soal hendak menghantar ka-Indonesia, saya fikir, sangat-lah awal hendak di-timbangkan pada waktu ini.

PERJANJIAN PERTAHANAN DENGAN INDONESIA

3. Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah bertanya kepada Menteri Pertahanan jika Kerajaan akan menandatangani satu Perjanjian Pertahanan baharu dengan Indonesia menggantikan Perjanjian Pertahanan dengan Britain.

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soal hendak mengikat satu perjanjian pertahanan dengan Indonesia sangat-lah awal untuk di-pertimbangkan sekarang ini oleh sebab rundingan di-antara kita dan Indonesia untuk menamatkan konfrantasi belum-lah lagi selesai.

PELUANG BAGI BUMIPUTERA SARAWAK DAN BORNEO ME- MASOKI ASKAR MELAYU

4. Tuan Ahmad bin Arshad (Muar Utara) bertanya kepada Menteri Pertahanan ada-kah benar bahawa Kementerian-nya berchadang hendak memberi peluang kepada ra'ayat bumiputera Sarawak dan Sabah memasoki Askar Melayu, dan jika benar, apakah sambutan yang di-berikan oleh kedua² Kerajaan Negeri itu dan adakah Majlis Raja² Melayu telah di-bawa berunding atas perkara ini.

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ra'ayat bumiputera Sabah dan Sarawak ada-lah di-benarkan masok berkhidmat dalam Askar Melayu Di-Raja dan langkah meminda Undang² Askar Melayu Di-Raja (Royal Malay Regiment Enactment) sedang di-ambil. Sambutan yang di-berikan oleh kedua² Kerajaan Negeri

itu ada-lah memuaskan hati, bagitu juga Duli² Yang Maha Mulia Raja² telah ma'alum hal ini.

LATEHAN TENTERA BAGI PEGAWAI² TENTERA MALAYSIA DI-SEBERANG LAUT

5. Tuan Ahmad bin Arshad bertanya kepada Menteri Pertahanan :

- (a) sebutkan negeri² yang memberi latehan tentera kepada Pegawai² Tentera Malaysia sekarang ini dan apa bidang latehan yang mereka jalani; dan
- (b) ada-kah Kerajaan berchadang menghantar Pegawai² Tentera kita untuk menerima latehan di-Maktab Tentera di-Burma, Jerman Barat dan Russia, dan jika ya, bila.

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: Tuan Yang di-Pertua—(a) Pada masa ini Pegawai² Angkatan Tentera Malaysia sedang menerima latehan tentera di-negeri² yang berikut ia-itu :

- (i) United Kingdom;
- (ii) Australia;
- (iii) India;
- (iv) Canada;
- (v) Amerika Sharikat;
- (vi) New Zealand.

Pegawai² ini menerima latehan dalam mata pelajaran tentera. (b) Pada masa ini belum ada ranchangan hendak menghantar anggota² Angkatan Tentera untuk berlately di-negeri² Burma, Jerman Barat dan Russia. Malaysia sedia menghantar anggota² Angkatan Tentera berlately di-mana² negeri juga jika latehan ini di-fikirkan berfaedah dan perbelanjaan-nya berpatutan.

MAJU-MUNDOR-NYA RANCIANGAN² LEMBAGA KEMAJUAN TANAH, NEGERI SEMBILAN

6. Tuan Hussein bin Sulaiman (U'u Kelantan) bertanya kepada Menteri Pembangunan Negara dan Luar Bandar ada-kah Kerajaan mengetahui maju-mundor-nya ranchangan² Lembaga Kemajuan Tanah Negeri Kelantan.

Menteri Muda Pembangunan Negara dan Luar Bandar (Tuan Sulaiman bin Bulon): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tidak. Kerana Kerajaan PAS di-Kelantan tidak memberikan apa² ma'lumat kepada Kerajaan Pusat berhubung dengan ranchangan² tanah yang di-jalankan di-Kelantan.

LANJUTAN RANCIANGAN² KEMAJUAN TANAH PERSEKUTUAN KA-NEGERI KELANTAN

7. Tuan Hussein bin Sulaiman bertanya kepada Menteri Pembangunan Negara dan Luar Bandar mana-kah usaha² yang di-jalankan oleh Kerajaan Pusat untuk membawa masuk Ranchangan² Kemajuan Tanah Persekutuan ka-negeri Kelantan, meski pun Kerajaan Kelantan payah hendak menerima Ranchangan² ini.

Tuan Sulaiman bin Bulon: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saperti Kerajaan² Negeri yang lain, Kerajaan Kelantan telah pun di-minta mengemukakan chadangan² ranchangan tanah yang hendak di-buka di-bawah kelolaan F.L.D.A. di-Kelantan. Sa-hingga hari ini tidak ada apa² chadangan yang telah di-kemukakan oleh Kerajaan Negeri Kelantan sunggoh pun Kerajaan Pusat dengan jelas-nya telah menyatakan niat-nya hendak menolong beribu² orang yang tidak bertanah di-Kelantan supaya mendapat tanah. Saya faham atas keenggaran Kerajaan Negeri Kelantan hendak mengemukakan chadangan² itu oleh kerana 510,000 ekar tanah yang ada dan yang boleh di-gunakan di-kawasan selatan negeri Kelantan telah pun di-keluarkan kepada sa-buah sharikat yang besar.

Wan Abdul Kadir bin Ismail (Kuala Trengganu Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soal tambahan. Tidak-kah pada satu masa yang lalu, Kerajaan Kelantan hendak menerima ranchangan² Kerajaan Pusat dan tidak-kah termasuk ranchangan F.L.D.A. ini.

Tuan Sulaiman bin Bulon: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tidak-lah termasuk ranchangan F.L.D.A. sa-bagaimana yang di-maksudkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat ini.

**DEATH OF DETAINEE KIEW
SENG LIEN OF SARAKEI,
SARAWAK**

8. Dr Tan Chee Khoon (Batu) asks the Minister of Home Affairs if he is aware that a detainee by the name of Kiew Seng Lien of Sarakei was sent home from Batu Gajah by plane to Kuching on 14th March, 1966, and that he passed away the next day; if so, to state what was the cause of his death and whether there has been any negligence on the part of any of the officials connected with this tragedy.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Tun Dr Ismail): Mr Speaker, Sir, Kiew Seng Lien, who was brought to the Batu Gajah Special Detention Camp on 13th October, 1964, was the Secretary-General and Chairman of the Sibu All Trades Employees Union and was actively engaged in the task of promoting Clandestine Communist Organisation United Front activities. He was arrested and detained for these activities. Since his arrival in the Batu Gajah Special Detention Camp, he was one of the detainees who actively participated in agitation within the Camp and boycotted Reviews by the Advisory Board.

The first indication that the Detention Camp Authorities had of his stomach ailment was on 23rd November, 1965, when he was treated as an out-patient at the Batu Gajah District Hospital for peptic ulcer. At the time of his treatment, deceased claimed that he had been suffering from this complaint off and on for about 20 years. He was admitted to the District Hospital, Batu Gajah, for treatment on 16th December, 1965 for the first time, and transferred to the Ipoh General Hospital on the 28th December, 1965, for further treatment of his complaint. While in hospital, he had very severe attacks of epigastric pain accompanied by frequent and persistent vomiting. Physical examination revealed signs of marked pyloric obstructions which were subsequently confirmed by a Barium meal X-ray. On operation conducted at the General Hospital, Ipoh, the pylorus was found

to be markedly obstructed by a cancerous growth, which was found to be inoperable as it has spread and involved surrounding structures. A gastroenterotomy was done to relieve the obstruction.

Kiew Seng Lien was transferred back to Batu Gajah for post-operative treatment at the beginning of January and discharged from Batu Gajah Hospital towards the end of that month. He was re-admitted to the Batu Gajah Hospital for further treatment towards the end of February for the same complaint. The Medical Officer, District Hospital, Batu Gajah, reported that, as Kiew Seng Lien was suffering from advanced cancer, his prognosis was poor and that he should be sent back to Sarawak to spend the remaining days of his life with his family.

On the recommendation of the Medical Officer, District Hospital, Batu Gajah, arrangements were made for Kiew Seng Lien to fly back to Kuching on the 15th of March, 1966, after having obtained a Certificate of Fitness to travel from the Medical Officer, District Hospital, Batu Gajah. On arrival in Kuching, he was immediately admitted to the General Hospital there for treatment but unfortunately, he passed away soon after arrival.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, may we know when was the Barium meal X-ray done on the deceased and when was the operation done on the deceased as well?

Tun Dr Ismail: Sir, I have given as much details as I could on this question. Now, I did mention at what time he was first treated and when the Barium meal X-ray was done on him. If I answer that question, I suppose the Honourable Member would like to know the everyday activities of the late Kiew Lien's life.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, it is incredible the Honourable Minister has not got these facts before him. The subsequent questions that I am going to pose depend very much

on the dates that the Barium meal X-ray was done and the operation was done, not that I am trying to pry too much into the top secrets of the operation in Batu Gajah or in Ipoh.

Tun Dr Ismail: I told the Honourable Member all the details about this detainee, the ex-detainee, and I do not intend to give any further details.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Minister in giving us these details I think was unworthy of him to draw lots of red herrings regarding the activities of the deceased, telling us that he was a Communist or indulging in Communist activities and boycott. That has nothing to do with the question that I have asked. Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Minister has told us that at the operation, the Surgeon decided that the case was an inoperable one. That being so, Mr Speaker, Sir, why did it take such a long time for the Medical Superintendent at Batu Gajah Hospital to come to the conclusion that the prognosis was bad. Surely, the Surgeon at operation, in deciding that it was inoperable, or in doing a gastrotony must have also informed the relevant authorities that the prognosis was hopeless. If the prognosis was hopeless, Mr Speaker, Sir, may I ask the Minister, why was it that the deceased was kept in Batu Gajah until

Mr Speaker: Did you say, "May I answer the Minister?"

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: "May I ask". May I ask why the deceased was kept in Batu Gajah until, as it turned out, he was almost dying before he was sent back to Kuching?

Tun Dr Ismail: I do not intend to have a debate with the Honourable Member on what the Medical Officers did on the patient. I was just relating the sequence of the events that took place. The whole responsibility must rest with the Medical Officers, and I have great confidence in the Medical Officers. I would like to remind the Honourable Member that in answering these questions, he could not dictate to me in what manner I should answer that question. If I wanted to give the

background to the late ex-detainee, I am entitled to do so.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am not saying that the Honourable Minister was not entitled. He was not entitled to blacken anybody's name, even though it is a person who is deceased. Mr Speaker, Sir, the Minister has still not answered this question. I am not quering the judgement of the

Mr Speaker: Can you frame your question as concisely as possible, so that people can understand it easily? *(Laughter)*.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: I beg your pardon Mr Speaker, Sir. I shall try and frame this in a non-technical language. Mr Speaker, Sir, I am not quering the judgement of the Medical Officers concerned, when they decided that the outlook for the deceased was a hopeless one at operation and later on. The question that I wish to pose to the Honourable the Minister is this. Why was not the deceased sent back to Kuching, when it was decided that his case was a hopeless one, that there was no future for him for recovery?

Tun Dr Ismail: The Honourable Member as a doctor would know that this gentleman has had an operation and a gastroenterotomy was done on him, and it would take sometime for the late ex-detainee to recover; and when it was recommended by the Medical Officers that he should be sent back to Kuching and a Certificate of Fitness to travel was given, then he was sent back to Kuching.

FORM VI ENTRANCE EXAMINATION

9. Dr Tan Chee Khoon asks the Minister of Education if he is aware of the widespread dissatisfaction with the Form VI Entrance Examination, and that Mr D. R. Daniels, President of the National Heads of Secondary Schools, has called for its abolishment; and if so, what steps he proposes to take to solve the problem.

The Assistant Minister of Education (Tuan Lee Siok Yew): Mr Speaker, Sir,

I do not believe that there is such widespread dissatisfaction with the Form VI Entrance Examination, although the President of the National Heads of Secondary School Conference has called for its abolition. This examination, however, cannot be abolished, because it is needed to select candidates on a provisional basis for admission to Form VI classes in January each year, pending the issue of the M.C.E. results a few months later.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, is the Honourable Assistant Minister not aware that one of the causes of this widespread dissatisfaction with the Form VI Entrance Examination is that those who take the Entrance Examination have subsequently failed either in the Senior Cambridge Examination, or have not done well enough in the Senior Cambridge Examinations to merit placement in the Form VI, or Lower VI; and as such the value of the Entrance Examinations is very much open to query. On the other hand, those who failed in the Entrance Examination in the Senior Cambridge Examinations have done so very well that they have been placed in the Form VI, or Lower VI, the next year.

Tuan Lee Siok Yew: Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not understand what the question was.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: If the Honourable Assistant Minister cannot answer that simple question of mine, perhaps, I will wait a little for some of the back-room boys to pass a slip down to him. That was quite a simple question that I asked.

Mr Speaker: I think your remark was very uncalled for.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: May I put the question again, Mr Speaker, Sir. Is the Honourable Assistant Minister aware that there are a large number of students who have passed the Entrance Examination, but at the Senior Cambridge Examination either failed the Senior Cambridge Examination, or

have done badly in the Senior Cambridge Examination, but passed, so as not to justify their entering the Form VI examination the next year. Conversely, there are those who have failed in the Entrance Examination but have done very well in the Senior Cambridge Examination in December and, therefore, have been placed in the Lower VI the next year. In the light of what has happened, surely the Ministry must review the value of the Entrance Examination.

Tuan Lee Siok Yew: Mr Speaker, Sir, if the Honourable Member can bring the specific cases to me, I will look into this matter. But on the question of the candidate concerned having failed the M.C.E. Examination, of course, he is not entitled to enter the Form VI classes.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Ministry knows that there are hundreds, who have passed the Form VI Entrance Examination in July, but have either failed in the Senior Cambridge Examination in December, or have not done well in the Senior Cambridge Examination of that year, to justify their study in the Lower VI the next year. The Honourable the Assistant Minister does not need me to give particulars, but if he wants, I can provide him with lots of examples.

Tuan Lee Siok Yew: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Ministry will review this.

LAYANAN DI-RUMAH SAKIT UMUM, KUALA LUMPUR

10. **Tuan Haji Othman bin Abdullah (Hilir Perak)** bertanya kepada Menteri Kesihatan ada-kah beliau sedar orang² sakit di-Rumah Sakit Umum, Kuala Lumpur, tidak mendapat layanan yang memuaskan terutama sa-kali berkenaan dengan mengeluarkan kad² kepada orang sakit; jika sedar, ada-kah Menteri Kesihatan akan menimbang-kan supaya di-ambil lebeh ramai lagi kakitangan pejabat untuk menulis kad².

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health (Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak tahu ada-nya rawatan dan layanan yang tidak memuaskan

di-beri kepada orang² sakit. Dan juga saya tidak terdapat pengaduan berkenaan dengan kelambatan mengeluarkan kad² kepada orang² sakit. Walau bagaimana pun oleh sebab Ahli Yang Berhormat itu menudoh ada-nya berlaku kelambatan, saya akan mengambil perhatian dalam perkara ini.

Tuan Haji Othman bin Abdullah: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak menudoh tetapi ada-kah Menteri Kesihatan sedar bahawa ada berlaku seperti ini dan saya sendiri pernah mengalami-nya dan kalau sa-kira-nya sedar tidak-kah patut di-perbaiki hal yang seperti ini dan kalau sa-kira-nya hendakkan keterangan yang lanjut boleh-lah saya chakap di-luar daripada Dewan ini.

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berharap Ahli Yang Berhormat itu boleh-lah berjumpa di-luar daripada Dewan ini supaya dapat keterangan yang lanjut.

PERATORAN RUMAH² SAKIT KERAJAAN UNTOK ORANG YANG MENDAPAT KEMALAN- NGAN JALAN RAYA

11. Tuan Haji Othman bin Abdullah bertanya kepada Menteri Kesihatan ada-kah menjadi peratoran rumah² sakit bahawa sa-saorang yang chedera dalam kemalangan jalan raya mesti mendapat kad sa-belum ia di-beri rawatan; jika benar, ada-kah Menteri Kesihatan sedar bahawa perkara² seperti ini pernah berlaku di-Rumah Sakit Umum, Kuala Lumpur, di-mana orang² sakit mengalami kesulitan untk mendapat kad² dan terpaksa menunggu lama sa-belum di-rawat.

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada-lah tidak menjadi peratoran bahawa sa-saorang yang mendapat kemalangan mesti mendapat kad sa-belum di-beri rawatan. Peratoran yang di-jalankan untk mendapat rawatan perubatan dan perchatitan—documentation—ada-lah ringkas dan jelas. Orang² yang mendapat chedera parah dan kehilangan banyak darah atau pun dalam keadaan pangsang akan di-bawa terus ka-bilek rawatan chemas untk mendapat rawatan perubatan dengan segera.

Pegawai² yang menchatitkan kad akan datang kepada orang² yang di-rawat atau pun kepada saudara si-sakit untk mendapatkan butir² yang akan di-chatitkan. Mereka yang mendapat kemalangan ringan di-kehendaki meng-ambil kad rawatan luar daripada bilek penerimaan casualty counter seperti biasa. Saya tidak mendapat tahu kejadian² seperti yang di-sebutkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat itu. Tetapi jika ada di-dapati kesulitan, maka boleh-lah menemui Penguasa Perubatan atau Medical Superintendent, Rumah Sakit Umum, Kuala Lumpur.

Tuan Haji Othman bin Abdullah: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pernah berlaku ada orang yang dekat hendak mati sudah dua tiga minit lagi pun kena ambil kad masuk ka-dalam Hospital dan ini saya sendiri pernah mengalaminya pada masa menghantar beberapa orang ka-Hospital Kuala Lumpur yang ta' dapat menerima rawatan daripada doktor dengan serta-merta sa-hingga mesti mendapat kad dan saya chari, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, orang yang menulis itu pergi minum kopi ka-belakang. Sudah itu saya chari pula doktor, kata orang doktor pergi belakang sana. Jadi perkara ini berlaku. Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya minta ada-kah Ahli Yang Berhormat itu pernah melawat Rumah Sakit Umum ini pada masa² yang mustahak mithal-nya malam² hari-kah (*Ketawa*), pukul sa-puluh-kah?

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya telah pun melawat Rumah Sakit Umum, Kuala Lumpur, tetapi tidak-lah masa malam (*Ketawa*) tetapi masa² sa-belum 4.30 petang. Berkenaan dengan tuduhan Ahli Yang Berhormat itu, saya telah pun berjanji yang saya akan menyiasat.

Tuan Haji Othman bin Abdullah: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya sa-kali lagi mengatakan saya tidak menudoh, tetapi kalau dia tidak pernah melawat malam, elok-lah dia pergi melawat malam². Kejadian ini berlaku selalu malam (*Ketawa*). Malam² selalu berlaku dan Ahli Yang Berhormat, kalau dia datang, ta' usah pakai necktie sebab nanti orang tahu yang bahawa

dia ini Secretary Politik kepada Yang Berhormat Menteri Kesihatan.

Mr Speaker: Dia sudah mengaku dan akan menyiasat. Jadi, malam-kah, siang-kah, terpulang kepada dia-lah (*Ketawa*).

**KUCHING² DI-WAD KANAK²
RUMAH SAKIT UMUM,
KUALA LUMPUR**

12. Dr Tan Chee Khoon bertanya kepada Menteri Kesihatan jika dia sedar bahawa kucing² telah memakan makanan orang sakit di-wad kanak² Rumah Sakit Umum, Kuala Lumpur, dan tentang bahaya kepada kesihatan orang² sakit yang di-sebabkan oleh perkara itu, dan jika sedar, apa-kah langkah yang dia telah ambil untuk mengatasi perkara yang membahayakan kesihatan² orang² sakit itu.

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya telah diberi tahu akan serangan kucing di-Rumah Sakit Umum, Kuala Lumpur. Darpada siasatan yang telah di-jalankan di-dapati bahawa, ini ada-lah di-sebabkan banyak-nya kucing itu dan anak² kucing yang di-lepaskan oleh penduduk² di-kawasan sa-keliling Rumah Sakit. Pekerja² Rumah Sakit ada di-arahkan untuk menangkap kucing² yang masok dalam wad dan menghantarkan kucing² itu kepada Jabatan Haiwan untuk di-buangkan. Saya ingin menambahkan di-sini adalah lebeh baik ada-nya kucing daripada ada-nya tikus (*Ketawa*) dan jika bilangan kucing itu di-kurangkan berma'ana-lah tikus akan bertambah banyak dan kita tahu, dan Ahli Yang Berhormat itu sendiri faham, yang tikus itu banyak membawa penyakit yang berjangkit.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: We have heard an extraordinary explanation given by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Health, that because there are many rats in the wards, perhaps that explains why the cats are there. Is the Honourable Parliamentary Secretary aware that rats pose a greater problem to the health of the patients in wards?

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya fikir Ahli Yang Berhormat itu ta' faham apa yang saya katakan tadi. Tikus² ada-lah lebeh bahaya daripada kucing—saya katakan tadi ia-itu tikus² ada-lah lebeh bahaya daripada kucing.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon Mr Speaker, Sir, is the Honourable Parliamentary Secretary trying to explain to us that because rats pose a greater menace to the health of the patients, consequently there were cats in the wards. But nevertheless, the question I wish to pose to the Honourable Parliamentary Secretary is this: Why did the hospital authorities, or the Ministry of Health, wait till the *Malay Mail* highlighted this story of cats eating the food of patients in the Pediatric Ward before it woke up to the fact that there were lots of cats in the Pediatric Ward—and perhaps in the other wards as well?

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya katakan tadi ia-itu kucing² yang ada di-sekeliling Rumah Sakit itu barangkali di-punyai oleh pekerja² di-situ atau pun barangkali di-kedai² yang berhadapan dengan rumah sakit, kerana Rumah Sakit Umum tidak ada pagar yang ta' boleh di-masok oleh kucing, kerana pagar² itu besar dan kucing boleh masok.

Tuan D. R. Seenivasagam (Ipoh): Mr Speaker, Sir, he has missed the point. The question says, "Is the Minister aware that the cats have been eating the food in the hospital?" I ask for a clarification as to whether the Ministry or the Minister is or was aware that the cats were eating the food of the patients?

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Kementerian Kesihatan telah pun membuat siasatan dan telah pun memberi arahan kepada Penguasa Rumah Sakit supaya memberi amaran kepada pegawai² yang menjalankan kerja di-situ.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Soalan tambahan. Dalam jawapan yang di-beri oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat

kita, saya dapati bahawa pegawai² hospital, pekerja²-nya, telah diperintahkan supaya menangkap kucing² itu untuk di-buangkan. Perkataan "untuk di-buangkan" ini dapatkah Menteri kita memberi penerangan di-buangkan ka-tempat lain supaya menyusahkan tempat lain, atau pun di-buangkan untuk memamatkan—yang berlawanan dengan perasaan peri kemanusiaan.

Yang kedua, saya hendak bertanya di-antara kucing² yang banyak itu ada-kah termasuk Black Cat sama (*Ketawa*).

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman:

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perkataan di-buangkan itu terpulang-lah kepada Jabatan Haiwan kerana kalau-lah kita bunuh kucing² itu ada pehak pula yang akan membangkang berkenaan dengan pembunuhan kucing². Berkenaan dengan "Black Cat" itu, saya tidak tahu, saya belum pernah lihat; barangkali, Ahli Yang Berhormat itu pernah lihat, kucing² hitam itu juga masuk hospital, saya tidak tahu-lah. (*Ketawa*).

Tuan C. V. Devan Nair (Bungsar):

Sir, could the question be posed this way: if the cats go for the patients' food, then the rats must be in short supply. So, either you increase the supply of rats, or you get rid of the rats, so that you can get rid of the cats also and the patients' food is saved? (*Pause*).

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, it seems that the Parliamentary Secretary is unwilling to answer or reluctant to answer that question. If I may make a little clarification on my own behalf, I wish to make it clear to the Ministry of Health that when I asked this question, I was not asking in my capacity as the President-elect of the Malayan Medical Association. I was asking it in my capacity as the Member for Batu. I hope the Ministry understands that, and I hope that the press will understand that, since they have stated that Dr So-and-so, President-elect, as that has nothing to do with my being an official of the

Malayan Medical Association. The question I wish to ask the Honourable Parliamentary Secretary is this: can he assure this House that the rats and cats have been got rid of in the whole Hospital compound of the General Hospital, Kuala Lumpur, or as is implied by the Member for Bungsar these abound still?

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman:

Bukan di-dalam kawasan, tetapi diwad² hospital itu telah pun kita bersekan daripada di-masoki oleh kucing².

BAN ON IMPORT OF WHEAT FLOUR

13. Tuan C. V. Devan Nair asks the Minister of Commerce and Industry whether he is aware of the economic hardships created by the Government's total ban on the import of wheat flour from 1st April, 1966, when the Tariff Advisory Board was still hearing evidence on whether to impose tariff on imported flour; and whether the interests of the ordinary consumers had been taken into consideration before imposing the total ban.

The Acting Minister of Commerce and Industry (Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh): Mr Speaker, Sir, in order to protect the pioneer industries in their initial stage, it is customary for all developing countries launching industrialisation to impose a partial or total ban on the importation of any commodities manufactured. The degree of such ban depends on a great number of factors such as capacity of production, consisting stock, etc. The conditions prevailing prior to the 1st of April, 1966, were such as to justify a total ban pending the examination and review by the Tariff Advisory Board, which provides the safety valve for the banning exercise. As the Alliance Government has always taken, is taking and will always take into consideration the interest of the people including the ordinary consumers, constant reviews are being made on the ban; and as a result of such reviews, instructions were, in fact, given yesterday and, in fact, it will be implemented today, to

lift partially the ban, and importers will be allowed to import 25% of the quota for the months of June and July before which further reviews will be made and by which time it is hoped that the reports of the Tariff Advisory Board will be made available, and I am afraid the Honourable Member's question appears to have jumped the gun.

Tuan C. V. Devan Nair: Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to know why there was this departure from previous practice, because the Honourable Minister of Commerce and Industry is on record on the 22nd of May, 1966, as saying that only after the public hearings and its own investigations, will the Tariff Advisory Board make its recommendations to Government and that, he suggested, was a very fair and very democratic way. But why was it that in this particular instance, when the Tariff Advisory Board has yet to complete its findings and make its recommendations, that this total ban on imports was made? And can I have an assurance, Sir, that in future such a departure from normal practice will not be allowed by the Government?

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I think the Honourable Member has answered his own question, because in the statement made on the 22nd May, the reply was that after the public hearing or the question of its investigation; the Minister of Commerce and Industry said that if his investigation justified the lifting of the ban, he would do so. And I have stated earlier that since the imposition of the ban, constant reviews have been made by my Ministry as to the stocking position, availability of the flour, and because of such reviews, even without waiting for the Tariff Advisory Board, and because the Alliance Government is always considering the interest of the people being paramount above anything else, that instruction was given yesterday for this ban to be lifted, and this will be implemented as from today and all importers will be given 25% of the quota for June and July, after which a further review will be made.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, will the Honourable Minister tell us whether it is true that this flour mill at Lumut has been given a monopoly in the milling trade?

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I think the Honourable Member's statement is incorrect. There is no question of being given a monopoly, because I think a statement has been made in this House that two pioneer companies are in existence and even that itself will answer the question posed by the Honourable Member, because if there are two pioneer companies for flour making there is no question of a monopoly; and furthermore as the Honourable Member, I understand, is also a member of the Tariff Advisory Board and the Tariff Advisory Board itself is a safeguard against any monopoly in this country.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, my acceptance of the membership of the Tariff Advisory Board—the Government wants to make use of it as a weapon to gag me—I wish to say that I have just been invited to serve and I have not attended any meeting on it.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the question I would like to pose is this, and here the Honourable Minister must pardon my ignorance: I think it is not generally known that there is yet another flour milling company in this country. If so, where has it started its operations.

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I can assure this House that a second pioneer certificate has been given. In fact, that was the decision made by the Cabinet, that there is room for two pioneer companies for flour in this country. I think if I am not mistaken, Mr Speaker, Sir, as I am only keeping the seat warm pending the return of the substantive Minister, the other factory is somewhere in Port Swettenham, and it will be starting production very shortly. There is no question of only one factory having the monopoly. As to what I said earlier, I must apologise to the Honourable

Member, as I was not aware that he has not attended a single meeting of the Board yet. But under no circumstances, did I mean to embarrass him by mentioning the fact that he is a member of the Board; and if I have made any wrong interpretation I apologise.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Is the Honourable Minister aware that, even if both these two flour mills work in full capacity, those in the trade estimate that they cannot cater for the demands of the people in the flour trade: for example, bread making, biscuit making, etc., etc. These two companies cannot cater consequently, is it wise for the Government to impose a complete ban on the import of flour from outside this country, or should there be a quota allowed in this country, or more competition be allowed by way of the setting up of yet another or more than another flour mill in this country.

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I think, for all independent countries striving to be economically viable, it is essential that we must launch on some form of industrialisation; and if we are to be proud of ourselves as an independent country and an economically viable people, we must suffer some teething trouble, and we cannot extract investments in the country, we cannot attract pioneer industries into this country, unless we can afford them some form of guarantee of market, and this is a rudiment of introduction of industrialisation; and as such this ban had to be introduced as in the case of other industries starting operation, but the safeguard is, as I said, pending the report of the Tariff Advisory Board to which all the people have excess to make representation as to adequacy of stocks, the capacity of production of the companies and because all the witnesses have the right to ask the producers as to their capacity, the pioneering of their production, etc., etc.; and only after careful study of the representations made will the Tariff Advisory Board submit its recommendations to the Government as to whether a total ban should be imposed, or a partial ban, or no ban

at all; and I hope the Honourable Member will contribute his part as he did in this House into the forming of the final opinion of the Tariff Advisory Board in this connection. As I said earlier the very fact that instructions have been given after constant reviews by my Ministry since April, since the ban was imposed, instructions have been made and given yesterday for the ban to be partially lifted and this means a 25% quota for the month of June and July, and if I remember correctly the figure is something like 15,000 tons for June and 15,000 tons was for July.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, can the Honourable Minister tell us how many workers are there not working at the flour mill and how many will be employed at the flour mill in Lumut, when it is working at full capacity?

Mr Speaker: Don't you think that is going too deep into this?

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: No, Mr Speaker, Sir, because the only justification for such a step is the employment that the flour mill provides. If the employment is small compared to the hundreds, if not thousands, who are out of work, then the decision made by the Government is totally wrong—the decision fits only a few and not the majority.

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, as much as I would like to oblige the Honourable Member, I am not a walking dictionary of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry. I require notice for that answer, because it requires figures; and if the Honourable Member will get in touch with me sometime today I would be very pleased to give him the figures.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Soalan tambahan sedikit. Ada satu point yang saya keliru dalam jawapan Yang Berhormat Menteri itu, ia-itu untuk mengatasi keadaan ini, Kerajaan chuba hendak mengangkat atau membuang sekatan² itu sama ada kesemua-nya atau sa-bahagian-nya, the

whole or partial. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pengalaman kita sudah mengajar kita bahawa apabila perusahaan tepung ini baharu sampai kepada darjat perintis sudah tentu-lah bila di-angkat sekatan barang yang hendak di-import itu barang itu mutu-nya lebeh baik daripada yang di-keluarkan oleh kilang perintis dalam negeri. Jadi, dengan demikian competition mendapat pasaran lebeh juga barang² yang kita import dan ini ada-lah berlawanan dengan dasar memelihara taraf perintis itu. Saya hendak bertanya ada-kah Kerajaan akan meneruskan langkah atau pun hendak mengubah kepada satu chara yang di-namakan protective tariff ia-itu kita boleh membawa masuk gandum² yang belum di-jadikan tepung tetapi dengan di-kenakan cukai mengikut kadar yang biasa-nya ka-atas barang² mentah untuk mengeluarkan barang² baharu, di-hantar keluar, dan daripada mengangkat sekatan itu supaya dia masuk lebeh banyak, mengancham pula perusahaan kita.

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I cannot grasp the question proposed by the Honourable Member at all. He was merely making a statement.

Mr Speaker: You are probably not the only one who cannot understand. *(Laughter).*

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Perhaps, he is not able to answer!

Tuan Geh Chong Keat: Mr Speaker, Sir, supplementary question.

Mr Speaker: Hold on a minute, let him explain a little more the question that he posed.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Saya maksudkan ia-itu Menteri kita sudah menerangkan hendak mengatasi kesulitan yang di-hadapi oleh ra'ayat kerana ada kilang² tepung ini yang harga-nya naik itu. Kalau begitu, Kerajaan kita mengemukakan satu chara hendak bagi hilang kesulitan ra'ayat, Kerajaan akan membatalkan sekatan² kepada tepung² yang di-bawa masuk di-sini—imported flour—itu, hendak

di-angkat kesemua sekatan itu atau pun sa-paroh. Saya berkata bahawa chara yang sa-macam itu maseh juga tidak dapat melegakan kita ini kerana tepung² yang di-keluarkan di-dalam perusahaan yang mertabat-nya baharu perintis akan persaingan, berlumba, dengan tepung² yang di-bawa masuk sedangkan tepung² yang di-bawa masuk tentu lebeh baik mutu-nya daripada tepung kita buat di-sini. Jadi dengan demikian itu bukan satu perubatan, bukan satu remedy. Kalau begitu saya bertanya ada-kah Kerajaan mahu bersedia mengubah chara lain ia-itu dengan chara mengadakan satu cukai, kalau tidak salah saya, di-namakan protective tariff kepada bahan² tepung ia-itu gandum² yang belum di-tepongnkan lagi supaya perusahaan perintis ini dapat mengeluarkan tepung, tidak ada competition, dengan tidak payah di-benarkan tepung itu masuk, dengan demikian taraf perintis ini tidak ada competition. Di-sini baharu-lah harga itu murah. Jadi saya tanya ada-kah Kerajaan mahu mengubah chara yang begitu?

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, as the Honourable Member has gone to such lengths to make a statement, I would try to please him on what he is trying to find out. I think what the Honourable Member wants to know is whether the lifting of the ban would prejudice the present manufacturers. Well, as I said, we are concerned not on the question of quality, as quite obviously it is agreed that certain brands have established their market in this country, and the people are very conscious; and because of that if we establish pioneer industries, we have to impose ban to protect the manufacturers. I think, that principle is agreed, but in this case we are not concerned with this—we are concerned with interim shortage of the supply. Since the manufacturers have not been able to fulfill the demands of the market and, as I have said earlier, the Alliance Government is committed to protect the interest of the people, a partial lifting of the ban has been made, and this partial lifting is only for a period of two months only—June and July—and before the end of

July a further review will be made; and if the stocking situation of the manufacturers is such as to have a considerable stock sufficient for the people, the total ban may still be imposed at the end of July.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah:

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tahu bahawa apa yang di-buat oleh Kerajaan itu baik. Saya perchaya Yang Berhormat ini sa-orang economist, sebab itu saya bertanya dari segi chara dia menahan-nya ia-itu bagini; taraf perintis ini mengeluarkan tepung, kilang taraf perintis ini keluarkan, sedangkan tepung itu tidak boleh di-keluarkan, kalau tidak ada gandum daripada luar negeri. Kalau bagitu, problem kita, pertama mengeluarkan tepung dengan taraf perintis. Yang kedua, bahan mentah itu kita bawa daripada luar negeri masuk. Di-samping itu pula kita membenarkan tepung² yang di-luar negeri itu masuk di-sini. Jadi, erti-nya sudah berlawanan dengan kita hendak menjaga taraf perintis itu. Kalau bagitu, Menteri kita kata dia akan tahan buat sementara dua bulan, sa-lepas dua bulan itu, dia akan tutup kesemua tepung² yang hendak di-bawa masuk. Bila tutup kesemua, ra'ayat di-sini terpaksa kena beli tepung daripada taraf perintis itu, dan ini-lah yang menyebabkan harga-nya naik, kerana barang ta' masuk. Jadi, kesulitan itu akan berlaku sa-mula dari segi ekonomi-nya.

Saya perchaya Menteri kita sa-bagai sa-orang economist, dia akan jawab dari segi economist-nya, bukan dari segi niat Kerajaan.

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to thank the Honourable Member for his compliments labelling me as an economist. I am afraid that I am far from being an economist; I am just an ordinary politician. I think the Honourable Member has made his statement on one assumption that the present shortage of flour in this country is due to the shortage of raw material for the manufacturers. I do not think that statement is correct—he is making an assumption of that. If that is the main cause of the shortage, this Government will, of course, look into it and assist the

manufacturers. But he is making a statement on this assumption. But whatever it is, if there is a shortage of flour for our people; the Ministry must take steps to remedy the situation and make flour available to the population, and meanwhile we will look into all the other causes; and before any further decision is made all the circumstances leading to the shortage will be examined by the Government before the end of July.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah:

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Menteri tadi telah menjawab perkara itu selesai sudah; tetapi he was trying to solve the problem. Kalau dia kata hendak menimbangkan perkara itu, selesai sudah benda itu.

Tuan Geh Chong Keat: The Honourable Minister has mentioned that there will be a 25 per cent release on the quota and that that quota is based on performance of import through the L.C. system. However our trading system of importation of flour is through the "letter of credit" or L.C. system, which is for Taiwan, Japan and other countries; but through Australia they establish a contract system on D.P. which is established a year or two ahead so as to provide the millers

Mr Speaker: Are you asking

Tuan Geh Chong Keat: Sir, I am coming to the point. (*Laughter*).

Mr Speaker: But you are making your speech so complicated before you get to the point! (*Laughter*).

Tuan Geh Chong Keat: Sir, the point is that the Australian millers would like to have the orders a year or two ahead established through contract on the D.P. system. Now, would the Minister consider the importation, or a release, on the performance through this contract system on D.P. which has been established a year, or more than a year ahead?

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am afraid I am not deeply involved in the whole exercise of the

importation on the L.C. system and what not, but I think the Honourable Member can rest quite assured that the expert officials in my Ministry will deal with this matter equitably.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Sir, the Minister has just told us that there is a lifting of 25 per cent of the quota to meet the shortage; and then he said that the total ban will be imposed if there is no shortage. The question I wish to pose is this: conversely if it can be proved to the Ministry that this 25 per cent is not enough at this moment, because, as I understand it, there is a tremendous shortage of flour, will this partial ban be further lifted to meet the existing shortage?

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Alliance Government is a Government elected by the people, for the people, and of the people; and as such I have stated that we will always look into the interest of the people. There is no hard and fast rule in this case, Sir, and in the light of the review made constantly by the Ministry, the ban may further be lifted or may be further restricted depending on the surrounding circumstances.

BANTUAN BAGI ORANG² YANG TINGGAL DI-RUMAH² MURAH YANG TIDAK MAMPU MEMBAYAR ANSORAN BULANAN-NYA

14. Tuan Ramli bin Omar bertanya kepada Menteri Kerajaan Tempatan dan Perumahan:

- (a) ada-kah beliau sedar ia-itu kebanyakan orang Melayu yang memileki rumah² murah tidak dapat membayar ansoran bulanan-nya;
- (b) apa-kah tindakan Kerajaan berchadang hendak ambil terhadap orang² yang ingin memileki rumah tetapi tidak mampu hendak membayar harga rumah oleh kerana satu² sebab; dan
- (c) ada-kah Kerajaan berchadang hendak membantu orang² saperti ini; jika ya, apa-kah jenis bantuan² yang Kerajaan akan beri.

Menteri Kerajaan Tempatan dan Perumahan (Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Kerajaan Negeri dan Majlis Perbandaran ada-lah bertanggung-jawab untuk memungut bayaran² ansoran bulanan atau sewa² rumah murah itu. Oleh yang demikian, Kerajaan Negeri dan Majlis² Perbandaran-lah yang mengetahui akan jumlah² bayaran ansoran, atau sewa² yang maseh belum berbayar lagi.

Kementerian ini belum lagi menerima sa-barang laporan rasmi mengenai tunggakan di-atas ansoran² atau sewa² itu. Di-dalam Majlis Perbandaran Ibu Kota, masaalah perkara tunggakan ini sangat-lah kecil.

Yang kedua, ini terpulang-lah kepada Kerajaan² Negeri, atau Majlis² Perbandaran mengenai tindakan yang perlu untuk memungut balek tunggakan itu dan juga mengambil tindakan undang² untuk mengeluarkan penduduk² dari rumah² itu.

Yang ketiga, perkara ini terserah-lah kepada Kerajaan² Negeri atau Majlis² Perbandaran yang berkenaan untuk menimbang-nya.

Tuan Ramli bin Omar: Soalan tambahan. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, peristiwa yang sedeh baharu² ini ia-lah bagi penduduk² Kampong Pandan, orang² yang rumah-nya kena tarek ini yang terdiri daripada orang² yang berpendapatan kecil, ia-itu terdiri daripada dahulu-nya penghuni² rumah haram. Mereka ini mendirikan rumah haram, kerana pendapatan-nya kecil—tidak mampu menyewa rumah. Oleh kerana rumah² mereka dipechahkan oleh Kerajaan, mereka terpaksa pindah ka-rumah² Kerajaan yang telah di-siapkan. Niat mereka ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, hendak mempunyai rumah itu, tetapi tidak terdaya hendak membayar \$35 satu bulan daripada pendapatan \$100. Jadi, apa-kah gaya-nya Kerajaan hendak mengatasi orang² yang sa-bagini rupa? Kalau Kerajaan main tarek² rumah ini sa-hari empat, bulan besok lima, mungkin lain kali orang² Melayu takut hendak menerima rumah² murah ranchangan Kerajaan, kerana takut tidak terbayar dan juga takut malu

kapada masyarakat apabila rumah² mereka kena tarek. Jadi, bagaimanakah Kerajaan hendak mengatasi orang² yang sa-bagini?

Tuan Abdul Samad bin Gul Ahmad Mianji (Pasar Mas Hulu): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, boleh-kah saya mendapat penjelasan? Orang² yang terlibat ini orang Melayu-kah? Itu sahaja saya hendak tahu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya hendak tahu, orang Melayu-kah yang terlibat itu?

Mr Speaker: Nanti! Soalan-nya dia belum jawab lagi pun. (*Ketawa*).

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, as I have stated earlier, all the administration of low-cost housing is a matter for the State Government as well as for the Federal Capital administration. As such, it is up to these people to carry out their administration effectively and efficiently. I would like to mention in this House, Sir, that the construction of low-cost houses itself is already highly subsidised by both the Federal Government and the State Government, and the houses are being provided to the people at very low cost and at very low re-payments extending initially to 14 years, but last year it has been extended, with the permission of the Treasury, to 17 years. In fact, for the very lowest income group, the repayment period has now been extended to 20 years and as such, Sir, these houses are sold or being rented out to the people with very high subsidy in the sense, Sir, that the funds given out by the Federal Government for this purpose are given out at the rate of interest of 2 per cent, for the low cost housing, although the Federal Government itself has to obtain loans from the public at anything up to 5½ per cent. From that, Sir, you will notice that there is in fact already a subsidy of 3¾ per cent for all low-cost housing.

Moreover, Sir, from the State Government angle, there is also a very high subsidy by the State Government, because the State Government provides land virtually free-of-charge, and if not free-of-charge at a very nominal price, and furthermore the State

Government has to provide amenities, facilities, such as roads, roadside drains, connection of electricity, connection of water and in many cases with very extensive laying of water pipes. In fact, in some cases, I have examined the estimates, and in some cases the cost of such development in low-lying ground can amount to anything up to 80 per cent of the cost of the house. As such, Sir, the houses are already highly subsidised by the State Government and by the Federal Government, and the people who are receiving these houses or staying in these houses are expected, and must be expected, to honour the terms of the occupation. Sir, there is a limit to which we can subsidise the low income group. Just because of the fact that they are all low income people and cannot pay, they cannot sit tight and refuse to do anything about it. I think that is not civic consciousness and they must assist their fellow countrymen in being civic-conscious and live up to their obligations, because they are already paying very low instalments for their houses. They do not pay any down payment, and no down payment is asked for; and all they have to do is to pay a first month payment—and the policy of the Federal Government in respect of repayment for a house must not exceed \$35 by way of instalment for a house. In some cases, for some of the fisherman's schemes along the coastal areas, the repayment is merely \$12 to \$15 per month. I am afraid, if any occupant fails to live up to his obligation there is no alternative but for the State Government, or the Local Authority, to take action. Usually, as far as I know, no action is taken unless for a very long period of arrears in payment—and I think in that respect, Sir, I would appeal to Honourable Members of this House to try to inculcate into our people some form of civic consciousness. If the State and the Federal Governments have gone so far to help one in getting a house, which I understand not many countries in the world are doing today, it is up to the individual citizen to live up to his part of the bargain.

Tuan D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr Speaker, Sir, supplementary question—Is the Honourable Minister aware of the specific case, within the Ipoh Municipal area, of the Sungei Rokan low-cost housing, which is a Malay Housing Scheme and is the Minister aware that when the Opposition party got the majority in the Local Authority, the State Government took over the control and running of the Sungei Rokan Housing Scheme? Question No 2: Is the Minister aware that those Malays living in the Sungei Rokan Housing Scheme are in arrears of their payments for a very long period of time and that no action has been taken by the State Government? In this manner you are only placing these Malay occupants into more and more difficulties by letting them get into arrears of huge sums of money and will the Honourable Minister at least assure this House that his Ministry will make an enquiry into this matter of the Sungei Rokan Housing Scheme? I raise this because the Municipality was asked to take back the Housing Scheme and collect all the arrears, but we are not prepared to do that after getting into a mess. I do hope that the Honourable Minister will assure this House whether he will look into this.

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, as I said, housing schemes in a State are run and administered by the State Government, and as such it is up to the State Government to decide what they intend to do with such Housing Estates. As far as the Federal Government is concerned, we provide the funds and we provide the technical assistance, and in my case, I assist the State Government in deciding the priorities and in some cases the type of houses to be built. But as far as administration is concerned, I am afraid that as long as the State Government pays up its repayment to the Federal Government, there is nothing more that I can do, and I cannot interfere with the State Government's administration; and as far as the arrears are concerned in Ipoh, I think that is a matter for the State Government to decide. If the State is prepared to carry on with the arrears, there is

nothing that the Federal Government can do about it. I might mention here, Sir, that it is the policy of the Federal Government, or the policy of the Alliance Government, that repayment for houses must not exceed more than 20 per cent of an individual's earning in this country; and this is a criterion which I derived after I have visited many countries in Europe as well as in Asia in determining what rental would be a reasonable rental to be paid by an individual; and from my experience in some European countries, 25 per cent has been adopted as a criterion, and I think it is not too unreasonable for us to expect our citizens to pay a maximum of 20 per cent of his earning for his housing and for his accommodation. I can quote an example: in Penang we have a fishermen's scheme in Telok Bahang for fishermen, and as far as we could ascertain some of the fishermen earn something like between \$80 to \$200 depending on how hard the fishermen work; and as such we determine our monthly instalment for the 17-year repayment period at \$15.50 per month. If the fishermen pays \$15.50 per month for the 17 years he owns the house and the land, and that is worked out to be roughly about 20 per cent of the lowest earning group that is \$80 per month, and I think that is reasonable to expect of any individual to repay for his accommodation.

Tuan D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr Speaker, Sir, that is not my question. My question is, will the Ministry try to put in a word to the State Government—that is if you allow these Malays to go on accumulating their arrears, they will end up like the RIDA assistance in bankruptcy in court, finally. So, I hope the Ministry will at least make an enquiry and give them some advice—and surely the Minister of Local Government and Housing has every authority to advise.

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, as I said, the State has its own autonomy in this matter, but certainly I will raise this with the State Government as a matter of practice that it would be highly undesirable to allow

very long arrears to accumulate. I think I notice that it is a favourite pastime of Opposition benchers to always single out any problem which involves a Malay, a Chinese or an Indian. Why should the Honourable Member persist in this kind of thinking. We must all think in terms of being Malaysians. We must not single out a problem where Malays are involved, Chinese are involved, Indians are involved. I think the time has come especially for Members of this Honourable House to take a lead in this matter and refrain from touching on any problem involving the Malays, Chinese, or Indians.

Tuan D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr Speaker, Sir, supplementary question—I wonder if the Honourable Minister understood the question. The question is specifically directed to Malays. My supplementary question to the Minister is, “Do you understand the question?”

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I understand the question perfectly. The question itself involves Malays; but the supplementary question raised by the Honourable Member has nothing to do with the question. It involves, Sungai Rokam, and he brought up the question that arrears arose, because they involve the Malays.

Tuan D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification. I never said it arose because it involves Malays. I said that it was a Malay Housing Scheme within this question; and the question raised was, that they are unable to pay their due. If the Honourable Minister wants to speak on non-communalism, I think he is the last qualified, because he is abetting communalism in this country.

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, do you want to be involved in a debate on this matter? I am prepared to do so with your leave, Sir.

Mr Speaker: I do not think that it is a question of debate on an outside matter. The questions and answers, how they have led to this, I cannot under-

stand, I think the Minister is being too kind to go beyond his limit to give his explanation, and in doing so he has been wrongly interpreted.

(Note: Question time was up, and the answers to Oral Questions Nos. 15 to 17 are given below):

PRINTING OF SUARA MALAYSIA

15. Tuan C. V. Devan Nair asks the Minister of Information and Broadcasting to state (a) the Printers for the different Language editions of Suara Malaysia; (b) whether tenders were called for the printing of these editions; (c) if so, whether these Printers had tendered the lowest quotations; and (d) if no tenders were called, whether other printing firms could have printed them at lower cost equally efficiently.

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Tuan Senu bin Abdul Rahman):

- (a) The Printers for Suara Malaysia are as follows:
 - (i) English and Rumi—Kum Printers.
 - (ii) Tamil version—Tamil Nesan.
 - (iii) Chinese version—China Press.
 - (iv) Jawi version—Solai Press.
- (b) Tenders were called for the printing of the paper.
- (c) Quotations for printing the Jawi and the Tamil versions were the lowest. In regard to the Rumi, English and Chinese versions, the contracts were given to printers which had adequate facilities such as linotypes, printing machines and type faces for headings. The advice of the Government Printer was sought in this matter. The Departmental Tenders Board considered the quotations received and the recommendations of the Government Printer. Treasury approval was obtained in accordance with the regulations.
- (d) Not applicable.

BILANGAN SHARIKAT BERITA DI-MALAYSIA

16. **Tuan Ahmad bin Arshad** bertanya kepada Menteri Penerangan dan Penyiaran (a) berapa-kah bilangan sharikat² berita yang di-benarkan melaporkan berita di-negeri ini; dan (b) sama ada Kerajaan Malaysia akan membenarkan Sharikat Berita Tass Soviet atau Sharikat² Berita dari negeri² didalam Blok Komunis Eropah membuka chawangan² di-Malaysia, jika tidak, mengapa.

Tuan Senu bin Abdul Rahman:

(a) Bilangan Sharikat berita yang di-benarkan melaporkan berita di-negeri ini pada masa ini: 7:

Reuter.

Associated Press of America.

United Press International.

Agence France Presse.

Cathay Service Agency.

Jiji Press.

Pan Asia News Agency.

Press Trust of India.

(b) Saperti Ahli Yang Berhormat sendiri sedar, kita tidak ada hubungan diplomatik dengan negeri² yang tersebut itu. Walau bagaimana pun jika hubungan diplomatik di-buat dan mereka membuat permohonan untuk membolehkan wakil² Sharikat berita di-negeri kita ini, permohonan itu akan di-timbangkan pada masa itu.

LANJUTAN PERKHIDMATAN TALIVISHEN

17. **Tuan Hussein bin Sulaiman** bertanya kepada Menteri Penerangan dan Penyiaran bila-kah perkhidmatan Talivishen dapat di-adakan di-Pantai Timor khas-nya di-Kelantan.

Tuan Senu bin Abdul Rahman: Persiapan dan persediaan untuk mengadakan Talivishen di-Kelantan sedang di-jalankan dan pada masa ini sudah pun hampir siap. Ada kemungkinan sa-kira-nya tidak di-halangi oleh apa² gangguan yang besar, Perkhidmatan Talivishen akan dapat di-perluaskan ka-Kelantan di-dalam bulan Julai ini.

ADJOURNMENT *SINE DIE* (MOTION)

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menhadangkan bahawa apabila tamat meshuarat hari ini Majlis ini akan di-tangguhkan kepada satu masa yang tidak di-tetapkan.

Tun Dr Ismail: Tuan Yang di-pertua, saya mohon menyokong usul ini.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

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

BILLS

THE SOCIETIES (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Tun Dr Ismail: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill entitled "an Act to amend the Societies Act, 1966," be now read a second time.

Sir, the object of this Bill is to amend certain sections of the Societies Act, 1966, and the sections referred to are clearly stated in the Explanatory Statement of the Bill. During this short period that the Societies Act has been enforced since 1st February, 1966, the sections under reference need to be amended, and for the information of Members of this House, I shall state briefly why these amendments are necessary.

It will be noted that among other things the Bill seeks to amend sections 2 (f), 24, 40 (1), and 53 (1) of the Act. In this connection, section 2 (f) and sections 40 (1) and 53 (1) of the present legislation make reference to the Registrar of Schools, Supreme Court and Sessions Court respectively. In so far as Sabah is concerned, there is no appointment of Registrar of Schools in that State, and for that matter nor is there a Sessions Court in Sabah and Sarawak. Supreme Courts in Malaysia are now known as High Courts. Therefore, to overcome this difficulty, a more general expression of a person or authority in place of the Registrar of

Schools, the substitution of the expression "High Court" for "Supreme Court", and addition of "Sessions Court" will rectify the present deficiencies contained in the legislation.

As regards section 17 (2), the present legislation provides that the Registrar of Societies may suspend the operations of section 17 of the Act only for the purpose of enabling a society to wind up its affairs. It is felt that it is rather restrictive, and the adoption of the procedure laid down in the old legislation, whereby the Registrar may suspend the operation of Section 17 (1) for any reason that he may think expedient, is administratively more convenient and practicable.

Lastly, Sir, amendment to subparagraph (a) of paragraph 2 of Schedule 1 to the Act involves an important principle. As the law stands, the Act requires every political party to make provision in its rules that every member, office bearer, executive officer, or adviser, other than a legal adviser, shall be Federal citizens. The amendment sought will make it mandatory that such an adviser will also be a Federal citizen, and this will be consistent with the principle laid down in the law that only citizens will be allowed to take part in the political affairs of the country.

Sir, I beg to move.

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

Tuan D. R. Seenivasagam (Ipoh): Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise merely on a point of clarification. The amendment with regard to legal advisers is reasonable in the context of the Societies Ordinance, but may I ask for clarification what will be the position if a society appoints a firm of solicitors, where there are Federal citizens and non-citizens employed by that firm. Is it clear in the Ordinance that only an individual can be appointed legal adviser, if not what would be the position, if such a firm is appointed legal adviser to a political party?

Tun Dr Ismail: If the adviser is in the form of a single person then it is quite clear as it is determined that they must be Federal citizens. But if it is a firm involving partners, some of whom may be citizens and some not, then I think the criteria would be whether the members of the firm, the majority of members of the firm—that include the senior partners—are Federal citizens.

Tuan D. R. Seenivasagam: Sir, on a point for clarification: Would it not be much easier and safer to say that only an individual can be appointed legal adviser, which would do away with the question of firm having non-citizens amongst them?

Tun Dr Ismail: A wonderful suggestion from the Honourable Member, but I would not like to restrict any political party, who may like to retain a firm to be political advisers to the party.

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 EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Dr Ng Kam Poh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to amend the Employees Provident Fund Ordinance, 1951", be read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to amend section 12 (3) (a) of the Employees Provident Fund Ordinance so that the rate of interest that is declared by the Employees Provident Fund Board at the end of each year of

operation can be credited to contributors account at the time that withdrawal of contribution is made.

Under the E.P.F. Ordinance, every employee, with the exception of those enumerated under the First Schedule to the Ordinance, is required to contribute to the Employees Provident Fund. At the end of each year of operation, the Employees Provident Fund Board is empowered to declare a certain rate of interest on contributions. This rate of interest varies from year to year, depending on the existing assets of the Fund at the time that the interest rate is determined. For example, the rate of interest declared for 1964 was $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent and in 1965, $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

The rate of interest that is declared at the end of a particular year cannot be applied to withdrawals in the course of the following year, because of the existing provision of Section 12 (3) (a) of the Ordinance which stipulates that the rate of interest payable on such withdrawals is only $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent per annum. It is considered that the interest rate payable on withdrawal should be the declared rate of interest from year to year instead of the present statutory rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent per annum. In other words, the benefits of a higher rate of interest on withdrawal should be passed on to the contributors. It is now intended that the interest rate on withdrawal of contributions should be the rate that is declared by the Board in respect of the preceding year rather than the statutory rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent per annum.

The Bill before this House seeks an amendment to section 12 (3) (a) of the Employees Provident Fund Ordinance accordingly to give effect to this benefit to contributors.

Sir, I beg to move.

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

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.

Dr Ng Kam Poh: Sir, I beg to move that the Bill be now reported back to the House.

Question put, and agreed to.

House resumed.

Tuan D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of order—I do not think there is a quorum.

(*Division bell rung: House counted: 26 Members present.*)

Dr Ng Kam Poh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to report that the Bill has been considered in Committee and has been agreed to without amendment, and I formally move that the Bill be read a third time and passed.

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

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a third time and passed.

THE LOAN (INTERNATIONAL TIN BUFFER STOCK) BILL

Second Reading

Dr Ng Kam Poh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to authorise the borrowing of a sum not exceeding the sum of ninety-four million dollars in order to finance the payment of the share of the Federation in the Buffer Stock to be established under Article X of the International Tin Agreement, 1965, and for purposes incidental thereto", be read a second time.

Mr Speaker, Sir, you will recollect that on 17th March, 1966, Command Paper No. 9 of 1966 was laid on the Table to inform members that Malaysia has signed the Third International

Tin Agreement. As required by the Agreement, the Instrument of Ratification has now been deposited with the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and North Ireland. The Third International Tin Agreement, 1965, replaces a similar Agreement entered into in 1960 for the purpose of primarily of stabilising the price of tin. Article X of the Agreement makes provision for the establishment of a Tin Buffer Stock to which producer countries are to contribute in total an amount equivalent to 20,000 tons of metal. Malaysia's contribution is based on its voting strength of 45.08% and is also dependent on the floor price of tin at the time the Agreement comes into force. The present floor price is £1,000 per ton and on this basis Malaysia's contribution is about £9 million. However, producer countries have asked the floor price of the Agreement be raised to £1,200 per ton. The Tin Council will be discussing this request in June and July this year, and in the event that the floor price is raised as requested before the coming into force of this Agreement, Malaysia's contribution to the Buffer Stock will be £10.8 million. It is not possible, therefore, at this moment, to specify exactly the total contribution that Malaysia will have to make, and for this reason the higher figure of £11 million or \$94 million has been used in the Bill. It follows that the total loan actually raised is likely to be below the amount stated in the Bill.

The loans raised by the Government for its contribution to the Buffer Stock, including interest and administrative charges, will be repaid by the collection of a cess on tin concentrates, or in other words, it will be repaid by money collected from tin producers within the country, so that when the loans are fully repaid no more cess is collected and the contribution made to the Buffer Stock is regarded as belonging to the tin miners. Upon the liquidation of the Buffer Stock, the Malaysian credit in it will be distributed to the tin miners concerned. The same arrangement applied to the Second Buffer Stock and the question could perhaps be asked why Malay-

sia's contribution to the Second Buffer Stock could not be transferred to the Third Buffer Stock. The reason is that it is necessary to return the money to the miners concerned, since some of those who contributed to the Second Buffer Stock have ceased production, while new producers may have emerged, and also, since the previous practice has been to return the money most of the miners involved have committed themselves on the strength of the refund.

It will be seen, therefore, that these loans will be in no way a burden on the general revenue of the country and although Clause 4 of the Bill provides that the loans and the interest on them are charged on the Consolidated Fund, this is merely to meet the requirement of the Constitution. Again, Clause 6 (2) envisages the full repayment of the loan within four years but, in fact, it is anticipated that repayment will be completed within 2 or 3 years from proceeds of the levy on tin concentrates.

Sir, I beg to move.

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

Question put, and agreed to.

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

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr Speaker *in the Chair*)

Clauses 1 to 6 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

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

THE EXCHANGE CONTROL (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Dr Ng Kam Poh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to amend the Exchange Control Ordinance, 1953" be read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is fully set out in the Explanatory Statement attached thereto, but I should like to take this opportunity to explain the main amendments.

The amendments of Section 3 of the principal Ordinance will make the Governor of Bank Negara the Controller of Foreign Exchange for the purpose of the Ordinance and would also empower the Controller to appoint officers of Bank Negara as well as Federal and State officers to assist him in the exercise and performance of his powers under the Ordinance. In this respect, I should point out that even at present the Governor of Bank Negara is exercising the powers and performing the duties of Controller of Foreign Exchange, having been appointed Controller by His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong. The provision concerning the appointment of the Governor of Bank Negara as Controller of Foreign Exchange is therefore merely for the purpose of making permanent an arrangement which is already in existence. The proposal to enable the Controller to appoint other officers to exercise his powers and duties under the Ordinance would definitely add to the efficiency of the administration, and, as regards the appointment of State or Federal officers, it is the intention that these officers will be appointed only in places where the Bank Negara does not have a branch.

Clause 2 of the Bill would have the effect of making the principal Ordinance permanent. The principal Ordinance came into force on 1st January, 1954, and was to continue in force for a period of one year although provision was made for the period to be extended. Till now seven extensions have been made and it is most unlikely that the need for exchange control will cease in the foreseeable future.

The amendment of Part I of the Fifth Schedule of the principal Ordinance would do away with the provision empowering the Controller to give direction to any person in Malaysia to supply information in his possession which may be required for the purpose

of assisting the Government of any of the scheduled territories to secure compliance with or detect evasion of their exchange control regulations. This provision was originally included mainly to enable the Controller to comply with requests from the United Kingdom on exchange control matters. With the present status of Malaysia as an independent country, it is no longer appropriate to retain such a provision. Besides, most of the scheduled territories do not make reciprocal arrangements.

Finally, it is considered that the authority to compound offences under Parts II and III of the Fifth Schedule to the principal Ordinance should properly rest with the Minister of Finance than the Controller of Foreign Exchange and Clause 9 of the Bill would provide for this.

Sir, I beg to move.

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

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah:
Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mengambil peluang mengucapkan terima kasih kepada pehak Kerajaan kerana walau pun sudah terlewat mengemukakan Bill yang sa-macam ini, tetapi kesedaran baharu mendesak mereka itu mengemukakan. Sa-patut-nya Bill sa-macam ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, hendak-lah sudah lama di-fikirkan sebab mengikut penerangan, keterangan di-sini di-dalam keterangan yang No. 5, mengatakan pindaan bagi section yang 40 dalam Ordinance ini ia-lah mustahak kerana hendak mensesuaian dengan Perlembagaan sendiri. Jadi erti-nya Perlembagaan kita sudah hampir² 10 tahun, tetapi sudah 10 tahun-lah baharu hendak di-samakan dengan Perlembagaan itu, dan ini menunjukkan satu daripada chuai Kerajaan dalam perkara ini. Dengan Bill ini, apabila kita luluskan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya perchaya-lah Governor Bank Negara kita dapat meneruskan satu tugas yang betul² Governor Bank Negara yang merdeka dan kita tidak-lah lagi bergantung kepada Bank of England di-dalam hendak menjual duit atau pun emas. Tetapi, Tuan Yang

di-Pertua, ada satu perkara yang saya ta' puas hati di-sini. Saya percaya Menteri yang mengemukakan itu agaknya tentu-lah dia dapat pesan² yang dapat menghilangkan keraguan saya, ia-itu dalam perkara Clause 9 kita hendak potong perkataan "The Controller or any person authorised by him" kemudian hendak gantikan dengan "A person authorised by the Minister of Finance." Jadi ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya rasa, apabila kita hendak bagi full control atau pun kawalan yang penoh kepada Bank Negara atau pun kepada Governor Bank Negara kita, saya rasa kuasa yang sa-macam ini tidak-lah patut kita berikan kepada Kementerian Kewangan. Sa-patut-nya di-serahkan dengan sa-penoh-nya kepada Governor Bank itu. Kalau kita serahkan bagini akan jadi-lah dua kuasa di-dalam menentukan power to compound dan saya bimbang akan berlaku satu salah faham di-antara politician dengan pentadbir dalam masalah ini. Itu pun ada baik-nya kalau sa-kira-nya kuasa itu di-pindahkan kepada Menteri itu sendiri tidak kepada orang yang di-beri kuasa itu, boleh tahan juga, sebab Menteri sa-orang tentu-lah ta' banyak ragam-nya. Jadi ini-lah saya tidak dapat hendak menerima pindaan yang sa-macam ini dengan sa-mata² hendak memindahkan kuasa daripada Governor Bank kepada orang yang di-beri kuasa oleh Menteri kechuali sa-mata² hendak memindahkan dengan tidak ada satu sebab yang mustahak yang perlu di-buat bagitu. Kalau sa-mata² hendak pindahkan sahaja, saya rasa Bill yang sa-macam ini mengandongi satu maksud² politik yang tertentu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita tahu bahawa hendak mengawal Exchange ini ada-lah satu perkara yang besar dan biasa-nya sa-buah negara itu menentukan polisi-nya, tetapi tidak-lah memasok champor dalam kerja² Governor Bank itu sendiri kechuali Menteri kita boleh menunjukkan bahawa ada negeri² yang di-dalam Exchange Control Ordinance memberi power to compound kepada orang yang di-lantek atau pun di-beri kuasa oleh Menteri kechuali kalau Menteri boleh me-

nunjokkan bagitu. Jikalau tidak, maka ini ada-lah satu perkara baharu dan rekaan baharu yang saya tidak fikir dapat di-terima di-dalam ilmiah kewangan dan ke-bankanan. Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua saya meminta penjelasan.

Dr Ng Kam Poh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I understand from the Honourable Member for Bachok that he congratulates the Government on the introducing of this Bill, but he says that it is a bit delayed. It is true, Sir, that it should have been done long ago. But Malaysia has been brought about only three years roughly ago. That is why we were thinking in terms of Malaysia then. For this reason, the question of exchange control did not arise until recently. That is why we were more or less extending the term of the Controller, who was appointed by His Majesty the Yang di-Pertua Agong to this day. Now, we make him a permanent fixture—he is permanently the Controller of Exchange Control. That, I think, will answer the question raised by the Honourable Member for Bachok.

The second point raised by him is why the Honourable Minister should be the one to compound offences instead of the Governor of Bank Negara. The reason is that he is the highest authority. Even though the Governor of Bank Negara is the Controller in the sense that he controls foreign exchange being passed out and coming into this country, the Minister of Finance is the highest authority in this land—that is the reason and not for political reasons. Otherwise, he is the proper person who can compound offences made in this Exchange Control Bill.

I hope I have satisfied the Honourable Member for Bachok upon the reasons which I have given.

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 9 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

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

THE EXTERNAL LOANS (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Dr Ng Kam Poh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to amend the External Loans Act, 1963", be read a second time.

At present external loans for the purpose of the Development Fund are raised under External Loans Act, 1963, which specifies a limit of \$300 million as the amount that can be raised. To date external loans amounting to \$285 million have been raised under the authority of this Act, so that further loans amounting to \$15 million can be raised externally although this amount will not suffice to meet the requirements of the First Malaysia Plan.

According to the First Malaysia Plan programme of loan raisings from external sources, a total gross sum of \$1,070 million will be required. This excludes a gross sum of \$330 million which will be raised externally for the National Electricity Board for which the Government is only a guarantor empowered to act as such under the relevant laws regarding Government guarantees. It is now necessary to raise the limit of the Government's power to borrow from external sources from \$300 million to \$1,370 million. However, it may be possible to raise about \$300 million in the form of extended credit, and I have been advised by law officers that extended credit is not covered by the External Loans Act. The present Bill, therefore, seeks to increase the maximum amount that can be raised to \$1,070 million only. The legal authority for borrowing in the form of extended credit will be sought separately.

Sir, I beg to move.

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

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, susah sadikit saya hendak menyokong atau hendak membangkang, ia-lah oleh kerana dalam penerangan pehak Menteri kita, dia sa-mata² mencheritakan hendak meminjam lebeh banyak duit-nya untok hendak melaksanakan Rancangan Malaysia Lima Tahun Yang Pertama tetapi dia tidak menerangkan di-mana mustahak-nya maka duit itu patut di-pinjam. Jadi tentang hendak mengubah *figure* itu saya tidak membangkang, lebeh daripada itu pun saya mahu. Tetapi masaalah-nya untok apa kita hendak berhutang lebeh banyak ini?

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bersetuju dengan pehak Kerajaan bahawa dalam development atau pembangunan sa-sabuah negara itu tentu-lah tidak terlepas daripada meminjam duit daripada luar negeri, tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, mengapa-kah kita mesti pinjam di-luar negeri sampai bagini banyak sedang mengikut Rancangan Malaysia Lima Tahun Yang Pertama itu, kita tahu terselit di-dalam-nya beberapa projek yang unproductive, yang tidak menghasilkan dari segi ekonomi-nya, sa-bagaimana Pertahanan dan Internal Security dan kerja² yang sa-macham itu. Jadi, sekarang ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, konfrantasi sudah selesai, Internal Security pun sudah tentu tidak banyak. Jadi, mengapa-kah duit ini kita hendak pinjam lagi lebeh banyak? Di-mana hendak di-belanjakan duit itu atau pun hendak ubah projek² yang termaktub di-dalam buku rancangan itu atau ada-kah hendak di-ubahkan lagi.

Saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tidak dapat hendak menerima hutang ini kalau-lah bermaksud sa-mata² hendak meminjam wang kemudian hendak menjalankan pula projek² yang sudah lama itu, kerana saya tahu, saya sedar, bahawa boleh jadi Kerajaan kita tidak meminjam sa-banyak ini, tetapi dia meminta izin di-sini, hendak meminjam di-sini—itu saya tahu. Saya tidak kata dia tetap hendak meminjam tetapi boleh jadi dia tidak pinjam tetapi ini-lah kerja² yang di-buat oleh Kerajaan yang nature-nya, tabiat-nya, sa-bagaimana tabiat Kerajaan Perikatan yang ada sekarang ini yang

walaupun kami chuba hendak menggulingkan tetapi belum sampai masa lagi. Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, biasanya dia mencheritakan hendak pinjam wang banyak bagini kemudian dia serentak dengan itu-lah dia mengishti-harkan kepada ra'ayat bahawa dia akan

Mr Speaker: Saya suka minta Ahli Yang Berhormat itu tepat kepada point-nya; lepas itu Menteri bagi jawapan; ta' usah kita pusing²; ta' payah-lah; masa sudah suntok.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Pusing sedikit² sahaja, Tuan, ta' banyak—sedikit

Mr Speaker: Ia-lah point itu sudah buat tadi, ulang balek lagi sa-kali. Saya diam sahaja di-sini, tetapi saya menjaga itu.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Terima kaseh Tuan. Jadi, hendak sambong-lah, hendak pusing ini ta' pakai, terus sahaja, ia-itu saya bimbang takut yang duit hendak di-pinjam ini boleh jadi dia tidak pinjam, tetapi sa-bagai satu alasan dengan Bill ini bahawa Kerajaan hendak mem-buatkan beberapa projek yang chukup progressive supaya ra'ayat² yang sudah leteh mendengar janji² ini mengharap-kan satu perkara baharu-nya balek. Jadi ini-lah yang saya tidak faham mengapa duit ini hendak di-pinjam dengan tidak di-terangkan dari mana, patut hendak di-belanjakan di-dalam Five-Year Plan itu. Yang ada di-sini ia-lah sa-mata² kata-nya to increase the maximum, chuma² hendak mem-banyakkan sahaja. Why? Fasal apa hendak membanyak²kan—dia tidak sebut. Jadi ini satu chara penerangan yang saya tidak dapat hendak mengata apa sebab Menteri Muda berbuat demikian—tentu-lah bodoh-nya banyak daripada Menteri yang betul. Jadi, ta' dapat-lah saya hendak kata chuma saya minta-lah Menteri ini menerang-kan bagaimana dudok-nya wang ini.

Dr Ng Kam Poh: Mr Speaker, Sir, even though it is explained here that we want to increase the amount we want to borrow, it is true that we did not say why we want to borrow,

according to the Member from Bachok. I can assure the Member for Bachok that if we succeed in borrowing this amount, Bachok itself will benefit by it. The reason why we want to borrow is that we do not have enough money in this country to accommodate our First Five-Year Malaysia Plan. We have reserves—I agree to the point of \$2.5 billion, but we need \$4.45 billion to implement the whole of the Five-Year Malaysia Plan. So there is the balance of \$2.5 billion—there is roughly a \$1.9 billion gap—which we have to borrow, and this Act if passed to enable us to raise the ceiling of borrowing as one of the means; and if we succeed in borrowing this money I am sure Bachok in Kelantan will also benefit to a great extent, and he will benefit for what the Alliance Government is doing for him. I hope he will understand my explanation and will be satisfied. Thank you.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Sayang, saya minta penerangan tadi; tetapi dia bagi terang apa yang saya kata dahulu. Jadi barangkali Yang Berhormat ini tidak faham, jadi saya hendak bacha apa yang saya minta tadi ini ia-itu Menteri kita tidak dapat hendak memberi penerangan melainkan hendak mencheritakan dia hendak buat banyak ini-lah yang di-katakan:

“When the people is restive the Government will announce a blue print of a very progressive project in nature, but when it comes to implementation the project gets watered down.” Jadi, hendak meminjam duit banyak ini hendak mencheritakan kami hendak buat itu, kepada Bachok pun dia hendak bagi, saya Opposition pun dia na' bagi. Ini kesemua satu cherita yang hendak menggemparkan orang, ini-lah nature-nya Bill ini dan itu-lah maksud-nya. Bila saya kata tadi dia menafikan tetapi dari jawapan-nya dia mengaku. Jadi erti-nya Menteri kita ini sa-chara langsung mengia-kan chakap saya, dan nature Bill ini patut di-tolak kalau begitu erti-nya.

Question put, and agreed to.

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

House immediately resolve 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 EXTENDED CREDIT BILL

Second Reading

Dr Ng Kam Poh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to authorise the raising of loans outside the Federation in the form of receiving goods or services and delaying the payment of the price therefor and the value of services together with interest thereon to some future dates and to provide for matters connected therewith", be read a second time.

The foreign assistance that has been offered for the First Malaysia Plan includes delayed payments for goods and services received by the Government from foreign sources. Such extended credit is increasingly being made available by foreign Governments and institutions, and it is estimated that for the purpose of the Plan it may be possible to raise a total sum of \$300 million by this method. The purpose of the present Bill is to enable the Government to take advantage of the extended credit offers to the extent of \$300 million. The External Loans Act, 1963, which at present provides authority for external borrowings, has no provision to enable the Government to enter into extended credit arrangements. I should point out that the sum of \$300 million, for which legal authority is now sought, is within the total figure of \$1,070 million for external borrowing as required by the First Malaysia Plan.

Sir, I beg to move.

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

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tentu-lah sabuah negara, sa-bagaimana negara

kita, memerlukan Bill yang sa-macham ini, tetapi ada disas desus yang boleh Menteri kita patut jawab ia-itu Bill ini, sa-lain daripada apa yang diterangkan dengan nyata di-sini, di-sebalek itu ada satu perkara yang lain pula ia-itu kita tahu dengan keterangan yang di-beri melalui Bill ini kita boleh melambatkan bayaran barang² dan juga khidmat². Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mendapat faham bahawa Kerajaan kita telah pun berhubong dengan pehak di-luar negeri ia-itu hendak membawa masok pekerja² ia-itu orang² yang boleh memberi service dan bagitu juga barang² di-luar negeri dengan chara bayaran instalment. Jadi memberi instalment, membayar harga dengan instalment, atau pun dengan lewat² ini tidak mudah kita dapat sa-bagaimana juga kita tidak mudah dapat hutang daripada England baharu² ini melainkan orang² yang dapat memberi service-nya yang tidak elok atau pun memberi barang-nya yang tidak elok. Oleh kerana kita berhajat sangat kepada barang² dan service dengan chara bayar lambat, maka negara kita akan di-penohi dengan unyor² yang sa-macham ini. Kalau-lah perkara ini tidak benar berlaku yang sa-macham itu, maka dapat-kah Menteri kita menerangkan bahawa pehak Kementerian kita akan menerangkan jenis² khidmat²—service—dan barang² yang akan terta'alok kepada kuat kuasa Bill ini apabila kita luluskan. Sekian, Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

Dr Ng Kam Poh: Mr Speaker, Sir, what the Member for Bachok was implying was that we would be receiving goods from England which later on might turn out to be not so serviceable, or the quality of the goods is not that good. But I can assure the Honourable Member for Bachok we are diversifying our range of imports of products from various countries in the Aid Malaysia Club. I hope the explanation satisfies the point as raised by the Honourable Member for Bachok.

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 4 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

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

THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK BILL

Second Reading

Dr Ng Kam Poh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to enable effect to be given to an International Agreement for the establishment and operation of the Asian Development Bank and to enable the Federation to become a member thereof and to make provisions for matters connected therewith" be read a second time.

Since 1947 the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East has provided a forum for discussions and analysis of the economic problems and outlook for the broad area stretching from Iran to the Pacific Islands and in 1963 an E.C.A.F.E. Expert Group on Regional Economic Co-operation first formally proposed the establishment of a regional bank for Asia. This proposal was subsequently endorsed by Ministers representing Asian nations at the E.C.A.F.E. Ministerial Conference on Asian Economic Co-operation in Manila in December, 1963. During 1964, detailed technical investigations were made by a Working Group of Experts and a comprehensive report was made available to governments at the end of that year. In March, 1965, the twenty-first session of E.C.A.F.E. which met in Wellington, New Zealand, unanimously agreed to set up a Consultative Committee made up of representatives of nine Asian countries, including Malaysia, to review the principal issues involved. After obtaining the views of various governments interested in the establishment of the Bank, the Consultative Committee drew up a preliminary charter for the

institution and the final form of this charter called the "Agreement Establishing the Asian Development Bank" was signed by representatives of Governments, including Malaysia, at a Conference of Plenipotentiaries in Manila in December, 1965. Membership, however, is subject to legislative approval and it is this approval, Mr Speaker, Sir, that I now wish to seek.

The Asian Development Bank has been conceived and brought into being by Asians to meet Asian requirements. Its members are predominantly Asian, its principal office is in Asia and it is managed and financed mainly by Asians. Its main purpose is to accelerate the economic development of Asia and the Far East by encouraging economic co-operation within the region and also by mobilizing funds from within as well as from without the region in order to finance the development of the region. Malaysia has traditionally supported international co-operation. She is a party to various international agreements. She is a member of various international institutions like the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund, the International Finance Corporation and the International Development Association. It is in keeping with this tradition that Malaysia's representatives have participated in the deliberations and discussions leading to the signing of the Agreement establishing the Asian Development Bank and it is with this tradition in mind that I now propose the acceptance of Malaysia's membership of the Bank.

The Asian Development Bank is not the first bank of its kind: the Inter-American Development Bank and the African Development Bank are already operating to promote economic development of the geographical regions concerned. Careful deliberation by the foremost experts in international finance has preceded its formation and the experience of the World Bank and other international institutions have been drawn upon in drafting its charter.

The Bank is to have an authorised capital stock of US\$1 billion of which US\$650 million will be subscribed by

Asian regional members while remaining US\$350 million is reserved for subscription by non-regional member countries. The authorised capital stock of the Bank and the subscription of each member to the capital stock will be made up of equal parts of paid-in and callable shares. Malaysia's subscription to the original capital stock is US\$20 million, equally divided between paid-in and callable shares. The callable shares will constitute a guarantee for borrowings by the Bank in private capital markets and they will be drawn on only in the unlikely event that the Bank is unable to meet its commitments. As regards paid-in shares, not all of a member's subscription is to be paid in cash from the outset and Malaysia will pay her subscription of US\$10 million in five equal annual instalments. Further, of each instalment one-half only will be in gold or convertible currency while the other half will be in Malaysian dollars, or "promissory notes or other obligations".

The Bank is open to membership by members and associate members of ECAFE and by other regional countries and non-regional developed countries which are members of the United Nations or of any of its specialised agencies. Thirty-one members including many non-regional capital-contributing countries have already signed the Agreement establishing the Bank. However, the Agreement enters into force only when fifteen Signatories, including ten or more regional members, having subscriptions of at least US\$650 million deposit their instruments of ratification with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Instruments of ratification must be deposited not later than 30th September, 1966, and the Articles of Agreement make no provision for the extension of this deadline.

Beside its paid-up capital, the financial resources of the Bank consist of Special Funds and funds it may raise in the future through borrowing in private capital markets. The Bank should also add to its resources through its earnings. Special Funds, in accordance with the Articles of Agreement

of the Bank, may be established by earmaking up to 10 per cent of its paid-in capital for the purpose, and by accepting funds for administration by the Bank. The Bank's lending operations are divided into two categories: "Ordinary operations" if they are financed from the ordinary resources of the Bank and "special operations" if they are financed from Special Funds. The ordinary operations will normally take the form of direct loans on terms similar to those of World Bank loans to developing countries. World Bank loans are presently made on terms of 5½ per cent with maturities normally up to 25 to 30 years. Special operations financed from any allocation of paid-in capital may be used to make or guarantee loans of high developmental priority, on terms and conditions more favourable to the borrower than the Bank's ordinary operations; special operations financed from Special Funds given to the Bank by the donor countries for administration may be for any purpose and on any terms not inconsistent with the overall purpose of the Bank. Of particular significance, the operation of Special Funds will enable the Bank to administer funds received from donor countries outside Asia on special terms to meet the special needs of the region.

Among other things the Articles of Agreement require that in the Bank's operations due regard will be paid to the needs of the smaller countries of the region and also to the ability of borrowing countries to repay any loans made. Malaysia naturally will be in a position to take advantage of these considerations and the Asian Development Bank can therefore be expected to be an additional source of development capital for Malaysia. The Bank may also be expected to provide finance on better terms than can be obtained from most other sources and at a time such as this when all possible sources of aid are being explored to finance the First Malaysia Plan, I cannot welcome more readily the opportunity for Malaysia to be a member of an institution such as the Asian Development Bank.

Sir, I beg to move.

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

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya amat-lah dukachita dengan chara Menteri kita mengemukakan Bill ini. Sa-patut-nya Bill yang kita hendak bahathkan lepas daripada ini-lah Menteri kita patut memberi penerangan, memberi report² apa dia Asian Development Bank itu, tidak payah-lah dia membacha. Ini memakan masa yang bagitu banyak yang barangkali tuan sendiri, kalau dudok di-tempat saya pun, tidak faham apa yang dia cheritakan. Jadi, ini-lah yang saya katakan chara Kerajaan Perikatan hendak membodohkan orang² sa-hingga orang dia pun tidak dapat faham dan tidak patut-lah sa-orang Menteri Muda yang handsome, yang smart macham itu, menchemarkan diri di-sini.

Saya bertanya kapada pehak Menteri kita dapat-kah, sa-telah dia memberi penerangan yang berjela² itu, memberi report, report berkenaan dengan penubohan Asian Development Bank ini supaya ahli² dalam Dewan ini dapat membacha dan menimbangkan di-mana baik-nya, kemudian boleh jadi bukan sahaja capital yang kita hendak \$70 juta atau pun berapa banyak-nya dan kita akan dapat menambah lagi, tetapi dengan dia memberi dalam 15 minit hendak membuat satu development bagi negara² Asia dan mengharapkan orang² kita ini dapat faham dengan 15 minit ini, saya rasa itu tidak baik.

Dan saya perchaya kita izinkan kapada Yang Berhormat Menteri ini mencheritakan apa yang dia bacha bagaimana gramophone tadi dia sendiri pun tidak tahu apa dia isi-nya. Jadi, ini satu perkara ta' tahu-lah hendak kata, Tuan Yang di-Pertua (*Ketawa*).

Dr Ng Kam Poh: Mr Speaker, Sir, unwittingly the Member for Bachok has said that I myself do not understand what I am reading. I do understand what I am reading, and the purpose of this Bill is just that we, the Asian nation set up an Asian Development Bank from which we ourselves can

borrow and also if we need to, we can get interest out of it. For the development of the Asian nations this is the purpose of setting up the Bank, and the Bank distributes its operation like any other bank—it is as simple as that: only it has got directors as well as executive officers—nothing different from any other bank. So, there is no need for me to explain to the Honourable Member for Bachok what a bank is. He should know. If he does not know, then he does not deserve to sit here. I regret, Sir, that I have to say such things. I do not mean it in any enmity towards the Member for Bachok; after all, he is a very good person. Thank you very much.

Question put to and agreed to.

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

House immediately resolve itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr Speaker *in the Chair*)

Clauses 1 to 8 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

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

THE LOAN (LOCAL) (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Dr Ng Kam Poh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that the Bill intituled "an Act to amend the Loan (Local) Ordinance, 1959," be read a second time. At present domestic loans are raised under the authority of Loans (Local) Ordinance, 1959, which specifies a limit of \$1,200 million for such loans. To date, a total sum of \$1,135 million has been raised, so that a further sum of \$65 million can still be raised under the authority of this Ordinance. However, it is now necessary to consider the requirements of the First Malaysia Plan which was tabled in November, 1965.

I should explain that in addition to the amount to be raised by way of Treasury Bills under the Treasury Bills (Local)

Ordinance, 1946, and by way of short-term loans under the Loans (Local) Act, 1961, the total amount of gross domestic borrowing required for the purpose of the First Malaysia Plan is \$1,075 million. It is, therefore, necessary to raise the limit of the Government's power to obtain domestic loans under Section 3 (1) of the Loan (Local) Ordinance by \$1,010 million, or to use a neater figure, by \$1,000 million, and the purpose of the present Bill is merely to revise the limit of the amount of loans that can be raised under the Ordinance from \$1,200 million to \$2,200 million.

Sir, I beg to move.

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

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah:
Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-kali lagi saya bangun menyatakan dukachita di-atas Bill ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita berhajat kapada hutang ini, ia-itu hutang yang di-namakan Local—hutang dalam, local loan, dengan maksud hendak menolong membiayai Rancangan Kemajuan Malaysia yang Pertama.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-bagaimana saya telah katakan di-dalam masa meshuarat perbelanjaan kita pada tahun yang lalu ia-itu saya amat-lah bimbang terhadap masa depan Pembangunan Malaysia ini kalau kita berhutang banyak sangat walau pun di-dalam negeri. Sebab-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pehak² yang boleh memberi hutang kapada Kerajaan atau kapada Negara kita tentu-lah orang² kaya bagaimana orang² yang ada kebun getah banyak, dan orang² perniagaan, business yang banyak jadi, ini-lah orang² yang dapat memberi hutang-nya, ra'ayat yang di-luar bandar tidak ada duit hendak memberi hutang. Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untuk menjayakan Rancangan Lima Tahun kita ini nyata-lah Kerajaan kita ini terpaksa mengadakan political compromise ia-itu satu tolak ansor politik antara Kerajaan dengan business interest ia-itu orang² yang pegang interest dalam negeri ini, jika tidak dia tidak akan dapat wang ini di-mana dia

hendak dapat kechuali kalau Menteri kita ada reserve fund barangkali Menteri² kita macham orang kata ia-lah yang ada duit itu masaalah lain.

Apabila benda ini berlaku, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita dapat hutang banyak bagini daripada orang² business ini maka kita mahu tidak mahu terpaksa ikut kapada term atau pun kapada peratoran² yang orang itu memberi di-luar—perkara loteri—itu yang kita takut. Jadi, dengan demikian pehak² tuan business yang besar memberi hutang kapada kita ini sudah tentu dapat mempengaruhi Kerajaan, dan akhir-nya Kerajaan ini akan tundok kapada tuan² hutang yang pada kita berhutang itu. Maalum-lah kalau saya berhutang kapada tuan tentu saya ikut sahaja tuan kata apa sa-kali pun. Jadi, ini erti-nya Kerajaan ini moving dan bergerak untuk hendak menggadaikan kemajuan negeri ini kapada business interest ini dan boleh jadi oleh kerana dalam business interest ini ada juga Menteri² kita yang ada masok sher halal.

Jadi, erti-nya dia memerintah satu pehak dan menjadi business satu pehak, jadi, dia sudah untong dua itu, itu sebab saya sa-malam bertanya kapada Timbalan Perdana Menteri ada-kah dia perchaya sa-sabua Kerajaan yang nature-nya bagini dapat membuat sa-suatu yang baik kapada ra'ayat; jadi, Timbalan Perdana Menteri kata Kerajaan kita "The nature of the Alliance Government is not of that". Maka hari ini kita nampak-lah wang ini kapada local Loan di-mana hendak dapat ini kalau tidak daripada pehak² business interest. Apabila diambil hutang ini maka kita akan terchengkam dengan kehendak² orang ini. Jadi, erti-nya Kerajaan kita ini menunjukkan kapitalis yang ada. Ini-lah satu perkara yang besar yang saya bimbang perkara ini akan berlaku dan saya perchaya Menteri kita tidak dapat menunjukkan di-mana dia boleh dapat duit ini kalau tidak daripada business interest. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, apabila kita dapat duit ini lagi sa-lain daripada saya membayangkan itu kita meminjam duit ini boleh jadi kita meminjam-nya dengan jalan undang² yang kita adakan tadi ia-itu dengan bayar ansor². Jadi,

erti-nya kita meminta duit daripada business interest itu hendak membuat building (bangunan) maka dia kata aku tidak ada duit, tetapi aku beri hutang dengan goods (barang²) jadi kamu boleh bayar chara beransor². Jadi membeli barang dia itu satu dia sudah dapat untong, dengan satu instalment sa-kali lagi dapat untong dan oleh kerana kita hendak berhutang dengan dia—lagi sa-kali dia dapat untong, jadi tiga kali. Jadi, itu-lah saya katakan Kerajaan kita ini sedikit berganjak kapada hendak menggadai negeri ini kapada kapitalis². Jadi, saya minta-lah Menteri kita ini beri penerangan. Saya tahu Ahli Yang Berhormat ini pandai dalam kedokteran, tetapi barangkali dia bukan-nya ahli ekonomi, dan bagaimana dia hendak champor ubat kimia itu?

Tuan Tajudin bin Ali (Larut Utara):

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun menyokong Bill yang di-kemukakan oleh Menteri Muda Kewangan. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, barang di-ingat sa-lain daripada Amerika semua negara dalam dunia ini berhutang, satu living thing mesti berhutang, satu Kerajaan yang progressive mesti berhutang, berlainan sangat dengan Kerajaan Kelantan, kalau tidak ada duit jual tanah sungguh pun tanah itu ia-lah tanah Malay Reservation. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perkara ini bukan satu perkara yang baharu, kita telah pun dapati ia-itu sa-banyak \$1,200 juta chuma kita hendak lebehan sahaja, dan ini untuk ra'ayat jelata. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, mana² pehak pun tidak di-paksa, di-pelawa dan di-hasut mengeluarkan duit mereka itu untuk memberi hutang yang Kerajaan pelawa kemudian hari kelak. Barang di-ingat, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kaum kapitalis sangat pandai, kalau duit-nya itu tidak dapat di-keluarkan di-sini, di-mana² negeri laku, umpama-nya di-Australia, India, di-mana², dan bunga-nya berlebehan lagi daripada yang kita dapati dalam negeri ini. Kaum kapitalis tidak dapat di-paksa, tidak dapat di-ajar, dia tahu meletakkan duit mereka itu di-mana² mereka itu suka dan lebeh lagi, tetapi

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah:

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, are you a capitalist?

Tuan Tajudin bin Ali: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak mahu jawab, dia ini langsung tidak ada fact berchakap, dia berchakap semua-nya supposition, agak² sahaja. Jadi, kita bernasib baik Malaysia ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada orang² yang sungguh ta'at setia pada negeri ini, terutama kaum kapitalis yang bekerjasama rapat dengan Kerajaan. Ini kita sanjong tinggi kaum kapitalis dalam negeri kita ini, kalau tidak kita ada ubat untuk mereka itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-lain daripada kita minta bantuan daripada orang yang ada duit dalam negeri kita ini, duit yang datang sa-chara ini, pada pendapat saya yang sengkat dapat kita mempertahankan mata wang kita itu. Ma'ana saya berchakap ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, supaya matawang itu jangan jatuh harga-nya. Jadi, ini satu daripada jalan yang sangat baik sa-lain daripada menolong Kerajaan menjalankan ranchangan² yang tertentu. Mata wang itu sentiasa kuat. Ma'ana-nya, kalau terlampau banyak duit dalam negeri, ta' dapat tiada harga wang itu akan sedikit demi sedikit jatuh. Dengan jalan ini semua dapat faedah, kaum kapitalis dapat faedah, lebeh² lagi ra'ayat jelata, Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

Jadi, saya tidak bersetuju sangat-lah perkara² yang di-keluarkan oleh wakil dari Bachok tadi, tidak ada satu perkara yang baharu, dia berchakap kerana hendak berchakap. Apabila di-suroh buat satu pun tidak boleh buat sampai negeri Parti dia jaga 1/3 daripada-nya telah pun di-jual. Kita tidak mahu bagini. Kita chari duit yang ada dalam negeri kita. Ini patut dia faham. Lain kali hendak berchakap bukan berchakap sahaja, kita hendak jalan apa yang kita boleh buat untuk faedah kapada ra'ayat. Ini besar ma'ana-nya. Jangan chakap angin sahaja.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah:

Untuk penjelasan. Berkenaan dengan urusan Negeri itu, saya bukan Ahli Dewan Negeri, saya Ahli Parlimen. Dia orang Perak dekat rumah saya. Tuan Speaker pun orang Perak, tidak patut Tuan biar saya bergaduh dengan dia, sama² Perak (*Ketawa*). Ini saya sudah naik marah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

Dr Ng Kam Poh: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Member for Bachok, who was originally from Taiping, I think, is really a bit confused. We have moved a few Bills in respect of External Loans and now we are moving a Bill for domestic loans. Mr Speaker, Sir, it is always a better way to raise money domestically, because then we do not lose foreign exchange. By this method we intend to raise the maximum by \$1 million, roughly, to \$2,200 million. It is not the business interest that we borrow from under all the capitalists who can influence the Government we borrow from. We borrow from, for example, anybody who wants to subscribe to a loan, and we publish it in the papers and the loan subscription is always over the normal which we are asked to subscribe. Supposing the people are asked to subscribe for \$15 million, we usually get an over subscription of \$5 million because the people like the E.P.F. would like to lend money to the Government and people like various banks, for example, would also like to lend money to the Government, because it is in the charter of the bank and various institutions that the money that they have accumulated is for the development of the country, so the domestic borrowing, where we are concerned, need not worry the Member for Bachok too much; after all I was from Taiping too, and if I am not worried from the country's point of view, I do not see why the Member from Bachok should be worried. Honestly, we are in a very strong financial position. If he does not believe it, it comes down to a simple, very simple elementary question of the common dollar.

Mr Speaker, Sir, at the present moment, in spite of all our loans, our one dollar is still comparable to the old dollar. One U.S. dollar is worth 3.06 Malayan dollar. Fifty-five cents of our Malayan dollar is equivalent to one Hongkong dollar. Roughly, one Malayan dollar is still equivalent to 7 times baht; and if you go round the currencies in the world, you will find that the Malaysian dollar is hard currency—it is one of the hardest currencies in the world. We can boast of that we have not only gold backing but foreign

reserve backing, and our backing for a dollar is 110%. Not even the U.S. dollar has got that amount of gold backing—That I can assure the Honourable Member for Bachok. So, he need not worry if we start borrowing, because by borrowing money, we pick up projects and from projects then we develop our country and from development we earn back money. In this way the money rotates. Thank you, Sir.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untuk penjelasan. Saya minta penerangan tadi saya berfaham bahawa duit² itu kebanyakan yang akan dapat dari sumber apa yang saya katakan business interest, tetapi Menteri kata tidak—*any body*. chuba-lah Menteri kita tunjukkan *any body* itu siapa? Tunjukkan satu example *any body*. What do you mean by any body? (*Interruption inaudible*).

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.

Mr Speaker: Persidangan ini ditempohkan sa-hingga pukul 4.00 petang ini.

Sitting suspended at 1.00 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 4.05 p.m.

(Mr Speaker *in the Chair*)

THE DEWAN BAHASA DAN PUSTAKA (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Tuan Lee Siok Yew: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that “the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka (Amendment) Bill, 1966” be now read a second time. As stated, Sir, in the Explanatory Statement, the Bill is self-explanatory. However, I

shall explain briefly the reasons for the proposed amendments.

Firstly, under sub-section (3) of section 4 of the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka Ordinance, 1959, the power to appoint the Secretary of the Board of Control of the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka is vested with the Minister of Education. But since the Board has the power under the provision of section 14 (a) of the same Ordinance to appoint, with the approval of the Honourable Minister of Education, the Director of the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, and the Secretary is working directly under the Board and the Director, it is considered desirable that the power to appoint the Secretary be vested with the Board.

Secondly, the existing provision for the making of loans to officers and servants of the Board restricts the power of the Board to give loans for the purpose of purchasing means of conveyance only. The Board is at present considering the making of housing loans to its officers and servants. In order to extend the provisions of giving loans to officers and servants of the Board for the purpose of acquiring, building and purchasing houses for their personal use other than conveyance only, it is necessary to amend section 19 (c) of the Ordinance as proposed in paragraph 2, Clause 2 of the Bill. Clause 2 of the Bill also requires the borrowers to mortgage the lands including houses to the Board as security for such loans.

Thirdly, paragraph 3 of Clause 2 is intended to give powers to the Board to make rules in respect of salaries, allowances and conditions of service of its officers and servants and to establish and manage its own Provident Fund. At present some of the Board's employees, apart from those required by law to contribute to the Government Employees Provident Fund, have been contributing 10 per cent of their basic salary towards the Board's Provident Fund for which no provision has been made in the Ordinance for its establishment. In order to regularise its establishment, it is necessary to amend the Ordinance as proposed in

Clause 2 of the Bill. The amendment also provides an enabling clause for the Board, with the approval of the Minister of Education, to make rules for a pension scheme should such change be considered desirable by the Government later on.

Sir, I beg to move.

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

Tuan Ahmad bin Arshad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun menyokong Rang Undang² yang ada dihadapan kita ini. Saya chuma hendak menyentoh atas penerangan yang diberikan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Muda Pelajaran tadi. Memandang kadapa Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka ini ada-lah satu badan yang terpenting pada hendak melaksanakan bahasa kebangsaan kita, maka memang sudah sa-mesti-nya Rang Undang² yang sa-umpama ini di-pinda. Di-samping itu dalam Lembaga Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka ini, gemar saya menarek perhatian pehak yang berkenaan supaya dapat meneliti pandangan² yang saya akan berikan.

Pertama sa-kali menurut hemah saya, sayugia di-adakan perchitakan sendiri. Pada masa ini segala penerbitan yang di-keluarkan oleh Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka itu semua-nya melalū perchitakan sa-chara borong; maka ini mendatangkan kesulitan, khas-nya pada waktu akhir² tahun.

Yang kedua, memandang kapada banyak buku keluaran daripada Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka ini, saya meminta supaya Lembaga ini memerhatikan pandangan saya ini dengan mengadakan satu setor bagi menambahkan setor yang ada supaya sesuai dan kemas bagi sa-buah Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka yang lengkap.

Yang ketiga, saya nampak supaya di-adakan juga penjualan buku chara bergerak dengan menggunakan kereta. Kalau buku² daripada luar negeri sanggup mengadakan penjualan chara bergerak ini, saya tidak fikir Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka ini tidak boleh membuat demikian pada satu masa yang akan datang. Maka dengan ini akan menyenangkan buku² keluaran

daripada Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka itu sampai kepada ra'ayat dalam negeri yang menghendaki buku² itu, bukan sahaja bagi kanak² sekolah tetapi termasuk-lah juga ra'ayat Malaysia yang menghendaki supaya bahasa kebangsaan itu hampir kepada mereka.

Sekian-lah, terima kaseh.

Wan Abdul Kadir bin Ismail (Kuala Trengganu Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong Rang Undang² ini bagi menyempurnakan perjalanan Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, suatu Lembaga yang sangat penting dalam negara kita ini, Lembaga yang menjadi alat memperkuat perkembangan bahasa kebangsaan yang menjadi alat perpaduan yang besar dalam masyarakat berbilang bangsa di-Malaysia ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya merasa bahawa Rang Undang² Pindaan ini sa-patut-nya sudah lama di-kemukakan, kerana saya tidak dapat memikirkan bagaimana Lembaga Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka itu berjalan selama ini dengan tidak ada Setia-usaha yang di-lantek, tetapi walau macham mana pun saya merasa sa-panjang masa ini Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka telah menjalankan tugas-nya dengan chemerlang dan baik dalam mendokong dan menggerakkan perkembangan bahasa kebangsaan. Saya merasa dalam memperkembangkan bahasa kebangsaan ini, saya suka-lah hendak menyentuh sedikit satu perkara yang sangat mustahak yang telah saya sentoh beberapa kali dalam Dewan ini ia-itu dalam hendak mempercepat dan melajukan gerakan perkembangan bahasa kebangsaan ini, ia-lah hasil² usaha dalam bahasa itu harus di-beri jaminan yang baik. Saya maksudkan bahawa sudah terlalu lewat masa-nya bagi pehak Kerajaan menimbangkan untok di-adakan Undang² Hak Chipta, sudah dua tiga tahun saya bincangkan tetapi sampai pada hari ini perkara ini belum lagi di-timbulkan. Saya berharap bahawa pehak Kerajaan dan dengan initiative Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka Rang Undang² Hak Chipta ini akan di-kemukakan ka-Dewan ini tidak lama lagi.

Saya bertanya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kerana pada 12hb Julai ini satu perbicharaan akan berlaku di-Mahkamah di-antara sa-buah penerbitan asing di-negeri ini dengan PENA (Persatuan Penulis National) yang mempertahankan kedudukan Penulis² kita, bahawa penulis² yang telah menulis beberapa karia telah di-ambil oleh pehak sa-buah penerbitan dan di-siarkan dengan tidak sa-tahu pengarang²-nya dan perkara ini patut di-selesaikan di-luar mahkamah tetapi telah lama sangat perkiraan dan kira bichara sangat ini sa-hingga terpaksa pehak PENA membawa perkara ini ka-mahkamah. 12hb Julai akan menjadi tarikh yang akan menentukan tentang perlu-nya Undang² Hak Chipta ini di-adakan dengan segera bagi menjamin kedudukan pengarang² kita dalam usaha supaya mereka dapat memberi sumbangan yang sa-benar²-nya bererti bagi perkembangan bahasa kebangsaan ia-itu tugas yang di-pikul oleh Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka sa-bagai pendokong-nya.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perkara yang kedua yang hendak saya sentoh ia-lah kita sekarang, seluroh Malaysia barangkali, berasa besar hati dengan perdamaian yang telah terchipta antara Malaysia dengan Indonesia. Saya suka-lah bila nanti perdamaian yang penoh di-chipta, langkah yang pertama yang akan di-jalankan ia-lah meluluskan ejaan Malindo yang telah lama di-persetujui tetapi belum sempat di-jalankan tiba² konfrantasi datang. Saya rasa itu-lah perkara yang pertama sa-kali, langkah yang pertama sa-kali, yang patut di-jalankan sa-lepas perse-tujuan yang akhir dapat di-tanda tangani antara Malaysia dengan Indonesia bagi mengakhiri konfrantasi kita. Ini-lah satu perkara yang sangat besar yang akan menjadi suatu titek sejarah yang penting dalam mendaulatkan bahasa Melayu ini menjadi bahasa perantaraan bagi Asia Tenggara seluroh-nya. Langkah ini perlu di-segerakan dengan tidak berlelah² lagi.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, satu perkara yang hendak saya sentoh ia-lah tentang soal bahasa kebangsaan yang

akan di-daulatkan pada tahun 1967—tahun hadapan—dan kita perchaya dengan ikrar yang di-akui oleh Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong dalam Titah di-Raja baharu² ini, tidak dapat tidak akan berlaku pada tahun hadapan. Tetapi di-dalam kerisis yang berlaku di-Sarawak baharu² ini, soal bahasa ini telah di-jadikan modal oleh sa-tengah² pehak yang hendak menerbitkan kekachauan di-sana dengan mengatakan bahawa perubahan pemerintah, Ketua Kerajaan di-Sarawak, sa-bagai satu daya hendak memaksa bahasa kebangsaan dengan serta merta di-Sarawak. Jadi perkara ini tidak benar kerana Perlembagaan kita mengatakan bahawa bahasa kebangsaan akan di-rasmikan di-wilayah Malaysia Timor 10 tahun sa-lepas hari Malaysia, erti-nya pada tahun 1973. Maka saya merasa suka-lah mengambil kesempatan ini menyeru kepada pehak Kerajaan supaya menjelaskan tahun 1973 ini di-Malaysia Timor ini patut pehak Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka mengadakan chawangan-nya di-Malaysia Timor bagi meninjau apa yang boleh di-buat, menolong usaha bagi memperkembangkan bahasa kebangsaan di-Malaysia Timor menjelang tahun 1973. Barangkali juga perlu di-adakan bukan sahaja kamus Melayu yang sekarang sedang hendak di-terbitkan tetapi barangkali suatu kamus Iban/Melayu atau pun perkara yang memerlukan penyiasatan, penyelidikan dan usaha yang khusus mengenai Malaysia Timor, yang harus di-pikul dan di-jalankan oleh pehak Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka. Saya rasa pada masa sekarang ini sangat-lah patut suatu usaha yang demikian, merupakan chawangan atau sa-bagai-nya di-adakan di-Malaysia Timor bagi menunggu dan menyediakan suasana di-Malaysia Timor, bagi menyambut bahasa kebangsaan yang akan di-jadikan bahasa rasmi yang kekal di-sana pada tahun 1973 kira² 7 tahun dari sekarang. Tujoh tahun itu bukan masa yang lanjut. Kalau kita bersedia dengan sa-penoh-nya dari sekarang, patut-lah di-adakan suatu chadangan di-Malaysia Barat ini menjadi chontoh baik bagi pehak Dewan Bahasa dan

Pustaka bergerak di-sa-belah Malaysia Timor. Terima kaseh.

Tuan Lee Siok Yew: Tuan Speaker, berkenaan dengan soalan yang di-bangkitkan tadi oleh Yang Berhormat daripada Kuala Trengganu Utara, perkara itu tidak di-dalam pentadbiran negeri ini. Tetapi soalan itu akan di-bentangkan kepada Lembaga Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka. Ahli Yang Berhormat bertata berkenaan dengan perkara hendak berhubung dengan *copyright*. Saya dapat tahu bahawa perkara ini ada-lah dalam tangan Kementerian saya, maka tidak elok-lah saya berchakap tentang perkara itu di-sini.

Berkenaan soalan yang di-bangkitkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Muar Utara berkenaan soal perchetakan—itu akan di-timbangan. Terima kaseh.

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 MIDWIVES BILL

Second Reading

The Minister of Health (Tuan Bahaman bin Samsudin): Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that the Bill intitled “an Act to repeal the Midwives Ordinance, 1954, and to enact a law to provide for better provisions regulating the registration of midwives and the conduct of midwifery and other matters connected therewith”.

The Midwives Ordinance which was passed in 1954 was in fact never brought into force. It is believed that one of the reasons was because the regulations to the ordinance were

never passed and, perhaps, also because there were then insufficient number of trained midwives throughout the country.

The Midwives Ordinance was prepared before the country became independent and its provisions have become out-dated and no longer fit into the present political administrative situation of the country which have undergone considerable changes since independence. It is now considered that a fresh start should be made and the Ordinance should be replaced by a more comprehensive law governing midwives and to provide for better methods of registration of all practising midwives in the States of Malaya. The Midwives Bill seeks to provide such provisions.

I will now touch on some of the important points which are incorporated in the Midwives Bill. The Bill provides for the establishment of a Midwives Board, its powers and duties. It provides for one registering authority for the whole country and the Director of Medical Services, States of Malaya, shall be the Registrar. Under the Midwives Ordinance, 1954, every Chief Medical and Health Officer is the Registrar who maintains the register of all practising midwives in the States.

Perhaps the most important power of the Board is its power to order the removal of the name of any midwife from the register for various reasons, including the obtaining of registration by a fraudulent or incorrect statement and for guilty of improper conduct or gross negligence. Any person aggrieved by the removal of his name from the register can appeal to the Minister against such removal.

The Bill also provides that all persons untrained in the practice of midwifery and who have during the period of two years immediately before the commencement of the new Act, attended women during child birth are given the opportunity to register within one year of the promulgation of law. Such untrained midwives are, therefore, not precluded

from continuing to practise midwifery. The Bill empowers the Minister to make regulations for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the law. This is an important provision as regulations may have to be amended from time to time.

Sir, I beg to move.

The Minister of Lands and Mines (Tuan Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub):
Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Dato' Dr Haji Megat Khas (Kuala Kangsar): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya memberi sokongan yang penoh kepada Rang Undang² yang telah di-kemukakan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Kesihatan, kerana ada-lah tujuan-nya Rang Undang² ini ia-lah hendak mengator dan memelihara hak² bidan² yang akan dapat masok didalam daftar itu, dan juga menyusun dan mengatornkan chara² mereka itu bekerja dan juga tentang perkara kelakuan terhadap kapada kerjanya dan orang² yang lain. Maka dengan sebab itu, saya tidak-lah hendak memanjangkan chakap di-sini, kerana saya memikirkan perkara ini telah patut lama di-adakan bukan-lah pada masa ini sahaja, tetapi bak kata orang tua², biar lambat asalkan datang juga.

Demikian-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, like the Honourable Member from Kuala Kangsar, I wish to congratulate the Honourable Minister of Health for bringing forth this piece of legislation and, like him too, I wish to say "better late than never".

Mr Speaker, Sir, I am particularly glad that the Minister has thought it fit to include in the Board four medical practitioners who should include an obstetrician, a member of the Medical Council, a member of the Malayan Medical Association and the Chief Medical and Health Officer. Such co-operation with the medical profession is indeed a step in the right direction; and, again, I wish to congratulate the Honourable Minister for it.

Mr Speaker, Sir, what I do not agree with the Bill is that on page 6, section

11 (2) (b), as the Honourable Minister mentioned just now:

“any person untrained in the practice of midwifery who, within one year of the commencement of this Act, satisfies the Registrar that such person has during a period of two years immediately before the commencement of this Act attended to women during child birth.”

Mr Speaker, Sir, this to me is a retrograde step, and I think it is in keeping with modern thinking that is in the Ministry—I refer to the controversy that rages in the press over the opening of the Dental Registrar to untrained dental personnel. Now, here is an instance where the Government is bringing forth the registration of midwife, who is untrained, and whose only qualification for being put on a register is that she has satisfied the Registrar that during a period of two years immediately before the commencement of this Bill she has attended to women during childbirth.

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not know how the Ministry chooses to interpret this. But supposing a chap who works in a maternity home and all that she has been doing is to swab the woman, to hold up the legs, to ask the woman to push—she has attended to the childbirth for two years—are we going to register such a person? The answer is “No”! I see the Minister is shaking his head. Yet you allow the Registrar this discretionary power which, I think, is a retrograde step.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the whole purpose of this Bill, I believe, is to see that people who are trained are allowed to take on the job of attending to the childbirth of women. Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, it may be that the Minister, or members of his Ministry think that attending to the childbirth of a woman is particularly difficult. After all, in ages past you did not have doctors, you did not have *bidans* and nature took its own course; if there was P.P.H. so much worse for the patient, and yet the mothers survived. But, I think, we in this spaceage should not be thinking along those lines. Those of us who have practised it, who are practising medicine or obstetrics, do know that

attending to a childbirth of a woman is a very unpredictable thing. A woman may deliver her child very normally, but then there comes a time when the blood pours out of the womb like water running out from a tap. Even with the best of medical attention, we do know that lives have been lost; and we also know that there are so many complications, and yet the Ministry has thought it fit to include this Clause to allow a person who is “untrained in the practice of midwifery”—these are the words in the Bill.

Now, I do hope that the Minister will either of his own volition withdraw this Clause, or, if he is very obdurate in wanting to let it remain, give us an assurance that only people who really have practised midwifery but never had a chance to take an examination should be allowed on the register. I, myself, am very unhappy over this. Being a professional man, we always would like to have people who are trained and who have passed a certain minimum qualification: for example, examination before they can be put on the register. Think of the parallel, if it is carried further in the profession. Today it is midwifery; tomorrow we are told it is untrained dental mechanics, who want to be placed on the register; the day after tomorrow it may be assistant medical officer, and so it goes. So, what is the value of being a trained midwife, or being a trained dental surgeon, or being a trained doctor?

Now, I am surprised that the Ministry, and the Minister himself, has subscribed to this idea of people untrained being placed on the register. I cannot understand the logic of it. If this Clause is put there, because there is a shortage of personnel, than I would have thought that the Ministry should get on with the job of training more personnel for the various midwife clinics to be scattered up and down the country. Here, I wish to bring this to the attention of the Minister—I do not know whether he knows a lot, but at least one high official in his Ministry knows about this. In the training of midwives, the

Ministry, some years ago, passed a ruling that no maternity hospital should train midwives except the Government Maternity Hospital. I believe, following on that, the State Government of Perak insisted that because of the shortage of midwives in that State, they despite the ruling by the Ministry, would go on training midwives and thereby the Perak Chinese Maternity Hospital has been training all these years midwives for Perak, and these people have gravitated from Perak on to Penang, Selangor and all over the country, and some have gone to the Government hospitals to work.

Now, I would draw the attention of the Minister that if it is a shortage of midwives, then why should not the Ministry encourage the other Chinese Maternity Hospitals or other Maternity Hospitals to train midwives. For example, in the Chinese Maternity Hospital in Kuala Lumpur; there you have a maternity hospital where the total deliveries per year are not far from that of the Maternity Hospital in Kuala Lumpur, and there you have as consultant obstetricians three M.R.C.O.Gs. Is there any valid reason why this Chinese maternity hospital in Kuala Lumpur should not be allowed to train midwives, seeing that it has on its staff three consultants as obstetricians and gynaecologists? I do hope that the Ministry will encourage maternity hospitals all over the country to train midwives and probably, it should see that the examinations should be standardised for the whole country.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I have made these pleas in the hope that the Ministry will see the logic of not putting on the register anyone who is untrained.

Tuan Ahmad bin Arshad: Saya bangun juga turut menyokong Rang Undang² yang ada di-hadapan kita ini. Saya chuma ingin menarek perhatian atas perbincangan dalam beberapa perkara yang telah di-sebutkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Kesihatan tadi. Saya nampak perkhidmatan bidan ini satu khidmat yang mulia kepada ra'ayat luar bandar, ia-nya boleh

membasmikan beberapa adat resam yang merosakkan ekonomi orang² Melayu.

Yang kedua-nya, dia boleh juga memberi kesihatan kepada anak² dan ibu² di-luar bandar. Saya puji jawatan ini yang menerima berbagai² ke-susahan yang di-datangkan oleh penduduk kampung dengan sabar tetapi, mereka terus berkhidmat dengan usaha, dengan tujuan memberi kesihatan kepada ra'ayat. Di-samping itu dalam chara pentadbiran yang lebeh baik, bagaimana yang di-kehendaki oleh Rang Undang² ini, gemar saya menarek perhatian Dewan ini, supaya dapat di-fikirkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Kesihatan, ia-itu dalam masaalah nama bidan. Nama bidan ini juga mendatangkan satu pertengkaran di-kampung² antara orang ramai dengan bidan. Bidan yang kita ambil itu bidan yang muda, orang kampung panggil dia Mak Bidan, memanggil dia Tok Bidan, tetapi bidan ini tidak setuju dengan nama itu, hingga mereka suroh gelar diri dia "Misi". Hal ini sebab saya bangkitkan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, telah terjadi. Sa-orang bidan dalam kawasan saya, menjadi pertengkaran orang mengatakan Tok Bidan, atau Mak Bidan, bidan ini marah, marah-nya membawa hingga ka-Balai Polis. Mujor-lah ketua Balai Polis itu orang yang tahu mententeramkan, hal ini selesai dengan begitu. Jadi, saya harap beri satu nama yang sesuai, bidan ini di-panggil Tok Bidan, Mak Bidan dia marah, kemudain dia suroh sebut nama dia "Misi". Orang kampung tidak setuju dengan nama "Misi"—ini chara pentadbiran yang saya hendak bangkitkan.

Kemudian lagi satu perkara dalam hal latehan telah di-beri dua tahun. Saya gemar bidan supaya di-beri latehan—kapada bidan² kita ini menunggang basikal dan motosikal. sebab ini menolong diri bidan. Kita tidak suka dengar bidan², terutama saka-li waktu malam hari, membunching motosikal atau basikal orang² lain. Telah jadi macham² cerita kita tidak suka, kalau dia naik motosikal, atau naik basikal dia sendiri, boleh pergi merawat orang yang hendak bersalin.

Yang ketiga, selalu pernah terjadi pekerja² bidan waktu menghadap sa-orang ibu yang akan bersalin, terutama sa-kali ibu yang bersalin sulong, bidan ini tidak sanggup merawat ibu itu, dia kata ibu yang hendak bersalin sulong ini hendak-lah di-hantarkan ka-rumah sakit, tetapi dalam tidak berapa lama itu ibu yang hendak bersalin ini telah melahirkan anak. Jadi, kejadian yang macham ini patut-lah di-perhatikan. di-beri kursus betul² kapada bidan² ini supaya boleh merawat bukan sahaja ibu² yang bukan beranak sulong tetapi ibu² yang beranak sulong pun. Penge-tahuan-nya bukan di-sampaikan kapada mereka, ini satu kesusahan kapada ra'ayat—kapada orang kam-pong yang jauh²an. Jadi saya fikir ada satu perkara lagi, Dato² Yang di-Pertua, berhubung dengan bidan. Biasa-nya, bidan kampong yang telah mengambil wang sa-banyak \$5—jika tidak salah dalam ingatan saya untuk membeli kapas, sabun, dan lain², tetapi sa-tengah ibu² yang hamil ini sa-tengah² telah mem-buat pengaduan dengan saya, ada barang² yang tidak di-sampaikan kapada orang yang bersalin itu. Jadi perkara yang macham ini-lah yang saya sampaikan mudahan² dapat perhatian Menteri Yang Berhormat itu.

Tuan Ismail bin Idris (Pulau Pinang Selatan): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun untuk menyokong Rang Undang² ini supaya dapat di-jalankan dengan sa-berapa chepat yang boleh. Maksud saya ia-lah dengan ada-nya Rang Undang² ini apakala di-luluskan nanti, maka harus-lah kurang kematian ibu² yang melahirkan anak di-rumah². Di-dalam soal mendaftarkan midwives atau bidan² ini, maka di-antara lain perlu-lah di-ambil perha-tian supaya satu pelajaran mengguna-kan perkataan lemak manis, perkataan lemah lembut, berperangai baik oleh bidan² atau midwives ini kapada ibu² yang maseh muda rumaja yang hendak melahirkan anak. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, biasa di-keluarkan perkataan² yang kesat, perkataan² yang kurang manis di-hemborkan kapada ibu² terutama sa-kali ibu² yang tinggal di-luar² bandar. Jadi dengan ada per-kataan² sa-macham ini kerap kali ibu²

yang datang dari luar² bandar itu sudah lemah semangat-nya untuk datang ka-hospital untuk menerima rawatan daripada bidan² ini.

Biasa kita mendapat rayuan atau pun repot² daripada ibu² ini dan suka-lah saya hendak memberi tahu kapada Menteri yang berkenaan baharu² ini satu perkara yang telah berlaku di-mana sa-orang ibu yang telah sarat hendak melahirkan anak di-Hospital. Jadi apakala ibu itu di-hantar ka-hospital pada waktu suboh telah di-dapati oleh Nurse atau pun Midwife itu kata-nya “awak belum sampai masa lagi untuk melahirkan anak, awak balek-lah dahulu”. Dengan perkatan² itu maka ibu yang datang daripada luar bandar yang begitu jauh itu ta' tahu hendak chakap apa² terpaksa dia pulang dengan hantaran sendiri. Apa-kala sampai-nya dia di-rumah lebeh kurang sa-jam di-antara perjalanan-nya itu tiba² dalam masa 15 minit maka lahir-lah anak di-rumah itu sendiri. Itu-lah keadaan yang telah berlaku baharu² ini dan harus-lah perkara ini saya kemukakan kapada Menteri. Itu-lah sebab-nya saya katakan tadi supaya Nurse apakala hendak di-daftarkan perlu-lah berkehendakkan percha-kapan² yang manis yang boleh menarek ibu² yang hendak melahirkan anak.

Yang kedua, saya bersetuju bagai-mana ucapan wakil daripada Muar Utara tadi ia-itu ibu² yang hendak melahirkan anak yang mula itu patut-lah di-lahirkan di-hospital kerana kita dapati—biasa kita dapati terutama sa-kali di-rumah yang jauh daripada hospital apakala hendak melahirkan anak yang mula itu sangat-lah susah, kadang² placenta atau uri itu tidak dapat di-keluarkan harus sampai ber-jam² sa-hingga terjadi kehilangan nyawa.

Dan yang ketiga, saya suka hendak mengeshorkan di-sini supaya pendaftaran bidan² ini hendak-lah di-hadkan kapada umor-nya. Umpama-nya, kalau-lah bidan² itu sangat tua melam-pau² umor bagaimana kita juga melihat kaki²-tangan Kerajaan apabila sampai umor 60 tahun dia di-beri

penchen dan sa-bagai-nya. Jadi tentu-lah bidan² ini juga harus di-hadkan umur-nya hanya sekian umur dapat di-daftarkan sa-lepas itu bagi penchen terus-lah penchen. Itu saya agak ada lebeh elok sadikit kerana kalau tua sangat bidan² itu, kalau ada orang di-kampong² hendak melahirkan anak ada-lah agak susah, kerana saya dapati dalam *Government Gazette* ada beberapa bidan telah melampau² umur 70 tahun ka-atas. Tahun 1890 di-lahirkan maseh lagi di-daftarkan sa-bagai bidan, orang tua itu harus sudah bongkok tidak daya lagi untuk hendak meng-usahakan—melahirkan anak.

Akhir-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya harap benar²-lah supaya Bill ini dapat di-luluskan dan bidan² yang tidak bertauliah itu tidak-lah harus dapat lagi hendak meneruskan kerja² melahirkan anak, ini satu pekerjaan yang paling mustahak saya dapati yang patut di-lekaskan, sekian.

Tuan Bahaman bin Samsudin: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka menjawab tegoran² yang telah di-beri oleh Ahli² Yang Berhormat dalam Rumah yang berbahagia ini. Pertama-nya tegoran yang baharu di-buat oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Penang Selatan dan juga Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Muar Utara. Kedua² Ahli Yang Berhormat ini bukan-lah membinchangkan hal Undang² di-hadapan ini tetapi ia-lah hal dasar Kementerian saya, tidak ada kena-mengena tetapi dia hendak chakapkan juga, saya tidak dapat-lah menahan, kena-lah saya jawab lebeh kurang, sebab barangkali tidak ada peluang mereka itu hendak berchakap hal lain.

Tentang kelakuan bidan² tadi samemang-lah kita adakan kursus² dan saya sendiri dan juga pegawai² Kementerian saya bila² pergi melawat di-jajahan² dan bertemu dengan bidan² ini dalam kumpulan² di-beri penerangan supaya berkelakuan baik dan baik-baik melayan orang² kampong. Tetapi dalam pada itu juga kita tahu sunggoh pun bidan² ini tidak berapa tinggi pelajaran-nya kita tahu orang yang berpelajaran dalam Parlimen ini banyak yang buat ta' senonoh kelakuan

kononkan pula bidan² di-kampong, tetapi kita chuba sa-berapa boleh untuk memberi penerangan kepada bidan² itu supaya berkelakuan baik.

Saya bersetuju tentang umur tadi tetapi kita ma'alum-lah ada orang umur-nya sunggoh 60, 70 tahun itu handal lagi (*Ketawa*), boleh lagi buat kerja macham².

Tentang chadangan hendak di-beri basikal atau motosikal, itu saya bersetuju patut kita beri dia basikal, dan ada tempat²nya kita telah pun beri basikal. Sekarang ini kita berchadang pula hendak beri motosikal "Honda" atau bagitu bagini, tetapi itu bersangkut-lah dengan wang ringgit, Kerajaan tidak chukup wang hendak memberi semua bidan basikal atau motosikal.

Nama bidan di-sebut Mak Bidan tadi, saya fikir itu terjadi di-kawasan Yang Berhormat itu sahaja. Saya ta' pernah dengar perkara ini, ini-lah baharu saya dengar, tetapi kalau ada apa² perkara yang terjadi di-kawasan² Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang tidak patut di-lakukan oleh bidan² Kerajaan itu, saya harap beri-lah Kementerian saya tahu supaya tindakan dapat di-ambil dengan sa-berapa segera-nya.

Saya ucapkan terima kaseh kepada Ahli Yang Berhormat yang menyokong tadi yang tidak ada changkok-nya kemudian. Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Batu sudah beruchap tadi mengatakan dia tidak bersetuju berkenaan dengan pendaftaran bidan yang tidak ada latehan.

Bidan² yang ta' ada latehan ini ia-lah bidan² yang jauh daripada pekan, di-ulu². Bilangan bidan ini sadikit sahaja lagi. Kita sekarang ini maseh kekurangan bidan. Sekarang kita berkehendakkan di-antara empat atau lima ratus bidan lagi. Jadi, bidan² ini telah di-beri kursus dan di-beri latehan boleh di-katakan tiap² minggu, atau tiap² bulan. Bidan² ini-lah yang termasuk dalam undang² yang di-sebutkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu tadi, tetapi ini barangkali lama kelamaan bila sudah chukup bidan kita, bidan² ini harus hapus dengan sendiri-nya.

Kita memandang pentadbiran negeri ini bukan-nya pada segi pekan sahaja sa-bagaimana Ahli Yang Berhormat itu tahu, tetapi kita pandang daripada segi kesusahan² orang² daripada kampung² yang jauh² daripada pekan. Di-situ bomoh pun ada lagi. Bidan² yang ta' terlatah pun ada lagi. Jadi, bidan² ini padakan ta' ada, biar-lah ada, sungguh pun ta' berapa pandai. Jadi dengan ada-nya itu boleh-lah menolong kita dengan sa-berapa boleh jika ada kechemasan dan kemudian daripada itu di-bawa kepada Pusat² Kesihatan. Bidan² ini ta' banyak bilangan-nya lagi. Mereka di-beri latehan² dan di-beri juga bermacam² perkakas, kerana mereka kebanyakan-nya tiada pelajaran tetapi ada pengalaman perbidanan. Betul juga kata Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu tadi pada dasar-nya, pada perinsip-nya ta' elok-lah orang yang ta' ada latehan ini hendak di-beri kuasa buat perbidanan, tetapi pada ta' ada, biar-lah ada, sungguh pun ta' berapa pandai dan lagi pun ta' banyak lagi bidan² itu, dan barangkali dalam dua tiga tahun ini akan hapus. Itu-lah sahaja jawapan saya.

Question put, and agreed to.

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

House immediately resolves itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr Speaker in the Chair)

Clauses 1 to 4—

Dato' Dr Haji Megat Khas: Tuan Pengerusi, saya mendengar di-dalam Rumah ini tadi, ia-itu bidan² yang telah terlatah pun telah di-masukkan di-dalam daftar—ta' suka bila di-panggil pak bidan-kah, emak bidan-kah, to' bidan-kah, jadi saya pun ta' tahu apa-kah satu perkataan yang lain yang boleh di-gunakan untuk menggantikan perkataan “bidan” itu supaya di-terima oleh bidan² yang menjalankan kerja bidan ini. Jadi, perkara ini nampak-nya ta' di-putuskan dalam Rumah ini tadi. Sekarang di-bawa di-dalam Jawatan-kuasa, saya mengambil peluang di-sini, kalau sa-kira-

nya ada sahabat² saya dari Ahli² Yang Berhormat di-dalam Dewan ini boleh memberi satu perkataan yang istilah-nya, yang berma'ana-lah juga bidan, boleh-lah kita pakai gamak-nya, tetapi bagi bidan² itu meminta orang² di-kampung² yang tinggal di-luar bandar memanggil mereka itu missy—missy itu yang pada fahaman saya yang telah sudah ia-lah di-pakaikan kepada jururawat. Bila jururawat itu dia panggil missy. Orang² kampung pun tahu, dia panggil missy, tetapi kalau to' bidan-kah, emak bidan-kah, kak bidan-kah—bidan juga-lah. Jadi, ini satu perkara yang mushkil yang kalau dapat di-sini kita bereskan dengan sa-kali, dengan ta' payah perkara ini berbangkit kemudian. Ini saya minta tolong-lah kepada Ahli² Yang Berhormat membawa satu perkataan yang boleh di-masukkan ka-dalam Rang Undang² itu untuk menggantikan perkataan “bidan”.

Wan Abdul Kadir bin Ismail: Tuan Pengerusi, fasal nama bidan ini telah ada chadangan hendak menggantikan nama ini, saya rasa sukar kita pada petang ini, kerana orang² yang lebeh tahu hal bidan² ini ia-itu saudara² kita orang² PAS. Dia sa-orang pun ta' ada dalam Dewan ini. Jadi, kalau dia ada bawa pindaan pada masa akan datang, barangkali boleh, tetapi saya ini ta' jumpa perkataan hendak menggantikan; sementara orang PAS itu datang, saya ingat kita pakai-lah perkataan “bidan” juga.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 5 to 21 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

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

THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

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

Sir, it will be recalled that in December, 1964, I sought the approval of this House to make certain amendments to the Local Government Elections Act, 1960. One of these was with regard to the addition of a new Section 11 (A) to provide for the appointment by the State Authority, in respect of a Town Council with an elected President, of a Secretary who shall exercise certain functions exercisable by the Chairman or President.

However, Section 11 (A) as it now stands only relates to the appointment of a Secretary for a Town Council established under the F.M.S. Town Boards Enactment (Cap. 137), and the Town Councils in the States of Johore and Trengganu, which were established under the Johore Town Board Enactment (No. 118) and Trengganu Town Board Enactment (No. 12 of 1355) respectively, are precluded from taking advantage of this Section. This Bill, therefore, clearly seeks to rectify the position and remove the anomaly. Sir, I beg to move.

Tuan Haji Abdul Hamid Khan: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid (Seberang Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun untuk menyokong Rang Undang² ini dan saya ingin-lah mendaratkan pandangan saya mengenai perlantekan Setia-usaha oleh Kerajaan Negeri kepada Majlis Tempatan itu kerana dengan ada-nya sa-orang Setia-usaha yang di-lantek oleh Kerajaan Negeri maka perhubungan di-antara Majlis Tempatan dengan Kerajaan Negeri akan menjadi lebeh erat lagi dan dapat-lah Kerajaan Negeri sendiri mengetahui pentadbiran Majlis tersebut.

Apa yang saya berasa dukachita sedikit ia-lah mengenai Majlis² Tempatan yang kedudukan kewangan-nya tidak bagitu sehat. Maka Majlis itu harus tidak dapat menerima sa-orang Setia-usaha yang berijazah peguam dengan gaji yang besar. Maka saya berharap supaya satu chara ia-itu yang berkelulusan rendah daripada itu boleh dapat jadi sa-bagai Setia-usaha Majlis Tempatan. Jadi, dengan ini, dapat-lah Setia-usaha itu menjalankan tugas

pentadbiran yang berasingan mengikut dasar yang di-perbuatkan oleh Ahli² Majlis Undangan Tempatan itu. Maka dengan chara yang sa-demikian dapat-lah perjalanan Majlis Tempatan dan sa-tengah²-nya yang kita dapati sangat burok perjalanan-nya di-baiki dan Kerajaan Negeri dapat mengetahui sa-benar²-nya kedudukan Majlis itu, ada sa-tengah² yang tidak memungut hasil yang di-hutang oleh penduduk² dalam kawasan itu. Dengan demikian boleh-lah Setia-usaha menjalankan tugas dengan tidak menghiraukan apa² tekanan oleh Ahli Majlis sendiri dan tidak berkait dengan party politik mereka itu. Dengan sa-chara yang sa-macam ini dapat-lah pentadbiran Majlis² Tempatan berjalan dengan lebeh baik dan memuaskan. Sakian sahaja.

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I thank the Honourable Member for Seberang Selatan for his support of this Bill. I think the various points raised by him are very pertinent points; and, in fact, Sir, my Ministry is looking into the question of rules and regulations of staff of local authorities, and amongst many things the question of the type of qualifications desirable for people filling up the post of Secretary of Local Authorities.

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.

Sitting suspended at 5.05 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 5.30 p.m.

THE CONTROL OF RENT (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an

Act to amend and re-enact the law relating to the control of rent and matters incidental thereto", be read a second time.

Sir, as this House is aware, a Committee was set up by the Cabinet in late 1964 with the following terms of reference:

"In the light of Government's intention to discontinue the provisions of the Control of Rent Ordinance, 1956, the Committee should make a comprehensive study as to the possible adverse effects of the sudden abolition on Rent Control in the States of Malaya with particular reference to the status and position of Kuala Lumpur as the capital of Malaysia and to make recommendations to Government as to what alternative measures are necessary to protect the interests of both landlords and tenants."

The Committee has since completed its report and its report has already in fact been tabled in this House as a Command Paper.

The main features of the report are that:

- (1) It does not make any separate recommendation in respect of Kuala Lumpur as it is considered that, except in degree, rent control and related problems are very much the same in Kuala Lumpur as elsewhere in the States of Malaya.
- (2) It recommends that the transition to complete decontrol should be gradual and that this transition should be harnessed to the twin principles of fair rent for the landlords and qualify security of tenure for all tenants. It further recommends that fair rent be determined by consent by the parties involved, settlement by a Rent Officer or determination by a Rent Tribunal.
- (3) It recommends that where the premises is needed for development or re-development and the landlord is able to satisfy the Tribunal that he is in a position to undertake within a specified time such development or re-development he should be assisted to gain vacant possession of the premises for the purpose,

provided that where premises were used by tenants to carry on trade, the compensation of two years rental should be paid.

- (4) It recommends that where landlords prefer to continue the system of chief tenancy, the chief tenant should be entitled to collect from his sub-tenants an increased rental of 10% over and above the fair rental. No such charge will be allowed the landlord, if he prefers the tenant as joint tenants.
- (5) It recommends that where premises or part thereof is allowed for business of trade, the tenant or joint tenants need not have to reside therein whereas if the premises are let for only dwelling purposes the tenant or joint tenants should reside therein.
- (6) It recommends that the choice of adopting complete control, partial control or complete de-control should be left to each individual State Government.
- (7) Finally it recommends no date to be fixed when control of rent will be removed wholly or partly.

In short, Sir, the recommendations in the report have been conceived to bring about a gradual self-executing process of de-control, while concurrently maintaining during its course the principles of fair rent for the landlord and security of tenure for the tenants.

The report was circulated to all State Governments for their comments, and as required under Article 95 (A) of the Malaysian Constitution, the report was further considered by the National Council for Local Government which agreed to accept the report subject to the following:

- (a) That State Appeal Boards should be established to hear all appeals from Rent Tribunal and that members of such Appeal Boards will be appointed by the appropriate State Authority, except in the case of the Federal Capital, where members of the Board will be appointed by the Minister

responsible for the Federal Capital, the decision of the Appeal Boards will be final and conclusive.

- (b) That the compensation to be paid in respect of trade premises should be decided by the Rent Tribunal after hearing both parties and the amount of compensation to be paid shall not be less than two years rental and not more than four years rental.
- (c) That tenants occupying premises other than trade premises should also be entitled to a compensation to be decided by the Rent Tribunal and the compensation to be paid shall not be less than one year rental and not more than two years rental.
- (d) That the recommended compensation of two years ground rental to occupants of temporary buildings is inadequate and that in addition to the compensation of two years ground rental an amount of compensation assessed by the Tribunal, having regard to the value of the buildings, if such buildings were paid for by the occupants or alternatively an additional compensation for the cost of demolition and transporting those materials to another site should be made.
- (e) That a maximum fine of \$10,000 be imposed on a tenant who fails to vacate the premises, when an order for recovery of possession is made, and also on the landlord for using such premises for purposes other than development proposal.
- (f) Finally, that the Act shall apply to the Municipality of Kuala Lumpur and all powers which are exercisable by the State Authority shall in relation to the Municipality be exercisable by the Minister charged with the responsibility for Local Government.

Mr Speaker, Sir, as explained in the explanatory note to the Bill, it has been found necessary for purposes of simplicity and clarity to replace the

Control of Rent Ordinance No. 2 of 1956 by a new Act which embodies most of the provisions of the present law and charges as recommended in the report and that by the National Council for Local Government. The explanatory note also deals in detail with the various provisions in the Bill which are self-explanatory, and as such I do not, Sir, propose to take more of the time at the disposal of this House in explaining further on the Bill.

Sir, I beg to move.

The Minister for Welfare Services (Tuan Haji Abdul Hamid Khan): Sir, I beg to second, the motion.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, it is not always that I agree with the findings of any Government appointed Committee. I, myself, feel that the Government in appointing people to various Committee always chooses several people so that they can get the right sort of report. But I wish to congratulate the Athi Nahappan Committee for bringing out a report which in the face of formidable difficulties, nevertheless, points out various solutions to this formidable problem and I need hardly read the conclusions of this Report. The first line says, "We are aware that our recommendations may not please everyone". Now, I think this sets the tone for the debate of this House. I notice the M.C.A. tycoons are missing from this House. No doubt, they will want to present the views of big business in this country. Unfortunately, as I look around me, there is only a trade unionist behind me, and I do not see anyone else to represent the views of the underdog.

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, let us consider the question of fair rent. The Bill and the Athi Nahappan Report sets out in detail how one can determine a fair rent from bilateral negotiations as between tenant and landlord—a Rent Officer, a Rent Tribunal, and, finally, a Board of Appeal.

In trying to determine this nomenclature of "fair rent", the Athi Nahappan Report itself has qualms about using the terminology fair rent.

It says here in paragraphs 30 and 31 of his Report:

“30. The epithet ‘fair’ attached to the word ‘rent’ was a word of easy acceptance. There were various other candidates such as ‘market rent’ and ‘ceiling rent’.

31. The word ‘fair’ was preferred because it could lend itself to stability. ‘Market rent’ had to reflect the current market or economic index. The word ‘ceiling’ was inappropriate because it reflected an element of finality.”

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, as I stated before, the Bill itself and the Report is quite clear in the procedure where there is a dispute. Now, let us not delude ourselves, Mr Speaker, Sir. Even before this Bill is debated in this House, this afternoon a tenant went to my dispensary and said, “Doctor, my landlord wants me to get out of my house. He has told me that if within three months I do not get out of this house he will get the Police to throw my things out of this house.” And, Mr Speaker, Sir, that tenant has lived in that house for almost half a century. Now, as I said, let us not delude ourselves. Already, I suppose, the landlords are sharpening their knives to see how much they can cut from either the chief tenant or the sub-tenants of their premises.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I notice that in the case of repossession or redevelopment, the Athi Nahappan Report has clearly stated the quantum of compensation. It could be as low as two years rent or as high as four years rent. In this instance, I suppose the Committee, in its wisdom, has left it purposely vague, except that in the Bill it has given us the criteria in the determination of such rent. It has talked about locality, and the like in the determination of a fair rent. Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, I would have been happier, if the Bill itself, or the Report, had recommended, at least as a guideline, what should be a fair rent—200 per cent of the existing rent, 300 per cent of the existing rent, or, as in the case of repossession, two years’ rent minimum and four years’ rent maximum; otherwise we are left to litigation and, I suppose, the only people who may well benefit from this Bill are the

lawyers, who will have a flood of work from the beginning of next month, with both landlords and tenants and sub-tenants going probably to the same person.

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, I have with me here a letter from a medical practitioner, and this reflects the apprehensions of the people in my profession—and I suppose this is so with all others in comparable professions or in business. It says here:

“I trust you will kindly put forward the practitioners’ view to ensure every protection within the clauses provided for the medical profession as a whole. We have had instances in the past where landlords have capitalised on the value of established practices and selling them under the guise of new tenancies to other fellow practitioners. It is, therefore, mandatory that medical practitioners with established practices should not be at the mercy of unscrupulous landlords, or chief tenants, and subject to any kind of extortion as a result of the Rent Control Bill.

We are already having further instances of demands for tea money on the face of the Bill or, alternatively, facing the prospect of eviction, as the landlord will be in the position to obtain the value of the established method of practice in the form of tea money or consideration from a fresh tenant. I feel, therefore, such abuses must be prevented and necessary amendments incorporated in the Bill to ensure adequate protection for the medical practitioners, failing which adequate compensation at par with the value of the medical practice concerned be guaranteed in extreme cases of eviction.”

Mr Speaker, Sir, I have, in reading this letter, indicated the apprehension of one section of the tenants, who will be affected by this Bill; and no doubt, as I have pointed out, right from the word “go” you will have, and it is quite natural, all the landlords wanting to have their pound of flesh. Let us not delude ourselves that because the Athi Nahappan Report has indicated the way, the procedure, very lucidly, as the Honourable Minister has indicated, and the Bill itself has done so, that there will be difficulties, I can envisage a whole heap of litigation in connection with the adjudication of a fair rent, and we hope that the Central Government, in the course of the implementation of this Bill, will perhaps in the years bring forth amendments where necessary in the light of experience gained.

Here, Mr Speaker, Sir, I wish to point out to the Honourable Minister the experience of London where also—I think it was about ten years ago—there was decontrol of rent. There a person by the name of Racheman, knowing that this Bill was going to come up, bought up a whole heap of houses in London, and when decontrol became law, all that he did was he used thugs to evict; he did not go to the Rent Officer; he did not go to the Tribunal or the Board of Appeal; he used thugs to evict his tenants. Now, if it had happened in London, with due deference to the Police in this country, it can also happen in Kuala Lumpur where you can always easily get the “08”, the “09”, or the “Wah Kee”, or the “Ang Bin Hoay” to come along and tell the tenant, “Look here, you know the landlord now has the power to evict you. You better make yourself scarce, before I use acid or beating up for you to get out”. Now, I am not saying that this can happen. This had happened in London, and the problem is not as simple as the Athi Nahappan Report would let us believe, or even the Minister would like us to believe, that, because the law has indicated the way, all is well and there should be no difficulty.

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, with regard to the question of repossession of property, I entirely agree that the control of rent has been a strangle-hold on the development of any city, let alone Kuala Lumpur, or any other smaller towns in Malaysia. I am entirely in agreement that these out-of-date houses, of these unsightly squatter hovels, should be repossessed by the landlords and developed, so that we can have a more beautiful, a more useful city, not only here, but elsewhere. And I am glad, as I have indicated before, that both the Athi Nahappan Report and the Bill has set out lower and the upper limits—two years rents or four years rents.

Now, with regard to the chief tenancy and joint-tenants, I am glad that the Athi Nahappan Report is aware of the exploitation of the sub-tenants by the

chief tenants. Now, I read from the Athi Nahappan Report, paragraph 53:

“From memoranda received and views heard we came to the view that under the present law, most chief tenants have been enjoying ‘heydays’ for too long at the expense of sub-tenants and landlords. By and large chief tenants have been illegally collecting market rents from sub-tenants whilst paying controlled rents to the landlords and having, in many cases, handsome margins of profit as middlemen.”

Here I think, this is an understatement by the Athi Nahappan Report of handsome margins of profit. I do know, for example of a chief tenant where he only pays \$5 as ground rent to the landlord, but I think he has collected rent every month in the region of a thousand dollars per month. Now, that is by no means a handsome margin of profit. I would say, comparatively speaking, that that is an enormous profit that the chief tenant has been squeezing out of the sub-tenants; and I am glad that both the Athi Nahappan Report and the Bill itself has indicated ways and means of regularising this situation of exploitation of sub-tenants by the land-lords.

But coming to this Bill itself with regard to sub-letting, I think the Bill is a little naive in thinking that the provisions of the law will be observed in full by the chief tenants, who are exploiting the sub-tenants. Clause 19 says:

“Where a tenant has sublet any part of the controlled premises, the tenant shall within fourteen days after each subletting, or in the case of a subletting effected before the date of the coming into force of this Act within three months after that date—

- (a) supply to the landlord with a statement in writing of the subletting giving particular of the occupancy, including the name of the subtenant and the rent charged;
- (b) and cause to be prominently displayed in or upon the premises a notice in the form set out in the Schedule of this Act clearly setting out the rent of the whole premises and the rent every part so sublet:”

I hope, Mr Speaker, Sir, that the Government does not think that, because the law says this is the procedure, it could be taken that it will be observed by the chief tenant. More often than not, I venture to say

that this provision of the law will be observed in the breach, and I hope that the law enforcement officer will see to it that the chief tenants comply with this provision of the law, so that the sub-tenants need not be exploited any more by the chief tenants.

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, I notice that the Bill itself has set out the procedure for repossession and the procedure of adjudicating of a fair rent. I do not know whether the Government in introducing this Bill on the 21st of June realises the practical difficulties of the implementation of this Bill, if assuming that it is passed by this House. Now, we do know that the Rent Control Ordinance ends on the 30th of this month—that means—this Bill is passed by this House tonight, it has to be passed by the Dewan Negara, and then it must receive the Royal Assent. Can the Government tell us whether that all these three stages will be implemented within the nine days that is left. If not, has the Government an alternative measure to provide for this gap between the lapsing of the Rent Control Ordinance of the implementation of this Bill, if and when it receives the Royal Assent. Secondly, as I have pointed, we have now a category of rent officers of 10 persons on the Tribunal. As I had pointed before, these people will be terribly overworked. Is the machinery ready to cope with the work that is bound to fall on the rent officers, the Tribunal, and the Board of Appeal. If it is not, has the Government thought of these practical difficulties in the implementation of this Bill?

In conclusion, Mr Speaker, Sir, I do know that the Athi Nahappan Report has set out the *pros* and *cons* of whether there should be control, or whether there should be outright lifting of control—and it has marshalled out very well the *pros* and *cons* of the measures taken. I only hope that the Government does not think that the implementation of this Bill is going to be easy and, that, as I have read a letter from a doctor which speaks well for the medical profession, if and when there are frauds pointed

out to the Government in the implementation of this Bill, the Government should not hesitate to redress any injustices that may occur not only to the tenants but also to the landlords as well. Thank you.

Tuan C. V. Devan Nair: Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to join the Honourable Member for Batu in congratulating the Committee headed by Senator Athi Nahappan for its recommendations. They had difficult job to do, essentially the problem of recommending how rent decontrol may be achieved in a controlled manner, without resulting in any adverse effects due to any sudden abolition of rent control. But how far this Bill will achieve its purpose remains to be seen. As the Honourable Member for Batu has pointed out, things can be complicated and, in any case, I think, we can be certain of good deal of litigation over the disputes which may arise.

Sir, the Government has decided that the provisions of the present Ordinance inhibit development activity, urban renewal, and so forth, and hence this Bill. It is a matter for regret, however, that the Bill contains provisions which appear to have a retrogressive effect.

Let us first take Clause 5 of the Bill. Clause 5 says that a fair rent shall be determined: "(a) by an agreement in writing between the landlord and the tenant of such premises; or (b) in the absence of such an agreement, by a decision of Rent Officer for the area in which such premises is situated provided that such decision is accepted by both parties; or (c) if such decision is not accepted by either party, by an order of the Tribunal". It seems clear enough, Sir, that if a fair rent is to be fixed in this manner, there will be no uniformity of the rent payable in the same area, or locality, for the same kind of building. Separate landlords and tenants in the same locality will no doubt agree on varying fair rents, and this, again, is bound to create complications and to create new problems.

Next, let us take, Sir, Clause 12 (8) of the Bill which provides that the proceedings of the Tribunal shall be held in camera but it may in its discretion open such proceedings to the public. This, I would submit, Sir, is a retrogressive provision as compared to Section 7 (7) of the present Ordinance which provides that "The proceedings of the Board shall be open to the public and minutes of the same, etc."—which is roughly the same—but the point is that the present Ordinance does provide that proceedings to be held in public.

Clause 13 (3) of the present Bill is also unsatisfactory in my submission. According to Clause 13 (3), no application to the rent Tribunal can be made for apportionment of fixing fair rent without a certificate of dispute from the Rent Officer. In other words, a Rent Officer must be consulted before application can be made. It is not difficult to imagine that this provision would only be an inevitable source of delay as well as possible abuse. And I would suggest, therefore, Sir, that in the interest of avoiding both delay and possible abuse, in the resolution of any dispute between the landlords and tenants over what constitutes a fair rent, this provision should be deleted to make it possible for either party to make a direct application to the Tribunal in case of dispute as to the quantum of fair rent payable.

Next, Sir, I refer to Section 10 of the present Ordinance, which is due to expire soon, which provides for the stating of a case for decision of the High Court. The present Bill abolishes any such statement of case for decision of the High Court; and this, I would submit, is again a retrogressive measure. Again, Section 11 of the present Ordinance provides that appeal shall lie on a point of law from any decision of the Board—that is under the present Ordinance. But in the present Bill no provision has been made for appeal to a court of law against the decision of the Appeal Board, which is provided for as I have said, in Section 11 of the present Ordinance. And all these,

Sir, are retrogressive measures which would stand to detract from the inherent virtues possessed by the Bill, and I submit that this should be considered by the Government.

Tuan Tai Kuan Yang (Kulim Bandar Bharu): Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to take this opportunity to say a few words relating to the Control of Rent Bill which I feel warrant a debate in this House. It appears to me, Mr Speaker, Sir, that some of my electorates as well as many others in all parts of this country are a bit worried by this Bill, which seems to me to give strong protection for the interests of landlords and vested interests, without taking into account the interests and well-being of the small businessmen, who themselves are tenants in business premises. The danger facing the small businessmen who are occupying such buildings are real, and we should pay serious attention to this problem. I hope the Honourable Minister of Local Government and Housing, after listening to the just and fair comments in this House, will find courage to agree to some of the amendments in the Bill, which I do feel will give sufficient protection and say to the small men in this country. It is a matter of grave concern, because in the long run it does affect the future well-being of their business.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I would now like to deal with Clause 18, paragraph (2) sub-paragraph (a). Mr Speaker, Sir, the compensation offered under this Clause is far from adequate, especially in the case of controlled premises occupied for trade purposes. It is only fair that a higher compensation should be paid for such traders or small businessmen, who are forced to cease doing business. The Honourable Minister of Local Government and Housing, before joining the Government, was in law practice, and consequently was himself associated with the growth and development of many business firms. The Honourable Minister obviously must be aware that it takes a lot of hard work and savings on the part of the traders, especially the small ones, to grow and become

prosperous. I am sure that the Honourable Minister would not like to see the hopes and aspiration of the small men dashed to pieces, or go down the drain, without adequate compensation, just because some of the greedy landlords want to make some quick money by putting up more houses under the guise of Development in this Bill.

I would therefore, urge the Government to re-consider the provision of this Bill in a manner that will look after the interests of everyone, and not just one section of the community.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to deal with another section in Clause 18, in paragraph (8). It is clear that if the offender is a landlord, and inspite of the fines imposed upon him which only benefits the Government, the aggrieved party, namely, the tenant is still left out in the cold. There should be a provision to install him back into of the controlled premises as the rightful tenant thereafter through the court action. There should also be a paragraph in Clause 18 under this Bill that having developed that area, the former tenants should have first priority should they wish to have tenancy in the new buildings.

Finally, Mr Speaker, Sir, I thank you for the opportunity you have given to me to raise a few points with regard to the Bill, which I am of the firm belief that they must be remedied. After all, as we are all representatives of the people, it is only right that we speak up without fear and favour of any legislation which affect the peoples' interests, especially the small men. Thank you, Sir.

Tuan Chan Seong Yoon (Setapak): Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise to speak in support of this Bill which, I think, will be welcomed to both landlords and tenants, particularly to the landlords whose investments in real property are more or less dormant for the past 18 years. Honourable Members of the House are aware that landlords, owning buildings built prior to the 31st January, 1948, have had little increase in their return and that whatever increase in the rental, as provided by the Control of Rent Ordinances, 1948,

and 1956, was not in proportion to the value of their capital investments.

This Bill, when it becomes law, will enable the landlords to receive a fair return for their investments. Mr Speaker, Sir, this Bill would also be a benefit to tenants, especially sub-tenants who have been paying exorbitant rents to unscrupulous chief tenants. It is true that our present law provides grounds for landlords to evict chief tenants in cases, where chief tenants make profits of more than 10% from sub-letting controlled premises; but the landlords do not derive any benefit therefrom and therefore very few landlords have taken steps to do so.

Under the new Bill the tenant has the opportunity of becoming the joint tenant of the premises and will hold such part of the premises as is sub-let to him directly from the landlord to whom he is responsible and to whom he shall pay rent. The joint tenant will only have to pay a proportionate part of the fair rent in respect of the whole premises. However, this opportunity of the sub-tenants of becoming direct joint tenants can only be initiated by the landlord, if he so desires. In practice, the desire to convert from the position of a sub-tenant to a joint tenant is more often with a sub-tenant rather than with the landlord, and it is unfortunate that the Bill does not empower the sub-tenant to convert his sub-tenancy to a joint tenancy. I hope the Honourable Minister will consider this point, if he contemplates any amendments to this Bill in the future.

The Bill, Mr Speaker, Sir, will incidentally be instrumental in providing a new face for our fair Capital of Kuala Lumpur and the other major cities of our country. I refer to provisions in this Bill, which now make it less cumbersome for landlords to recover possession in cases where there is a genuine desire to develop the land. It would now appear that where a landlord has a genuine desire to develop his land, he may do so by proving that the plans for development have been approved by a proper

authority, that he has funds to carry out such development, and also by giving an undertaking that commencement of development will take place within three months of the date of vacant possession. I would like to compliment the Honourable Minister and those responsible for this Bill in including the third condition, as this will assure that no unscrupulous landlords will take advantage to obtain vacant possession, in order to enhance the price of the building. However, here I wish to comment that there is no provision as to what would happen, if the landlord fails to carry out this undertaking, unless one gives a wide interpretation to sub-section (7) and sub-section (8) of section 18 of the Bill.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I again wish to compliment the Honourable the Minister and those responsible for this Bill in the fair manner in which this Bill has been drafted, having regard both to the interests of the landlord and the tenant. In the provision for recovery of vacant possession of premises for the purpose of development, the tenant does derive some benefit in the form of compensation equivalent to two to four years rent. This is a new provision and although some may say that two to four years rent is too small a sum, but then considering the position of the tenant under the present law, where the tenant receives nothing, I am sure Honourable Members of the House will agree with me that this is an improvement. At this juncture, Mr Speaker, Sir, I should like to mention in passing that the definition of what is development in this Bill seems to give too wide a latitude to landlords to recover vacant possession of controlled premises.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to say a few words as regards the main feature of the Bill which changes entirely the principle regarding the rent of controlled premises. Under the present law, the maximum recoverable rent has no bearing whatever to the annual value of the premises as assessed by the Municipal Valuer

under the Town Boards Enactment. It would now appear under the present Bill that the fair rent will have a bearing on the annual value of the premises.

Mr Speaker, Sir, this Bill, I believe is motivated by the easing of the shortage of accommodation in all major cities, towns and villages, and I congratulate the Honourable Minister and all those responsible for this Bill for providing a step in the de-control of pre-1948 premises which is fair both to tenants and landlords, and the interests of both landlords and tenants have been justly considered.

Tuan Geh Chong Keat: Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to associate myself with the comments of the Member for Kulim and Bandar Baharu. Sir, I would like to draw the attention of this House and that of the Honourable the Minister to the fact that the Report by this Committee is based more on the city and urban areas. Sir, unfortunately, the Bill in its description of the premises and the coverage of the jurisdiction defines "premises" as any other land and "local authority" is defined to mean a Municipality, Town Council, Town Board or Rural Board and in respect of any part of its area which immediately before the coming into force of the Local Councils Ordinances of 1952.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Bill in trying to help the city and the urban areas to develop and to pave the way for development, it also covers de-control in the rural areas. Here, I would like to bring out this point in respect of the rural areas, where you have big estate: in the old days the landlords or the estate owners welcome squatters to those areas as an economic way of maintaining the estates and helping them to look after the estates. These squatters, who have been invited to squat in these estates, have to pay a nominal rent of 50 cents to a dollar to occupy and cultivate an area of an acre or more. Now, with the passing of this Bill, those estates in the rural areas would be affected. The price of land will go up, developments which start setting in and these farmers,

cultivators, have got to give way. The question that I would like to ask is whether the compensation of from two years to four years rent for the city area sufficient for those living in the rural areas, who earn their living through cultivation and rearing of poultry pigs and cattles? Sir, if these people have got to be removed, we have got to find alternative accommodation or place, or another form of livelihood for them. But, unfortunately, most of these farmers and cultivators know only the present way of cultivation and practising their farming. So, if we ask them to come to the city to stay they will be at a loss and will starve; if you ask them to quit the land with a maximum compensation of four years rent, they will find it difficult. Therefore, I would like to request the Honourable Minister to make the necessary amendment to the relevant section to provide for a time factor for these people to rehabilitate themselves, and also to provide appropriate compensation, so that they can carry on with their livelihood in another area, failing which they can rehabilitate themselves to earn their livelihood by changing their methods of profession.

Sir, I am sure that the Honourable Minister, after reading through the Report and the Bill, is only fully aware of the city areas. I would commend to the Member the view presented by the Member for Kulim-Bandar Baharu in respect of the small man's point of view of being sub-tenants and those who are operating small trading shops in the villages in the suburban area, as these people would be really affected, and I would be grateful if the Minister could give an assurance that these people would be taken care of and their hardships and their problems would be studied and looked into him, so as to give them assurance of certainty and relief from the anxiety of the coming into force of this new Bill. Sir, I am sure the developers are waiting and are rubbing their hands to come in. Mr Speaker, Sir, if I were to say that the developers are going to exploit the situation to the full, perhaps the

Minister may reply that I am a pessimist, but I would say, Sir, that the days of great profit and the days of the rush for houses are still not over. Thank you, Sir.

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to reply to some of the remarks made by Honourable Members of this House.

First, I would touch upon the points raised by the Honourable Member for Batu. As has been pointed out in the Report itself and with which the Honourable Member has agreed, no solution can satisfy all parties. It is to avoid a situation, which was created in Kelantan State, I think, that that State way back in 1962 decontrolled rent completely without any interim process. It is with that in mind that the Federal Government decided to appoint this Committee to look into this whole question, so that during the interim process there will be equal protection for the landlords as well as for the tenants as I have said when I first introduced the Bill.

Now, the Honourable Member touched on the question of fair rent and perhaps I may take this opportunity to explain a little bit about the question of fair rent. Fair rent is in fact a new concept, a new concept under this Bill, and in respect of which there is no precedent; and it is a new concept under this Bill, because hitherto they used the term "standard rent" which was unfair as it was based on the rent as on the 1st September, 1941, under the existing Rent Control Ordinance. What is fair rent now is described in Clause 6. In that clause definite principles have been made out for the guidance of the respective stages to determine what would in fact constitute a fair rent. It is again not possible for the landlords to evict any one as easily as the Honourable Member is trying to picture. There is still protection as in the existing Ordinance, as under Clause 18 of this Bill, a landlord has to pay compensation before he can get the premises back.

As regards the suggestion by the Honourable Members that my Ministry

should bring into this House further amendments in the light of experience in future, in case we find undue hardships through the implementation of this new law, I would like to say that we are all aware of the fact that no law is perfect, and the fact that we are practising democracy, I think, is the best safeguard for this matter. In fact, this very House itself is a watchdog for any depressive laws and it is always open to Members of this House to bring about amendments should there be undue hardships caused through the implementation of the law; and of course this Government will always bring in amendments if it is felt that such amendments are necessary on account of unnecessary hardships as a result of the implementation of this law.

I think the Honourable Member also mentioned Section 19 (1) and asked, "what if the chief tenant refuses to abide by the order?" It is quite clear here, because there is ample provision in subsequent sub-sections that if a chief tenant fails to toe the line, he is liable to three months imprisonment or a fine of \$1,000.

There is also another point raised by the Honourable Member as to what happens after 30th June., because unless the present law is renewed, there may be a gap. I think I can inform the Honourable Member that under sub-section (5) of section 2 of the Rent Control Ordinance, 1966, the Ordinance is kept alive for another year, unless another Act is brought into force before the life of the Ordinance expires in other words, even if the present Ordinance is not renewed by the end of this month, there is an automatic renewal of one year. I think there is no need to fear that there is a gap. Obviously, I do not think that the new law would be brought into force on the 1st of July because we have to go through the process of getting staff and things like that, to look into the administrative side and as far as the law is concerned, the present Rent Control Ordinance would continue for another year.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: On a point of clarification, Mr Speaker, Sir, is the Honourable Minister suggesting that this Bill, when it becomes law, will only be implemented one year hence? This is very important for the landlord and the tenant.

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, just now the Honourable Member entertains some fear that there will be a vacuum; of course, I agree with the Honourable Member that any vacuum would not be desirable, as we have witnessed in the P.M.I.P.-controlled State of Kelantan. In this case, it is laid down in sub-section (22) of Clause 1 which says: "This Act shall come into force on such date as the Minister of Local Government and Housing may by notification in the *Gazette* appoint"; so until such time as the Minister has appointed the date in the *Gazette*, the present Rent Control Ordinance will continue to be in force. With regard to the suggestion that thugs will take over as soon as this new law comes into being, I think that is unfounded, because even under the present Rent Control Ordinance where the rent is less, there is no evidence that thugs have taken over the situation and forced the tenant to get out of the premises. Under the present law the landlord is in fact, getting a little bit more rent than previously and I think that fear is quite unfounded.

Now, I come to the Honourable Member for Bungsar. The Honourable Member has commented on the effect of the implementation of this law which will bring about some confusion and with no uniformity of rent in the same locality. I think that even under the present circumstances, there is no such thing as uniformity of rent in the same locality. I do not see how any confusion or complication, should arise as a result of that because, as has been pointed out, according to the provisions in the Bill, this is a bipartite arrangement, and it is up to the landlord and the tenant to come to some arrangement, agreement, as to the fair rent to be paid.

Now, with regard to the remarks made by the Honourable Member for Bungsar that the effect that no appeal would be allowed to the Court is a retrogressive step, I beg to differ. In this case appeal is precluded, because we want to provide an inexpensive and expeditious remedy for both the tenant and the landlord. As we all know, processes in Court are very time consuming and in some civil cases, from my past experience when I was practising, you may have to wait for two or three years before you can get a civil case listed for hearing in the High Court. This is to provide for an expeditious and inexpensive—the keynote to it is “inexpensive”—Tribunal for the cases to be dealt with quickly. Now, there is ample provision in the Bill to ensure that in respect of appeals the Tribunal will deliver what we can consider to be judicious decisions; and as far as the Tribunal is concerned, Clause 12 (2) provides the qualifications for the Chairman of the Tribunal. The Chairman must be one of the following, and I quote:

- “(a) a member of the Judicial and Legal Service of the Federation;
- (b) a person being an advocate and solicitor who has been in legal practice for at least five years;
- (c) a District Officer for the area or areas concerned; or
- (d) such other person who has sufficient standing and integrity as the Ruler or the Governor, as the case may be, may appoint”.

I think this is sufficient safeguard for the Tribunal, because the Chairman is essentially a judicial man or a man of experience as District Officer. As we all know, for a long time, it has always been the customary practice for District Officers to sit also as Magistrates.

With regard to the Appeal Board, in this case the qualification is stricter. It is under Clause 15 (3) where it is provided that the Chairman shall be a person possessing legal qualifications and experience and, furthermore, the members of the Appeal Board shall be persons possessing sufficient standing and integrity. So,

there you are, both the Tribunal and the Appeal Board have on them Chairman with judicial qualifications and experience and, furthermore, with members of standing and integrity. The most important of all, as I have said, is that this process will provide an inexpensive and expeditious remedy available both to the landlord and to the tenant.

I think I have dealt with all the points raised by the Honourable Member for Bungsar except one. With regard to the Honourable Member's comment under section 12 (8) with regard to the provision allowing proceedings to be held in camera, I cannot see what is the objection to that, because, after all, in the initial stages this is purely a bipartite method between two parties; it is not something for public concern; it does not involve public morals; it does not concern anything of public interest and this is purely an arrangement between two persons and, therefore, if the two persons so desire, they can have the hearing in camera. But nevertheless, there is also the provision, if necessary, for the Tribunal to hold the proceedings in public.

Now, I come to the Honourable Member for Kulim Bandar Baharu. There was one point raised by the Honourable Member

Tuan C. V. Devan Nair: Sir, on a point of clarification, if I may—I would like the Honourable Minister's comment on one part of my submission and that was whether we could do away with the requirement for a certificate of dispute before a matter could be taken to the Tribunal?

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: I thank the Honourable Member for drawing my attention to this omission. It has somehow or other escaped my attention. The Honourable Member suggested that there should be no certificate of dispute. I think from the practical reason, we would not know, I mean, the Tribunal would not be in a position to know that the two parties have failed to reach an agreement. What if one party went to the Tribunal and

said, "I want the case to be heard by the Tribunal? Therefore, it will be necessary for procedural reasons and in order that the Tribunal is satisfied that in fact both parties have failed to reach an agreement that a certificate of dispute is necessary. So, for practical and procedural reasons, it will be necessary to have a certificate of dispute. Now, the Honourable Member for Kulim Bandar Baharu touched on one point whether the tenant who has lost his controlled premises should be given a priority in the premises newly developed. I think this is a point which will be beyond the purview of this, because once a premise is de-controlled, and a new development has taken place, even under the present Rent Ordinance, any premises developed after a statutory date provided by the Rent Controller is no longer controlled. The landlord can deal with the premises as he likes. Also with regard to the Honourable Member for Kulim Bandar Baharu who stated that the compensation under Clause 18 (2) (a) is not adequate, varying between two to four times rental, and that a higher amount should be paid. I would like to point out that under the original report of this committee, the compensation recommended was only twice the rental; and it was because this paper was submitted to the National Council for Local Government that the final decision was taken increasing the amount; as previously the recommendation was that the amount should not be exceeding two years, but now the decision is that it should be a minimum of two years with a maximum of four years. In fact, the National Land Council for Local Government has already increased this amount of compensation to higher than the amount recommended by the Committee.

Also the Honourable Member entertained some fears that small businessmen will be thrown out of the premises and such like fears. I would like to assure the Honourable Member that the Bill itself provides ample safeguard for the tenant, including small businessmen; and I have said earlier that if the implementation of this law should bring about undue

hardship, on receipt of specific details from Honourable Members or members of the public, my Ministry will certainly review this law and will bring amendments to this House.

Sir, I would like now to reply to a points raised by the Honourable Member for Setapak. He raised the question that there is no provision in the case of a landlord who fails to carry out the development once he has obtained possession or vacant possession of the premises. I think the provision under Clause 18 (7) is quite clear on this matter. Section 18 (7) says,

"The premises vacated by the tenant or tenants under this section shall not be used by the landlord for any purpose other than the purpose of effecting developments in accordance with the plan approved for such purpose and until such developments are effected, such premises shall remain locked."

In other words, Sir, it is up to the landlord, after obtaining vacant possession, to proceed with development at any time he likes; that means failing the use of the premises, he would have to have the premises perpetually locked, and I do not think any landlord after having obtained vacant possession will allow that state of affairs to continue to happen.

Tuan Chan Seong Yoon: Perhaps, I have not made myself quite clear. What I meant was, what happens if the landlord after giving an undertaking does not use the premises for any purposes, but sells the premises. As we all know vacant premises will fetch a higher price. I wonder if that sub-section (7) covers that point.

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I think my interpretation of this would be, that whoever buys the premises succeeds or steps into the shoes of the previous landlord, and of such he would have to keep the premises perpetually locked, or develop the premises. I think I would interpret the law that way, but if there should be a situation, whereby the law is not interpreted that way I would certainly bring amendment to this House to have this loophole stopped.

Now, finally, I come to the Honourable Member for Pulau Pinang

Utara who portrays the picture that developers are now rubbing their hands waiting to grab hold of the tenant. I do not think that the picture is as bad, as that. Sir, I think probably, the Honourable Member has derived that picture out of one or two adverse press comments, which I heard came from Penang. But by and large, I think Honourable Members of this House, if they have been following the press, will find that the editorial comments of the press or average editorial comments of the press, has been quite favourable with regard to this Bill, I can say from my own knowledge of this Bill that the Bill is a good compromise between the interests of the landlord and the tenant. Thank you.

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 11 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 12 to 18 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 19 to 22—

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Chairman, Sir, may I ask, how long does the Minister envisage that the setting up of this machinery will take, particularly, in Kuala Lumpur?

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Chairman, Sir, I think it is the intention of our Ministry to implement this as soon as possible. But, as I have stated earlier, it depends on the question of the setting up of the machinery for this, Rent Officer for each State, and also the appointment of the Tribunal and also the Appeal Board by the State Authority. However, I can assure the Honourable Member that implementation of this Bill will come as soon as possible.

Clauses 19 to 22 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 23—

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Sir, I beg to move an amendment to Clause 23, paragraph (b) of sub-section (1). I beg to move that, the words and brackets “(other than a monthly tenant)” be deleted. Now, this amendment is to make the provision of Clause 23 to be consistent with the paragraph 67 of the Report of the Committee which has recommended that “where a tenant for any reason gives up his tenant of a controlled premises or required to do so by law then such premises should be declared as uncontrolled premises.”

Amendment put, and agreed to.

Clause 23, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 24 to 27 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Schedule ordered to stand part of the Bill.

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

THE CONTINENTAL SHELF BILL

Second Reading

Tuan Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that the Bill intituled “the Continental Shelf Bill, 1966” be read a second time.

Honourable Members would be aware that at present no legislation exists with respect to the rights of exploring and exploiting the natural resources of the Continental Shelf, being the sea-bed and subsoil of those submarine areas adjacent to the coast of the States of Malaya, but beyond the limits of the territorial waters of those States. The sea-bed and subsoil of the areas within the territorial waters, however, are vested in the respective State Authority under the National Land Code. The present Bill is therefore intended to provide for this deficiency.

The Continental Shelf Bill is essentially an enabling legislation providing for the sovereign rights and powers to deal with the mineral and other natural resources in the sea-bed and subsoil of the shelf in pursuance of the terms of the Geneva Convention of the Continental Shelf (1958) which was ratified in 1960 by the Government of the Federation of Malaya then. It also provides for the application of the criminal and civil laws of the Federation in regard to act or omission which takes place on any installation or device constructed in, on or above the Continental Shelf.

As the Explanatory Statement which is attached to the Bill gives sufficient, clear and lucid explanation, Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not wish to add anything to what is already stated there.

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

Question put, and agreed to.

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

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr Speaker *in the Chair*)

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

Clause 6—

Tuan Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub: Mr Chairman, Sir, I beg to move an amendment to Clause 6 as stated in the amendment slip which has already been circulated to all Honourable Members. The amendment reads:

Insert the following proviso immediately after sub-section (2)—

“Provided that nothing in this section shall affect the rights and powers of the State Authority under the National Land Code or any other written law in respect of areas within the limits of the territorial waters of the State.”

Amendment put, and agreed to.

Clause 6, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Schedule ordered to stand part of the Bill.

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

THE PETROLEUM MINING BILL

Second Reading

Tuan Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled “the Petroleum Mining Bill, 1966” be read a second time.

Honourable Members will remember that in moving the Bill for the Continental Shelf just now I explained that the issue of licences for the exploration and exploitation of petroleum in the sea-bed and subsoil of the shelf will be provided under the Petroleum Mining Bill. The opportunity has also been taken to provide a single uniform legislation for the exploration and exploitation of petroleum within the onshore areas and submarine areas beneath the territorial waters of the various States of Malaya.

The National Land Council has been consulted and has agreed to this proposed legislation. Hence this Bill seeks to make provisions relating to the issue of licences for the exploration and exploitation of petroleum not only in the sea-bed and subsoil of the Continental Shelf but also within the onshore areas beneath the territorial waters of the various States of Malaya.

The important Clauses in the Bill, Mr Speaker, Sir, are explained in the Explanatory Statement.

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

Question put, and agreed to.

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

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr Speaker in the Chair)

Clauses 1 to 6 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 7—

Tuan Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub: Mr Chairman, Sir, I beg to move an amendment to sub-clause (4) of Clause 7 as stated in the amendment slip which has already been circulated to all Honourable Members and reads as follows:

Clause 7 (4)—

For the words "The same shall cease to be subject to his or any other exploration licences" occurring therein substitute the words "all exploration licences covering such area or any part thereof shall determine without the Appropriate Petroleum Authority being liable to pay any compensation to licensees."

Amendment put, and agreed to.

Clause 7, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 8 to 13 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 14—

Tuan Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub: Mr Chairman, Sir, I beg to move an amendment by adding a new clause 14 immediately after Clause 13 as stated in the amendment slip which reads as follows:

"New Clause 14—

Insert the following new Clause 14 immediately after the end of Clause 13—

*Permis-
sion to
enter
upon
alienated
land.

14. (1) Where a licensee or a person who is a party to a petroleum agreement has been refused entry upon an alienated land by the owner thereof such licensee or such person may make an application to the State Authority for a permission to enter upon such alienated land; and the State Authority may subject to sub-section (2) grant the permission applied for on condition that the applicant undertakes to pay compensation for all the damage which may have been caused to the land or crops or property therein or on such other conditions as the State Authority may deem fit to impose.

(2) Before granting the permission referred to under sub-section (1), the State Authority shall grant to the owner of such alienated land the right of being heard, and the permis-

sion so granted shall be final and shall not be questioned in any Court of Law.

(3) Upon the production to the owner of such alienated land of the permission granted under sub-section (1), such owner shall allow the person in whose favour the permission is granted or a person authorised by him to enter upon such land.

(4) If, after having been produced to him the permission referred to under sub-section (1) the owner of such alienated land refuses or fails to allow entry upon his land by the person in whose favour the permission is granted or a person authorised by him, such owner shall be guilty of an offence and upon conviction shall be liable to a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars and a further fine not exceeding ten dollars for every day during which the refusal or the failure continues.

(5) For the purpose of this section the expression 'owner' includes chargee, lessee, occupier or any person having interest in the land; and the expression 'entry' includes the exercising of any rights contained in the licence or the petroleum agreement."

Amendment put, and agreed to.

Clause 14, as an addition, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

First Schedule ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Second Schedule—

Tuan Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub: Mr Chairman, Sir, I beg to move an amendment to the Second Schedule as stated in the amendment slip which has already been circulated to all Honourable Members, and which reads as follows:

"Second Schedule—

(a) For the proviso to paragraph 2, substitute the following—

'Provided that this licence shall not confer any right to search in areas of off-shore/on-shore lands in respect of which a petroleum agreement has been entered into by the Government with the licensee or another person and that the rights hereby granted shall determine in respect of any such areas or part thereof upon the entry of such as agreement by the Government with the licences or another person in respect thereof without the Government being liable to pay compensation to the licensee or that other person.'

(b) In paragraph 5 (a) insert the words 'Menteri Besar/ Chief Minister' immediately after the word 'Minister'."

Amendment put, and agreed to.

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

Bill reported with amendments: read the third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

(MOTION)

The Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications (Tan Sri V. T. Sambanthan): Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that the House do now adjourn.

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

ADJOURNMENT SPEECH

EXEMPTION OF TOLL ON MOTOR CYCLES

(Slim River/Tanjong Malim)

Tuan Lee Seck Fun (Tanjong Malim): Mr Speaker, Sir, the subject on which I would like to touch in my adjournment speech is the exemption of toll fees for motor cycles at the Slim River-Tanjong Malim Toll Gate.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I wish to register a vote of thanks to the Alliance Government for having built a fine and first class highway to substitute the winding and dangerous stretch of road from Tanjong Malim to Slim River. The Slim River-Tanjong Malim highway is now being used by Malaysians of all walks of life, whether they are going to the North or coming from the South, by taking full advantage of the magnificent stretch of highway made possible by the Alliance Government under the dynamic Ministry of Works, Posts and Telecoms. I endorse the principle that the Alliance Government is legitimate to collect tolls on the use of the Slim River-Tanjong Malim highway in accordance with the principle of direct cost, with a view to gradually reducing the huge capital expenditure being spent on the

construction of the highway. It is satisfying to say that the motoring public understands the motive and the necessity of such highway tolls in relation to the frequency of usage. However, I would, Mr Speaker, Sir, like to make a humble request to the Alliance Government to exempt certain categories of persons from paying highway tolls. The people I have in mind are small wage-earners working in rubber plantations, in mines, estates, and in agricultural farms, in and around the Tanjong Malim sub-district. These people are low income earners living from hand to mouth, so to speak. They have to make daily trips on the Slim River-Tanjong Malim highway and the nominal tolls imposed on them will add up to formidable proportions in relation to their meagre earnings. These people usually shall ride on motorcycles which are in most cases purchased on hire-purchase arrangements. Mr Speaker, Sir, I would therefore humbly request the Government to consider the exemption of motor-cyclists from paying tolls in using the Slim River-Tanjong Malim highway, for these people are low income people and their difficulties are real in relation to their low income capacity. I am most confident that the Alliance Government will give sympathetic consideration to my humble request on behalf of the low income earners in the Tanjong Malim sub-district.

Tan Sri V. T. Sambanthan: Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to thank the Honourable Member for his tribute both to the Government and to my Ministry. The Slim Road, as you know, has been a road built for fast traffic, and we have imposed tolls with the intention of trying to collect back part of the expenses involved. As you know, this Ministry has been engaged in the straightening of roads in various parts of the country, and with the increase in traffic the need for widening roads is all the more important. Therefore, we have got to recover the money that we put in, and the imposing of tolls is now a normal feature in most modern countries. However, it is pleasant to observe,

from the Honourable Member's speech, his interest in the members in his constituency. While the Government on the one side needs to collect tolls, I do recognise that we have got to prevent hardship, where the hardship is real; and as such I shall undertake to give consideration to the request made by the Honourable Member. It may well be that we may start to have a system of season tickets possibly, but then I should not

speaking about this without consulting my colleagues, the Minister of Finance and the Cabinet. This I shall assure the Honourable Member I will certainly do.

Question put, and agreed to.

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

Adjourned at 7.10 p.m.