

Volume III
No. 36



Monday
20hb Februari, 1967

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

OFFICIAL REPORT

**THIRD SESSION OF THE SECOND PARLIAMENT
OF MALAYSIA**

CONTENTS

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 4949]

BILL:

The Supply Bill, 1967—

Committee of Supply (Thirteenth Allotted Day)—

Heads S. 50 to S. 57 [Col. 4952]

Heads S. 58 to S. 60 [Col. 5003]

Head S. 61 [Col. 5039]

MALAYSIA

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)
Official Report

Third Session of the Second Dewan Ra'ayat

Monday, 20th February, 1967

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

PRESENT:

- The Honourable Mr Speaker, DATO' CHIK MOHAMED YUSUF BIN SHEIKH ABDUL RAHMAN, S.P.M.P., J.P., Dato' Bendahara, Perak.**
- „ the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, **TAN SRI V. T. SAMBANTHAN, P.M.N. (Sungei Siput).**
- „ the Minister of Transport, **TAN SRI HAJI SARDON BIN HAJI JUBIR, P.M.N. (Pontian Utara).**
- „ the Minister of Health, **TUAN BAHAMAN BIN SAMSUDIN (Kuala Pilah).**
- „ the Minister of Commerce and Industry, **DR LIM SWEE AUN, J.P. (Larut Selatan).**
- „ the Minister for Welfare Services, **TUAN HAJI ABDUL HAMID KHAN BIN HAJI SAKHAWAT ALI KHAN, J.M.N., J.P. (Batang Padang).**
- „ the Minister for Sarawak Affairs, **TAN SRI TEMENGGONG JUGAH ANAK BARIENG, P.M.N., P.D.K. (Sarawak).**
- „ the Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives, **TUAN HAJI MOHD. GHAZALI BIN HAJI JAWI (Ulu Perak).**
- „ the Minister of Lands and Mines, **TUAN ABDUL-RAHMAN BIN YA'KUB (Sarawak).**
- „ the Assistant Minister of National and Rural Development, **TUAN SULAIMAN BIN BULON, (Bagan Datoh).**
- „ the Assistant Minister of Culture, Youth and Sports, **ENGKU MUHSEIN BIN ABDUL KADIR, J.M.N., S.M.T., P.J.K. (Trengganu Tengah).**
- „ the Assistant Minister of Education, **TUAN LEE SIOK YEW, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Sepang).**
- „ the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, **TUAN IBRAHIM BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Seberang Tengah).**
- „ 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).**

The Honourable WAN ABDUL KADIR BIN ISMAIL, P.P.T. (Kuala Trengganu Utara).

- .. TUAN ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAJI TALIB, P.J.K. (Kuantan).
- .. 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 AHMAD BIN ARSHAD, A.M.N. (Muar Utara).
- .. TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN SAAID, J.P. (Seberang Utara).
- .. PUAN AJIBAH BINTI ABOL (Sarawak).
- .. TUAN AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Muar Dalam).
- .. TUAN 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 CHIA CHIN SHIN, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- .. 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 EDWIN ANAK TANGKUN (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).
- .. 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 STANLEY HO NGUN KHIU, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- .. TUAN HUSSEIN BIN To' MUDA HASSAN, A.M.N. (Raub).
- .. DATO' HAJI HUSSEIN BIN MOHD. NOORDIN, D.P.M.P., A.M.N.,
 P.J.K. (Parit).
- .. TUAN HUSSEIN BIN SULAIMAN (Ulu Kelantan).
- .. TUAN HAJI HUSSAIN RAHIMI BIN HAJI SAMAN,
 (Kota Bharu Hulu).
- .. TUAN IKHWAN ZAINI (Sarawak).
- .. TUAN ISMAIL BIN IDRIS (Penang Selatan).
- .. TAN SRI SYED JA'AFAR BIN HASAN ALBAR, P.M.N.
 (Johor Tenggara).
- .. PENGHULU JINGGUT ANAK ATTAN, Q.M.C., A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- .. TUAN KADAM ANAK KIAI (Sarawak).
- .. TUAN KAM WOON WAH, J.P. (Sitiawan).

The Honourable TUAN THOMAS KANA (Sarawak).

- .. TUAN EDMUND LANGGU ANAK SAGA (Sarawak).
- .. TUAN LEE SECK FUN, K.M.N. (Tanjong Malim).
- .. DATO' LING BENG SIEW, P.N.B.S. (Sarawak).
- .. DR LIM CHONG EU (Tanjong).
- .. TUAN LIM PEE HUNG, P.J.K. (Alor Star).
- .. DR MAHATHIR BIN MOHAMAD (Kota Star Selatan).
- .. TUAN T. MAHIMA SINGH, J.P. (Port Dickson).
- .. TUAN C. JOHN ONDU MAJAKIL (Sabah).
- .. TUAN MOHD. ARIF SALLEH, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- .. 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).
- .. WAN MOKHTAR BIN AHMAD (Kemaman).
- .. TUAN HAJI MOKHTAR BIN HAJI ISMAIL (Perlis Selatan).
- .. TUAN MUHAMMAD FAKHRUDDIN BIN HAJI ABDULLAH (Pasir Mas Hilir).
- .. TUAN HAJI MUHAMMAD SU'AUT BIN HAJI MUHD. TAHIR, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- .. DATO' HAJI MUSTAPHA BIN HAJI ABDUL JABAR, D.P.M.S., A.M.N., J.P. (Sabak Bernam).
- .. TAN SRI NIK AHMAD KAMIL, D.K., S.P.M.K., S.J.M.K., P.M.N., P.Y.G.P., Dato' Sri Setia Raja (Kota Bharu Hilir).
- .. TUAN NG FAH YAM (Batu Gajah).
- .. TUAN ONG KEE HUI (Sarawak).
- .. TUAN HAJI OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Hilir Perak).
- .. TUAN QUEK KAI DONG, J.P. (Seremban Timor).
- .. TUAN HAJI RAHMAT BIN HAJI DAUD, A.M.N. (Johor Bahru Barat).
- .. TUAN RAMLI BIN OMAR (Krian Darat).
- .. TUAN HAJI REDZA BIN HAJI MOHD. SAID, P.J.K., J.P. (Rembau-Tampin).
- .. RAJA ROME BIN RAJA MA'AMOR, P.J.K., J.P. (Kuala Selangor).
- .. TUAN SANDOM ANAK NYUAK (Sarawak).
- .. TUAN SEAH TENG NGIAB, P.I.S. (Muar Pantai).
- .. TUAN SIM BOON LIANG, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- .. TUAN SIOW LOONG HIN, P.J.K. (Seremban Barat).
- .. TUAN SNAWI BIN ISMAIL, P.J.K. (Seberang Selatan).
- .. TUAN SNG CHIN JOO (Sarawak).
- .. TUAN SULEIMAN BIN ALI (Dungun).
- .. TUAN SULEIMAN BIN HAJI TAIB (Krian Laut).
- .. TUAN TAI KUAN YANG (Kulim-Bandar Bharu).
- .. TUAN TAMA WENG TINGGANG WAN (Sarawak).

The Honourable DR TAN CHEE KHOON (Batu).

- „ TUAN TAN CHENG BEE, J.P. (Bagan).
- „ TUAN TAN TOH HONG (Bukit Bintang).
- „ TUAN TAN TSAK YU (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN TIAH ENG BEE (Kluang Utara).
- „ TUAN YEH PAO TZE, A.M.N. (Sabah).
- „ TUAN STEPHEN YONG KUET TZE (Sarawak).
- „ 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 Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Defence and Minister
of National and Rural Development, TUN HAJI ABDUL RAZAK
BIN DATO' HUSSAIN, S.M.N. (Pekan).
- „ the Minister of Home Affairs and Minister of Justice,
TUN DR ISMAIL BIN DATO' HAJI ABDUL RAHMAN,
S.S.M., P.M.N. (Johor Timor).
- „ the Minister of Finance, TUAN TAN SIEW SIN, J.P.
(Melaka Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Education, TUAN MOHAMED KHIR JOHARI
(Kedah Tengah).
- „ 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 for Sabah Affairs and Civil Defence,
TUN DATU MUSTAPHA BIN DATU HARUN, S.M.N., P.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ the Assistant Minister without Portfolio, TUAN HAJI ABDUL
KHALID BIN AWANG OSMAN (Kota Star Utara).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Finance, DR NG KAM POH, J.P.
(Telok Anson).
- „ the Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour,
TUAN LEE SAN CHOON, K.M.N. (Segamat Selatan).
- „ WAN ABDUL RAHMAN BIN DATO' TUANKU BUJANG, A.B.S.
(Sarawak).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDUL RASHID BIN HAJI JAIS (Sabah).
- „ DATO' ABDULLAH BIN ABDULRAHMAN, S.M.T., Dato' Bijaya
di-Raja (Kuala Trengganu Selatan).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI MOHD. SALLEH, A.M.N., S.M.J.,
P.I.S. (Segamat Utara).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABU BAKAR BIN HAMZAH, J.P. (Bachok).
- „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN ABDULLAH, S.M.K. (Kelantan Hilir).
- „ O.K.K. DATU ALIUDDIN BIN DATU HARUN, P.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ DR AWANG BIN HASSAN, S.M.J. (Muar Selatan).

The Honourable TUAN CHEW BIOW CHUON, J.P. (Bruas).

- „ TAN SRI FATIMAH BINTI HAJI HASHIM, P.M.N. (Jitra-Padang Terap).
- „ TUAN S. FAZUL RAHMAN, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ DATU GANIE GILONG, P.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).
- „ TUAN HARUN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N., J.P. (Baling).
- „ WAN HASSAN BIN WAN DAUD (Tumpat).
- „ TUAN KHOO PENG LOONG (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN AMADEUS MATHEW LEONG, A.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).
- „ TUAN LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).
- „ TUAN PETER LO SU YIN (Sabah).
- „ TUAN JOSEPH DAVID MANJAJI (Sabah).
- „ DATO' DR HAJI MEGAT KHAS, D.P.M.P., J.P., P.J.K. (Kuala Kangsar).
- „ DATO' HAJI MOHAMED ASRI BIN HAJI MUDA, S.P.M.K. (Pasir Puteh).
- „ ORANG TUA MOHAMMAD DARA BIN LANGPAD (Sabah).
- „ TUAN MOHD. ZAHIR BIN HAJI ISMAIL, J.M.N. (Sungai Patani).
- „ TUAN MUSTAPHA BIN AHMAD (Tanah Merah).
- „ TUAN OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Perlis Utara).
- „ TUAN D. R. SEENIVASAGAM (Ipoh).
- „ DATO' S. P. SEENIVASAGAM, D.P.M.P., P.M.P., J.P. (Menglembu).
- „ TUAN SOH AH TECK (Batu Pahat).
- „ PENGIRAN TAHIR PETRA (Sabah).
- „ TUAN TAJUDIN BIN ALI, P.J.K. (Larut Utara).
- „ TUAN TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Melaka).
- „ TUAN TOH THEAM HOCK (Kampar).

PRAYERS

(Mr Speaker in the Chair)

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

PEGAWAI² ARKIB YANG MENGHADHIRI KURSUS

1. Tuan Muhammad Fakhruddin bin Haji Abdullah [*bawah S.O. 24 (2)*] bertanya kepada Perdana Menteri berapa ramai-kah pegawai² Arkib kita yang telah menghadhiri kursus² yang di-anjorkan oleh UNESCO, berhubung dengan urusan² Arkib, bagi tahun² 1965 dan 1966.

The Assistant Minister of Youth, Culture and Sports (Engku Muhsein bin Abdul Kadir): Sa-orang pegawai kanan yang telah membuat lawatan sambil belajar anjoran UNESCO, badan² Arkib dan sa-bagai-nya di-United Kingdom, Holland, German Barat dan France sa-lama 8 bulan. Pegawai ini sekarang memegang jawatan sa-bagai Pengarah.

PAKAR ARKIB DARI UNESCO

2. Tuan Muhammad Fakhruddin bin Haji Abdullah [*bawah S.O. 24 (2)*] bertanya kepada Perdana Menteri adakah Kerajaan mahukan perkhidmatan sa-orang pakar Arkib dari UNESCO, ia-itu Dr F.R.J. Verhoeven, untuk menasihatkan pegawai² arkib kita.

Engku Muhsein bin Abdul Kadir:
Perkhidmatan Dr F.R.J. Verhoeven sebagai pakar UNESCO di-Arkib Negara sa-lama 4 tahun satu bulan sudah pun tamat pada bulan Disember yang lalu. Kerajaan berpendapat tempoh ini sudah menchukupi.

ROMBONGAN² KEBUDAYAAN

3. Tuan Muhammad Fakhruddin bin Haji Abdullah [*bawah S.O. 24 (2)*] bertanya kepada Menteri Kebudayaan Belia dan Sukan berapa banyak rombongan² kebudayaan kita yang telah dihantar keluar negeri dalam tahun 1966, dan sebutkan nama negeri² yang mereka lawati.

Engku Muhsein bin Abdul Kadir:
Satu rombongan kebudayaan telah dihantar ka-Bangkok dalam tahun 1966 kerana mengambil bahagian di-Pertunjukan Kebudayaan Temasha Sukan Sa-Asia. Rombongan ini telah mempersembahkan tarian² Malaysia.

Sa-lain daripada itu pameran² Seni Lukis Malaysia telah berada di-beberapa bandar Eropah. Pameran itu dianjurkan oleh Kerajaan dengan kerjasama Majlis Seni Lukis Negara.

BILL

THE SUPPLY BILL, 1967

Order read for resumption of consideration of the Supply Bill, 1967 in Committee of the whole House (18th February, 1967).

House immediately resolved itself into Committee.

Mr Speaker: Ahli² Yang Berhormat, saya suka hendak mengingatkan ini hari yang ke-13 dan besok hari yang penghabisan di-atas kepala² ini. Jadi kalau dapat di-tetapkan pandangan kapada perkara yang hendak di-tarek pandangan itu dan di-pendekkan perbahathan, lebih elok lagi-lah saya fikir.

THE SUPPLY (1967) BILL

Committee

Order read for resumed consideration of debate in Committee of Supply (Thirteenth Allotted Day).

House immediately resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(Mr Speaker in the Chair)

SCHEDULE

Debate resumed.

Head S. 50—

Tuan C. V. Devan Nair (Bungsar):
Mr Chairman, Sir, I hope to take just over ten minutes, but just one second to say how very nice it is to see you back in the Chair.

I shall make my remarks under S. 50, Ministry of Lands and Mines. The Honourable the Minister of Lands and Mines is concerned, among other things, with the implementation of the National Land Code. It has been claimed that safeguards to prevent sub-division of estates are included in section 136 of the National Land Code. The considerable fragmentation that has taken place in the last one year is ample testimony to the fact that section 136 of the National Land Code has done nothing of the kind. I have with me here, Sir, a legal opinion on this matter. It reads as follows:

"Section 136 has to be read in conjunction with Section 135—both sections deal with matters of procedure. While Section 135 allows applications for sub-division into two or more portions, Section 136 lays down in what circumstances the Collector approves sub-division. The circumstances of approval are fairly lax. All that is necessary is that any proposed sub-division does not contravene any restrictive interest to which the land may be subject and would not be contrary to any written law. There being no written law against sub-division, this provision, would be meaningless. Again, approval of planning authority must be obtained and sub-division should not be contrary to any plan approved by the State Authority for development of the area in which the land is situated. Has the planning authority been issued with any directions that any particular land shall not be sub-divided? Of the remaining provisions, only agricultural land used for an agricultural purpose is required to be not less than one acre. Therefore, by implication any other land can be sub-divided into smaller portions of less than an acre."

This was handed to me by Mr P.P. Narayanan of the N.U.P.W. and ends up with a small sentence:

"Is the Minister pulling wool over our eyes? This is a piece of special pleading designed to gloss over the truth"—

and with respect I shall pass this on to the Minister for his study.

Sir, if sub-division is to be prevented then the National Land Code obviously has got to be revised. But before the Code is revised, it would be useful to clarify the objectives we should have in mind. Everything hinges on the basic approach and attitude we take towards rubber plantations.

Our rubber plantations have so far constituted an industry—in fact the main industry in the nation—which has contributed more than anything else to the nation's prosperity. But once you start fragmenting or sub-dividing rubber estates, rubber ceases to be an industry and sub-divided holdings become no more than uneconomic agricultural plots.

Bitter international experience in other countries, where they have plantation economies, should guide us in this matter. When plantations remain economic units, they come under the classification of industry, but when they are fragmented into plots, they become ordinary agricultural land units exposed to deterioration and exhaustion. The crucial question is, "Are we going to keep rubber as an industry, or are we going to convert the mainstay of our national economy into agricultural small-holdings, poor in productivity, efficiency and in employment opportunities?"

Fragmentation, as a process, may be equated to losing on the roundabouts what one has gained on the swings. Let me explain. What one individual saves and invests in land may be dissaved by another who sells the land. From the social point of view, the net effect may be zero saving. The preference for land as an asset as well as for other social reasons may thus act as an instrument of dissaving, and hence, as a break on the national capacity to save. Furthermore, most of the people who buy fragmented land do so, because they desire to invest their scarce financial resources. Now, it has been the experience of many countries that ultimately such fragmented lands have invariably resulted in less efficient use of land, causing incalculable harm to productivity and employment.

We might mention here that enormous amounts of public money have been expended on replanting in rubber small-holdings. The urge to easy profits from such small-holdings has also led to what is known as "slaughter tapping" in rubber small-holdings. It is needless to state that "slaughter tapping" leads to the slaughter of rubber trees, which have been planted at so much public expense.

An analysis of the sub-division of estates so far will show that only a few rapacious speculators including, according to the Honourable Member for Ipoh, some very eminent M.I.C. gentlemen, have made fortunes overnight at the expense of the industry, of national wealth and of employment. Many countries have arrested this vicious tendency on the part of unscrupulous men after bitter experience.

The inevitable solution to this problem of fragmentation must be the creation of a favourable investment climate. Obviously such a favourable climate is ceasing to exist. One cannot account otherwise for the fact that companies owning large estates should be selling out at such a disturbingly fast rate. I would suggest, Sir, let us not play the fool with the major industry which today props up the nation's economy. Since the tendency to fragmentation will lead to grave consequences for the national economy, productivity and employment, the Government should amend the National Land Code in such a way that: (1) no transfer is valid unless approved by a competent authority, say the Minister concerned, or even better, by a Cabinet committee; (2) first option should be given to the workers to form themselves as co-operative owners of the plantation to be so transferred, if compelled to do so; (3) the land acreage to be so transferred should be economically viable to sustain productivity and employment.

All in all, it must be as clear as a pikestaff that fragmentation must be prevented, in the interests of the national economy, and in order to avoid the growth of serious social

unrest as a result of mass unemployment in the plantations.

In his memorandum to the 1960 committee, Professor Ungku Aziz made three significant prophecies, which have been largely borne out by events: (1) The real consequence of sub-division of estates are to be quite different; the new owners of the sub-divided pieces of ex-estate land are more likely to be absentee landlords than owner-operators; (2) the new workers on the sub-divided pieces of land are likely to earn incomes equal to half, or even less than those earned by estate workers where rates are maintained by agreements between the workers and the employers; and (3) conditions will not be safeguarded by officials from the Ministry of Labour and, what is especially important from the national point of view, the quality of the rubber produced will be of a lower grade.

So, the necessary revision of the National Land Code must be made on basis of the acknowledgment that fragmentation is economically dissipative, socially disintegrative and altogether a blow to the national economy.

Wan Abdul Kadir bin Ismail (Kuala Trengganu Utara): Tuan Pengerusi, saya hendak mengambil bahagian sedikit dalam perbahathan peruntukan Kementerian Tanah dan Galian ini dan saya menyokong peruntukan yang diminta oleh Menteri yang berkenaan.

Saya suka hendak menyentoh sedikit di-bawah Kepala S. 51, ia-itu tentang soal permohonan² tanah yang pada masa ini di-bekukan untuk permohonan orang² persaorangan. Saya merasa soal ini patut-lah di-kaji sa-mula pada masa ini, kerana dengan peranchangan soal pembukaan tanah yang di-buka dengan tiga chara, ia-itu chara F.L.D.A., chara Tanah Pinggir, dan chara Tanah Terkawal, yang sa-panjang ini boleh dikatakan antara 60% dengan 80% telah berjaya. Maka banyak orang² persaorangan yang menghendaki mendapat tanah yang tidak menurut peratoran² di-bawah tiga² keadaan bahagian tanah yang tersebut tadi—maseh ramai lagi.

Pada masa ini kita ada dengar yang Kerajaan Negeri Pahang ada bercha-

ng hendak membuka sa-mula permohonan persaorangan dan saya rasa perkara ini patut-lah di-jalankan oleh semua negeri dengan persefahaman yang penoh dan arahan daripada Majlis Tanah Negara. Saya rasa pembekuan yang di-jalankan itu sudah-lah cukup waktu-nya dan patut-lah pada masa ini pehak Kerajaan Pusat dan Kerajaan Negeri, terutama-nya Kerajaan² Negeri, menimbangkan sa-mula untok di-buka sa-mula permohonan² tanah bagi orang² persaorangan, kerana pada masa ini soal tanah haram yang di-buka dengan tidak ada kebenaran Kerajaan itu tidak juga dapat di-berhentikan dengan pembekuan permohonan tanah itu. Saya rasa satu jalan bagi menyekat berluas²nya pembukaan tanah haram itu ia-lah dengan membuka sa-mula permohonan tanah sa-chara persaorangan.

Tuan Pengerusi, saya juga ingin menyentoh sedikit tentang beberapa segi daripada Undang² Tanah Negara kerana pada pendapat saya ada beberapa segi yang kecil yang patut ditinjau sa-mula Undang² Tanah Negara itu. Saya, terutama sa-kali, bermaksud tentang pembayaran² yang di-tetapkan oleh Undang² Tanah Negara yang baru ini dari segi upah ukor-nya, umpamanya yang pada masa ini walau bagaimana kecil pun lot-nya di-kenakan \$150 dan ini menjadikan suatu sebab kegelisahan orang kampung yang hendak mendapatkan tanah; walau bagaimana kecil pun lot-nya itu dia terpaksa membayar \$150 padahal dahulu tidak demikian, maka ini lebih 10 kali ganda dari masa² yang lepas.

Saya rasa segi ini sangat-lah patut di-timbang dan di-tinjau sa-mula supaya tidak terasa berat beban yang di-bayar oleh orang² luar bandar terutama sa-kali dalam upah ukor ini di-tinjau dan di-kaji dan di-ubah sa-mula hingga sesuai dengan keadaan² yang ada pada masa ini. Demikian juga bayaran² yang lain yang di-tetapkan oleh Undang² Tanah Negara itu seperti bayaran² tukar geran dan lain²-nya yang telah jauh bertambah besar pada masa² yang lalu dan ini menjadi punca kegelisahan yang saya katakan tadi pada orang ramai terutama orang² kampung dan orang² di-luar bandar.

Tuan Pengerusi, sa-lain daripada itu saya suka hendak menyentuh sedikit tentang S. 57, Jabatan Orang² Asli. Rakan² saya telah berchakap beberapa orang tentang ini dan saya rasa memang saya sangat setuju supaya usaha² yang lebeh pesat dan lebeh besar di-jalankan bagi mempercepatkan integrasi orang² asli ini ka-dalam masyarakat kita. Segala usaha yang dapat di-jalankan untuk mempercepatkan kemajuan mereka itu bagi mempercepatkan integrasi atau "intergration" itu patut-lah di-jalankan. Sa-lama ini Jabatan Orang Asli telah berjalan sedikit sa-banyak hasil-nya dapat kita lihat tetapi semua orang bersetuju bahawa kalau boleh biar-lah hasil itu lebeh chepat lagi.

Saya merasa salah satu chara bagi mempercepatkan dan melichinkan dan melekaskan usaha² kemajuan orang² asli ini ia-lah tidak kita membiarkan segala urusan orang asli ini hanya di-bawah perjalanan Pesurohjaya Orang Asli sahaja atas tanggung-jawab-nya sa-orang. Saya rasa lebeh sempurna penyelenggaraan orang asli ini kalau dapat di-tubuhkan sa-buah jawatan-kuasa penasehat yang memberi nasehat kapada Pesurohjaya Orang Asli ini dalam segala perkara hendak di-jalankan bagi kemajuan dan kebajikan orang² asli dan saya chadangkan di-dalam Jawatan-kuasa Penasehat itu patut-lah dudok orang² asli sendiri yang telah ada pengalaman dan kematangan dan juga wakil² bumiputera yang lain serta pegawai² yang berkenaan sama ada Pegawai² Perubatan atau Pegawai Kebajikan. Dengan demikian maka segala usaha yang di-ranchangkan bagi kebajikan orang asli itu akan lebeh sempurna dan lebeh terator dan lebeh kemas. Pada masa ini hanya terserah bulat² kapada Pesurohjaya Orang Asli sahaja-lah memikirkan apa yang patut hendak di-jalankan, padahal jika kita tubuhkan Jawatan-kuasa Penasehat ini, ini akan dapat menolong Pesurohjaya itu.

Pada masa ini umpama kita katakan dalam perjalanan pembangunan, kita ada Pegawai Kemajuan Negeri, tetapi kita ada Jawatan-kuasa Pembangunan, Jawatan-kuasa Kemajuan Negeri dan Daerah yang membantu Pegawai Kemajuan Negeri yang berkenaan dalam

perkara pembangunan negeri dan saya rasa chontoh ini patut kita ambil dan jalankan untuk kemajuan orang² asli kerana kita tidak menunggu lama dalam usaha kita mempercepat integ rasi ka-dalam masyarakat kita.

Tuan Pengerusi, saya suka juga menyentuh sedikit tentang S. 55—"Forest" atau Kehutanan. Dalam perkara ini saya rasa negeri kita ini lebeh kurang, lebeh daripada separoh negeri kita ini maseh di-liputi oleh hutan, dan pada masa ini kawasan hutan simpan kita di-merata² tempat, di-merata² negeri, ada-lah luas, oleh kerana pembangunan kita berjalan dengan pesat dan pembangunan luar bandar ini ditujukan terutama sa-kali untuk membuka tanah² baru yang lebeh luas. Soal hutan simpan ini saya fikir, Tuan Pengerusi, patut di-kaji sa-mula. Ada banyak barangkali tempat² hutan simpan, yang di-tepi² jalan, di-tepi kawasan yang telah terbuka yang patut di-tinjau sa-mula kedudukan-nya ia-itu patut-lah hutan simpan yang sa-bagitu di-buka dan di-benarkan di-buka bagi di-teroka untuk pembangunan dan boleh di-dudoki oleh orang² yang tidak ada tanah. Chuma dalam perkara ini satu perkara yang saya rasa patut menarek perhatian Pegawai Pejabat Forest yang berkenaan dalam membenarkan kawasan² hutan ini di-buka sama ada di-buka untuk di-jadikan tanah tanaman atau di-buka untuk kawasan balak terutama sa-kali untuk kawasan balak supaya jangan-lah hendak-nya Pegawai yang berkenaan itu mahu tundok kapada tekanan² politik.

Saya tahu, Tuan Pengerusi, sa-tengah² negeri dan saya boleh katakan kerap di-negeri Kelantan banyak kawasan² hutan-nya di-buka dan di-bahagi²kan kapada orang² politik yang tertentu untuk tujuan² politik, sama ada dengan persetujuan Pegawai Hutan atas perkara ini atau tidak, betul tidak ada apa² di-sabalek-nya atau dengan tekanan² politik yang lain. Ini yang saya takutkan, sebab saya beri ingat supaya perkara ini tidak lagi berulang².

Saya rasa kawasan² hutan yang hendak di-buka untuk di-jadikan kawasan balak ini, Tuan Pengerusi, patut di-buka dengan arahan Kerajaan Negeri

di-bawah satu ranchangan yang tersusun. Saya suka hendak membawa satu chontoh yang di-jalankan di-negeri Trengganu pada masa ini segala pembukaan tanah hutan untuk di-jadikan kawasan balak di-serahkan kepada Perbadanan Ekonomi Negeri dan segala orang yang hendak mengambil bahagian di-minta membeli saham² daripada Sharikat Balak Membalak yang di-buka oleh Perbadanan Ekonomi Negeri itu.

Jadi dengan demikian, terelak-lah keadaan tekanan² politik dan maksud² politik yang berjalan dalam pembukaan tanah² hutan yang di-ambil kayu balak seperti yang berlaku di-Kelantan itu, yang pada masa ini saya katakan kawasan² balak itu di-buka sa-bagai bahagian pusaka hidup kepada tokoh² politik di-sana.

Tuan Pengerusi, berkenaan dengan ini, saya suka hendak sentoh, pada akhir-nya sa-kali, tentang peruntokan yang di-beri sa-bagai penyelesaian tanah² di-Kelantan yang pada tahun ini peruntokan-nya ada sa-banyak kira² \$300,000 di-belanjakan bagi penyelesaian tanah di-Kelantan itu. Dan saya rasa ini satu sumbangan daripada Kerajaan Pusat yang patut di-beri penghargaan oleh Kerajaan Negeri Kelantan. Tetapi sa-panjang masa ini mengenai soal tanah Kerajaan Negeri Kelantan ini, Tuan Pengerusi, selalu sahaja menchabar Kerajaan Pusat dan merendah² kan segala ranchangan Kerajaan Pusat mengenai tanah. Saya rasa kalau sampai pada waktu-nya dan Kerajaan Kelantan terlalu tidak mengenang budi dalam perkara ini, saya chadangkanlah supaya soal penyelesaian tanah di-Kelantan itu di-serahkan sahaja kepada Kerajaan Negeri Kelantan kalau ia memang pandai dan bijak dan pakar melebehi segala orang dalam perkara tanah dan penyelesaian tanah.

Tuan Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Tuan Pengerusi, saya hendak berchakap sedikit sahaja berkenaan dengan S. 51, kerana saya tahu bahawa urusan pentadbiran tanah ini ada-lah terletak kepada Kerajaan² Negeri.

Tetapi oleh kerana Article 76 (4) dalam Perlembagaan kita membenar-

kan Parlimen menchampori dalam hal ini bagi mengadakan undang² dan dasar yang sama sa-kata dan oleh sebab Yang Berhormat Menteri sendiri telah menyatakan yang beliau sendiri sedar dan sedang berusaha untuk membaiki kelemahan² pentadbiran tanah di-negeri², saya perchaya tegoran² saya ini akan dapat perhatian daripada beliau.

Tuan Pengerusi, saya berpendapat dan saya rasa semua Ahli² Yang Berhormat dalam Dewan ini bersetuju bahawa pentadbiran tanah sangat-lah perlu bukan sahaja bagi menjaga nama baik Kerajaan yang memerintah, tetapi juga bagi kemajuan dan perkembangan ekonomi negara seluroh-nya. Saya tahu Kerajaan Pusat chukup insaf atas hal ini dan itu-lah sebab-nya National Land Council di-adakan, Kementerian Tanah dan Galian ini di-tubuhkan selepas pilihan raya tahun 1964, dan baharu² ini National Land Code di-luluskan oleh Dewan ini.

Sungguh pun begitu, Tuan Pengerusi, saya dapati bahawa keinsafan dan kesedaran itu belum-lah meresap dan menjalar ka-tingkatan negeri dan daerah dengan sa-penoh-nya, terutama ka-pada Pegawai² Rendah.

Tuan Pengerusi, mengikut pendapat saya, pentadbiran tanah bergantung kepada kecekapan dan pengalaman pegawai² yang menguruskan hal tanah yang terdiri daripada pegawai² Pemungut Khazanah Tanah, Penolong Pegawai Pemungut Khazanah Tanah dan Pegawai Pertempatan. Biasa-nya di-tingkatan daerah, Pegawai² Pemungut Khazanah Tanah ini ada-lah juga Pegawai Daerah bagi jajahan itu dan oleh kerana di-atas bahu Pegawai Daerah ini di-longgokkan segala kerja yang dapat di-fikirkan oleh Kementerian², maka biasa-nya kerja² urusan tanah itu di-bebankan kepada Pegawai² muda yang baharu sa-tahun dua bekerja dengan Kerajaan dan tidak ada mempunyai sedikit pengalaman pun berhubung dengan pentadbiran tanah. Jadi, saya tahu Yang Berhormat Menteri ini sedar akan hal ini dan untuk menambah kecekapan dan kebolehan pegawai² yang muda itu, Kementerian ini telah mengadakan kursus bagi me-reka.

Tetapi malang-nya, Tuan Pengerusi, ada kala-nya sa-belum mereka ini tamat kursus yang di-berikan berkenaan dengan pentadbiran tanah atau sa-telah balek daripada kursus 3-4 bulan, Pejabat Perjawatan telah memerentahkan bertukar ka-pejabat² lain. Sebab kejadian² ini, Tuan Pengerusi, yang menjadi tulang belakang atau back bone pada pentadbiran tanah di-tingkatan² daerah hanya-lah Pegawai² Pertempatan. Tetapi malang-nya, Tuan Pengerusi, Pegawai² Pertempatan itu masok di-dalam Pegawai² gulungan rendah yang mengikut S. 51 ini Butir (19), tingkatan gaji-nya hanya-lah C. 146 ia-itu gaji mula \$137.50, mati sa-lama 22 tahun bekerja \$498.00.

Dengan tangga gaji itu hanya pemuda² yang lulus L.C.E. sahaja, yang kata orang Kelantan "berahi" meminta jawatan itu dan akibat-nya ia-lah pegawai² yang menjadi back bone yang saya katakan tadi, Tuan Pengerusi, pada kelichinan pentadbiran tanah di-isi oleh apa yang kita gelarkan Third Graders. Dan hasil-nya ia-lah sungutan yang di-terima oleh Wakil² Ra'ayat atas kelambatan permintaan² daripada orang ramai berkehendakkan tanah dan penyelesaian berkenaan dengan hal² tanah.

Jadi nama baik Kerajaan dengan sebab ini ada-lah terancham pada masa ini, Tuan Pengerusi.

Tuan Pengerusi, berhubung dengan usaha Yang Berhormat Menteri untuk melichinkan urusan pentadbiran tanah ini, saya suka-lah mengeshorkan kepada beliau bagi timbangan-nya dan kalau perlu lagi timbangan National Land Council perkara² di-bawah ini:

Satu—perkhidmatan tertutup atau yang di-namakan Close Service, yang di-namakan Land Administration Officer atau pun Pegawai Pentadbiran Tanah yang tingkatan gaji-nya sama dengan M.A.S. atau pun Scale B 32 (A) dalam ini, terbuka kepada penuntut² yang mempunyai kelayakan sa-kurang² nya H.S.C. dan kalau dapat pass degree hendaklah di-adakan ka-tingkatan Federal bagi dihantar kepada Pejabat Tanah Daerah.

Tuan Pengerusi, shor ini bukan-lah satu perkara yang baharu, kerana saya maseh ingat dalam tahun 1956 ada satu Surohanjaya berkenaan dengan

pentadbiran tanah ini di-jemput dari-pada India dan telah mengeshorkan kepada Kerajaan supaya perkhidmatan yang saperti ini di-adakan.

Tuan Pengerusi, shor saya itu bukan-lah hendak memindahkan pegawai² yang ada berkhidmat dengan Kerajaan sekarang kepada perkhidmatan yang baharu itu, tetapi, ia-lah satu perkhidmatan yang baharu yang mengambil pegawai² yang baharu dan sa-telah itu di-beri latehan berkenaan dengan pentadbiran tanah sa-telah mendapat latehan yang chukup baharu-lah dihantar ka-Pejabat Daerah. Di-antara pegawai² Land Administrative Officer ini yang barangkali ada kebolehan yang istimewa, maka patut-lah Kerajaan menimbangkan supaya mereka di-naikkan kepada tingkatan yang lebeh tinggi saperti MCS yang di-buat oleh Kerajaan pada masa sekarang kepada pegawai² MAS.

Yang kedua, Tuan Pengerusi, saya ingin-lah mengeshorkan kepada Yang Berhormat Menteri supaya scheme dan tangga gaji bagi Pegawai Pertempatan itu hendak-lah di-kaji sa-mula. Saya mengeshorkan pada masa yang akan datang oleh kerana pemuda² kita terlampau banyak yang lulus School Certificate dan FMC, kelulusan yang sa-rendah²-nya bagi Pegawai² Pertempatan ini hendak-lah di-beri kelulusan School Certificate atau pun Federation of Malaya Certificate. Dan jikalau kita hendak menarek pemuda² yang lulus daripada itu, hendak-lah kita meminda juga tangga gaji bagi Pegawai² Pertempatan itu.

Saya berharap bahawa kedua² shor² saya ini akan di-timbangkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri bagaimana saya katakan tadi dan kalau perlu di-bawalah Kerajaan² Negeri berunding atas hal ini bagi melichinkan lagi pentadbiran tanah, satu perkara yang sangat penting bagi kemajuan negara dan nama baik Kerajaan. Terima kaseh.

Dr Mahathir bin Mohamad (Kota Star Selatan): Tuan Pengerusi, saya ingin mengambil bahagian sedikit di-dalam perbahathan di-bawah Head S. 50 dan S. 51 ia-itu berkenaan dengan soal Pemechahan Estate².

Tuan Pengerusi, kita telah dengar berkali² semenjak 15 tahun dahulu tentang bermacam² masaalah yang telah di-timbulkan akibat pemecahan kebun² getah yang besar di-Malaysia. Masaalah yang terbesar sa-kali ia-lah kesusahan pekerja² estate oleh kerana pekebun² kechil tidak berkehendakkan pekerja² lama dan jika mereka berkehendak sa-kali pun tidak dengan memberi gaji dan kemudahan² saperti dahulu.

Sa-masa kita memikir atas soal kesusahan pekerja², kita juga mesti mengingatkan ia-itu kebanyakan estate yang besar ada-lah hak kepunyaan orang asing dan di-uruskan oleh orang asing. Sa-bagai negara yang merdeka ini ia-lah satu kedudukan yang tidak sesuai. Kita tahu ia-itu satu daripada sharat² penanaman modal dalam negeri ini ia-lah sa-bahagian besar daripada modal mesti-lah daripada warganegara Malaysia.

Sa-balek-nya estate² ini, kadang² tidak langsung ada saham²-nya yang di-pegang oleh orang Malaysia. Ini berma²ana keuntungan dapat kepada orang² asing dan di-belanja²kan di-luar daripada negeri ini. Sa-lain daripada itu, Tuan Pengerusi, memileki tanah di-pandang di-mana² negeri pun sa-bagai hal istimewa warganegara. Kedudukan yang mana sa-bahagian besar daripada tanah yang subur di-mileki oleh orang asing ia-lah tidak sehat. Sa-berapa daya yang boleh tanah tidak-lah patut di-benarkan di-mileki oleh orang asing.

Tuan Pengerusi, saya ingin membawa perhatian juga kepada satu perkara yang selalu terjadi dalam negara yang merdeka yang sama juga kesan-nya pemecahan estate². Ia-itu industri yang baharu yang memaksakan quota dan kenaikan cukai. Umpama-nya apabila di-adakan perusahaan membuat tepong gandum, sungguh pun ini menambah peluang bekerja, tetapi ini tentu membawa akibat yang burok kepada pekerja² dalam perusahaan mengimpot tepong. Tetapi kita tidak dapat tidak mesti menerima keburukan ini jika kita ingin menukar aliran dan chara² perniagaan untuk mengawal kewangan

kita. Dari itu, sa-belum kita memereksa soal pemecahan estate² yang chuma dari segi akibat-nya kepada pekerja², mahu-lah juga kita beri penghargaan juga kepada kepentingan negara yang merdeka dan kepada lain² pihak yang terlibat dalam soal ini.

Tuan Pengerusi, hasil daripada pemecahan estate² ia-lah banyak daripada orang yang tidak memileki tanah. Ini beruntung kepada orang² yang bukan Melayu terutama-nya. Dengan ada-nya pemecahan estate² kehausan tanah di-antara orang² China dengan orang² India di-sini dapat-lah di-hilangkan. Tanah estate² bukan sahaja sesuai untuk berchuchok tanam tetapi juga boleh di-jadikan tapak fekteri dan lain² perusahaan.

Saya tahu banyak daripada factory² membuat bata di-dirikan di-estate² lama di-Kedah. Negara yang menggalakkan *property owning democracy* mesti-lah menerima baik jalan² yang boleh memberi lebeh banyak anak negeri memileki tanah dan harta. Yang lebeh elok lagi ia-lah chara yang telah di-sediakan untuk pekerja² sendiri membeli dan memileki estate² ini. Saya tahu, usaha untuk mendatangkan faedah kepada pekerja² ia-lah usaha sa-orang Menteri Kerajaan dan ahli politik, tetapi apa yang patut di-titek beratkan ia-lah ini menguntongkan pekerja². Kalau betul sa-kali pun tuduhan² yang datang dari pihak Pembangkang dan juga lain² orang, apa yang tidak dapat dinafikan ia-lah pekerja² ini benar² menjadi pemileki tanah estate. Lebeh² lagi, Tuan Pengerusi, chara menolong pekerja saperti ini bukan-lah monopoli Sharikat Kerjasama yang di-pimpin oleh ketua MIC sahaja. Siapa juga boleh meniru chara² ini. Tidak ada sebab yang Kesatuan² Sekerja, umpama-nya, tidak boleh berusaha untuk menolong pekerja² dengan chara ini. Kalau pekerja² boleh jadi majikan sendiri penindasan atas pekerja² tentu-lah senang hilang.

Tuan Pengerusi, di-sini saya ingin menyebut sedikit berkenaan dengan jualan satu ladang getah di-Negri Sembilan. Ladang ini di-jual dengan

harga yang cukup murah. Malangnya jualan ini di-buat dengan senyap dan syndicate yang membeli-nya cuma bertujuan memecah dan menjual. Pekerja² tidak di-beri peluang sama sa-kali membeli ladang ini terlebih dahulu. Saya berharap penjualan seperti ini tidak di-lakukan lagi. Ini membawa saya kepada tanggungan Kerajaan berkenaan dengan pemecahan estate². Biasa-nya Kerajaan tidak mengambil tindakan dengan tergesa², tetapi perkara ini telah lama berlaku dan penyelidekan yang teliti telah pun di-buat. Walau pun orang² yang memilik tanah berhak menjual untuk mendapat balek modal-nya, nampak-nya, dalam soal pemecahan estate², hak ini patut di-hadkan sedikit. Walau pun pemecahan membolehkan banyak orang memiliki tanah, kita tidak patut menggalakkan perkara ini dengan buta tuli. Kita patut di-beri kuasa untuk menyelidik dan memeriksa tiap² chadangan menjual estate yang besar untuk menentukan akibat-nya terhadap semua pihak. Sa-berapa yang boleh patut-lah kita galakkan pekerja² sendiri membeli estate² dengan cara apa sa-kali pun. Jika pemecahan mesti di-lakukan lot² baharu mesti-lah cukup besar-nya untuk menjadi economic holdings.

Akhir sa-kali kepada pekerja yang menganggor, Kerajaan patut-lah mencari jalan supaya mereka dapat sagu hati daripada majikan dan jika boleh mereka di-beri peluang bekerja di-lain² tempat, umpama-nya di-Sabah. Sa-takat ini sahaja-lah yang patut Kerajaan tanggong dan tanggungan² ini patut-lah di-kaji dari satu masa ka-satu masa. Terima kasih.

Tuan Haji Zakaria bin Haji Mohd. Taib (Langat): Dato' Pengerusi, saya mengucapkan tahniah kepada Kementerian ini dan menyokong di-atas Anggaran Perbelanjaan yang di-minta oleh Menteri yang berkenaan dan di-samping menyokong Kementerian ini saya suka-lah, Dato' Pengerusi, mengemukakan sedikit pandangan mudah²an supaya dapat Yang Berhormat Menteri yang berkenaan mengambil tindakan.

Berchakap di-atas S. 52—saya sa-bagaimana tahun yang lalu, menguchapkan terima kasih kepada Pejabat ini—Pejabat Galian, yang mana dalam kawasan saya dalam tahun 1960 Pejabat ini telah menambah lagi memberikan pas mendulang kepada penduduk² di-sana. Dalam kawasan saya, Dato' Pengerusi, kehidupan penduduk²-nya ia-lah menoreh getah tetapi dalam kawasan saya ada banyak lombong dan ada banyak bumi-nya yang berisi bijeh timah. Jadi penduduk² di-sana, sa-lain daripada menoreh getah, mereka yang ada pas mendulang bijeh pun menjalankan kerja mendulang bijeh ini untuk menambah sara hidup mereka.

Akan tetapi sungguh pun Pejabat ini telah mengeluarkan dalam tahun 1966, menambah lebih kurang 80 pas mendulang bijeh, tetapi pas² ini maseh di-kehendaki banyak lagi. Saya berharap apa-lah kira-nya supaya pas² mendulang bijeh ini di-keluarkan kepada ra'ayat di-sana dengan tidak ada di-hadkan. Pas² mendulang bijeh ini hanya di-keluarkan kepada orang² perempuan sahaja dan saya pun bersetuju begitu dan perempuan² ini dapat-lah bekerja menolong menambah pendapatan keluarga mereka dan perempuan ini kebanyakan-nya orang yang ta'at kepada undang² dan ta'at kepada peratoran. Sungguh pun ada perkara di-bangkitkan dalam Dewan ini berkenaan dengan menchuri bijeh di-tanah² kepunyaan orang² persendirian atau pun di-tanah² Kerajaan, tetapi mereka² yang menchuri bijeh itu bukanlah perempuan dan bukan-lah orang yang ada mempunyai pas mendulang. Kerja menchuri bijeh di-tanah² orang di-tepi² sungai ia-lah di-kerjakan oleh orang laki² yang kuat badan-nya. Perkara ini memang ada berlaku. Jadi Yang Berhormat Menteri jangan-lah bimbang di-atas perkara ini, mereka yang mendapat pas mendulang ini, perempuan² ini, ada-lah ta'at mengikut peratoran.

Di-samping itu, Dato' Pengerusi, suka-lah sedikit berchakap berkenaan dengan hal perlombongan ini. Jabatan Galian ini ada-lah bekerja dengan baik tetapi sedikit kesulitan nampak-nya kerja² Jabatan ini tidak begitu lancar

oleh kerana barangkali kerjasama dengan Pejabat Tanah tidak begitu di-dapati. Saya harap supaya dapat Yang Berhormat Menteri memikirkan supaya dapat di-chari satu jalan, ikhtiar, kerjasama, di-antara Jabatan Galian dan Jabatan Tanah ini dapat di-jalankan dengan lancar, dengan baik-nya, supaya pemohon² yang berkehendakkan lesen menchari galian atau PP dapat-lah di-selenggarakan dengan sa-berapa chepat yang patut.

Ada juga orang yang memohon untuk menchari galian PP ini sampai dua tahun belum pun ada jawapan apa² lagi, tetapi ini bukan salah Jabatan Galian, ini ia-lah kesilapan di-antara Jabatan² yang berkenaan. Masa dahulu bila sa-orang telah dapat PP atau pun Lesen Chari Gali, biasa-nya di-beri tempoh kepada mereka enam bulan untuk mereka mengerjakan boring. Apabila sampai enam bulan biasa-nya masa dahulu Kerajaan telah menghantar surat kepada pemegang PP ini menanyakan sama ada dia hendak menyambong lagi yang PP-nya akan mati, tetapi pada masa sekarang ganjil sedikit ia-itu belum lagi lesen permit PP orang yang mempunyai belum lagi mati, belum lagi chukup enam bulan, sudah ada pula orang yang memohon—sudah berlipat pula ada orang yang memohon dan apabila orang yang memegang PP ini tadi bila sudah chukup tempoh-nya enam bulan, dia pun memohon bales supaya di-sambong. Jadi masa dia hendak menyambong itu datang-lah kerumitan, datang-lah kelam kabut. Oleh kerana apa, PP-nya belum lagi mati orang sudah datang minta, empat lima. Jadi ini menyusahkan pentadbiran. Jadi pada fikiran saya untuk melichinkan pentadbiran ini lebih baik-lah di-tanya orang yang memegang PP sama ada dia hendak menyambong atau tidak PP-nya yang sudah chukup tempoh itu.

Dato' Pengerusi, saya berchakap di-atas Kepala 55. Dato' Pengerusi, kawasan saya, Langat, barangkali berlainan sedikit daripada kawasan lain. Di-kawasan saya, tanah Kerajaan telah tidak ada lagi—sudah habis, yang ada ia-lah estate, ladang² getah dan hutan simpan. Hutan simpan ada banyak di-

kawasan saya dan ada di-antara hutan simpan itu miskin dan hutan simpan lalang.

Jadi saya suka-lah mengeshorkan kepada Yang Berhormat Menteri, hutan yang miskin ini dan juga yang lalang ini yang berhampiran dengan pekan² dan yang berhampiran dengan kediaman² orang ramai patut-lah tanah ini di-beri kepada orang ramai, kerana orang ramai dan ra'ayat jelata di-kawasan saya banyak yang maseh laparkan tanah kerana di-sana tanah² Kerajaan hampir² sudah tidak ada lagi. Dan juga saya shorkan kepada Yang Berhormat Menteri tanah hutan yang miskin yang lalang dan yang paya itu patut-lah di-siasat, di-selideki dan di-chari gali kalau ada berisi bijeh. Di-kawasan saya banyak bijeh dan pelombong² di-sana dan orang² yang menchari bijeh di-sana semua-nya—hampir semua-nya—datang daripada luar—bukan datang daripada tempat saya—datang daripada luar, terutama dari Kuala Lumpur. Jadi, saya shorkan supaya hutan² yang sa-macam ini di-chari gali dan di-siasat jika di-dapati ada berisi bijeh patut-lah di-keluarkan untuk di-jadikan perusahaan perlombongan yang mana sekarang ini Pejabat Hutan bila hutan miskin, bila hutan lalang, kata-nya di-tanam baharu, tanam sa-mula, jadi cherita hendak menchari gali ini pun langsung-lah tidak dapat lagi.

Tuan Pengerusi, saya suka juga menyambong berkenaan dengan perusahaan kayu balak, perusahaan hutan simpan.

Mr Chairman: Saya suka juga hendak mengingatkan masa-nya suntok, jadi kalau boleh chepat²kan sedikit point itu.

Tuan Haji Zakaria bin Haji Mohd. Taib: Terima kasih, Tuan Pengerusi, hutan simpan di-kawasan negeri Selangor ini, terutama sa-kali dalam kawasan saya, ada banyak, ada sedikit perbedzaan yang memushkilkan hati kita ia-itu orang² kita Melayu yang ingin menchampur diri dalam perusahaan kayu balak memohon kepada Pejabat Hutan dan Pejabat Hutan ada berikan dengan di-kenakan premium hutan simpan ini satu ekar sampai \$55.00

ada pula sa-tengah chara-nya di-adakan tender kepada pemohon² orang Melayu ini kerana hendak mengusahakan kerja kayu balak di-adakan tender² di-antara mereka, dan ini sangat-lah menyusahkan. Tetapi yang menghairankan kita pemodal² yang ada mempunyai ranchangan kilang papan telah di-untokkan hutan yang banyak beribu² ekar dengan hanya mengenakan premium \$1.00 satu ekar sahaja, jadi berapa-lah besar bezanya. Mereka yang mempunyai modal² yang besar di-beri hutan yang beribu² ekar. Di-kawasan saya itu sa-lagi ayer sungai itu mengalir, mula daripada Ulu Kenaboi ayer sungai mengalir hingga sampai ka-Sungai Ulu Langat, Sungai Semenyeh sa-panjang sungai mengalir itu sudah di-untokkan kepada sa-orang pemodal dengan hanya \$1.00 satu ekar di-kenakan premium, tetapi kepada bumiputra chuba-lah Ahli² Yang Berhormat memohon tanah hutan untuk kerja kayu balak, terutama sa-kali orang Melayu, di-kenakan \$55.00 sa-ekar. Jadi ini tidak hairan-lah Kalau sa-kira-nya orang kita selalu patah hati, tombang harapan, untuk bekerja kayu balak ini.

Tuan Pengerusi, yang akhir sa-kali saya suka berchakap dalam perkara S. 51 ia-itu berkenaan dengan Undang² Kawalan Sewa Tanah, Undang² Enactment No. 9, 4/1955. Saya suka menarek perhatian Yang Berhormat Menteri supaya apa-lah kira-nya dapat mengetatkan Undang² Sewa Kawalan Tanah ini supaya dapat-lah kita memelihara petani² yang menyewa tanah daripada tuan² tanah dan daripada tuan² tanah yang tidak bertimbang rasa dan dapat-lah kita memelihara dan menjaga mereka² yang menyewa tanah itu dan undang² ini patut-lah di-kekatkan lagi untuk memberi faedah kepada petani² yang menyewa. Sekian-lah, terima kaseh.

Tan Sri Syed Ja'afar bin Hasan Albar (Johor Tenggara): Tuan Pengerusi, saya ada satu dua yang saya ingin sebutkan dalam membincangkan perbelanjaan bagi Kementerian Tanah dan Galian. Subject atau perkara yang amat menarek hati dalam masa yang kebelakangan ini ia-lah soal fragmentation atau pun menchaing²kan estet² besar. Barangkali ramai juga daripada

Ahli Dewan ini yang telah menyebutkan perkara ini, dan saya di-sini tidak bermaksud hendak mengulang hujah² atau alasan² yang telah di-berikan oleh Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang lain berkaitan dengan penchaingan atau fragmentation estet² itu. Daripada hujah² atau pun alasan² yang di-berikan oleh Ahli² Dewan ini menentang fragmentation nampak-nya ia-lah kerana dengan berlaku-nya fragmentation itu maka pekerja² dalam ladang itu akan menghadapi kesusahan dan kerumitan sebab di-buang kerja. Ini-lah alasan yang besar yang di-kemukakan oleh penentang² fragmentation ini, tetapi saya sendiri, Tuan Pengerusi, tidak menentang fragmentation ini pada zat-nya, sebab pada saya fragmentation ini satu usaha yang baik ia-itu untuk menghanchorkan monopoli yang ada dalam negeri ini. Kita ketahui banyak estet² dalam negeri ini di-monopoli oleh satu dua kampeni yang besar², bukan pula kampeni yang di-tubuhkan dalam negeri ini. Jadi apa salah-nya estet² yang ada itu di-beli dan di-ferekmentasehkan dan di-chaing²kan supaya lebeh banyak tangan yang mempunyai hak milek atas estet² yang tadi-nya di-monopoli oleh satu dua kampeni sahaja. Saya hanya akan bersetuju dengan orang² yang menentang fragmentation ini dari segi kerana pekerja² di-estet yang menemui nasib fragmentation itu akan terbuang, tetapi ini bukan-lah dengan menganjorkan kepada Kerajaan supaya menahan fragmentation malah kewajiban kita dalam Dewan ini meminta Kerajaan membuat satu chara dan peratoran supaya pekerja² dalam estet², dalam ladang² yang menemui fragmentation itu supaya di-pelihara dan di-kawal dan di-jaga jangan sampai bertempiaran tidak ada kerja dan ini saya perchaya dapat di-usahakan dan dapat di-ikhtiarkan dan di-chari jalan bagaimana estet² yang hendak di-chaing²kan itu atau di-ferekmenteshenkan itu supaya di-untokkan sa-bahagian daripada-nya umpama-nya untuk labourers yang bekerja di-situ. Kita berbelanja bermilion² ringgit untuk F.L.D.A. untuk hendak memberi tanah kepada orang yang tidak bertanah, mengapa, umpama-nya, kita tidak boleh mengambil sedikit daripada

peruntukan kepada F.L.D.A. dan digunakan wang itu untuk membeli sahagian daripada estet yang di-fereksmenteshen itu dan portion atau bahagian itu di-serahkan kepada pekerja² dengan menubuhkan management-nya yang chergas, yang efficient. Dengan jalan ini labourers, pekerja² estet, bukan sahaja mendapat kerja, tetapi mendapat tanah juga, dan orang² yang tidak biasa pernah memilik 5 atau 10 ekar, atau 20 ekar daripada tanah estet dapat peluang memiliki 10-20 ekar daripada estet yang sudah di-fereksmenteshen itu. Jadi saya fikir menentang fragmentation pada zat-nya itu tidak kena jalan-nya, tidak kena pada saya, fasal saya boleh di-katakan mempunyai sikap against monopoli.

Jadi saya harap supaya Kerajaan apakala menimbangkan pandangan² dan perhatian² yang di-berikan oleh Ahli² Dewan ini menentang fragmentation supaya menimbangkan, supaya fragmentation ini tidak di-larang, tetapi di-kemas dan di-ator, di-susun, supaya tidak membahayakan kedudukan pekerja² yang ada dalam ladang itu.

Ini satu, Tuan Pengerusi, lagi satu perkara yang saya ingin menarek perhatian Yang Berhormat Menteri yang berkenaan ia-lah berkenaan dengan mengexport kayu² balak daripada negeri ini. Saya tahu bahawa Kerajaan mengenakan sharat² yang sukar, ketat dan payah untuk mengexport kayu² keluar negeri. Apakala saya sebutkan keluar negeri ma'ana-nya bukan ka-Singapura, sebab ka-Singapura sunggo pun negeri itu negeri luar dan negeri asing daripada kita pada hari ini sabagai hasil daripada perpisahan, tetapi kita boleh export balak kita berapa ribu lori pun sa-hari asal ada dengan tidak ada sekatan, dengan tidak ada tegahan, dan tidak ada sharat² yang menyusahkan kerja ini.

Saya, Tuan Pengerusi, bingung memikirkan perkara ini, boleh jadi Kerajaan ada mempunyai alasan² yang baik untuk menghalalkan perbuatannya itu, tetapi pada saya, walau bagaimana pun, alasan² itu saya tidak dapat hendak menelan-nya. Kalau hendak larang balak² kita

daripada keluar negeri, larang kesemua sa-kali jangan membenarkan balak² kita di-hantar ka-luar negeri termasuk ka-Singapura. Kita ada mempunyai dua keuntongan yang besar. Awal pertama perniaga yang menghantar barang itu akan mendapat harga yang lebih baik untuk barang-nya, untuk balak-nya—satu, dan yang nombor dua kita akan dapat foreign exchange untuk negeri kita. Di-hantar ka-Singapura, foreign exchange apa yang hendak dapat? Saya tidak mengerti. Barangkali Kerajaan akan memberi jawapan atas perkara ini mengatakan bahawa kalau kita benarkan pengiriman kayu balak keluar negeri dengan begitu senang dan mudah, boleh jadi kita akan menghadapi kekurangan kayu dalam tanah ayer kita sendiri. Kalau ini-lah hujah-nya, kalau ini-lah alasan Kerajaan, saya fikir perkara ini dapat di-ator dan dapat di-atasi dengan mengambil tahu berapa banyak pengeluaran kayu yang di-keluarkan tiap² bulan daripada negeri kita ini dan berapa banyak consumption yang ada di-pakai dalam negeri kita ini, lebih-nya biar-lah keluar. Kita dapat harga yang lebih baik dan kita boleh dapat foreign exchange untuk negeri kita. Jadi saya fikir dan saya berharap daripada sahabat saya Menteri Yang Berhormat supaya menimbangkan dua perkara ini. Soal yang pertama berkenaan dengan fragmentation dan soal yang kedua berkenaan dengan pengiriman kayu² balak keluar negeri, bukan ka-Singapura dan ini saya fikir Yang Berhormat Menteri yang berkenaan akan memberikan timbangan yang sa-wajar-nya khususnya nisbah perniaga² Melayu yang baharu chuba bertateh², hendak berniaga di-dalam kayu balak ini, dapatlah bimbingan, dapatlah dokongan, dapatlah sokongan daripada Kerajaan. Sekian.

Tuan Mohamed Daud bin Abdul Samad (Besut): Tuan Pengerusi, saya ingin berchakap sedikit dalam S. 50, Butiran (19), muka surat 477 ia-itu berhubung dengan perkara Kajibumi Malaysia Timor, ia-itu Sarawak.

Tuan Pengerusi, apa kenyataan yang ada di-sini pada tahun 1966 ada tiga

orang Pegawai Kajibumi Bahagian (A) dan peruntokan-nya sa-banyak \$34,955 dan pada tahun ini di-kurangkan, tinggal dua orang sahaja dengan perbelanjaan sa-banyak \$22,650. Saya ingin mendapat penjelasan, Tuan Pengerusi, pada sa-tengah² perkara di-kurangkan pegawai itu ada baik-nya, tetapi kepada pegawai kajibumi ini bila di-kurangkan, saya di-fahamkan tidak baik, sebab pengalaman telah menunjukkan bahawa pembukaan tanah bagi satu² negeri, atau pun satu² kawasan itu telah menjadi satu syarat hendak-lah lebeh dahulu pehak kajibumi ini mengakui bahawa di-kawasan itu sudah tidak ada isi bumi yang boleh di-buka untuk menambahkan hasil, atau pun perusahaan saperti bijeh.

Tuan Pengerusi, saya tidak tahu-lah kalau mithal-nya di-Sarawak ini pehak Kerajaan Pusat tidak berchadang hendak membuka tanah dengan sa-luas²-nya, atau pun sa-banyak²-nya. Sapatut-nya mengikut fahaman saya bukan di-kurangkan, tetapi hendak-lah di-tambah daripada tiga itu kepada empat atau pun lima yang akan lebeh chepat pehak Kerajaan mengetahui bahawa di-seluruh negeri Sarawak itu ada mempunyai bijeh, atau pun isi² bumi yang lain yang boleh mengeluarkan hasil.

Tuan Pengerusi, dengan chepat-nya dapat di-ketahui isi bumi dan kalau ada-nya bahan², atau pun isi bumi yang baharu, maka akan dapat menambahkan hasil di-Sarawak dan boleh pula menolong Kerajaan Malaysia ini membanyakkan hasil. Dengan demikian, Tuan Pengerusi, maka tidak-lah pehak Kerajaan dari satu masa kasatu masa hanya menaikkan chukai atau pun hasil yang telah ada, tetapi dapat-lah pula menambahkan hasil dan chukai.

Tuan Pengerusi, saya berpindah pula ka-muka surat 486, Pechahan 9—Pampasan kerana Kerosakan Charigalian. Tuan Pengerusi, di-sini juga saya ingin mendapat penjelasan ada token vote sa-banyak \$10 jadi ganti rugi kerosakan ini Kerajaan akan beri kepada siapa? Sebab, kita fahamkan bahawa orang yang mendapat pros-

pecting permit ini ada-lah terdiri daripada orang² yang berada. Jadi kalau selalu-nya amalan pehak Kerajaan memberi ganti-rugi atau pun memberi pertolongan kepada orang² yang telah berada, maka makin renggang-lah jurang di-antara pehak yang tidak berada dengan pehak yang berada. Sedangkan berkali² di-dalam Rumah yang mulia ini kita diperdengarkan bahawa pehak Kerajaan hendak merapatkan di-antara gulungan yang tidak berada dengan gulungan yang berada. Ini juga, Tuan Pengerusi, saya ingin mendapat penjelasan daripada pehak Menteri Tanah dan Galian.

Sa-lain daripada itu, Tuan Pengerusi, saya suka menyentuh S. 52, muka surat 484, ia-lah Inspector of Mines, ia-itu biasa-nya sa-saorang yang mendapat prospecting permit, maka pehak Inspector of Mines ini-lah yang akan mengesahkan sama ada di-kawasan yang mereka dapat itu ada mempunyai isi yang chukup yang membolehkan pehak orang yang mendapat prospecting permit itu menjalankan pekerjaannya. Dan bagitu juga soal percentage bagi bijeh timah, atau pun bijeh besi dan lain²-nya. Jadi yang menjadi satu tanda-tanya kepada orang² yang mendapat prospecting permit ini, Tuan Pengerusi, yang pertama-nya orang Melayu yang baharu bertateh atau pun belajar hendak chuba melombong ini, banyak sangat kalau orang² Melayu yang mendapat prospecting permit ini, pehak Inspector of Mines ini mengatakan bahawa di-kawasan itu tidak chukup bijeh, tidak chukup percentage-nya—jadi ini-lah yang menjadi masalah dan tanda-tanya kepada mereka itu. Dan saya harap kalau tidak menjadi satu halangan atau galangan, pehak Kerajaan mengadakan satu jawatan-kuasa kecil, mithal-nya, terdiri daripada tiga orang yang pakar atau pun ahli bahagian mengetahui banyak sedikit-nya isi bumi itu dan percentage bagi kawasan itu, atau pun satu² tempat yang pehak orang itu mendapat prospecting permit ini. Dengan demikian, saya perchaya-lah dapat-lah pehak orang² yang mendapat prospecting permit ini merasa lebeh puas hati oleh kerana kawasan atau

pun isi bumi yang mereka dapat prospecting permit itu di-adili, di-halusi dan di-siasat oleh tiga orang pakar atau pun orang yang mempunyai pengalaman dalam bahagian itu.

Tuan Pengerusi, akhir-nya saya suka sentoh S. 55, muka surat 494—Ketua Pemelihara Hutan. Tuan Pengerusi, wakil daripada Kuala Trengganu Utara sa-kejap tadi menyeru bahawa hendaklah di-kaji sa-mula soal hutan simpanan ini. Saya juga bersetuju dengan apa yang di-serukan-nya itu, dan apa yang saya berchakap dan ingin mendapatkan tahu, sa-kira-nya pehak Menteri Tanah dan Galian ini ketahuī, bahawa di-Kemaman, Trengganu, ada satu badan perusahaan daripada perbadanan negeri Trengganu, nama-nya PUSAKA yang telah menjalankan perusahaan kayu balak atau pun kayu-kayan disana. Dan baharu² ini kita telah membacha dalam surat khabar, bahawa pehak perbadanan perusahaan kayu balak ini menyatakan bahawa perusahaan mereka tidak mendapat sambutan daripada pehak orang ramai. Apa yang saya ingin, supaya pehak Menteri ini menerangkan kalau pehak Yang Berhormat Menteri ketahuī kedudukan yang sa-benar-nya.

Di-sa'at² yang akhir ini, Tuan Pengerusi, perbadanan kayu balak itu telah dengan sa-chara senyap² bertukar menjadi satu kawasan menanam kelapa sawit. Jadi kalau macham ini-lah, Tuan Pengerusi, selalu di-pesongkan tujuan awal, sedangkan pehak perbadanan itu menerangkan bahawa badan ini ada-lah satu perusahaan yang baik, hendak-lah kita anak negeri Trengganu atau orang Melayu membuat sambutan, tetapi ta'dan-lah kita fahamkan kedudukan perbadanan itu, maka telah di-pusingkan atau di-tukar menjadi kebun kelapa sawit. Ini saya harap dapat keterangan, sama ada benar atau pun tidak, Tuan Pengerusi. Sekian, terima kaseh.

Tuan Mohd. Tahir bin Abdul Majid (Kuala Langat): Terima kaseh, Dato' Pengerusi. Saya hendak menyentoh didalam perkara S. 51. Sa-bagai mana rakan² sejawat saya tadi yang telah menyentoh di-dalam pemecahan

ladang² yang besar², saya juga sa-pendapat dengan Ahli daripada Kota Star Selatan dan Johor Tenggara, tetapi apa yang saya hendak sampaikan kepada Menteri yang berkenaan ia-lah perlaksanaan pemecahan itu supaya di-awasi dengan sa-benar² awasan. Sebab di-dalam pemikiran saya, pemecahan² ladang² ini bagi pehak yang telah mendapat ladang itu terlebih awal dan terlalu lama, dan boleh jadi juga mereka ini sudah jemu terlalu banyak telah mengumpulkan wang² di-dalam tabong-nya, maka mereka chuba mengorak langkah ka-lain² tempat untuk menggantikan tempat yang ada di-dalam negeri ini. Kebanyakan, sa-bagaimana yang telah di-katakan, peladang² ini ia-lah datang-nya daripada orang² dagang. Hasil² orang² dagang ini, sa-belum kita menerima mereka telah dapat tanah² yang di-jadikan ladang yang begitu besar, yang sa-bagitu murah dan telah mengambil hasil-nya beratus² tahun.

Jadi oleh yang demikian, di-atas jasa baik peladang² itu, yang kita minta, jika mereka sudah bosan, jika mereka sudah jemu, jika mereka sudah banyak mengumpulkan harta-benda dan kewangan, maka pulangkan sahaja-lah tanah² itu kepada Kerajaan² Negeri, supaya bukan pula Kerajaan Negeri itu akan mengambil dengan begitu sahaja, tetapi dapat-lah Kerajaan Negeri sendiri mentaksirkan berapa banyak-kah yang patut di-bayar kembali kepada peladang² perusahaan itu berdasarkan harga yang asal. Kerana kalau kita bebaskan mereka boleh menjual dan memecah ladang² itu kepada siapa juga, berma'ana ini akan dapat di-monopolikan juga oleh sa-bahagian besar pemodal² dalam negeri ini bahkan dapat kepada orang² yang kehausan tanah atau pun yang tidak mempunyai tanah sama sa-kali. Jadi chara yang saya shorkan tadi kalau Kerajaan ambil aleh dengan sumpama yang saya katakan, maka Kerajaan boleh berdasarkan bagaimana yang telah di-dasarkan oleh F.L.D.A. pada hari ini dan ini akan mencheramatkan kerja² F.L.D.A. dengan kerjasama Kerajaan Negeri daripada kewangan² perbelanjaan yang besar.

Dan saya rasa masa untuk mengambil, menyusun itu pun tidak begitu panjang.

Sayugia di-ingati bahawa di-dalam ladang² besar ini banyak-lah pekerja² di-dalam-nya dan kita tidak patut mesti melupakan mereka. Walau bagaimanapun, ada juga pekerja² yang datang-nya daripada orang² dagang. Tetapi kita mesti utamakan-lah kepada pekerja² di-dalam ladang itu kepada warganegara kita sendiri yang patut kita sanjong tinggi, yang patut kita beri keutamaan untuk memileki jika Kerajaan membuat ranchangan sa-bagai yang di-adakan oleh F.L.D.A. itu. Kerana pekerja² yang di-dalam ladang² yang besar ini kalau kita teliti sunggoh², mereka itu barangkali sa-suap pagi sa-suap petang tidak dapat menyimpan untuk membeli bekal hidup di-hari yang kemudian.

Perkara yang kedua, Dato' Pengerusi, saya menyentuh S. 53 ia-itu berkenaan Juru Ukur. Saya berharap kepada Menteri yang berkenaan dan kepada Ketua² Juru Ukur juga-lah kalau dapat kalau bagi pihak Kerajaan tidak dapat melaksanakan dengan sa-berapa chepat tanah² yang di-keluarkan pada hari ini di-ukur dan di-beri kepada pemilek² yang permohonan-nya telah di-perkenankan, maka saya harap Menteri² dan Ketua² Juru Ukur mengambil satu chara rundingan supaya kerja ukur ini di-serahkan kepada satu sharikat atau pun kepada satu badan untuk melaksanakan pengukoran tanah² ini supaya dapat di-laksanakan dengan segera, kerana banyak pemohon² tanah di-waktu ini hanya terletak oleh kerana pengukoran belum siap tidak chukup juru ukur—banyak perkara yang hendak di-buat. Ini saya berharap kepada Menteri yang berkenaan mengambil tindakan dengan sa-chepat mungkin.

Yang akhir sa-kali S. 55 berkenaan Perhutanan. Saya rasa saya sa-orang-lah berbedza dengan pendapat rakan sejawat tadi oleh kerana berkehendakan di-keluarkan hutan di-tebang, hutan di-beri kepada seluroh pemohon berkenaan hutan dan bijeh dan sa-bagai-nya kerana kehutanan ini banyak muslihat-nya. Kalau kita perhatikan biasa kita pergi keluar negeri, mana negeri yang tidak ada hutan langsung

kita pasti hawa-nya itu sudah lain daripada yang lain. Ini akan menyentuh kesihatan kita dan demikian juga kalau tidak ada hutan² rimba yang menahan ayer terlalu deras maka keruntuhan tanah—"erosion", "soil erosion"—akan berlaku dengan sa-berapa chepat. Dengan ini saya berharap jika Menteri yang berkenaan ada berangan² dengan sa-umpama itu, saya harap fikirkan-lah kali yang kedua untuk meninjau ka-belakang 100 atau pun sa-ribu tahun yang akan datang.

Sekian, Tuan Pengerusi.

Sitting suspended at 11.30 a.m.

Sitting resumed at 11.49 a.m.

(Mr Deputy Speaker in the Chair)

House immediately resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(Mr Deputy Speaker in the Chair)

Debate resumed.

Mr Deputy Speaker: Ahli² Yang Berhormat, saya suka mema'alumkan kepada Ahli² sakalian ia-itu saya akan beri dua orang lagi berchakap dalam bab ini dan kemudian daripada itu saya minta Menteri Yang Berkenaan menghabiskan Kementerian-nya.

Dr Lim Chong Eu (Tanjong): Mr Chairman, Sir, I have only two points to raise with regard to the Estimates for this Ministry. In prefacing my remarks, I would like to say that during the course of the debate on the Supply Bill, I have indicated my opposition to the general Supply Bill on the grounds that the Government must radically change its policies and review its policies with regard to its different Ministries, in order to make savings.

Sir, here is a wonderful example of where the Ministry, in spite of increased expenditure, finds it very difficult to control the administration of lands and mines—by virtue of the fact that we have seen so much objection from all sides of the House. However, that is no fault of the Honourable Minister, because the difficulties involved are so great.

Sir, take for example this question of fragmentation. Fragmentation has been a problem existing with us for over ten years. It was quite refreshing in one way to listen to the Honourable Member for Johor Tenggara making his outright statement that he is in favour of fragmentation. Sir, however, there is a great difference in this question of fragmentation of estates, particularly of rubber estates, which is an industry in this country and fragmentation in general. I feel, Sir, that the Honourable Minister might profitably look into the provision of the Land Code, particularly section 136, and consider either putting an Annexure to the National Land Code, or to bring out a separate Bill in relation to the National Land Code on the entire subject of fragmentation.

Sir, fragmentation can be solved. The suggestions to the solution of fragmentation of land have been put forward in several ways either by nationalisation or, the other extreme, by some kind of co-operative effort or conjoined effort on the part of the potential land buyers. However, there are certain aspects which, I think, the Ministry can control over and above the control, which is exerted by the States themselves, and I think the Minister appreciates this greatly because his control to some extent is made indirect because of the State powers contained under the Constitution. However, this subject is important because there are, I think, three aspects in such an annexure, which I will appeal to the Honourable Minister to look into.

One is that fragmentation of such estates should be defined properly, so that the size of the fragmentation should be controlled. Secondly, the economic potential of the fragmented estates must be controlled—that is to say, one could fragmentate the estates to an uneconomic size from the point of view both productivity as well as from the point of view the management of the estate. The other factor, the third factor, which is important, is how fragmentation, particularly of estates like rubber estates, which is an essential industry in the country, will affect the livelihood of the workers.

Sir, previously in the Budget for Labour, I had suggested the question of looking into the possibilities of co-operatives in the future. Sir, it is very difficult to debate the estimates because, as I said, unless the Government's policy is reviewed we have an issue where the Government has got to look into Lands and Mines, Commerce and Industry, Agriculture and Co-operatives, Labour, and even look into the question of Rural Development, because in the State of Penang, we have had two instances of attempts to solve this question of fragmentation neither of which, I think, legally or, from the point of view of Budget supply, is satisfactory.

In the first case, right from the very beginning, I think, the Honourable Minister is aware of one of the earlier pioneer methods of solving fragmentation, namely how we solved this question of Bertam Estate Division fragmentation when the State Government purchased the land but the overall return of the purchase price by the people who bought the land to the Government was too long and so the revenue accruing to the State in the long run did not pay off.

In the second instance, Sir, we have had just during the course of this Budget Session an instance where the Penang State Assembly passed a Bill whereby the Federal Government, against all the injunctions of the Minister of Finance, gave a loan to the Penang State Government for the purpose of helping a group of people living in the Brown Estate to form co-operatives to purchase the Brown Estate, so that they can retain the holdings in the Brown Estate. Sir, that type of purchase, or that type of nationalization on estate basis, is again not profitable, because it does not satisfy the requirements of production not of industry because there the prevention of fragmentation only solves the needs of the people living in the area, but does not help to advance the progress of the country nor of that particular estate itself, and the return expected in 15 years is much too high.

Sir, what I have said with regard to the necessity of revising the Land Code either by adding an annexure, or by a special law on the question of fragmentation applies in general, also in principle, to the question of mines. I believe that the Ministry has a proposal to integrate the different mining laws prevailing in the different States, and I urge the Minister as soon as possible to try and get this particular National Mining Code out, in order that we can have some uniformity in mining. We have heard different views expressed over the question of prospecting permits from different Members in this House. All that I wish to ask the Honourable Minister is that in making this new Mining Code, the Minister will look particularly into the interests of the small miners and the traditional miners, who have been for generations miners and who have now run out of land, because in this particular field I agree with the Honourable Member for Johor Tenggara in that one is against monopoly. And there is no question that the big mines are always in a position either to suppress, or oppress, and even depress the development of the small miners. And the recent suggestion, for example, made by certain members of the Mines Department in the State of Perak that mining applications, particularly for mining certificates in North Perak, will be awarded by a new system of allocation, that is to say, if there is only one applicant—this is only from what I read in the newspapers—for a mining certificate then he will get the allocation, but if there were two and the lot was rich, then some discretion will be made as to how to divide the land. Sir, that suggestion by itself is a very difficult one, because, and I am quite sure the Department of Mines will indicate that no matter how good the reading there may be, in mining there is always a risk and a gamble—that is to say, whatever the prospecting results may be when you dig down you may get nothing. So, in view of this fact, Sir, if one State comes out with an idea of how to solve the problem and another State comes out with another one, you will get a whole mess of inco-ordination and eventually the Commissioner for

Mines will be in no position to handle the differences of opinion, and I urge the Minister, therefore, as soon as possible to bring a common National Mining Code into operation.

Tuan T. Mahima Singh (Port Dickson): Mr Chairman, Sir, I shall be very brief. This Ministry, Sir, has been responsible for clearing a lot of backlog and has helped the country to a very large extent, but as Rome was not built in a day, we cannot expect any perfection in such a short period. In this connection, Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the Minister—I am speaking under Heads S. 50, S. 51 and S. 57—to the very slow response to applications in the towns to subdivisions and recession of expressed conditions. I have papers with me to show that just to do a recession of expressed conditions from agriculture to housing in certain Land Offices takes more than a year, and I am sure if the Minister were to look into the matter these things could be done very much faster.

The next thing I would like to speak, Sir, is on fragmentation. A lot of views have been expressed on this matter and I think this is a matter of national importance. I think the most important factor in fragmentation is the human factor. There are other factors—economy, production—but I would say that the human factor is the most important factor, where the livelihood of not hundreds but thousands of families is concerned, and as such I would suggest to the Ministry that a separate Department be created to make a thorough study as to the effects of this fragmentation. In my opinion, it has done more harm, and it is likely to do more harm than good. If we see the number of unemployed persons going round the towns, sleeping in the verandahs, because they can find no place to go to, you will find that most of these are the result of fragmented estates. If this fragmentation is not properly controlled in the rubber estates, it might spread to other agricultural plantations, like coconut plantations or may be, not likely, even to the oil palm plantations;

and fragmentation brings about other evils. Improvements in new planting, new way of manuring, cannot be done when the holdings are so small that the owners are not in a position to benefit by these improvements. Health facilities, educational facilities are disrupted, and as such I would strongly suggest to the Ministry that this fragmentation, as is being carried on now, should not be allowed to continue. But what I would strongly repeat, which I had said earlier, is that these workers on the estates be encouraged, be given an opportunity, to become part owners of these estates. As my Honourable friend from Johor Tenggara has suggested, we are spending millions of dollars every year to improve the country, to help rural development; I would say that a large amount of money, may be even a hundred million dollars, be put aside to help these co-operatives, which are formed not of outsiders, not of people from the towns, but of workers who are right on the estates, and they be allowed to pay these amounts by stages, which are calculated by the Ministry to be fair and which are calculated that the workers will be able to pay without undue difficulty to them. There may be cases, as one of the speakers has suggested, that certain portions of the estates might be useful for a factory—it was mentioned that in a certain estate there was land which was found to be suitable for a big factory. Well, if a few acres are taken away from that estate to put up a big factory, it will not do any harm to the estate as a unit, it will not upset the livelihood of the workers, who might be in hundreds or may be even a couple of thousands. Now, in that case, it will not do any harm to the unit, if a few acres are taken away for a big factory or the portions that are adjoining the town, if the town is expanding and if it is necessary to bring in housing, that might only take a portion of the estate, and as such I do not think that would be sufficient excuse to allow fragmentation.

The next item, Mr Chairman, Sir, is that I would like to congratulate the Ministry, and I would say also the Cabinet, in having given such impor-

tance to the Department of Aborigine Affairs. This is a very vital group of people, who are not able to do much for themselves, and it is the duty of society to bring them into better conditions of living as early as possible, and I do hope that more can be done for these people. Thank you, Sir.

Tuan Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub:
Tuan Pengerusi

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Sir, can I speak a few words?

Mr Chairman: Saya sudah beri tahu kepada Ahli² Yang Berhormat ia-itu saya benarkan dua Ahli sahaja lagi berchakap, sebab 13 Ahli sudah berchakap, jadi Menteri akan menjawab panjang dalam bab ini.

The Minister of Lands and Mines (Tuan Abdul-Rahman bin Yakub): Tuan Pengerusi, saya ingin menjawab masalaah² yang kecil dahulu yang telah di-timbulkan oleh rakan² saya. Ahli² Yang Berhormat. Pertama, masalaah course perubatan di-kampung Sungai Kuching yang telah di-bangkitkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Kuala Lipis. Ini akan di-adakan dalam tahun 1968. Sa-benar-nya dalam masa yang lepas kita telah chuba akan mengadakan course perubatan ini, bagitu juga dalam tahun 1967, tetapi pihak Treasury telah memotong perbelanjaan itu dengan sebab itu ranchangan ini terpaksa di-tanggohkan pada tahun 1968.

Masalaah jawatan doktor memanglah kita suka jika ada doktor yang sunggoh² mahu berkhidmat di-dalam Jabatan Orang Asli. Dari semenjak beberapa tahun kita telah chuba, menerusi Kementerian Kesihatan, untok mendapat doktor², tetapi dukachita-nya sa-hingga pada masa ini kita terpaksa bergantung kepada kebanyakan nya doktor² sukarela daripada luar negeri, daripada Peace Corps dan juga badan² yang lain. Ahli Yang Berhormat ada menyebutkan sa-orang doktor yang telah memberi tahu kepada beliau yang dia suka ingin hendak berkhidmat dalam jabatan ini. Saya ingin mengetahui nama doktor

itu dan jika benar dia suka berkhidmat, kita akan menimbangkan mengambil dia di-dalam Jabatan Orang Ahli.

Ahli Yang Berhormat itu juga menhadangkan dalam masaalah taksiran harta pusaka yang sekarang ini di-taksir sa-banyak \$10,000 di-naikkan kepada \$25,000 di-bawah Undang² Pembahagian Harta Kechil. Di-sini saya suka-lah memberi penerangan yang agak lanjut sadikit. Sa-benar-nya perkara ini telah di-kemukakan oleh Kementerian Ke'adilan Malaysia setelah menerima surat rayuan daripada Setia-usaha UMNO Bahagian Pahang Barat meminta supaya di-naikkan taksiran harta pusaka kechil daripada \$10,000 kepada \$25,000 dengan di-pinda Section 3 Cheraian (2) Undang² Pembahagian Harta Pusaka Kechil, 1955. Chadangan ini telah juga mendapat sokongan daripada Pemegang Amanah Raya Muflis dan Pentadbiran Pusaka Tanah Melayu. Kementerian Ke'adilan Malaysia telah menulis kepada Pesuruhjaya Tanah Negeri² Tanah Melayu dan meminta buah fikiran-nya atas chadangan menaikkan taksiran harta pusaka kepada nilai yang tersebut. Oleh kerana memandangkan perkara pembahagian harta pusaka kechil ini akan di-uruskan oleh Pejabat² Tanah Negeri, maka perkara ini telah di-kemukakan kepada Pesuruhjaya² Tanah dan Galian Negeri untuk mendapat pandangan mereka. Jawapan yang kita terima daripada kebanyakan Pesuruhjaya² Tanah dan Galian ia-lah mereka tidak bersetuju di-naikkan taksiran harta pusaka kechil daripada \$10,000 yang di-tetapkan dalam undang² sekarang kepada \$25,000 dengan alasan bahawa ini akan melibatkan banyak lagi permohonan² yang akan di-uruskan oleh Pejabat² Tanah yang maseh belum dapat menyelesaikan permohonan² yang lama kerana kekurangan kakitangan. Kerumitan bagi menyelesaikan permohonan² kuasa kechil di-Pejabat² Tanah yang menghadapi kekurangan pegawai tanah ia-lah satu daripada masaalah yang di-hadapi oleh Pejabat Tanah Negeri.

Saya suka menerangkan ia-itu taksiran harta pusaka kechil telah pun

di-naikkan daripada \$5,000 kepada \$10,000 dalam tahun 1959 sa-lepas undang² ini berjalan kuat-kuasa-nya pada tahun 1955. Oleh yang demikian, saya tidak dapat hendak menyokong chadangan wakil dari Kuala Lipis itu kerana jika di-tambah lagi maka akan bertambah banyak lagi orang yang pergi kepada Pejabat Tanah itu dan sekarang pun mereka ini tidak dapat menyelesaikan permohonan dengan sa-berapa chepat mungkin yang kita mahu, jadi kalau tambah lagi sa-makin banyak datang makin lambat-lah kerja itu.

Tuan Abdul Razak bin Hussin: Tuan Pengerusi, untok penjelasan. Sa-bagaimana surat yang di-jawab kepada Setia-usaha UMNO Bahagian Pahang Barat itu satu daripada jawatan-nya ia-lah kekurangan orang luar bandar yang mempunyai nilai harta sa-banyak \$25,000. Jadi di-sini Yang Berhormat Menteri menjawab kerana kekurangan pegawai. Jadi saya suka-lah menerangkan pada masa keadaan sekarang ini penduduk di-luar bandar telah mempunyai harta lebeh daripada \$10,000. Surat itu saya tahu kerana saya berdekatan benar dengan Setia-usaha UMNO Bahagian Pahang Barat itu.

Tuan Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub: Ini harus benar, Tuan Pengerusi, tetapi ini bukan daripada segi perinsip. Pada perinsip-nya kita bersetuju chuma masaalah melaksanakan supaya pekerjaan itu dapat di-jalankan dengan chepat. Jadi di-tingkatan ini nasihat yang saya terima daripada pegawai² sakalian, dan saya tidak ada sebab tidak akan menerima nasihat ini, ia-lah jika kita naikkan lagi lebeh banyak lagi permohonan ini akan datang ka-Pejabat² Tanah dan dalam keadaan sekarang ini jika ini di-benarkan tidaklah dapat mereka itu menjalankan tugas mereka dengan chepat saperti yang di-kehendaki oleh kita sakalian.

Satu lagi masaalah yang di-nyatakan oleh Yang Berhormat itu dan juga oleh Wakil dari Hilir Perak, kalau saya tidak salah, ia-lah tentang penyelesaian tanah negeri Kelantan yang di-biaya oleh Kerajaan Pusat. Oleh kerana soal tanah ada-lah perkara Kerajaan Negeri

kata mereka, maka mereka minta supaya ranchangan itu di-uruskan oleh Kerajaan Negeri sahaja.

Untuk menjawab-nya saya suka menerangkan ia-itu ranchangan penyelesaian tanah negeri Kelantan telah di-tubuhkan dalam negeri Kelantan dalam tahun 1956 apabila undang² penyelesaian tanah Kelantan di-luluskan oleh Majlis Meshuarat Undang² Persekutuan dalam bulan November, 1955. Maksud² ini ia-lah untuk membetulkan daftar hak milek menchatit kepentingan² menyelesaikan tuntutan² kedudukan tuan² punya dan mengeluarkan surat² milek tanah. Oleh kerana undang² ini ada-lah Undang² Persekutuan, maka pejabat ranchangan penyelesaian tanah Kelantan ada-lah sa-buah Pejabat Persekutuan, dan segala perbelanjaan di-tanggong-jawabkan oleh Kerajaan Pusat. Sebab² pejabat ini di-tubuhkan ia-lah kerana pentadbiran tanah di-negeri Kelantan itu di-dapati tidak-lah sa-bagitu sempurna dan terator, sa-bagaimana yang terdapat di-negeri² lain di-Persekutuan, umpama-nya, di-seluruh negeri Kelantan ada lebih kurang 400,000 lot² tanah, tetapi hanya sa-bilangan kecil sahaja daripada jumlah itu yang telah di-keluarkan surat² milek tanah. Tanah² yang di-duduki tidak merupakan tanah yang di-punyai oleh orang² yang mana nama mereka di-chatitkan dalam daftar hak milek di-sebabkan pertukaran milek tidak di-daftarkan dari sa-orang ka-saorang atau pun tuan² tanah yang telah mati bertahun² lama-nya tidak di-ambil kuasa dan lagi oleh kerana tanah² itu pada mula²-nya telah di-ukor dengan menggunakan chara dalam bahasa Inggeris plan table sahaja, maka ukoran itu ada-lah di-dapati tidak betul dan susah hendak menentukan kedudukan tanah itu sekarang ini, boleh di-katakan tidak ada batu² sempadan di-penjuru² tanah itu. Jika kekusutan ini tidak di-betulkan dengan segera-nya, Tuan Pengerusi, maka ada-lah di-khuatirkan oleh Kerajaan Pusat dalam tahun 1954 keadaan di-Pejabat² Tanah di-negeri Kelantan akan menjadi kuchar-kachir dan akibat-nya ada-lah di-fikirkan sangat merbahaya dari segi keamanan dan ketenteraman di-negeri Kelantan

lebih² lagi keburokan ini harus membangkitkan huru-hara pada ra'ayat di-negeri itu.

Oleh yang demikian dengan permintaan dari Kerajaan Negeri Kelantan pada masa itu, Kerajaan Persekutuan telah bersetuju memberi bantuan untuk menyelesaikan kekusutan ini dengan menubuhkan ranchangan ini mula² di-Jajahan Pasir Mas pada tahun 1956. Kerja² menyelesaikan lot² di-Jajahan Pasir Mas telah mengambil masa salama lebih kurang 4½ tahun. Sa-banyak 73,428 lot² tanah semua-nya telah di-selesaikan sa-belum pejabat ini berpindah ka-Jajahan Kota Bharu dalam bulan September tahun 1960 dan kerja menyelesaikan lot² tanah di-jajahan itu di-jangka akan memakan masa 2 tahun lagi sa-belum beraleh ka-Jajahan Tumpat pula. Bagi keseluruhan negeri Kelantan ada-lah di-jangka pekerjaan ini akan selesai dalam masa 30 tahun lagi, jika pasokan² yang bertugas sekarang berjalan sa-bagaimana biasa dan tidak di-tambah bilangan kaki-tangan-nya. Dengan sebab² saya terangkan di-sini, Tuan Pengerusi, tidak boleh di-berhentikan ranchangan yang berjalan sekarang sungguh pun segala perbelanjaan terpaksa di-tanggong oleh Kerajaan Pusat.

Perkara yang saya suka hendak memberitahu Dewan ini ia-lah kerjasama yang rapat dengan Kerajaan Negeri Kelantan ada-lah sangat² di-kehendaki oleh Kerajaan Pusat, terutama sa-kali Kementerian saya dalam perkara pendaftaran hak² milek dan pengeluaran surat² milek atas tanah² yang di-selesaikan oleh pejabat Kerajaan ini. Ketika saya melawat Kelantan beberapa bulan dahulu, saya telah membincangkan perkara ini dengan Kerajaan Negeri Kelantan. Kerja² ini hendak di-uruskan oleh Pejabat² Tanah Negeri sendiri supaya merengankan bebanan yang di-pikul oleh pejabat ini sa-lama ini oleh kerana pekerjaan ini tugas yang patut dan biasa di-buat oleh Pejabat² Tanah di-mana² negeri Persekutuan sa-hingga sa-takat ini saya belum lagi menerima jawapan daripada Kerajaan negeri Kelantan.

Mengenai negeri Perlis ranchangan ini ada-lah sa-rupa sahaja dan ranchangan penyelesaian tanah yang dijalankan di-negeri Kelantan perbezaannya hanya-lah sedikit sahaja ia-itu di-negeri Perlis sa-banyak 52,500 keping tanah yang perlu di-siasat untuk di-keluarkan hak milek baharu berbanding dengan 400,000 lot² tanah di-negeri Kelantan. Dan lagi ukuran di-atas lot² tanah di-Perlis ada-lah di-dapati tidak banyak perselisihan dengan ukuran yang lama dahulu. Sunggoh pun ranchangan ini di-mulakan pada tahun 1960 akan tetapi oleh kerana tidak ada undang² mentadbirkan ranchangan itu maka pekerjaan ini telah tersekat di-sebabkan tidak ada tegahan jual beli dalam masa penyelesaian dijalankan dan hak² milek maseh di-gunakan oleh Pejabat Tanah Kangar.

Dengan ada-nya undang² yang diluluskan oleh Dewan Undangan Negeri Perlis pada akhir tahun 1966, kerja² penyelesaian akan dapat di-chepatkan lagi dan ranchangan ini di-jangka boleh di-tamatkan dalam tempoh tiga tahun lagi.

Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Hilir Perak juga telah menyentoh dalam masaalah kekurangan Kerajaan Negeri Perak mengeluarkan surat² milek untuk menggantikan tanah² yang di-benarkan dengan lesen menduduki sementara. Saya suka menerangkan di-sini, Tuan Pengerusi, ia-itu menurut Fasal 65 kalau saya ta' salah, menurut Fasal 65—Temporary Occupation Licence ini chuma di-beri mengenai State land, atau pun mining land not for the time being used for the purpose of mining atau pun reserve land not for the time being used for the purpose for which it was reserved,—ma'ana-nya orang ini di-beri kebenaran untuk sementara sahaja menggunakan tanah itu. Ini bukan-lah bererti jikalau sa-orang itu memohon tanah untuk menanam getah dan lain² barang yang lebeh kurang tetap, maka mereka akan di-beri Temporary Occupation Licence—tidak. Jadi oleh kerana nama Temporary Occupation Licence itu menerangkan maka tidak-lah ada pertukaran daripada licence ini kepada title yang tetap. Jikalau sa-saorang

yang menduduki tanah dengan chara T.O.L. ini mahu tanah itu di-pegang dengan chara title, terpaksa-lah mereka itu menghantar permohonan untuk mendapatkan geran atau pun lease saperti mereka yang lain juga.

Jadi saya berhadap dapat-lah penjelasan ini di-beri oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat itu kepada pendudok² di-tempat-nya, ia-itu bagi mereka yang mahukan title yang biasa, terpaksa-lah mereka menghantar permohonan sa-chara biasa mengikut undang² kepada Kerajaan Negeri hendak-lah diberitahu juga bahawa bukan bererti bila sa-saorang itu mendapat T.O.L. sa-telah dua tahun, tiga tahun dengan sa-chara automatic, mereka akan mendapat title kepada tanah yang telah digunakan mereka itu.

Masaalah Mergastua, Tuan Pengerusi, Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Kuala Lipis telah bertanya kenapa anggaran \$300 tahun yang lepas telah di-turunkan kepada \$200 untuk penyelenggaraan burung dan binatang yang di-tangkap. Saya suka menjelaskan ini, kerana kita hendak menjimatkan belanja yang Treasury telah memotong permohonan Kementerian saya daripada \$300 kepada \$200. Saya suka juga menerangkan di-sini, ia-itu bukan sa-ekor sahaja rusa yang ada di-Taman Negara sekarang ini; sekarang ini ada dua, sa-ekor anak dan rusa ini bukan di-tangkap, tetapi telah diselamatkan dalam tangkapan harimau. Benar-lah kata Ahli Yang Berhormat itu rusa ini sangat jinak, tidak lari daripada manusia, jikalau kita menghampiri-nya. Sa-benar-nya pejabat ini tidak ada ranchangan untuk menangkap binatang² yang buas yang lain² untuk menjinakkan binatang² ini; dan saya akan terangkan policy dalam perkara ini.

Concept Taman Negara, Tuan Pengerusi, ia-lah untuk membiarkan mergastua² dan tumbohan²-nya hidup saperti sedia kala, atau pun natural state tanpa gangguan daripada manusia. Sa-suatu Taman Negara ditubuhkan untuk pemeliharaan, atau pun conservation dan preservation segala jenis kejadian alam termasuk

gunong-ganang, binatang, burung, ikan dan tumbohan² di-mana taman itu terletak. Ini akan membolehkan ahli² science mengadakan kajian² tentang ekologi, kajian tumbohan, sociology dan lain² perkara di-sakeliling taman itu yang belum di-sentuh oleh manusia lagi.

Taman Negara juga ada-lah tempat untuk ra'ayat negara ini dan pelan-chong² dari luar negeri saperti yang di-sebutkan oleh Yang Berhormat itu menekmati keindahan alam di-situ dan tempat mereka untuk menghabiskan masa dalam suasana aman dan tenteram berbanding dengan kesebukan di-kota². Jadi concept-nya berlainan daripada concept zoo di-mana binatang² itu di-tangkap dan di-simpan untuk di-lihat oleh manusia.

Mengenai masaalah gambar² binatang dan burung² liar yang patut di-pertunjukkan di-Kuala Tahan untuk faedah pelan-chong, saya suka menerangkan Jabatan Mergastua sekarang sedang mengumpulkan gambar² saperti yang di-sebutkan itu untuk di-pertunjukkan di-tempat yang tersebut. Jikalau Yang Berhormat wakil tersebut melawat Kuala Tahan sa-kali lagi Yang Berhormat itu akan dapat melihat gambar² itu.

Pada akhir tahun ini, tahun yang lepas tadi, Jabatan ini mungkin dapat pula menjual post-card² yang menunjukkan binatang² liar daripada taman tersebut. Saya sendiri, Tuan Pengerusi, telah melihat taman ini dan memang mempunyai satu potentiality yang besar bagi pelan-chong² daripada luar negeri dan sa-benar-nya ada kerjasama yang rapat di-antara Kementerian Per-usahaan dan Perdagangan dan Kementerian saya dalam masaalah Taman Negara ini.

Yang Berhormat daripada Kuala Trengganu Hulu, kalau saya tidak salah, telah membangkitkan masaalah bayaran menyukat tanah. Di-sini saya suka menerangkan sa-benar-nya upah ukor bagi sa-keping tanah Kerajaan, atau pun State land bagi agriculture yang ta' lebeh daripada tiga ekar luas-nya ia-lah \$45. Untuk wet padi ia-lah

\$2 sa-ekar. Pesurohjaya Tanah dan Galian Negeri boleh mengurangkan bayaran upah ukor. Ini jikalau di-fikirkan-nya patut sa-banyak dua pertiga daripada angka yang tersebut di atas dan juga upah ukor bagi pechahan tanah, kerana dua lot ia-lah \$125 bagi tiap² lot ia-itu \$150 bagi dua lot. Principle yang di-gunakan dalam menentukan bayaran ini, Tuan Pengerusi, ia-lah berapa banyak kerja yang terpaksa di-jalankan oleh pegawai² yang berkenaan, bukan erti-nya berapa harga tanah itu. Jadi itu-lah concept principle yang telah di-gunakan sa-lama ini.

Dalam masaalah hutan pula—forest reserve, atau pun hutan simpan, sa-benar-nya kuasa menentukan sama ada hutan simpan itu patut di-keluarkan untuk di-beri kepada ra'ayat, atau pun untuk di-gunakan dalam per-usahaan kayu balak, ada-lah di-dalam kuasa Kerajaan Negeri. Dengan hal yang demikian, maka bukan-lah terletak dalam tangan pegawai² daripada Pejabat Hutan yang menentukan, atau pun mengambil keputusan yang muk-tamad sama ada satu hutan simpan itu patut di-keluarkan, atau pun di-excise. Jadi tuduhan, atau pun kata² daripada Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Kuala Trengganu Hilir, kalau saya tidak salah, supaya pegawai² ini jangan-lah mengikut tekanan politik²—itu tidak begitu tepat. Jikalau pun ada tekanan politik, tekanan politik itu ada-lah dikenakan kepada Ahli² Exco bukan kepada pegawai². Pegawai² di-bawah jabatan ini chuma memberi nasihat kepada Kerajaan Negeri daripada segi fahaman technical knowledge mereka dan daripada segi policy-nya terserah kepada Kerajaan Negeri untuk menen-tukan.

Kementerian saya tidak ada berkuasa dalam perkara ini. Bagi pehak Kemen-terian saya sendiri dan juga pegawai² di-bawah Jabatan ini memang kita suka melihat pembahagian industri kayu balak ini mengeluarkan forest reserve dan lain² di-buat dengan chara terator. Jadi selalu-lah kita lihat, bahawa fahaman daripada Jabatan ini kadang² tidak di-terima atau pun tidak sa-chuchok dengan polisi Kerajaan

Negeri. Bila berlaku-nya keadaan demikian, maka keputusan Kerajaan Negeri itu akan di-ikut kerana di-bawah Perlembagaan kita, kuasa ini ada-lah di-dalam tangan mereka sendiri, bukan di-dalam tangan kita.

Ada juga Ahli Yang Berhormat berchakap yang memberi kesimpulan ia itu hutan² simpan ini harus tidak mempunyai guna. Jawapan telah di-beri oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Kuala Langat dengan tepat kepada masalah ini—hutan ini mempunyai kegunaan yang besar, satu industri yang nombor tiga di-dalam negeri kita ini. Ini, orang² kita tidak begitu faham—nampak hutan ini, apa ada guna hutan ini; elok tanah ini di-beri kepada ra'ayat semua—hutan ini ta' ada harga. Tetapi sa-balek-nya jika hutan di-dalam negeri kita ini kita beri kepada semua ra'ayat dan kayu itu kita potong, kita keluarkan balak dengan tidak ada pengawalan lagi, maka negara kita akan rosak—bukan sahaja kita akan kekurangan kayu di-dalam negeri ini, tetapi juga masaalah banjir, masaalah tanah akan rosak, ya'ani ada erosion, sa-terus-nya akan berlaku. Jadi itu-lah sebab daripada segi Jabatan Hutan, kita suka melihat Kerajaan Negeri sakalian menjalankan polisi mereka dengan terator, memandang bukan sahaja daripada tiap² negeri itu sendiri, tetapi juga daripada kepentingan seluruh negara kita di-sini.

Masaalah expot kayu balak, memang telah menjadi polisi Kerajaan kita daripada lama tidak menggalakkan export² kayu balak. Dahulu, beberapa jenis kayu balak kita benarkan expot, mithal-nya, meranti puteh, mersawa dan sa-terus-nya yang tidak di-gunakan oleh pehak sawmill² (kilang² papan) tetapi apabila kita telah ada plywood factory dan sa-terus-nya yang menggunakan jenis² kayu ini, daripada bulan enam tahun yang lepas kita tidak membenarkan expot² kayu ini. Tetapi dengan keadaan yang sekarang, negeri Kelantan berjanji hendak memberi 300,000 ekar lebih kepada Timber Mines dan lagi tanah² lain lagi yang akan di-beri kepada kompeni² yang lain, harus juga dalam negeri kita sekarang mempunyai surplus logs atau pun kayu balak yang berlebehan dari-

pada yang di-kehendaki di-dalam negara. Jadi di-dalam keadaan yang sekarang ini, jika perkara begitu berbangkit, maka untuk menyekatkan pengeluaran kayu ini kepada Singapura akan merosakkan perusahaan ini dalam negeri kita sendiri.

Saya faham maksud Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Johor Tenggara tadi yang mengatakan tidak ada nampak lojik-nya kesimpulan chakap-nya, kita tidak benarkan expot kepada negeri yang lain, tetapi kita benarkan expot kepada Singapura, sa-buah negeri yang asing juga sama saperti negeri yang lain. Jawapan yang dapat saya beri, oleh kerana Singapura itu rapat sangat kepada kita dan juga telah menjadi kebiasaan negara kita dahulu tidak menyekatkan expot kayu² balak ka-Singapura, maka di-tingkat ini belum ada lagi chadangan kita hendak menyekatkan pengeluaran expot kayu balak ka-Singapura. Bagaimana pun, di-dalam polisi yang baharu ini tadi mengenai chukai 10% bagi tiap² kayu balak yang di-expot, itu kita kenakan kepada semua expot sama ada kepada Singapura atau pun kepada negeri yang lain.

Kementerian saya bersama dengan Kementerian yang lain, mithal-nya Kementerian Perdagangan dan Perusahaan, ada satu jawatan-kuasa yang terdiri daripada pegawai² yang mengkaji masaalah ini dan repot ini sedang di-tunggu masa ini. Dan juga kita akan mengadakan satu interim National Forest Policy, masa ini masaalah itu maseh lagi ada di-dalam tangan Perbendaharaan dan sa-telah Land Capability Classification itu siap, kelak kita akan mengadakan satu National Forest Policy yang tetap.

Bagi membantu pembalak² Melayu yang kechil, memang-lah menjadi azam Kerajaan sa-bagaimana yang di-sebutkan daripada satu masa ka-satu masa supaya orang² bumiputra dalam negeri ini mendapat bahagian di-dalam perusahaan dan industri saperti kayu balak dan juga industri² yang lain. Saya rasa, bila saya nampak statistics yang di-keluarkan oleh Kerajaan² Negeri dalam dua tiga tahun yang lepas, ada kemajuan di-dalam lapangan

ini membantu bumiputra² sakalian supaya berusaha dalam kayu balak ini.

Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Besut telah bertanya apa yang telah terjadi kapada Ranchangan Kayu Balak yang di-jalankan oleh Kompeni PESAKA di-Kemaman, Trengganu—Kenapa, tannya beliau, berlaku ranchangan yang asal supaya bumiputra masuk dalam industri kayu balak ini, sekarang telah di-pusing kapada ranchangan menanam kelapa sawit? Ini menunjokkan bahawa Ahli Yang Berhormat itu sendiri tidak tahu ranchangan yang di-jalankan oleh Kerajaan negeri Trengganu sendiri, menerusi State Economic Development Co-operation. Sa-benarnya ranchangan ini dua—kayu dahulu, kemudian sa-telah hutan itu di-rimba, di-potong, tanah itu berseih, tanah itu di-tanam dengan kelapa sawit. Ini dia ranchangan dua yang di-buat oleh Kerajaan negeri Trengganu yang tidak di-buat di-negeri Kelantan. Jika mereka buat

Tuan Mohd. Daud bin Abdul Samad:

Tuan Pengerusi, saya minta penjelasan lagi. Ada-kah perbadanan perusahaan kayu balak ini sa-kadar-nya hendak mengusahakan kayu² kerana hendak buat kebun kelapa sawit itu sahaja, erti-nya tidak hendak jalan terus perusahaan kayu balak itu kalau tidak ada kawasan kebun kelapa sawit.

Tuan Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub:

Mereka akan terus menjalankan perusahaan² kayu balak ini jikalau ada hutan lagi dapat di-berikan kapada mereka. Ranchangan ini ranchangan dua. Jadi merupakan satu polisi yang dinamis, satu polisi yang mempunyai jangka panjang, yang Kerajaan PAS ta' buat ini di-negeri Kelantan.

Dalam masalaah perkara² yang lain, Tuan Pengerusi, yang telah banyak dibangkitkan oleh Ahli² Yang Berhormat, saya telah mengambil chatitan, dan saya menguchapkan ribuan terima kaseh kapada mereka. Jika saya ta' sempat menjawab perkara² itu pada pagi ini, jikalau perkara itu perlu menghendaki jawapan daripada saya, saya akan menghantar jawapan dengan chara bertulis.

Chuma dua perkara yang besar yang akan saya sentoh di-sini, sa-belum saya berhenti, Tuan Pengerusi, ia-lah masalaah integrasi orang² asli. Memang-lah menjadi dasar Kerajaan kita daripada dahulu lagi, supaya orang asli ini di-integrasi dengan masharakat² yang lain di-dalam negara kita. Seruan daripada Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Lipis supaya kita menentukan satu tarikh bilamana mereka ini tidak lagi di-panggil orang asli. Perosess integrasi, Tuan Pengerusi, satu perosess yang tidak dapat hendak kita paksakan, kerana ini satu social perosess yang mesti mengambil masa, bergantong kapada perkembangan atau pun kemajuan pelajaran dan kemajuan ekonomi orang asli ini sendiri. Perkataan orang asli itu tidak-lah dapat di-samakan dengan perkataan Red Indian di-dalam Amerika. Perkataan ini sungguh pun kita tidak dapati dalam bahasa kebangsaan, dalam Perlembagaan kita ada di-sebutkan dalam fasal ta'arif-nya "Aborigines". Jadi sa-benar-nya, bagi saya menyebutkan orang asli ini orang asli, tidak mendatangkan perasaan pada sa-orang ini rendah daripada mereka yang lain, tidak mempunyai taraf yang sama daripada mereka yang lain. Dan juga mereka² ini sendiri yang telah saya jumpa, lebeh suka mereka ini di-panggil ketika ini dengan nama orang asli. Mereka bangga, kerana dengan nama itu mereka rasa banyak hak² istemewa yang mereka dapati daripada ranchangan² yang kita jalankan, yang harus mereka rasa, akan tidak di-beri oleh Kerajaan jikalau mereka tidak di-panggil orang asli. Jikalau tidak orang asli, maka harus kita memanggil dengan nama² asal yang lain, dan mereka ini tidak begitu suka sekarang ini di-panggil dengan nama² itu. Jadi usaha² Kerajaan untuk mengintegrasikan orang² asli ini dengan masharakat² dalam Malaysia ini, akan dapat saya nyatakan dengan lebeh lagi apabila kita membina-ranchangan Pembangunan. Untuk maksud di-sini sahaja, saya suka-lah menerangkan, semenjak tahun 1955 kita telah mengadakan ranchangan kilat untuk mengubah nasib yang sangat burok di-kalangan mereka ini di-berapa tempat. Rumah untuk

mereka itu, pada tahun 1965 ranchangan kilat telah membuat 55 unit, pada tahun 1966 180 unit, lebih daripada tiga kali ganda. Ini merupakan satu usaha yang positif untuk memberikan kehidupan dan harapan yang baharu kepada mereka ini. Kemudian pula Fiston ada 35, sekolah sekarang ini ada 74, kebanyakan-nya di-buat daripada kontrekter² dahulu, sekarang di-buat di-bawah ranchangan kilat, Medical Post-nya atau Post Perubatan-nya sekarang ada 140 dan semua-nya di-jaga oleh pegawai² yang terdiri daripada orang asli sendiri.

Sa-lain daripada itu kita telah memberi 300 ekor kerbau, 1,000 ekor kambing dan juga ayam² pun banyak lagi telah kita berikan kepada mereka ini. Jika kita pergi ka-Ayer Baning, kita akan nampak bagaimana usaha Kerajaan Perikatan, Kerajaan Pusat, membelanjakan tiap² tahun menerusi Ranchangan Pembangunan Negara dan Luar Bandar untuk membantu orang² asli ini. Kalau saya tidak salah, dalam bulan 4 atau pun bulan lima yang akan datang ini, Yang Teramat Mulia Tengku Perdana Menteri akan pergi merasmikan pembukaan kampung ini. Saya telah meminta kepada Yang Teramat Mulia Tengku itu, khabarnya Yang Teramat Mulia Tengku telah bersetuju untuk membuka kampung itu.

Jadi erti-nya kita bukan-lah berjalan senang hati dengan perjalanan yang telah di-lakukan empat, lima, enam tahun dahulu. Sekarang dalam tiga empat tahun tempoh begitu hebat kita jalankan untuk membantu mereka itu siapa lagi yang akan membantu. Ketika British dahulu mereka telah tidak dapat kemudahan² yang patut di-beri kepada mereka. Sekarang kita telah merdeka, mereka ini warganegara Malaysia sendiri sama taraf-nya dengan kita, mempunyai undi sama dengan kita maka bagi saudara kita tinggal kebelakang kita yang maju patut memberi bantuan.

Masaalah subdivision of estate, Tuan Pengerusi, Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Bungsar telah membacha kepada Dewan ini tadi satu faham daripada sa-orang peguam mengenai tarif Section

135 dan Section 136, yang konon-nya tidak dapat mengawal pemecahan tanah. Sa-pintas lalu saya bacha legal opinion, comment saya, orang yang memberi legal opinion ini telah tidak mengkaji section itu dengan chara mendalam. Section 136 sendiri berkata sa-lain daripada apa yang telah di-terangkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat itu "No Sub-division shall be approved by the State Commissioner or as the case may be, the Collector, unless the following conditions are satisfied. banyak syarat² nya. Dan satu syarat yang saya suka mengambil perhatian Ahli Yang Berhormat itu ia-lah "without prejudice to the generality of paragraph (b) above, if the case falls within any direction in that behalf given by the State Authority, that the subdivision has the consent of any body or authority specified in, or appointed by, the direction." Jadi dalam faham saya, Tuan Pengerusi, kuasa yang di-beri oleh National Land Code ini kepada Kerajaan Negeri boleh mengawal jika di-gunakan dengan chara yang bijaksana masaalah yang berlaku sekarang ini dalam segi pemecahan estate.

Oleh kerana Ahli Yang Berhormat itu telah menggunakan bahasa Ingeris dalam perbahathan-nya, elok-lah saya supaya senang mengerti menjawab segala kata²-nya dalam bahasa Ingeris juga dan saya suka mengambil kesempatan di-sini untuk menjawab beberapa pandangan² dan tuduhan² yang telah di-buat oleh National Union of Plantation Workers, Setia-usaha Agong-nya P. P. Narayanan.

Mr Chairman, Sir, according to this legal opinion, the last paragraph says or asks the question: "Is the Minister pulling wool over our eyes?" Here is a piece of special pleading designed to gloss over the truth. My submission, Mr Chairman, Sir, is that if anyone is pulling wool over anybody's eyes, it is the Secretary-General of the N.U.P.W. who is pulling the wool over the workers' eyes. He submits, Mr Chairman, Sir, that sub-division of estates necessarily means that all the labourers will be dismissed and that the quality of the rubber will go down.

These two points may or may not be true. It is not necessarily correct to say that if sub-division is effected, all the labourers will be retrenched. The trees will be there; the rubber estates will have to be managed whether big or small. That is one point. Another point is that in this country, Mr Chairman, Sir, 50% of the estates are called estates—large holdings, and another 50% are smallholders but according to the Minister of Commerce and Industry 85% of our rubber is first-class quality. Why? Because the R.R.I. has one service, which is called “The Small Estate Advisory Service” which assists the smallholders. On top of that we have set up a number of groups of processing centres in Malaya here channelled through MARA. Also, the latex is sold to some big companies. Then further the contention by the Secretary-General of the National Union of Plantation Workers is not fully accurate and to that extent, I said that he is really pulling wool over the workers’ eyes. He is also pulling the wool over the workers’ eyes when he said several days ago, Mr Chairman, Sir, that the Government was notoriously complacent over the problem of sub-division of estates. To that I replied that the Government had not been notoriously complacent. Well, in fact, in the same breath, in his own speech, the National Union of Plantation Workers admits that the Government has been considering this matter and taking steps, in order to control sub-division of estates. I read the full text of his speech as reported in the *Eastern Sun*. First, he said, referring to the Mentri Besars:

“The recent trend in sub-division of estates has concerned many places in authority. This is a good sign for the health of the nation. The Mentri Besar of Selangor, Y.B. Dato’ Harun bin Haji Idris, urged the Central Government on 11th December, 1966, to take strong measures to stop sub-division, as he rightly pointed out that sub-division causes great harm to the nation’s economy. He also pointed out that there was no reason to sub-divide estates, etc.”

The Secretary-General of the N.U.P.W. also quoted the Mentri Besar of Perak, the Mentri Besar of Negri Sembilan, His Royal Highness the Sultan of Selangor, and so forth and came to the

conclusion that people in authority now are greatly concerned with this problem—but earlier on, he said the authorities have been notoriously complacent. Again, I say that he is pulling wool over the workers’ eyes. He went on to say that voices were also heard in the *Dewan Ra’ayat* as well as in the Perak Legislative Assembly regarding sub-division. His one allegation, Mr Chairman, Sir, which I would like to rebut here, is that the State Governments have been urging the Federal Government to introduce legislation, administrative measures, stop fragmentation, control sub-division, and so forth.

The picture for me, Sir, for the Federal Government, seems to be black, as if we are not interested in the welfare of the workers. The truth is just the reverse. In fact, the Ministry of Lands and Mines has to remind so many State Governments about the provisions of Sections 135 and 136. I have got in this file all the letters that we wrote to the State Governments, “Appoint your committee and control sub-division.” The Mentri Besar of Selangor after his first statement had to qualify his statement again, a few days afterwards, by saying, “We have already appointed a committee to control this sub-division, and as a result of that statement, Mr Chairman, Sir, the Secretary-General of the N.U.P.W. agreed with me a few days ago that the situation in Selangor was moving for the better.

The Mentri Besar of Selangor, the Mentri Besar of Perak, and the Mentri Besar of Negeri Sembilan made statements in no uncertain terms—and I got all the statements in the file here—that, “if it is going to affect the economy of the country, we will not allow sub-division.” Where did they get the authority from if not from sections 135 and 136?

The President of the N.U.P.W. also made statements accusing the Government of not taking adequate steps, not providing in the National Land Code provisions to stop this fragmentation, or sub-division of estates. To that I would say, “Why was he dumb in the Senate, why did he not suggest an

amendment to section 136 in the Senate, when the National Land Code Bill was debated? Why did he just keep quiet? I explained at great length the National Land Code and the irony of this is what I pointed this out, Mr Chairman, Sir, to the Secretary General of the N.U.P.W. I asked my Secretary to do it on the 17th February, 1967.

Sir, there are many other allegations, one of which says that so many estates have been sub-divided in 1966. The moment I read this thing in the papers, I asked my Secretary to get in touch with the States concerned and from the information that I got so far no application for sub-division has been received or approved by Perak, Selangor, or Negeri Sembilan in 1966. Before that—1965, 1964—the National Land Code had not come into operation.

The Union has also said that the provision in the National Land Code does not apply to other States but only applies to Johore. Again, whoever advises him on that legal matter is wrong—sections 135 and 136 apply to all the States of Malaya.

Now, be that as it may, Mr Chairman, Sir, when I met the Secretary-General of the N.U.P.W. at the birthday party, Sri Taman, two nights ago, we agreed after his protest meeting on the 26th, he would present to me and to the Minister of Labour a memorandum setting out the suggestions by the N.U.P.W. on how to tackle this problem of sub-division of estates, and I promised that both the Minister of Labour and myself would be very willing to hear those views from the Union and then if the views merit action, if any action should be taken, in order to help, or remedy any defects of any bad consequences, undesirable consequences as a result of such sub-division, we will not hesitate to take immediate action. However, I would like to stress here that land is essentially a State matter and, therefore, one cannot expect the Ministry of Lands and Mines of the Federal Government to take steps overnight. We have got to go to the National Land Council, we have got to prepare a paper to be sent to all

State Governments, and the State Governments have to discuss the matter in the State Executive Council, before we can discuss the thing in the National Land Council.

There is one final point that I would like to mention, Mr Chairman, Sir. The National Union of Plantation Workers also said that the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister in 1963 made press statements in this connection, and I would like to read in full the statement, unlike the Secretary-General of the N.U.P.W., who only quoted that bit of the statement which suits his purpose.

“The Deputy Prime Minister Tun Razak announced today that workers misplaced as a result of the fragmentation of the estates would be considered for Land Schemes under the Rural Development Plan. Tun Razak gave this assurance when he met the Joint Delegation from the N.U.P.W. and the All-Malayan Estates Staff Union. He said: ‘I am prepared to consider the case of workers affected by sub-division of estates for land schemes under the Rural Development Plan. In fact I think we already have such schemes for them and it is not quite right to say that Government has rejected the majority of the report in the sub-division of estates.’”

This is the point which have been constantly made by the Secretary-General of the N.U.P.W., namely, the Government rejected the majority report and, therefore, did not practice democracy. In fact, the truth is not that, Sir. We have not rejected the whole of the majority report but rather we have accepted most of it; only on one point we have disagreed, namely, we did not consider it in 1963, because at that stage it was necessary to introduce legislation on the same lines as the Ceylon Legislation.

“Tun Razak went on to say that in fact we had accepted most of the recommendations in the report except that we do not agree, that we should pass a legislation similar to that in Ceylon, to control the sub-division of estates. Frankly at this stage I do not think it is necessary for us to take such drastic steps as in Ceylon. What we need in this country is not to pass new laws, but to bring about certain amendments to existing legislation. We may need to add new provisions to the National Land Code. Furthermore we may enhance the powers of labour and health officers to deal with the labour problem.”

The promise by the Federal Government to incorporate special provisions

dealing with sub-division of the Land Code has been implemented in the form of Section 135 and Section 136.

Finally, I am not saying that we are complacent. The Ministry of Lands and Mines, the Ministry of Labour, the Prime Minister's Department, the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, we have got people watching this thing—in fact, only a few days ago there was a meeting. When we receive a report from the Ministry of Labour as to the effects of certain proposals to sub-divide land, for example, then a meeting will be convened immediately to see what steps can be done, in order to control sub-division that might have had consequences, bad effects on the economy of the country. Thank you, Mr Chairman, Sir.

Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$484,752 for Head S. 50, the sum of \$642,429 for Head S. 51, the sum of \$1,338,911 for Head S. 52, the sum of \$14,093,182 for Head S. 53, the sum of \$1,165,633 for Head S. 54, the sum of \$1,813,069 for Head S. 55, the sum of \$253,424 for Head S. 56, and the sum of \$2,205,402 for Head S. 57 ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

House resumed.

(Mr Deputy Speaker in the Chair)

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: Meshuarat ini di-tanggohkan hingga pukul 4.00 petang ini.

Sitting suspended at 1.00 p.m.

House resumed at 4.00 p.m.

(Mr Deputy Speaker in the Chair)

THE SUPPLY (1967) BILL

The House immediately resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(Mr Deputy Speaker in the Chair)

SCHEDULE

Debate resumed.

Heads S. 58, S. 59 and S. 60—

Dr Lim Swee Ann: Mr Chairman, Sir, with your permission, I would take

Head S. 58, Ministry of Local Government and Housing—\$467,654, Head S. 59—Town and Country Planning—\$442,306, and Head S. 60—Fire Services—\$224,667.

Under Head S. 58, the Personal Emoluments show an increase of three new posts, namely, one Assistant Secretary, one General Clerical Service and one typist. These posts have been approved specifically by the Treasury to do the necessary ground work and assist a special Committee to examine thoroughly the Housing Development (Control and Licensing) Act, 1966, to draw up rules and regulations, all with a view to early implementation and enforcement of the Act.

The Commission of Enquiry to investigate into the working of Local Authorities—Honourable Members will note that the provision is only for three months, since at the time of preparation of the Ministry's Estimates, it was anticipated that the Commission would be able to submit its report by the first quarter of the year. It has now been made known by the Commission that its report will probably be completed some time in the middle of this year. It will, therefore, be necessary to apply for supplementary provision during the course of the year.

Under O.C.A.R., except for Sub-heads 2 and 7, the provisions required are the same as those for 1966. The increase of \$1,293 under Sub-head 2 is to service the post of the new Assistant Secretary and other administrative expenses. A small increase of \$100 is required for Sub-head 7 mainly to meet the increase in water bill resulting from the increase in the rate of water charges the rate has increased from 60 cents to \$1 per thousand gallons.

Under O.C.S.E., there is a decrease of \$71,445 mainly from Sub-head 9 and Sub-head 13. A decrease of \$50,000 in respect of Sub-head 9, Development of Minor Works in Local Council Areas, is in keeping with Government's intention to cut down expenditure. A reduction of about \$20,000 is shown against Sub-head 13,

Expenses of Commission of Enquiry to investigate into the Working of Local Authorities, because provision is not being made for a full year. Sub-head 8 shows a provision of \$2,000. This amount is required for the purchase and replacement of office furniture, when the Ministry moves to a new building at Tanglin some time this year.

As regards Sub-head 10, a token provision of \$10 is made for the proposed housing survey. The purpose of the survey is to collect data on overcrowding, slums, existence of squatters, existing stock of buildings and other information so as to give the Ministry some direction in planning its housing activities and also locating housing schemes in appropriate areas. It is not possible to carry out the survey because of other priorities, but it is hoped that something can be done later in the year.

Two sub-heads have been created with a token provision of \$10 each for Expenses of Experts (Sub-head 11) and Training Expenses for Local Government Courses (Sub-head 12). This Ministry is seeking the services of two experts in the field of housing and housing development. As other details have still to be worked out, only a token provision can be entered against Sub-head 11. With regard to the other new Sub-head 12, the Ministry proposes to conduct training courses on Local Government for Senior Officers, Chairman and Councillors of Local Authorities in the States of Malaya. An exact amount has not been entered as the nature and frequency of this course has yet to be determined.

Honourable Members will observe that expenditure for the Ministry in 1967 is less than that for 1966 by \$63,750.

Under Head S. 59, Town and Country Planning, Personal Emoluments show one new post of Senior Assistant Commissioner of Town and Country Planning has been created. The Senior Assistant Commissioner will be required to supervise the work of the three Assistant Commissioners in

charge of actual land use planning both in urban and rural areas. Under the supervision of the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner, the Senior Assistant Commissioner's function will be to guide them on national policies and at the same time deal with immediate problems of importance. He will also be responsible for new town work. A new item (24) has been created to meet Special Allowances to Division IV Officers approved by Government. On the whole there is an increase of \$47,354 under Personal Emoluments.

Under O.C.A.R. there is an increase of \$10,000 in Sub-head 2 and this amount is required for renting of office accommodation for use of the Department of Town and Country Planning until such time as the new building is completed some time this year. An increase of \$1,560 under Sub head 3 is also required for the payment of allowances to an additional Technical Apprentice who is filling the vacancy of one of the Technical Assistants who has proceeded to the United Kingdom on a Federal Scholarship.

Under O.C.S.E. the provision of \$1,750 in Sub-head 8 is required for the purchase of additional office equipment.

The overall provision for the Department shows an increase of \$61,664 over that for 1966.

Under Head S. 60, Fire Services, there is an increase of one post of Instructor in Item (16). The additional post is required as a result of the already expanded training activities and intake of students at the Central Fire Training School. A large number of Industrial concerns have shown considerable interest in having their staff trained in fire fighting and fire protection with a view to make them competent to handle fire fighting equipment installed in their factories. This is to be encouraged as it keeps fire losses down and hence minimises destruction of national assets. These additional activities have imposed a severe strain on the existing staff and therefore the additional post of Instructor is considered reasonable.

Under O.C.A.R., an increase of \$2,700 is shown and out of this sum \$450 is required to meet the estimated increase in the consumption of light, power and water at the School. The rest is required to pay the increased wages of 2 Gardeners and 10 Labourers at the School, and other increased incidental expenses.

Under O.C.S.E., provision of \$14,000 is entered at Sub-head 7. This provision is to purchase two trailer pumps required for the Central Fire Training School to replace two existing ones which are 12 years old and no longer economical to maintain.

Under Sub-head 8, \$13,000 is required to purchase two vans to replace two existing ones which are more than 10 years old and also not economic to maintain.

Under Sub-head 9, a provision of \$780 is made for the purchase of two new typewriters to replace two existing ones which are 8 years old.

Sir, I beg to move.

Tuan Quek Kai Dong (Seremban Timor): Mr Chairman, Sir, I would like to refer to Head S. 58, Sub-head 10, Housing Survey on page 508, in which there is a token vote of \$10.

Mr Chairman, Sir, I am shocked to learn that although the Ministry has grand design to build houses, it has only earmarked a pitiful sum of \$10 for housing survey. This goes to show that the Ministry is not taking the housing survey seriously.

Mr Chairman, Sir, the whole country is now aware of the evils of the Rent Control Ordinance which has created far too many devils among the landlords and landladies, some of them hope to be millionaires overnight, and some others hope to be near millionaires to-morrow morning.

Mr Chairman, Sir, I am sure the Honourable Minister of Local Government and Housing is aware of the hue and cry of the people in this country because of these devils among the landlords and landladies. I hope the

Honourable Minister will look into this problem seriously. I understand many of the landlords have sent out notices to increase the rental ranging from a few hundred to one thousand per cent. It seems to me that there is a race among some of the landlords to be millionaires and I am sure the Honourable Minister will not allow these people to get away with it. As elected representatives of the people, we owe a special duty to our people. If the laws are unjust, they must be amended without fear or favour. I do not want to hear excuses that the poor man affected by the Rent Control Ordinance can appeal to the Tribunals set up.

Mr Chairman, Sir, Tribunals are good things under certain circumstances. In this case those affected by the Rent Control Ordinance are small men and it is impossible for them to fight a long legal battle with the landlords.

The Government must do everything possible to safeguard the interests and well-being of the small men. This token vote of \$10 is certainly not enough. If we are to spend money for a good cause, the Honourable Minister cannot only expect my sympathy but my wholehearted support. But when money is spent on things which bring no results, instead trouble and hardship for the people as in the case of the Rent Control Ordinance, it will only generate opposition by all concerned.

I, therefore, propose that the Rent Control Ordinance should be amended so that owners are allowed to increase their rent up to the extent of the annual value of the house or by a fair percentage of the existing rent provided that the increase should be the lower of the two methods.

Thank you, Mr Chairman, Sir.

Dato' Haji Mustapha bin Haji Abdul Jabar (Sabak Bernam): Tuan Pengerusi, saya bersama menyokong Rang Anggaran bagi Kementerian Kerajaan Tempatan dan Perumahan yang dibentangkan di-hadapan kita pada petang ini. Di-samping itu juga saya suka memberi satu dua perkara yang saya fikirkan mustahak untuk memberi

tegoran, kalau² memberi munafa'at dan membena kapada kebajikan Kementerian ini.

Tuan Pengerusi, yang pertama-nya saya hendak berchakap di-dalam muka 507 ia-itu di-bawah Pentadbiran Kementerian Kerajaan Tempatan dan Perumahan. Saya agak berasa tidak begitu puas hati berhubung chara keutamaan bagi mendirikan rumah² murah yang di-buat oleh Kementerian ini, kerana saya dapat tahu beberapa tempat dan pekan² yang besar yang belum lagi dapat di-adakan rumah murah walau pun tempat itu di-fikirkan mustahak, mithal-nya di-pekan Klang, Kajang dan begitu juga di-Sabak Bernam, tetapi malang-nya, Tuan Pengerusi, saya dapat tahu ada beberapa pekan yang kechil², mithal-nya, di-Kelompang, Batang Kali, Batang Berjuntai. Ini saya rasa merupakan satu pekan yang kechil, jadi bagaimanakah agak-nya pekan ini boleh mendapat keutamaan lebeh dahulu daripada pekan² yang besar, sedangkan tujuan kita hendak mendirikan rumah murah ini ada-lah untuk mengatasi kawasan² sesak untuk memberi pertolongan kapada penduduk² yang ramai di-dalam pekan² itu.

Yang kedua, Tuan Pengerusi, saya suka membawa satu pandangan bagi kawasan Majlis Tempatan ia-itu satu Majlis Tempatan yang saya fikirkan sangat² ganjil keadaan-nya kalau dibandingkan di-dalam Majlis² Tempatan barangkali di-seluruh negeri Selangor ini ia-itu Majlis Tempatan Sungai Ayer Tawar di-Sabak Bernam ia-itu di-kampong saya Majlis Tempatan ini telah di-tubuhkan mulai daripada tahun 1957 hingga-lah tahun ini—tahun 1967 ya'ani 10 tahun telah di-tubuhkan Majlis Tempatan itu, tetapi malang-nya hingga-lah pada hari ini jalan di-dalam Majlis Tempatan itu tidak ada langsung. Kalau waktu musim hujan maka terpaksa-lah orang² yang akan datang ka-pekan itu meninggalkan basikal-nya di-luar daripada Majlis Bandaran dan berjalan kaki. Ini perkara yang sangat² ganjil dan pelek walau pun tempat saya, saya tidak-lah berasa malu untuk menyampaikan kapada Yang Berhormat Men-

teri ini supaya dapat satu tindakan yang sa-wajar-nya untuk ke'adilan kapada semua Majlis Tempatan yang ada di-seluruh Tanah Melayu ini.

Tuan Lim Pee Hung (Alor Star): Mr Chairman, Sir, I would like to speak on Supply Head 58, Sub-head 10—Housing Survey, in which there is a token vote of \$10. Sir, this vote is far from adequate for the officers of the Ministry in carrying out any housing survey, particularly as recent events have proved.

With regard to the Rent Control Ordinance, I am sure the Honourable Minister must be very disturbed by some of the actions of the landlords in raising rents of dwelling and shop houses. I am sure the Honourable Minister must be spending many sleepless nights, as a result of this problem, and I myself would like to extend my heartfelt sympathy to him.

Mr Chairman, Sir, the Rent Control Ordinance has brought about utter confusion and frustration to our people, especially the poorer classes, who are renting houses. This Ordinance is a greater shock than any of the new taxes introduced by the Honourable Minister of Finance so far, because this legislation has affected the livelihood of the masses, and I am sure that this unpopular legislation is the work of those who work against the interests of the people, the Alliance Party, and the Government. Whoever thought of this legislation and hoped to introduce it in this country should be subjected to investigation to ascertain their motives. It seems to me that the introduction of this Ordinance has not benefited anyone—perhaps, only the many lawyers in this country. I am told that lawyers of good standing are themselves shocked by the carelessness of those responsible for introducing this Ordinance.

This Ordinance does not stipulate what is a "fair rent", or where the ceiling rate should be. So, the whole thing on the question of rent is left open to exploitation by some crocodiles among the landlords (*Laughter*), and I

hope the Honourable Minister will act immediately to curb some of the crocodiles, who are exploiting the situation to the extent of raising rents as much as 1000 per cent in some cases. I hope the Honourable Minister will review the whole Bill and modify it, where necessary, so that some form of restrictions may be imposed to protect the interests of the tenants from being exploited. Thank you.

Tuan Tan Toh Hong (Bukit Bintang): Mr Chairman, Sir, I would like to speak under Supply Head S. 58 on the Rent Control Ordinance. Honourable Members would agree that this Ordinance has brought about serious ill-effects to many people. Some unscrupulous landlords have increased rentals fantastically, bringing about a sense of worry and uncertainty to many tenants of shops and dwelling houses.

Sir, one has only to visit the shops in Kuala Lumpur and in other parts of the country, to hear howls of protest from affected tenants. In Kuala Lumpur, I have heard of cases where rents have sky-rocketed to 900% or more. This I say is definitely too much. As a Member of Parliament elected by the people, I would fail in my duty if I do not voice their protests here.

Sir, one of novel aspects of the Rent Control Ordinance is the concept of "Fair Rent". Although this phrase appears to be sound superficially, an interpretation and analysis of this concept in the light of practical implementation does not take us very far.

Sir, in determining what is "fair rent" the law provide the following factors to be considered:

- (a) the location of the controlled premises in question;
- (b) the age and character of the controlled premises;
- (c) the state of repair of the controlled premises;
- (d) the type of controlled premises; and
- (e) any improvement made to the controlled premises by the tenant with the consent of the Landlord.

Sir, these factors could mean any amount of increase in rentals when translated into monetary terms. This is too vague and unscrupulous landlords have taken advantage of this to increase the rentals indiscriminately. As there is no ceiling limit to the definition of "fair rent", it has brought about a lot of social discontent and unfair exploitation.

Sir, I, for one, deeply concerned with these ill-effects, like to propose that there should be a limit, or rather, a ceiling limit to correct the social ill-effects brought about as a result of this Ordinance.

This ceiling limit should be based on an automatic formula. A new rental increase should be subjected to a ceiling limit, which is depending on whichever is the lower figure, either a 50% increase or the annual assessment value of the premise. For example, if the old rental is \$1,000 per year and the annual assessment value is \$1,300 per year, then the new rental should not be more than \$1,300.

Sir, it is only fair to say that tenants living in rent-controlled houses do not object to rents increases provided if such increases are reasonable. But they certainly object to unscrupulous exploitation by landlords who increase their rentals not according to reasonable dictates of reality, but according to their whims and fancies.

The other point I would like to bring up under Head S. 58 is about Kuala Lumpur, the Federal Capital. Amidst our prosperity and progress, it is shocking to note that the Federal Capital of Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, is gradually being turned into an unhygienic place. Sir, I wish, particularly, to refer to the problem of rubbish and refuse in Kuala Lumpur.

I am sure that many Honourable Members, who know Kuala Lumpur well, as I do personally, will agree with me that one of the ugliest sights of the Federal Capital is the growing number of uncollected heaps of rubbish, refuse and dumpings.

Sir, to my mind, it appears that these heaps of rubbish are the result of the following—

- (1) too few collections of rubbish in some areas; or
- (2) inefficiency in the methods of collection;
- (3) the failure to cart away rubbish and silt after clearing the drains; and
- (4) poor supervision.

The combined effect of these four causes is something to be seen to be believed. We can see heaps of rubbish, litters and dumpings piled behind the UMNO Building, opposite the Sikh Temple in Jalan Perkins, Jalan Haji Hussain and its surroundings, the Pudu Market, Kampong Loke Yuen, Lok Yew Road, the dumps in Kia Peng Road apposite the Municipal Swimming Pool, Bukit Bintang area, Kampong Pandan dan Kampong Bahru, particularly Jalan Watson and Jalan Hamzah. These are the areas where I have seen heaps of uncollected rubbish myself and I am sure that other Honourable Members might have seen similar heaps of rubbish in other parts of the Federal Capital.

Sir, we are all well aware of the adverse effects of uncollected rubbish on our health, for these uncollected heaps of refuse are the favourite places of common flies, which carry diseases. This factor is particularly alarming in the case of Kuala Lumpur as we all know that the town is congested.

These heaps of rubbish and refuse are such an ugly sight that it mars the status of Kuala Lumpur as the Federal Capital. We all know that the Federal Capital receives large numbers of visitors from other parts of the country and from foreign countries. Recently, the Mayor of Rotorua, New Zealand, on his visit to Kuala Lumpur, praised the administration of Kuala Lumpur. But like all other polite visitors, he did not mention the unfavourable aspects of the capital. Frankly speaking, the general untidiness of Kuala Lumpur and the heaps of rubbish, in particular, give a bad image of Kuala Lumpur.

Sir, what shocks us most is the undeniable fact that as the assessment paid by the taxpayers goes up, heaps of rubbish also pile up (*Laughter*). If we compare the figures of 1960 with those for 1965, the collection rates, assessment and market fees have almost doubled. In 1960, approximately about \$5½ million was collected, whereas in 1965 about \$11 million was collected. Similarly, the annual expenditure for the Municipal Health Department has almost doubled. Whereas it spent \$3.4 million in 1960, it spent about \$6 million in 1965. While the people are prepared to accept the high cost of living in the Federal Capital, I am sure that they have a right to see to it that they enjoy a reasonable degree of cleanliness in their environment. Sir, it is intolerable that as rates and assessments go up rubbish and refuse also pile up (*Laughter*).

Mr Speaker, Sir, as one concerned with the welfare and health of people, in this case, the people of Kuala Lumpur, I call upon the authorities concerned to take immediate measures to clear all the rubbish.

Sir, if we have any pride at all in our Federal Capital, we should make it as presentable as possible. More important, we should make it a pleasant place for all of us to live in. In this respect, there is plenty of work and no place at all for complacency.

Tuan Siow Loong Hin (Seremban Barat): Mr Chairman, Sir, I cannot help but agree with the Honourable Member the opposite side who mentioned about rubbish in the Municipality. I think there is quite a lot of rubbish too in the Town Council areas all over this country which, in spite of the increased rates and assessments, nobody seems to take any notice, and rubbish is piling up in back lanes all over the place.

However, Mr Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the estimates of the Ministry of Local Government and Housing under Head S. 58. I listened with interest to the introduction by the Honourable Minister just now, when

he mentioned, in particular, sub-head 10, regarding housing surveys. Apparently, this provision of a token vote of \$10 would make it appear that either we do not have the machinery to conduct the survey, or that we do not consider housing survey a necessity as yet. I think all of us realise that we are very much concerned with the question of shortage of housing in this country, and the need for housing survey is very urgent. I hope that the Honourable Minister will take immediate steps to set up the necessary machinery and seek the necessary funds to have a housing survey done for this country. Housing, as we know, is a great problem in this country, particularly so in all the major towns, and a housing survey is long in the offing.

Mr Chairman, Sir, the recent legislation on the Control of Rent Act was primarily meant to try and alleviate the present housing problem in this country. It is one of the factors which we have looked into last year and out of which a Rent Control law has been passed.

The Control of Rent Act, which was recently enforced, has caused, as many of the speakers have said, considerable amount of anxiety to the people of this country, especially to the tenants. This Control of Rent Act can be said to be one of the major legislation on housing and was brought about after considerable thought, but due to its many complicating aspects, it has also brought about tensions, frustrations, and anxiety to both the tenants and landlords alike.

Any law, Mr Chairman, Sir, however good its intentions may be, but which through its implementation gives rise to dissatisfaction and anxiety to the people as a whole, needs to be reviewed and re-examined. The Control of Rent Act is one of such laws. I must state that there is a need for such a law, in order that the landlord should be given a fair rent for their premises, but this does not mean that they should take undue advantage of the law so provided to the detriment of the tenants.

There are a few aspects of this law which I would like to point out and to

make an appeal to the Honourable Minister for his consideration, with a view of re-examination and a modification of the sections of the law, which are causing great difficulties to the public at large.

The first aspect is the determination of what is called a "fair rent". Since the Act was enforced in January this year, landlords have served notices through their lawyers, raising rents ranging from 100% to some 600% or 700%, and even in some cases as much as 1,000%. Although the Act has laid down under section 6 the procedure for determining a fair rent and also provided the machinery for negotiations by the setting up rent officers, rent tribunals and rent appeal boards, it will in my opinion not be able to solve the problem of how to determine a fair rent acceptable to both sides. I am sure all of us are aware that, through this procedure, it will take a considerable time before disputes are heard and such long delay will undoubtedly cause prolonged anxiety and eventual hardships on the tenants. The uncertainty of the yardstick for the increase of rent is neither satisfactory to the landlord nor for the tenants. As provided for in the Act, the decision of the Appeal Board is final and cannot be questioned in Court. Though it may be said that it is implied that such cases can be brought to Court, it can only be done at some great expense especially to the tenants, who would in most cases be unable to afford such prolonged legal action. Again, should the case be heard after some long delay by the Rent Appeal Board, would it mean that the tenants will have to pay arrears of rent dating back on the date when notices were served on them? If this is so, it will cause great hardship to the tenants not to mention the prolonged anxiety they have to undergo. Undoubtedly, Mr Chairman, Sir, this will cause great dissatisfaction to either party concerned.

I would suggest, Mr Chairman, Sir, that in order to alleviate this problem, a fixed formula be set for the increase of rent. Such a formula would avoid extensive negotiations and the determination of a fair rent could be arrived

at expeditiously. The formula could be based on a general maximum increase of 100% of existing rent, or based on the annual value of the premises whichever amount is less. This formula, if acceptable, I am sure, would create a better atmosphere and obviate any frustrations, tensions or anxiety by the people as a whole. It would also deter landlords from exploiting the tenants by not raising the rents with a view to re-possession.

The other aspect, Mr Chairman, is the amount of compensation given for vacated premises. The amount as provided in the Act—not less than two years rental and not more than four years rental—is in my opinion not quite fair to the tenants. In most rented premises at present, the cost of renovation and repairs have been borne by the tenants, owing to the fact that the landlords have not been given a fair rent. If such compensation is paid according to the rates laid down in the Act, the tenants will stand to lose. Again, some landlords are taking advantage of the Act in regard to re-possession of premises, and have not raised the rents with a view to eventual re-possessing the premises and to pay compensation on existing rental. This would undoubtedly be unfair to the tenants. I would suggest that the rates of compensation be raised for premises used for trade purposes to ten years and for dwelling purposes to five years, bearing in mind that in raising the quantum of compensation that in a number of cases the landlord is also benefited by payment of tea money for such premises. This raising of the quantum of compensation, I am sure, would not be a deterrent to development as landlords as a whole are in a better position to develop their property without undue strain on their financial position.

I am sure, Mr Chairman, Sir, that all the present unhappy state of affairs could be obviated, if the law could be modified into a much simpler form for all concerned to understand them. Though it can be said that the purpose of this law is to provide for a gradual and painless decontrol and also as a compromise between conflicting inte-

rests, it has in fact created greater conflicts and painful adjustments by both the tenants and landlords.

I would like to mention that the general public at large is very unhappy about the composition of the members of the Rent Tribunals and the Appeal Boards, as it appears that all members of such tribunals or boards are either landlords or people of means. In this case, the tenants would find it difficult to expect them to give a fair decision on the determination of a fair rent, or the amount of compensation to be given for the re-possession of premises.

Sir, I would appeal to the Honourable Minister to take immediate steps to review this Control of Rent Act, 1966, and bring about such modifications in the Act, especially in regard to two aspects mentioned, so as to obviate all unnecessary process of a protracted nature in determining a fair rent and a fair compensation.

In discussing Head S. 58, Mr Chairman, Sir, I would like to touch on the question of Town Council and Town Board by-laws. We all realise that since independence up to now, many of these by-laws of Town Councils under Caption 137 are still based on the old laws, which were enacted many years ago; and in some towns which are more progressive, I should say, action has been taken to bring about more progressive by-laws in Town Councils. Now, this sort of piecemeal standardisation of Town Council by-laws is not a very happy state of affairs, because if in one town you get a new set of by-laws, in another town you still apply the old set of by-laws, it makes it very difficult for towns progress in the same manner. May I suggest, Mr Chairman, Sir, to the Honourable Minister to consider a standardisation of by-laws for Town Councils and Town Boards all over the country which is now long overdue. In conjunction, I would say that there should also be a standardisation of building by-laws. There have been cases, like in Seremban, where the building by-laws are some 40 to 50 years old. Even today, when people want to build new buildings, they have

got to adhere to the old building by-laws. I hope the Honourable Minister would consider these two points of bringing about a standardisation of Town Councils by-laws and building by-laws in this country. Thank you, Sir.

Dr Lim Chong Eu (Tanjong): Mr Chairman, Sir, I must confess that it was very refreshing to listen to so much opposition from the backbenchers of the Alliance, particularly from the M.C.A. component of the Alliance. One thing, however, which rather struck me ironically on this side of the Opposition is that, when the Rent Control Bill was being discussed in this House and we in the Opposition took cudgels with the Government benches, these strong loud voices, which are now protesting against the implementation of the Rent Control Act, were silent, and they did absolutely nothing! And they were the people who passed the legislation against which they are now protesting! However, Sir, this is not a moment for us to try and express our own righteousness, but we welcome this fresh air of opposition. However, I do not think that this is the proper place to discuss the Rent Control Act, or amendments to the Rent Control Act, because we are discussing the Budget.

Sir, the Rent Control Act has created a lot of trouble and has created a lot of anxiety, but we in the Opposition have brought up our points at the proper level, and I do not think, Sir, apart from the Municipality of Kuala Lumpur, which is the Federal capital and, therefore, comes under Budget Control under this Ministry, we can properly in this House discuss this matter. However, Sir, I would like to suggest that, if the Members feel so strongly about this matter, as on other occasions, they could consider setting up a legal advice bureau to help the tenants.

The matter, however, that I would like to bring up to the Government, with regard to the application of the Act, is the hope that the Government will try to allay the fears and anxieties not only of the tenants but also of the

landlords by the Government making a slight amendment to the Act, or an administrative announcement with regard to the proposed Rent Control amendments by just making it known that the application of the newly adjusted fair rent, after it has gone through consultations between the tenant and landlord, through the Rent Control Officers right up to the Appeal Board, will not take place until it has been finalised by the Appeal Board or wherever it is finalised. That is to say, if there is an agreement between the tenant and the landlord, well and good, on the date of the agreement then the fair rent will apply. But if there is any challenge then it goes on right up to the Appeal Board, when the Appeal Board determines the date, then the rent will apply from that date.

The reason is that the machinery for examination of disagreements between tenants and landlords may take quite a long time, and it may be difficult, particularly for tenants, to meet any change or any hiking up of the rent, if it has to be back-dated, say a year or six months or something of that nature. However, Sir, I cannot but add that from the Opposition point of view, just as we condemn the introduction of the Rent Control Act, we now can tell you from your own backbenchers' point of view the Act has brought confusion and disaster, and I hope the Government will act upon that. The solution of this matter, as indeed with the other two points which I am going to raise first, is in the hands of the Alliance Party and Alliance backbenchers.

Before I come to that I want to touch on this provision for housing survey and the question of town planning in general and I want to apply this in particular to the question of Butterworth and Prai. Sir, this is again a matter which concerns the probable and future integration of Penang Island into the common market and the kind of conditions that we would like to see the Government fulfill, before we in the State of Penang and in the Island of Penang can come to an agreement.

From the point of view of housing surveys, Sir, we have, on many occasions, suggested that with the development of industrial sites in Province Wellesley, in Mak Mandin, and particularly in the Butterworth area, housing provisions and building of low-cost housing must be integrated with the industrial development in the area, so that workers, who have traditionally lived in the Island, can be sure of cheap, fair and good housing on the mainland before they can be persuaded to take part in the industrial development that is going to be phased in the mainland site.

From the point of view of town planning, Sir, Butterworth is today the beginning or the nucleus of probably a very important complex in the north, especially if Government fulfills its promise of opening up the East-West highway through towards Butterworth. However, up to this date, Sir, we have had no assurance from the State Government, no assurance certainly from the Butterworth Town Council, that there is any serious overall town planning and urban and rural planning for that complex, which will include Butterworth as the next big sized town development in Malaysia and, Sir, I urge the Ministry to provide sufficient impetus and encouragement, so that this town planning can be carried out and carried out effectively and quickly and publicly. Sir, I mention the word "publicly" because I believe that in the case of the Federal Capital of Kuala Lumpur—I can understand the Member for Bukit Bintang, when he talks about the heaps of rubbish piling up—it is simply because—although one understands from the press recently that there is now already a town plan for Kuala Lumpur, a master plan for Kuala Lumpur very few people really know who were responsible for this master plan, who created the master plan, and whether the master plan was subjected to any public opinion and what the master plan actually is. I think the master plan at the present moment, as far as I understand it, exists, but is on a restricted circulation and very few people really know very much about

this master plan. In the case of Butterworth-Prai complex, Sir, if the Honourable Minister sets about setting up a master plan and a town planning for this area, it should be done amongst everything else publicly.

Sir, all these matters, town planning, house surveys, Rent Control Act and so on—and indeed the question of the revision of the Municipal by-laws—had been promised us ever since independence—*Merdeka*. We had been told that the Municipal by-laws had been reviewed and the intention of bringing out a new Municipal Ordinance has been going on for well over 10 years. I think, Sir, that it is about time that we really bring it out, or at least discuss it very frankly to bring it out. All these matters, Sir, can be solved by one method, because this Ministry, Sir, provides for the Ministry of Local Government and Housing. We, in the Opposition, have suggested that in the final analysis, it is because the Government has through confrontation—admittedly that was the excuse given by the Government—suppressed local authority elections, and because of the suppression of local authorities elections we have all these troubles piling up without the people being able to express their grievances at the right time and at the proper place.

Sir, I take this opportunity, therefore, to urge the Honourable Minister to look into the possibility of re-introducing as soon as possible the suspended Local Authority elections which have been put under suspension on emergency for now over two years.

Tuan Kam Woon Wah (Sitiawan): Sir, to the Honourable Member for Tanjong, the Alliance party and the Alliance back-benchers can never do right even though they are right.

Sir, he said that when this Rent Act was presented to the House, Opposition Members objected to it, because they knew that it was no good or it could not work. But what did some of the back-benchers say? They did not say that the whole Act was bad: they only said that one or two sections of it were bad—that is the difference. In

other words, only one or two sections, such as the question of fair rent, should be modified and not the whole Act.

Sir, you have heard the complaints by the various speakers just now about the question of fair rent. In my opinion, the whole thing can be solved by a simplified procedure that is, as suggested, based on the annual value of the houses or of the holdings. We can by that remove the so-called rent officers.

Sir, I hope that the appointment of rent officers, will not be abused, because the fear now by the tenants is that the landlord can afford to approach the rent officer to jack up the price, the value, a little higher, whereas the tenant or sub-tenant cannot do it. So, therefore, on this point, the rent officer is not necessary.

Another point is that it is a very complicated procedure. How many tenants know how to go about it, and how many tenants can afford to engage lawyers to fight the landlords on this complicated procedure?

Sir, one of the intentions of the Act was to try to stop the chief tenants making money on this rental. But now the problem is, what about the sub-tenants? Yes, there is a section which says that the sub-tenants can become the tenants of the landlords—can directly become tenants—but there is a very important question. I have heard that a certain landlord has got round the chief tenants and says: "Well, if you can agree with me, we jack up the agreed rental of, say, \$100 and make it \$600 and, therefore, from the \$600, you apportion among your sub-tenants". By that method, the chief tenant can come to a private understanding with the landlord: "Well, you just pay me a few dollars and let us call it quit. So that is also a method that some unscrupulous landlords are adopting.

Sir, another thing we have to consider is the sociological problem. Sir, if the rent keeps on going up, it passes on to the tenants and sub-tenants. Now, supposing those houses in the Chinatown areas, where the sub-tenants

cannot afford to pay any more increased rental, where are they going to? Are they going to be driven to the Streets? Sir, on this point, I think the solution lies with the Government to keep on building more low-cost houses, so that the purpose of the Act will be achieved by this method and also sociologically it is also a feather in the cap of the Government.

Sir, another question is that if the rent keeps on increasing then, as I said, the danger of inflation would set in, because the tenants, or the sub-tenants, who are businessmen, very conveniently would pass on the increased rental to the business they are doing and that, by going round about, is not good to our economy. Sir, that is so far on the Rent Control Act. Now, Sir, I would like to touch on Head S. 60—Fire Services. I regret that there is no provision made for the purchase of any fire brigade for my constituency. Sir, there was a fire which destroyed 12 houses in a row in Sitiawan and I was told—I was not on the scene at that line—that we had only one dilapidated fire brigade rushing to the scene with a little old rubber hose. Sir, I was told that if the fire brigade was up to date, it could saved at least another 8 houses, instead of having all the 12 houses being burnt down. As a result, they had to call for help from as far as Kuala Kangsar, but by the time when the fire brigades arrived Sitiawan, they just said, "Good-bye, I am going back, nothing else to do, because all the houses have been burnt down". Sir, this is also urgent and I request the Honourable Minister to see to it that a new fire brigade, or whatever it is, is supplied to my constituency in case any repetition of fire may happen there again.

Tuan Ong Kee Hui (Sarawak): Mr Chairman, Sir, it has not been my intention, in fact, to participate in this debate because, fortunately or unfortunately, this Ministry has not so far extended its activities to Sarawak, and I do not think even to Sabah. Listening to what Honourable Members on the Alliance back-benches have to say on

two things (a) Rent Control Act and (b) on the general administration of the Federal Capital, I am prompted to make some observations which, I hope, will not be thought presumptuous, or taken in bad part by the Ministry concerned.

Sir, we also have a rent control Ordinance, which applies to the State of Sarawak. I do not think the present legislation on rent control about which so much has been spoken extends to Sarawak at this stage. In our case, it seems to weigh the other way round. So much of the legislation is in fact out of date that it weighs perhaps a little bit too much on the side of the tenants, and occasions have arisen where landlords not only get not an economic rent but even have to subsidise the tenants, because they do not recover even what they pay out in rates to the Local Authorities. This, of course, has from time to time prompted a lot of criticism, and time and time again, we have thought of making suitable amendments, but I am very glad, in the light of the experience in West Malaysia, we have not yet tampered with that particular Ordinance.

I think Sir, the Honourable Member opposite, who spoke before me, hits the thing on the nail, when he made the observation that this is in fact a situation brought out artificially by legislation, and the solution lies in fact in building more and more houses. That, I think, is the key to the whole thing, and I think the emphasis should be on greater activity by the Ministry in the building of more low-cost housing and doing away with an artificial condition, which is largely created as a result of the last war. I think so long as the law of supply and demand cannot operate, we get a situation where an anomaly such as those which have been cited will arise—in the case of West Malaysia where the landlords seem to have it all their own way, or in the case of East Malaysia, particularly Sarawak, the tenants seems to have it their own way and the landlords are being discouraged from further development in

this respect. Fortunately, we have not thought fit to control—rent control does not operate on houses which were built at a date I forget the actual date that was fixed by legislation. Anyhow, any house that was built subsequent to that the Rent Control Act does not operate. I think it is 1948. So much for rent control, Sir.

With regard to the state of the Federal Capital, although an outside observer, I might say I have been also struck by the remarks made by several Honourable Members and, I think, there the Honourable Member for Tanjong has the point—that in fact where you have bureaucracy and not representative Government you always get the situation, where the administrators are not so sensitive to pressure and there, I think, he is right in suggesting that the sooner representative government is restored in the Federal Capital the better it would be, because then I think you have the people being able to voice their grievances, being able to put pressure on their representatives in the Government and therefore a more efficient administration should result from such pressures.

I see here, Sir, that provision has been made for training expenses for local government courses. From our own experience in Sarawak we find this is a very valuable exercise, because we have for quite a number of years taken advantage of this and sent people abroad for training courses on local government. We have, I think, now a system of local government of which we are very justly proud. As one, who has for a long time been associated with local government, I can say that we have over the years made mistakes, but we have also gained valuable experience and anything we can do, I mean to share our experience with our experience with our sister towns in West Malaysia, I am sure we would be too happy to extend any facilities that we may have for officers concerned with local government wherever possible. I am sure that our State Minister for Local Government would be very happy, I think, although I

cannot profess to speak for him, to extend any facilities that we may have in Sarawak, and I hope my remarks would not be considered too presumptuous coming from what is generally regarded as a more backward State in Malaysia.

Tuan Tan Cheng Bee (Bagan): Mr Chairman, Sir, I must thank my Honourable friend, the Member for Tanjong, for taking so much interest in my constituency of Bagan, which includes Butterworth and Prai. I am sure, as a Member of the Legislative Assembly of Penang, he is fully aware that industrial development and State developments are the concern of the State Government, and many of development projects are kept away from the knowledge of the Local Councils. If he wants to have developments to be publicly known to the people before the project is started or launched, then it is wise for him to take this matter in the State Legislative Assembly.

Sir, I refer to Head S. 58 under the Minister for Local Government and Housing. Mr Chairman, Sir, some time last year we passed in this august House a Bill to provide for the control of developers and it has now become law, but for some reasons or other it has not been made effective—it has not been put into effect as yet. One of the reasons given for enacting that legislation was because there appears to be increasing evidence of victimisation of purchasers of these houses.

I have Sir, now in my constituency of Butterworth a developer known as the Malaysia Enterprise, who is developing the area near Mak Mandin by putting up housing schemes in Butterworth. Sir, no sooner had the advertisements gone up that they intend to put up a housing scheme, then all the houses in Phase I were all booked up, and after the agreements were signed and the deposits paid, there appears to be signs of construction work, but after a couple of months all construction, suddenly stopped, because the developer failed to meet the payment of the contractor in accordance with the agreement.

Sir, the developer then started to victimise the purchasers by demanding subsequent payments for the houses for which they have booked. All that I understand now, Sir, is that the land that is being developed is being mortgaged to a Finance Company in Taiping. The purchasers, I am told, have seen the developer, and they are being told that if they want their houses, they must pay up all the money that is due for their houses.

Sir, this is, in fact, a shock to the purchasers because when they took up the houses they were told that they could pay up a certain portion as deposits or first payment and the balance of money to be paid by instalments that could be arranged by the developer for them. The purchasers are now worried that the mortgager may foreclose the property and the purchasers would lose everything that they have paid up. As it appears, the mortgager had already threatened to foreclose the property by the end of March, because the due date for the mortgage is up to the end of March. Sir, most of these purchasers are wage-earners and small businessmen, and the deposits they have paid up are all their life savings and, Sir, if this property were to be foreclosed, I am sure it will be a dire loss to all of them. I hope, Sir, that the Minister will try to take up the matter and see if he could help these 46 purchasers, either to get back what they have paid up, or to try to get their houses that they have booked and partly paid for erected as soon as possible. Sir, I think this sort of victimisation, or in reality cheating by the developer is really going from bad to worse and I am told that this same developer started another housing scheme in Ipoh and never completed the development. I am sure, Sir, such kind of unscrupulous developers must be dealt with. If I could have my way, Sir, I would send this man to jail.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Chairman, Sir, I do not wish to be so drastic as to say, "If I have my way I would close down, or send any developer to jail". I dare not spout out such things in this august House.

Mr Chairman, Sir, I like to speak on this Rent Control Act that this House has passed last year and that has come into effect this year. Sir, hardly a day goes by without a lawyer in this country—and some of them in this House too—sending notices on behalf of landlords to the tender victims, namely, the tenants of these houses which have been under rent control in this country. Now, Mr Chairman, Sir, when we debated this Rent Control Bill last year, I was one of those who particularly wanted the Minister to give us a definition of what constitutes a fair rent, and in his wisdom the Minister then said, “You just leave it to the Government; you just trust us; don’t you worry; we will not slaughter the people, who are living in rent control houses; you just have faith in the Alliance Government.” I also warned this House, Mr Chairman, Sir, that amongst the people who will benefit most this decontrol of rent will be the lawyers of this country. They will make hay while the sun shines and sure enough, Mr Chairman, Sir, as soon as the rent control was removed on 1-1-67, what do we see? Lawyers sending out two months’ notices, three months’ notices. In one instance, Mr Chairman, Sir, I am ashamed to say that I read a notice from a Member of this House giving 10 days’ notice. He said, “Within 10 days if you don’t give me this rent, I will take proceedings to get you out of the house.” Now, Mr Chairman, Sir, the increases are not in the region of what the Minister then assured us of a fair rent. Well, as I see it, a fair rent would be how much—20%, 30%? Mr Chairman, Sir, if you multiply 20, 30, 40 by 10, you will arrive at what the landlords in this country, and what their lawyers also in this country, think constitutes a fair rent—200%, 300%, 400%, 500%.

Now, Mr Chairman, Sir, I do not understand why the Ministry of Local Government and Housing or the Department of Information does not go round the country telling the poor victims of this rapacity of both the lawyers in this country and of the landlords in this country and the capitalists in this country, that they

have nothing to fear, that they can easily throw these lawyers’ notices into the waste paper basket, where they should be, and why they do not tell the tenants in this country that there are three stages to go before the poor tenants in this country are forced or have to pay a fair rent to the landlord: namely, if a tenant disagrees to the increase in rent, the matter has to go through a rent officer, and failing to get satisfaction there, it should go through a tribunal and finally an Appeals Board.

Now, Mr Chairman, Sir, I do hope that either the Ministry of Local Government and Housing, or the Ministry of Information should forthwith go round the country telling each and every tenant in this country that they have their basic rights guaranteed under the Rent Control Act, and that they have nothing to fear from the landlords, and that they hope the rent officers who have been appointed to the Rent Tribunal which has been set up, and the Appeals Board which has been set up will see to it that a fair rent should be the rent that the tenant has to pay.

Now, Mr Chairman, Sir, this is a very serious thing, because already we hear of people wanting to vacate their premises, or people saying, “This benevolent Government has assured us of a fair rent, now there is a surtax, now there is a Development tax, and on the top of these, now there is a 500% increase in rent. How on earth can I make ends meet? Does the Government want to *menchekek* me, squeeze me to death?” And, Mr Chairman, Sir, this Bill is designed, to *menchekek* the poor tenants and feed the capitalists of this country.

Now, Mr Chairman, Sir, I also wish to touch on the appointment of two officers under this Act, namely, the Chairman of the Appeals Board, Mr R. C. Hoffman and another one, Mr Joseph Lai, on the Appeals Board. Now, Mr Chairman, Sir, it is no secret that the Minister of Local Government and Housing once belonged to the firm of Allen and Gledhill. Hence, one finds it incomprehensible to understand

why he should always be thinking of his quondam partners in practice—namely Mr R. C. Hoffman and Mr Joseph Lai—and appoint them to these responsible positions. One should see that justice must not only be done but must be seen to be done, because I am fairly certain that Allen and Gledhill also issue notices on behalf of the landlords.

Dr Lim Swee Aun: On a point of clarification—I am told they do not, Sir.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: I am very glad for this assurance that they do not. But whatever it is, Mr Chairman, Sir, it does seem unethical, to say the least, that the Minister should with singular ineptitude appoint these two persons concerned. We do hope that he will have second thoughts on this matter and withdraw these two persons, and appoint two other persons who have nothing to do with Messrs Allen and Gledhill.

The other thing, Mr Chairman, Sir, I refer to is the move by the Ministry of Local Government and Housing. The Ministry of Local Government and Housing also, in its wisdom and also with similar ineptitude, has chosen at this particular moment to increase rent of the so-called low-cost housing. I refer, Mr Chairman, Sir, also to the notices that have been going out all over Kuala Lumpur to the people, who are doing business in the ground floor of low-cost housing in Kuala Lumpur, and, perhaps, outside Kuala Lumpur as well but who have flats upstairs. Now, these people, who have premises downstairs who have flats upstairs, they have been also given notices saying that the flats upstairs also have to pay 100 per cent. increase, Mr Chairman, Sir, and this should take effect from April Fool's Day—April the 1st. Why they choose April Fool's Day I do not know, Mr Chairman, Sir. (*Laughter*). Mr Chairman, Sir, I say that this is inappropriate and inept, because it gives the poor tenants on the ground floor premises the impression that they are the people who are also connected with this removal of rent control—and also

coming at a time when they have also to pay surtax and development tax, Mr Chairman, Sir, whereas the poor barber, earning perhaps \$120 a month, has no fear of any visit from the Inland Revenue officers, now he has to pay 5 per cent. on his earnings; and, consequently, I say it is very inept of the Ministry of Local Government and Housing to ask for this increase. Fortunately, Mr Chairman, Sir, this much I will say: the officials of the Ministry of Local Government and Housing and the Officials of the Federal Advisory Board have been most helpful, when I pointed out to them this singular ineptitude of this increase at this particular moment, even assuming, Mr Chairman, Sir, that there is a case for the increase, which I doubt, because I do hope the Ministry of Local Government and Housing takes the premise that the Ministry must not make any profit out of low-cost housing. What it should do is to cover cost. I wish to emphasise, Mr Chairman, Sir, I only mentioned this, because I do hope that the Ministry in any future action of this nature, particularly with reference to increase of rent, should be a little more careful to think of the adverse effects it may have on the tenants and, in particular, of the people doing business in low-cost housing. I again wish to emphasise that the officers concerned have been most helpful when I pointed out these things to them and they have promised to have second thoughts to re-examine the position in the light of what I have told them. Thank you.

Dr Lim Swee Aun: Mr Chairman, Sir, I am indeed very encouraged to hear so many Honourable Members of this House making suggestions as to how to improve the Rent Control Ordinance. It seems to me, Sir, that we have many promising King Solomons in this House. Unfortunately, Sir, these suggestions have come rather late in the day, but as the saying goes: Better late than never.

The Rent Control (Amendment) Act was not rushed through this House, but a Working Committee, was set up to investigate into and recommend to

Government what it should do with regard to the existing Rent Control Ordinance. This Working Committee did ask for views and asked for memoranda and did consult various Chambers of Commerce and also gave an opportunity to all parties interested to give their views before the Bill was drawn up. After the Bill has been drawn up, it had to be approved by the National Council on Local Government where all the different State Governments were given the opportunity to comment and make amendments. It was only after that that the Cabinet agreed to introduce this Bill to this House where it was fully debated—and, unfortunately, Sir, if at that stage all these suggestions had been brought forward, perhaps there would not have been this so-called frustration, exploitation and victimisation.

I am very glad, Sir, that there have been constructive thinking and constructive suggestions by Honourable Members in this House in that they have stated that it would be useful both to the owners and the tenants, if there was a ceiling placed on the definition of “a fair rent”, and suggestions have been made that it should be based on either the annual value or a percentage increase. Sir, I am happy to report to this House that the Cabinet, in fact, on Saturday, on the proposal of the substantive Minister of Local Government, the Honourable Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh who, although he was sick, attended this Cabinet meeting, did suggest that there should be an amendment to this Rent Ordinance; and with Cabinet approval, which has already been given, I hope to be able to bring to this House an amendment to the Rent Control Act at this meeting of the House (*Applause*) which will put a ceiling on which a fair rent can be increased.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Chairman, Sir, on a point of clarification. The Minister must not think that the substantive Minister for Local Government and Housing or the Cabinet has to take credit for it. When we debated that Bill we in this House asked for a ceiling, the assurance was: “Don’t you worry. It is a fair rent that we passed

it.” We asked for a ceiling in terms of annual value or in terms of percentage.

Dr Lim Swee Aun: He is only saying it now because I never heard it during the debate, Sir. (*Laughter*) He is trying to claim credit now.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Look up the proceedings.

Dr Lim Swee Aun: In any case, Sir, that is the position.

On the other point raised by the Honourable Member for Seremban Barat about the question of compensation for re-possession of premises, that will also be looked into and we will see whether there is a need for an amendment of the Act.

Sir, several Members did speak on the inadequacy of the token vote of \$10 for the Housing Survey. The reason given was that a full-scale National Housing Survey will be carried out when the National Census is undertaken in 1970. However, in the meantime, pilot and sample surveys will be undertaken by the Ministry so that there will be a survey on the squatters who are living in Kuala Lumpur and other bigger towns to get useful information with regard to the planning of the building of low-cost houses. It is not that there is a low priority to it but to save money a full blown Housing Survey for the whole nation could best be made during the National Census.

The Honourable Member for Seremban Barat also suggested that Cap. 137 of the Town Boards Enactment, and also the standardisation of building by-laws, particularly the building by-laws, throughout the country should be brought up-to-date, and that piecemeal modernisation would not benefit the country. The Ministry fully agrees with this. That was why a Commission to look into the workings of Local Governments has been set up and it will be one of the functions of this Commission, which has now done a lot of work, to make recommendations as to what amendments should be made in the Town Board By-laws. A draft

Municipal Ordinance has also be prepared by the Consultative Committee of Municipal Corporations, but several improvements will still have to be made and then it will be submitted to the National Council for Local Governments before it is brought to this House.

On the question of the Kuala Lumpur Master Plan, this Plan has already been completed and is with the Ministry for study prior to presentation to the public, because the law requires that it has to be presented to the public for its inspection for a period of three months to hear any objections or amendments and this will be done very soon.

The problem of regional planning for Penang and Butterworth has already been completed. This plan has taken into consideration all the points raised in this debate here, particularly in relation to the East-West Road link and the future of the development not only of Butterworth and Penang Island but also of the coastal hinterland including Bukit Mertajam and Nebong Tebal. This regional plan has been under intensive study by the National Development Planning Committee and final discussions are at present being held with the officials of the Penang State Government. It must be fully realised that development cannot be held up or deferred until the full acceptance of this plan, but I am told that all major technical proposals of the plan are in fact being safeguard and observed during the day-to-day development and building control by the State Planning Officer of Penang in the advice he gives to the various local authorities as well as to the State Government.

Dr Lim Chong Eu (Tanjong): Does it take into consideration the bottle neck of the new Prai Road?

Dr Lim Swee Aun: It takes into consideration the whole thing. On the question of housing in Butterworth, low-cost housing should be tied up with industrial development is in fact the principle adopted, and for the information of the Honourable Mem-

ber, for the first phase of the project of Mak Mandin 240 units will be built and piling of the site for this has been commenced and at Chain Ferry Road, also the first phase, where 672 units will be built, soil investigation has been completed. Both the projects are directly related to the industrial development of the Mak Mandin industrial estate and the port development of Butterworth.

The Honourable Member for Bukit Bintang commented very adversely on the collection of rubbish in Kuala Lumpur, the Federal Capital. He claims that with the increase in assessment the rubbish also increases. Sir, I am glad that he did make the statement, because Kuala Lumpur is a growing town and because it is a growing town there is greater development, which means more and more people are concentrated here and more and more people are coming to stay here and as a result rubbish must increase (*Laughter*). But the removal of rubbish has also cost the Municipality considerable sums and I am glad that he did admit that the expenditure by the Municipality has been doubled, which means the Municipality of Kuala Lumpur has taken action to remove this rubbish. But no Municipality will always be able to keep the state of its Municipality such that there will be no rubbish at all times. Obviously there must be some rubbish at some time.

Tuan Tan Toh Hong (Bukit Bintang): Unfortunately, there has been a lot of rubbish in certain places for a long time (*Laughter*).

Dr Lim Swee Aun: In that case, I think I should appoint the Honourable Member as an honorary inspector of rubbish (*Laughter*) to help the Ministry of Local Government and Housing to put pressure on the Commissioner of Kuala Lumpur Municipality to clear the rubbish as soon as possible. However, I do take his point and this Ministry, though not directly responsible for cleaning rubbish, will take this matter up with the Kuala Lumpur Municipality. However, I would like to

draw to the attention of this House that there have been very many favourable comments. Not one but very many foreign visitors, not tourists but people who have standing in the running of local governments, have said that not only in Kuala Lumpur but, on the whole, all the towns in Malaysia are, perhaps, the cleanest in the whole of Asia. That, I think, is a credit we should not look down on, or a credit that cannot be sniffed at.

The Honourable Member for Seremban Barat also did say that there is also rubbish collecting in Seremban. Naturally, there is rubbish collecting in every town and it is the responsibility of the local government to clear that rubbish. But to say that elections to local governments should be immediately re-introduced, as suggested by the Honourable Member from Sarawak, so that the administration can be more sensitive to the criticisms and the views of the electorate cannot always be true, because the Seremban Town Council and the Penang City Council, both elected governments and both run by the Socialist Front, have been suspended because of their inefficiency. It does not mean that election always gives efficiency to the administration. However, the question of re-introducing elections in local councils will have to wait till the report of the Commission of Enquiry on Local Authorities.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon (Batu): On a point of clarification, does the Minister know that there are also Town Councils run by the Alliance Party that have also suspended? Does that mean that the rubbish there also keeps on increasing?

Dr Lim Swee Aun: I accept that. But my point is that it does not necessarily mean that you can get greater efficiency through and elected local government—that is the point.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: May I seek a further clarification? Does that mean that the burden of the thesis of the Honourable Acting Minister for Local Government and Housing is that since elected officials to run local authorities

do not mean increased efficiency, that he, for one would advocate that we should do away with the democratic process?

Dr Lim Swee Aun: Not at all, I do not propose that in any way. I am just pointing out to the Honourable Member from Sarawak that his argument that by having an elected local council you can clear the rubbish faster and that there would not be any accumulation of rubbish is something which I do not think is correct.

Tuan Ong Kee Hui (Sarawak): On a point of clarification, would the Honourable Minister not admit the point I made, that an elected government is more sensitive to public pressure than a bureaucracy?

Dr Lim Swee Aun: Of course, I do but it is the question of clearing rubbish that is under discussion, Sir. *(Laughter)*.

Dr Lim Chong Eu: On a point of clarification—I think the City of George Town had always held a pride of place as far as rubbish elimination is concerned, and I do not think the closing down or suspension of the City Council of George Town was due to inefficiency. I think the reasons given by the Government as to why it was suspended was not due to inefficiency but for some other factor.

Dr Lim Swee Aun: I accept that. There are reasons besides inefficiency *(Laughter)*.

The Honourable for Sitiawan has suggested that the Minister of Local Government and Housing should buy him a fire brigade to stop fires in his place. Sir, the point is that fire brigades come under State and the supply of fire engines comes out of the State Government's votes. However, this Ministry will take the matter up with the State Government.

The Honourable Member for Sabak Bernam has complained that towns around his constituency like Sabak Bernam, Kajang and Klang were not given priority with regard to low-cost houses whereas other smaller towns were given priorities. Sir, I would like

to inform this House that priorities for low-cost housing are accorded on the basis of submissions by the State Governments, which are in a better position to assess the housing needs of their respective States and their respective Districts.

With regard to his other suggestion that roads should be built at the Local Council area of Sungei Ayer Tawar, I certainly agree with him, but then, again that is a State matter and not a matter for the Ministry of Local Government and Housing.

Sir, I think I have covered practically all the major points, and I, therefore, beg to move the estimates be approved. (*Applause*).

Question put, and agreed to.

The sums of—

\$467,654 for Head S. 58;

\$442,306 for Head S. 59; and

\$224,667 for Head S. 60

ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Mr Chairman: Meshuarat ini ditangguhkan sa-lama lima-belas minit.

Sitting suspended at 5.44 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 6.00 p.m.

Mr Deputy Speaker in the Chair

House resumed at 6.00 p.m.

(Mr Deputy Speaker in the Chair)

House immediately resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(Mr Deputy Speaker in the Chair)

Head S. 61—

Menteri Muda Pembangunan Negara dan Luar Bandar (Tuan Sulaiman bin Bulon): Tuan Pengerusi, saya minta kebenaran mengemukakan Kepala Perbelanjaan 61 bagi Kementerian Pembangunan Negara dan Luar Bandar.

Ahli² Yang Berhormat sedia ma'alum ia-itu bagi tahun 1967, jumlah perbelanjaan di-bawah Kepala tersebut ia-lah sa-banyak \$10,552,250. Jumlah ini ada-lah menunjukkan kekurangan sa-banyak \$817,344 daripada perbelan-

jaan bagi tahun yang lalu. Kekurangan perbelanjaan ini ada-lah di-sebabkan oleh kekurangan perbelanjaan mengenai Penempatan Pengumpulan samula di-Negeri² Malaysia Timor, oleh kerana, dengan izin Tuhan, konfrantasi Indonesia sudah tamat. Kekurangan ini juga ada-lah di-buat menurut dasar Kerajaan untuk berjimat chermat dengan bersungguh².

Sa-bagaimana Ahli² Yang Berhormat sedia ma'alum, Kementerian saya senentiasa menjalankan usaha² Pembangunan Negara dan Luar Bandar terutama sa-kali untuk memperbaiki dan meninggikan taraf hidup ra'ayat di-luar bandar, dan usaha² ini ada-lah dijalankan dengan pesat-nya terus menerus dari sa-masa ka-samasa sa-hingga taraf ekonomi dan masyarakat ra'ayat luar bandar itu sampai ka-perengkat yang sa-imbang dengan ra'ayat yang diam di-bandar².

Bagi hendak menentukan segala kejayaan² yang di-chapai serta meranchangkan tindakan² selanjut-nya, Kementerian saya telah menubuhkan satu chawangan Penyelidikan, Penilaian dan Latehan dengan di-ketahui oleh sa-orang pegawai anak negeri yang telah mendapat latehan yang chukup dan sesuai untuk menjalankan tugas² ini dan di-bantu pula oleh sa-orang pakar yang mahir dari luar negeri.

Kerajaan telah juga melancharkan satu ranchangan yang di-beri nama Gerakan Maju atau pun Ranchangan Pembangunan Masyarakat untuk meninggikan taraf hidup penduduk² luar bandar. Usaha dan tenaga ra'ayat ada-lah faktor yang paling penting dan usaha dan tenaga ra'ayat ini juga hendak-lah di-satu padukan dengan usaha dan tindakan daripada pihak Kerajaan. Dengan itu Kerajaan telah melancharkan Gerakan Maju ini dalam tahun yang lalu dengan tujuan untuk melipat gandakan lagi usaha dan tenaga ra'ayat serta bersama² di-satu padukan dengan usaha dan tindakan Kerajaan di-segala perengkat untuk mendapatkan kejayaan² yang lebeh lagi bagi ra'ayat sakalian.

Tidak perlu-lah saya menghuraikan dengan panjang lebar di-atas usaha²

yang telah dan sedang di-laksanakan untuk meninggikan taraf hidup ra'ayat oleh kerana segala kemajuan² ini boleh di-lihat di-mana² juga di-serata perosok tanah ayer.

Tuan Pengerusi, dengan izin tuan, saya suka menerangkan lebih lanjut berkenaan perbelanjaan di-bawah Kepala Perbelanjaan yang sedang di-bahathkan sekarang. Di-bawah Bahagian 'Am Kementerian Pembangunan Negara dan Luar Bandar, tidak ada tambahan mengenai jawatan². Sadikit tambahan di-dalam anggaran tahun ini ia-lah daripada kenaikan gaji tahunan pegawai². Lima jawatan yang di-tunjokkan di-bawah Majlis Amanah Ra'ayat ia-itu di-muka 516 ia-lah meliputi jawatan² pegawai² Kerajaan yang di-pinjamkan kepada Majlis itu. Gaji dan elaun mereka ada-lah di-biaya² oleh Majlis Amanah Ra'ayat itu sendiri.

Manakala dua jawatan lagi ia-itu Butiran (56) dan (57) ada-lah jawatan² pegawai Kerajaan yang telah di-pinjamkan kepada Lembaga Kemajuan Tanah Persekutuan. Gaji dan elaun mereka juga seperti pegawai² yang di-pinjamkan kepada Majlis Amanah Ra'ayat ada-lah di-biaya² oleh Lembaga tersebut.

Berhubung dengan Lembaga Kemajuan Tanah Persekutuan sukachita-lah saya menerangkan di-sini dengan serba ringkas di-atas kemajuan² yang telah di-chapai oleh Lembaga tersebut sahingga hari ini. Lembaga Kemajuan Tanah Persekutuan telah pun berjaya membuka 159,127 ekar tanah baru bagi menanam getah dan kelapa sawit. 119,444 ekar daripada jumlah itu ditanam dengan getah jenis baik dan 39,683 ekar di-tanam dengan kelapa sawit.

Dalam ranchangan Pembangunan Malaysia yang pertama Lembaga Kemajuan Tanah Persekutuan akan membuka 141,000 ekar tanah baharu bagi kelapa sawit dan getah. Dalam tahun 1966-67, tahun pertama ranchangan itu, Lembaga Kemajuan Tanah Persekutuan telah pun berjaya menebas dan menebang sa-luas 26,223 ekar tanah untuk di-tanam dengan kelapa sawit dan getah. Peserta² yang

telah di-tempatkan di-dalam 62 ranchangan pembukaan tanah Lembaga Kemajuan Tanah Persekutuan ia-lah 10,720 orang dan ini ada-lah berma'ana sa-takat kemajuan telah terchapai, 62 ranchangan tanah itu akan memberi faedah kepada 50,000 orang penduduk. Sukachita juga saya mengambil perhatian Dewan ini ia-itu hingga akhir tahun 1966, 12 ranchangan² sa-luas 10,416 ekar tanah telah pun mula mengeluarkan hasil. Jumlah hasil yang telah di-keluarkan daripada ranchangan² itu di-dalam tahun 1966 pula ada-lah lebih daripada \$3 juta.

Sa-bagaimana Dewan ini sedia ma'alum Kerajaan ada-lah sedang meranchangan satu ranchangan tanah yang besar di-kawasan Jengka. Di-dalam perbahathan Anggaran Pembangunan, saya akan menyentuh dengan lebih lanjut lagi mengenai ranchangan tanah yang besar ini.

Sekarang saya beredar pula kepada Anggaran Perbelanjaan di-bawah Bahagian Pembangunan Masyarakat dan Pelajaran Dewasa dalam Kementerian saya. Tambahan di-bawah Gaji ada-lah di-sebabkan oleh satu jawatan baru ia-lah Pegawai Penyelidikan, Penilaian dan Latehan dalam Butiran (31), yang telah di-wujudkan untuk mengetuai Bahagian Penyelidikan, Penilaian dan Latehan.

Tuan Pengerusi, mengenai jawatan² dan lain² perbelanjaan pegawai² di-bawah Kementerian saya di-Malaysia Timor telah di-masokkan di-bawah Butiran (58) hingga (105) termasuk-lah Pejabat² Kemajuan Negeri Sarawak dan Negeri Sabah, Pejabat² Pelajaran Dewasa bagi kedua² negeri ini serta Pejabat Penempatan dan Pengumpulan sa-mula Malaysia Timor. Bagi Pejabat Penempatan dan Pengumpulan sa-mula mungkin akan di-kurangkan kakitangan-nya dari semasa ka-semasa mengikut keadaan keselamatan dalam kedua² negeri tersebut.

Tuan Pengerusi, sekarang saya suka membawa pandangan Ahli² Yang Berhormat kepada lain² perbelanjaan di-bawah Kementerian saya. Pada tahun ini satu jumlah peruntukan sabanyak \$330,000 telah di-tetapkan

untuk Taman² Latehan Wanita di-Malaysia ini. Di-dalam Taman² Latehan Wanita ini Kerajaan menjalankan kursus² bagi melateh guru² perempuan yang di-pilih daripada kampung² diseluruh Malaysia untuk berlateh dalam Pelajaran Urusan Rumah Tangga bagi bertugas sa-bagai guru² yang mengajar di-kelas² Pelajaran Dewasa Bahagian Urusan Rumah Tangga di-merata² kampung di-negeri ini. Boleh-lah di-katakan ranchangan ini telah mendapat sambutan yang sangat baik daripada penduduk² luar bandar.

Kementerian ini juga akan terus menjalankan kursus² latehan untuk Penghulu² dan Pemimpin² Kampung di-bawah Ranchangan Pembangunan Masharakat. Peruntukan bagi tahun 1967, mengikut Pechahan-kepala 9 muka S. 20, ia-lah \$25,000, \$5,000 lebeh daripada peruntukan tahun lalu.

Bantuan sa-banyak \$70,000 akan diberi kepada Persekutuan Perkumpulan Perempuan sa-Malaysia dalam Pechahan-kepala 31. Saperti yang telah saya terangkan pada tahun yang lepas, Kementerian ini mengangap Pertubohan Perkumpulan Perempuan sa-Malaysia ada-lah satu pertubohan yang mempunyai tujuan yang sama dengan Ranchangan Pelajaran Dewasa Kerajaan, dalam bidang Pelajaran Ekonomi Rumah Tangga. Dia ini-lah sebab-nya ranchangan ini di-kekelolakan oleh Kementerian saya.

Pechahan-kepala 32 menunjukkan peruntukan \$10,000 kerana Peraduan Kemajuan di-antara Jawatan-kuasa² Kemajuan Kampung. Peraduan ini bertujuan untuk menimbulkan semangat bertanding sa-sama sendiri untuk meninggikan taraf hidup mereka di-bawah Ranchangan Gerakan Maju.

Mengenai Pechahan-kepala 33 pula, Tuan² Yang Berhormat terlebih ma'alum bahawa Perbadanan Wang Simpanan Bakal² Haji atau Tabong Haji telah mendapat sambutan yang chermmerlang daripada penduduk² daripada orang² Islam di-Negara kita. Kutipan yang di-terima daripada penyaliran² yang berjumlah lebeh daripada 29,100 orang pada akhir bulan

Disember, tahun 1966 ia-lah \$4,771,000. Manakala wang simpanan berupa harta/saham ada-lah berjumlah \$2,897,000. Perbadanan Wang Simpanan Bakal² Haji atau Tabong Haji akan juga mengeluarkan bonus bagi tahun 1966 dengan persetujuan Kementerian Pembangunan Negara dan Luar Bandar dan Perbendaharaan kepada penyaliran², dan bonus yang di-keluarkan itu akan di-simpan dalam kira² penyaliran yang berkenaan. Pada awal tahun 1967 ini penyaliran² yang hendak menunaikan Fardzu Haji melalui Tabong Haji ada-lah berjumlah lebeh daripada 900 orang. Ranchangan Tabong Haji ini telah pun di-perluaskan ka-negeri Sabah dan Sarawak. Dengan perkembangan-nya ka-Malaysia Timor ini, maka terpaksa-lah Perbadanan ini mendapat bantuan lagi daripada Kerajaan Pusat kerana Perbadanan ini belum lagi kukuh untuk menjalankan ranchangan-nya dengan sendiri.

Perbelanjaan yang lain itu ada-lah mengenai perbelanjaan² biasa yang di-belanjakan pada tiap² tahun.

Tuan Pengerusi, saya kemukakan perbelanjaan² di-bawah Kepala S. 61 untuk di-luluskan.

Tuan Ramli bin Omar (Krian Darat):

Tuan Pengerusi, terima kaseh. Dengan izin, Tuan Pengerusi, saya hendak mengambil peluang bagi membahath perbekalan Kementerian Pembangunan Negara dan Luar Bandar ini, ia-itu saya juga tidak ketinggalan menyokong peruntukan bagi Kementerian ini saperti mana yang di-bentangkan oleh Menteri kita tadi dan pada saya, Tuan Pengerusi, tujuan yang besar bagi Kementerian ini ia-lah untuk membangunkan negara kita. Bukan sahaja itu dasar-nya tetapi juga untuk memberi peluang kepada ra'ayat jelata yang dahagakan tanah di-beri tanah untuk penghidupan-nya dan juga pelajaran, bukan sahaja pelajaran akhirat tetapi juga pelajaran dunia untuk hidup mema'amorkan bagi keturunan² kita pada masa akan datang.

Tuan Pengerusi, yang pertama sekali saya suka berchakap sedikit ia-lah

muka 516—Pembangunan Masyarakat dan Pelajaran Dewasa. Memang-lah sudah menjadi hasrat kita untuk membangunkan masyarakat kita daripada nyanyian² penjajah dahulu dan juga membangunkan mereka daripada ajaran² fatwa yang tidak masuk akal dan tidak menguntungkan kehidupan yang bersemangat baharu. Azam kita, Tuan Pengerusi, untuk membangunkan masyarakat ia-lah mema'amorkan ra'ayat serta di-beri ajaran dan latehan yang berguna dan tidak-lah lagi di-ajar, kais pagi makan pagi, kais petang makan petang dan sa-chupak tidak boleh menjadi sa-gantang. Jadi fatwa² yang sa-bagini tidak mendatangkan chara fikiran yang progressive dan bersemangat baharu dan patut-lah di-chari satu ilham baharu seperti tujuan Kementerian ini berjalan.

Tuan Pengerusi, dalam kita memberi kesedaran dan membangunkan masyarakat kita, kita hendak-lah melateh dan melebehen dalam bidang bertani sa-chara moden dan dengan itu mata² pelajaran kelas² dewasa hendak-lah memberatkan sa-belah tani. Kerana, kalau kita beratkan yang lain mungkin tidak berguna sangat pada mereka itu. Oleh itu, latehan² bacha-membacha dan tulis-menulis hendak-lah di-beratkan sangat kepada chara bertani moden kita yang mana akan mendatangkan besar faedah kepada negara dan bangsa.

Yang kedua, Tuan Pengerusi, saya beraleh kepada Pechahan-kepala 3—Penyelidekan dan Penilaian di-muka 520. Di-sini, Tuan Pengerusi, saya suka ia-itu Pengawai Penyelidekan ini menyelidek ia-itu ada-kah akan memberi keuntungan atau faedah atau tidak kepada ra'ayat jelata kita di-luar bandar.

Saya fikir akan memberi faedah, kerana kita sekarang ada banyak Balai Raya. Jadi Balai² Raya ini yang saya nampak sa-lain daripada di-gunakan bagi Kelas² Pelajaran Dewasa dan tempat² masyarakat kampung mengadakan mesuarat², ada banyak Balai² Raya yang di-dapati tidak ada orang yang bertanggung-jawab. Dan saya hendak tahu daripada Yang Berhormat

Menteri bagi menjelaskan dalam Dewan yang mulia ini siapa-kah yang bertanggung-jawab bagi mentadbirkan sa-sabuah Balai Raya yang di-bangunkan di-kawasan luar bandar yang guna-nya Balai² Raya yang akan memberi faedah, tetapi saya bukan katakan Balai Raya tidak memberi faedah kepada ra'ayat tetapi apa yang saya hendak dapat penjelasan, siapa-kah yang bertanggung-jawab bagi mentadbirkan Balai Raya itu?

Di-sini, Tuan Pengerusi, suka-lah hendak mengshorkan, pada fikiran saya faedah-nya satu chara baharu dalam mengenai Balai Raya ini hendak-lah di-sesuaikan untuk penggunaan Balai Raya itu dengan menjadikan Balai Persatuan² Peladang kita yang hari ini banyak berselerak di-tubuhkan di-kawasan² luar bandar. Oleh itu bagi hendak mentadbirkan Balai² Raya ini kita serahkan Balai² Raya itu kepada Persatuan² Peladang kerana ini-lah yang akan mentadbirkan Balai Raya ini dengan memberi faedah. Jadi saya harap dengan sa-tinggi² harapan, kerana mithal-nya di-dalam kawasan saya ada menjalankan Ranchangan Menanam Dua Kali sa-tahun. Maka Kerajaan juga dan petani² hari ini ada membeli alat² moden dan perkakas² dan meneruskan Ranchangan Bidang dan Pembangunan Luar Bandar kita ini dalam bahagian Balai Raya ini. Jadi dapat-lah petani² atau Persatuan² Peladang menggunakan Balai Raya itu dengan menyimpan segala alat kelengkapan di-situ dan peruntukan yang ada mengenai hendak membuat Balai² Raya itu dapat di-sambong bagi peruntukan kepada Persatuan² Peladang. Jadi, in-lah sahaja, Tuan Pengerusi, yang saya dapat menyatakan dalam Dewan ini, terima kasih.

Tuan Haji Rahmat bin Haji Daud (Johor Baharu Barat): Yang Berhormat Tuan Pengerusi, saya sokong atas Belanjawan Kementerian Pembangunan Negara dan Luar Bandar.

Saya berchakap berkenaan dengan S. 61 muka 517 ia-itu Butiran (56)—Lembaga Kemajuan Tanah Persekutuan. Di-Johor Baharu, daerah saya, di-situ ada satu Ranchangan Kemajuan

Tanah di-kawasan Tebrau. Penduduk² di-situ ada 50 kelamin dan tiap² satu kelamin di-beri rumah, tanah di-beri sa-banyak lapan ekar, enam ekar di-tanamkan getah dan yang dua ekar untok tanaman buah²an dan lain².

Tetapi malang-nya tanah yang dua ekar itu selalu tenggelam, dan samalam juga saya ada pergi melawat di-tempat² yang tenggelam, mereka telah di-pindahkan sementara di-Balai Raya, di-tempat² yang tinggi sadikit, lebeh kurang ada 10-15 kelamin dan dapat bantuan daripada Pejabat Kebajikan Masharakat. Tenggelam di-kawasan itu bukan sa-tahun sa-kali bahkan sa-tahun sampai empat, lima, enam kali. Jadi-nya, tanah yang dua ekar itu sesia sahaja. Tanaman yang boleh di-tanam di-situ hanya keladi. Saya sudah berchakap juga keladi ini di-makan pun tidak boleh—gatal kadang². Jadi memang tidak guna-lah tanah yang dua ekar tadi.

Baharu² ini saya dapat tahu di-sabelah kawasan tanah Teberau, ada tanah sa-luas 90 ekar yang di-tanam dengan tanaman getah. Barangkali dalam 50 ekar getah itu yang boleh ditoreh sa-banyak 30 ekar dengan getah yang baharu dan sa-paroh lagi belum lagi di-tanam dan belum di-pagar samula. Tanah 90 ekar itu, hendak di-jual dengan harga lebeh kurang \$700. Jadi penduduk² di-kawasan itu merayu pada Pegawai Daerah Johor Baharu supaya tanah itu di-beli, dan mereka itu sanggup membayar balek mengikut peratoran berhutang.

Jadi saya shorkan supaya dapat Lem-baga Kemajuan Tanah ini membeli tanah yang 90 ekar, itu dan di-jual kapada penduduk² di-situ sa-banyak 50 kelamin. Kalau di-bagi dapat-lah tambahan sa-banyak satu ekar tiga suku pada tiap² sa-orang menjadikan jumlah-nya tanah yang di-tanam getah tujuh ekar tiga suku, saya pandang kalau sa-kira-nya tanah ladang kechil itu tidak di-beli dan di-bagi²kan kapada penduduk² di-situ, saya takut satu masa kelak enam ekar tidak menchukupi bagi mereka itu untok membelanjakan anak² yang makin bertambah pada masa yang akan datang kelak.

Boleh di-katakan tanah yang dua ekar itu tadi tidak ada guna-nya sama sa-kali. Demikian-lah saya berharap, pehak Kementerian ini dapat menyiasat dan menolong sa-penoh-nya di-atas penduduk² di-situ, supaya dapat mereka itu dudok dengan sempurna pada masa yang akan datang. Terima kaseh.

Tuan Abdul Karim bin Abu (Melaka Selatan): Tuan Pengerusi, dalam menyokong Anggaran Perbelanjaan daripada Kementerian Pembangunan Negara dan Luar Bandar ini, saya suka-lah mengambil bahagian berchakap di-muka surat 516—Majlis Amanah Ra'ayat.

Tuan Pengerusi, apa yang saya maksudkan MARA ini memang menjadi satu harapan terutama sa-kali kapada orang Melayu bagi hendak meninggikan ekonomik orang Melayu. Tetapi, Tuan Pengerusi, saya berasa dukachita perkara ini tidak patut saya sampaikan di-sini, tetapi bagi mengingati bersama dan surat rayuan yang saya terima ini akan saya sampaikan kapada Menteri yang berkenaan berhubung dengan Pegawai yang bertanggung-jawab berhubung dengan MARA di-negeri Melaka. Ini sa-orang, Tuan Pengerusi, bukan ramai yang telah mengechewakan kapada mereka² yang berhutang dengan Kerajaan dengan mengeluarkan kata² yang kasar terhadap terutama sa-kali kapada driver² teks yang berhutang, dan pernah mereka ini mengeluarkan kata² kalau tidak ada duit hendak berhutang, lebeh baik pergi berhutang kapada orang China.

Jadi sa-orang pegawai yang sa-rupa ini patut-lah mendapat timbangan daripada Kerajaan. Saya berkata ini, Tuan Pengerusi, tujuan saya, bagi pehak Kementerian ini, saya tahu akan mengadakan dan sudah mengadakan kursus kapada pegawai² yang berhubung dengan hal ini. Jadi saya bukan-lah melibatkan semua pegawai², tetapi pegawai yang saya katakan ini ada bukti-nya.

Tuan Pengerusi, pada muka surat 516—Pembangunan Masharakat dan Pelajaran Dewasa. Saya sentoh Butiran (31), Pegawai Penyelidek. Saya harap pegawai yang bertanggung-jawab ini

akan menyelidek keadaan apa yang telah jadi berhubung dengan Rancangan Kemajuan di-Luar Bandar. Penduduk² di-luar bandar sedang menanam segala hasil² tetapi yang mendukung hasil² ini tak dapat di-jual dengan sempurna, kerana dapat tekanan daripada orang-tengah. Jadi saya berharap sangat² Pegawai Penyelidek ini dapat membuatkan persediaan men-chadangkan bagaimana hendak mendingangkan hasil yang di-tanam oleh penduduk² luar bandar itu dengan tidak melalui orang-tengah. Ini saya tidaklah menafikan kerja yang telah dijalankan oleh sharikat kerjasama tetapi tidak memadai, Tuan Pengerusi, kerana ini juga mendapat tekanan yang sungoh² kapada petani² kita melalui orang-tengah ini. Jadi umpama-nya ramai orang bertanam jagong tetapi apabila terlampau banyak jagong sudah tidak dapat hendak di-pasarkan jagong itu—jadi harga jagong jatuh. Jadi saya harap-lah supaya Pegawai Penyelidek ini dapat menyelidek hasil² yang dikeluarkan daripada petani² ini dapat

betul di-salorkan, di-perdagangkan dengan tidak tertekan oleh penanam² ini. Sa-lain daripada itu

Mr Chairman: Habis?

Tuan Abdul Karim bin Abu: Muka 517.

Mr Chairman: Pukul 6.30—sudah habis sekarang?

Tuan Abdul Karim bin Abu: Belum!

Mr Chairman: Sudah pukul 6.30.

House resumed.

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: Ahli² Yang Berhormat, saya suka mema'alumkan ia-itu Jawatan-kuasa Rang Undang² Perbekalan tahun 1967 ini telah sampai kapada Kepala 61 bagi Jadual dalam Rang Undang² ini.

Meshuarat di-tanggohkan hingga pukul 10 pagi esok.

Meshuarat di-tanggohkan pada pukul 6.38 petang.