

Volume III
No. 21



Thursday
26th January, 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. 3357]

BILL PRESENTED [Col. 3371]

BILL:

The Supply (1967) Bill [Col. 3371]

ADJOURNMENT (Motion) [Col. 3475]

ADJOURNMENT SPEECH:

Sharikat Kerjasama Polis di-Raja Malaysia [Col. 3475]



MALAYSIA

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

Official Report

Third Session of the Second Dewan Ra'ayat

Thursday, 26th January, 1967

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

PRESENT:

- The Honourable Mr Deputy Speaker, TUAN SYED ESA BIN ALWEE,
J.M.N., S.M.J., P.I.S.
- „ 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 Transport, TAN SRI HAJI SARDON BIN
HAJI JUBIR, P.M.N. (Pontian Utara).
- „ the Minister of Education, TUAN MOHAMED KHIR JOHARI
(Kedah Tengah).
- „ 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 of Labour, TUAN V. MANICKAVASAGAM, J.M.N.,
P.J.K. (Klang).
- „ the Minister of Information and Broadcasting and Minister
of Culture, Youth and Sports, TUAN SENU BIN ABDUL RAHMAN
(Kubang Pasu Barat).
- „ the Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives,
TUAN HAJI MOHAMED GHAZALI BIN HAJI JAWI (Ulu Perak).
- „ the Minister of Lands and Mines, TUAN ABDUL-RAHMAN
BIN YA'KUB (Sarawak).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Culture, Youth and Sports,
DATO' ENGGU 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 Labour,
TUAN LEE SAN CHOON, K.M.N. (Segamat Selatan).

- The Honourable the Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister,
 TUAN CHEN WING SUM (Damansara).
- „ TUAN ABDUL GHANI BIN ISHAK, A.M.N. (Melaka Utara).
- „ TUAN ABDUL KARIM BIN ABU, A.M.N. (Melaka Selatan).
- „ WAN ABDUL KADIR BIN ISMAIL, P.P.T.
 (Kuala Trengganu Utara).
- „ TUAN ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAJI TALIB, P.J.K. (Kuantan).
- „ WAN ABDUL RAHMAN BIN DATU TUANKU BUJANG, A.B.S.
 (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDUL RASHID BIN HAJI JAIS (Sabah).
- „ TUAN ABDUL RAZAK BIN HAJI HUSSIN (Lipis).
- „ TUAN ABDUL SAMAD BIN GUL AHMAD MIANJI
 (Pasar Mas Hulu).
- „ Y.A.M. TUNKU ABDULLAH IBNI AL-MARHUM TUANKU ABDUL
 RAHMAN, P.P.T. (Rawang).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI MOHD. SALLEH,
 A.M.N., S.M.J., P.I.S. (Segamat Utara).
- „ TUAN ABU BAKAR BIN HAMZAH (Bachok).
- „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN ABDULLAH, S.M.K. (Kelantan Hilir).
- „ TUAN AHMAD BIN ARSHAD, A.M.N. (Muar Utara).
- „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN SA'AID, J.P. (Seberang Utara).
- „ PUAN AJIBAH BINTI ABOL (Sarawak).
- „ DR AWANG BIN HASSAN, S.M.J. (Muar Selatan).
- „ TUAN AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Muar Dalam).
- „ TUAN JONATHAN BANGAU ANAK RENANG, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ PENGARAH BANYANG ANAK JANTING, P.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN CHAN CHONG WEN, A.M.N. (Kluang Selatan).
- „ TUAN CHAN SIANG SUN, P.J.K. (Bentong).
- „ TUAN CHEW BIOW CHUON (Bruas).
- „ TUAN CHIA CHIN SHIN, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN FRANCIS CHIA NYUK TONG (Sabah).
- „ TUAN CHIN FOON (Ulu Kinta).
- „ TUAN D. A. DAGO ANAK RANDAN *alias* DAGOK ANAK RANDEN
 (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN C. V. DEVAN NAIR (Bungsar).
- „ TUAN EDWIN ANAK TANGKUN (Sarawak).
- „ DATIN HAJAH FATIMAH BINTI HAJI ABDUL MAJID
 (Johor Bahru Timor).
- „ TAN SRI FATIMAH BINTI HAJI HASHIM, P.M.N.
 (Jitra-Padang Terap).
- „ TUAN S. FAZUL RAHMAN, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ DATO GANIE GILONG, P.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).
- „ TUAN GANING BIN JANGKAT (Sabah).
- „ TUAN GEH CHONG KEAT, K.M.N. (Penang Utara).
- „ TUAN HAJI HAMZAH BIN ALANG, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Kapar).
- „ TUAN HANAFI BIN MOHD. YUNUS, A.M.N., J.P. (Kulim Utara).
- „ TUAN HANAFIAH BIN HUSSAIN, J.M.N. (Jerai).

- The Honourable TUAN HARUN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N., J.P. (Baling).
- „ WAN HASSAN BIN WAN DAUD (Tumpat).
- „ TUAN STANLEY HO NGUN KHIU, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ TUAN HUSSEIN BIN TO' MUDA HASSAN, A.M.N. (Raub).
- „ DATO' HAJI HUSSEIN BIN MOHD. NOORDIN, D.P.M.P., A.M.N., P.J.K. (Parit).
- „ TUAN HUSSEIN BIN SULAIMAN (Ulu Kelantan).
- „ TUAN HAJI HUSSAIN RAHIMI BIN HAJI SAMAN, S.M.K. (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).
- „ TUAN KAM WOON WAH, J.P. (Sitiawan).
- „ TUAN THOMAS KANA (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN KHOO PENG LOONG (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 JOSEPH DAVID MANJAJI (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).
- „ TUAN MOHD. ZAHIR BIN HAJI ISMAIL, J.M.N. (Sungei Patani).
- „ WAN MOKHTAR BIN AHMAD (Kemaman).
- „ TUAN HAJI MOKHTAR BIN HAJI ISMAIL (Perlis Selatan).
- „ TUAN MUHAMMAD FAKHRUDDIN BIN HAJI ABDULLAH (Pasir Mas Hilir).
- „ TUAN HAJI MUHAMMAD SU'AUT BIN HAJI MUHD. TAHIR, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ DATO' HAJI MUSTAPHA BIN HAJI ABDUL JABAR, D.P.M.S., A.M.N., J.P. (Sabak Bernam).
- „ TUAN MUSTAPHA BIN AHMAD (Tanah Merah).
- „ TAN SRI NIK AHMAD KAMIL, D.K., S.P.M.K., S.J.M.K., P.M.N., P.Y.G.P., Dato' Sri Setia Raja (Kota Bharu Hilir).
- „ TUAN NG FAH YAM (Batu Gajah).
- „ TUAN ONG KEE HUI (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN HAJI OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Hilir Perak).

- The Honourable **TUAN OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Perlis Utara).**
- „ **TUAN HAJI RAHMAT BIN HAJI DAUD, A.M.N. (Johor Bahru Barat).**
- „ **TUAN RAMLI BIN OMAR (Krian Darat).**
- „ **TUAN HAJI REDZA BIN HAJI MOHD. SAID, P.J.K., J.P. (Rembau-Tampin).**
- „ **TUAN SANDOM ANAK NYUAK (Sarawak).**
- „ **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 SOH AH TECK (Batu Pahat).**
- „ **TUAN SULEIMAN BIN ALI (Dungun).**
- „ **TUAN SULEIMAN BIN HAJI TAIB (Krian Laut).**
- „ **TUAN TAJUDDIN BIN ALI, P.J.K. (Larut Utara).**
- „ **TUAN TAI KUAN YANG (Kulim Bandar Bharu).**
- „ **TUAN TAMA WENG TINGGANG WAN (Sarawak).**
- „ **DR TAN CHEE KHOON (Batu).**
- „ **TUAN TAN CHENG BEE, J.P. (Bagan).**
- „ **TUAN TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Melaka).**
- „ **TUAN TAN TOH HONG (Bukit Bintang).**
- „ **TUAN TAN TSAK YU (Sarawak).**
- „ **TUAN TIAH ENG BEE (Kluang Utara).**
- „ **TUAN TOH THEAM HOCK (Kampar).**
- „ **TUAN STEPHEN YONG KUET TZE (Sarawak).**
- „ **TUAN HAJI ZAKARIA BIN HAJI MOHD. TAIB, P.J.K. (Langat).**

ABSENT:

- The Honourable **Mr Speaker, DATO' CHIK MOHAMED YUSUF BIN SHEIKH ABDUL RAHMAN, S.P.M.P., J.P., Dato' Bendahara, Perak.**
- „ **the Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs, Y.T.M. TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN PUTRA AL-HAJ, K.O.M. (Kuala Kedah).**
- „ **the Minister of Home Affairs and Minister of Justice, TUN DR ISMAIL BIN DATO' HAJI ABDUL RAHMAN, S.S.M., P.M.N. (Johor Timor).**
- „ **the Minister of Finance, TUAN TAN SIEW SIN, J.P. (Melaka Tengah).**
- „ **the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, TAN SRI V. T. SAMBANTHAN, P.M.N. (Sungei Siput).**
- „ **the Minister for Local Government and Housing, TUAN KHAW KAI-BOH, P.J.K. (Ulu Selangor).**
- „ **the Minister for Sarawak Affairs, TAN SRI TEMENGGONG JUGAH ANAK BARIENG, P.M.N., P.D.K. (Sarawak).**
- „ **the Minister for Sabah Affairs, 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 Honourable the Assistant Minister of National and Rural Development,
 TUAN SULAIMAN BIN BULON, P.J.K. (Bagan Datoh).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Finance, DR NG KAM POH, J.P.
 (Teluk Anson),
- „ the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance,
 TUAN ALI BIN HAJI AHMAD (Pontian Selatan).
- „ DATO' ABDULLAH BIN ABDULRAHMAN, S.M.T., Dato' Bijaya
 di-Raja (Kuala Trengganu Selatan).
- „ O. K. K. DATU ALIUDDIN BIN DATU HARUN, P.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ TUAN CHAN SEONG YOON (Setapak).
- „ PENGHULU JINGGUT ANAK ATTAN, Q.M.C., A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN KADAM ANAK KIAI (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN AMADEUS MATHEW LEONG, A.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).
- „ TUAN LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).
- „ TUAN PETER LO SU YIN (Sabah).
- „ DATO' DR HAJI MEGAT KHAS, D.P.M.P., P.J.K., J.P.
 (Kuala Kangsar).
- „ DATO' HAJI MOHAMED ASRI BIN HAJI MUDA, S.P.M.K.
 (Pasir Puteh).
- „ ORANG TUA MOHAMMAD DARAH BIN LANGPAD (Sabah).
- „ TUAN QUEK KAI DONG, J.P. (Seremban Timor).
- „ RAJA ROME BIN RAJA MA'AMOR, P.J.K., J.P. (Kuala Selangor).
- „ TUAN SEAH TENG NGIAB, P.I.S. (Muar Pantai).
- „ TUAN D. R. SEENIVASAGAM (Ipoh).
- „ DATO' S. P. SEENIVASAGAM, D.P.M.P., P.M.P., J.P.
 (Menglembu).
- „ TUAN SNG CHIN JOO (Sarawak).
- „ PENGIRAN TAHIR PETRA (Sabah).
- „ TUAN YEH PAO TZE, A.M.N. (Sabah).

PRAYERS

(Mr Deputy Speaker *in the Chair*)

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

CHADANGAN MELATEH PEGAWAI² TENTERA DI- INDONESIA

1. Tuan Ahmad bin Arshad (Muar Utara) bertanya kepada Menteri Pertahanan (a) ada-kah benar Kerajaan Indonesia telah menawarkan Kerajaan Malaysia supaya melateh Pegawai² Tentera kita di-Indonesia; jika ya, nyatakan sama ada sa-siapa daripada pegawai² kita yang telah di-hantar, atau sa-jauh mana-kah rancangan ini telah di-jalankan, dan (b) sama ada Kerajaan Indonesia berchadang hen-

dak menghantar pegawai² tentera mereka berlateh di-Maktab Tentera kita.

The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Defence (Tun Haji Abdul Razak): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Kerajaan Indonesia telah membuat tawaran sa-chara tidak rasmi kepada saya untok melateh pegawai² tentera kita di-Indonesia. Perkara ini sedang dikaji oleh Kementerian. Buat sementara ini belum ada di-terima apa² permintaan daripada Kerajaan Indonesia untok menghantar Pegawai² Tentera mereka berlateh di-Maktab Tentera kita.

Tuan Ahmad bin Arshad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soalan tambahan. Melihatkan perkembangan yang menggalakkan dalam bidang ketenteraan

antara Kerajaan Indonesia dengan Malaysia, ada-kah kemungkinan di-satu masa kelak bila-mana perjanjian kita dengan Kerajaan British berbubong dengan ketenteraan itu di-bubarkan, dapat di-gantikan tentera Indonesia di-tempat yang kosong itu sebagai kerjasama pertahanan bersama antara dua buah negeri.

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak dapat hendak menentukan perkara ini—perkara² ini akan di-rundingkan di-masa yang akan datang dan bergantung-lah dengan chara perhubungan kita dengan pehak Indonesia.

EX-OFFICER OF RIDA IN VARIOUS COMMITTEES OF MARA

2. **Tuan Ong Kee Hui (Sarawak)** (*Under Standing Order 24 (2)*), asks the Minister of National and Rural Development to state if he is aware that the officer who was responsible for the mess in the accounts of RIDA has now left that post and is now with a private firm of accountants and in that capacity sits on various committees of MARA, and if so, what steps he has taken to see that the same officer does not make a mess of things with MARA.

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: Mr Speaker, Sir, no such person is sitting on any of the committee of MARA.

PERHUBONGAN ANTARA AHLI² POLITIK DENGAN PEGAWAI² KERAJAAN

3. **Tuan Ahmad bin Arshad** bertanya kepada Menteri Pembangunan Negara dan Luar Bandar bahawa memandang betapa mustahak-nya di-adakan perhubungan yang erat di-antara ahli² politik dan pegawai² Kerajaan untuk melancarkan usaha² gerakan Pembangunan Negara dan Luar Bandar, dalam Rancangan Malaysia yang Pertama, ada-kah Kementerian beliau sedar ia-itu ada pegawai² pentadbir yang enggan memberi kerjasama mereka; jika sedar nyatakan langkah² yang beliau berchadang hendak ambil dalam perkara ini.

The Minister of National and Rural Development (Tun Haji Abdul Razak): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak mendengar perkara ini. Saya selalu memberi perintah kepada pegawai² Kerajaan bahawa mustahak-lah mereka itu, bukan sahaja bekerjasama di-antara satu dengan lain, tetapi juga bekerja rapat dengan wakil² ra'ayat dan ra'ayat jelata juga dalam melaksanakan perkara² rancangan² pembangunan negara kita.

Jika sa-kira-nya Ahli Yang Berhormat mengetahui perkara yang tertentu yang menunjukkan sa-sorang pegawai bersikap demikian, saya berharap Ahli Yang Berhormat itu dapat memberi ma'alumat² yang tertentu mengenai perkara ini supaya tindakan yang munasabah dapat di-ambil.

SUBANG INTERNATIONAL AIR- PORT—AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL FACILITIES

4. **Tuan C. V. Devan Nair (Bungsar)** asks the Minister of Transport whether international airlines serving the Subang International Airport are satisfied that adequate air traffic control facilities, like radar installations, etc., exist at the Airport to regulate take-offs and landings in accordance with international standards of safety, and if not, what steps the Government proposes to take in order to rectify any shortcomings which might exist.

The Minister of Transport (Tan Sri Haji Sardon bin Haji Jubir): Mr Speaker, Sir, when the Kuala Lumpur International Airport was first planned the International Airport Transport Association was consulted as to the operational facilities that were considered essential for international services, and these have as far as possible been provided. A full operational lighting system of accepted international standards combined with visual approach slope indicators is installed and the installation of an electronic instrument landing system should be completed within the next two months and will be a valuable addition to the airport facilities for guiding aircraft coming in during adverse weather conditions. The system

is the same type as operated at many of the world's international airports, and has been put in at a cost of approximately \$½ million.

Under the Development Plan a Very High Frequency Omni-Directional Range Coupled with Distance Measuring Equipment is planned to be positioned in the vicinity of the Airport and would act as an approach aid in bad weather and assist in air traffic control. This installation would cost approximately \$600,000 and work is in hand to finalise a site and order equipment so that the installation could be effected some time next year.

In the long-term planning radar installation is planned at a cost of approximately \$2 million to assist in air traffic control set up in this area.

MISAPPROPRIATION OF CHEQUES—MINISTRY OF HEALTH

5. Dr Tan Chee Khoon (Batu) asks the Minister of Health what disciplinary action has he taken against the officers responsible for the misappropriation of four cheques totalling \$56,637.50 cents in December 1964 and January 1965 and what steps he has taken to prevent a recurrence of such misappropriation.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health (Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman): Mr Speaker, Sir, A Committee of Enquiry was appointed in the Ministry of Health to investigate into the circumstances leading to the loss of the four cheques in December 1964 and in January 1965. This Committee conducted a thorough investigation by holding interviews of the officials involved and the observations of the procedures of preparation and despatch of cheques. The matter was also reported to the Police which made a thorough investigation into the relevant documents believed to be connected with the loss of the four cheques. Out of the \$50,637.50, a sum of \$7,000 had been recovered from one of the banks concerned, and the Attorney-General will be taking civil actions in the High Court against the other banks. As a result of the Police

investigation, a private individual was convicted and sentenced to two years' jail in respect of a sum of \$10,900. Both these investigations showed that the normal requirements of financial regulations have been complied with and that none of my officers were found to be responsible for the loss of the cheques.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: I see that the Honourable Parliamentary Secretary has ended up with saying that "none of my officers have been found responsible for the loss of the cheques". Mr Speaker, Sir, is the Honourable Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health trying to tell this House that while the officials of the Ministry are blameless, it is the crookedness of the others outside who caused the loss of \$56,000 plus? Can he tell us how this can take place, if there is no negligence on the part of the officials of the Ministry of Health?

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman: The matter has been taken up by the Police and the Police is making a thorough investigation.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: May I ask, then, whether the Police have investigated the part played by officials of the Ministry of Health, or the Police only investigated the banks and the contractor—if I have heard the Honourable Parliamentary Secretary rightly? Did the Police investigate the part played by the officials of the Ministry of Health as well, and to see whether there is any negligence—I do not say criminal negligence—negligence on the part of the officials of the Ministry of Health, so that the Ministry of Health can take steps to see that such loss will not occur, and this is a big sum for the taxpayers?

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman: Full investigations have been made and some of the officials of the Ministry were also investigated.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Now we are told that some of the officials of the Ministry of Health were investigated. Can the Honourable the Parliamentary Secretary tell us what was the verdict

on the investigation on some of the officials of the Ministry of Health?

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman:

It was found that none of my officers was found to be responsible for the loss of funds over the cheques.

NON-OCCUPATION OF THREE RURAL HEALTH SCHEME QUARTERS IN KEDAH

6. Tuan C. V. Devan Nair (Bungsar) asks the Minister of Health whether he is aware that as on 31st May, 1965, one out of every three quarters constructed under the rural health schemes in Kedah was not occupied; and to explain this gross wastage of Government resources when his colleague, the Minister of Finance, was calling for economic stringency to face lean times ahead.

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman:

Mr Speaker, Sir, I am aware that as at 31-5-65, there were quarters, which had not yet been occupied. In our rural health schemes quarters at health centres and midwife clinics are built at the same time at the centres and clinics according to a standard pattern in design, construction, and of staffing. The idea is, of course, to save expenditure as building quarters piece-meal will certainly cost more. The staffs are undergoing training and therefore as and when they are available, they will be sent to the centres and clinics and the vacant quarters will then be gradually occupied. In the course of time the whole lot of them will be occupied. I can assure the Honourable Member that we are as anxious, or more so than he is to save Government expenditure.

Tuan C. V. Devan Nair: May we have information as to exactly how many of the 237 quarters built as on 31st May, 1965, are at present unoccupied?

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman:

There are actually 39 main centres, 135 sub-health centres, and 664 midwife clinics, amounting to more than 800; and I do not know from where the Honourable Member for Bungsar got

the figure, but from what the Ministry has found, only 25 to 28 quarters are not occupied.

Tuan C. V. Devan Nair: I got my information not from any DAP publication, but from the Report of the Auditor-General, Malaysia, on the accounts of the Federal Government. I read from there: "Sub-head 218. No new health centres were built in Kedah in 1964. However, the staffing position in the three main centres . . ."—I will come to the relevant part—"On the 31st May, 1965, out of a total establishment of 279, only 174 posts have been filled and out of a total of 237 quarters built only 162 were occupied." This is only in respect of Kedah. My question is directed at finding out how many of these 237 quarters which had been completed as at 31st May, 1965, remain unoccupied today.

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman:

The number unoccupied today, I give the number, is about 25.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: I think the Parliamentary Secretary told the Honourable Member for Bungsar that the Government is as anxious, if not more anxious than the Honourable Member, to save expenditure. Can the Honourable Parliamentary Secretary tell us, why is it that the backroom boys of the Ministry of Health could not plan in such a way that as the buildings come up, the trained officers will be ready to move in, or is it a task beyond the capacity of the officials of the Ministry of Health?

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman:

As the Honourable Member for Batu is aware, the para-medical staff have got to go for 3 years and 4 months training. So we cannot wait for those staff to complete their training before quarters are built. So, the quarters cannot be built piece-meal. They have standard pattern. When the sub-health centres are built, there should be a certain number of quarters for the staff together, for example doctors' quarters, dental officers quarters, Hospital Assistants and nurses and so on. So, actually

today there are more than 2,500 para-medical staff under training.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: The question that I asked was, why was it not that the planning could be so dovetailed that the one would fit into the other. We were told just now that it takes three years to train para-medical staff. Consequently, the question that I would like to pose to the Honourable Parliamentary Secretary is this: rural development was talked of not in May 1965. The days when I was in the Government service, more than 19 years ago, we talked about rural house development then. There were plans talked of then. Consequently, was it not be beyond the capacity of the officials of the Ministry of Health to train para-medical staff three years prior to 1965, so that as these new quarters were being built, new staff could move in, trained staff could move in.

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman: Para-medical staffs are under training not from 1965 or 1966, but they have been under training since 1960. So every year we have to take in at least about 600 nurses and 100 or so Hospital Assistants, midwives, and so on, and so we have got to recruit every year about 700 to 800 para-medical staff.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: We are told now that every year para-medical staff is being trained. The point I wish to pose is this, and I would be very grateful for an answer from the Honourable Parliamentary Secretary: the Ministry's backroom boys obviously would know in what year they would build whatever health centres, sub-centres, and midwife clinics in what areas. Consequently, prior to that, they would also know what would be the staff requirements. Could not these two be dovetailed, so as to prevent this wanton wastage of taxpayers' money?

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman: Sir, as I said earlier, we have got to plan in such a way that there is a standard pattern of training and construction. So, we cannot build just five quarters, when we have five staff. We have got to build the quarters in

advance, thereby waiting for the para-medical staff in training, because every year the para-medical staff are passing out at the rate of 200 to 300 yearly.

Tuan C. V. Devan Nair: Are we to take it then, Sir, because of this pattern of planning in the Ministry of Health, that every year a proportion of quarters built will remain unoccupied?

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman: It is so.

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY FEASIBILITY OF SETTING UP A NATIONAL SHIPPING LINE

7. Dr Tan Chee Khoon asks the Minister of Commerce and Industry when will the special committee appointed to study the feasibility of setting up a national shipping line be ready and whether he is aware that the national shipping line if established will reduce the invisible expenditure of the transportation of goods both for imports and exports estimated at about \$700 million in 1965, and if so, whether he will expedite the working of this special committee.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Dr Lim Swee Ann): Mr Speaker, Sir, the Committee on the Formation of the National Shipping Line has now completed its work and will be submitting its report to Cabinet. The Government is aware that freight charges constitute something like \$700 million in 1965 for both our exports and imports. The Government has always been anxious to cut down the loss of foreign exchange through this source, and will consider definite steps to expedite the establishment of our own merchant marine.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Can the Honourable the Minister of Commerce and Industry tell us—I don't mind precisely, because he is aware that all this invisible drain of capital to the tune of \$700 million—if the Cabinet will expedite its deliberations on the report of this Committee; then we will not only stop this invisible drain of capital but also provide more work

for Malaysians, which I presume is one of the objectives of the Minister of Commerce and Industry.

Dr Lim Swee Aun: Of course, the Cabinet will expedite establishment, if it is feasible—that is the whole problem. The question is that the establishment of a National Shipping Line has got to be one that not only will save foreign exchange but should not be one that is subsidised by taxpayers' money.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: But, if it is found that the financial burden is too big, presumably, that is what the Honourable Minister mean by whether it is feasible or not, then will the Minister or the Alliance Government consider going into business together with our neighbours—he has one example in M.S.A., and will be followed that lead by having a joint-shipping line with our nearest neighbour, namely, Singapore.

Dr Lim Swee Aun: This Committee has studied that, and we will be studying the report.

NON-CITIZEN LABOURERS IN GOVERNMENT AND SEMI-GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

8. Tuan Ramli bin Omar asks the Minister of Labour to state, in view of the fact that there is a large number of Malaysians who are unemployed, whether he would consider taking action against Government and semi-Government labourers who do not possess the citizenship certificate.

The Minister of Labour (Tuan V. Manickavasagam): Mr Speaker, Sir, all appointees in Federal Government Departments are expected to be Federal Citizens, and Employment Exchanges in my Ministry normally only refer candidates who are Federal citizens to both Government and semi-Government Departments. There are, perhaps, some non-citizens directly recruited by these semi-Government agencies, but these must be persons who had been first employed well before 1950. There is no law at present to take action against them because

they are holders of red identity cards. Consideration is however, being given to this matter.

Dr Mahathir bin Mohamed (Kota Star Selatan): Mr Speaker, Sir, there are instances where identity cards have to be changed at the age of 18, and it is found that quite a number of people with blue identity cards when they re-register at the age of 18 are issued with red identity cards. Would these people be considered as citizens when they register at the exchange?

Tuan V. Manickavasagam: At the moment registration in Employment Exchanges is not confined to citizens alone.

REGISTRATION OF NON-MALAYSIAN CITIZENS IN LABOUR EXCHANGES

9. Tuan Ramli bin Omar asks the Minister of Labour to state whether non-Malaysian citizens who came to Malaysia to seek employment are encouraged to register their names in Labour Exchanges.

Tuan V. Manickavasagam: Mr Speaker, Sir, the immigration laws of the country do not at present permit the entry of foreigners for the purposes of employment, except for certain specific categories. The Employment Exchange service does not register any non-citizen from abroad for employment. There is nothing in the law, as I stated earlier, however, to prevent non-citizens who are already here—that is red identity card holders—to seek employment and, if necessary, to seek the assistance of the Employment Exchange service.

EMPLOYMENT OF SINGAPORE CITIZENS IN KOTA TINGGI MAINS, JOHORE

10. Tuan Ramli bin Omar asks the Minister of Labour to state the number of Singapore citizens working in Kota Tinggi Mains, Johore, and whether any employment regulations are imposed, e.g. a post which carried a salary less than \$866 a month is not given to a citizen of Singapore.

Tuan V. Manickavasagam: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am informed that there are 51 Singapore citizens working at the Waterworks situated at the Terbau, Gunong Pulai, Scudai and Ulu Chor. I am not aware of the existence of the Waterworks at Kota Tinggi. There is no legislation precluding Singapore citizens being employed on salaries less than \$866 a month.

1964 GENERAL ELECTIONS— PUBLICITY CAMPAIGN

11. Tuan C. V. Devan Nair asks the Minister of Information and Broadcasting, with reference to paragraph 58 of the Auditor-General's Report on the 1964 Accounts of the Federal Government to give:

- (a) the details of the publicity campaign which necessitated an expenditure of \$327,200 without recourse to public tender and without Treasury sanction; and
- (b) give the name of the printer responsible for this particular assignment, and to explain on what basis this particular printer was picked.

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Tuan Senu bin Abdul Rahman): The sum \$327,200 was spent primarily in producing publicity material for the 1964 general elections, such as posters, leaflets and booklets to teach the electorate the mechanics of voting, "Do's and Don'ts", when, where and how to vote. In addition publicity material on the need for unity to meet external threats and achievements in various fields were prepared. It is not true that one printer was given the job of printing all these publications. In fact, 9 printers handled the production of these assorted publications.

Tuan C. V. Devan Nair: Could I, Sir, have the names of the nine printers?

Tuan Senu bin Abdul Rahman: Mr Speaker, Sir, the names of the nine printers are: Standard Engravers, Lai Than Fong Press, Thian Hwa Press, Life Printers, Solai Press, Malayan

Printers, Kok Ming Press, Aziz Printers and Wakil Printers.

Tuan C. V. Devan Nair: Mr Speaker, Sir, may we seek an assurance as general elections can be planned some time ahead now, that in future tenders will be called for such jobs.

Tuan Senu bin Abdul Rahman: Yes, that I can assure the Honourable Member.

BACHAAN AL-QURAN KARI DAN KARIAH MALAYSIA

13. Tuan Ahmad bin Arshad bertanya kepada Menteri Penerangan dan Penyiaran:

- (a) apa-kah negeri² yang tertarek dengan gaya bacaan Al-Koran oleh Kari dan Kariah dari Malaysia, dan menyebabkan mereka meminta rakaman² suara johan² pertandingan membaca Koran Antara-bangsa;
- (b) bila-kah rakaman² itu di-kirimkan;
- (c) berapa banyak rakaman² yang telah di-jual di-negeri ini dan berapa-kah jumlah hasil-nya.

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, semua negara² yang di-lawati oleh rombongan Kari dan Kariah baharu² ini telah tertarek dengan gaya bacaan² Al-Koran oleh Kari² dan Kariah² dari Malaysia. Negara² itu Afganistan, Iran, Turki, Republic Arab Bersatu dan Sudan. Kapada negara² itu semua telah di-hadiahkan pita² rakaman yang mengandongi bacaan Al-Koran Kari² dan Kariah² kita yang terpilih dan juga filem² pertandingan.

Sa-lain dari itu, negara² lain yang tidak di-lawati pun telah di-kirimkan juga bahan² yang tersebut menerusi perwakilan² Malaysia di-luar negeri, seperti Ethiopia dan Somalia yang telah meminta di-berikan rakaman² itu. Sayugia di-sebutkan di-sini selepas tiap² pertandingan pita² rakaman dan filem² pertandingan ada-lah di-hadiahkan kapada tiap² negara yang turut serta dalam pertandingan itu. Di-negara² yang bukan Islam pita²

rakaman dan *fitem* ada juga di-sampai-kan kepada pertubohan² Islam di-sana.

Mengenai soalan :

(b) pula rakaman² itu tidak ada di-jual di-negeri ini, semua rakaman² itu di-buat oleh Radio Malaysia di-atas pita rakaman dan, seperti yang saya sebutkan tadi, rakaman itu di-hadiahkan sahaja.

BILL PRESENTED

THE PERTUBOHAN BERITA NASIONAL MALAYSIA BILL

Bill to establish and incorporate the Pertubohan Berita Nasional Malaysian National News Agency and to make provisions for the management and supervision thereof and other matters connected therewith; presented by the Minister of Information and Broadcasting; read the first time; to be read a second time at a subsequent sitting of this House.

BILL

THE SUPPLY (1967) BILL

Second Reading

Order read for resumption of debate on Question,

"That the Bill be now read a second time" (25th January, 1967).

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah (Kelantan Hilir): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya hendak mengambil bahagian dalam perbahathan Bill yang ada di-hadapan kita ia-itu Budget 1967.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kenyataan yang telah di-buat oleh Yang Berhormat Kementerian Kewangan di-atas kedudukan kewangan di-dalam tahun 1966 ia-lah satu kenyataan yang berma'ana akuan yang sangat terang dan nyata dan jelas bahawa ada-lah kedudukan kewangan negara makin sa-hari makin bertambah burok. Ini ia-lah kedudukan yang burok di-sebabkan oleh beberapa sebab yang telah di-terangkan di-dalam kenyataan-nya.

Pertama-nya ia-lah kerana belanjawan bagi pertahanan makin sa-hari

makin bertambah. Belanjawan Per-tahanan ini terbit-nya ia-lah kerana Malaysia Timor atau pun kerana dua buah negeri—Sabah dan Sarawak sana. Kami daripada pehak pembangkang apabila Malaysia Bill dahulu telah di-kemukakan dalam tahun 1963 telah menolak Malaysia Bill itu dengan satu kenyataan yang chukup jelas dan terang bahawasa dengan kemasokan Sabah dan Sarawak ka-dalam Malaysia akan mendatangkan bebanan yang berat ka-atas Kerajaan Negeri ini dalam segi pertahanan dan lain² lagi kerana dua buah negeri ini bercherai lebeh daripada sa-ribu batu jauh-nya dan ini akan menimbulkan satu masa-alah yang paling rumit sa-kali di-dalam segi pertahanan dan kewangan, tetapi keterangan kami yang telah kami kemukakan kepada Kerajaan telah di-tolak dengan sa-mena².

Yang kedua-nya ia-lah perbelanjaan yang telah di-beri kepada dua buah negeri ini lebeh daripada yang telah di-tetapkan. Mengikut kenyataan yang telah di-keluarkan di-dalam Budget speech di-hadapan kita bahawasa anggaran sa-banyak \$500,000,000 yang telah di-tetapkan bagi belanjawan pembangunan dua buah negeri yang tersebut. Ini berma'ana tiap² tahun akan di-beri belanja sa-banyak \$100,000,000 kepada dua buah negeri ini, tetapi apa yang telah berlaku ia-itu dalam tempoh dua tahun sahaja belanjawan yang telah di-berikan kepada dua buah negeri itu ia-lah sa-banyak \$270,000,000 berlebehan \$70,000,000 daripada yang telah di-tetapkan dahulu. Sa-lain daripada itu sebab²-nya lagi ia-lah kerana banyak bangunan² yang telah di-bangunkan oleh Kerajaan tidak-lah mengikut utility (kegunaan) bahkan mengikut prestige atau pun ke-indahan dan nama baik sahaja seperti mana Subang Airport kita yang telah memakan belanja \$52,000,000 ia-lah satu bangunan yang paling besar sa-kali, walhal kapal² terbang yang turun di-Subang Airport itu tidak lebeh daripada 15 buah pada tiap² hari.

Saya baru² ini pergi melawat ka-Australia, saya telah melihat bangunan Pejabat Kapalterbang di-Sydney. Saya

tengok tidak-lah begitu hebat, tidak-lah begitu besar sa-bagaimana bangunan yang kita ada di-Subang Airport. Walhal beratus² kapal terbang turun tiap² hari di-padang kapal terbang Sydney. Ini-lah sa-tengah daripada sebab²-nya yang mendatangkan kerumitan dan kemerosotan didalam masalah kewangan bagi negeri kita hingga menyebabkan kekurangan sa-banyak \$28,000,000. Ini deficit didalam Current Account. Ini berma'ana bahawasa neracha kira² bagi current account bagi tahun 1966 sudah tidak betul.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada tahun 1967 ini kita ada mempunyai belanjawan akan di-belanja ia-lah \$1,820,000,000 dan akan mempunyai the overall deficit sa-banyak \$680,000,000 sa-belum di-kenakan atau di-kemukakan chukai² yang baru² ini yang akan memberi kepada Kerajaan sa-banyak \$115,000,000 dan deficit ini akan di-kambuskan dengan hutang yang sa-banyak \$450,000,000. \$300,000,000 daripada hutang ini akan di-pinjam daripada ra'ayat dalam negeri ini, dan \$150,000,000 akan di-pinjam daripada luar negeri.

Kita tahu bahawasa Public Debt didalam negeri tidak-lah menjadi begitu bebanan yang besar kepada pehak Kerajaan dari segi kewangan dan dari segi perbelanjaan bangunan, tetapi direct real burden yang akan hasil daripada Public Debt ini ka-atas ra'ayat jelata sangat-lah berat, kerana Public Debt itu berma'ana transfer ia-itu di-ubahkan atau di-ambil wang daripada satu pehak gulungan ra'ayat dan di-bayarkan kepada Kerajaan dan Kerajaan akan membayar wang itu kepada kontrekter dan Government Servant dan lain² lagi. Pemindahan wang ini ia-lah terdiri daripada orang yang mempunyai wang, yang kaya, yang dapat membeli bond² Kerajaan. Pemindahan ini ia-lah satu perkara yang penting yang, apa-bila Kerajaan hendak mengadakan satu Public Debt, mesti mengambil timbangan di-atas perkara ini.

Kemudian untuk membayarkan sa-banyak \$300,000,000 hutang di-dalam

negeri ini Kerajaan terpaksa mengenakan chukai ka-atas ra'ayat jelata.

Chukai yang akan di-kenakan tadi bukan-lah bebanan-nya akan jatuh kepada orang yang kaya sahaja bahkan kepada ra'ayat jelata sakalian-nya. Sa-bagaimana yang kita ketahui didalam tahun ini ada chukai² baharu, saperti Sur Tax. Sur Tax ini telah di-kenakan di-atas barang² import yang dapat di-pindahkan oleh pehak² saudagar² kepada consumer atau pun ka-atas orang yang menggunakan barang². Ini berma'ana bahawasa ra'ayat jelata yang miskin-lah yang akan menanggung bebanan yang paling berat didalam perkara ini.

Pada hari ini dalam *Straits Times* ada menyebutkan bahawa oleh kerana Sur Tax—sa-kali pun Sur Tax tidak di-kenakan di-atas barang² saperti beras—harga beras sudah naik dari \$1.80 sampai \$2. Ini bebanan yang di-pikul oleh ra'ayat jelata yang miskin yang dudok di-dalam kawasan² luar bandar sangat²-lah berat. Kerana, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, orang² yang dudok di-dalam kawasan luar bandar pendapatan mereka itu, income mereka itu, remain static—tidak berubah, tidak bertambah—tetapi harga barang² yang mereka itu beli bertambah² naik. Ini berma'ana dengan wang sa-ringgit pada tahun 1965 dahulu dapat mereka itu membeli barang yang lebeh banyak kerana tidak ada chukai baharu tetapi buat pada tahun 1967 ini kerana di-kenakan chukai² yang baharu ini, maka dengan wang sa-ringgit itu juga tidak dapat mereka itu membeli sa-banyak barang² yang dapat di-beli pada tahun 1966. Ini berma'ana economic welfare bagi orang yang dudok di-luar bandar telah pun berkurangan. Ini hendak-lah di-timbangkan oleh pehak Kerajaan dari segi perkara ini kerana kita tahu lebeh daripada 80% penduduk² dalam negeri ini hidup mereka itu di-dalam kawasan² luar bandar.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak-lah akan mengambil masa banyak didalam perkara taxes dan lain² lagi, chuma satu perkara saya hendak menyentoh di-sini tentang perkara kenaikan chukai sa-banyak 12 sen di-atas

minyak diesel. Ini satu perkara yang akan mendatangkan satu bebanan yang paling berat ka-atas kaum nelayan. Di-Pantai Timor, khas-nya, beratus² nelayan yang ada mempunyai perahu² yang menggunakan motor boat yang menggunakan minyak diesel. Dengan kenaikan chukai sa-banyak 12 sen sekarang mereka itu telah mengalami kesusahan yang paling besar. Buat driver teksi² Kerajaan telah memberi satu kemudahan kepada mereka itu dengan menghapuskan chukai sa-banyak \$5 tiap² passenger, tetapi kaum nelayan apa-kah kemudahan yang Kerajaan telah berikan?

Kita tahu bahawa sa-nya kehidupan kaum nelayan sangat² miskin, mereka itu hidup kais pagi makan pagi, kais petang makan petang. Apa pendapat yang mereka itu dapat daripada ikan yang mereka itu tangkap sangat²-lah sedikit, tidak menchukupi untuk menjaga atau pun membela anak pinak mereka itu, tetapi dengan kenaikan 12 sen itu bagi diesel oil, ini akan menambahkan lagi kesengsaraan mereka itu. Oleh sebab yang demikian saya harap kepada Kementerian yang berkenaan hendak-lah memberi kemudahan kepada mereka itu sama ada di-kurangkan sewa perahu mereka itu atau sewa motor boat mereka itu dan sa-bagai-nya supaya dengan yang demikian, azab sengsara mereka itu yang akan bertambah ini dapat di-elakkan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam Command Paper No. 49 of 1966 nyata-lah kepada kita bahawasa-nya belanja rural development pada tahun ini akan berkurangan sa-banyak 0.4 peratus. Ini berma'ana bahawa Kerajaan pada tahun ini akan melebuhkan wang untuk memperbaiki penduduk² dalam kawasan bandar. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-sini suka saya hendak sebutkan di-atas kehidupan dan kemiskinan orang² yang dudok di-dalam kawasan luar bandar. Orang² yang dudok di-dalam kawasan luar bandar kehidupan mereka itu ia-lah satu kehidupan yang miskin yang tidak dapat di-nafikan kerana pendapatan mereka itu sangat rendah tidak lebeh daripada \$30 pada satu bulan, tidak lebeh daripada \$30 bagi satu

kelamin pada tiap² bulan. Dengan \$30 ini kita tahu bahawasa mereka itu tidak dapat menjaga dan memelihara anak pinak mereka itu dari segi persekolahan, makanan dan lain² lagi. Sebab-nya maka kemiskinan ini telah timpa di-atas mereka itu ia-lah dua perkara :

- (i) kerana pendapatan mereka itu, income mereka itu datang-nya daripada hasil tanaman² mereka itu yang tidak dapat harga yang tinggi kepada mereka itu, kerana kita tahu middlemen (orang tengah) yang menghisap darah mereka itu—walhal bagaimana yang telah di-terangkan tadi harga barang² keperluan bagi hari² saperti minyak, sabun dan lain² lagi telah bertambah meningkat naik tinggi;
- (ii) orang yang dudok di-luar bandar telah menjadi "racial victimization" di-dalam segi "their participation in economic activities".

Kita tengok sekarang ini mengikut kenyataan yang di-berikan di-dalam ucapan Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan bahawasa di-dalam Malaysia ini ada mempunyai 1,113 lombong yang sedang berjalan sekarang ini. Baik! Di-dalam 1,113 lombong yang sedang berjalan di-dalam tanah ayer kita ini berapa-kah orang daripada buroh² itu terkandung daripada orang² Melayu? Saya minta kenyataan ini daripada Menteri Buroh untuk di-terangkan kepada Rumah yang mulia ini. Daripada 1,113 lombong yang sedang berjalan di-dalam tanah ayer kita sekarang, berapa-kah orang Melayu yang dapat kerja di-dalam lombong² itu? Pula mengikut kenyataan ini juga di-dalam Pioneer Companies ada sa-banyak 112 sharikat² besar di-Petaling Jaya dan lain² tempat—di-dalam 112 companies berapa-kah orang Melayu, berapa orang buroh² Melayu yang dapat bekerja di-dalam 112 pioneer companies ini?

Sa-lain daripada itu, saya suka juga hendak bertanya kepada Menteri Buroh, berapa ribu contractor² yang sedang menjalankan pekerjaan mereka tiap² hari di-dalam negeri ini yang

menggunakan berbelas² ribu atau pun berpuluh² ribu buroh di-dalam tanah ayer kita ini, berapa-kah orang daripada contractor² ini yang telah menggunakan orang² Melayu sa-bagai buroh dan berapa-kah banyak buroh orang Melayu yang mereka itu telah ambil. Semua keterangan ini saya pinta kepada Menteri Buroh untuk di-terangkan kepada Rumah ini supaya sakalian kita dapat mengetahui bagaimana kedudukan yang sa-benar-nya orang Melayu di-dalam segi ini—economic activities. Ada-kah di-beri peluang mereka itu yang sama untuk mengambil bahagian di-dalam kehidupan mereka itu di-dalam pekerjaan buroh dan lain² lagi. Ini ia-lah satu sebab yang mendatangkan kemiskinan orang Melayu. Saya telah bertanya kepada Menteri Buroh pada 15 Jun tahun 1966 di-muka, ini *Written Answers to Question*. Saya bertanya kepada Menteri Buroh berapa bilangan penganggor² mengikut bangsa yang telah mendaftarkan nama mereka itu di-Pusat² Buroh dalam tiap² negeri di-Tanah Melayu dalam tahun 1960, 61, 62, 63 dan 64. Jawab-nya ia-lah sa-banyak 96,733. Saya bertanya kepada-nya mengikut bangsa. Saya minta kepada-nya supaya di-berikan kenyataan bangsa Melayu berapa orang daripada orang ini, berapa orang bangsa China dan bangsa India dan lain² lagi, mengikut bangsa. Tetapi nampak-nya Menteri Buroh dengan sengaja tidak memberikan kenyataan ini untuk hendak menudongkan satu kesalahan besar yang telah tertimpa ka-atas orang Melayu. Tetapi yang aneh-nya, yang pelek-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-belum kemudian daripada ini, Setia-usaha Tetap Kementerian Buroh telah membuat satu kenyataan di-Ipoh sana, bahawasa orang yang tidak mendapat kerja ia-lah sa-banyak 125,000 orang lebeh dan terlebeh daripada lapan puluh peratus daripada mereka itu terdiri daripada orang Melayu, kenapa? Ini *discrimination against Malays, why?* Kenapa Kerajaan tidak dapat membuat satu legislation, undang², tiap² kontrekter mesti menggunakan sekian² banyak orang² Melayu. Tiap² pioner kompeni dan apa juga kompeni mesti menggunakan sekian banyak orang² Melayu. Dengan demikian, baru-lah dapat orang Melayu

hidup dalam negeri mereka itu sendiri. Tetapi, kenapa Kerajaan tidak mahu buat *legislation* yang bagini.

Baru² ini, kita telah mendengar kenyataan yang telah di-buat oleh Menteri Yang Berhormat Menteri Penerangan. Dia berkata, orang² Melayu jangan-lah keluar daripada kampong², mahu-lah duduk di-dalam kampong², jangan keluar ka-bandar² menchari rezki, menchari kerja. Ini satu arahan atau pun kenyataan yang paling menyedehkan, kerana kenyataan yang bagini tidak-lah akan menolong orang² Melayu.

Kenyataan yang bagini boleh ber-ma'ana dua erti. Pertama-nya biar-lah orang² Melayu kekal hidup sa-lama²-nya sa-bagai kaum tani, walau pun kehidupan mereka itu merosot. Kita tahu, *national growth*, pertambahan kanak² yang besar, yang sedang di-alami oleh negara kita. Kalau sa-kira-nya satu family pada tahun 1960 mempunyai tiga anak, dan dia mempunyai satu ekar tanah, pada tahun 1966 dia telah mempunyai sa-kurang² bertambah dua anak, atau pun tiga anak, menjadi enam anak. Tetapi *acreage-nya remained the same* sa-bagai itu juga. Kalau enam anak, dengan dua ibu bapa, jadi lapan orang, hendak memakan hasil daripada satu ekar, ada-kah menchukupi? Tentu tidak.

Kalau hendak di-gunakan enam orang ini untuk bekerja di-atas itu, di-atas satu ekar tanah, ini mengikut dari segi *economic principle* pun tidak betul, kerana kalau di-tambah buroh ini *marginal return* akan kurang kalau di-tambah buroh dengan banyak, hasil-nya tidak akan bertambah. Kalau begitu, orang yang lebeh itu ka-mana hendak pergi? Terpaksa mereka itu keluar ka-bandar² menchari kerja.

Jadi, kenyataan daripada Menteri Yang Berhormat Menteri Penerangan, mengatakan jangan-lah orang Melayu keluar daripada kampong², telah memberi dua ma'ana. Pertama-nya biar-lah orang Melayu kekal sa-lama²-nya hidup sa-bagai kaum tani yang merosot, yang mendapat pendapatan yang makin hari makin kurang, makin

sadikit, kerana bertambah anak dan sekarang bertambah harga barang² bagi keperluan mereka itu.

Yang kedua, jangan-lah orang Melayu menchapai kemajuan di-dalam perdagangan dan perusahaan, kerana apabila di-tegah orang Melayu daripada keluar kampung², bagaimana mereka itu dapat masuk kerja di-kilang², kalau tak dapat mereka itu masuk dalam kilang² bekerja sabagai buroh dan sa-bagai-nya, bagaimana-kah dapat mereka itu membelajar teknik dan dapat *experience*, pengalaman, tentang perdagangan dan perusahaan dan lain² lagi? Ini ia-lah satu perkara yang menyedehkan hati kita. Kemiskinan dan tindasan *racial discrimination is being practised on our bumiputera*. Kita masuk ka-kedai² yang penoh di-Kuala Lumpur ini. Berapa banyak anak Melayu yang dapat bekerja di-kedai² itu? Saya pernah melawat satu *European* kompeni, ia-itu East Asiatic kompeni. Saya tengok, tidak lebeh daripada dua orang daripada kaki-tangan-nya terdiri dari orang² Melayu, yang sa-orang sa-bagai peon dan sa-orang lagi tukang jaga pintu. Yang lain-nya, yang beratus² clerk yang bekerja dalam-nya, sama ada pegawai² *executive* dan lain² lagi semua-nya terdiri daripada bangsa asing. Kenapa ini *racial discrimination*? Why? Kalau Kerajaan kita mem-practisekan demokrasi, kenapa tidak di-adakan *legislation*, menegah perkara ini yang tidak baik.

Orang bangsa asing datang ka-negeri kita ini dengan sa-helai sapinggang, dan telah jadi millionaire, mempunyai bermillion² ringgit sekarang kekayaan mereka itu, kerana kekayaan negeri ini. Kenapa mereka itu tidak mahu tumpah balek satitek dua kapada bangsa kita? Kenapa?

Keterangan yang saya beri ini ia-lah keterangan yang tak dapat di-nafikan. Saya ulangkan sa-kali lagi, saya pinta kapada Menteri Buroh memberi keterangan kapada Rumah ini, berapa puloh ribu orang yang bekerja di-dalam 1,113 *mines, which are under operation now? How many of their employees are Malays?* Saya hendak

tahu dari 140 kompeni yang besar² dalam Malaya ini yang sedang berjalan sekarang ini berapa banyak daripada *employees* itu dari orang² Melayu? *I would like to get this information from him.*

Ini *racial discrimination*, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bukan sahaja di-dalam segi *economic activity* yang telah menyebabkan kepapaan bangsa kita, bahkan *racial discrimination* ini telah menjelema masuk di-dalam segi, di-dalam bidang pelajaran dan lain² lagi.

Tahun lalu, kita dengar sungutan daripada wakil² daripada pehak Kerajaan sendiri, mengatakan anak² Melayu telah di-tindas di-dalam kelas² mereka itu dan tidak di-galakkan mengambil bahagian di-dalam sains. Kenapa? Baru² ini pula di-Ipoh, di-Perak sana kita mendengar bahawa sa-orang guru besar, sa-bagaimana yang telah di-siarkan dalam *Utusan Melayu*, telah mengumpulkan murid² Melayu ini di-dalam kelas B dan C dan tidak kelas A bukan dalam kelas A.—Why? Kata-nya mengikut laporan yang telah di-laporkan oleh *Utusan Melayu*, C.E.O. Perak akan menyelidek di-atas perkara ini.

Tetapi hingga sekarang ini kita belum tahu apa-kah hasil penyelidekan-nya. Ini berma'ana, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, *racial discrimination* ini bukan sahaja di-dalam ekonomi activities bahkan menjelema pula masuk dalam pelajaran.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perkara ini sangat-lah menyedehkan kalau kita orang Melayu hendak membelakan hak yang tinggal sa-kerat pun di-namakan kami sa-bagai *racialist* atau perkauman. Tetapi bagi pehak bangsa² yang memperaktikan sistem *racial discrimination* tidak di-namakan *racialist*, tidak di-namakan perkauman.

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: Saya suka mengingatkan Ahli Yang Berhormat sudah berchakap hampir sa-tengah jam. Jadi, minta Yang Berhormat pendekkan sahaja.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah: Terima kaseh, sadikit lagi sahaja. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya akan berchakap

sadikit dalam masalah FAMA. FAMA telah terdiri dalam tahun 1965 hasil daripada tangisan beratus² wakil yang telah bersidang di-Kuala Lumpur pada bulan Jun 1965. Tujuan FAMA tidak lain dan tidak bukan ia-lah untuk hendak membaiki kaum² tani di-dalam kampong² di-dalam segi pemasaran padi, ikan dan lain² lagi. Kerana Kerajaan telah chukup puas hati yang bahawa kaum tani di-dalam kawasan luar bandar sedang di-tindas dan di-tipu oleh kaum tengah. Maka ini-lah sebab-nya FAMA telah di-dirikan untuk memperbaiki kehidupan mereka itu supaya dapat-lah wang yang telah di-makan, keuntungan yang telah di-dapati oleh pehak kaum tengah tadi dapat di-kembalikan balek kepada *producer*, kepada kaum tani ini. Dengan yang demikian bertambah-lah pendapatan mereka itu dan dengan demikian pula kehidupan mereka itu bertambah baik. Tetapi suka-lah saya hendak bertanya, sa-hingga sampai sekarang ini, FAMA belum lagi dapat menjalankan tugas-nya, ia-itu membeli padi.

Saya baru² ini pergi ka-Australia dan di-sana, saya telah di-beri peluang untuk melawat satu tempat bernama *Griffith* untuk mengkaji soal tanaman padi dan soal *marketing*, pemasaran. Saya telah di-beritahu bahawasa-nya orang² Australia mula menanam padi pada tahun 1925, dan hasil yang di-dapati pada tahun itu ia-lah 220 tan sahaja. Tetapi pada tahun 1928, tiga tahun kemudian daripada itu, Kerajaan telah melantek *Marketing Board*. Satu board Juma'ah Pengarah bagi pemasaran padi yang chuma hasil-nya pada tahun 1925, 220 tan sahaja.

Kenapa *Marketing Board* itu telah di-dirikan ia-lah untuk hendak mem-bela dan menjaga nasib kaum² tani yang bertanam padi di-Australia sana. Tetapi kita sudah beratus² tahun menanam padi, tetapi maseh menjadi mangsa beratus² tahun lama-nya kepada orang tengah. FAMA telah di-dirikan pada tahun 1965, tetapi hingga sampai sekarang ini belum dapat membeli sa-chukup padi lagi daripada kaum tani. Kenapa begitu lambat? Kerana apa-kah begitu lemah-nya pendirian FAMA? Bahkan mengikut

kenyataan yang di-buatkan oleh FAMA, FAMA sedang mengalami bermacam² desakan yang melemahkan FAMA daripada menjalankan pekerjaannya.

Mengikut satu kenyataan yang telah di-keluarkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Pertanian yang telah di-siarkan oleh *Utusan Melayu* pada 28 haribulan Disember, kata-nya Lembaga Pemasaran Pertanian Persekutuan (FAMA) akan menubuhkan lembaga pemasaran padi dan beras yang pertama sa-kali di-kawasan Tanjong Karang sahaja. Kenapa di-kawasan² lain tidak di-dirikan? Sa-tengah daripada sebab² kata-nya mengikut penyelesaian-nya yang sedang di-buat untuk menentukan sama ada pemasaran boleh di-lakukan atau tidak. Kenapa tidak boleh FAMA mengadakan pemasaran? Kkuatkuasa telah di-berikan kepada FAMA oleh Kerajaan, kenapa FAMA tidak dapat mendirikan Lembaga Pemasaran di-tempat² lain? Sa-tengah daripada sebab²-nya kata Yang Berhormat Menteri ia-lah sa-tengah² tempat tersebut telah mendapat harga padi yang baik dari Tanjong Karang—ia-itu harga yang tidak kurang dari \$16 sa-pikul. Ini berma'ana sa-kira-nya kaum tani itu mendapat harga padi sa-pikul \$16 tidak perlu lagi FAMA menjalankan kerja itu. Dan ini tidak-lah akan melepaskan kaum tani daripada tindakan kaum tengah. Saya tahu sebab²-nya maka FAMA tidak dapat menjalankan tugas²-nya kerana mengikut banyak ahli² ekonomi yang berkata "*The Government representing a political compromise between aristocratic, landed, and business interests cannot suppress monopolistic abuses, exploitation*" dan lain². Ini betul, kerana Perikatan yang terdiri daripada tiga buah parti, M.C.A., M.I.C. dan UMNO, ini ada-lah political² *compromise* yang tidak dapat menghapuskan *political abuses* dan exploitation di-dalam Negeri ini. Kita tahu apa-kah nasib MARA, atau FAMA, apa-kah nasib RIDA, dan sekarang tekanan dan tindakan yang sedang di-alami oleh FAMA, dan kita di-dalam sadikit tahun lagi dapat menunjokkan segala kelemahan² ini yang lebeh lagi terang terhadap pehak Kerajaan.

Kelmarin timbul satu soalan dalam perkara perusahaan kain batek yang soalan ini telah di-kemukakan oleh wakil Bungsar yang mengatakan, kenapa 30 buah kilang perusahaan kain batek di-Kelantan telah di-tutup. Saya tahu sebab²-nya. Saya di-dalam Rumah yang mulia ini sudah 4-5 tahun mengadu hal kepada pehak Kerajaan, merayu kepada Menteri yang berkenaan ia-itu Kementerian Perdagangan, meminta supaya protection di-berikan kepada kain batek. Kerana kain batek yang beratus² ribu kodi masok-nya daripada Thailand, yang masok daripada luar negeri yang lain² lagi telah memberi satu pukulan yang hebat kepada perusahaan kain batek di-Kelantan sana.

Sa-lain daripada itu pula, sa-bagai-mana akuan yang telah di-buat oleh pehak Kerajaan sendiri, bahawa satu kilang kain batek telah di-dirikan di-Bukit Mertajam yang mengeluarkan kain batek dengan banyak-nya. Maka daripada dua sebab ini-lah pukulan yang paling hebat telah menimpa kepada perusahaan kain batek di-negeri Kelantan. Apabila kita bertanya kenapa *protection* tidak dapat di-berikan kepada perusahaan kain batek di-Kelantan? Jawab Menteri Yang Berhormat ia-lah kerana *definition* tidak dapat di-buat hingga sampai sekarang. *Definition* bagi kain batek itu tidak dapat di-buat sudah sa-lama 3-4-5 tahun. Saya hairan pehak Kerajaan yang mempunyai expert, yang mempunyai ahli ekonomi, yang mempunyai loyar dan lain², tidak dapat membuatkan satu *definition* kain batek untuk membela perusahaan kain batek orang² Melayu yang berpuluh² ribu mereka itu dapat kehidupan daripada perusahaan ini.

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: Sa-kali lagi saya mengingatkan ia-itu Yang Berhormat sudah mengambil masa sudah 40 minit. Jadi, saya merayu-lah supaya di-beri peluang kepada ahli² yang lain yang hendak berchakap. Saya tidak berkuasa boleh merentikan, tetapi meminta dan merayu-lah supaya dapat peluang ahli yang lain berchakap.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah: Lagi satu perkara, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-lah soal bahasa. Sa-bagai-mana yang kita telah dengar kenyataan yang di-buat oleh wakil dari Ipoh, dapat-lah kita faham dengan jelas-nya bahawasa-nya soal bahasa akan menjadi satu soal yang paling besar yang kita akan alami pada tahun ini. Dan orang² Melayu sakalian-nya sedang memerhatikan langkah, gerak geri pehak Kerajaan. Sa-takat mana-kah keberanian pehak Kerajaan hendak melaksanakan tujuan, dan hendak melaksanakan Perlembagaan yang menyatakan bahawasa-nya bahasa Melayu akan di-jadikan bahasa rasmi yang tunggal pada tahun 1967. Orang Melayu di-sakalian tempat di-dalam Malaysia ini sedang memerhati langkah² Kerajaan. Kalau sa-kira-nya Kerajaan chuai untuk melaksanakan Perlembagaan ini, maka ini satu perkara yang sangat merbahaya, dan kedudukan Kerajaan sendiri akan dapat pukulan yang paling hebat yang harus memusnahkan Kerajaan sendiri. Sekian-lah.

Wan Abdul Rahman bin Datu Tuanku Bujang (Sarawak): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada keseluruhan-nya Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan kita boleh-lah di-beri tahniah kerana membentangkan satu Budget pada tahun ini yang menerima pujian bukan sahaja dari Parti Perikatan tetapi juga dari pehak Pembangkang. Tetapi beberapa perkara yang di-sebutkan beliau dalam ucapan-nya ada-lah tidak begitu menyenangkan.

Satu daripada-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-lah amaran beliau, ia-itu ada kemungkinan bahawa beberapa orang kaki-tangan Kerajaan harus di-berhentikan dengan alasan hendak menjimat-chermatkan perbelanjaan Kerajaan pada tahun ini. Saya harap, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, langkah yang mungkin akan di-ambil oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan itu tidak akan menyentuh atau mengena kaki-tangan² Kerajaan di-Malaysia Timor. Sa-bagaimana yang di-ketahui oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri itu, kami di-Malaysia Timor sangat-lah

kekurangan kaki-tangan Kerajaan, terutama sekali di-dalam lapangan teknikal dan *professional*. Kerajaan Pusat, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dan Kerajaan negeri pada masa ini, baharu sahaja dalam peringkat permulaan menjalankan rancangan di-Malaysia Timor untuk mengharmoniskan hasil² dan faedah² dari kemerdekaan kita. Jika di-tingkat ini Kerajaan akan bertindak seperti yang telah di-bayangkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri itu, maka akan tergendala projek² pembangunan dalam negeri² di-Malaysia Timor.

Juga, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kaki-tangan Kerajaan di-Malaysia Timor tidak-lah mempunyai kelakuan yang agak hebat dan nakal seperti beberapa banyak kaki-tangan² Kerajaan di-Malaysia Barat ini. Kaki-tangan Kerajaan di-Malaysia Barat ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, suka mengambil keputusan dengan bertindak menuntut naik gaji dan berbagai² lagi tuntutan yang lain. Jika Kerajaan enggan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, memenohi tuntutan mereka itu, mereka akan melangkah sa-tapak lagi dengan mengadakan mogok atau mengambil tindakan *work to rule* dan sa-bagai-nya. Saya berpendapat ada banyak kaki-tangan² Kerajaan dan Union² di-Malaysia Barat ini boleh di-anggap sa-bagai *spoiled children*. Ini ada-lah di-sebabkan Kerajaan sangat² memanjakan mereka itu pada mulanya, sa-hingga sekarang keadaan-nya telah sampai kepada satu tingkat, sa-olah² union²-lah dan kaki-tangan² Kerajaan-lah yang berkuasa penoh dalam negeri ini.

Pada beberapa hari yang lalu, kita juga dapat membacha berita² di-akhbar² tentang tindakan yang telah di-ambil oleh sa-bahagian atau pun sa-golongan kaki-tangan² dalam rumah² sakit. Kita bershukor Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-itu kaki-tangan² Kerajaan di-Malaysia Timor dan union² di-sana mempunyai pemimpin mereka yang bertanggung-jawab kepada negara, nusa dan bangsa. Mereka tidak mempunyai kelakuan seperti rakan² dan saudara² mereka yang di-Malaysia Barat ini. Dalam perkara ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kaki-tangan Kerajaan di-Malaysia Barat patut-lah mengambil

chontoh seperti kaki-tangan Kerajaan di-Malaysia Timor.

Sa-bahagian lagi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh telah menda'awa dalam Dewan ini, ia-itu kemenangan Parti SNAP ia-itu Parti Dato' Kalong dalam Pilihan Raya Kechil di-Pelagus pada sadikit bulan yang lalu ada-lah menjajokkan bahawa seluruh ra'ayat Sarawak tidak lagi perchaya kepada Parti Perikatan di-sana. Ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya anggap sa-bagai satu *exaggeration of the first order*. Saya suka menerangkan di-sini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada-lah Pilihan Raya Kechil itu chuma satu pilihan kepada satu *district council* sahaja. Pengundi² dalam kawasan itu chuma berjumlah lebeh kurang 800 orang sahaja, yang di-mana lebeh kurang 500 orang sahaja yang keluar mengundi. Dari-pada mereka yang keluar mengundi itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Parti SNAP mendapat sa-banyak 285 undi, yang baki-nya di-bahagikan di-antara Parti Perikatan dan SUPP. Saya perchaya tidak sa-orang manusia yang berfikir human akan berani menda'awa bahawa bilangan penduduk yang bagitu kechil sekali boleh di-anggap sa-bagai suara ra'ayat Sarawak yang mana mempunyai penduduk lebeh kurang 800,000 manusia. Dengan hal yang demikian, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli Yang Berhormat dalam Dewan ini tentu bersetuju dengan saya, ia-itu Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh sudah tentu tidak dapat menda'awa bahawa parti-nya mewakili seluruh ra'ayat dalam negeri Perak, pada-hal parti-nya chuma mendapat kemenangan dalam *Ipoh Municipality* sahaja.

Pada pertengahan tahun 1966 dahulu, chalun Parti Perikatan Tuan G. G. Bandong, sa-orang yang beragama *Catholic* telah menewaskan sa-orang chalun yang merupakan dirinya sa-bagai chalun bebas, tetapi yang sa-benar-nya chalun ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-lah penyokong kuat parti SNAP. Dia sengaja berpura² bertopengkan bebas sebab dia tahu ia-itu Parti SNAP tidak sama sekali mendapat sambutan, atau pun sokongan di-kawasan itu. Sungguh pun bagitu,

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sekali pun tipu-helah chalun yang bertopengkan bebas itu malah chalun Parti Perikatan telah mendapat kemenangan dengan mudah sekali. Sunggoh pun demikian kemenangan kami, kami tidak pernah menda'awa di-mana² pun bahawa seluruh penduduk Sarawak telah menunjukkan kepercayaan mereka kepada Parti Perikatan.

Sa-orang lagi Ahli Pembangkang dari Sarawak, ia-itu Yang Berhormat Edmund Langgu telah bertanya kepada Yang Amat Mulia Tunku Perdana Menteri dalam persidangan ini, ia-itu sama ada satu Pesuruhjaya dari luar negeri akan datang untuk memerhatikan Pilehan Raya yang akan datang di-Sarawak. Pertanyaan ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, benar² merupakan ia-itu Parti SNAP itu maseh lagi mempunyai perasaan dan belum keluar dari taraf *colonial puppet*, sedang seluruh ra'ayat Sarawak, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, mengetahui bahawa Parti SNAP itu maseh lagi kaseh dan sayang kepada *colonial masters-nya* dahulu. Kalau dahulunya SNAP telah pernah menolak chadangan SUPP, ia-itu Parti Pembangkang Sarawak supaya kuasa luar champor-tangan dalam hal menentukan hasrat ra'ayat Sarawak terhadap Malaysia, maka terbukti-lah sekarang dengan jelas-nya ia-itu SNAP telah menyokong pendapat, pendirian dan perjuangan SUPP dalam perkara ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada hari kelmarin, kita sakalian dalam Dewan ini telah mendengar satu peti nyanyi Parti SNAP juga dari Sarawak dengan nyaring-nya bermain lagu² yang di-sukai oleh Colonial Masters. Parti itu dan juga oleh pehak kominis di-Sarawak. Nama peti nyanyi itu ialah Yang Berhormat Enche' Edmund Langgu juga ia-itu buatan His Master's Voice of England.

Sekarang, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, nampak-nya peti nyanyi itu sentiasa bermain lagu² anti-Kerajaan Pusat, tetapi saya mendengar peti nyanyi itu telah berkarat, kerana kebanyakan perkataan² dalam pantun-nya telah tidak di-sebutkan dengan betul dan sempurna. Bagini-lah keadaan-nya,

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-orang wakil ra'ayat yang mengaku diri-nya mewakili ra'ayat Sarawak, tetapi tidak dapat mengeluarkan fikiran-nya sendiri dan tidak dapat membuat ucapan-nya sendiri. Dia chuma tahu membacah ucapan² yang di-sediakan oleh orang lain. Apa-kah harga-nya ucapan yang di-keluarkan oleh beliau? Bagi diri saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sunggoh pun saya telah tewas dalam pilehan raya District Council dalam tahun 1963, tetapi saya telah suka, lebeh suka berdiam² sahaja dalam Dewan ini daripada membenarkan diri saya menjadi sa-buah peti nyanyi.

Yang Berhormat Enche' Edmund Langgu juga sekarang berpekek² minta pilehan raya sa-chara langsung di-adakan dengan segera-nya di-Sarawak, kerana konon-nya kata beliau Kerajaan sekarang ini tidak lagi mendapat kepercayaan ra'ayat Sarawak. Ketika Parti SNAP maseh lagi dalam Perikatan dahulu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dan ketika Dato' Ningkan maseh lagi menjadi Ketua Menteri, Dato' Ningkan dan parti-nya telah bertalu² menolak seruan SUPP supaya pilehan raya sa-chara langsung di-adakan di-Sarawak. Sekarang oleh kerana SNAP menjadi pehak Pembangkang dan di-tolak oleh ra'ayat Sarawak, peti nyanyi yang rosak jarum-nya itu menyanyikan lagu yang telah lama dimainkan oleh SUPP. Jika SNAP sunggoh benar mahu pilehan raya di-adakan di-Sarawak dengan segera dan yakin mendapat sokongan yang besar daripada ra'ayat Sarawak, apa-kah sebab-nya Dato' Ningkan tidak menasihatkan Tuan Governor Sarawak untuk membubarkan Council Negeri Sarawak dan mengadakan pilehan raya ketika dia maseh lagi menjadi Ketua Menteri Sarawak? Sekarang apabila pehak Parti Perikatan telah menerangkan bahawa pilehan raya akan di-adakan pada tahun ini, maka baharu-lah Yang Berhormat itu berpekek² meminta pilehan raya di-adakan segera.

Satu lagi piring hitam, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, juga buatan His Master's Voice of England yang di-mainkan oleh peti nyanyi itu menyanyikan lagu bahawa ra'ayat Sarawak di-buat sa-bagai warga negara kelas dua oleh

Kerajaan Pusat. Nasib baik, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ra'ayat Sarawak telah jemu mendengar lagu itu. Mereka telah tahu di-antara sakalian Negeri² di-dalam Malaysia ini, Sarawak dan Sabah mendapat layanan yang istimewa terutama sa-kali dalam lapangan pembangunan. Satu bukti, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, yang terang bahawa Sarawak mendapat layanan yang istimewa ia-lah dalam lapangan Immigration. Ra'ayat Sarawak boleh datang dan tinggal di-Malaysia Barat dengan tidak ada sekatan, tetapi ra'ayat Malaysia Barat tidak boleh tinggal di-Sarawak dengan tidak ada kebenaran daripada Kerajaan Negeri Sarawak. Yang Berhormat itu chuma tahu membuat tudohan umum sahaja, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tetapi tidak dapat memberi bukti; ini tidak-lah menjadi hairan kepada Dewan ini. Sekarang beliau chuma tukang bacha ucapan sahaja.

Dalam masaalah pelajaran, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, His Master's Voice dari Parti SNAP mengaku ia-itu system pelajaran di-Sarawak pada masa ini merugikan penduduk bumiputera, terutama sa-kali yang dudok dari luar bandar, tetapi I.G.C. system penjajah dahulu hendak-lah di-gunakan di-Sarawak sa-lama 10 tahun dan sa-telah itu jika Council Negeri bersetuju, boleh-lah system di-Malaysia Barat di-gunakan di-Sarawak. Apakah sebab-nya Dato' Ningkan dan Parti SNAP tidak mengambil tindakan menerusi Council Negeri Sarawak, mengubah system colony yang buruk itu ketika Dato' Ningkan maseh menjadi Ketua Menteri dahulu?

Ahli² SNAP, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kerap kali berchakap besar menentang sa-barang perchubahan hendak mengubah I.G.C., bagaimana-kah system penjajah dapat di-ubah jika I.G.C. tidak di-ubah. Saya bersetuju, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dengan Ahli Yang Berhormat itu apabila beliau menda'awa ia-itu perusahaan kayu balak menguntongkan sa-golongan yang kechil sahaja. Tidak-kah Yang Berhormat itu sedar ia-itu orang yang mendapat kawasan yang paling besar sa-kali di-Sarawak ia-lah Mr James Wong, sa-orang daripada pemimpin

SNAP. Bukan-kah Mr James Wong mempunyai lebih daripada 500,000 ekar hutan? Berapa ribu ekar-kah yang telah di-beri oleh Kerajaan Dato' Ningkan kepada rakan² yang gulongan kechil itu? Siapa-kah yang mendapat kekayaan ketika pentadbiran Dato' Ningkan? Tuan Yang di-Pertua, oleh kerana perbuatan Dato' Ningkan-lah maka gelaran Dato'² di-Sarawak pada masa ini tidak berharga.

Dato' Ningkan memberi gelaran itu pada pengikut²-nya saperti Enche' Dustan Endawi, pemimpin SNAP yang berumor chuma lebih kurang 30 tahun mendapat gelaran Dato' sa-telah bekerja lebih kurang 2 tahun menjadi Menteri Kerajaan Negeri. Bagitu juga Dato' Ningkan sendiri, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dia telah memberi gelaran itu kepada diri-nya sendiri, sunggoh pun perkhidmatan-nya kepada negara sa-belum dia menjadi Ketua Menteri boleh di-katakan tidak ada yang istimewa.

Abang Othman menjadi Dato', Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-telah dua bulan menjadi Menteri. Bagini-lah chorak yang sa-benar-nya pemimpin SNAP itu.

Pada akhir-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka menguchapkan sa-tinggi² tahniah dan terima kasih kepada Ahli dari Sarawak juga, ia-itu Enche' Stephen Yong siapa yang berchadang dalam ucapan-nya dalam Dewan ini pada dua hari yang lalu ia-itu dia telah berkata Kerajaan Pusat jangan-lah membuang wang untuk menentang kominis² di-Sarawak. Saya tidak hairan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sedikit pun kepada Ahli Yang Berhormat itu dengan mengemukakan chadangan yang tersebut, oleh kerana, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli Yang Berhormat itu ia-lah Setia-usaha Agong SUPP Sarawak. SUPP itu ada-lah sa-buah parti yang menjadi topeng kepada parti kominis di-Sarawak. Sunggoh pun Ahli Yang Berhormat itu ahli Pembangkang dan diri saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada-lah dari ahli Perikatan yang mempunyai ta'at setia yang tidak berbelah bagi pada Perikatan dan kepada Malaysia 'am-nya, tetapi saya

menyokong dengan sa-penoh²-nya atas chadangan Ahli Yang Berhormat itu supaya Kerajaan jangan membuang wang untok menentang kominis di Sarawak. Oleh kerana fikiran saya, otak mereka² itu tidak mungkin dibasoh, atau di-chuchi lagi, saya berpendapat, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, karat kominis telah sangat tebal meliputi di-seluroh otak mereka semenjak beberapa tahun yang lalu. Saya sa-bagai sa-orang bumiputera Sarawak suka menunjukkan perasaan saya dalam Dewan ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dan juga perasaan sa-bahagian besar daripada bumiputera Sarawak, sungguh berasa kesal dan sayang-nya apabila kami melihat di-sekitar kawasan² terkawal ia-itu Control Area Kuching yang mana tidak dapat di-napikan, ia-itu Kerajaan telah membelanjakan berjuta² ringgit di-kawasan² itu dengan tujuan atau harapan agar ra'ayat² yang bersemangat kominis di-sana akan menjadi manusia yang sempurna. Ini ada-lah jawapan Yang Berhormat Menteri Keselamatan Dalam Negeri di-waktu beliau menjawab ucapan saya pada tahun yang lalu.

Sa-sudah itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, baharu² ini satu usaha lagi telah di-jalankan dengan di-beri nama Operation Harapan. Kedua² usaha ini nampak-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tidak bagitu memberi puas hati kepada ra'ayat² Sarawak yang ta'at kepada Malaysia, terutama sa-kali kepada bumiputera Sarawak. Dengan ada-nya hasil² yang tidak memberi puas hati dari usaha² yang telah di-jalankan oleh Kerajaan itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, maka ini kedua kalinya saya berseru dalam Dewan ini kepada Ahli² Yang Berhormat dan khas-nya kepada Yang Berhormat Menteri Keselamatan Dalam Negeri untok mempertimbangkan perkara ini supaya mendesak Kerajaan menghantar semua mereka yang melakukan gerakan subversive dengan sa-buah slow boat to China. Terima kaseh (*Tepok*).

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: Meshuarat ini di-tanggohkan sa-lama 15 minit.

Sitting suspended at 11.30 a.m.

Sitting resumed at 11.50 a.m.

(Mr Deputy Speaker in the Chair)

Debate resumed.

Dr Lim Chong Eu (Tanjong): Mr Speaker, Sir, as usual one cannot but compliment the able and efficient manner whereby the Honourable Minister of Finance delivered his Budget speech. There were the habitual features of encouragement, self-satisfaction and pride, accompanied by warnings, threats and cajolery, which beguiled and brain-washed his listeners to a state of confusion, before he began his operation of extracting more money from the taxpayers.

We were told of the increased Gross National Product, the increased rate of capital formation, the overall monetary stability, the stability of retail prices and, quite naturally, we all felt that the people in our country have really done their part well in the past year. The people in our country have indeed worked hard, produced more than ever before, paid out even more in Income Taxes, and they had done all these in the face of confrontation.

But then we were warned that the prices of our main export commodities had fallen, that there are "some strains on the economy", "the Central Government's overall budgetary deficit has remained at a high level", and the overall deficit of over \$500 million is "uncomfortably large", this year there will be a deficit of \$28 million in our current account, and that to meet the problem of our overall deficit we will have to borrow another \$406 million thereby increasing the size of Public Debt, which in turn will further increase our Public Debt charges in future, and we were also informed that "during the first 11 months of 1966, Malaysia's foreign reserves declined by about \$107 million".

With the superb skill of the cave-man tax-collector, the Honourable Minister then began to wield his big stick.

Beginning with an almost apologetic note that "the accounts for 1966 have

been closed but not yet finalised", paragraph 56 of his speech paints "the general picture of increasingly severe strain" of Government's finances, tells us of the "uncomfortably large" overall deficit of \$500 million, and conclude with the stunning revelation that the Government's realisable assets of about \$400 million has taken us back to the level nine years ago, 1958, "which was one of our worst years in this respect."

Almost before one could recover from this astonishing fact, the Honourable Minister then prepares to deliver his first threat. Beautifully, with all the skill he has acquired during his years as Finance Minister, he glows over the striking increase in the collection from income tax of 21% before he hits out with the viciousness of a "Cassius Clay special punch"—"if there is any evidence of tax evasion, the full weight of the law will be brought to bear upon them", that is to say, upon the very tax-payers who have just paid out \$365 million in 1966 and thereby set a new record of payments! If that were not enough, the Honourable Minister goes on with almost sadistic pleasure to tell the meek tax-payers that "it would then be too late for the evaders to ask for mercy. The full rigour of the law will be applied and its penal provisions will be invoked to mete out the penalties appropriate to them".

Then in rapid succession the Honourable Minister lashes out.

Beginning with his characteristically ambivalent ploy of sweetness followed by the bitter pill, he states in paragraph 60 of his speech that "while the increase in revenue has been satisfactory, the growth in expenditure has been a major source of anxiety." Then quickly absolving his own difficulties in trying to cut down on increases in expenditure he hits out with telling blows.

Parents are warned that "while we would like to provide the best for our children we cannot ignore the facts of life and must accept that we can only provide what we can afford."

Public servants are warned that "the time is rapidly approaching when the Government will be faced with either a major retrenchment exercise or with an overall pay-cut from top to bottom or with both measures."

Even the constituent States of the Federation are warned that "the Federal Government will not consider any request for help from any State unless the Treasury is satisfied that the State concerned has practised the utmost economy and done everything it could to help itself by increasing its revenue to the maximum extent possible from the sources available to it."

Sir, I shall have more to say about the reasons advanced by the Honourable Minister for the strain on the Federal Government's financial position, when I go on to criticise the proposed Budget. Suffice it to say that in his anxiety to present a tolerable budget, the Honourable Minister seems to have arrogantly placed the interests of the Federal Government so high as to forget that the Federation of Malaysia is a federation of sovereign States, and to try and brow-beat the States, the public servants, the parents and the taxpayers in the country into accepting his new tax proposals will in effect mean that the Central Government has transmitted its financial strains into terms of political stresses in the relationships between the State Governments and the Central Government, and those between the people in the country and the party in power.

This is significantly brought out by the Honourable Minister himself when he precluded his new tax proposals with the curious plea that "after all, even Finance Ministers are human and, like all politicians, do not court unpopularity for the fun of it."

However, in the light of the harshness of his attitude, which I had quickly tried to delineate, one has to admit that it is simply human if the people in the country, the parents, the public servants, the State officials and the taxpayers were to regard Finance Ministers as the very incarnations of the devil himself, and to regard that the

new taxes as harsh, merciless and inconsiderate, measures.

The Honourable Minister of Finance states quite categorically that he is "convinced that there is no other course open to us if we are to maintain our financial viability and economic stability" except to impose the additional taxes proposed. However, he has in his conclusion asked for "constructive advice as to what we should do to make ends meet."

Mr Speaker, Sir, it is because I fundamentally do not agree with him that there is no other course open to us to maintain our financial viability and economic stability that I opposed in principle the additional taxes which he has proposed.

This is not blind opposition to the new tax measures. The Honourable Minister has asked for a sense of responsibility from all of us. I assure him that it is with this sense of responsibility that I find it necessary in principle to oppose his proposals.

I hope that the Honourable Minister will not have forgotten that last year I suggested that "the entire turnover tax be completely repealed." and that "because of the unpopularity of this tax a single stage tax at source be levied on the actual value of the imported goods but called by another name". This proposal on our part was made in the face of a ministerial attitude which implied that those opposed to the turnover tax were "blood-suckers" and which arrogantly brushed aside Opposition view as "utterly irrelevant" and which "we can afford to ignore."

Now that the Honourable Minister has repealed the Turnover Tax, I consider it only fair on our part to congratulate him on his new found spirit of accommodation to the people's wishes and the opposition's suggestions. Further, having committed myself last year to a levy at source, I have in full conscience to support his proposal of a 2% Surtax on imports to replace the unpopular Turnover Tax.

However, I must in no uncertain terms oppose the imposition of the 2% Surtax on imports to include imports into Penang Island.

Sir, it may appear paradoxical to the Honourable Minister of Finance that the very valid reason which he advanced that imports into Penang Island were also liable to turnover tax cannot be accepted by the people in Penang Island.

But I would like to reiterate the opinions of the people of Penang, particularly in Penang Island, with regard to the retention of the "free port status of Penang Island". Over this issue the Honourable Prime Minister has given his assurance that the free port status of the Island will not be taken away until the people in Penang Island have been persuaded to do so.

The imposition of the Import Surtax in Penang Island means in effect that the Honourable Minister of Finance does not intend to uphold and honour the principle and the promise given to the people of Penang Island by the Honourable Prime Minister. Once this principle is nullified, there will be nothing to prevent the wholesale incorporation of the Island into the Common Custom Area without compensatory provision of alternative means of development. For example, we yet have to see any sign or move for the construction of a Causeway connecting the Island to the mainland as proposed by the Honourable Prime Minister two years ago. The University which has been promised is still so much unpublished report. Even the Minister of Commerce and Industry tried to dampen enthusiasm for Tourism development in the Island during his last visit there.

On top of all these, the Government now proposes to extend West Malaysian rates of import duty on sugar, matches, cigarette lighters and completely built up motor vehicles to Penang Island. Admittedly, there is a special provision of exemption of goods involved in the entrepot trade kept in bonded warehouses.

But the issues which interest us profoundly are that in his speech the Honourable Minister of Finance only indicated that "the extension of the duty on completely built up motor vehicles to Penang Island has been specifically agreed to by the State Government" and the tax yield will be in the order of \$3.7 million. Are we to understand by implication that the import duty on the other items sugar, matches, and cigarette lighters, were not agreed to by the State Government? If so, this is added evidence that the Central Government does not intend to honour the principles of consulting the wishes of the people of Penang on the question of the retention of the free port status of Penang Island.

The States of Penang, with its very limited resources of revenue, contributes a fair share of its financial wealth to the Federal Government. How large this share is we have never been able to assess, because the Federal Government cannot provide us with adequate breakdown figures. But the annual operating Budget of the State is only in the region of \$18 million. We receive a capitation grant of about \$5 million—slightly over \$5 million—from the Central Government. It will, therefore, be seen that the extraction of \$3.7 million from Penang Island, which is slightly more than half of the State in terms of population, means in effect that the Federal Government will virtually take away more than what it contributes to the people in the Island of Penang in terms of the Capitation Grant.

In the light of the lack of Federal Government assistance in the establishment of revenue producing development in Penang Island, and of the promise by the Honourable the Prime Minister to sustain the principle of the retention of the free port status of the Island, I have to oppose the imposition of the Surtax on Imports in Penang Island and the extension of the short list of new Customs duties.

Sir, this is what I mean when I say that I oppose the new taxation measures in principle.

To the people of Penang Island they simply know that the new taxation measures will further cripple their endeavours to secure an equitable livelihood. The Honourable Minister of Finance has given his reasons for the Customs duty on imported sugar, but the people's question must stick at his throat; why should it be that sugar manufactured just across the water in a factory which has special fiscal support and protection by the Federal Government? That is a question which must be answered if the people in Penang Island are to be made to accept the new taxes. It is no use just telling them that we must be prepared to buy Malaysian produced goods, even if they are more expensive. Most of us will accept such a call in relation to goods primarily produced in Malaysia itself. But where the primary materials are not even produced from Malaysian soil it becomes a difficult political exercise to distinguish the role and position of the importer, the entrepreneur and the processor in the economy of our country.

Sir, I would like to suggest to the Federal Government that it should set up an Economic and Development Survey Commission to look into the problems of how best to integrate Penang Island into the Common Customs Area and at the same time provide a blue-print of the development of new economic potentials in the Island to replace the losses which will be incurred by incorporation into the Common Customs Area. I earnestly suggest this as one of the best ways of equitably resolving this very thorny issue, it will be foolish and unfair simply to bludgeon the people in Penang into blind acceptance of taxes which they so deeply resent; for, under those circumstances, what the people in Penang would prefer is that if the Minister must exercise his power of "a stroke of his pen" he should then sign away his office rather than the people's means of livelihood.

Over the imposition of the new increases in the registration fees, I would like the Honourable Minister to better define what he means by "the

smallest business". As his proposal now stands, the comparison of this category of business which will qualify for exemption to rubber small-holders with less than 25 acres is not clear enough. If the intention is to exempt the poorer income groups then the analogy cannot apply. If the intention is to exempt those business with a capital outlay of less than the \$25,000 to \$30,000 which a rubber small-holder with less than 25 acres represents, then the exemption level may be set too high.

The new Development Tax has already drawn sufficient criticism from all sides of the House for me to comment upon except to say that I agree with the views that the Government must exercise great care to ensure that this new tax is not merrily passed on to the consumers, and that it will not adversely affect those who literally cannot afford to pay for it. My Honourable friend the Member for Bungsar has fully elaborated on this point. I hope that in his reply the Honourable Minister will sketch out for us the scan of the type of trade, business, profession, or vocation, and also rent from the letting of properties upon which he based his estimated yield of \$50 million, so that we can have a better idea of his proposals. As it now reads, the proposed new tax will certainly meet with the most vehement opposition from the very small traders and businessmen, who are already quite heavily burdened, and every hawker, trishaw-rider, cart driver, taxi-owner, coffee-shop owner, hairdresser or barber, and bicycle repairer, amongst others, will curse the day that he foolishly voted for the symbol of the sailing boat.

Sir, earlier in my speech I said that I would like to debate the reasons advanced by the Honourable Minister for the strain in the Federal Government's financial position. In so doing, I would like to elaborate upon why I do not agree with his view that his budgetary proposals this year have been made because "there is no other course open to us if we are to maintain our financial viability and economic stability".

I agree with him when he said that the fact that our current account is not in balance is an extremely serious trend which must clearly be reversed. How serious this problem really is can be readily understood when we recall that last year he warned us—and, Sir, with your permission I would like to quote—"the trend of the current account outturn is ominous. The surplus on current account in 1960 which stood at \$237 million had declined to \$135 million by 1962, and was down to \$57 million in 1964. This year"—i.e. 1966—"it will almost completely disappear. It is, therefore apparent that the position in this respect is deteriorating not only progressively but alarmingly so, and therein lies the danger."—these are the words of the Honourable Minister of Finance himself. "The ideal, of course, would be a budget provided for even development expenditure out of current account. At the least, it is essential that a significant part of the Development Budget should be financed from current revenue. To finance, however, the whole of the Development Budget and, worse still, even a part of the Ordinary Budget from loans, is the surest way to eventual financial disaster. This trend will, therefore, have to be reversed, somehow or other." That was what he said last year.

It is quite clear, therefore, that the Government has not only not been able to do what they set out to do last year, but this year the same warning has to be repeated and meanwhile the financial position has become worse.

How much worse has the position become? The question is answered by the Honourable Minister himself in paragraph 64 of his speech, which bears repeating:

"With development expenditure at \$600 million and special receipts at \$57 million, the overall deficit for 1966, including the current account deficit of \$28 million, is now estimated at \$571 million. This will be financed by domestic and foreign loans totalling \$406 million and a rundown of \$165 million in the Federal Government's reserves."

To make this crystal clear (if I may borrow a favourite phrase of the Honourable Minister), our Current Account which showed a surplus of

\$237 million in 1960, only seven years ago, has now been reversed to the extent that there is a deficit of \$28 million. How much more expenditure the Government is to incur through Supplementary Supply Bills in the course of this year is anybody's guess, but even without taking this into consideration, the situation is grave indeed.

In 1965, our external reserves stood at \$3,058 million. At the end of November, 1966, it had fallen to \$2,657 million. With the present budget proposal of drawing \$165 million from our reserves to partially finance the overall deficit, we can anticipate our reserves to have fallen to a level of \$2,492 million by the end of the year. At this rate of rundown of 6.1% per year, unless something drastic and radical were done to halt the trend of expenditure, we shall be in dire trouble in the not so distant future.

Using the very guide-posts set out by the Honourable Minister himself, the decision to finance our overall deficits from loans and a rundown of our reserves is grimly ominous. We have slipped down the path which is "the surest way towards eventual financial disaster". From this point of view, Sir, this harsh, merciless and inconsiderate Budget is also disastrous.

It is around this theme of anxiety, alarm and sense of ominous disaster that the Honourable Minister has tried to work out his problems and, to convince himself, that there is no other course open to us to maintain our financial viability and economic stability except by imposing the additional new taxes he proposes. That this course will in fact, continue to be practised in the future is suggested to us when the Honourable Minister said towards the end of his speech that "in spite of the additional taxation measures proposed in this Budget, this country is by no means overtaxed." But the writing is already there on the wall for all those who want to see it, when the Honourable Minister also admits in paragraph 127 that "it is also clear that taxation exercises of the magnitude proposed in this Budget cannot be imposed every year."

How then, Sir, are we to reverse the very serious trend in our financial situation?

Sir, in all earnestness, I suggest that the Alliance Party in power must radically review its policies and political direction, and the Government must absolutely cut out any unnecessary expenditure. It is not enough for the Honourable Minister of Finance to say outside this House that he intends to keep down expenditure "by hook or crook", when we are told by him that "the increase in 1966 (in the Ordinary Budget Expenditure) has taken place in spite of Treasury efforts to limit or turn down demands for additional funds from various Ministries and Departments."

When the Honourable Minister has to pressurise the taxpayers, the parents, the public servants and the State Governments, we can see no reason why he should not exert the same harsh pressure upon his colleagues. It is clear that, whilst the Government would insist upon the people of the country to accept the rather dubious law of Nature that "nothing worthwhile is achieved without sacrifice", nevertheless, the Honourable Minister of Finance has not managed to completely persuade his ministerial colleagues to accept the hard facts of life, that we are already financially on the slippery slope down towards eventual disaster.

It is because the Honourable Minister has revealed to us that "there is considerable pressure to increase expenditure due mainly to the need to implement Government policies already decided upon" that I have advanced my suggestion that there is need for a radical review of Government policies.

We are bluntly told that "the economic development in West Malaysia must clearly go on, because otherwise there is no hope for the future" and that "we must provide for development and defence of East Malaysia because we have no other choice". But the Honourable Minister subtly suggests to us that "we can, however, choose between comprehensive schools and increased pay for the Public Service."

It is this kind of attitude which so completely frustrate the people in our country. But to give the Honourable Minister of Finance his due, I am not very certain whether he was addressing this view to the people outside this House, or to his own side of the House, or to his own ministerial colleagues.

In paragraph 71 of his speech he had, in fact, stated the type of solution which we on this side of the House will give all our support. He said then :

"The increase in (education) expenditure cannot, of course, be avoided if existing policies are pursued but in view of the fact that we are coming to the limit of our resources, it will be necessary to reappraise such policies in the course of 1967, so that expenditure can be accommodated within a figure which we can afford."

So, finally, it is not the sensitivity of the multi-racial community within our country which will insist upon a realistic review of the education policy, it will not be due to the desire of the Alliance Party in power to provide for a more equitable and better type of education which will stimulate the education policy, certainly, Sir, we do not think that this review will be undertaken because of insistence on our part on this side of the Opposition, but it will be the stark naked truth that we are facing great financial strains and stringencies which will force the Government to review its education policy. However, to our mind this will be a step in the right direction. From the point of view of the strain our financial position, it is correct that this is the real alternative to stopping the spiralling increases in expenditure and in additional taxes.

It is, perhaps, fortuitous that the Honourable Minister should pick on this item of expenditure to indicate that in fact there is an alternative course to secure our financial viability and economic stability. And to drive home my point, this other course is simply that the Government *must review its policies*. Sir, this is very important. The Minister has adopted the policy of cuts in expenditure, but if the Government's policies are one which go on being spendthrift, then there is nothing that we can do. The Government must review its policies.

This course of action may be applied with equal cogency and pertinence in relation to our Defence and Internal Security aspects of the Budget, and to other Ministries and Departments.

But, Sir, whilst we are on the subject of education, I cannot help commenting on the fact that the 1956 Report on Education, which is often called the Razak Report, proposed that the Government's educational policy then should be reviewed in the light of our financial commitments. It is a sad thing to reflect that the ensuing Committee of Review in 1960 should have lost sight of its objectives and instead proposed the experiments in education, which today has become a political as well as a financial Frankenstein to the Alliance Government.

I do not wish to stir up more issues at this time, but I would like to repeat what I have so often proposed before that the Government must separate the education problem from the issues of the National language. Therefore, if it is, in fact, the Government's intention to review its policies on education, the Government should also conveniently at the same time set up a Royal Commission of Inquiry to look into the question of the implementation of the national language.

But returning once again to the question of Education, I hope that the Committee of Review will take into account not only the problems of how to sustain and improve upon our present system and standards of education but also how we are to integrate our education system with the problem of resolving the employment opportunities of our students. The fact that the Minister year in and year out gave us figures of new employment seekers with no jobs—from last year, 60,000, and this year 142,000—really shakes us right down to the very toes.

I would like to commend to the Minister of Education that he could perhaps profitably recall some of the conclusions of the 1956 Committee of Review, of which he was a member, that we should encourage the development of more private schools and that the Boards of Governors of Schools

should be given greater autonomy and be responsible for some of the current expenditure in the upkeep of their schools. It may be interesting for us to compare our present system with that prevailing in our neighbouring countries, particularly in Singapore, where quite apart from other features, they seem to be able to shorten their period of education from Primary to Secondary levels by one year compared with our own.

I believe that it is the Ministry's intention to develop a new system which is called the Upper Secondary School System. Whilst it is premature to comment on this at the present time, there are two points which I would like to raise on this occasion. The first is that the Government should not force those schools who do not want to adopt the system to follow it; and the second is that in order to prevent wastage at this level of academic selection there must be a clearer and closer adjustment of our own Entrance Examination standards to ensure that every child going into the Upper Secondary School will have at least a four years' stay in the school and a second chance to complete his Pre-University Studies.

Mr Speaker, Sir, coming now to the reasons advanced by the Honourable Minister of Finance for the strain on the Government's financial position, I must say that I could not help being reminded of a popular song of the 1920s as I listened to the Minister's speech. This song, "I'm forever blowing bubbles", goes on with the words:

"Pretty bubbles in air,
They fly so high, nearly reach the sky,
Then like my dreams, they fade and die."

To the country at large and to the general voter during the last General Elections, the recounting of the difficulties of the Alliance Government in balancing its Budget must be like the bursting of pretty bubbles of Alliance's election promises. There is an air of unreality in the policies of the Alliance Party which further strengthens my plea to them to radically review their policies for the sake of the future of our country.

It is strangely sad to consider that whereas in 1963 we in the United Democratic Party had advised the Alliance Party in power to think very carefully over the formation of Malaysia because of the possible heavy financial commitments which could check the progress of the Federation of Malaya, and to go slow over the manner of its implementation because it could lead to troubles with our neighbouring countries, it is only now that the Honourable Minister of Finance should ask us to "make up our minds that we are going the right direction" and that "we must also satisfy ourselves that the pace is neither too fast nor too slow." This is sad because he had also told us that "we have to run very fast in order to stand still", and now we are left in some doubt as to whether the Government is fully aware that it is going in the right direction.

I would briefly cite what I would like to call two Alliance "bubbles" as examples of what I mean, and to illustrate why the people generally feel that these "bubbles" have popped.

At the time of the formation of Malaysia, the Alliance propaganda machine, including the leaders who are now Ministers, blithely went round the country telling the people that with the formation of Malaysia, and in particular with the inclusion of Sabah and Sarawak, our country will become more prosperous, and there will be more opportunities of employment.

Today, when touching upon the increasing costs of defence (paragraph 82), one can almost sympathise with the almost wistful statement of the Honourable Minister of Finance that: "In 1962, which was the year immediately preceding the formation of Malaysia, expenditure on defence, both recurrent and capital, amounted to a mere \$109 million. The comparable figure for 1967, only 5 years later, is \$360 million. Most of this increase would not have been necessary if we did not have to defend East Malaysia, a thousand miles away". Then in the following paragraph he concludes by telling us that "what we receive from

them"—that is, Sabah and Sarawak—"in the form of tax revenues is insignificant but what we pour into them in the form of Federal expenditure is becoming an increasingly onerous burden".

I am quite sure that many of the taxpayers, parents, public servants and State officials who have been bludgeoned so heavily by the Honourable Minister will reciprocate these opinions; the only difference is that like the majority of the electors in the country they can justifiably add the question: "But why did you bluff us in the first place?"

Sir, this unrealistic tendency of blowing bubbles of propaganda is evident from the very opening remarks of the Honourable Minister right up to the end. The formation of Malaysia has been accomplished at the insistence of the Alliance Party in power. The problems challenging us are real and stupendous. It is sweet folly to pretend to the people that the situation is otherwise.

Even on the issue of the ending of confrontation. Not so very long ago the Alliance propaganda machine blew pretty bubbles about the munificence of the peace to come, that there would be more money for schools, for social services, and happiness would reign everywhere. However, it did not take the Honourable Minister of Finance very long to burst this bubble, because right at the outset of his speech he told us that "though the ending of confrontation will result in some decrease in the expenditure on defence and internal security, such a decrease will by no means be as large as generally believed." The irony, Sir, is that the general belief was inculcated by the Party in power itself. The Budget statement of the Honourable Minister was the truth, a truth which however was realised and told to the people too late. The responsible leaders in the Government should not have miscalculated the financial significance of the withdrawal of Commonwealth forces.

Sir, I would like to suggest to the Government that it should be more

realistic. The time has passed when the Party in power can stop the constituencies blowing "pretty bubbles" to beguile the people into supporting them. The pull ahead of us is tough enough. It will require all the efforts of our people to surmount this challenge. It is unkind to frustrate them at the end of their efforts, simply because official propaganda is unrealistic and had blown too many optimistic forecasts of what the future will bring.

It is with this note that I would now like to discuss briefly the Currency problems which confront us.

Throughout his Budget Speech the Honourable Minister studiously skir-mished any reference to the separation of Singapore and the ensuing problems consequent upon this event. Last year, in a more realistic manner, he had hinted that the separation of Singapore "could have far-reaching economic consequences." The introduction of the new currency issue is one of these consequences.

Whilst we all welcome the information that both the Singapore and Brunei Governments have agreed with us in principle "to adopt arrangements which will ensure the free interchangeability of our respective currencies after the 11th of June", one cannot help feeling that willy-nilly the political antagonisms of the past are still exerting an influence over the policies of our Government and that if they are allowed to continue unchecked, then they inevitably will lead us to an economic confrontation with Singapore.

There can be no doubt at all that some of the new duties and fiscal policies proposed in the new Budget were influenced by a desire to insulate our country from the economic influences of Singapore. No matter what the political feelings may be, the hard fact is that demographically, socially and economically, the destinies of our two countries are intimately interlocked.

A realistic approach to the problems of the future, I would like to suggest to the responsible leaders in the Government, is to put aside the political

animosities they harbour towards one another and to consider the wider interests of the peoples living in our two small nations, so many of whom have close kinship ties, or trade and business, as well as other ties. These are the really important issues which will decide our future destinies.

The task of working out satisfactory currency interchangeability arrangements with our neighbour south of the Causeway should provide our Government with a new opportunity to review our economic policies vis-à-vis each other. It is my considered opinion that the future of our financial viability and economic stability depends more upon the re-establishment of close and friendly economic ties rather than upon the creation of stronger and higher tariff walls to separate the economics of our two countries.

In the long term it is unrealistic for us not to think in terms of the setting up of inter-regional common market arrangements, particularly with Singapore, because the hard fact is that economically our continued survival and progress are concomitant and complementary; and economically

Dr Lim Swee Aun: How is it that the Honourable Member is in favour of a common market with Singapore when he is against the common market with Penang?

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Sir, that is a very interesting question, but I have nearly finished. May I take this time to answer? Sir, there is no common market between Penang and the rest of Malaysia. The Honourable Minister should know that under the terms defined by his Government that what we have is a Principal Customs Area or a Common Customs Area, and I have already suggested to the Government a possible way of how to incorporate Penang in the Customs Area. What we want to know in Penang is, why you are so reluctant to help us to develop? Over this question of common market between independent countries, I think the Honourable Minister himself is an expert. I mean the

Government itself has declared that it intends to develop the previous A.S.A. arrangements into one which will develop into an inter-regional common market area. The idea comes from the Government—I am just repeating them, Sir.

Dr Lim Swee Aun: Which means to say that the Honourable Member is prepared to have Penang join the Common customs union. Is it correct?

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Knowing that the Government is setting up an economic development planning commission, which can give us a satisfactory blueprint of the potential development which Government is going to provide us, we will seriously consider the proposal.

Therefore, just as the older members of the Alliance used to protest against the separation of our two countries as an artifact of British colonial rule, I hope that they themselves will not be party to the putting up of any unnecessary artificial barriers to keep our two peoples economically apart.

I earnestly believe that our present Budget would not have been so heavy, if the Government had reviewed its attitude and policies on this admittedly delicate and sensitive political problem of how we are to establish a proper *modus vivendi* with the Republic of Singapore, who after all was not so long ago a constituent part of Malaysia itself. Sir, as a matter of fact, I was very very gentle when I referred to the transmutation of financial strains into political stresses. It could very well turn out that if Government persists in this neckless attitude, the pressures will be such that Penang will flow out and Sarawak will also flow out.

Sir, I would like to conclude by stating a simple truth. From the evidence in front of us, it is inevitable that so long as the Alliance remains in power, and the policy makers in their Party refuse to review their policies realistically, then future Budgets will continue to heap more and more taxation upon the people. As a responsible Opposition Member in this House, I

can only oppose the Budget proposals in principle, because they do not indicate that the Government has done enough on its part to curb the tremendous increase in expenditure, and because I do not think that there is no other method and no other course to ensure our financial viability, and because I do not think that our present direction is the right direction.

To the people who are opposed to the naked weight of the new taxation measures, I can only advise them to weigh carefully the words of the Honourable Minister of Finance himself. These are his words: "We must (then) ensure that we are receiving full value for money spent"—after all the money comes from the people—"and if we are satisfied on this point also, then we must be prepared to bear the cost". His concluding sentence of the entire speech is as worthy of consideration as the whole of his speech put together, because he concluded by this terrific sentence: "We cannot do more and they cannot ask for more."

In the final analysis, the present financial strain in our economy is due to the sorry state of affairs to which the Alliance Party has led us after 10 years of financially careless and unchecked spendthrift rule.

In a democratic nation such as ours, the people must learn not to just blindly oppose, but to weigh and measure the financial and political problems put forward to them. And if they are not satisfied, the final course to maintain our financial viability and economic stability, ultimately, is in their hands at the next general elections. It will be the people of our country, who must bear the responsibility of passing the final decision as to whether or not they have the right to ask for more and expect a better and a more efficient Government to do more for them.

Tuan Tan Toh Hong (Bukit Bintang): Mr Speaker, Sir, we are facing a year with full of challenges—challenges arising out of our economic growth and defence expenditure. While the Alliance Government has to forge ahead with its dynamic vision of

developing the nation at a rapid speed and raising the standard of living of the people of our country, the Finance Minister is faced with the problem of how to find the necessary revenue to meet the expenditure. On the whole, he has offered sound, fair and concrete proposals to deal with this financial problem, bearing in mind the situation of extreme financial delicacy and complexity facing our nation now. His Budget proposals are fair. There is love for all and malice towards none. After due analysis by any enlightened economist, he would have found that much thought and wisdom has been given by the Finance Minister to ensure that the burden of the new taxation is spread equitably with the redeeming feature of taxing those who are capable to pay.

The most outstanding feature is the repeal of the turnover tax, which is a sign of relief to all the business and manufacturing communities.

While our rate of national development is accelerating and our economy is steadily forging ahead, the grim feature of our budget deficit against the background of rising development and defence expenditure must rank as the most serious in the Malaysian economic history.

The Current Account, including transfer of development funds, amounts to a deficit of about \$29 million. While the amount of deficit may be comparatively small, it has some serious fundamental implications. It means, simply, that we are living beyond our means. The nation is spending more than a dollar for every dollar it earns. If this were to be repeated in the coming year, then, there is no alternative but for the nation to run down our reserve funds, or to rely on loans to finance our day-to-day living. No economy can afford to have increasing taxation every year. There is a limit to it. If such a situation were to occur, we should be faced with serious and inescapable economic crisis.

It seems, therefore, appropriate at this juncture, to have a searching appraisal of government expenditure and public spending to ensure that value is obtained on money spent. Our

priorities of spending should be on those projects in which, if the nation spends one dollar, it should be able to get back later more than a dollar. While the people do not mind paying increased taxes for national development, national defence and our survival, what the people do feel most strongly is that of irresponsible spending and extravagant wastage of public funds. There should be a strong deterrent against such irresponsibility.

The House has heard, over the course of debate on the Budget, many complaints on various Government departments. But, by comparison, some of the worst offenders are some public statutory bodies and autonomous public organisations.

It is well known that quite often some of these organisations embark on uncontrolled spree of reckless spending. For instance, it was not long ago that, at the opening of a new office, one statutory board invited about one thousand guests and champagne flowed freely at this function. The poor taxpayers have to bear the bill. Even in housing it is common that executive officers of the statutory bodies live amidst luxury in rent-free bungalows—in Kuala Lumpur, for instance, some of those bungalows are in Kenny Hill furnished in a manner fit for millionaires.

Again, let us take the case—as an accountant I have a professional interest—of two Australian experts engaged by the Management of the Penang Port Commission. They are supposed to look into the improvement of the port's operation and administration. This action by the Port Management at first sight appeared to be justifiable, but what is shocking is the fantastic sum of money to be paid to these two overseas so-called experts. I understand, Sir, that these two foreigners are to be paid a sum of almost half a million dollars over a contract period of eighteen months. This works out approximately to \$28,000 per month for the two of them, or about \$14,000 each. Mr Speaker, Sir, our Honourable Prime Minister is only paid \$4,000 per month. Are we to assume that these two

foreigners are equal to seven Prime Ministers? (*Applause*).

Sir, as Alice in financial Wonderland would have said, the plot becomes "curiouser and curiouser". These two so-called foreign experts started work in August, 1966, but before they have even got their teeth into the problem, I understand that their contract is to be extended for another three months, or so with additional thousands of dollars as appropriate remuneration. But, that is not the end of the plot, it has only just began. I further understand that these two so-called experts, engaged at such a fantastic sum, have very little experience in the operation and administration of ports. In that respect, Sir, we have much better qualified and experienced local people. If I am rightly informed, and I stand to be corrected, one of the so-called experts is a Company Secretary-cum-Accountant, while the other is a chemical engineer. By no stretch of imagination, Sir, can one see the justification of employment of a chemical engineer to improve the port's operations. What has chemistry got to do with the running of a port?

Sir, the biggest shock is yet to come. A few weeks ago, Sir, I understand that this foreign engineer was sent by the Management together with the General Manager to London, Rotterdam and Europe to study the operations of the ports there all at the expense of the Penang Port Commission. The saddest part of the whole story is that the Port Management engages a so-called expert at fantastic expense to come all the way from Australia to advise them on improving the port operations in Penang. Now that he is here, they have sent this engineering expert, the engineer, at further great expense, to go and study the port in Europe, so that he could return to Malaysia to advise them on how to run the port. Are we Malaysians so backward that we have to get a foreign adviser to come here, pay him extravagantly for his advise, then pay him to go overseas to observe and study the port there, getting paid while he is observing in overseas, and then for him to come back to advise us about our port? What has the Ministry of Transport got to say on this?

Sir, it is high time that such public autonomous bodies realise that they are dealing with public funds and that they cannot carry on with their fantastic financial irresponsibility. Autonomy does not mean that they can do what they like and how they like with public money.

I would like to urge the Government very strongly, Sir, to declare a financial martial law to control and to check such type of irresponsibility. In a developing economy of a newly emergent nation like ours, we cannot afford to waste a single dollar. Every available single dollar is needed for economic growth. Unless we grow, we will wither. Hence, any financial irresponsibility in public funds should be regarded as a criminal and subversive action.

Sir, we have the emergency laws to punish those subversive who try to subvert our country. We must also have equivalent martial law to punish irresponsible spenders of public funds, after all such irresponsible actions are tantamount to economic and financial subversion. Martial laws containing harsh, punitive measures would deter those spendthrifts of public and make them aware of the real urgent needs of the country, and assure that Malaysia forever would be in sound financial footing.

Wan Abdul Kadir bin Ismail (Trennganu Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun menyokong Anggaran Belanjawan yang di-kemukakan oleh Menteri Kewangan kerana ia merupakan satu anggaran belanjawan yang saksama dan berpatutan, hinggakan Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bungar sendiri terpaksa mengaku bahawa ia adalah merupakan anggaran belanjawan yang *realistic*. Chadangan² chukai di-kemukakan pula ada-lah chadangan² chukai yang berpatutan. Tetapi sa-perkara yang merunsingkan saya, sa-bagaimana ia merunsingkan Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang lain, ia-lah kenaikan harga barang² yang bukan². Satu dua barang² yang di-kenakan chukai baru itu di-jadikan kesempatan oleh pekedai² dan peniaga² untuk menaikkan hampir semua barang² yang lain terutama

barang² keperluan hari² yang tidak kena mengena dengan barang² yang di-naikkan chukai itu, hingga hari ini kelapa pun naik dan apabila di-tanya maka pekedai itu menjawab kerana chukai naik. Hal ini berlaku tiap² tahun, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dan belanja hidup pun melambong dari sa-tahun ka-satahun dengan tidak ada fasal.

Kementerian Perdagangan yang berhadapan dengan hal ini mengugut pada tiap² tahun hendak menjalankan kehendak Undang² Perbekalan 1963 terhadap peniaga². Ugutan itu merupakan ugutan kosong sa-hingga sekarang. Alasan yang di-beri ia-lah tidak ada ma'alumat² yang penoh di-terima oleh Kementerian Perdagangan itu untuk mengambil tindakan. Saya rasa tidak perlu di-tunggu sampai di-terima sagni ma'alumat dan keterangan itu baharu hendak di-ambil tindakan. Memadai-lah satu perkara yang diperolehi keterangan sudah chukup untuk menjalankan Undang² Perbekalan 1963 dan bila sa-orang kena, peniaga² yang lain akan serek.

Baharu² ini Kementerian itu ada menubuhkan satu Jawatan-kuasa Penasehat dalam hal ini tetapi itu tidak chukup. Saya mengeshorkan supaya ditubuhkan satu unit penyiasat atau intelligence sa-bagaimana yang di-jalankan oleh Pejabat Kastam, unit ini tidak perlu besar. Kerjanya ia-lah untuk menyiasat tentang kenaikan harga barang² yang bukan². Di-atas hasil penyiasatan itu di-kenakan tindakan dengan tidak ada belas kasehan lagi. Di-negeri² yang maju, persatuan pengguna² atau consumer association, memainkan peranan yang penting memerangi kenaikan harga yang bukan² ini, tetapi di-Malaysia ini persatuan itu belum bertapak lagi. Saya shorkan supaya Kementerian Perdagangan menolong dan menggalakkan penubuhan Persatuan pengguna² itu di-seluruh negara dan di-segenap pelusok tempat dengan di-beri bantuan² yang patut sa-bagaimana di-lakukan oleh Kementerian Kebudayaan, Belia dan Sukan terhadap penubuhan persatuan² belia di-seluruh negeri ini. Dengan demikian, bila persatuan pengguna tumbuh dan berjalan dengan baik, ia akan menjadi

senjata yang sangat berguna dalam memerangi kehalubaan peniaga² yang tidak berhati perut itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, mengenai menjimatkan belanja negara, maka saya ada-lah turut sama merasa pehak Kerajaan patut menjalankan segala langkah yang boleh menjimatkan perbelanjaan negara. Yang kebanyakan berlaku dan biasa berlaku, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-lah projek² yang di-jalankan itu naik harga-nya dengan sendirinya pada masa pembenaan di-jalankan. Ambil contoh bangunan Parlimen ini sahaja di-anggarkan pada mula-nya \$10 million tetapi bila sudah harga naik jadi \$17 million; Masjid Negara \$5 million menjadi \$10 million, Pusat Kesihatan Universiti yang sedang dibena sekarang daripada asal-nya \$50 million sekarang menjadi \$70 million. Jikalau anggaran yang di-buat mula itu berdasarkan kedudukan yang betul dan tidak di-ubah², maka tentu-lah suatu langkah yang besar untuk menjimatkan belanja dapat di-jalankan; dan jikalau dari segi pehak Kerajaan memberi pandangan berat, saya perchaya ke-adaan menjimatkan perbelanjaan ini akan dapat di-jalankan dengan baik.

Mengenai pegawai² Kerajaan saya berpendapat pada keseluruhan-nya pegawai² Kerajaan ada-lah menjalankan tugas mereka dengan baik. Hanya ada sa-bahagian atau sa-bilangan kecil daripada mereka yang membawa nama yang kurang baik dalam perkara ini. Sa-tengah² pegawai yang termasuk gulongan yang kecil ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kadang² tidak menjalankan tugas dengan betul, kadang² melepaskan diri mereka itu daripada terikat pada menjalankan dasar Kerajaan, sa-olah² mereka itu memandang yang mereka itu satu gulongan yang terasing daripada lembaga Kerajaan yang ber-jalan.

Ini-lah perkara yang saya rasa menjadikan banyak sungutan orang ramai kepada pegawai² Kerajaan dan kepada apa sahaja yang di-jalankan oleh Kerajaan, kerana pegawai² Kerajaan, itu-lah yang menjadi gambaran Kerajaan kepada mata orang ramai. Saya rasa di-Malaysia ini Kerajaan belum lagi menjalankan sa-bagaimana

di-Singapura, ia-itu langkah “membersehhkan otak” pegawai itu dengan menghantar mereka itu kepada *Political Study Centre*. Tetapi jikalau ada-lah gulongan² yang kecil daripada pegawai² Kerajaan ini yang maseh tidak memberi perhatian yang penoh kepada perkara ini, saya suka mengeshorkan supaya di-Malaysia ini pun kita patut mengadakan *Political Study Centre* untuk membersehhkan otak—*brain washing*—supaya mereka itu dapat menjalankan kerja dengan lebeh chekap dan lebeh sempurna dalam menjalankan dasar² Kerajaan, kerana mereka dengan sendiri-nya sa-bahagian daripada Kerajaan dan tidak terpisah daripada Kerajaan sama sa-kali.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Malaysia, dalam hubungan luar negeri, telah pernah menjalankan beberapa *initiative* yang baik yang membawa nama baik kepada kita, dan saya suka menyebut soal *Apartheid* dalam mana *initiative* yang di-jalankan oleh Perdana Menteri kita membawa kepada tertandang keluar-nya Afrika Selatan daripada *Commonwealth*. Saya rasa *initiative* yang sa-bagini patut kita jalankan dari sa-masa ka-samasa. Saya suka mengeshorkan dalam perkara ini untuk merapatkan lagi hubungan dengan negara Afrika Asia, terutama sa-kali negara Islam yang semua-nya ada dudok dalam gulongan Afrika-Asia ini, supaya kita mengambil *initiative* mengadakan perundingan menghapuskan *visa* antara negeri kita dengan negeri² kita. Pada masa ini tidak ada *visa* yang di-kehendaki oleh peratoran kepada ra'ayat *Commonwealth* yang datang ka-mari atau ra'ayat kita yang pergi ka-negeri² *Commonwealth* dan bagitu juga dengan satu dua buah negeri yang lain, dengan Italy umpama-nya. Apa-kah salah-nya langkah yang sa-bagini di-jalankan dengan *initiative* daripada Kerajaan kita ia-itu kita mengshorkan supaya di-hapuskan *visa* ini dengan segala negara² Islam yang ada dalam gulongan Asia-Afrika dan lepas itu boleh-lah di-ambil langkah berikut yang lebeh luas lagi. Dan ini juga akan memberi jalan yang pertama kepada pelaksanaan chita² Perdana Menteri kita bagi mewujudkan *Commonwealth* Islam—satu ikatan

kerjasama ekonomi dan kebudayaan negara² Islam seluroh-nya.

Berhubung dengan Malaysia Timor saya suka menyatakan bahawa Malaysia Timor itu bukan-lah merupakan satu "biawak hidup" ka-atas kita seperti yang di-katakan oleh ahli dari Bachok. Tertuboh-nya Malaysia dengan masok-nya Sabah dan Sarawak ka-dalam Malaysia merupakan satu perkongsian nasib yang di-chapai dengan persetujuan bersama, oleh itu walau bagaimana pun kita sa-bagai orang yang berkongsi bersama dalam negara yang bersatu itu akan terus berjalan dan akan terus memikul segala tanggung-jawab yang di-perlukan oleh keadaan negara kita masa ini bagi menghadapi masa depan.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah (Bachok): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soalan tambahan, kalau bagi jalan hendak bagi penjelasan sedikit.

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: Masa tak chukup, saya minta habiskan sedikit sahaja lagi.

Tuan Wan Abdul Kadir bin Ismail: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tetapi ada satu perkara yang saya suka menarek perhatian dalam perkara ini ia-itu pada masa ini oleh kerana kuasa *Immigration* itu maseh ada di-tangan negeri² Sabah dan Sarawak, maka perjalanan Malaysia Barat ka-Malaysia Timor harus memakai *Passport*. Saya merasa bagi menyuborkan rasa perpaduan patut-lah di-fikirkan oleh Kerajaan Sabah dan Sarawak supaya perkara passpot ini kalau dapat di-hapuskan sa-belum daripada masa yang di-hadkan di-dalam I.G.C. report, kerana ini suatu chara yang kalau di-biarkan lama kelamaan pun akan tidak meninggalkan kesan yang baik. Pada minggu ini kita semua mendengar pendapat daripada Pengarah Pelancong yang juga berpendapat perhubungan passpot antara Malaysia Barat dengan Malaysia Timor ini patut di-hapuskan dari segi kepetingan pelan-chongon.

Dalam Dewan ini pada kali ini kita telah dengar satu dua orang ahli dari Malaysia Timor telah bertanya sendiri chara bagaimana kalau dapat di-satukan sistem pelajaran yang ada di-Sabah dan

Sarawak dengan Malaysia. Jadi, keinginan untuk menghapuskan *barrier*², atau batasan² ini, terdapat bukan sahaja di-pehak Malaysia Barat tetapi juga daripada pehak Malaysia Timor. Maka oleh itu dua *barrier* atau dua rintangan yang ada, ia-itu dari segi passpot dan dari penyatuan dasar pelajaran ini, patut-lah di-fikirkan supaya kita dapat mengatasi dalam masa yang lebeh singkat daripada masa yang di-tetapkan oleh I.G.C. report. Bila passpot dapat di-hapuskan di-gantikan-lah sahaja dengan kad pengenalan untuk perjalanan di-antara Malaysia Timor dan Malaysia Barat, dan juga di-segi pelajaran, bila-mana pehak Kerajaan Sabah dan Sarawak bersetuju supaya di-lekaskan lagi masa untuk menyatukan dasar pelajaran di-Sarawak dan di-Sabah dengan sistem pelajaran kebangsaan di-Malaysia Barat ini, maka lebeh chepat kita menchapai perpaduan dan lebeh lekas kita menchapai kejayaan dalam menghadapi gulungan anti Malaysia dan anti Nasional yang ada di-Sabah dan di-Sarawak dan yang ada juga di-Malaysia Barat ini sendiri.

Kerana jikalau kita sudah dudok dalam satu rumah, kalau saudara² dari Sabah dan Sarawak maseh hendak mengutamakan mendapat bilek sendiri yang terasing dalam rumah itu, maka tentu-lah pergaulan dalam rumah itu tidak sa-mesera sa-bagaimana yang sa-mesti-nya.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tentang bahasa, saya mendengar dua tiga orang ahli daripada pehak pembangkang dan daripada PAS yang telah berchakap tentang bahasa tetapi tidak sa-patah pun mengutok apa yang di-katakan oleh ahli dari Ipoh. Ahli Bachok umpamanya hanya membuat khabar angin atau membuat fitnah yang membatu apikan keadaan, konon-nya ada perpechahan dalam Perikatan dalam soal bahasa. Apa yang di-tuntut oleh ahli dari Ipoh yang mahu di-jalankan dasar berbagai² bahasa yang akan di-perjuangkan-nya sampai ka-akhir hayat-nya, tidak sedikit pun di-kutok ahli daripada PAS.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: Dia tidak beri jalan.

Tuan Wan Abdul Kadir bin Ismail: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam soal ini terang sahaja-lah bahawa pehak PAS sendiri yang telah berper² membela bahasa Melayu dan kebangsaan Melayu hanya menyebut² perkara ini sa-bagai modal politik sahaja dan tidak ikhlas keluar daripada hati.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam soal bahasa ini saya maseh hairan orang² sa-bagai ahli daripada Ipoh yang maseh berper² hendakkan dasar berbagai bahasa atau multi-lingualism. Saya meminta ahli Ipoh itu apabila dia berchakap, memang saya tahu dia tidak ada dalam Dewan ini sekarang, supaya dia memandang kepada India sendiri. India sendiri menjadikan bahasa kebangsaan-nya bahasa Hindi, sedangkan di-India ada gulongan berpuluh² million berchakap bahasa Tamil, ada gulongan berpuluh² million berchakap bahasa Urdu dan bahasa² yang lain, kenapa India tidak menjadikan multi-lingualism bahasa rasmi India: bahasa Tamil, bahasa Urdu dan berbagai² bahasa yang lain yang besar? Kalau India sendiri tidak menjalankan dasar itu, kenapa ahli dari Ipoh berper² hendakkan dasar itu di-Malaysia ini? Sedangkan kita hendak menchapai satu perpaduan ra'ayat dan perpaduan bangsa yang hendak menumpukan ta'at setia mereka yang tidak berbelah bagi kepada negara ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ini-lah perkara yang harus di-fikirkan oleh ahli dari Ipoh dan kunchu²-nya dalam perkara soal bahasa dan soal tuntutan mereka untuk merasmikan bahasa² lain sa-lain daripada bahasa Melayu.

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: Berapa minit lagi?

Tuan Wan Abdul Kadir bin Ismail: Lima minit.

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

Meshuarat di-tangguhkan pukul 1.00 tengah hari.

Sitting resumed at 4.00 p.m.

(Mr (Deputy) Speaker in the Chair)

THE SUPPLY (1967) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Wan Abdul Kadir bin Ismail (Kuala Trengganu Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-bagaimana saya katakan tengah hari tadi, tidak ada sebab sama sa-kali bagi Ahli daripada Ipoh dan kunchu²-nya untok berper² menuntut penggunaan berbagai bahasa bagi negeri ini kerana berbagai bahasa itu tidak dapat di-terima oleh ra'ayat negeri ini. Lihat chontoh-nya di-India. India mempunyai beberapa bahasa yang besar, yang mempunyai sejarah dan sastera yang besar saperti bahasa Benggali yang di-gunakan oleh lima puluh, enam puluh million orang dan yang melahirkan pujangga besar—Tagor. Bahasa Tamil yang di-gunakan oleh berpuluh² million orang dan yang melahirkan President India sekarang. Bahasa Urdu yang di-fahami oleh lebeh sa-ratus juta orang di-India dengan kebanggaan sejarah sastera-nya yang agong; tetapi hanya bahasa Hindi yang di-fahami dan di-gunakan oleh orang² di-utara India sahaja di-jadikan bahasa rasmi dan di-jadikan sementara ini bahasa Inggeris sa-bagai bahasa rasmi sama. Kenapa India melakukan demikian? Ini ia-lah sa-mata² untok menyatukan perpaduan ra'ayat dan membulatkan semangat mereka. Bahasa ia-lah alat perpaduan yang utama dan sa-siapa yang tidak mahu bahasa perpaduan yang satu maka ia ada-lah dari gulongan yang hendak menghanchorkan negara.

Dalam hubungan ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka menarek perhatian tentang sukatan pepereksaan bahasa Melayu bagi pegawai² Kerajaan Division I dan II. Dalam masa kita hendak merasmikan bahasa Melayu menjadi bahasa rasmi yang tunggal pada tahun ini, sukatan itu maseh merupakan sukatan lapok yang di-bentok 10 tahun yang lalu dan yang memakai buku² text—Buku Sang Kanchil, Buku Nakhoda Tenggara, Buku Tiga Beradek di-England, dengan menggunakan

bahasa yang lama. Sa-saorang yang telah lulus daripada peperiksaan ini tidak dapat menulis memo dan surat dengan chara bahasa modern yang digunakan pada masa ini. Sudah sampailah masa-nya sukatan pelajaran untuk pegawai Division I dan II ini di-tukar oleh Pejabat Perjawatan Kerajaan. Jika tidak di-tukar maka hanya akan sia² sahaja-lah pelajaran yang di-terima oleh pegawai ini yang di-belanjakan oleh Kerajaan bagi tiap² sa-orang pegawai itu sa-banyak \$55 sa-bulan bagi elau munshi-nya, bagi guru bahasa-nya. Perkara ini saya faham telah di-bawa kepada pehak Pejabat Perjawatan beberapa kali, tetapi belum lagi di-ambil perhatian, dan saya harap perkara ini tidak-lah akan di-chuai²kan dan di-pandang sepi oleh pehak Pejabat Perjawatan Kerajaan.

Saya juga, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, suka hendak menyentoh sedikit tentang perusahaan perintis—perusahaan yang di-kechualikan dari chukai untuk jangka masa yang tertentu dan terlepas hatta dari Chukai Pembangunan yang baharu di-kenakan pada tahun ini. Saya suka supaya perusahaan perintis ini di-kaji sa-mula dan kajian itu termasuk segi sa-banyak mana-kah perusahaan² perintis itu telah memberi sumbangan dalam membantu usaha Kerajaan untuk memberi kesempatan yang lebeh luas kepada bumiputera bekerja dalam lapangan perusahaan dan perdagangan dan dalam memegang jawatan² executive dalam perusahaan² itu, serta sa-takat manakah perusahaan² membantu Pusat² Pendaftaran Buroh Kerajaan (Labour Exchanges) yang sa-tiap masa mendaftarkan warga negara yang menganggor dan tidak mempunyai pekerjaan. Bagaimana-kah chara perusahaan² baharu ini mengambil pekerja²-nya, ada-kah dengan chara suka hati mereka sahaja, dan ada-kah mereka tidak pernah menggunakan Pusat Pendaftaran Buroh Kerajaan? Daripada sa-tengah iklan yang di-siarkan oleh sa-tengah² perusahaan² itu dalam akhbar², ternyata-lah bahawa sa-tengah² perusahaan itu sengaja menyekat bumiputera daripada di-terima menjadi pegawai² yang agakan dalam perusahaan² itu. Umpamanya, di-sharatkan mesti-lah mengetahui

bahasa kebangsaan dan mengetahui juga satu dua dialect China. Sudah tentu kerja itu akan pergi kepada warga negara keturunan China. Mana ada bumiputera yang tahu dialect China? Chontoh-nya seperti beberapa iklan yang di-siarkan oleh sharikat British Petroleum. Usaha² seperti ini ada-lah berlawanan dengan dasar Kerajaan dan mengkhianati kepentingan bumiputera di-negeri ini.

Sebab itu-lah kedudukan perusahaan perintis itu hendak-lah di-kaji sa-mula. Perusahaan² itu tidak boleh di-biarkan bermaharaja lela begitu, sedang mereka membolot demikian banyak-nya keuntongan perchuma sa-lama ini.

Akhir sa-kali, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya hendak menyentoh tentang urusan hal ehwal Haji. Pada masa ini, ada beberapa pehak yang bersangkutan dengan urusan Haji ini. Ada Pejabat Kawalan Haji di-Pulau Pinang yang kerja-nya ia-lah mengawal pelayaran orang Haji; ada lagi satu Jawatan-kuasa Pusat yang mengatasi pejabat itu, nama-nya Jawatan-kuasa Haji; dan sekarang ada pula Perbadanan Simpanan Wang Bakal² Haji yang juga akan menguruskan penyimpan² yang akan naik Haji bila penyimpan² itu sudah chukup wang simpanan-nya.

Kadang², Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tidak ada penyelarasan, *co-ordination*, antara ketiga² badan ini. Susunan Pejabat Kawalan Haji dan Jawatan-kuasa Haji itu tidak di-ubah² dari semenjak belum merdeka lagi. Oleh kerana keadaan sekarang sudah berubah, dan sambutan orang ramai kepada Tabong Haji lebeh daripada memuaskan, jumlah orang² yang naik Haji makin bertambah, maka saya rasa susunan dalam hal ehwal Haji ini perlu di-kaji sa-mula dan di-susun sa-mula supaya sesuai dengan keadaan sekarang.

Perbadanan Tabong Haji yang telah berjalan dengan begitu berjaya, patut-lah di-jadikan asas penyusunan sa-mula itu, ia-itu asas bagi suatu Perbadanan Besar Hal Ehwal Haji, dengan di-chantumkan ka-dalam-nya segala urusan dan penyelenggaraan yang bersangkutan paut dengan Haji dan simpanan bakal² Haji. Dengan demikian,

urusan segala hal ehwal Haji tidaklah berselerak dan terchapai-lah kelichinan perjalanan dan pentadbiran hal ini, dan jawatan-kuasa-nya yang ada sekarang tidak akan wujud lagi dengan keadaan-nya yang tidak mempunyai kuasa pelaksanaan sendiri itu.

Bila ini dapat di-lakukan, maka lebeh sempurna dan lebeh chepat, saya rasa, terchapai maksud hendak mengadakan kapal Haji sendiri, yang dapat membawa orang² Haji pada musim Haji dan di-gunakan pula untuk tujuan pengangkutan yang lain pada masa di-luar musim Haji.

Akhir-nya, saya merasa hairan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli daripada Kelantan Hilir yang berapi² marah tadi, atas seruan Menteri Penerangan, supaya pemuda² luar bandar jangan pindah beramai² ka-kota besar. Saya tidak tahu ada-kah ahli itu faham maksud seruan itu.

Seruan itu ia-lah supaya pemuda jangan terus menerus berpindah ka-kota besar, saperti Kuala Lumpur atau Pulau Pinang, umpama-nya. Ini merupakan masa'alah *social* yang besar. Ini perkara yang di-alami oleh kebanyakan negara di-dunia pada hari ini, hatta di-Amerika sendiri. Tetapi bukan-lah maksud seruan itu supaya pemuda kampung jangan pergi ka-Kota Bharu, atau ka-Pasir Puteh, atau ka-Jerteh kerana menchari kerja, kerana ini tidak termasuk istilah kota besar.

Kita sa-boleh²-nya hendak membawa perusahaan² ka-kota² kechil saperti Kota Bharu, Pasir Puteh atau Bukit Mertajam, supaya peluang bekerja terbuka luas, supaya hijrah ka-kota² besar dapat di-chegah dan ini lebeh kurang sudah ada berjalan.

Ahli dari Kelantan Hilir itu tak sedar, bahawa dasar berhijrah ini akan menjadi masa'alah polisi yang besar kapada-nya sendiri, kerana kalau orang² di-kawasan-nya di-Kelantan Hilir banyak pindah ka-Kuala Lumpur dan bekerja di-sini, serta bertambah luas pandangan mereka dengan sebab pergaulan baharu itu, Ahli itu sendiri nanti tetap akan kalah di-kawasan

pilehan raya-nya dalam pilehan-raya tahun 1969 yang akan datang ini (*Ketawa*).

Tuan Siow Loong Hin (Seremban Barat): Mr Speaker, Sir, the tax proposals this year have been considered by many as fair, and I consider them to be not only fair but imaginative as they will serve to generate additional opportunities and employments and incomes. This can be said to be a magnificent performance by the Minister of Finance. But, however fair the tax proposals may be, Mr Speaker, Sir, there will be opposition to it. Members of the Opposition Bench, true to form, will castigate it, and especially those from the socialist parties will bemoan that workers are being bled and exploited.

The Member for Batu has raised the alarm as to the worsening situation as regards Public Debt. He quoted statistics from 1965 to 1966 to show the rate of increase in Public Debt, both internal and external. What he apparently failed to realise, or chose to ignore, is that in 1955 when we first achieved self-government the demands for services and economic development were small. As the years go by, especially after Independence in 1957, with the introduction of the First Malaya Plan and subsequent Plans, Public Debt rose as the demand for new services and economic development increased to meet the rising expectations of the people. Public Debt is a feature of development, more so of Governments, who are trying their best to raise the economic and living standards of the people, who have been living in economic stagnation during the colonial days. Debts *per capita* in other countries are very much higher, e.g. in highly developed countries like the United States, the United Kingdom and Japan. The important factor regarding Public Debt is that the debt should not grow as fast as G.N.P. growth. In our case, though Public Debt may continue, it is only a temporary feature, for as soon as the economic development programmes undertaken in the early 60's, especially

the F.L.D.A. schemes, come into fruition they will begin to show results and bring increased revenue.

The Member for Batu also said that out of the domestic debt of \$2,500 million in 1966 about \$1,500 million come from the E.P.F., which represents about 75% of domestic borrowing by the Government. At the same time, he said, that it costs about 12 cents in a dollar for the servicing of public debts. Would not this debt service also benefit the workers of this country whose money the Government has borrowed? Is this not a form of transfer of income? The socialist opposition are only concerned with the exploitation of the workers but they do not see the benefits the workers receive in return.

The Member for Batu's conclusion is that the increase of external debt will cause a flight of capital. This might be true if our external debts so out-grow G.N.P. growth that it will cause a lack of confidence in the country's monetary stability. This might be true also if we were to live just on external borrowings and not use it for economic development as some countries have done, especially those who have adopted socialism and the socialist structure of economy.

Mr Speaker, Sir, economic development depends primarily on domestic effort, but foreign capital also plays an important role. The assistance provided by foreign capital, if effectively employed, can make an important and often crucial difference. In Malaysia the momentum of development created demands for capital unmatched by any comparable increase in savings. We have to find investments needed for our development. A good deal will have to come from public sources, national and international. Of importance is the need to build up a strong domestic private sector. One cannot but appreciate the contribution private business can make if given proper incentives and not by stifling them like what the Member for Batu suggests—nationalisation. Nationalisation is not, by any test of economic realism, acting in the best interest of development objectives. It is the surest way to encourage the

flight of capital. Socialism has no secret formula for economic growth, neither has it any magic formula of any kind.

Modern economic society requires a considerable habit of savings and a body of people and institutions capable of putting savings to work productively. Savings and productivity should not be punished by taxation. Savings for productivity should be deductible from tax. It must pay to work and to save. An important feature of the pattern of savings is personal savings. No figures are available on the relative contribution of the different sectors to total savings. The shortage of savings in relation to investments will result in a considerable strain on the economy which can only be eased through larger inflow of external resources. On a broad assessment, it appears that of the total investment in the economy over the Second Five Year Plan about 2/3rd was financed from domestic resources, private and public sectors, and 1/3rd from utilisation of external assistance and foreign exchange reserves. In the First Malaysia Plan for the net investment of \$10,500 million it would mean the stepping up of the rate of investment from 19% onwards. Correspondingly, there will have to be an increase in domestic savings because there is a limit beyond which it is neither feasible nor desirable to rely on external resources.

Stepping up the rate of savings necessarily implies a restraint on consumption. If consumption increases as fast as incomes, obviously the rate of savings cannot be increased. It is argued in some sections that restraint on consumption is the very opposite of development; that unless consumption increases, there can be no spurt to development. This is clearly a misconception. First the total demand in economy consists not only of consumption but it is made up of consumptions, investments and exports. In a situation where exports have to increase and we want to step up investments, there has to be some restraint on consumption in the sense

that consumption must not be allowed to rise to the full extent of the increase in money incomes. Secondly, a restraint on consumption does not mean either that the consumption levels must be reduced or even that they must not be allowed to increase at all. All that it means is that if national income is rising by, say, 6% per annum, the total consumption in the community, including increased consumption because of rising population, should rise by say 4% so that about a third of the increase in incomes is available for investment purposes. The remaining two-third goes to improving living standards. At present, our consumption increases at the same rate of income. Our savings have remained unchanged at about 19% but this can be increased to about 20 to 23% through incentives like the accelerated depreciation allowances recommended by the Minister of Finance. In Japan savings is about 30% of GNP ration.

There is a tendency among the Opposition to take the past experiences of resources available and project them more or less mechanically for the future and then to proceed to paint a dismal picture of the resources available and underline the need for caution. It has, however, to be emphasized that resources for economic development are not some fixed pre-existing quantity but the resources themselves are results of development. The essential point is that the pool of resources itself can be and indeed must be enlarged. The key to larger resources for development is obviously greater production, particularly agricultural production through improved techniques and through utilisation of under-employed man power. Resources in our developing economy is not static and the problem always is to consider how they can be expected to grow and what proportion of the increased resources can be ploughed back to investment.

The question of phasing is again of importance. The whole process of planning cannot be, in fact, considered complete unless year by year figures have been prepared covering both the

public and private sectors and unless these figures have been examined to see whether:

- (a) the output of inter-related items keep reasonably in balance each year;
- (b) whether the foreign exchange position is manageable each year;
- (c) whether internal resources for investments are matched with the claims each year;

This useful calculation has become important now, because there is no cushion in the form of large foreign balances which could absorb any miscalculation and because it is imperative for us to maintain a degree of price stability.

Regarding the question of price stability, it has attracted a great deal of attention in recent months. The rise in both wholesale and retail prices during the past year or so has made many people concerned. There is no denying of the fact that the stability of the currency is a very important matter and that the avoidance of inflation is a *sine qua non* of balanced growth. A pressure on price is basically a symptom of imbalance in the economy. Some form of price mechanism is essential to effect stabilisation of prices. Price increases in consumer goods affect the rural areas most. Price increases seem to be a normal feature during the festival periods where consumer goods at times are increased by some 10% to 20%. The recent announcement that Thailand is stopping the export of rice has caused a considerable increase in the price of rice. Despite the warning given by the Government that drastic measures would be taken it has apparently no effect to curb price increases. Price controls and such like mechanisms may not be workable or desirable. But certainly some means have to be taken to try and control price increases. The consumer is always blamed for price increases and the profiteers get away scot free. The Government has urged consumers to co-operate by reporting about price increase, but this is not a very satisfactory way to curb prices.

Would it not be possible for Government to demand price tagging in all shops based on a fixation of uniform or pooled prices for essential commodities. If this could be done, it would be one form of bringing about stabilisation of prices.

We have heard from the Honourable Minister of Finance's Budget Speech that it is difficult to get money nowadays. The price of money today is high. Inflationary tendencies in industrial countries have made tight money unavoidable. This has affected financing progress in industrial countries and have impeded developing countries like Malaysia to put the needed capital for economic expansion. The flow of capital is governed by interest rates and at present high interest rates are a problem. We must have low interest rates for economic expansion. Highly industrialised countries like the United States should not just pay lip service but show by concrete measures their desire to help. We have done all we can in our domestic efforts to finance our economic development. If the developed countries insist on higher interest rates, the burden of paying interests on loans and repaying of capital would eventually even out whatever grants we may receive.

In addition to this, the drop in the prices of primary products will undoubtedly affect our economic activity and will obviously suffer grievous setbacks. Though the volume of our exports has increased, this was offset by lower commodity prices. American stockpiling has depressing effects on price of rubber and tin which accounted for 40% and 42% respectively of world output. The high interest rates on loans and the drop in the prices of our main revenue earning products would eventually offset our effort to break through to self-sustained growth.

Mr Speaker, Sir, American aid policies have changed completely—where grants had constituted 90% up to 1955, loans were now representing more than 70% of it. The debt service burden increased so rapidly that it has cancelled out much of the growth in total aid. In Europe under the Marshal

Plan, more than 80% of the aid given were in the form of grants and this was given at a time when America's own position was far worse than it is today. Yet today, when America is better off, its aid policies have changed radically. It must be remembered that the most affluent sector of the world cannot insulate itself. It cannot be impervious to the desperate needs of developing countries like Malaysia. To refuse the developing countries like ours of the capital needed for development is fraught with dangers to world peace. The realities of the world unfortunately continuously vindicate this thesis. The affluent sectors of the world should adopt a practical plan to provide assistance to developing countries on realistic terms so that the present trend for growth does not lose its momentum. This is absolutely true, Mr Speaker, Sir, in our case.

Mr Speaker, Sir, in the industrial sector, though we may have maintained a growth rate of 16 per cent, the manufacturing sector accounts for a relatively small proportion of gross domestic product—11 per cent—and they account for 16 per cent on full time employment. Though the Government has done comparatively well in industrialisation, we have yet to spell out our policy on industrialisation and the direction it takes. Who shall decide the direction it takes—the private sector, the Government, or both? We must not forget that one of the basic principles of industrialisation on which the West was built was on specialisation—getting the maximum total output through having each country making the thing it produces best. In the industrial revolution days the West has abundance of land and shortage of labour. Tools and machinery were relied on to fill the gap. In developing countries, like ours, labour is a great underdeveloped asset. It is, therefore, necessary to think and plan how to use this resource effectively. Undoubtedly, our present industrialisation programme would not be able to absorb much of our labour resources unless we have labour intensive industries or through increased production for export. On this I congratulate the Minister of

Finance for his insight into this problem, for his tax proposals on the timber industry, and the duty placed on loose rubber will undoubtedly generate additional employment opportunities.

Industrialisation, Mr Speaker, Sir, is saddled with many problems, especially in terms of personnel with experience, not only in "know-how" but also in forecasting the pattern of wants. The Economic Planning Unit need to be further strengthened. Personnel should be seconded to United Nations agencies to gain further experience. We must exploit the best of our resources as well as discover more effective means to exploit nature, if we hope to achieve our industrial aspirations.

Mr Speaker, Sir, it has become customary for us to talk of economic development in terms of increasing the rate of investment in the country. This is correct up to a point because the level of investment and the pattern of investment are the two crucial determinants of the rate of growth of income. It has to be recognised, however, that the process of development is much more complex than merely raising the level of investment. It involves a change in attitude: it requires a certain sense of dedication and discipline without which a high rate of development cannot be sustained. Development requires not only more money, it requires administrative energy, efficiency and adaptability. Merely taking orders will not do. We need administrators with energy to venture into uncertainty and adaptability to sense shifts in demands. Character and imagination are needed every bit as much as slide rules and minute writing. If one considers the role of moral ideas and social outlook in economic development such attributes look to be even more important, as one can consider economic growth as a spiritual problem. Without the will and the ideal there can be no sustained development. Economic growth is impossible if people value old routines more than greater incomes. If people are so intent on protecting their own position that they refuse to allow gifted

men to act and to excel, there can be no economic growth; it is also true if people are too anxious for immediate satisfaction to save for the future.

The Minister of Finance has given a warning on the matter of pay rises in the Public Services. He said more pay is given to the same bodies and these same bodies are giving less service for more pay. This state of affairs, he said, cannot go on indefinitely. Pay cut or retrenchment, in my opinion, is not the answer to this problem. A complete reorganisation of the Public Services is needed to create more efficiency in order to generate service to justify the pay bill. Rising wage claims will undoubtedly lay open the national economy to inflationary forces. If new wage claims were presented, in spite of growing unemployment, the situation would deteriorate further. The Government would face an acute crisis due to growing liabilities caused by unemployment. The paradox then could happen: that available money would finance smaller production at higher cost and prices instead of larger production at lower cost and prices. Our problem should not be one of spending ourselves out but fighting ourselves out of the financial situation. There is enough flexibility in our economy to withstand it. Ours is not a lean economy nor a lean society. What is required is a long range approach to our problems. For this there must be a fair sharing of the burdens.

To conclude, Mr Speaker, Sir, I would say that progress, however good it may be, has its price to be paid for. It is paid in hard thinking, hard work and the sacrifice of many of the accustomed ways of life. It requires not only energy but patience to lay sound foundation and to build effectively upon them. It cannot be won by the spectacular or by just politically popular measures and projects. As we move into the pace of modern industrial life we have to face increased disciplines and responsibilities. There need to be law and order, a reasonable degree of political stability and responsibility and a respectable administration of financial and other public affairs. Perhaps, Mr Speaker, Sir, no

country has ever combined these elements to perfection, but history has demonstrated that economic development is speeded up or slowed down in relation to the extent that they have existed. This, Mr Speaker, Sir, I think would be something for us to think about over these years in our economic development activity. Thank you.

Tuan Geh Chong Keat (Penang Utara): Mr Speaker, Sir, in spite of some complaints here and there about the Budget presented, I personally feel that the Minister of Finance, with his team of financial wizards, has completed the great job entrusted to him of financing the nation's expenditure and he deserves our compliments for having done a good job of it, in spite of a few flaws. We do appreciate the laborious hours and dilemma involved in solving those financial problems. However, we wish to clarify that it is also our duty to study and comment on this national Budget and we hope that the Honourable Minister of Finance would not take any problem presented lightly.

As the Honourable Minister of Finance has indicated that he would welcome constructive advice as to what we should do to make ends meet, I have this offer: plug all the holes of the federal purse to prevent illegal leakage or drainage—in short, exterminate the "rats" nibbling at the federal revenue—

- (1) reinforce and facilitate the legislation of the anti-corruption laws for more effective actions, as the erosion of corruption has already set in and is at the very foundation of our Administration;
- (2) more stringent control of the Customs Department at various entry points and separate the job of assessment and collection of duties instead of having only one officer to assess and collect the duties. (This will stop the leakage of a large portion of our revenue. Then, with the enormous sum recoverable, there will be no cause to toil with the question of cutting down the salaries of Government servants), and

- (3) more stringent control at all revenue-collection centres in general, for example, at the Penang Port Commission.

Sir, it is a very wellknown fact that ticketless travel, especially motor-cycles and passengers, on the ferry vessels is rampant. Any seasoned travellers on the ferry will confirm this. Let us say that for each trip the Port Commission shortcollects \$5. Basing on 120 trips per day the loss is about \$600 per day or \$18,000 a month, or \$216,000 a year. At 20 cents per passenger, this is equivalent to 1,080,000 passengers who have paid for their use of the ferry, but the estimated loss of revenue of \$216,000 per year has gone to some people's pocket instead of accruing to the Government. This just simply gross misappropriation of public funds. The Treasury should send a team to investigate there.

A few months ago the Management had employed two so-called Australian experts at fantastic fees to improve the collection of revenue and other things. What have they done to rectify this? We would like to know what improvements have been made and precautions taken, as still a large number of people and much traffic travel in the ferry with the ticket collection disappearing into some peoples' pockets.

Development Tax—While appreciating the exemption for individuals who are not partners and whose development income does not exceed \$500 per annum, would the Honourable Minister of Finance give consideration to the plight of small tradesmen, small stallholders, roadside sellers, vegetable sellers and fishmongers, who do not come under the category of hawkers and who under the circumstances had to form a partnership but their individual earning is less than \$3,000 (for married) or \$2,000 (for single) per year to be accorded exemption?

Business Registration—While agreeing with the Honourable Minister of Finance that the smallest businesses such as the rubber smallholders with less than 25 acres are exempted from registration, can this House presume

that the Honourable Minister has in mind the exemption for small traders, roadside and market stallholders, vegetable sellers and fishmongers whose income fall within the group of those rubber small-holders with less than 25 acres? We know that there are many cases of small traders in villages and small towns struggling for survival besides having to provide their children with education and who had difficulties to pay the existing registration fees. I appeal to the Honourable Minister to reconsider this group of small traders registration fee and \$5 annual renewal with a re-adjustment of \$20 on first fee.

The taxes and the new duties imposed on foodstuffs have created a lot of hardship in Penang and the mainland and have caused the prices of these foodstuffs to escalate to a fantastic figure. I would appeal to the Government to work out a way by which the plight of the people could be alleviated and the prices of foodstuffs could be maintained at as practical a level as is possible.

These, in fact, affect the home economies of the family.

Surtax—The 2% Surtax may appear to be less burdensome than the turnover tax which it replaces, but has caused anxiety and concern in regard to the bleak future of Penang entrepot trade. Penang Island's entrepot trade has thrived for over 180 years through importation of foreign goods from neighbouring countries and various parts of the world and importing rubber, copra, betelnuts, essential oils and other produces from Thailand, Burma and Indonesia. Even tuna fish were caught in the Indian Ocean and were brought into Penang for deep freeze and re-export. All these imports are being repacked and re-exported for distribution throughout South-East Asia and other parts of the world, thus earning foreign exchange for the nation and giving employment to the citizens.

It was expressed by the Chambers of Commerce and the rubber traders of Penang that the levy of Surtax on goods imported for re-export is affecting

Penang's trade very adversely, because the turnover tax was only on sales of imported goods into the Island or within the Principal Customs Area and the goods for export were specifically exempted as in the case of packed rubber.

The contention is that if the Surtax is to replace the turnover tax then it must not extend beyond the scope of application, especially in items exempted by the turnover tax. The exemption from the Surtax was interpreted to apply to only goods imported through bills of lading and it is necessary for the entrepot trade of the port that exemption should be extended to goods imported for re-export. We appeal to the Honourable Minister of Finance for the interpretation of, I quote "goods in transit and in bond" to cover the exemption of goods imported for re-export such as

- (i) packed rubber, betelnuts, copra, essential oils, tuna fish and other products, and
- (ii) all finished and unfinished manufactured goods.

The Honourable Minister of Finance and the Honourable Minister of Commerce and Industry and myself, besides other Members of Parliament from the Island of Penang, have been struggling over this issue of the free port status of Penang Island for many years in Parliament. We had, in duty bound, presented our case over and over again in this august House without avail. Our Honourable Minister of Finance, on harmonisation of Customs Union, was really solving the Custom's dilemma as they were very severely pricked by the smugglers, who operated outside Penang Island and thriving on some officers' weakness—for this the people of Penang were labelled as smugglers and people living on the best of two worlds. The Honourable Minister of Finance was bent on fitting Penang Island into his industrialisation harmonisation programme, but we in Penang Island did not get a justifiable portion of the industrialisation development programme—like that across our narrow channel.

Speaking on industrialisation, it would appear that what we are launching on now, as the Honourable Minister of Commerce and Industry has said, is industrialisation in reverse, and industrialisation in reverse had led to monopolistic industrialisation, as we had experienced. Sugar and flour were imported from the same source as by those industries in Singapore, and yet the prices of these finished products in Malaysia are much higher, than those in Singapore, and businessmen, dealing in entrepot trade, instead of purchasing from Malaysia, are being forced to purchase from Singapore which offers a lower price than the price quoted in Malaysia. Therefore, this monopolistic trade had caused a drainage of our foreign exchange, and I request the Honourable Minister of Commerce and Industry to look into it and study the matter.

Sir, I must emphasise again that to solve the question of the free port status of Penang, there must not be a challenge, but rather, in the approach, there must be emphasis on Government's positive actions, in positive economic planning and development on the Island itself, which will guarantee the economic well-being of the Islanders, also that the Central Government must indicate how fast it can implement and accomplish—

- (i) the immediate need of establishing and improving existing industries by giving financial assistance to Penang Island to put her on a proper scale of industrialisation and tourism;
- (ii) positive economic planning and development to meet the needs of the Island and policies designed to raise the living standard of the residents to gain employment, economic, social and cultural progress.

In the previous sitting of Parliament the Honourable Minister of Finance promised me that during his visit to the United States of America he would invite a team of World Bank experts to stay in Penang and listen to the people of the Island before submitting a report on the destiny of the Island.

We are thankful for this proposal and hope that he would facilitate the visit of this international team of World Bank experts. May I also enquire from the Honourable Minister of Finance the result of the industrial survey conducted by Professor Hamzah assisted by the students from the University of Malaya, on which the State Government of Penang spent approximately \$30,000?

We in Penang would also like to know in this respect what and how was the feeling of the World Bank representatives who stayed in Penang for a couple of days, like Professor Rueff. Could the Honourable Minister of Finance oblige me and the State Government of Penang with a copy each of the reports and also that of Munro's report. Sir, we can face facts and we would like to read those reports. We would also like to hear from the Honourable Minister of Finance his outlines as to the advantages to be gained, which would outweigh the disadvantages of the loss of the free port status of Penang Island, and as to what extent the Government is prepared to go along with us, e.g.,

- (i) setting up of a University College;
- (ii) financial assistance for the construction of Dewan Negeri Penang which is a Convention Hall Complex with a Public Library;
- (iii) encouragement to industrialise and to meet the inconveniences and extra cost including concession rate of ferry charges;
- (iv) Tourism promotion by development of Pantai Acheh National Park; and
- (v) the bridge (causeway) linking Penang Island to the Mainland.

I must specifically indicate that this is not a bargain, but an appeal for the people of the Penang Island to be briefed.

Before concluding on this issue, perhaps the House would like to hear the latest remarks as reported in the *Straits Echo* from a very recent distinguished visitor, Mr Nigel Waite, a

deputy leader of the British Trade Mission, who was in Penang over the week-end and who declared in no uncertain terms that it was vitally necessary for Penang to retain its free port status and that the future of the Island lay in its still being a free port.

Mr Speaker, Sir, touching on Tourism, I would like to appeal to the Honourable Minister of Commerce and Industry for more and larger allocations of financial grants to develop the tourism attractions of Penang, like the proposed Penang Hill Road, and the natural scenic beauty of the beaches.

Mr Marvin Plake, executive director of the Pacific Area Travel Association, who is extremely well qualified to speak on tourism, stated that Penang could vie with other wellknown areas such as Hawaii, provided it was adequately developed. Coupled with the advice of the Honourable Minister of Commerce and Industry to exploit our Island's assets, we could exploit Penang's potential to the fullest for development as a Tourist Centre, if greater grants are given to us for this specific purpose.

Mr Speaker, Sir, touching on education, we are grateful to the Honourable Minister of Finance and the Honourable Minister of Education for a large portion of allocation to the children's education in this nation. In this respect, I would like to request the Honourable Minister of Education to provide the continuance of the teaching of the mother tongue in the schools, such as Chinese and Tamil in the English stream. Last year these classes were provided, but since the beginning of this year when the schools reopen we understand that no instruction has been given to these teachers teaching the mother tongue in these schools up to today. Therefore, I request the Honourable Minister of Education to look into this matter.

Sir, providing for Boards of Management for the schools is one thing and the efficient management of the schools is another. In this respect, I would like to request the Minister of Education to provide the Board of Management with a copy of the Instrument of Management, and this Instrument

should be translated into the language they could understand best, because we have the problem that in most of the Chinese schools the headmasters are usually the secretaries of the Board, and it is quite usual in Chinese schools, where members could not understand English for the secretary to interpret the law to his advantage and convenience. But if such Instrument are translated and given to each and every member of the Board, I am sure there will be smoother running of the school by the Board of Management. Sir, speaking on this subject again, it has been experienced during this period that the Chinese schools or the national type primary schools of the Chinese stream require more class-rooms for the Sekolah Menengah of the Chinese type. Many students had to leave their schools and were transferred to the other stream much to the liking of the parents and these children. Therefore, I would request the Honourable Minister of Education to look into this matter.

Sir, talking of school children we cannot run away from the responsibility that these children must be looked after in respect of transportation. It has caused anxiety and worries to the parents, and I would like to request the Honourable Minister of Transport and the Minister of Finance to solve the big problem of trying to assist the *sekolah* taxis, where it is possible to allow micro-buses to be used where we can transport more school children spread out throughout the rural areas of our country. It is only by means of these school taxis and micro-buses that we can group these children and transport them to their various schools through a faster and cheaper means, besides giving more employment to our unemployed; and it would be helpful if the Honourable Minister of Finance could co-operate with the Minister of Transport by reducing the fees for these *sekolah* taxis.

Sir, I would be failing in my duty if I don't speak on the subject of benefit societies. I wish to inform this House that the beneficiaries receive an immediate advance on the death of a member that help materially to defray

the funeral expenses and then a balance was left to tide over the family to a certain period until they could find means to provide their future. We understand that the law provides a sum not exceeding \$600. Now, Sir, we understand that an advance of \$150 is paid to the beneficiaries and the balance is held kept in suspense pending the final decision of the Registrar of Societies, and in many cases the deceased had been paying contributions for over 15 to 20 years. There is one point which we fail to understand, that while restricting the benefit societies at Penang to pay an advance of \$150 and retaining the balance, a uniformity advance payment has been given to the benefit societies in Kuala Lumpur, which are allowed to pay up the initial payments to a limit of \$400. Therefore, I request the Honourable Minister of Finance to look into this uniformity of payment and, if possible, to maintain to the amount of not exceeding \$600.

Thank you, Sir.

Tuan Haji Mohamed Yusof bin Mahmud (Temerloh): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-belum saya masok dalam perbahathan Undang² Perbelanjaan ini, saya suka mendapat perhatian, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, supaya *Standing Order* chara kita berbahath di-Dewan ini dapat di-pinda kerana pada perhatian saya tiap² kali kita meshuarat perbelanjaan ini, saya mendengar-lah Tuan Yang di-Pertua merayu kepada Ahli² supaya memendekkan ucapan-nya dan juga Ahli² kita berebut² hendak beruchap. Maka pada pandangan saya ini menjatohkan maruah Dewan kita. Ada lebeh baik kita pinda chara² perbahathan itu supaya sesuai, dan pada pandangan saya, yang saya telah lihat sa-bagaimana di-jalankan di-negeri Taiwan ia-itu dengan perkakas *electronic* boleh membaikkan maruah Dewan itu: yang kedua chara² di-*United Nations* menjalankan perbahathan. Jadi saya berharap Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dapat membawa perkara ini kepada Majlis Tertinggi supaya di-pinda *Standing Order* kita ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya masok dalam perbahathan perbelanjaan ini. Saya tidak hendak memuji tetapi saya

terus kepada perkara² yang saya hendak beri pandangan kepada Kerajaan. Puncta kepada segala pendapatan negara ada-lah hasil daripada baik-nya Perkhidmatan Awam kita. Ini-lah rasa saya tumpuan yang patut di-beri dalam perkara ini. Pegawai² Perkhidmatan 'Awam ia-lah bertanggung-jawab mendapatkan segala wang yang banyak kepada negara kita. Dalam ini-lah rasa saya banyak kechuaian² yang telah di-jalankan pada pendapat saya, bagaimana saya kata bagitu, ia-itu chara kita membelanjakan wang yang telah di-untokkan oleh Parlimen, pada pendapat saya, semenjak tahun 1959 sampai pada masa ini, perbelanjaan² yang telah di-untokkan oleh Parlimen selalu-nya tidak menchukupi sa-bagaimana telah di-untokkan, ada-kah sebab chuai meletakkan anggaran² ini atau sengaja?

Kita Ahli² Dewan boleh mengetahui ini daripada penyata² *Public Accounts* daripada tahun 1959 sampai tahun 1963. Dalam penyata² ini terang dan jelas bagaimana kechuai²an yang telah di-dapati oleh penyata *Public Accounts Committee* dan kita Ahli² Dewan chuma mendapat penyata ini sa-telah perkara² itu berjalan. Sebab itu, kita tengok, tiap² tahun selalu-nya Dewan ini di-minta meluluskan perbelanjaan tambahan dari satu masa ka-satu masa. Ini rasa saya satu perkara yang patut kita awasi, ia-itu kita mengawas perbelanjaan ini sa-belum di-belanjakan, mesti-lah kita Ahli² Dewan mengetahui mengapa hendak di-belanjakan bukan sa-telah di-belanjakan dan kita meluluskan. Ini boleh kita perbuat, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-umpama chara² di-*England*, di-*Parlimen British* di-mana satu *Estimate Committee* di-adakan yang bertanggung-jawab sa-bagai wakil orang ramai bagaimana perbelanjaan² itu dapat di-jalankan. Jadi, dengan chara ini, rasa saya, baru betul² yang perbelanjaan itu di-jalankan atau di-belanjakan bagaimana di-untokkan oleh Parlimen. Saya telah chuba bangkitkan perkara ini dalam tahun 1964 supaya kita mengadakan *Parliamentary Estimates Committee* untok menchegeh perbelanjaan² yang sa-macham ini.

Pada masa ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita chuma tahu sa-telah *Oditor Jendral*

menyatakan penyata-nya dan penyata itu Tuan Yang di-Pertua, yang dapat kita ketahui ia-lah untuk tahun 1964 sahaja, kita sudah masuk tahun 1967, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tahun 1965, 1966 kita belum tahu. Apa-kah perbelanjaan² yang lebeh dan mengapa di-belanjakan? Sekarang *Public Accounts Committee* baharu menyiasat perbelanjaan tahun 1964 sahaja, dan ini chuma dapat kita mengetahui dalam tahun 1967. Jadi, ini rasa saya satu kelemahan patut kita baiki. Sunggoh pun pada masa yang lampau kita membiarkan chara² lama, chara menjalankan perbelanjaan ini, tetapi rasa saya sampai-lah masa-nya yang chadangan saya ia-itu adakan *Parliamentary Estimate Committee* dan sa-terus-nya *Committee* ini akan bertanggung-jawab sa-belum membelanja-kan satu² projek. Jika lebeh perbelanjaan daripada yang di-peruntokan oleh Parlimen maka dapat di-ketahui oleh *Committee* ini dan di-beritahu kepada Dewan ini, dengan penerangan yang penoh supaya kita berpuas hati yang perbelanjaan² itu betul. Sebab saya katakan bagitu jikalau kita perhati *Public Accounts Committee Report* daripada tahun 1959 hingga 1963 ada menerangkan banyak perkara² perbelanjaan² yang berlipat² kali ganda daripada peruntokan² yang telah di-luluskan.

Yang kedua, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, banyak perbelanjaan² kita dapat jimat-kan berkenaan dengan hal membeli belah barang² keperluan Kerajaan. Saya tidak tahu pada masa ini macham mana? Tender² Board boleh menentukan perbelanjaan², pada hal kita tengok, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-umpama-nya *accounting machine*—tiap² *department* yang kita tengok, tidak lain, tidak bukan ia-itu dari kompeni² NCR sahaja. Mengapa? Pada hal kita tahu *machine*² ini boleh kita dapat perlumbaan harga daripada beberapa kompeni. Ada juga penjelasan yang di-terima di-katakan itu-lah senang, kerana NCR ada chukup perkakas-nya, tetapi ini satu perkara yang tidak lojik, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Sa-patut-nya-lah perkara² itu di-beri perlumbaan di-antara satu² kompeni, yang membolehkan kita membeli barang² yang murah. Jadi, ini rasa saya satu juga, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dapat

kita menchermatkan perbelanjaan Kerajaan daripada terlibat dalam kompelot² yang sengaja hendak membeli barang² yang mahal untuk Kerajaan.

Bagitu juga, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bagi satu dua chontoh perbelanjaan yang lain saperti dalam *Replanting Board*, dalam Tanam Semula, pada hal kita tahu perlumbaan sains pada masa ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sangat besar dan dalam perlumbaan sains ini harga² menurun, mengapa *Replanting Board* ini menggunakan baja² yang mahal yang mengakibatkan beratus² ribu? Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada hal kita tahu *compound*² baja daripada perusahaan dalam negeri ini yang mana saya telah mendapat kenyataan yang penoh boleh menurunkan perbelanjaan itu, tetapi tidak mendapat perhatian. Saya tidak menyalahkan kepada Bapa² Menteri kita kerana mereka bergantung kepada pakar² sahaja.

Jadi, ini saya berchakap bukan-lah melulu, tetapi ada bokti² pada saya yang keadaan sa-macham ini, sa-umpama CCM Tanah Melayu, telah dengan sain²-nya menggunakan *compound*² baja yang boleh dapat menjimatkan belanja lebeh kurang \$500,000 tiap² tahun, tetapi Lembaga ini maseh lagi tidak mahu menggunakan *product* daripada CCM ini. Saya tidak tahu mengapa? Ada-kah mutu pembuatan kita di-negeri ini kurang daripada baja² yang datang daripada luar ini? Ini-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada pandangan saya satu dua perkara dalam perkara menchermatkan perbelanjaan Kerajaan. Jadi, saya rasa sudah sampai masa-nya-lah Dewan ini, menubuhkan satu Jawatan-kuasa lain, ia-itu mengadakan *parliamentary tender committee* terdiri daripada Ahli² Dewan ini, supaya dapat menchegeh perkara² yang saya cheritakan tadi. Sebab saya chadangkan bagitu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam *Board*² yang ada dalam tanah ayer ini, kebanyakan ahli² Jawatan-kuasa-nya terdiri daripada pegawai *expatriate* yang telah berhenti daripada bekerja dalam negara ini. Mereka² ini mengutamakan *product*² daripada negeri mereka sendiri, sa-bagaimana saya chontohkan tadi atau saya cheritakan tadi, ia-itu RRI atau *Rubber Research*

atau *Rubber Board* menggunakan baja² yang datang dari luar negeri.

Bagitu juga, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak tahu mengapa-kah kita mengutamakan juga sharikat² yang modal-nya dan kebanyakan ahli²-nya bukan daripada ra'ayat Malaysia kita. Sa-bagaimana Rubber Board mengutamakan satu sharikat Bian Heng & Co. (M) Ltd, daripada Singapura, padahal kita ada sharikat² Malaysia yang ada di-tanah ayer kita yang boleh menjalankan perusahaan ini, mengapa tidak di-utamakan? Ini pandangan² saya dan saya harap dapat perhatian berat daripada pehak Kerajaan.

Sa-lain daripada kita berjimat, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada penghujung ucapan Menteri Kewangan kita ada mengatakan, "Saya suka hendak mendengar *constructive criticism* atau pun chadangan² yang baik bagaimana kita hendak mendapatkan wang yang banyak untok kegunaan negara". Jadi rasa saya kalau hendak di-cheritakan itu banyak, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tetapi syarat-nya Jawatan-kuasa yang hendak mencari itu biar-lah daripada ahli² yang di-pileh oleh ra'ayat, sebab mereka² lebeh tahu siapa yang boleh membayar, bukan daripada Ahli Jawatan-kuasa yang terdiri daripada mereka² yang kaya² dan yang berpendapatan lumayan. Ini yang di-kehendaki, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kerana dengan chara Jawatan-kuasa terdiri daripada orang² yang berpangkat tinggi, yang bergaji besar dan orang² kaya, millionaire, maka bila masa pun mereka² tidak memikir yang mereka² patut membayar. Kita tengok dalam negeri kita, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, orang² yang patut membayar chukai² dalam negeri ini—banyak, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Sa-umpama apa-kah perlu orang² ini ada empat lima buah rumah² bunglow yang besar², patut mereka² ini, di-kenakan chukai yang tertinggi kerana untok menjaga mereka dan negara yang aman dan ma'amor ini. Jadi satu chontoh saya beri, kalau hendak banyak lagi boleh saya cheritakan.

Jadi saya harap dapat Kerajaan memikirkan chadangan mengadakan Parliametary Committee yang boleh menetapkan, menunjokkan, di-mana tempat² yang dapat kita tap atau pun

kita toreh mengeluarkan getah yang memberi hasil yang banyak dalam negeri ini.

Saya berjangkit, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kapada satu ucapan Menteri kita berkenaan perburohan, penganggorean dalam negeri ini. Ini juga pada pandangan saya dapat kita baiki. Kalau kita menyelidek segala perkara yang patut di-buat dalam negeri, mengapa kita buat di-luar negeri? Sa-umpama packing getah untok keluar negeri, mengapa tidak di-adakan dalam negeri kita? Padahal perusahaan ini di-adakan di-Singapura. Getah² kita semua di-hantar ka-Singapura dan Singapura membuat packing and processing. Perusahaan ini mengutamakan tenaga antara 20,000 hingga 30,000 buroh. Mengapa tidak di-buat di-negeri kita? Jadi ini-lah chara² yang boleh kita baiki berkenaan perburohan kita. Bagitu juga mengapa pedagang² kita mesti menggunakan lagi pelabohan Singapura? Mengapa Kerajaan tidak tegas menyatakan segala barang² yang datang daripada luar negeri mesti menggunakan Port Swettenham? Dengan ini yang boleh memberi pekerjaan yang banyak pada buroh² kita dan ini juga mengechilkan perbelanjaan kita—dagangan daripada England mahu pergi ka-Singapura baharu balek ka-Kuala Lumpur—mengapa tidak daripada England, Amerika terus ka-Port Swettenham datang ka-Kuala Lumpur? Ini problem² kita, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, chara² ini bukan sahaja untok mendapat wang yang banyak tetapi memberi pekerjaan yang banyak kapada buroh² kita dalam negeri ini.

Uchapan dari Ahli PAS tadi mengatakan dia mushkil kerana ucapan daripada Menteri Penerangan kita tidak membenarkan pemuda² daripada kampong² datang ka-bandar² untok mencari kerja buroh dan daripada ucapan itu, saya berpendapat yang beliau itu berkehendakkan chuma orang² luar bandar itu makan gaji buroh sahaja. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Kerajaan Perikatan kita tidak berniat bagitu. Kerajaan Perikatan mahu supaya orang² di-luar bandar itu mendapat pendapatan lebeh daripada gaji² buroh yang ada dalam bandar,

dengan ada-nya ranchangan² luar bandar yang kita dirikan—saperti Lembaga Kemajuan Tanah Persekutuan, yang akan memberi pendapatan yang lumayan. Jadi saya rasa, saya tidak bersetuju dengan chadangan-nya itu supaya orang kita di-luar bandar di-galakkan menchari kerja buroh di-bandar². Ini rasa saya tidak lojik, dan saya tidak bersetuju, dan Kerajaan Perikatan memang tidak bersetuju supaya orang di-luar bandar itu menjadi buroh di-dalam bandar, tetapi bagi mereka² yang dalam bandar saya bersetuju. Orang² Melayu yang ada di-Petaling Jaya patut dapat bekerja di-perusahaan² ini kerana mereka² tidak ada peluang masuk dalam ranchangan pembangunan luar bandar, patut sangat mereka itu di-beri peluang. Bagitu juga saya berharap dapat Kerajaan menitek beratkan atau mendapatkan penyata berapa-kah orang Melayu yang telah bekerja di-dalam perusahaan di-Petaling Jaya daripada orang² Melayu di-Petaling Jaya? Kalau sa-kira-nya perjanjian kita dengan tiap² company yang mempunyai pioneer status tidak bagaimana yang telah di-terangkan dalam perjanjian itu, tidak menggunakan bumiputra dan orang Malaysia ini, sa-patut-nya-lah kita timbangkan balek bagaimana kedudukan pioneer status yang telah di-beri kepada mereka² itu. Saya mendapat tahu kebanyakan sharikat ini bukan sahaja tidak menggunakan bumiputra bahkan bukan orang Malaysian. Jadi ini saya berharap dapat penyiasatan daripada Kerajaan kita—adakan satu Jawatan-kuasa melihat sendiri, kita round, tengok factory² itu, siapa-kah buroh² yang di-gunakan di-tempat² perusahaan mereka.

Satu lagi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, usaha² Kerajaan kita pada masa yang lampau untuk mendapatkan hasil yang banyak, pengeluaran hasil yang banyak daripada negeri kita, rasa saya sudah menchukupi. Tetapi mengapa hasil dari penyiasatan² yang telah kita beri belanja wang yang banyak, saperti satu parti penyiasatan galian melalui aerial, melalui udara, parti daripada Canada yang telah menyiasat negeri kita, apa-kah telah terjadi kepada penyata² itu? Padahal tujuan kita supaya pakar² yang hendak menyiasat

segala² galian yang ada di-tanah ayer kita ini membolehkan kita berusaha, tetapi semenjak penyiasatan itu di-adakan dengan belanja tidak kurang dekat suku juta ringgit belum lagi kita dapat faedah daripada penyiasatan itu. Ini-lah satu² perbelanjaan rasa saya patut, pada masa hadapan, di-kurangkan. Pakar² yang di-panggil daripada luar negeri, pakar², bermacam² pakar, terutama sa-kali berkenaan dengan pakar² yang telah di-adakan berkenaan dengan menyiasat bagaimana Malayan Railways patut di-ubah chara pentadbiran-nya dan penyata telah ada ditangan Kerajaan, mengapa tidak di-laksanakan? Sekarang kita mendengar satu pakar lagi hendak di-panggil daripada United Nation pula, saya tidak tahu-lah kita akan membayar atau tidak perbelanjaan-nya, tetapi saya perchaya kita akan membayar-nya. Jadi satu pakar, dari satu pakar telah di-chuba maka ini-lah belanja yang banyak kita keluarkan.

Lagi pakar² ini, saya tidak payah berchakap banyak lagi, kalau saya hendak mencheritakan hal pakar daripada negeri Jepun untuk menunjukkan kita chara² menjalankan Talivishen di-tanah ayer kita ini, sa-telah pakar² itu pergi perkara itu tidak boleh di-jalankan, jadi di-jalankan banyak perkara² yang membazir. Jadi satu² yang dapat saya terangkan kepada Dewan pada masa hadapan kita jangan-lah gunakan pakar² yang membazir itu.

Lagi satu, ucapan Menteri kita berkenaan dengan hal mengurangkan pegawai² Kerajaan kerana hendak mengurangkan perbelanjaan. Rasa saya ini tidak mustahak sangat. Pada pendapat saya mengapa kelemahan² daripada pegawai² kita daripada sa-tiap perkhidmatan ia-lah kerana yang pertama saya perhatikan ia-itu Ketua² Pejabat tidak di-hormati² oleh pegawai² rendah. Tiap² perentah yang di-beri oleh Ketua² Pejabat itu tidak di-hormati oleh pegawai di-bawah-nya. Jadi, sa-patut-nya-lah kuasa yang telah di-beri pada masa kita bersidang tahun sudah, suatu kuasa yang di-beri kepada Ketua² Pejabat supaya hendak meluruskan, streamlinekan pejabat² supaya tiap² pekerja itu tahu yang mereka bekerja

di-bawah sa-orang ketua. Kalau sa-lagi kerja² yang di-perintah oleh Ketua² Pejabat tidak di-jalankan oleh pegawai² yang di-bawah, sa-bagaimana kehendak General Orders, sa-lagi itu-lah kita tidak akan dapat kebaikan perkhidmatan negara kita. Jadi, saya berharap, Kerajaan menitek beratkan lagi dalam kuasa yang di-beri oleh Parlimen ini kepada-nya, untok ketua² pegawai menjalankan tugas²-nya.

Kita tengok, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada masa penjajah, tiap² pegawai² rendah tak usahkan tak membuat kerja, hendak lambat datang pun ka-pejabat, mereka² akan chari jalan yang sa-halus²-nya supaya mereka tidak nampak kepada ketua² pejabat. Tetapi tidak sekarang, Tuan Yang di-Pertua: patut mereka² datang ka-pejabat pukul 8.00 pagi, ketua pejabat pukul 7.45, tetapi peon yang datang 9.00 pagi. Apabila kita marah, mereka² ini berkata apa dia boleh buat sama saya. Tetapi insha Allah, rasa saya, dengan kuasa yang di-beri pada masa ini, saya berharap Kerajaan kita memberi sokongan yang kuat kepada Ketua² Pejabat, supaya menjalankan tugas² mereka dalam tiap² pejabat supaya pejabat² itu dapat berjalan dengan baik.

Yang kedua-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, patut penyiasatan kita adakan: mana-kah pejabat² yang kurang mustahak kepada negara kita kurangkan pegawai² itu, kita tukarkan pegawai itu ka-tempat yang mustahak, umpamanya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, satu pejabat yang sangat² mustahak ia-itu Pejabat Tanah di-tiap² negeri. Saya tengok kerja² yang di-jalankan itu memang tak chukup pegawai² yang ada itu. Tetapi, ada pejabat² yang saya masok, daripada pukul 9-10 pagi sampai pukul 11.00 pegawai²-nya duduk minum kopi dan bacha surat khabar.

Jadi, teringat saya pada tahun 1928, 1929, masa saya budak sekolah lagi. Sa-bagaimana Kerajaan British mengadakan *retrenchment*, di-adakan satu jawatan-kuasa sulit yang senentiasa melawat di-tiap² pejabat dan memberi penyata²-nya kepada Kerajaan, keadaan pegawai² bekerja dalam pejabat. Jadi dengan chara ini rasa saya, baru dapat Kerajaan kita tahu di-mana-kah

pejabat² yang mustahak, di-mana-kah pegawai² yang betul² bekerja dan bertugas.

Yang kedua-nya, kelemahan² ia-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada pegawai yang bertungkus lumus bekerja bersungguh², tetapi bila datang hendak memberikan penghargaan kerja² mereka, di-beri kepada pegawai² yang langsung tak bekerja, yang langsung tidak nampak muka-nya pada masa bekerja dan mereka² ini di-beri penghargaan tinggi oleh Kerajaan. Jadi, ini juga yang melemahkan perkhidmatan 'awam kita.

Sekarang, saya masok satu lagi perkara, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untok menjimatkan masa, ia-itu berkenaan hal galakan Kerajaan hendak memberi bumiputra masok dalam perusahaan dan perdagangan. Pada masa ini, galakan memang banyak, tetapi pelaksanaan-nya sangat mendukachita. Ada bumiputra² yang dapat mengadakan persatuan² mereka, mengadakan modal² mereka dalam satu² chawangan. Tetapi bila hendak melaksanakan, kita menerima tentangan yang hebat. Saya tunjukkan satu, ia-itu satu sharikat yang di-namakan sharikat Bumiputra Limited, yang bumiputra-nya telah mengumpulkan modal dan telah mendapatkan kerjasama beberapa perengkat, tetapi, bila persatuan ini chuba hendak melangkah dalam lapangan yang besar, kita mendapat halangan² daripada—saya kata-lah—daripada Kementerian.

Apabila sharikat ini chuba hendak mendapatkan perdagangan dalam membekalkan baja² kepada Persatuan² Pekebum Kechil—apa alasan-nya? Alasan-nya di-tolakkan kepada Lembaga Bertanam Semula untok menolakan permintaan Sharikat Bumiputra ini. Pada hal, dasar kita, yang kita menggalakkan supaya bumiputra masok chergas, tetapi tidak mendapat sokongan daripada Kementerian yang bertanggung-jawab. Ini-lah yang sangat² di-mushkilkan. Jadi, beban untok menolakan itu pulang kepada Lembaga Penanam Semula, tetapi daripada penyata² atau pun penerangan² daripada Kementerian ini-lah yang menolak supaya Bumiputra jangan di-terima

menjadi pembekal baja² kepada pekebun² kecil. Jadi, ini-lah satu contoh yang saya dapat bongkar, tetapi rasa saya banyak lagi perkara, tetapi, kalau keadaan yang sa-macam ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, segala chadangan² kita untuk hendak memberi sama peluang² kepada bumiputra mengambil bahagian dalam segala lapangan per-usahaan, tidak dapat di-laksanakan. Kalau tidak dapat di-laksanakan, maka ketenteraman negara kita tidak akan dapat kita samakan.

Jadi, ini-lah saya berharap, sebab perkara ini permulaan, dapat lagi kita pinda, dapat kita baiki lagi. Jadi ini menjadi, rasa saya, dorongan daripada Kerajaan membaiki keadaan itu.

Apa salah-nya kalau kita hendak tolak, panggil dia punya Jawatan-kuasa supaya perbincangan dapat di-adakan. Saya takut dengan sebab ini akan Kerajaan di-tuduh bermacam² chara. Jadi, rasa saya ada masa-nya lagi boleh kita baiki segala usaha yang macam ini. Modal yang telah di-kumpulkan, satu lengkongan yang telah dapat di-kumpulkan, kalau hendak menolakan, panggil mereka² itu, di-bincangkan antara peminta dengan kita supaya dapat di-selesaikan apa² masalah² itu. Jikalau masalah² itu betul bagi pehak Kerajaan sa-umpamanya jika di-katakan ah, kami tak boleh bagi kerana peruntokan telah tak ada. Jangan berselindong, kepada Lembaga, tolak permintaan orang ini.

Jadi saya harap, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dapat perhatian daripada Kerajaan kita dan para Menteri kita. Dengan itu saya ucapkan terima kaseh kepada Tuan Yang di-Pertua yang telah memberi peluang kepada saya berchakap.

Tuan Tan Tsak Yu (Sarawak): Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Minister of Finance, in his Budget speech under debate, has frankly told this House the true financial position of the Federal Government and what he would propose to do to meet the deficit in the Budget. He also told this House what could be done and what could not be done. He also revealed his realisation that tax increases on the 1967 scale

cannot be imposed every year. Finally, he called for the reduction of non-essential expenditure.

Sir, our sympathy lies with the Minister of Finance, who has an unpleasant and difficult duty to perform. To manage a family budget is not an easy task, not to say the least the management of a national Budget of such magnitude, where colossal sums of money must be found to meet the needs of the economic and social development throughout Malaysia and at the same time provide money for the defence and security of East Malaysia, in view of the withdrawal of Commonwealth Forces from the area. Furthermore, the Honourable Minister of Finance's task in budgeting is made more difficult because of the fall in the prices of rubber and tin, from which the Treasury will be getting \$58 million less this year. Sir, under these circumstances, it is understandable that additional revenue must be found to meet the deficit, if Malaysia is to maintain her record of economic stability. However, every year, since Malaysia, this House has been asked to approve new taxes to meet increased expenditure. If this state of affairs is allowed to continue, it will simply kill the goose that lays the golden egg. So, it is now time to call for a halt in the imposition of new taxation.

With regard to the reduction of non-essential expenditure, the Honourable Minister of Finance is an expert on this. I have heard a remark about him regarding his generosity on expenditure—it is easier to squeeze water from a rock than to get money from Enche' Tan Siew Sin! Sir, it is up to this House to strengthen his hands to cut out the waste and to keep on reducing non-essential expenditure. I think this is very important, if we wish to improve the Federal Government's financial position.

Sir, now I wish to touch on the surtax, the development tax and on the question of the promotion of Malaysian industry.

Surtax: The repeal of the turnover tax has come as a relief to the trading

community as a whole. The imposition of a 2 per cent surtax in its place is what the trading community asked for. Therefore, there must be general satisfaction with the imposition of the surtax. I would like to take this opportunity of thanking the Minister of Finance for taking steps to repeal the turnover tax. Sir, I wish to point out to the Honourable Member for Batu, who made the allegation that the consumers were exploited by merchants, who passed on 5 per cent to the consumers instead of the 2 per cent turnover tax, that while this may be true with certain importers who have very good agency lines, most importers in Sarawak, and I believe also in other parts of Malaysia, were not even able to pass on the 2 per cent turnover tax to the consumers in face of strong competition.

Development tax: The Honourable Minister of Finance in proposing to impose the development tax of 5 per cent gave these reasons: firstly, too many companies and businesses pay no income tax at all, largely because they are not disclosing their true profits; and, secondly, to broaden the base of the company tax and business profit tax so that a minimum development tax of \$500 per annum in the case of a company and \$100 in the case of a taxpayer other than a company or an individual will be imposed.

Sir, with regard to the first point, the Inland Revenue Department in Sarawak is quite capable in finding ways and means to make the companies and businesses pay their income tax, even if they have no profit to declare. As a result, most of the companies and businesses in Sarawak are paying income tax. As regards the second point, there is presently imposed in Sarawak a trade licensing fee of \$360 per annum in the case of any importer or exporter and \$180 in the case of a retailer. So this tax, in my opinion, will hit the small businesses in Sarawak, particularly in the rural areas as the importers and retailers in that State are paying at the moment \$360 and \$180 respectively. It is my view, therefore, that it would be simpler and easier to increase the company tax and business

profit tax by 5 per cent instead of imposing a development tax.

Promotion of Malaysian industry: In order to promote industries in Malaysia, the Honourable Minister has proposed to use more extensively tariff protection, which is considered as one of the most potent weapons. This is a move in the right direction. However, before tariff protection is applied, will the Minister assure this House: (i) that Malaysian made products are adequate to meet the demand of the whole of Malaysia; (ii) that the quality of the Malaysian made products are comparable with that of the imported goods; and (iii) that the prices of the Malaysian made products should be fair and reasonable so that they will not drive up the cost of living. Thank you, Sir.

Tuan T. Mahima Singh: Mr Speaker, Sir, in supporting the Bill, I would like to say that it is very difficult to please the whole country, but this time the Minister of Finance has pleased more than the number one would have expected. In passing, I would like to make a few observations, Sir.

*Fragmentation of estates—*This question of fragmentation has been receiving the attention of this House and of the public for quite a number of years, and after these six or seven years, it has been found that fragmentation has brought more evils than good. The only good expected from fragmentation was that it would produce land owners, but in doing so it has uprooted a large number of families who have been the backbone and who have helped to build the country's economy by being the chief producers of our main product—rubber. At the same time, we do not wish to rob the owners of their liberty to sell their estates, or sell and buy as they would like. Sir, I am speaking against fragmentation and not the sale of estates. In this direction we are lucky that a certain society has been formed which, while keeping the estates as they are as big economic units, at the same time has encouraged the workers on the estates to become owners. I refer to the National Land Finance

Co-operative Society. I believe, Sir, that this is a step in the right direction and I hope that the Government will give all possible help to such societies, if they are formed in the future.

Sir, we are investing large sums of money, hundreds of millions of dollars, in the rural development plan, so that more of our citizens can own their homes and have enough land to produce incomes to be able to support their families. Here, in these estates which are in danger of being fragmented, we have ready-made estates and the workers are on the spot, and I feel very strongly that the Government should be able to create a department or section in some Ministry—like MARA—so that it could give financial help to the workers in particular, in order that they could become owners of land.

In this connection, we have another society that has been helping the workers to a very large extent. I refer, Sir, to the National Union of Plantation Workers. They have been a very useful body. They are a moderate union and I am sure that with their very large membership, if they took an interest in helping their workers to own estates, a great deal of good work could be done.

In this connection, Sir, I would like also to refer to the estate schools. I have spoken on this matter before and I would like to mention it again because, according to my information, not much improvement has been made. The estate schools are, to a large extent, neglected. The conditions of the buildings and the furniture are to say the least, below standard and the results are, I am informed, usually below average in comparison to schools in the bigger areas. I would hope that the Ministry would be able to look into the matter of these estate schools, so that these children of the poor workers, who cannot afford to travel from their homes, would get a better deal.

Next, Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to make a passing reference to Television Malaysia. This Department has done extremely well during the short

period of its existence, and I would particularly like to pay my compliments to the Arts Section of Television Malaysia and to the Programmes Section, particularly when it comes to local musicians and local artists. I would think that during the short period of their existence they have done very well, but when it comes to imported films, I sometimes feel that many of the films shown are quite harmful to our younger generation. Television in this respect, Sir, is slightly different from the cinemas, which we may or may not visit, but when a television set is in the home, the young children are there, who are very impressionable, and when you have too much of this love-and-kiss stories, too much of killing, too much of murder, too many holdups and robberies, these young children are inclined to get the impression as if this was the natural way of life, which it is not, and once these ideas have gone into their tender brains, I am sure they would be very harmful to them and to the society at large.

Another point, Sir, about television is that we would hope that in the near future it would be possible for this Ministry to provide us with two channel programmes so that when, say, for example, an Indian programme comes along on television, the Chinese and the Malay viewers do not need to switch off and *vice versa*. If we have two channels it would be possible for the listeners of one language to switch over to the other language.

I would like to mention a few words, Sir, about the protection of local industries. During the short period of our Merdeka a lot has been done to encourage local industries, and Petaling Jaya is a standing monument to the success of the Alliance Government. Joint ventures have been encouraged; pioneer status is given all the help and encouragement by the Government. Local products are given preference to a certain extent, but there is one section of the trade which, I feel, Sir, the Ministry has neglected in not giving any assistance at all. I refer to the agency houses. We have agency houses owned by foreigners, which have been

established for a great number of years—fifty to sixty years—well established, and with proper organisation. It is, in many cases, quite impossible for Malaysian firms, entirely owned and staffed by Malaysians, to be able to compete with these giants which have large capitals and huge organisation. I feel, Sir, that these new businesses deserve the consideration—very serious consideration—of the Ministry and they should be given some fair and legitimate assistance and encouragement.

Some reference was made this afternoon to the expatriates in our country. These expatriates, in most cases, have done valuable service. We have nothing against expatriates. However, when the head of a department retires or resigns from the Government Service and then on joining a private firm passes all his knowledge, which in many cases, or in some cases, may not be for public consumption and may be only meant for the Government information, I do not think it is fair to the country. Once an expatriate has retired, unless he has acquired citizenship, I do not think it is fair for him to join a private firm and pass on his knowledge which he has acquired to the firm, which gains a very unfair advantage over the others.

In regard to foreign affairs, we should compliment our Ministry in getting a practical view of foreign affairs. As has been mentioned, Malaysia would like to be friends with every country that wants to be friendly with us and does not intend to interfere with our home affairs. In this respect, it was very encouraging when the Cabinet decided to send a mission to Moscow, and it is gratifying to know that Moscow in the near future would be sending a cultural mission to this country. This is only fair because we do not wish to mix politics with trade. Even Japan and England, which do not actually consider Communism as the best way of life, still have their trade missions in Communist countries, and we are happy to see that Malaysia will soon be having trade relations with those countries who are very good customers in buying rubber. Thank you, Sir.

Tuan Abdul Ghani bin Ishak (Melaka Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berchakap sedikit dalam Belanjawan, 1967 ini. Sa-belum mengalu²kan apa yang di-bentangkan oleh Menteri Kewangan, suka-lah saya berchakap daripada apa yang saya telah dengar sama² dalam Dewan ini, terutama saka² kali hujah² atau pun bahathan² yang di-keluarkan oleh Parti² Pembangkang.

Maseh lagi kita dapati, sa-tengah² pemimpin yang ada di-tanah ayer kita ini mengambil kesempatan—kata orang menanggok di-ayer yang keroh, ia-itu sa-makin menggelapkan atau pun suka menggelapkan pemikiran ra'ayat dalam bertanggung-jawab untok pembangunan negara kita sekarang ini. Kita suka memberi tahu Dewan ini dan kita harap juga bagi pehak pemimpin² yang sabagini keadaan-nya, hendak-lah kita faham sa-sunggoh-nya dalam sa-sabua²h negara yang baharu merdeka yang jangka jauh atau jangka panjang pembangunan kita berkehendakkan sa-suatu daripada-apa yang patut kita dermakan kapada negera kita.

Jadi, dalam keseluruhan Belanjawan yang di-bentangkan oleh Menteri Kewangan ini, saya rasa tidak-lah boleh bagi pehak ra'ayat atau pun bagi pehak pengundi² berasa sebal, kerana tidak lain dan tidak bukan semua puncha atau pun pendapatan yang akan timbul daripada belanjawan ini tidak lain dan tidak bukan untok kepentingan kita seluruh-nya.

Dalam hal Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan mengatakan bahawa dalam masa hadapan ini bahawa kaki-tangan Kerajaan akan di-kurangkan mengikut apa yang di-fikirkan untok Kerajaan hendak mengurangkan perbelanjaan ini—dalam hal ini bagi pehak saya sendiri suka-lah memberi tahu Menteri Yang Berhormat supaya satu jawatan-kuasa patut di-tubuhkan bagi menyiasat perkara ini sa-sunggoh-nya berlaku dengan 'adil pada masa akan datang. Kita tahu ada banyak pegawai² yang berjawatan sementara dan mereka ini harus barangkali akan *terkena nasib* sa-bagaimana yang di-ishtiharkan atau pun yang di-ucapkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri itu.

Tetapi, dalam pandangan saya, ada sa-tengah² kaki-tangan Kerajaan yang bertugas sa-chara sementara ini sangat mustahak dalam zaman pembangunan ini. Jadi, oleh sebab itu-lah saya mengharap dalam masa Kerajaan menjalankan pemotongan kaki-tangan Kerajaan, kalau sa-kira-nya hendak di-jalankan pada tahun 1967 ini, maka elok-lah berhati² dan sa-sunggoh-nya tidak akan menjalankan tindakan yang barangkali juga boleh di-katakan tidak 'adil.

Tetapi, dalam masaalah ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, patut juga saya berchakap dalam Dewan ini, terutama sakali kapada sahabat² saya pekerja² Kerajaan atau pun pekerja² seluruh-nya. Mereka kebanyakan apa yang saya lihat, maseh lagi mengingatkan—pekerja² ini—atau pun orang² yang bekerja, sa-olah² menjadi tuan pada satu² tempat itu. Ini-lah satu masaalah atau pun satu perkara yang sedang kita perhatikan berlaku ranchak di-tiap² jabatan di-seluruh tanah ayer kita. Kerana sa-tengah² memikirkan bahawa tugas atau tanggung-jawab yang ada di-pejabat mereka masing², ini tepok dada tanya selera—ini bila kami na' sudahkan, bila kami na' buat. Ada-kah perkara ini boleh berlaku berlanjutan pada masa akan datang, ini sangat di-kesalkan. Saya memahamkan, orang² atau sa-bahagian pekerja² yang bagini maseh lagi mengingatkan yang ia-nya di-gaji atau ia-nya di-suroh oleh satu kuasa lain, macham zaman belum kita merdeka dahulu.

Wal hasil apabila kita telah merdeka, patut-lah fahaman kita, pemikiran kita, berubah daripada keadaan sa-belum merdeka kapada sa-orang yang telah merdeka, kerana tugas mereka di-pejabat walau pun mereka mendapat gaji bulanan sa-bagai buroh, atau pekerja, tetapi tidak lain dan tidak bukan, tugas² itu demi kepentingan negara dan kita sama² kita boleh jadikan juga umpama-nya kita adek beradek atau anak beranak dalam satu negeri, atau dalam satu negara. Oleh sebab itu, saya suka, kalau dapat bagi pehak Kerajaan menganjorkan bukan sahaja pada masa yang lalu telah di-buat ia-itu untuk memberi kursus² kapada pegawai² di-jabatan tinggi dan pengala-

man saya, atau pandangan saya, pegawai² tinggi ini tidak-lah dapat kita hendak sebutkan banyak dalam perkara, dalam hal kerja² yang kita nampak ada hati bagi pehak Kerajaan hendak memotong, atau pun hendak mengurangkan pekerja²-nya, kerana apa yang kita tengok, pegawai² yang di-atas dengan pegawai² pertengahan ini berlainan sama sa-kali. Apa yang di-sebutkan oleh sahabat² saya di-lain² tempat, maseh mereka melihat lagi yang pegawai² Kerajaan pertengahan membuang² masa, atau pun menghabiskan² masa pada perkara² yang tidak menasabah, wal hasil mari-lah kita perhatikan dengan sa-sunggoh-nya dalam pembangunan negara kita, atau negeri kita sekarang ini, tugas dan tanggung-jawab mereka ini di-kehendaki sangat oleh ra'ayat dan kita harap mereka sama² menginsafi bahawa kita ini telah merdeka dan hendak-lah kita bersama² membuat kerja dengan chara yang tulus ikhlas.

Oleh itu saya suka-lah mengeshorkan kapada pehak Kerajaan supaya mereka ini di-beri kursus² yang tertentu, atau pun pengertian² yang tertentu supaya apabila mereka bertugas menjalankan kerja ini, tidak-lah terasa mereka sa-bagai menantikan pandangan daripada belakang atau pun pandangan daripada ketua² di-atas sahaja, baharu-lah mereka ini hendak bekerja.

Jadi, dalam hal ini, saya harap bagi pehak Kerajaan akan memerhatikan dan akan mengambil tindakan supaya di-dalam sa-buah negara yang merdeka, walau pun kita kati-tangan Kerajaan, walau pun di-mana, atau pun kita kerja bukan sa-bagai kaki-tangan Kerajaan, hendak-lah kita merasa kita ia-lah ra'ayat Malaysia yang akan bekerja kait-mengait, umpama-nya "aur dengan tebing" dalam bahagian² untuk melaksanakan kemajuan negara kita pada masa yang akan datang.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berchakap berkenaan dengan hal yang sedang kita hadapi sekarang telah pun di-timbulkan sedikit demi sedikit oleh pehak² Pembangkang ia-itu dalam soal² bahasa kebangsaan. Saya sendiri mithal-nya, kalau saya berpindah ka-negeri Siam, kalau saya ramai, atau pun barangkali

keluarga² kami akan berpindah ka-Siam mithal-nya, tentu-lah kami atau keluarga kami ini akan menjadi sanggoh-nya sa-bagai ra'ayat Siam yang bersama² memikirkan, atau pun mengeluarkan sa-suatu itu dari pandangan, atau pun dari segi kepentingan ra'ayat negeri Siam dan sa-balek-nya di-Malaysia ini—di-Malaya ini, walau pun pada 10 tahun yang dahulu, 10 tahun yang lalu telah sama² sabilangan besar ra'ayat yang ada di-Malaysia ini telah bersetuju ia-itu dalam masa 10 tahun yang akan datang bahawa tidak lain dan tidak bukan bahasa Melayu akan kita jadikan sa-bagai bahasa rasmi yang tunggal di-tanah ayer kita ini, tetapi pada hari ini apa yang di-ucapkan oleh pehak wakil dan apa yang di-ucapkan oleh sa-tengah² wakil Pembangkang di-sana maseh lagi menyuarakan perkara² yang sama dengan dua tiga tahun yang lalu, atau pun daripada masa² yang lalu.

Ini saya rasa, saya nampak wakil² yang berchakap ini, atau pun mereka yang mempunyai fikiran yang bagini, fikiran yang sama dengan wakil Ipoh, atau pun wakil daripada Tanjong, juga wakil daripada Batu, mithal-nya, yang hendak berbagai² bahasa di-rasmikan di-tanah ayer kita ini, maseh lagi memandang dari kepentingan, atau pun dari suara² yang orang² yang nampak-nya sunggoh tidak ada ta'at setia pada tanah ayer kita ini, kerana bagi pehak Perikatan, saya rasa telah pun lama hendak menanamkan semangat persamaan, menanam semangat perpaduan dengan menerusi satu bahasa kebangsaan sa-hingga kita dapat menchiptakan satu bahasa pada masa yang akan datang yang tidak kira dia datang daripada keturunan daripada negeri China, atau keturunan daripada Ceylon, keturunan daripada India, bahkan mereka menganggap bahawa mereka ada-lah orang² yang daripada Malaysia ini sendiri.

Ini terpaksa saya tegaskan di-sini, kerana dalam soal bahasa, ada sa-tengah² pemimpin yang mengambil kesempatan sedang ngapi²kan, atau maseh lagi, barangkali, memberi sokongan kepada suara² kechil yang

sedang berjalan, atau pun yang sedang menjalankan ikhtiar-nya dalam masa² menchari kesempatan pada akhir² untok menegakkan satu bahasa rasmi dan bahasa kebangsaan yang rasmi di-tanah ayer kita ini.

Saya rasa, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perkara ini apabila Kerajaan telah merasmikan satu daripada bahasa kebangsaan ini menjadi satu bahasa rasmi dalam tahun ini yang akan datang, patut bagi pehak pertubohan—Pendaftar Pertubohan sama ada yang berchorak politik, atau pun tidak, patut di-ubah, atau pun di-sediakan daripada sekarang supaya masalah bahasa ini tidak boleh di-timbulkan di-dalam negeri kita pada masa yang akan datang, kerana kita perhatikan tidak ada satu negeri pun dalam dunia ini yang hendak merasmikan banyak bahasa di-dalam sa-buah negeri dan bagi pehak rakan² kita yang ada di-Malaysia ini yang mempunyai keturunan barangkali daripada keturunan China, atau India, saya rasa apa yang telah di-buat, apa yang telah kita laksanakan sekarang dan apa yang telah di-jalankan oleh Kerajaan, tidaklah patut mereka ini boleh mengatakan bahawa kita ini tidak democratic, kerana apa yang di-buat oleh Kerajaan ini tidak-lah langsung² untok menekan, atau pun menjalankan masalah bahasa ini dengan chara kuku besi, kerana daripada apa yang di-laksanakan oleh Kerajaan sama ada hal² yang bersangkutan-paut dengan hal persekolahan dan lain² yang menggunakan bahasa pengantar lain daripada bahasa kebangsaan, maseh lagi terang banyak wang² Kerajaan yang di-churahkan untok hal² ini dan perkara ini tidak ada berlaku langsung di-tempat² lain dalam dunia.

Jadi, ini patut-lah kita bersama² bershukor dengan keadaan yang ada pada sekarang ini dan kita harap bagi pehak sahabat² kita orang² yang lain daripada keturunan Melayu ini, patut bersama² menchari jalan bagaimana-kah kita dapat memadukan keadaan kita seluroh ra'ayat di-Malaysia ini dengan satu pemikiran, atau pun dengan satu tanggong-jawab ia-itu

tidak berbelah bagi ta'at setia kita pada tanah ayer kita.

Menyebut dalam hal bahasa kebangsaan ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka hendak menyentoh kerana perkara ini telah hampir benar atau pun kita akan bersama² meshuarat untuk merasmikan bahasa kebangsaan ini tetapi daripada segi pelaksanaan yang telah di-buat pada masa sekarang ini maseh banyak lagi di-ragu²kan, maseh banyak lagi perkara² yang patut menjadi alat atau pun alat penyampaian dengan tujuan kita yang sa-benar-nya maseh lagi belum chukup pada masa sekarang. Mithal-nya, dalam hal² persekolahan maseh lagi pada hari ini kita dapat rungutan daripada ibu bapa murid² masok ka-sekolah² tidak dapat atau pun maseh lagi melihat buku² pelajaran yang di-keluarkan oleh Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka belum lagi menchukupi kehendak² yang ada sekarang ini. Buku Hisab mithal-nya, Ilmu Alam Tinggi dan lain² perkara ini maseh lagi tidak ada, maseh lagi tidak chukup dan pada tahun ini, rasa saya, lebeh kurang 10 darjah Tingkatan VI dalam bahasa pengantar Melayu telah pun di-mulakan oleh Kerajaan walhasil gerak langkah yang di-buat oleh Dewan Bahasa, mithal-nya, dalam menchukupi buku pelajaran ini maseh lagi kurang. Jadi, saya sendiri memerhatikan hal ini harus agak-nya oleh sebab Dewan Bahasa memikirkan hal² perniagaan-kah atau lain daripada segi penerbitan-nya kerana dia mempunyai satu badan yang khas. Jadi saya ber-setuju kira-nya Dewan Bahasa ini pada masa yang akan datang ini di-jadikan sa-bal-agian daripada jabatan di-bawah Kementerian Pelajaran kita. Kerana Kementerian Pelajaran mengetahui, umpama-nya, pada tahun 1967 berapa ribu-kah murid yang akan masok ka-Tingkatan III dan berapa ribu-kah murid yang akan masok Tingkatan IV, Tingkatan V atau pun berapa banyak-kah buku² sains rendah, sains tinggi yang di-kehendaki oleh tiap² tingkatan pelajaran ini walhasil perkara ini tidak dapat hendak di-adakan kerana Dewan Bahasa ada-lah satu badan yang lain yang barangkali tidak-lah dapat menjalankan kerja sa-bagai sa-buah jabatan di-bawah Kementerian

Pelajaran oleh sebab masa berjalan sangat pantas pada masa akan datang, dan keperluan² ini hendak-lah kita utamakan, hendak-lah kita segerakan supaya tingkatan pelajaran di-tanah ayer kita pada masa akan datang sunggo² dapat menchapai kapada tujuan² pelajaran yang sa-benar-nya.

Masaalah pelajaran ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tentu-lah sangat besar bagi pehak sa-sabuah negeri yang ingin maju, kerana kalau mithal-nya kita banyak factory, banyak barangkali perkara² yang lain², walhal ra'ayat dalam negeri kita sendiri atau pun bumiputera sendiri atau ra'ayat di-negeri ini sendiri tidak boleh dapat menchapai atau pun dudok pada tempat yang sa-benar melainkan dudok pada tempat² yang bawah atau pun di-bawah² sahaja. Jadi ini tentu-lah bagi pehak kita, bagi pehak Kerajaan, tentu-lah ingin melipat gandakan kerja² kita dalam hal masaalah pelajaran.

Ada satu perkara dalam hal pelajaran ini juga, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, yang saya hendak cheritakan sedikit apa² yang saya nampak pada masa sekarang ini yang patut bagi pehak Kerajaan memerhatikan atau pun membantu usaha² yang akan meletakkan pelaksanaan tujuan Kerajaan kita untuk menambah pelajaran kapada ra'ayat sakalian. Umpama-nya baharu² ini atau pun darjah menengah yang ada sekarang ini baharu kita jalankan dalam masa akhir² ini. Jadi oleh sebab itu tentu-lah banyak perkara² yang menjadi rintangan atau pun yang menjadi tujuan kita tidak sampai kapada matalamat-nya untuk semua murid² di-sekolah rendah mesti masok atau pun dapat belajar di-tingkatan menengah. Jadi saya nampak perkara² ini patut sama² bagi pehak kita bagi menjalankan tugas untuk mendekatkan lagi bagi pehak ra'ayat semua atau pun orang ramai menghantar anak²-nya ka-sekolah menengah, dan sa-bagai pengalaman.

Timbalan Speaker: Dapat-kah tuan pendekkan sahaja supaya dapat saya memberi dua orang lagi berchakap. Pendekkan sahaja-lah.

Tuan Abdul Ghani bin Ishak: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sedikit sahaja lagi. Dalam hal membanyakkan lagi murid² masuk sekolah menengah ini contoh yang baharu di-jalankan di-Melaka pada tahun ini, langkah yang di-buat oleh Kerajaan Melaka, nampak-nya memberi kesan sungguh ia-itu kalau kita ambil peratus murid² masuk sekolah menengah pada tahun 1965 dahulu murid² Melayu hanya sa-takat 59 peratus sahaja yang sanggup masuk sekolah menengah. Murid² daripada keturunan China 85 peratus dan murid² daripada keturunan India 91 peratus, tetapi apabila gerakan atau bantuan yang di-beri atau pun keterangan² yang betul di-beri untuk memudahkan murid² masuk sekolah menengah alhamdulillah nampak-nya pada tahun ini jumlah 95 peratus daripada semua jenis sekolah² itu sanggup hendak menghantar anak² mereka ka-sekolah menengah. Ini yang besar perkara ibu bapa tidak dapat menghantar anak² ka-sekolah menengah ini kerana kemiskinan hidup, ini kita tahu-lah dan kita pun sama² sedang berjalan ka-arah tujuan kita untuk menaikkan taraf hidup ra'ayat tetapi pada masa sekarang kalau tidak di-beri kemudahan² kepada anak² ini, maka tentu-lah tujuan untuk bagi pihak kita mendapatkan mereka ini pelajaran menengah dan sa-terus-nya kepada pelajaran tinggi kurang juga.

Jadi, apa yang saya nampak sekolah² menengah yang di-dirikan sama ada diluar² bandar ini patut-lah di-dirikan sama asrama sa-telah di-kaji berapa ramai-kah agak² murid yang jauh datang daripada tempat² yang saking-liling itu, kerana ini-lah sebab yang pertama sa-kali saya nampak maka murid² ini kurang masuk sekolah² menengah atau pun ka-tingkatan menengah.

Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Kerajaan Melaka menguntokkan \$100,000 untuk membeli basikal mithal kata untuk hendak mendekatkan anak tetapi ini pun maseh lagi kita dapati anak² kita yang perempuan, anak² kita maseh mentah yang duduk 12 batu, 13 batu, 9 batu jauh-nya daripada sekolah menengah ini tidak menyambut ranchangan ini kerana budak² yang

berumur 12 tahun atau 11 tahun lebeh itu tidak dapat menggunakan basikal dengan baik dan tentu-lah ibu bapa yang miskin susah hendak menghantar anak-nya atau pun hendak menyambut ranchangan yang baik itu. Jadi asrama, saya rasa, ada-lah perkara yang paling baik sa-kali di-dirikan pada masa akan datang untuk menampung anak² ini supaya dapat masuk ka-sekolah menengah.

Satu perkara lagi saya ingat satu dua minit lagi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-itu hal Keselamatan Dalam Negeri. Saya telah pun berchakap pada satu masa dahulu ia-itu kita bukan tidak perchaya kepada Menteri Keselamatan Dalam Negeri untuk menjaga keselamatan ra'ayat di-negeri ini tetapi apa yang timbul daripada pengalaman yang kita tengok sekarang ini ia-itu orang² yang di-buang daerah, mithalnya, perkara ini patut di-kaji balek kerana saya dapati orang² yang di-buang daerah ini bukan dapat mengubah sa-saorang itu berkelakuan baik dan boleh menjadi ra'ayat yang berguna bahkan mereka ini menaborkan atau menjangkitkan kuman² yang ada pada mereka sendiri di-tempat² yang mereka duduk dua atau tiga tahun di-tempat² buangan. Tempat saya kecil sangat-lah, Masjid Tanah nama-nya, menjadi belum pernah umur, saya sudah 40 tahun lebeh—ada rompakkan berlaku di-tempat saya—dalam kampung, tetapi sekarang ini dalam dua tiga tahun yang lalu dua tiga kali rompakkan telah berlaku di-pekan yang kecil, saya rasa pekan ini tidak sampai 200 biji rumah peniagaan tetapi rompakkan telah berlaku dua tiga kali.

Saya shorkan supaya Kerajaan mengkaji balek dasar pembuangan daerah kepada mereka² yang bersalah ini supaya di-haskan umpama-nya di-hantar ka-Pulau Besar, di-sana dia sama dia sahaja bekerja atau pun buka satu projek pembukaan tanah supaya dia ini jangan dapat masa lama dia berchampur dengan orang lain dan menaborkan kuman² yang tidak elok ini kepada anak² muda kita di-tempat² mereka yang di-buang. Jadi, sa-tengah² tempat pada masa dahulu sangat-lah baik tengkah laku anak² muda sopan santun, elok

dengan keadaan masyarakat sa-tengah tempat itu tetapi sa-telah keadaan ini berjalan orang yang di-buang itu apabila sampai had-nya balek ka-tempat masing² dan ada mereka yang melakukan lagi kerja² bahkan kuman² yang di-tinggalkan di-tempat² bangunan itu telah menjadi².

Jadi ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya rasa tentu-lah bagi pehak Menteri yang bersangkutan akan mengkaji untuk kebaikan kita pada masa akan datang. Terima kaseh.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid (Seberang Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ucapkan terima kaseh di-atas peluang yang di-beri pada saya untuk berchakap.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam Rang Belanjawan bagi tahun ini, sa-bagaimana kita telah tahu, ia-itu pada pendapat saya ada-lah Rang Belanjawan yang baik sa-kali semenjak saya berada di-dalam Dewan ini daripada tahun 1959 kerana kita dapati sa-kurang²-nya ada tiga daripada parti pembangkang yang telah menyokong pada dasar-nya. Jadi, boleh-lah dianggap bahawa Rang Belanjawan ini merupakan satu Rang yang chukup 'adil dan chukai² yang hendak dikenakan itu akan di-kenakan kepada orang yang ada kemampuan. Jadi, pehak yang tidak ada kemampuan tidak terlibat dalam chukai ini.

Chuma saya berasa khuatir kerana perkara ini sudah pun berlaku semenjak Rang Belanjawan ini di-kemukakan, pehak² ahli perniagaan telah mengambil peluang atau mengambil kesempatan menaikkan harga barang². Ini ada-lah satu perkara menjadi chukup berat kepada orang² pembeli ia-itu harga beras di-Kuala Lumpur daripada \$2.10 sa-gantang telah dinaikkan sa-hingga \$2.80 sa-gantang, dia ambil peluang untong satu gantang 70 sen. Beras ada-lah satu perkara yang tidak kena mengena pun dengan kenaikan chukai tetapi pehak² peniagaan dengan tidak ada peri kemanusiaan mengambil peluang ini menindas pembeli². Walhal kita tahu benar² bahawa harga padi yang di-tetapkan oleh Kerajaan \$16.00 sa-pikul bukan-lah harga padi itu di-

naikkan. Maka saya berharap-lah pehak Kerajaan, khas-nya Kementerian Perdagangan dan Perusahaan, akan mengambil perhatian yang berat di-atas perkara ini supaya menyekat dan menahan dan mengambil tindakan ka-atas orang² yang tidak bertanggung-jawab menekan pehak² kebawahan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-kira-nya kita lihat kemajuan yang di-laksanakan oleh Kerajaan Perikatan sa-lama hampir² 10 tahun kita berasa chukup puas hati di-atas apa yang di-lakukan, kalau di-bandingkan pula dengan kemajuan² yang di-buat pada masa penjajahan dahulu ia-itu sa-lama lebeh daripada 175 tahun, kalau-lah kita kaji-kaji kemajuan yang di-buat oleh penjajah dan juga Kerajaan Perikatan, kita dapati penjajah akan mengambil masa 200 tahun lebeh untuk hendak menyamakan kemajuan yang kita adakan sekarang ini. Jadi, ini-ada-lah satu kejayaan yang chemerlang dan patut tiap² warganegara berterima kaseh kapada Kerajaan Perikatan yang mana di-pimpin oleh Yang Teramat Mulia Perdana Menteri dan Jema'ah Menteri-nya bekerja dengan sabar, tekun dan tabah sa-hingga tiap² ra'ayat jelata yang ada di-dalam tanah besar ini ia-itu Tanah Melayu dan juga di-Sabah telah pun mengechap nikmat kemerdekaan yang di-chapai itu, ada yang mengechap lebeh daripada yang patut dan ada yang dapat sedikit sahaja.

Oleh yang demikian saya berharap ia-itu satu kurniaan istimewa di-beri kapada Jema'ah Menteri kita. Dan kalau pula kita kaji di-atas gaji yang di-beri kapada Menteri kita sangat tidak patut kerana saya dapat tahu bagaimana yang di-sebutkan oleh wakil Bukit Bintang tadi sa-orang pakar dapat sa-banyak \$14,000 sa-bulan dan saya dapat tahu bahawa Pengurus Agong bagi sa-buah sharikat mendapat \$8,000 sa-bulan lebeh daripada Perdana Menteri yang memerintah sa-buah negara yang merdeka. Oleh itu saya chadangkan supaya dinaikkan gaji Perdana Menteri dan Jema'ah Menteri-nya pada tingkatan yang patut, yang sesuai dengan kedudukan jawatan yang di-pegang itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, oleh kerana banyak rancangan² yang ada di-dalam Buku Merah dan kerja makin bertambah saya mengeshorkan supaya Menteri² melantek Menteri Muda yang belum lagi di-gantikan khas-nya Menteri Perdagangan, dahulu-nya ada Menteri Muda sekarang tidak ada, Menteri Buroh tidak ada Menteri Muda. Maka dengan ada Menteri² Muda kepada Menteri yang banyak kerja dapat mereka melaksanakan kerja lebeh chepat lagi.

Satu perkara yang saya berasa terharu dan merasa hairan ada-lah sikap satu gulongan pekerja² ia-itu satu kesatuan daripada guru bukan-lah saya tudoh kepada kesemua guru² tetapi ada sa-bahagian daripada guru yang menjadi sa-bagai pendidek bagi anak² warganegara kita ini menunjokkan satu sikap, sikap konon-nya hendak bekerja mengikut peratoran. Saya harap orang² yang bersikap bagini mesti-lah sedar dan insaf. Pada masa sa-belum perang dahulu saya lihat sa-orang guru pun tidak pernah memakai motokar, tidak pernah memakai motosikal, tetapi pada masa sekarang ini boleh di-katakan 80% daripada guru² menggunakan motor-kar, motosikal dan kenderaan. Ini ada-lah satu nikmat yang besar yang mereka telah dapat di-beri dengan ikhtiar daripada Kerajaan Perikatan.

Kalau kita pandang pula kerja sa-orang guru dengan sa-orang kerani, guru mengatakan bahawa mereka hendak bekerja mengikut peratoran ia-itu masa masok bekerja sa-lama 5 jam chukup mereka tidak hendak bekerja untok mengawas murid² bermain, mengawas murid² dalam hal pengakap, mengawas murid² dalam hal pandu putri, mengawas murid² dalam berkebudan dan lain². Ini ia-lah satu perkara yang salah kerana mengikut peratoran kerja kaki-tangan² Kerajaan mesti bekerja sa-lama 8 jam sa-hari. Guru yang di-beri mengajar sa-lama 5 jam, yang 3 jam itu bukan-lah terbiar sahaja bahkan dia mesti bekerja, dia kena datang ka-sekolah dan pada malam-nya dia kena buat ringkasan untok hendak mengajar atau memeriksa buku kanak² sa-lama 3 jam. Sa-kira-nya guru² ini bersikap demi-

kian, saya mengeshorkan kepada Kementerian Pelajaran, manakala tutup pukul 1.00 segala guru² di-jemput datang ka-sekolah, kita bagi chukup 8 jam juga, yang mana mereka mengawas budak², mengawal budak² berkenaan apa yang saya sebutkan tadi patut di-buat, buat persediaan untok mengajar besok atau periksa buku² budak. Ini ada-lah satu kehendak international, bekerja sa-lama 8 jam.

Saya berharap Yang Berhormat Menteri akan mengambil perhatian di-atas shor saya ini supaya tidak lagi orang² yang sa-macham ini boleh mengeluarkan satu pendapat mereka hendak bekerja mengikut peratoran.

Bagitu juga saya melihat kaki-tangan² Kerajaan Pembanchoh Ubat (Laboratory Assistant) dan Jururawat. Mereka konon-nya mengugut hendak mogok. Saya berharap pehak² yang di-beri tugas ia-itu Ketua bagi pejabat² yang ada kuasa sekarang ini meninjau dan mengambil perhatian dalam 8 jam itu, berapa jam-kah yang sa-benar²-nya mereka itu bekerja dan di-bayar gaji di-atas jam yang dia bekerja sa-benar²-nya. Maka ini ada-lah satu perkara yang 'adil. Bekerja ikut peratoran—8 jam kerja mesti 8 jam bekerja, kalau 7 jam bekerja potong satu jam, kalau 5 jam bekerja potong 3 jam. Saya harap pehak² yang mentadbir pejabat² itu akan mengambil perhatian supaya jangan mereka itu dudok masok dalam pejabat bacha surat khabar dan tidak bekerja. Dengan sa-chara ini akan memberi satu perasaan, satu kesedaran kepada kaki-tangan Kerajaan yang telah pun mengugut hendak mogok.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, mengenai elaun sewa rumah, saya telah membuat chatitan sadikit sa-banyak, dalam perbelanjaan ini saya dapati peruntukan bagi Elaun Sewa Rumah ini chuma saya ambil dengan kasar sahaja—Jabatan Perdana Menteri \$57,000, Perangkaan \$257,193, Kementerian Pertanian dan Sharikat Kerjasama ada dua bahagian ia-itu \$273,153 dan \$208,903 jumlah \$482,056. Pelajaran satu bahagian \$220,621 dan lagi satu bahagian

\$350,000 jumlah \$570,621. Kastam \$452,074, Polis \$600,000, jadi jumlah kasar yang saya dapat \$2.5 juta—belum lagi saya masukkan peruntukan bawah daripada \$100,000. Jadi anggaran saya Elaun Sewa Rumah ini pada sa-tahun lebeh kurang \$4 juta. Saya mengeshorkan kepada Kerajaan supaya Kerajaan benakan rumah bagi pegawai² Kerajaan dengan menggunakan wang ini. Kerana sa-orang pegawai Kerajaan yang mendapat gaji lebeh daripada \$700 basic ekonomik rent dia dapat \$450 sa-bulan dan sa-orang Pegawai Division I yang baharu masok dia mempunyai gaji basic \$592.00 dia dapat \$350 sa-bulan. Bagitu-lah Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sahingga ka-bawah-nya. Jadi saya mengeshorkan supaya tiap² Kementerian adakan satu kawasan perumahan bagi kaki-tangan Kementerian-nya sendiri bagi Bahagian I buat benaan rumah menyesuaikan dengan pangkat-nya, Bahagian II, Bahagian III dan Bahagian IV supaya senang di-tadbirkan dengan wang itu dapat kita mengurangkan daripada memberi Elaun Sewa Rumah kepada kaki-tangan Kerajaan kerana wang yang dikeluarkan boleh masok balek kepada Kerajaan jikalau kita ada rumah sendiri. Kaki-tangan Kerajaan menyewa dudok dalam rumah akan di-kenakan bayaran yang berpatutan sa-bagaimana masa Kerajaan British banyak benaan rumah² untuk kaki-tangan Kerajaan supaya mereka itu dudok dan di-kenakan bayaran-nya sadikit untuk maintenance, untuk menyelenggarakan, untuk diperbaiki. Ini ada-lah satu chara yang baik dan saya harap dapat perhatian pehak Kerajaan. Kalau kita mulakan pada tahun ini kita akan dapat selamatkan berjuta² ringgit pada tahun² yang akan datang, kerana sa-buah rumah dapat di-beli siap sa-banyak \$20,000 harga-nya bagi pegawai Bahagian I dudok dan \$10,000 Bahagian II dan III dengan membuat rumah² pangsa boleh Bahagian IV dudok di-sana sa-kali. Jadi ini satu chara boleh menjimatkan wang Kerajaan.

Saya lihat Setia-usaha Parlimen dan Setia-usaha Politik dapat \$150 sahaja Elaun Sewa Rumah, Setia-usaha Politik dapat \$100 berbanding dengan sa-

orang Bahagian I mendapat \$450 sa-bulan. Ini ada-lah satu perkara yang saya fikir tidak 'adil dan saya harap dapat perhatian daripada pehak yang berkenaan.

Lagi satu perkara, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-lah mengenai Elaun Belanja Hidup. Elaun Belanja Hidup ini diadakan pada mula sa-belum perang tahun 1941. Jadi pada masa ini saya ingat tidak mustahak di-adakan Elaun Sara Hidup itu lagi kerana bukan masa kita berperang. Jadi saya berharap pehak berkenaan akan dapat mengkajikan di-atas perkara ini supaya dapat di-hapuskan atau pun di-masokkan ka-dalam gaji yang tetap dan boleh di-bayar bulan².

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dasar Kerajaan kita, bagaimana yang kita tahu, ia-lah menunjukan segala ikhtiar dan usaha untuk hendak meninggikan taraf hidup ra'ayat keseluruhan-nya dalam bahasa Inggeris-nya to level up the economic position of the people especially in the rural areas. Jadi, kalau kita hendak menaikkan taraf hidup orang yang di-lapisan bawah, sampai bila-kah dapat orang ini mengechap ne'mat jikalau kita tidak sekat daripada orang yang atas menambahkan lagi kekayaan-nya?

Dengan dasar perniagaan bebas, dengan perusahaan bebas tidak ada sekatan bagi diri-nya boleh memilek beberapa lesen, boleh memilek beberapa permit, boleh tanam beberapa banyak modal, boleh memilek beberapa luas tanah, boleh buat beberapa perusahaan—menjadi sa-bagai pengurus bank, pengurus sharikat itu dan sharikat ini, mana-lah ada peluang bagi orang yang bawah hendak meningkat ka-atas. Jadi

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: Masa sudah chukup. Ahli Yang Berhormat, saya sedar dan faham, ia-itu ada ramai lagi ahli² yang tak dapat berchakap. Dalam masa yang telah lalu sa-lama empat hari ini, hanya 36 orang sahaja dapat berchakap, tetapi saya dukachita sa-bagai Speaker di-sini tak dapat memanjangkan masa-nya, kerana mengikut atoran dan peratoran 66 (2), ia-itu terpaksa-lah saya tutup pada pukul 6.30 hari ini.

ADJOURNMENT

(MOTION)

The Minister of Agriculture and Co-operative (Tuan Haji Mohd. Ghazali bin Jawi): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mengemukakan bahawa meshuarat ini di-tangguhkan sekarang.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Dr Lim Swee Aun): Sir, I beg to second the motion.

ADJOURNMENT SPEECH

SHARIKAT KERJASAMA POLIS DI-RAJA MALAYSIA

Dr Tan Chee Khoon (Batu): Mr Speaker, Sir, the Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives made a statement to the Parit Transport Co-operative Society to the effect that the failure of co-operative societies in this country was due mainly to committee members being dishonest and weak. In view of this, it is surprising that the Minister has been so complacent over the affairs of the Sharikat Polis di-Raja Malaysia.

Mr Speaker, Sir, this Co-operative Society is no ordinary co-operative society. It is the biggest and richest in Malaysia. As such, it should act as a model and a beacon to guide other co-operative societies in this country. Instead its actions during the past few years have given rise to grave doubts as to the integrity of some of its office bearers for the past few years, and yet as far as one can see, from the reports of the Co-operative, one have yet to see the Minister clean up the mess in the Sharikat Polis di-Raja Malaysia.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Committee of this Co-operative has been flouting its own constitution and the Co-operative Ordinance and I have yet to see the Registrar of Co-operatives taking any action on such irregularities. Is the Registrar afraid of the *mata*² or are the *mata*² of this country in the Co-operative law to themselves? Thus, the constitution of this society states that the annual general meeting shall be held at least once a year, or as soon as possible after 31st December, and in

any case not later than three months after the close of the year. However, the 31st and the 32nd annual general meetings were held in December 1965 and 1966 respectively, in flagrant contravention of the constitution. I noticed that at both these two meetings, a senior officer of the Co-operative Department was present, Sir, and as far as I can see from the minutes of these two meetings, he did not point out the breach of the constitution.

Next, the Society sold its Government securities, resulting in a loss of \$239,377.49 and bought Esso, Shell and Malaya Borneo Building Society stocks without the appropriate authority from the Registrar of Co-operatives, as required under Section 33 of the Ordinance. Here, Mr Speaker, Sir, I am not questioning the wisdom, or otherwise, of the Co-operative in selling what is thought were bad securities of the Government. What I am questioning here is, why it did not get the permission of the Registrar of Societies?

Regarding this Mr Speaker, Sir, at the 31st Annual General Meeting the President of the meeting stated:

"Jabatan Kemajuan Sharikat² Kerjasama ada di-tanya berkenaan penjualan dan pembelian saham² ini dan kebenaran pembelian saham² baru itu ada di-dapati."

Mr Speaker, Sir, unfortunately, for the President who is none other than the Inspector-General of Police, the Auditors in their report for the year ending 31st December, 1964, has this to say: "We have seen no minute of the Committee or other authority for the change in the investments which gives rise to the loss referred to above; nor have we seen the appropriate authority from the Registrar of Co-operatives required under Section 33 of the Ordinance, allowing the Society to invest in securities other than those covered by the said section." Mr Speaker, Sir, who is right? Is the President of the Society or the auditors? I shall be very grateful for an answer by the Minister.

Another equally serious breach of the Co-operative Ordinance arose out of the purchase of 80 acres of land at Klang for \$960,000 and 115 acres of

land at 4½ mile Ipoh Road for \$2,434,687.59. Regarding this purchase, the auditors have this to say: "We have seen the minutes of the Committee approving the purchase of the above lands but we have not seen the appropriate authority from the Registrar of Co-operatives required under Section 15 of the Co-operative Ordinance allowing the Society to purchase both lands.

Mr Speaker, Sir, these two breaches of Sections 15 and 33 of the Co-operative Societies Ordinance are very serious for they literally involve millions of hard-earned savings of the rank and file of the Police Force—and they are the humble *mata*². The purchase of this land at Ipoh Road has given rise to consternation and dismay among the members of the Society. Mr Speaker, Sir, the details of this purchase are as follows:

Lot No.: 4729.

Certificate of title: 13333.

Area: 115 acres 3 roods 30 poles.

First Owner: Ampang Tin Dredging Limited.

Second Owner: Ng Choo Kiat Construction Limited. (He bought this on the 21st April, 1964).

Third Owner: Puteh Maria binti Ibrahim Rashid. (The transfer was effected on 13th September, 1965. The purchase price for her was \$1,402,843.75).

The Final Owner: The Sharikat Polis di-Raja. (The transfer was effected also on 13th September, 1965. The purchase price was \$2,434,687.50).

Mr Speaker, Sir, it is incredible that in a matter of three hours the said land has appreciated by \$1,031,852.75. I hope the Minister, if he has not got the reply, will look into this matter—in a space of three hours, Mr Speaker, Sir, the vendor made a profit of a million plus dollars, and this out of the hard-earned savings of the humble *mata*² of this country. I think lots of us in this House missed our vocation. We should have been an ordinary broker and, if we have landed such a deal, we need not have worked for the rest of our lives; nor, if the Honourable Minister were in such a fortunate position he need not be a Minister for the rest of his life.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the rank and file of the Society cannot accept this fantastic

increase in the value of the said land, and this has given rise to doubts about the integrity of some of the past Committee Members. Why should the Society buy the property at 4½ Mile Ipoh Road, so soon after the purchase of the 80 acres at Klang? The proper thing would have been to develop fully the land at Klang and then think of acquiring more land. As it is, both lands have not been developed so far.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the rank and file of the Co-operative are righteously indignant over the irregularities that I have pointed out. I have seen a report of these sale of lands made by Enche' Jalaluddin bin Haji Kassim and Enche' Zainuri. This report was circulated to all the members at the 31st annual general meeting of the Society held in December, 1965, but the big brass in the Police from the I.G.P. downwards so browbeat these two humble members that they had to withdraw this report. Further, I am told that those who asked inconvenient questions were transferred out of Kuala Lumpur to prevent them from turning up at future annual general meetings. Thus Enche' Jalaluddin bin Haji Kassim was sent to Tokyo soon after the meeting and he is still there, Mr Speaker, Sir, thus missing the meeting held last month of this said Co-operative Society.

Finally, Sir, I shall read an extract of a letter written by some members of the rank and file. I quote:

"Kami tidak ada lagi kepercayaan kepada Ahli² Jawatan-kuasa Penguasa Sharikat sekarang. Mereka itu bukan mentadbirkan Sharikat, tetapi menduduki kerusi menchari kekayaan untuk mereka sendiri."

Mr Speaker, Sir, these are very serious irregularities concerning the Sharikat Polis di-Raja, and if I may reiterate them, they are—

- (i) The holding of the annual general meetings in contravention of the Society's own constitution.
- (ii) The contravention of Section 33 of the Co-operative Societies Ordinance by selling shares.
- (iii) The contravention of Section 15 of the Co-operative Societies Ordinance in buying lands, both of these without the appropriate

authority of the Registrar of Co-operative Societies.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I shall be very grateful for a clarification from the Honourable Minister, because the rank and file's only hope for putting matters right in the said Society lies in the Minister ordering the Registrar of Co-operative Societies to have a fullscale investigation on the irregularities that I have just mentioned. Thank you.

The Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives (Tuan Haji Mohamed Ghazali bin Haji Jawi): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-masa Sharikat Kerjasama Polis ini di-tubuhkan, ahli²-nya chuma lebeh kurang 500 orang. Tetapi pada masa ini ahli Sharikat Kerjasama itu meningkat kapada 18,000 orang. Oleh yang demikian usaha memeriksa kira² bagi Sharikat Kerjasama yang mempunyai ahli sa-banyak 18,000 orang akan mengambil masa yang panjang. Oleh itu Sharikat ini tidak dapat mengadakan meshuarat agong-nya pada masa yang di-tentukan. Undang² Sharikat Kerjasama tidak menentukan tempoh masa bagi mengadakan meshuarat agong pada tiap² tahun.

Sharikat ini pada masa ini boleh mengadakan meshuarat agong-nya chuma pada pertengahan tiap² tahun dan Sharikat ini telah pun berchadang meminda tambahan peratoran-nya. Ada-lah benar pertukaran pemilikan saham² sa-bagaimana yang di-nyatakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu itu mendatangkan kerugian sa-banyak \$239,377.49 sen. Tetapi kerugian ini boleh di-tutup atau di-hapuskan dalam masa empat tahun dengan sebab saham² ini yang baru di-beli akan mendapat keuntungan yang lebeh tinggi.

Ada-lah di-anggarkan sa-lepas daripada tahun yang keempat saham² yang baru di-beli itu akan mendatangkan perolehan tambahan sa-banyak \$60,000.00 bagi tiap² tahun. Tetapi sharikat itu telah pun melanggar berkenaan dengan pembelian dengan tidak mendapat kebenaran, dan perkara itu pehak Pesuroh Jaya telah pun mengambil tindakan ia-itu meminta penjelasan dan sa-bagai-nya sa-bagaimana yang di-sebut oleh Pemeriksa Kira².

Kebenaran Pesuroh Jaya di-bawah bab 33 Undang² Sharikat Kerjasama telah tidak di-dapati oleh Sharikat itu untok membeli share² daripada Esso, Shell dan Malaya Borneo Building Society stock dan Sharikat ini telah pun membuat permintaan kebenaran sa-bagai membetulkan kesilapan ini. Permohonan ini sedang di-timbang oleh Pesuroh Jaya Sharikat Kerjasama. Kebenaran Pesuroh Jaya bagi membeli tanah di-Klang dan di-Ipoh Road telah tidak di-dapati. Pesuroh Jaya telah pun menerima permintaan kebenaran itu sa-sudah pembelian di-buat. Pesuroh Jaya Sharikat Kerjasama telah pun meminta Jawatan-kuasa Sharikat itu memberi penjelasan bersama² dengan penyata taksiran atau pun valuation report di-atas tanah itu daripada Qualified Appraiser. Ahli² Sharikat Kerjasama itu di-dalam meshuarat agong pada 18 haribulan Disember tahun 1965 telah membangkitkan juga soalan berkenaan dengan pembelian tanah di-Ipoh Road itu dan nampak-nya puas hati dengan penjelasan yang di-beri. Mereka juga berpeluang membangkitkan masaalah itu di-dalam meshuarat agong pada 11 haribulan Disember tahun 1966, tetapi tidak berbuat demikian. Tambahan pula ahli² Jawatan-kuasa yang lepas ia-itu ahli Jawatan-kuasa tahun 1966 telah dipileh sa-mula untok menjadi ahli Jawatan-kuasa tahun 1966-67. Ini menunjukkan yang mereka itu mempunyai kepercayaan ahli² Jawatan-kuasa itu.

Untok pengetahuan Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu dan Dewan ini, Inspector-General of Police bukan-lah memegang jawatan sa-bagai pengerusi sharikat itu tetapi chuma sa-bagai Yang di-Pertua kerana jawatan atau pun ex-officio President bagi Sharikat Kerjasama itu. Saya suka-lah menegaskan di-sini, perkara ini ada-lah sedang di-dalam siasatan dan kajian daripada Pesuroh Jaya Sharikat Kerjasama dan langkah² akan di-ambil menurut Undang² Sharikat Kerjasama. Terima kaseh.

Question put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at 6.50 p.m.