



PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

DEWAN RA'AYAT (HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

OFFICIAL REPORT

THIRD SESSION OF THE SECOND PARLIAMENT OF MALAYSIA

CONTENTS

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 3493]

MOTIONS:

The Customs Ordinance, 1962—The Customs Duties (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1967 [Col. 3502]

The Sabah Customs Ordinance (Cap. 33)—The Customs Duties (Sabah) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1967 [Col. 3503]

The Sarawak Customs Ordinance (Cap. 26)—The Customs (Import and Export) Duties (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1967 [Col. 3504]

The Excise Act, 1961—The Excise Duties (Amendment) Order, 1967 [Col. 3504]

The Excise Ordinance, Sabah, 1959—The Excise Duties (Amendment) Order, 1967 [Col. 3505]

The Customs Ordinance, 1952—The Customs Duties (Penang) Order, 1957 [Col. 3505]

The Customs Ordinance, 1952—The Surtax (Imports) Order, 1967 [Col. 3506]

The Sabah Customs Ordinance (Cap. 33)—The Surtax (Imports) Order, 1967 [Col. 3507]

The Sarawak Customs Ordinance (Cap. 26)—The Surtax (Imports) Order, 1967 [Col. 3507]

The Customs Ordinance, 1952—The Customs Duties (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1967 [Col. 3508]

The Excise Act, 1961—The Excise Duties (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1967 [Col. 3508]

The Excise Ordinance Sarawak (Cap. 27)—The Excise Duties (Amendment) Order, 1967 [Col. 3509]

BILLS:

Rang Undang' Persatuan Peladang (The Farmers' Association Bill) [Col. 3509]

The Supply (1967) Bill [Col. 3536]

ORDER OF BUSINESS (Motion) [Col. 3536]

MALAYSIA
DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

Official Report

Third Session of the Second Dewan Ra'ayat

Friday, 27th January, 1967

The House met at half-past nine o'clock a.m.

PRESENT:

- The Honourable Mr Deputy Speaker, TUAN SYED ESA BIN ALWEE, J.M.N., S.M.J., P.I.S. (Batu Pahat Dalam).
- „ the Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs, Y.T.M. TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN PUTRA AL-HAJ, K.O.M. (Kuala Kedah).
- „ the Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Defence and Minister of National and Rural Development, TUN HAJI ABDUL RAZAK BIN DATO' HUSSAIN, S.M.N. (Pekan).
- „ the Minister of Home Affairs and Minister of Justice, TUN DR ISMAIL BIN DATO' HAJI ABDUL RAHMAN, S.S.M., P.M.N. (Johor Timor).
- „ the Minister of Finance, TUAN TAN SIEW SIN, J.P. (Melaka Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, TAN SRI V. T. SAMBANTHAN, P.M.N. (Sungei Siput).
- „ the Minister of Transport, TAN SRI HAJI SARDON BIN HAJI JUBIR, P.M.N. (Pontian Utara).
- „ the Minister of 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 Honourable the Assistant Minister without Portfolio, TUAN HAJI ABDUL KHALID BIN AWANG OSMAN (Kota Star Utara).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Culture, Youth and Sports, DATO' ENSKU MUHSEIN BIN ABDUL KADIR, J.M.N., S.M.T., P.J.K. (Trengganu Tengah).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Education, TUAN LEE SIOK YEW, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Sepang).
- „ the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, TUAN IBRAHIM BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Seberang Tengah).
- „ the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, TUAN ALI BIN HAJI AHMAD (Pontian Selatan).
- „ the Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister, TUAN CHEN WING SUM (Damansara).
- „ TUAN ABDUL GHANI BIN ISHAK, A.M.N. (Melaka Utara).
- „ TUAN ABDUL KARIM BIN ABU, A.M.N. (Melaka Selatan).
- „ WAN ABDUL KADIR BIN ISMAIL, P.P.T. (Kuala Trengganu Utara).
- „ TUAN ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAJI TALIB, P.J.K. (Kuantan)
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDUL RASHID BIN HAJI JAIS (Sabah).
- „ TUAN ABDUL RAZAK BIN HAJI HUSSIN (Lipis).
- „ TUAN ABDUL SAMAD BIN GUL AHMAD MIANJI (Pasir Mas Hulu).
- „ Y.A.M. TUNKU ABDULLAH IBNI AL-MARHUM TUANKU ABDUL RAHMAN, P.P.T. (Rawang).
- „ TUAN 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).
- „ TUAN JONATHAN BANGAU ANAK RENANG, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ PENGARAH BANYANG ANAK JANTING, P.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN CHAN CHONG WEN, A.M.N. (Kluang Selatan).
- „ TUAN CHAN SEONG YOON (Setapak).
- „ TUAN CHAN SIANG SUN, P.J.K. (Bentong).
- „ TUAN CHEW BIOW CHUON (Bruas).
- „ TUAN 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).
- „ TUAN GANING BIN JANGKAT (Sabah).

The Honourable 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 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 KADAM ANAK KIAI (Sarawak).

„ TUAN KAM WOON WAH, J.P. (Sitiawan).

„ TUAN THOMAS KANA (Sarawak).

„ TUAN KHOO PENG LOONG (Sarawak).

„ TUAN EDMUND LANGGU ANAK SAGA (Sarawak).

„ TUAN LEE SECK FUN, K.M.N. (Tanjong Malim).

„ DATO' LING BENG SIEW, P.N.B.S. (Sarawak).

„ DR LIM CHONG EU (Tanjong).

„ DR MAHATHIR BIN MOHAMAD (Kota Star Selatan).

„ TUAN T. MAHIMA SINGH, J.P. (Port Dickson).

„ TUAN C. JOHN ONDU MAJAKIL (Sabah).

„ TUAN MOHD. ARIF SALLEH, A.D.K. (Sabah).

„ TUAN MOHD. DAUD BIN ABDUL SAMAD (Besut).

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

The Honourable TUAN ONG KEE HUI (Sarawak).

- „ TUAN HAJI OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Hilir Perak).
- „ TUAN OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Perlis Utara).
- „ TUAN QUEK KAI DONG, J.P. (Seremban).
- „ 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 SEAH TENG NGIAB, P.I.S. (Muar Pantai).
- „ TUAN D. R. SEENIVASAGAM (Ipoh).
- „ TUAN SIM BOON LIANG, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN SIOW LOONG HIN, P.J.K. (Seremban Barat).
- „ TUAN 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).
- „ PENGIRAN TAHIR PETRA (Sabah).
- „ TUAN TAJUDDIN BIN ALI, P.J.K. (Larut Utara).
- „ TUAN TAI KUAN YANG (Kulim Bandar Bharu).
- „ DR TAN CHEE KHOON (Batu).
- „ TUAN TAN CHENG BEE, J.P. (Bagan).
- „ TUAN TAN TOH HONG (Bukit Bintang).
- „ TUAN TAN TSAK YU (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN TIAH ENG BEE (Kluang Utara).
- „ TUAN 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 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 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 Labour, TUAN LEE SAN CHOON, K.M.N. (Segamat Selatan).
- „ WAN ABDUL RAHMAN BIN DATO' TUANKU BUJANG, A.B.S. (Sarawak).

- The Honourable DATO' ABDULLAH BIN ABDULRAHMAN, S.M.T., Dato' Bijaya di-Raja (Kuala Trengganu Selatan).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI MOHD. SALLEH, A.M.N., S.M.J., P.I.S. (Segamat Utara).
- „ O. K. K. DATU ALIUDDIN BIN DATU HARUN, P.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ DR AWANG BIN HASSAN, S.M.J. (Muar Selatan).
- „ TUAN AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Muar Dalam).
- „ DATO GANIE GILONG, P.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).
- „ TUAN HANAFIAH BIN HUSSAIN, A.M.N. (Jerai).
- „ PENGHULU JINGGUT ANAK ATTAN, Q.M.C., A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN AMADEUS MATHEW LEONG, A.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).
- „ TUAN LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).
- „ TUAN LIM PEE HUNG, P.J.K. (Alor Star).
- „ TUAN PETER LO SU YIN (Sabah).
- „ TUAN JOSEPH DAVID MANJAJI (Sabah).
- „ DATO' DR HAJI MEGAT KHAS, D.P.M.P., J.P., P.J.K. (Kuala Kangsar).
- „ DATO' HAJI MOHAMED ASRI BIN HAJI MUDA, S.P.M.K. (Pasir Puteh).
- „ ORANG TUA MOHAMMAD DARA BIN LANGPAD (Sabah).
- „ RAJA ROME BIN RAJA MA'AMOR, P.J.K., J.P. (Kuala Selangor).
- „ DATO' S. P. SEENIVASAGAM, D.P.M.P., P.M.P., J.P. (Menglembu).
- „ TUAN SNG CHIN JOO (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN TAMA WENG TINGGANG WAN (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Melaka).
- „ TUAN YEH PAO TZE, A.M.N. (Sabah).

PRAYERS

(Mr. (Deputy) Speaker *in the Chair*)

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

KILANG PELURU

1. Tuan Ahmad bin Arshad (Muar Utara) bertanya kepada Menteri Pertahanan (a) apa-kah nama dan berapakah harga kilang peluru yang akan dibena di-Malaysia kelak; (b) apa-kah jenis peluru yang akan di-buat oleh kilang itu; dan (c) sama ada peluru² itu akan di-gunakan untuk maksud pertahanan negara kita atau untuk di-eksepot ka-luar negeri.

The Deputy Prime Minister and the Minister of Defence (Tun Haji Abdul Razak): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, belanja

membena kilang peluru ada-lah bergantung pada jenis dan banyak-nya peluru yang hendak di-buat itu. Belanja yang sa-kecil²-nya ia-lah \$3 juta bagi membena kilang peluru senjata² kecil, ia-itu satu jenis peluru sahaja dan boleh meningkat sampai \$100 juta bagi membena kilang membuat ubat bedil jenis kuasa tinggi atau *high explosive ammunition*. Ada-lah di-chadangkan pada permulaan ini untuk membuat peluru senjata kecil sahaja. Bagitu juga di-chadangkan pada permulaan ini peluru² itu di-buat bagi kegunaan pertahanan dan juga pehak polis. Apabila kilang itu sudah berjalan dengan baik-nya, boleh-lah di-timbangan bagi di-jualkan peluru ini ka-luar² negeri.

KAWALAN DI-SELAT MELAKA

2. Tuan Ahmad bin Arshad bertanya kepada Menteri Pertahanan (a) sama ada apa² rundingan telah di-adakan

dengan Kerajaan Indonesia atas masa-alah Kawasan Malaysia Barat (Perayeran di-Selat Melaka) untuk menyekat ahli² komunis dari berulang alek antara Malaysia dengan Indonesia; (b) sama ada ini termasuk meronda bersama di-perayeran Antarabangsa untuk menghapuskan lanun² yang bermaharajalela di-situ; dan (c) sama ada Kementerian beliau akan memberikan butir² keterangan supaya nelayan² kita dapat merasa terjamin atas keselamatan diri mereka.

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-bagai Ahli Yang Berhormat sedia ma'alum, satu meshuarat di-antara Pegawai² Indonesia dan Malaysia telah di-adakan dalam bulan September tahun lalu bagi membincangkan peratoran² keselamatan dan pertahanan di-daerah² sempadan di-antara kedua² buah negara itu sa-bagai satu langkah untuk mengembalikan perhubungan di-antara dua buah negara ini kepada keadaan saperti biasa. Perjanjian telah di-buat, di-antara lain² ia-lah mengatorkan peratoran bagi melaksanakan gerakan bersama atau sa-laras atau *co-ordinated operation* di-antara Angkatan Tentera Indonesia dan Malaysia. Perjanjian ini akan di-sahkan tidak berapa lama lagi.

Soal yang di-sebutkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat ini ada-lah termasuk di-dalam perjanjian itu.

Yang kedua-nya, perkara ini juga termasuk dalam perjanjian. Apabila perjanjian ini telah di-sahkan, Angkatan Tentera dari dua buah negara itu akan merundingkan peratoran² bagi menjalankan gerakan bersama untuk keamanan dan keselamatan, termasuklah keamanan dan keselamatan di-Selat Melaka. Butir² gerakan tentu-lah tidak dapat hendak di-ishtiharkan tetapi boleh-lah di-beri ma'aluman kepada kapal pengail² ikan bahawa dengan sa-berapa boleh-nya Angkatan Tentera daripada dua negara itu akan menjalankan gerakan untuk keselamatan mereka itu.

Tuan Ahmad bin Arshad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soalan tambahan. Dapat-kah atas kemurahan Yang Berhormat Menteri Pertahanan memberi

tahu Dewan ini sama ada umum atau detail atas kejayaan yang di-chapai oleh rombongan tentera kita ka-Medan yang di-ketua² oleh Leftenan Jeneral Tan Sri Abdul Hamid bin Bidin tentang perundingan-nya dengan pehak berkuasa Tentera di-Medan, dan bolehkah di-beri tahu apa perkhabaran yang menggembirakan kita atas kejayaan rombongan itu.

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, rombongan ini ia-lah rombongan muhibbah. Rombongan ini telah melawat ka-Sumatra, Medan di-atas jemputan Ketua Tentera di-sana untuk bertukar² fikiran. Tentu-lah saya tidak dapat hendak terangkan butir² yang telah di-rundingkan di-antara dua pehak itu, dan rombongan daripada pehak Ketua Tentera di-Indonesia pun akan melawat Malaysia pada hujung bulan ini. Jadi tujuan lawatan ini yang sa-benar²-nya ia-lah hendak bertukar² fikiran dan apabila perjanjian yang telah di-rundingkan itu dapat di-sahkan, beberapa butir² yang mustahak barangkali dapat-lah di-terangkan untuk ma'aluman ra'ayat di-kedua² negara.

EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND ORDINANCE—AMENDMENT TO ALLOW RE-COMMENCEMENT OF CONTRIBUTION BY RETIRED PERSONS, ETC.

3. Tuan C. V. Devan Nair (Bungsar): asks the Minister of Finance whether he would consider amending the Employees Provident Fund Ordinance with a view to enabling a retired person who has withdrawn his credit from the Fund to re-commence contribution to the Fund after he has taken up a new employment, and also to enable retired persons who intends to re-commence contributions to the Fund to make partial withdrawals from his credit if he chooses.

The Minister of Finance (Tuan Tan Siew Sin): Mr Speaker, Sir, I assume that the Honourable Member's reference to a "retired person" is to an individual who has reached the age of 55 years, when he may withdraw his credit with the Employees Provident Fund, if he has been a member of the

Fund. The Honourable Member will be aware that the Fund has been established to provide contributors with retirement benefits when they are unable to continue in gainful employment. It should be remembered that a contributor is not compulsorily required to withdraw from the Fund; when he reaches 55 years of age; if he continues to be gainfully employed there is no reason why he should retire from the Fund when he attains this age. In fact, it is obvious that he would be more advantageously placed, if he were to continue as a contributor to the E.P.F. for so long as he is gainfully employed, whatever the notional age of retirement may be. It will be appreciated that in this context the age of 55 is a purely arbitrary qualification for a member of the Fund to withdraw if he so desires. It does not mean that a person who reaches the age of 55 must be regarded as a "retired" person.

I agree, however, that the law as it stands at present does not accommodate cases of the nature referred to by the Honourable Member. While I appreciate that there is some merit in allowing those who have genuinely retired, in the sense that they have ceased to be gainfully employed, to resume their contributions to the Fund, such a concession may also make it possible for a contributor to "retire" one day and start to work again twenty-four hours later, solely as a device to enable him to collect the credit balance due to him in the Fund. Unless an amendment to the law designed to give effect to such a concession can also, at the same time, provide adequate safeguards against an abuse of this concession in the manner indicated, it will also be appreciated that the main purpose of the Fund itself will have been defeated. In spite of this, the Government is prepared to examine this matter further in the light of the considerations I have outlined.

LANGKAH KESATUAN KEBANGSAAN GURU²

4. Tuan Ahmad bin Arshad bertanya kepada Menteri Pelajaran sama ada benar bahawa Kesatuan Kebangsaan

Guru² telah mempergunakan murid² sekolah untuk menyebarkan risalat² yang tertentu, untuk mendapat simpati ibu bapa murid² tersebut bagi kepentingan diri mereka sendiri; jika benar, nyatakan:

- (a) sama ada perbuatan yang demikian di-anggap melanggar peraturan tata-tertib pegawai² Kerajaan; dan
- (b) apa-kah langkah² yang telah diambil untuk mengatasi keadaan ini.

The Minister of Education (Tuan Mohamed Khir Johari): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, memang benar Kesatuan Kebangsaan Guru² telah menggunakan murid² untuk menyebarkan beberapa risalah dengan tujuan mendapat simpati ibu bapa terhadap perjuangan mereka, sunggoh pun tidak ada peraturan tertentu atau pun peraturan yang bertulis untuk melarang Kesatuan Kebangsaan Guru² itu, atau pun lain² kesatuan dari bertindak seperti itu, akan tetapi Yang Berhormat Ahli itu tentu-lah bersetuju dengan saya, ia-itu memang buruk dari segi moral bagi sabuah persatuan itu menggunakan murid² sama ada dengan chara terus terang atau sa-balek-nya bagi mendapatkan sokongan untuk mencapai tujuan dan matalamat kesatuan sarkerja mereka.

Tuan Ahmad bin Arshad: Soalan tambahan atas jawapan yang dibangkitkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran tadi. Ada-kah Kementerian ini maseh lagi menerima ugutan mogok yang akan di-lancarkan oleh Kesatuan Kebangsaan Guru² ia-itu NUT atau telah di-perolehi penyelesaian yang baik.

Tuan Mohamed Khir Johari: Perkara itu ia-lah terpulang kepada kesatuan itu sendiri. Bagi pihak Kerajaan telah pun memberitahu sikap-nya dan pihak saya sendiri telah pun memberi pengakuan bahawa saya akan berikhtiar supaya segala tuntutan mereka itu akan mendapat layanan yang sa-patut-nya.

Tuan C. V. Devan Nair: Sir, whatever the Government's views may be on the merits or demerits of the case

of the National Union of Teachers, would it not be possible to agree that as a lawfully registered organisation it is the legitimate function of such a lawful organisation to try and obtain public sympathy for its cause?

Tuan Mohamed Khir Johari: Sir, I do not dispute the right of the Union to obtain public support and support of the parents for their cause. But what we are objecting to, I think, is the means by which they do it. So long as they do not make use of school children towards the achievement of their aims, I do not think anybody can argue about it.

JAWATAN-KUASA PELAJARAN UGAMA

5. Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah (Bachok) bertanya kepada Menteri Pelajaran ada-kah kerja² yang sudah di-buat oleh sa-buah Jawatan-kuasa Pelajaran Ugama yang di-lantek oleh Kementerian Pelajaran tidak berapa lama dahulu.

Tuan Mohamed Khir Johari: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dua buah Jawatan-kuasa telah di-tubuhkan oleh Kementerian bagi pelajaran ugama di-sekolah² dalam Malaysia Barat:

- (a) Sa-buah Jawatan-kuasa untuk menyemak sa-mula sukatan pelajaran yang ada sekarang bagi pengajaran ugama Islam di-sekolah² bantuan dan mengshor-kan satu chara yang sesuai untuk mengajar ugama. Sukatan pelajaran baharu itu telah pun siap dan telah di-kemukakan kepada Persidangan Raja² untuk persetujuan.
- (b) Sa-buah Jawatan-kuasa bersama di-antara Kementerian Pelajaran dan Kolej Islam yang telah ditugaskan untuk mengemukakan satu chadangan mengenai sukatan pelajaran dan kursus² pelajaran bagi Kolej Islam Malaya dan juga sekolah² menengah ugama di-Malaysia Barat yang Kementerian berchadang untuk memberikan bantuan penoh telah di-tubuhkan. Jawatan-kuasa ini maseh lagi mengkaji chadangan²

itu. Penyata²-nya ada-lah di-jangka akan keluar dalam tahun ini juga.

KOLEJ ISLAM MALAYA

6. Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah bertanya kepada Menteri Pelajaran sama ada Kerajaan akan menjadikan Kolej Islam Malaya di-Petaling Jaya sa-buah Kolej Universiti Malaya dalam tahun 1967, dan jika tidak, kenapa.

Tuan Mohamed Khir Johari: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-buah Jawatan-kuasa bersama di-antara Kementerian Pelajaran dan Kolej Islam telah di-tubuhkan untuk mengemukakan satu shor mengenai kursus² pelajaran dan sukatan² pelajaran bagi Kolej Islam. Sa-takat ini Jawatan-kuasa tersebut telah pun menyudahkan sukatan² pelajaran yang sa-taraf dengan peringkat Tingkatan VI dan Jawatan-kuasa itu maseh menimbangkan kursus² pelajaran untuk Kolej Islam sa-bagai Maktab Pelajaran Tinggi. Oleh yang demikian tidak-lah dapat saya memberitahu Ahli Yang Berhormat itu sama ada Kolej Islam itu akan di-jadikan sa-buah Kolej bagi Universiti Malaya atau pun tidak pada sa'at ini.

PERUNTOKAN TAMBAHAN KAPADA KOLEJ ISLAM

7. Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah bertanya kepada Menteri Pelajaran ada-kah Kerajaan bersedia memberi peruntokan tambahan kepada Kolej Islam Malaya sa-lain daripada peruntokan yang di-untokkan bagi tahun 1966.

Tuan Mohamed Khir Johari: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, wang sa-banyak \$76,384 telah di-adakan dalam Anggaran Perbelanjaan Biasa tahun 1966 untok Kolej Islam Malaya. Dalam tahun 1967 peruntokan bagi Kolej Islam Petaling Jaya ia-lah sa-banyak \$100,000. Angka ini tidak termasuk peruntokan bagi Kolej di-Klang yang akan di-jadikan sa-buah Sekolah Menengah berasrama.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Soalan tambahan. Saya bertanya di-dalam soalan ini, ada-kah Kerajaan

bersedia untuk memberi peruntukan tambahan erti-nya lebih daripada yang di-utuskan di-dalam Budget itu, kalau yang di-dalam Budget itu memang sudah tetap.

Tuan Mohamed Khir Johari: Kalau Kolej itu boleh menunjukkan keterangan² yang cukup yang apa-kah sebab-nya mereka itu berkehendakkan bantuan tambahan, maka pihak saya sedia memberi pertimbangan.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soalan tambahan yang terakhir. Sa-kira-nya bagi pihak Kolej Islam itu dapat menunjukkan satu sukatan pelajaran dan bersedia untuk membolehkan kolej itu menjadi Universiti Kolej, ada-kah Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran bersedia untuk menerima pengeshoran dan chadangan itu untuk menjadikan Kolej Islam itu sa-bagai Universiti Kolej, tidak hanya tempat belajar bagi Form VI sa-mata².

Tuan Mohamed Khir Johari: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jawapan saya yang terakhir. Saya telah bagi tahu tadi, soal hendak di-jadikan Kolej Islam itu satu Universiti Kolej tidak dapat di-perse-tujukan pada sa'at ini. Jika sa-kira-nya pihak Kerajaan menerima shor daripada Jawatan-kuasa untuk di-jadikan Kolej itu satu Universiti Kolej maka tentu-lah mereka itu berkehendakkan bantuan tambahan untuk menjalankan shor-nya.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Soalan tambahan baharu (*Ketawa*).

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: Tadi kata pada akhir-nya.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Ini yang baharu.

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: Yang baharu pula!

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada-kah benar bahawa Jawatan-kuasa ini telah mengemukakan kepada pihak Kementerian Pelajaran supaya di-tambahkan lagi pensharah atau lecturer yang ber-

pengalaman tetapi pihak Kementerian tidak dapat mengadakan peruntukan tambahan untuk lecturer yang di-tentukan itu. Nampak-nya pihak Kementerian bergantung kepada lecturer² tempatan yang ada sahaja, adakah benar perkara itu?

Tuan Mohamed Khir Johari: Untuk pengetahuan Ahli Yang Berhormat, Kolej itu mula dari 1 haribulan Januari tahun ini sahaja yang di-ambil alih oleh Kementerian Pelajaran. Jadi, saya telah dapat persetujuan supaya di-lantek sa-orang yang terkemuka untuk menjadi Pengerusi bagi Lembaga Pentadbir bagi Kolej Islam yang baharu dan saya berharap apabila Lembaga Pentadbir bersidang nanti dalam sedikit masa lagi, mereka itu dapat membuat satu plan yang lengkap untuk membuat perubahan² yang perlu bagi menjadikan Kolej Islam itu satu tempat pengajian tinggi dengan erti kata yang sa-benar-nya.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dapat-kah Menteri kita memberi tahu siapa-kah pengerusi yang baharu bagi Lembaga Pentadbir Kolej Islam.

Tuan Mohamed Khir Johari: Tuan Speaker, sa-chara tidak rasmi saya boleh bagi tahu tetapi di-luar Dewan (*Ketawa*).

MOTIONS

THE CUSTOMS ORDINANCE, 1952

The Customs Duties (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1967

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

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of Sub-section (2) of Section 10 of the Customs Ordinance, 1952, the Customs Duties (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1967, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 14 of 1967 be confirmed.

The Order before the House implements part of the duty changes which came into effect when the Second Reading of the Supply Bill, 1967, was

moved on 19th January. Details of these changes and the reasons for making these amendments have already been given at that time.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister (Tuan Chen Wing Sum): Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of Sub-section (2) of Section 10 of the Customs Ordinance, 1952, the Customs Duties (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1967, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 14 of 1967 be confirmed.

THE SABAH CUSTOMS ORDINANCE (CAP. 33)

The Customs Duties (Sabah) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1967

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

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of Sub-section (3) of Section 8 of the Sabah Customs Ordinance (Cap. 33), the Customs Duties (Sabah) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1967, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 15 of 1967 be confirmed.

The Order before the House implements part of the duty changes which came into effect when the Second Reading of the Supply Bill, 1967, was moved. Details of these changes and the reasons for making these amendments were already given at that time.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move.

Tuan Chen Wing Sum: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of Sub-section (3) of Section 8 of the Sabah Customs Ordinance (Cap. 33), the Customs Duties (Sabah) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1967, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 15 of 1967 be confirmed.

THE SARAWAK CUSTOMS ORDINANCE (CAP. 26)

The Customs (Import and Export) Duties (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1967

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

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of Sub-section (3) of Section 8 of the Sarawak Customs Ordinance (Cap. 26), the Customs (Import and Export) Duties (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1967, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 16 of 1967 be confirmed.

The Order before the House implements part of the duty changes which came into effect when the Second Reading of the Supply Bill, 1967, was moved. Details of these changes and the reasons for making these amendments were already given at that time.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move.

Tuan Chen Wing Sum: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of Sub-section (3) of Section 8 of the Sarawak Customs Ordinance (Cap. 26), the Customs (Import and Export) Duties (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1967, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 16 of 1967 be confirmed.

THE EXCISE ACT, 1961

The Excise Duties (Amendment) Order, 1967

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

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of Sub-section (2) of Section 7 of the Excise Act, 1961, the Excise Duties (Amendment) Order, 1967, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 17 of 1967 be confirmed.

The Order before the House implements part of the duty changes which came into effect when the Second Reading of the Supply Bill, 1967 was moved. Details of these changes and the reasons for making these amendments were already given at that time.

Sir, I beg to move.

Tuan Chen Wing Sum: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of Sub-section (2) of Section 7 of the Excise Act, 1961, the Excise Duties (Amendment) Order, 1967, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 17 of 1967 be confirmed.

THE EXCISE ORDINANCE, SABAH, 1959

The Excise Duties (Amendment) Order, 1967

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

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of Sub-section (2) of Section 3 of the Excise Ordinance, Sabah, No. 18 of 1959, the Excise Duties (Amendment) Order, 1967, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 18 of 1967 be confirmed.

The Order before the House implements part of the duty changes which came into effect when the Second Reading of the Supply Bill, 1967 was moved. Details of these changes and the reasons for making these amendments were already given at that time.

Sir, I beg to move.

Tuan Chen Wing Sum: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of Sub-section (2) of Section 3 of the Excise Ordinance, Sabah, No. 18 of 1959, the Excise Duties (Amendment) Order, 1967, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 18 of 1967 be confirmed.

THE CUSTOMS ORDINANCE, 1952

The Customs Duties (Penang) Order, 1967

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

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of Sub-section (2) of Section 143 of the Customs Ordinance, 1952, the Customs Duties (Penang) Order, 1967, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 19 of 1967 be confirmed.

This Order extends to Penang Island the duties currently applicable in the principal customs area of West Malaysia on sugar, matches, mechanical lighters and motor vehicles. The reasons for these action have also been given when the Supply Bill, 1967, was read for the second time on 19th January, 1967.

Sir, I beg to move.

Tuan Chen Wing Sum: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of Sub-section (2) of Section 143 of the Customs Ordinance, 1952, the Customs Duties (Penang) Order, 1967, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 19 of 1967 be confirmed.

THE CUSTOMS ORDINANCE, 1952

The Surtax (Imports) Order, 1967

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

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of Sub-section (2) of Section 10 of the Customs Ordinance, 1952, the Surtax (Imports) Order, 1967, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 20 of 1967 be confirmed.

This Order has the effect of imposing a surtax of 20% on imports into West Malaysia. Items which have been excluded from this Surtax are listed to the Schedule to the Order. As has been mentioned when the Supply Bill, 1967, was read for the second time, the purpose of introducing the Surtax is to replace the Turnover Tax which has been repealed.

Sir, I beg to move.

Tuan Chen Wing Sum: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of Sub-section (2) of Section 10 of the Customs Ordinance, 1952, the Surtax (Imports) Order, 1967, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 20 of 1967 be confirmed.

THE SABAH CUSTOMS ORDINANCE (CAP. 33)

The Surtax (Imports) Order, 1967

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

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of Sub-section (3) of Section 8 of the Sabah Customs Ordinance (Cap. 33), the Surtax (Imports) Order, 1967, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 21 of 1967, be confirmed.

This Order implements the Surtax on imports in Sabah. It is in every way similar to the Surtax (Imports) Order, 1967 for West Malaysia which has just been confirmed by this House.

Sir, I beg to move.

Tuan Chen Wing Sum: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of Sub-section (3) of Section 8 of the Sabah Customs Ordinance (Cap. 33), the Surtax (Imports) Order, 1967, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 21 of 1967, be confirmed.

THE SARAWAK CUSTOMS ORDINANCE (CAP. 26)

The Surtax (Imports) Order, 1967

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

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of Sub-section (3) of Section 8 of the Sarawak Customs Ordinance (Cap. 26), the Surtax (Imports) Order, 1967, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 22 of 1967 be confirmed.

This Order is similar to the Surtax (Imports) Order, 1967 for Sabah which has just been confirmed by this House.

Sir, I beg to move.

Tuan Chen Wing Sum: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of Sub-section (3) of Section 8 of the Sarawak

Customs Ordinance (Cap. 26), the Surtax (Imports) Order, 1967, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 22 of 1967 be confirmed.

THE CUSTOMS ORDINANCE, 1952

The Customs Duties (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1967

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

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of Sub-section (2) of Section 10 of the Customs Ordinance, 1952, the Customs Duties (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1967, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 28 of 1967 be confirmed.

This Order implements a part of the duty changes announced when the Second Reading of the Supply Bill, 1967 was moved. I shall therefore not elaborate further on it.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move.

Tuan Chen Wing Sum: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of Sub-section (2) of Section 10 of the Customs Ordinance, 1952, the Customs Duties (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1967, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 28 of 1967 be confirmed.

THE EXCISE ACT, 1961

The Excise Duties (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1967

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

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of Sub-section (2) of Section 7 of the Excise Act, 1961, the Excise Duties (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1967, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 29 of 1967 be confirmed.

This Order also implements a part of the duty changes announced at the Second Reading of the Supply Bill, 1967, and I do not propose to elaborate further.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move.

Tuan Chen Wing Sum: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of Sub-section (2) of Section 7 of the Excise Act, 1961, the Excise Duties (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1967, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 29 of 1967 be confirmed.

THE EXCISE ORDINANCE, SARAWAK, (CAP. 27)

The Excise Duties (Amendment) Order, 1967

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

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of Sub-section (2) of Section 3 of the Excise Ordinance, Sarawak, Cap. 27, the Excise Duties (Amendment) Order, 1967, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 30 of 1967 be confirmed.

This Order also implements part of the duty changes announced at the Second Reading of the Supply Bill, 1967, and I do not propose to elaborate further.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move.

Tuan Chen Wing Sum: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of Sub-section (2) of Section 3 of the Excise Ordinance, Sarawak, Cap. 27, the Excise Duties (Amendment) Order, 1967, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 30 of 1967 be confirmed.

BILL

RANG UNDANG² PERSATUAN PELADANG (THE FARMERS' ASSOCIATION BILL)

Second Reading

Menteri Pertanian dan Sharikat Kerjasama (Tuan Haji Mohamed Ghazali bin Haji Jawi): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya pohon mengemukakan Rang Undang² yang bergelar Undang² Persatuan Peladang 1967 di-bacha bagi kali yang kedua.

Sa-bagaimana yang di-ketahui, negeri² yang memperolehi kejayaan

yang berkesan mengenai ranchangan² luar bandar dan perkembangan pertanian ada-lah bergantung kepada penyertaan dan kegiatan petani² di-negeri itu sendiri.

Kementerian Pertanian dan Shari-kat Kerjasama telah lama sedar tentang perlu-nya gerakan Persatuan² Peladang yang boleh di-jadikan perantaraan melalui mana bantuan² Kerajaan boleh di-salurkan. Peladang² hendak-lah di-beri kesedaran untuk menerima teknik² pertanian sa-chara modern supaya bantuan² yang telah di-salurkan itu dapat di-gunakan dengan baik-nya. Persatuan² Peladang ia-lah bukti yang tegas bagi pergerakan perkembangan Bahagian Pertanian Kementerian ini yang mempunyai tujuan hendak membanyakkan, menyegerakan dan mengelakkan lagi ranchangan² tentang menganjor penduduk² luar bandar untuk menjalankan segala jenis ranchangan kemajuan masyarakat bagi memperkukuhkan kedudukan ekonomi dan social mereka.

Ranchangan bagi menubuhkan Persatuan² Peladang ini telah bermula semenjak tahun 1959. Semenjak itu banyak-lah pertubohan² yang besar telah di-dapati, tetapi Persatuan² Peladang ini ada-lah di-daftarkan di-bawah Undang² Persatuan atau pun Societies Ordinance. Segala peransang telah di-beri bagi penubohan-nya kerana Persatuan² Peladang ada-lah satu pergerakan yang berharga bagi menyedarkan peladang² untuk mengambil berat tentang segala chara pertanian yang maju dan juga sa-bagai satu persatuan yang terator bagi menyebarkan pengetahuan² teknik yang berkaitan.

Rang Undang² ini bermaksud hendak mengadakan peruntukan bagi pendaftaran dan penyeliaan badan² yang di-tubuhkan oleh peladang bagi maksud memajukan kesejahteraan atau kepentingan ekonomi dan masyarakat mereka sendiri. Badan² yang boleh di-tubuhkan ia-lah Persatuan² Peladang Kawasan, Persatuan² Peladang Negeri dan Persatuan² Peladang Persekutuan. Persatuan² Kawasan boleh di-tubuhkan sa-chara sukarela oleh sa-ramai 50 orang

peladang atau lebih sa-bagaimana yang di-ta'arifkan di-dalam Fasal 2 bagi mana² kawasan di-dalam Persekutuan. Badan² ini boleh bergabung dengan menjadikan satu Persatuan Peladang Negeri, Persatuan Peladang Negeri boleh juga bergabung menjadi Persatuan Peladang Persekutuan mengikut Fasal 3.

Peratoran bagi pergabungan itu ada-lah juga di-nyatakan di-dalam Rang Undang² ini mengikut Fasal 15 dan 16. Sunggoh pun penubuhan Badan² ini dan penyeliaan perlembagaan dan atoran² bagi badan² ini ada-lah bebas dan sukarela pada asasnya, tetapi sa-belum badan² ini boleh di-daftarkan di-bawah Undang² ini, atoran²-nya mesti-lah mengandungi peruntokan² yang ada di-peruntokkan di-dalam atoran² yang akan di-buat di-bawah Undang² ini. Peruntokan² ini ia-lah peruntokan yang akan di-fikirkan penting dan mustahak di-beri kepada badan² itu—sistem yang perlu bagi menchapai tujuan²-nya. Tujuan satu, Persatuan Peladang boleh di-tubuhkan ada-lah di-nyatakan di-dalam Fasal 5. Apabila di-daftarkan di-bawah Undang² ini semua Persatuan² Peladang ia-itu termasuk Persatuan Peladang Negeri dan Persatuan Peladang Persekutuan ada-lah menjadi pertubuhan² yang dapat di-perbadankan yang mempunyai kuasa² yang tersebut di-dalam Fasal 18. Maka tidak-lah sah di-sisi Undang² bagi Badan² ini menjalankan apa² urusan melainkan di-daftarkan menurut Fasal 4.

Pengarah Pertanian ada-lah menjadi Pendaftar di-bawah Undang² ini menurut Fasal 6 (1). Ia boleh mewakilkan mana² daripada kuasa²-nya kechuali kuasa² di-bawah Fasal 20 atau Fasal 6 (3). Pehak² kuasa penyelia di-dalam tujuan ini ada-lah di-lantek oleh Menteri menurut Fasal 9. Tugas² bagi Pegawai Penyelia yang mana berada di-bawah arahan Pendaftar ada-lah di-nyatakan di-bawah Fasal 10. Jika Pendaftar berpendapat bahawa ada-lah untuk kepentingan peladang² 'am-nya, di-dalam mana² kawasan atau negeri yang di-tentukan dia, boleh dengan jalan perintah, menggantungkan perlembagaan atau atoran² Persatuan Peladang Kawasan atau Negeri

yang berkenaan, akan tetapi sa-telah sahaja perintah itu di-buat, Pendaftar hendak-lah mengadakan satu siasatan di-jalankan dan sa-lepas siasatan itu boleh-lah membetulkan peratoran itu atau membuat satu² perintah selanjutnya untuk membubarkan Persatuan yang berkenaan itu.

Perkara² yang berhubung dengan pergantungan termasuk-lah pengurusan Persatuan di-dalam masa pergantungan itu dan peruntokan berkenaan dengan rayuan ada-lah di-nyatakan di-dalam Fasal 20, 21, 22 dan 23 dalam Rang Undang² itu. Menteri boleh-lah membuat atoran² dan peratoran² untuk menjalankan kuatkuasa peruntokan² Rang Undang² ini.

Fasal 26 dan 27—Atoran² itu boleh mengadakan, antara lain, peruntokan bagi pergantungan dan pembubaran Persatuan Peladang. Peruntokan² berkenaan dengan odit dan kuasa² Menteri bagi mengechualikan Persatuan Peladang daripada sa-tengah peruntokan undang² ini ada-lah di-nyatakan dalam Fasal² 25 dan 28: Menteri Kewangan boleh, dengan jalan perintah, menurun atau mengurangkan chukai yang boleh di-kenakan ka-atas Persatuan² Peladang yang tersebut dalam Fasal 29.

Peruntokan² yang sa-lebih-nya itu, Fasal² 30, 31 dan 32, ada-lah berkenaan dengan larangan daripada menggunakan perkataan Persatuan Peladang di-dalam perniagaan dan urusan, melainkan apa² yang di-kechualikan.

Berkenaan dengan tidak terpakai-nya sa-tengah² undang² dan berkenaan dengan kesalahan², Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mengemukakan Rang Undang² ini untuk bacaan kali yang kedua-nya.

Setia-usaha Parlimen kepada Menteri Kesihatan (Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong.

Tuan Mohd. Daud bin Abdul Samad (Besut): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka mengambil bahagian di-dalam

membahathkan Rang Undang² Persatuan Peladang ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Rang Undang² Persatuan Peladang ini nampak-nya ada-lah suatu Rang Undang² yang istimewa daripada Rang Undang² yang lain yang telah di-kemukakan di-dalam Rumah yang mulia ini. Saya mengatakan suatu Rang Undang² yang istimewa, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, oleh kerana bila kita mendengar penerangan dan keterangan yang ada di-dalam Rang Undang² ini, ada-lah menunjukkan bahawa ada beberapa fasal dan fasal² itu menunjukkan: Menteri ada mempunyai kuasa yang lebih besar daripada pehak Kerajaan sendiri, kalau kita pandangkan beberapa fasal itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam keterangan tadi, saya kurang jelas, apakah sebab-nya pehak Menteri berkehendakkan begitu banyak kuasa: tidak seperti Rang Undang² atau pun undang² yang lain.

Saya suka menarek perhatian kepada Fasal 9 mithal-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bahagian 4 Pegawai Penyelia Persatuan Peladang Negeri, 9 (1) maka hendak-lah di-lantek bagi tiap² Negeri sa-orang Pegawai Penyelia Persatuan² Peladang dan perlantekan itu hendak-lah di-buat oleh Menteri.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ini satu daripada fasal yang saya nyatakan tadi istimewa. Ada pun kita tahu, bahawa pegawai² kerajaan yang lain memang di-lantek, di-pilih oleh Surohanjaya Perkhidmatan 'Awam atau pun *Public Service Commission*. Ada pun Penyelia Persatuan Peladang ini di-lantek oleh Menteri, maka saya khuatir, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau perlantekan ini di-buat oleh Menteri, maka akan berlaku-lah pula seperti Penyelia Kelas Dewasa. Dan saya nampak, oleh kerana kegagalan kelas dewasa atau pun Penyelia Kelas Dewasa itu-lah, maka hendak di-lantek Penyelia Persatuan Peladang yang baharu untuk menggantikan Penyelia Kelas Dewasa.

Jadi kalau ini-lah akan berlaku, saya yakin dan perchaya apa yang di-harapkan oleh peladang. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, oleh Persatuan Peladang dan apa yang di-harapkan oleh Menteri

yang berkenaan itu, akan menemui kegagalan pula, sebab-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada banyak gangguan daripada pehak parti politik, walau pun parti mana yang memerintah di-dalam negeri ini. Di-dalam sa-buah negeri yang berdasarkan demokrasi seperti ini, saya perchaya bahawa segala ranchangan kemajuan yang akan di-jalankan walau tujuan-nya itu baik dan Rang Undang² itu baik, tetapi pelaksanaan—oleh kerana ada-nya gangguan daripada pehak ahli² parti politik di-dalam negeri ini, maka tidak akan menemui satu kejayaan yang benar² yang di-kehendaki oleh tujuan satu Rang Undang² atau pun satu ranchangan yang akan di-laksanakan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya harap-lah supaya pehak Kerajaan dan pehak Menteri yang berkenaan menimbang-kan sa-mula, berhubung dengan perlantekan Penyelia Persatuan Peladang ini supaya kita akan dapat benar² orang yang mempunyai kelayakan, orang yang mempunyai pengalaman bagi memajukan persatuan ini, bukanlah orang yang hanya untuk hendak menjaga kepentingan satu² parti politik.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-lain daripada itu, mengikut keterangan dan juga tertulis di-dalam Rang Undang² ini sendiri bagaimana yang di-sebut oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri tadi, menunjukkan—Fasal 26 (1): "Menteri boleh membuat atoran² bagi maksud menjalankan kuatkuasa mana² peruntukan Act ini. Dengan tidak menyentoh keluasan ma'ana sekshen-kecil (1) atoran² yang di-buat di-bawah sekshen ini boleh mengadakan peruntukan bagi apa² jua peratoran yang berikut."

Jadi ini juga, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, menunjukkan bahawa Menteri memang ada mempunyai lebih kuasa di-dalam Rang Undang² ini, sedangkan kita tahu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Menteri yang memerintah di-dalam sa-buah kerajaan dalam negeri ini, maka sudah tentu datang-nya daripada mana² parti politik. Jadi suka-lah saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, supaya di-fikir dan di-timbang-kan kuasa yang di-beri, yang telah di-letakkan kepada Menteri itu, di-kaji dan di-serah kepada Kerajaan

untuk menimbangkan supaya tidak timbul suatu tuduhan atau pun suatu rasa khuatir, yang pehak ra'ayat mengatakan ini ada-lah satu ranchangan parti Perikatan untuk memenangi pilihan raya pada masa yang akan datang. Jadi bila timbul suatu pemikiran, atau pun suatu kekhuatiran seperti ini daripada ra'ayat, maka bagaimana yang saya katakan tadi, ranchangan itu baik, tetapi tidak akan dapat sambutan dan tidak akan berjalan dengan baik dan akan merugikan wang ra'ayat sedangkan kita tahu di-dalam *Budget* yang telah di-kemukakan oleh Menteri Kewangan dua tiga hari ini menunjukkan kita telah mempunyai kegentingan dan kekurangan kewangan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau di-dalam Rang Undang² ini juga menunjukkan bahawa Pegawai Pendaftaran itu, mithal-nya, boleh di-serah kepada Pengarah Pertanian Persekutuan Malaysia ini, kenapa-kah Penyelia Persatuan Peladang ini tidak boleh kita serah kepada Pegawai Pertanian Negeri, mithal-nya, bagaimana yang telah berjalan sekarang ini? Kalau kita dapat menyerahkan kepada Pegawai Pertanian Negeri menjadi Pegawai Penyelia Persatuan Peladang ini, saya yakin ini lebih memberi kepercayaan kepada seluruh ra'ayat di-dalam negeri ini dan dapat menjamin wang dengan tidak melantek pegawai baharu yang akan di-terima oleh Menteri bagaimana yang telah di-beri kuasa di-dalam Rang Undang² ini sa-kira-nya di-luluskan pada hari ini nanti.

Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bukan-lah membangkang Rang Undang² ini, memang pada dasar-nya saya bersetuju tetapi saya suka-lah menarik perhatian bagaimana yang saya telah nyatakan tadi atas beberapa fasal ia-itu Fasal (9) berkenaan dengan perlantakan Penyelia Persatuan ini begitu juga Fasal (26) dan (27).

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya perchaya-lah kalau Rang Undang² ini di-timbang dan di-fikirkan sa-mula dan di-beri suatu gambaran yang baik yang benar² hendak memajukan Persatuan Peladang ini, saya yakin dan perchaya bahawa akan mendapat suatu kejayaan

yang baik dan akan di-sambut oleh seluruh peladang² di-dalam seluruh Malaysia ini. Sebab, kita tahu, mengikut tafsiran yang telah di-beri oleh Rang Undang² ini ada pun yang bernama peladang itu ia-lah terdiri daripada ahli nelayan dan orang² yang berchuchok-tanam, erti-nya satu bahagian yang besar kalau sa-kira-nya ranchangan ini berjalan dengan baik. Mereka yang merupakan tulang belakang negara ini akan dapat merasa nikmat kemajuan ini.

Tetapi sa-balek-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-kira-nya Rang Undang² ini tidak di-pertimbang dan tidak di-beri perhatian yang betul bagi melaksanakan chita² dan tujuan ini, maka chita² dan tujuan ini tidak akan berhasil pula.

Tuan Mohamed Idris bin Matsil (Jelebu-Jempol): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam membahathkan Rang Undang² Persatuan Peladang yang di-kemukakan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Pertanian dan Sharikat Kerjasama baharu² ini tadi, saya mengambil peluang mengalu²kan Rang Undang² ini kerana dengan ada-nya Rang Undang² ini maka dapat-lah persatuan² peladang yang telah berchambah dalam negara kita sekarang berjalan dengan pesat-nya.

Di-dalam keterangan Yang Berhormat Menteri tadi, Persatuan² Peladang ini telah bermula semenjak daripada tahun 1959 dan sa-hingga hari ini baharu-lah satu Rang Undang² yang boleh mengawal pergerakan Persatuan Peladang ini dapat di-bentangkan di-dalam Dewan yang mulia ini. Walau pun telah lewat, tetapi saya suka-lah mengambil peluang menguchapkan satinggi² tahniah dengan usaha tenaga-nya maka sa-buah Rang Undang² dapat di-laksanakan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam satu daripada fasal yang di-bentangkan di-dalam Rang Undang² ini, walau pun mungkin tidak ada kuasa yang diberikan kepada Yang Berhormat Menteri, tetapi bagaimana pun kalau boleh, bagi permulaan ini, patut-lah di-timbangkan sa-mula ia-itu berkenaan

dengan fasal keahlian Persatuan Peladang ini. Semenjak tahun 1959 hingga tarikh ini ahli² Persatuan Peladang, mengikut peratoran²-nya atau pun undang² persatuan itu, memang-lah daripada kaum² tani atau dengan lain² perkataan kaum peladang. Tetapi oleh sebab memandangkan sa-sabuah kawasan yang di-tubuhkan kesatuan itu mungkin barangkali tidak ramai ahli cherdek-pandai, untuk mentadbir persatuan itu, maka banyak-lah ahli² Jawatan-kuasa, pegawai² kesatuan itu di-ambil daripada mereka² sa-umpama guru² sekolah dan juga kerani² dan sa-bagai-nya. Walhal mengikut keahlian Persatuan Peladang, mengikut Rang Undang² ini, hendak-lah sa-orang peladang yang juga menumpukan atau pun yang memperolehi pendapatan-nya yang besar daripada pertanian. Jadi dengan fasal yang tersebut, maka tentu-lah pehak yang saya sebutkan tadi akan menghindarkan diri dan tidak dapat lagi kita dengan ada-nya Rang Undang² ini, menchampori diri, melateh atau pun di-beri latehan kapada satu pentadbiran Persatuan Peladang di-sa-sabuah kawasan itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, memandang kapada tujuan yang begitu luas bagi Persatuan Peladang ini, maka saya berharap dan merayu kapada Kementerian Pertanian dan Sharikat Kerjasama supaya sa-telah di-kanunkan Rang Undang² ini maka Pertubohan² Persatuan Peladang itu, terutama sa-kali pegawai²-nya, patut-lah di-beri satu latehan yang sa-luas²-nya. Manakala saya sebutkan latehan² yang sa-luas²-nya itu tidak-lah berma'ana latehan dua atau tiga bulan, tetapi hendak-lah satu latehan yang membolehkan mereka itu, pada satu masa kelak, menjalankan segala tujuan² yang di-bentangkan sa-bagaimana yang kita dapati di-dalam Fasal 5 (a) hingga kapada (i).

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita faham bahawa negara kita ada-lah sa-buah negara pertanian dan kita pernah juga di-beritahu bahawa sa-kurang²-nya 60% daripada penduduk negara ini ialah daripada kaum tani dan kita pernah juga mendengar pertubohan² sa-umpama ini, tetapi tidak mendapat

sokongan yang erat daripada pehak Kerajaan saperti Pertubohan² Belia dan sa-bagai-nya. Maka saya berharap juga bahawa Kerajaan akan memandangkan berat kapada Pertubohan² Persatuan Peladang ini terutama, bagi permulaan-nya, patut-lah ada satu² chara contribution atau pun satu² chara² bantuan daripada Kerajaan untuk sa-sabuah pertubohan itu bergerak atau menggerakkan pertubohan-nya dengan lancar. Dan tentu-lah tidak dapat pertubohan itu bergerak dengan lancar terutama sa-kali pada permulaan-nya kalau hanya sa-nya di-harapkan kapada yuran² yang di-pungut daripada ahli²-nya itu sahaja.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-telah di-kanunkan undang² ini, saya suka-lah mendapat penerangan daripada Yang Berhormat Menteri bagaimana-kah kesudahan atau ada-kah satu² pindaan atau pun satu² chara pengubahan yang akan di-lakukan kapada beberapa buah Pertubohan Persatuan Peladang yang telah di-daftarkan mengikut keterangan Yang Berhormat Menteri tadi ia-itu melalui jabatan atau pun melalui pejabat Pertubohan² mengikut Undang² Pertubohan yang ada sekarang? Kerana di-dalam Rang Undang² ini ada-lah meliputi ia-itu sa-sabuah Persatuan Peladang itu boleh-lah di-tubuhkan mengikut fasal² dan kuasa² yang di-sebutkan di-dalam Rang Undang² di-hadapan kita ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, satu lagi daripada sebab² yang sering berlaku, kita dapati dalam Pertubohan² sa-umpama ini ia-lah kekurangan pegawai² yang mengawal dan pegawai² yang melateh di-dalam sa-sabuah pertubohan itu. Mithal-nya, kita pernah dapati daripada gerakan² sharikat kerjasama umpamanya—walau pun satu² gerakan itu sama ada di-peringkat kampung, mukim atau pun negeri—berjalan dengan lancar dan mendapat sokongan yang penoh daripada ahli²-nya, tetapi oleh sebab kekurangan pegawai dan kekurangan latehan, maka di-dapati beberapa perkara kechurangan berlaku di-dalam sa-sabuah gerakan itu dan akhir-nya gerakan itu di-tutup atau pun terbengkalai begitu sahaja.

Saya berharap dan saya merayu-lah supaya Pertubohan Persatuan Peladang ini, dengan ada-nya sa-buah Undang² yang akan di-kanunkan sekarang ini, dapat memberi pegawai² yang chukup, bukan sahaja penyelia² yang ada di-sebutkan di-sini, sama ada pegawai² yang di-fikirkan di-beri gaji atau pun pegawai² yang boleh di-berikan dengan sa-chara sukarela atau sa-bagai-nya, supaya dapat-lah tujuan² Persatuan Peladang ini berjalan sa-bagaimana yang di-kehendaki oleh negara kita.

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: Meshuarat ini di-tangguhkan.

Sitting suspended at 10.45 a.m.

Sitting resumed at 11.10 a.m.

Tuan Haji Othman bin Abdullah (Hilir Perak): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menguchapkan sa-tinggi² kepujian kepada Menteri yang berkenaan yang telah mengemukakan Rang Undang² bagi Persatuan Peladang ini yang kita pandang ada-lah satu Rang Undang² yang sangat mustahak dan penting bagi mengawal dan menjaga berjalan-nya Pertubohan² Peladang itu dengan sempurna menuju kepada tujuan bagi memperbaiki taraf hidup mereka di-dalam kawasan² ladang.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya Wakil daripada kawasan yang boleh di-katakan seluruh-nya kawasan pertanian di-Sungai Manek, Labu Kubong dan di-sapanjang² Sungai Perak. Pada masa² yang terakhir ini telah berlaku suatu benchana apa yang di-namakan Mala Petaka Kebangsaan dan Mala Petaka Ayer Bah yang mengenai sa-bahagian daripada kawasan saya itu boleh-lah di-katakan telah mengenai juga kawasan² penanaman padi di-mana pada hari ini maseh lagi di-tenggelami ayer yang saya tidak tahu bila-kah ayer itu akan surut dan bila-kah petani² itu akan dapat balek memulakan hidup-nya chara bertani.

Maka di-dalam semua hal walau pun di-dalam banjir ini mereka yang terlibat kerana kemusnahan pertanian mereka ini nyata kelihatan, tetapi dengan ada-nya Persatuan² Peladang yang sekarang ini berkeliaran telah banyak

di-negeri kita ini dan belum dapat di-kawal di-dalam suatu Undang² saperti Rang Undang² yang di-kemukakan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri di-dalam Dewan yang mulia ini, maka Persatuan² Peladang itu belum-lah dapat lagi menyatakan tenaga mereka sa-chara bagaimana hendak memulehkan kehidupan baharu sa-telah mereka dilanda oleh Mala Petaka Banjir, umpama-nya.

Di-dalam Rang Undang² ini kita telah menengok dan kita telah membaca bahawa tujuan²-nya ia-itu bagi maksud memajukan kesejahteraan dan kepentingan ekonomi dan masharakat kaum tani dan kaum peladang itu sendiri. Maka pada faham saya tidak-lah patut ada di-antara Ahli² Yang Berhormat di-dalam Dewan ini yang memikirkan bahawa Rang Undang² ini atau pun peratoran yang hendak di-kanunkan ini merupakan suatu usaha bagi hendak memenangi Pilehan Raya pada masa yang akan datang saperti yang telah di-tudoh oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Besut. Kita telah mendengar keterangan Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Besut tadi mengatakan bahawa dia ada-lah menyokong dan menerima Rang Undang² ini dalam beberapa fasal terutama sa-kali dalam tujuan² daripada Rang Undang² ini. Di-dalam tujuan Rang Undang² ini kita dapat membaca dalam Fasal 5 (a) sampai kepada (i) tidak ada ternampak atau pun sa-suatu yang boleh kita ambil mengatakan bahawa Rang Undang² ini mempunyai tujuan² politik sa-lain daripada usaha dan ikhtiar Kerajaan, terutama-nya Kementerian Pertanian dan Sharikat Kerjasama ini, bagi membawa peladang² kita ini ka-arrah yang lebeh sempurna pada masa yang akan datang.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, satu perkara yang mustahak saya menarek perhatian Yang Berhormat Menteri ia-itu di-dalam Fasal 10 tentang kewajipan Pegawai² Penyelia—Fasal 10 ini menyatakan Pegawai Penyelia Persatuan² Peladang itu hendak-lah berkenaan dengan Negeri di-mana dia di-letakkan ia-itu bertugas, satu, menasihatkan Persatuan² Peladang Kawasan dalam Negeri itu atas kegiatan² persatuan² itu.

Jadi yang saya menarek perhatian kepada Menteri Yang Berhormat ia-itu kalimat “menasihatkan Persatuan² Peladang.” Kalau Pegawai² Penyelia yang mengikut fasal yang lain ada-lah tugas kepada Menteri ini dan hak-nya untuk melantek Pegawai² itu yang sa-suai, yang berkelayakan dan yang mempunyai pengalaman di-dalam soal² yang berkaitan, kalau tugas-nya itu sa-kadar memberi nasihat kepada Persatuan Peladang—itu sahaja. Maka pada faham saya nasihat ini boleh diterima dan boleh juga di-tolak, dan ma’ana-nya tujuan Rang Undang² ini untuk hendak membetulkan Persatuan Peladang itu mengikut kehendak dan peratoran tujuan yang ada dalam Rang Undang² ini tidak akan dapat dilaksanakan oleh kerana dia hanya merupakan satu badan penasihat.

Maka oleh kerana itu saya menarek perhatian supaya kalimat “menasihatkan peladang²” itu patut di-ubah, dan patut di-pinda kepada “mengawal Persatuan² Peladang”. Yang penting bagi pegawai itu ia-lah mengawal—mengawal Persatuan² Peladang dalam kawasan negeri itu dan memberikan arahan² kepada mereka supaya mereka itu dapat mengisi tujuan dan maksud yang tersebut di-dalam Fasal 5 dan yang tersebut di-dalam fasal² yang lain bagi keuntungan dan faedah kaum peladang itu sahaja.

Kita telah banyak mempunyai penasihat² dan kadang² kita terpaksa mengambil penasihat² daripada luar negeri yang kita namakan pakar² atau expert². Mereka itu telah memberikan nasihat kepada kita, tetapi kadang² nasihat yang di-berikan kepada kita itu tidak bersesuaian dengan apa yang kita hadapi di-dalam negeri kita sendiri. Maka oleh kerana itu saya rasa kalimat “memberi nasihat” ini sahaja rasa saya tidak akan sampai kepada maksud dan tujuan yang kita kehendaki. Tetapi mereka mempunyai kuasa, mesti mempunyai hak untuk mengawal Persatuan² itu bukan sahaja bagi mencapai tujuan tetapi juga mengawal jangan di-masoki oleh anasir² apa yang di-khuatiri oleh Yang Berhormat dari Besut yang di-kata-nya anasir² politik.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Besut menyatakan dia takut Pegawai² Penyelia itu nanti menggunakan kuasa² politik. Tetapi kalau kita tengok kepada fasal lain pada permulaan Rang Undang² ini, maka Persatuan ini di-tubuhkan atau di-adakan hanya berdasarkan kepada sukarela, kepada sa-chara sukarela, bukan dengan sa-chara paksaan kepada mereka² yang menjadi petani² atau peladang² itu sendiri. Maka yang penting bagi mereka itu menyatakan, apa-kah faedah yang patut dan yang harus mereka dapat manakala Persatuan Peladang itu dapat di-pertubuhkan mengikut lunas² Rang Undang² ini. Maka untuk mencapai tujuan dan maksud Persatuan Peladang ini, walau pun Menteri yang berkenaan mempunyai hak untuk memilih sa-barang Penyelia di-dalam sa-sabuah negeri, pemilihan-nya harus di-lakukan itu hendak-lah orang² yang terlalu chenderong kepada kepentingan kaum² peladang dan kepada kepentingan kaum² tani terutama sa-kali di-dalam negeri Kelantan, mithal-nya, Trengganu dan negeri² yang terlibat oleh banjir. Kalau mereka ini tidak betul² dapat menyesuaikan diri dengan petani² hendak menubuhkan Persatuan Peladang itu—maka penghidupan baharu bagi mereka tidak akan dapat di-mulakan. Trengganu dan Kelantan telah menderita panjang dan kerosakan yang banyak. Saya rasa Kerajaan akan memberi bantuan² serta chara pemulahan kepada penghidupan mereka. Kalau sa-kira-nya Penyelia atau pun Pegawai yang akan di-lantek dalam negeri Kelantan, mithal-nya, kita serahkan negeri Kelantan memilih-nya, maka mereka akan menggunakan kesempatan ini untuk berdiri dan mengatakan kepada petani² di-negeri Kelantan bahawa Kerajaan Negeri Kelantan-lah yang memberi penghidupan baharu kepada mereka dan Kerajaan Pusat tidak mengambil sa-barang tindakan. Ini berlaku beberapa kali di-dalam perengkat² kemalangan di-negeri² yang tersebut. Maka apa yang di-takuti oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Besut itu tadi, kalau sa-kira-nya negeri Kelantan tahu kawasan Besut atau negeri Trengganu di-pilih daripada orang yang pro-PAS, mithal-nya, mereka tidak akan menentang Rang

Undang² ini, tetapi mereka akan menyokong-nya. Tetapi yang mereka khuatirkan ia-itu kalau sa-kira-nya Penyelia itu nanti di-lantek oleh Menteri dan Menteri berkuasa melantek Pegawai Penyelia itu, maka itu yang di-khuatirkan-nya bahawa tujuan ini tidak sampai.

Di-sini kita nampak bahawa Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Besut tadi itu—belum lagi Rang Undang² ini kita luluskan, belum lagi kita bahathkan habis² dan belum lagi kita sampai kepada perangkat yang ketiga, maka beliau telah terang² menyebut di-dalam Dewan yang mulia ini bahawa tujuan daripada Undang² ini berbau politik yang mereka akan balek ka-kampung menyatakan bahawa Rang Undang² ini tidak patut di-sokong dan Persatuan Peladang ini tidak patut di-sokong, sama seperti mereka berkempen jangan menyokong sekolah² dewasa di-Kelantan kerana kata-nya ini berbau politik. Jadi kalau ini-lah kempen yang di-kemukakan oleh sahabat yang daripada Besut, maka di-dalam hati-nya ada tersebut dan tersemat perasaan politik yang mengkhawatirkan akan berjaya-nya Persatuan Peladang di-mana nanti kawasan² yang sekarang ini mereka mempunyai akan kembali ka-tangan Perikatan.

Tuan Mohd. Daud bin Abdul Samad (Besut): Untuk penjelasan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, wakil daripada Hilir Perak tadi mengatakan bahawa saya menentang-nya—kalau pileh orang PAS saya bersetuju. Tetapi boleh buka tape recorder yang ada di-dalam Dewan ini, saya tidak menyebut pun masaalah PAS atau apa, saya hanya memberi suatu pandangan dan menyatakan bahawa hendak-lah memberi suatu gambaran yang baik kepada seluruh ra'ayat negeri ini supaya rancangan Persatuan Peladang ini akan mendapat sambutan daripada seluruh ra'ayat yang ada di-dalam negeri ini.

Tuan Haji Othman bin Abdullah: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, gambaran yang di-kemukakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat itu sendiri suatu gambaran yang kabor sa-hingga dia telah menggambarkan dalam Dewan ini sendiri bahawa Rang Undang² ini bertujuan

lain, bertujuan tidak baik. Jadi kalau Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Besut tadi menukarkan fikiran dan kembali ka-kawasan-nya menyatakan tujuan yang sa-benar-nya daripada Rang Undang² ini, tidak menyatakan bahawa di-sabalek Rang Undang² ini mempunyai tujuan politik, sa-hingga tujuan Rang Undang² ini dapat di-terima dengan baik-nya oleh ra'ayat di-dalam kawasan ladang, maka saya rasa tinjauan atau pun sokongan yang di-beri oleh Yang Berhormat daripada Besut itu akan mendatangkan faedah. Di-dalam Dewan ini sendiri dia menyatakan kekhuatiran-nya kalau² Penyelia yang di-tugaskan—kewajipan Penyelia² yang mempunyai hak Menteri untuk melantek-nya—akan mengikut jejak sekolah dewasa atau pelajaran dewasa.

Pelajaran ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-negara² yang lain mendapat kejayaan yang baik dan mendapat tempat yang bagus dan banyak sudah orang² yang dahulu buta huruf sekarang ini sudah pandai membacha dan menulis, hanya sa-bahagian kawasan sahaja di-mana ada kempen² politik seperti yang di-sebutkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Besut yang menyatakan tujuan daripada Sekolah Dewasa ini tidak baik, maka kerana itu-lah di-kawasan² itu tidak berjaya sekolah² yang kita maksudkan.

Tuan Mohd. Daud bin Abdul Samad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untuk penjelasan, saya tidak pernah mengatakan kelas dewasa itu tidak baik. Chuba Ahli Yang Berhormat itu dengar apa yang saya chakap sa-kejap tadi.

Tuan Haji Othman bin Abdullah: Dengar, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tetapi dia memberikan suatu gambaran yang kabor bahawa dia mengatakan bahawa tujuan ini nanti akan tidak sampai kepada tujuan-nya. Kapada Menteri ini di-beri kuasa untuk memilih Pegawai Penyelia. Kalau telinga saya ini tidak menipu, itu-lah chakapan dia (*Ketawa*).

Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong Rang Undang² ini bahawa Menteri mesti mempunyai hak dan mempunyai kuasa untuk memilih

Penyelia bagi negeri² itu, maka timbulah keributan atau pun kalau sa-kiranya dia ini di-hantarkan ka-P.S.C.—sa-bagai Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Besut kata tadi—serahkan kepada P.S.C., maka akan dapat-lah orang² yang tidak berkaitan sama sa-kali dengan kepentingan² petani di-daerah atau negeri yang kita hajatkan. Maka kerana itu hak kepada Menteri untuk memilih Pegawai Penyelia ini ada-lah mustahak supaya dia dapat berfikir, memandang, meneliti, memereksa, menengok orang² yang layak bagi menjadi Penyelia di-negeri² itu supaya tujuannya itu nanti di-kempen oleh orang² PAS mengatakan bahawa Persatuan Peladang itu ia-lah pertubuhan orang UMNO. Jadi ini yang patut di-kikiskan. Kalau Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Besut pula mengikis fikiran itu dan kembali pula ka-kawasan-nya, kampung-nya, dan menyatakan bahawa tujuan itu baik, maka saya rasa kerjasama ini akan mendatangkan faedah kepada petani² itu sendiri.

Jadi sebab itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menekankan sa-kali lagi menyatakan bahawa pegawai² kewajipan-nya (a) menasihati. Jadi saya tidak berapa berkenan dengan kalimah² “menasihatkan kepada Persatuan Peladang” tetapi apa yang saya berkenan ia-itu “mengawas Persatuan² Peladang” itu supaya jangan di-salah gunakan oleh siapa² orang yang mempunyai kepentingan di-situ sa-hingga tujuan ini tersimpang.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, satu yang menarek perhatian saya di-dalam tujuan Rang Undang² ini, ia-itu hendak menyatukan petani² kita dengan melalui Persatuan² Peladang di-daerah. Di-sini di-sebutkan daerah wilayah atau daerah. Kawasan yang di-sebutkan di-sini, saya tidak begitu dapat memahami maksud daripada kawasan, apa-kah maksud-nya kawasan itu, satu district atau sub-district, atau kawasan² yang lebih kecil daripada jajahan atau jajahan kecil—sub-district dan district, atau kawasan² yang kecil sa-kali pun di-benarkan mengadakan satu Persatuan Peladang.

Kalau ini tujuan-nya, maka saya rasa akan lebih mendatangkan faedah kepada petani² dan peladang² kita di-

negeri kita ini, di-mana kawasan mereka itu tidak di-penohi oleh kawasan² tani atau kawasan² ladang, tetapi mereka itu juga mempunyai kesempatan, sa-kurang²-nya 50 orang boleh mendirikan dan menubuhkan satu Persatuan Peladang dan kemudian daripada Persatuan Peladang daripada Daerah ini mereka akan dapat menchantumkan diri kepada negeri dan sampai kepada perengkat kebangsaan. Ma'ana-nya, kalau sa-kira-nya tujuan daripada Rang Undang² ini dapat dilaksanakan dan di-kawal dengan baik-nya oleh pegawai² Penyelia yang akan di-pilih itu, maka pada keseluruhannya Persatuan Peladang ini akan merupakan satu Persatuan yang kuat, yang kokoh bagi perengkat kebangsaan kita. Dan nanti akan ada-lah orang², saudara² kita daripada Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang telah melawat Filipina baharu² ini atau Taiwan, akan menyatakan bahawa di-negeri² itu telah mempunyai Persatuan Peladang bagi perengkat wilayah, bagi perengkat negeri², bagi perengkat kebangsaan-nya, sa-hingga mereka telah dapat menjadikan suatu tenaga yang besar bagi meninggikan atau pun memper-tahankan dan memperkokuhkan ekonomi bagi negara mereka.

Maka tujuan ini, walau pun kata saya tadi ada-lah suatu tujuan yang baik dan patut mendapat sokongan dengan tidak ada perasaan shak-wangka di-dalam hati—baik, terutama sa-kali daripada hati Yang Berhormat daripada Besut, maka tujuan ini akan dapat kita chapai dan kita laksanakan. Hanya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau umpama-nya Persatuan Peladang ini yang di-gerakkan nanti oleh penyelia ini dapat di-tubuhkan, maka bantuan² yang hendak di-berikan oleh Kerajaan Pusat, atau pun sokongan yang hendak di-berikan oleh Kerajaan Pusat kepada petani² yang telah kehilangan mata pencharian-nya di-masa bah, hendak-lah melalui sumber², saluran² yang betul, saluran² mengikut persatuan² ini dan mengikut penyelia² yang telah di-tubuhkan itu dan mereka memberikan penjelasan bahawa jangan-lah sampai lembu punya susu sapi dapat nama. Dalam soal hendak mengatasi masalah² mala petaka national ini jangan-lah

ada orang memikirkan soal parti terlalu banyak. Dan di-kawasan saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, orang PAS pun ada, dan ada juga chawangan² PAS satu dua di-situ dan baharu² ini dia hendak membubarkan diri-nya hendak masuk UMNO-lah semua (*Ketawa*). Oleh kerana di-dalam masa ayer bah baharu² ini, mereka mendapat layanan yang 'adil daripada Kerajaan Pusat dan bukan sahaja Kerajaan Pusat, sebab negeri Perak sahaja, saya ini dari negeri Perak, Hilir Perak, belum pernah lagi Kerajaan Pusat memberi bantuan tentang ayer bah, kalau saya tidak salah. Bukan macham negeri Kelantan, yang terpaksa di-hantarkan dengan kapal terbang, dengan helicopter sa-umpamanya. Kawasan saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, belum lagi Kerajaan Pusat memberi bantuan, district, negeri kami sendiri telah beri bantuan kepada orang² dengan tidak meminta bantuan kepada Kerajaan Pusat, kalau saya tidak salah. Dan bila kami memberikan bantuan ini, kawasan Parit yang terok, itu Dato' Raja Abu Hanifah yang sudah kehilangan Dato'-nya itu bertanding di-situ dahulu dan banyak orang PAS di-sana. Begitu juga dalam kawasan saya, banyak orang PAS di-situ.

Manakala kita beri bantuan, kami tidak tanya pada dia orang, dia orang PAS atau dia orang UMNO: kita beri pada dia tiap² orang walau pun hari ini beranak dua chupak sa-orang, sehingga ada orang dapat lapan gantang, sa-puluh gantang, dengan tidak memandang dia orang PAS atau dia orang Perikatan. Sebab ini ada-lah mala petaka kebangsaan dan duit atau beras yang di-berikan ini ia-lah beras yang di-berikan oleh Kerajaan Perikatan yang 'adil kepada ra'ayat-nya, sa-kali pun ada ra'ayat itu tidak mahu mengundi dia. Jadi oleh kerana itu-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, baharu² ini, minggu sudah, saya balek ka-sana, ada pemimpin² PAS telah berjumpa saya dan meminta supaya mengishtiharkan pembubaran beberapa chawangan PAS dalam kawasan saya—(AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: *Betul*)—(*Ketawa*).

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mengharapkan kepada Menteri Yang Berhormat yang sekarang ini telah di-

pileh menjadi Menteri yang banyak pengalaman-nya dalam soal pertanian dan telah lama bekerja dalam kawasan saya, Hilir Perak, dan kawasan Sungai Manik dan Labu Kubong, sekarang ini maseh di-tenggelami ayer. Ini akibat orang² yang menjual macham² fitnah-nya, kami menerima akibat di-Hilir Perak ini sedikit², maka saya harap mereka dapat di-pulehkan dengan melalui Persatuan² Peladang. Dan kalau Bill ini kita luluskan maka Persatuan² Peladang di-kawasan saya itu pun ada juga banyak Persatuan Peladang, tetapi dengan ada pengawalan terhadap persatuan itu, mereka akan dapat memberikan jasa dan khidmat kepada diri mereka sendiri bagi memulehkan penghidupan baharu. Terima kaseh.

Dato' Mustapha bin Haji Abdul Jabar (Sabak Bernam): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ucapkan terima kaseh. Saya berdiri bersama² menyokong Rang Undang² ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dan saya menguchapkan sa-tinggi² terima kaseh kepada Menteri yang berkenaan, kerana dapat mengemukakan Undang² Persatuan Peladang yang saya fikir sa-patut-nya Undang² yang sa-rupa ini dapat di-adakan lebeh dahulu daripada ini. Tetapi, walau bagaimana pun, saya merasa belum-lah begitu terlambat bagi mengadakan Undang² Persatuan Peladang ini. Sa-bagaimana kita sedia ma'alum, sa-buah negara sa-bagai Malaysia ini, ia-itu negara pertanian, memang-lah sangat mustahak kita mengadakan Persatuan Peladang yang sa-rupa ini, supaya sentiasa mendapat perhatian dan galakan serta arahan daripada Kerajaan untuk melateh dan memimpin ra'ayat supaya dapat berdiri di-atas kaki-nya sendiri.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-sini saya suka menarek perhatian Dewan ini, berhubung dengan tujuan² yang telah di-kemukakan di-dalam Rang Undang² ini. Di-antara-nya ia-lah melateh pemuda² untuk memajukan pertanian dan juga di-dalam bahagian menternak binatang².

Sa-belum undang² ini di-adakan dahulu, saya dapat tahu, banyak di-antara pemuda² yang telah di-hantar berlateh di-dalam pertanian dan begitu

juga di-dalam ternakan, tetapi oleh kerana pada masa itu tidak lagi ada Persatuan Peladang yang terator sabagaimana yang akan di-buat oleh Kerajaan yang di-kemukakan pada hari ini, saya dapati pemuda² itu apabila pergi berlateh dan balek daripada berlateh, mereka² itu tidak dapat berkhidmat kepada masharakat. Hanya mereka pergi berlateh sahaja, tetapi balek tidak akan dapat menyibarkan ilmu pengetahuan apa yang di-perolehi daripada latehan² mereka itu, disebabkan mereka itu tidak di-tunjok oleh Persatuan² Peladang. Jadi oleh kerana itu, di-dalam tujuan ini, saya berharap di-masa yang akan datang, apabila kita hendak menghantarkan pemuda² untuk di-lateh di-dalam segi pertanian atau pun perternakan, saya harap supaya dapat di-tunjok oleh Persatuan² ini dan apabila mereka itu balek akan dapat memberi ilmu pengetahuan kepada Persatuan² ini. Jadi, ini baharu-lah kena pada tujuan dan maksud Kerajaan supaya satu² latehan yang di-adakan oleh Kerajaan itu memberi faedah dan kesan yang baik kepada masharakat peladang.

Yang kedua-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berhubung dengan tujuan (c) ia-itu membantu pada menjalankan perkara mempamerkan hasil² pertanian. Ini juga kita dapat tahu Kerajaan telah menchurahkan beberapa banyak wang bagi mengadakan pertunjukan hasil pertanian daripada petani² di-merata² daerah yang ada kawasan pertanian di-dalam negeri ini. Tetapi apa yang telah kita ketahui di-masa yang lampau apabila sampai masa-nya pertunjukan pertanian akan di-adakan di-daerah² atau pun di-peringkat negeri, maka kebanyakan kita dapati petani² ini pergi di-market² untuk membeli barang², sayor²an dan sabagai-nya bagi di-pertandingkan di-dalam pertunjukan² ini. Ini ada-lah sangat² tidak di-kehendaki dan keluar daripada tujuan Kerajaan bagi menggalakkan pertunjukan² dan pameran² pertanian ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dengan adanya Persatuan ini, maka saya mempunyai kepercayaan persatuan ini akan dapat mengawal, mithal-nya, kita akan

mengadakan pertunjukan pertanian maka hendak-lah kita hadkan kepada ahli² persatuan² ini sahaja yang akan di-benarkan untuk mengambil bahagian dan barang² yang akan di-pertunjukkan itu supaya benar² hasil daripada pertanian mereka itu sendiri.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, lagi satu di-sini berhubung dengan kemudahan bagi memproses hasil² pertanian. Hasil pertanian yang saya maksudkan barangkali termasuk juga penanam² kelapa. Di-sini saya suka mencheritakan sedikit bagaimana petani² di-dalam kebun² kelapa chuba mengusahakan dan membuat proses bagi menjadikan kelapa² kering, mendirikan salai² kelapa di-kampung². Tetapi malang-nya tidak begitu lama umur-nya petani² ini mengadakan salai² itu di-sebabkan tidak mendapat sokongan daripada petani² sendiri ya'ani mereka² lebih suka menjual kepada orang²-tengah atau pun kepada kaum² modal yang mendirikan salai kelapa di-kampung² itu. Dengan ada-nya Persatuan Peladang ini saya berpendapat maka orang² tani yang dapat mendirikan salai² kelapa itu supaya mendapat sokongan daripada ahli² persatuan-nya sendiri dan tidak akan menjual kepada orang²-tengah atau pun taukeh² kelapa yang ada pada masa ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam tujuan bagi kemudahan atau pun menggalakkan tabong² wang, ini ada-lah satu perkara yang sangat mustahak supaya petani² ini dapat di-galakkan bagi berjimat chermat bagi mengadakan tabong kewangan-nya sendiri. Dengan adanya persatuan ini saya berharap persatuan ini juga akan dapat menggalakkan bagi mengadakan pertandingan² kepada ahli² Persatuan Peladang ini menyimpan wang, di-adakan pertandingan pada tiap² tahun, persatuan mana-kah yang lebih banyak dapat menjimat atau menyimpan wang-nya untuk kemajuan ahli²-nya sendiri. Ini satu galakan yang sangat² baik.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-lain daripada itu, saya suka-lah mengshorkan kepada Yang Berhormat Menteri ini di-dalam persatuan ini juga, kalau boleh, kita memasokkan pegawai² yang

berkenaan dengan kemajuan peladang ini, umpama-nya, Pegawai² Jabatan Parit dan Taliayer, Pegawai² Sharikat Kerjasama, Pegawai² FAMA yang bersangkutan dengan hal ehwal peladang ini supaya dapat bersama² hadhir apabila di-kehendaki. Kerana kedudukan petani² atau pun ahli² peladang ini sentiasa bersangkutan di-antara satu jabatan dengan jabatan² yang lain yang bersangkutan dengan masalah² pertanian. Jadi oleh kerana itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong penoh Rang Undang² yang di-kemukakan ini untuk di-luluskan.

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

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: (*Kapada Tuan Haji Abu Bakar*): Biar saya beri peluang kepada Ahli² yang belum berchakap, kemudian saya akan beri peluang kepada Yang Berhormat.

Siapa tadi yang bangun yang belum berchakap lagi?

Tuan Haji Mokhtar bin Haji Ismail (Perlis Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun mengalu²kan Rang Undang² Persatuan Peladang ini kerana. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ada-lah mewakili satu negeri yang paling luas sa-kali mengeluarkan hasil² pertanian ia-itu padi beras. Oleh yang demikian sangat-lah perlu dan mustahak-nya bagi saya memberi sokongan penoh kepada Rang Undang² ini.

Sungoh pun di-masa² yang telah lalu ada di-tubuhkan Persatuan Peladang di-merata² negeri dalam negara kita ini, khas-nya negeri Perlis, tetapi oleh kerana kita tidak mempunyai kuasa yang ketat bagi mengawal hal² Persatuan Peladang itu, maka banyak-lah perkara² yang tidak di-ingini telah berbangkit terutama sa-kali berkenaan dengan ahli² siapa-kah yang berhak menjadi ahli² persatuan peladang itu. Di-masa² yang telah lalu—orang yang berhak menjadi ahli persatuan peladang itu tidak di-tentukan. Umpama-nya dalam negeri Perlis ada guru² yang menjadi ahli persatuan peladang dan ada juga orang perniagaan yang men-

jadi ahli persatuan peladang dan sa-bagai-nya. Maka orang² ini kebanyakannya menchari kesempatan dan menchari keuntongan di-dalam penubuhan Persatuan Peladang.

Umpama-nya sedikit masa yang telah lalu telah berbangkit dalam negeri Perlis berkenaan dengan pembahagian baja. Pada hal baja itu ada-lah hak kepunyaan peladang². Tetapi banyak-lah baja² itu yang tidak sampai tangan peladang². Bagitu juga berkenaan membajak tanah, umpama-nya, Kerajaan Negeri dan Kerajaan Pusat telah menyediakan tractor² bagi kemudahan² ahli persatuan peladang². Tetapi apa yang telah berlaku, ada orang² yang chuba hendak menchari kesempatan menggunakan pembajak², tractor² itu dan menyewakan kepada orang² yang bukan daripada ahli persatuan peladang. Jadi dengan sebab ini-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyambut baik Rang Undang² ini dan sa-bagaimana yang telah di-terangkan oleh sahabat saya daripada Sabak Bernam, saya menyokong penoh-lah supaya di-dalam masa kita melaksanakan atau menjalankan satu² tugas dalam kemajuan Persatuan Peladang ini, maka hendak-lah pegawai² saperti dari Jabatan Parit dan Taliayer dan juga Sharikat Kerjasama dan lain²-nya hendak-lah memberi sumbangan yang besar di-dalam memajukan Persatuan Peladang ini.

Sa-bahagian besar dalam kemajuan peladang ini ada-lah berkehendakkan kapada wang, dan oleh sebab itu, saya tidak tahu-lah ada-kah Persatuan Peladang ini dapat menjadi agency atau wakil² daripada penjual², umpama-nya, baja—dapat-kah Persatuan Peladang ini mengambil peranan bersama menjadi wakil untuk menjual baja² dan sa-bagai-nya bagi keperluan peladang. Dan jika ada, saya menguchapkan ber-banyak terima kaseh dan sa-kira-nya jika tidak ada, saya harap Menteri Pertanian dapat memberi pertimbangan supaya Persatuan Peladang ini dapat menjadi wakil², saperti baja dan sa-bagai-nya yang mana memberi kepentingan kepada peladang².

Dan pada akhir-nya saya merayu sa-kali lagi kepada Menteri yang berkenaan bahawa di-dalam negeri Perlis, sungguh pun banjir yang baharu ini tidak-lah begitu banyak memberi kerosakan kepada jiwa dan rumah-tangga, tetapi bagi peladang² atau petani² banyak-lah juga yang telah menderita, dan oleh sebab itu saya merayu-lah kepada Menteri yang berkenaan supaya mengambil satu tindakan untuk memberi bantuan kepada mereka² yang telah mengalami banjir itu.

Dan yang akhir sa-kali, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka-lah mengshorkan juga, bahawa ini satu Rang Undang², ia-itu Rang Undang² Persatuan Peladang, tetapi saya meminta-lah kepada Menteri yang berkenaan supaya memikirkan juga bagaimana supaya dapat kita mengawal nelayan² seperti mengadakan undang² *Fisheries Association* sa-bagaimana undang² Persatuan Peladang ini. Dengan ini saya rasa dapat-lah memberi kemudahan dan keuntongan yang besar kepada nelayan².

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid (Seberang Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun untuk mengalu²kan Rang Undang² Persatuan Peladang dan menyokong dengan sa-penoh²-nya di-atas Rang Undang² ini.

Sa-bagaimana kita tahu bahawa Persatuan Peladang di-dalam negara kita ini bukan-lah baharu sahaja, bahkan telah pun berjalan semenjak tahun 1961. Tetapi Undang² yang ada sekarang ini tidak begitu luas, yang membolehkan peladang² menjalankan urusan yang lebih luas daripada yang ada sekarang ini, hanya Undang² itu di-jadikan sa-bagai satu Undang² mengenai perkumpulan sahaja. Maka dengan Undang² yang baharu ini, maka terbuka-lah peluang yang chemerlang bagi peladang² untuk memperbaiki kedudukan kehidupan mereka itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada-lah Rang Undang² ini di-buat dengan desakan dan rayuan daripada Persatuan² Peladang daripada seluruh negara kita dan juga wakil² daripada Persatuan Peladang di-dalam negeri ini telah pun di-beri peluang untuk melawat sa-buah negara yang maju, ia-itu negara Taiwan,

pada tahun yang lalu—dengan lawatan sambil belajar dan dengan melihat dengan mata sendiri, maka dapat-lah pelajaran² yang amat berguna bagi memajukan Persatuan Peladang dalam negara kita ini.

Bagaimana kita tahu, negara Taiwan ada-lah sa-buah negara yang kecil sa-besar Pahang sahaja, tetapi penduduk²-nya mempunyai 12 juta orang manusia. Pergerakan Persatuan Peladang di-sana cukup maju sa-hinggakan kehidupan petani² di-sana, ada mempunyai, hitong panjang, satu keluarga 2½ ekar, mendapat hasil atau pendapatan tidak kurang daripada \$250 sa-bulan. Dan mereka berusaha dengan sungguh² untuk menanamkan sa-kurang²-nya empat jenis tanaman dalam tanah yang mereka punya² itu sa-luas 2½ ekar. Kita telah pun dapat melihat bagaimana baik-nya pemasaran hasil² pertanian, bagaimana pertanian mereka itu dan juga memberi bermacam² bantuan kepada Persatuan² Peladang. Jadi saya harap dengan terlaksana-nya Rang Undang² ini, maka dapat-lah Kerajaan mengambil perhatian dan memberi apa juga bantuan yang mustahak kepada Persatuan Peladang.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, mengenai nasib peladang ini kebanyakan-nya tinggal di-luar bandar, masalah² yang di-hadapi ada-lah terlampau banyak. Di-harapkan dengan terlaksana-nya Rang Undang² ini, maka dapat-lah diperbaiki sedikit demi sedikit. Di-antara masalah² yang di-hadapi oleh peladang² atau petani² kita, yang pertama bahan² keluaran hasil pertanian mereka itu, manakala mereka hendak jual, di-tindas dan di-beri harga yang tidak berpatutan.

Yang kedua, petani² kita khas-nya pesawah² padi, tidak mempunyai tanah-nya sendiri—mengikut perangkaan, 60% daripada pesawah² kita menyewa tanah daripada tuan² punya tanah.

Yang ketiga, mengenai kehidupan mereka itu yang tidak-lah begitu baik jika di-bandingkan dengan kehidupan orang² yang lain.

Juga, mengenai harga padi—di-negara Taiwan, Persatuan Peladang Peringkat

Persekutuan akan mengadakan perundingan dengan pihak Kementerian menetapkan harga padi. Saya harap dengan terlaksana-nya Undang² ini dapat di-adakan perundingan, tiap² masa padi na' masak dengan pihak Persatuan Peladang Peringkat Persekutuan supaya menentukan harga padi yang akan di-jualkan oleh peladang².

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam keseluruhan-nya yang saya lihat Rang Undang² ini, ada dua perkara yang saya ingin menegor Yang Berhormat Menteri supaya dapat perhatian-nya. Yang pertama, ia-lah mengenai Section 10 (c) di-sini menyebutkan "memeriksa dan menyelia kegiatan² Persatuan² Peladang kawasan dalam negeri itu". Jadi dengan tertulis-nya (c) ini bermakna bahawa Penyelia chuma dapat mengawasi atau menasehatkan Persatuan² Peladang dalam negeri, ia-itu peringkat mukim sahaja. Maka saya berharap supaya Yang Berhormat Menteri akan membuat satu pindaan yang saya mengshorkan dan di-tambahkan dengan perkataan "dan Persekutuan Peladang Negeri" di-hujung itu. Maka dapat-lah penyelia itu, mengawasi dan menasehatkan Persatuan Peladang peringkat negeri.

Yang kedua ia-lah Section 12 (i). Di-sini ada di-sebutkan tiap² satu Persatuan Peladang kawasan Negeri dan Persekutuan hendak-lah di-kelelai oleh satu Lembaga Pengarah yang di-pilih pada meshuarat agong tiap² kesatuan itu sa-kali tiap² satu tahun. Jadi jika dalam sa-buah negeri itu ada 200 Persatuan Peladang, kira-nya di-adakan Meshuarat Agong sa-tahun sa-kali, maka akan membebankan kerja² kepada penyelia, juga pegawai² yang berkenaan untuk menghadziri meshuarat² agong, juga orang² yang di-lantek menjadi pengarah ini chuma dapat tempoh sa-lama satu tahun sahaja untuk menjalankan tugas mereka itu, harus mereka tidak dapat menjalankan dengan sa-penoh-nya. Dari itu saya . .

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: Sudah pukul 12.00—meshuarat ini di-tanggohkan hingga pukul 4.00 petang ini.

Sitting suspended at 12 noon.

Sitting resumed at 4.00 p.m.

(Mr (Deputy) Speaker in the Chair)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

(Motion)

The Minister of Lands and Mines (Tuan Abdul Rahman bin Ya'kub): Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move under Standing Order 15 (2),

That the House do now proceed forthwith to the consideration of Item 16 on the Order Paper for today.

The Assistant Minister of Culture, Youth and Sports (Engku Muhsein bin Abdul Kadir): Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

Question put and agreed to.

Resolved,

That the House do proceed forthwith to the consideration of Item 16 on the Order Paper for today.

BILL

THE SUPPLY (1967) BILL

Second Reading

Order read for resumption of debate on Question, "That the Bill be now read a second time" (26th January, 1967).

The Prime Minister: Mr Speaker, Sir, it is normal in this Budget session for Honourable Members to talk on almost anything and everything under the sun. Some talk more than others and talk in anyway they like. They all take advantage of the privilege accorded to them by this House, and I must say in these last few days they have made the best use of it. Honourable Members from the Opposition have much to say about the Government, rightly or wrongly, it is of no concern to them how they say it, so long as they can attack this Government—at times to ridicule it and to hold this Government in contempt. It is immaterial to them how much harm can come out of what they say; and after having said everything they want to say they then turn round and ask; "Is there a democracy in this country?"

This is often heard in this House. Although they do not say it in so many words, at least, that is the deduction which we all understand. For me and my Colleagues, I say, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. If the Government is as bad as the Opposition claim it to be, then we would not have Malaysia as it is today—a happy, prosperous, and good country to live in and, perhaps, second to none. We have had trouble, no doubt. Trouble from without and trouble from within by the enemies, who accept orders from outside, or who owe allegiance to powers from outside. One thing which this Government is anxious about is the maintenance of peace, of law and order in this country and which the Government will try to uphold at all cost. This is a country which, unlike others, has people of all racial origins, who have come here to make a home of this country, and those who have acquired Malaysia citizenship, it can be said, would not want to return to their country of origin; and those who have gone back to their country of origin, you will find that very soon they start to make their way back here, because the way of life they lead here and the way of life their country of origin has is entirely different from what we are used to; and so as I said, and it has been said often enough, that this is a good country. Many people from outside have tried to make their way here, because they have heard what this country can offer them. They find their way here by fair or foul means. The work of the Immigration Department as a result of that is full of applications to come here. I had to deal with this subject some time back and I found that my work was so occupied with this that I had often been unable to do other things, and I passed it to my colleague Tun Dr Ismail. The reasons given are that they have relatives here, their grandfathers here, or ex-husbands here, and they all want to come here. So, we can see from this that the reputation which this country enjoyed abroad, particularly among the Asian countries, is pretty good.

Now, if the Malaysian Government is as bad as the Opposition have tried

to make it out to be, there would have been no such influx of people, who want to come to this country. When we agreed on Independence for our country, the main political parties then in existence and the Alliance Party gave a lot of thought and planning as to what shape our Independence should take, because of the special position which we enjoy, i.e., of a multi-racial society in this country. We worked hard to find a Constitution that would be agreeable to all, and we obtained the help of people, jurists, from outside to come here to help draft our Constitution; and in doing so they took a lot of trouble to seek the opinions and views of almost everybody and anybody that matter in this country—all associations, all organisations, all political bodies, and tradesmen, politicians alike were asked what sort of Independence we would have. It was only after hearing the views and opinions of all these bodies of responsible people that the Constitution was finally drafted and passed, not in this Parliament but in the Legislative Council, which we have at that time.

The Council passed this Constitution unanimously, and one of the provisions of the Constitution is that this nation shall have a language, an official language, of its own. It is written therein that the National language shall be the Malay language and shall be in such script as Parliament may by law provide, provided that no person shall be prohibited or prevented from using (otherwise than for official purposes) or from teaching or learning, any other language, and nothing shall prejudice the right of the Central Government, or of any State Government, to preserve and sustain the use and study of the language of any community in the Federation. Parliament can also provide the use of English in both Houses and the Government can also allow, even after a period of 10 years, Bills and Acts of Parliament to be written in English, and also proceedings in English in the Supreme Court. It is the intention of this Government to implement Malay as the National language of this country and at the same time to allow the liberal use of

other languages and to use English for some years to come both in this Parliament, in the institutions of learning, in the Courts and other places such as provided, or the intention of our Constitution, under Article 152 of our Constitution. It is not the intention, never has it been the intention of this Government to prevent other people from using their own language. It is obvious to all that that is not the intention of the Government, because the Government spend millions of dollars in trying to set up schools of other languages and pay for the running of these schools.

The policy of this Government in regard to the language issue is a just and a fair one. When I spoke at the Sesquicentenary Celebration of my old school, the Penang Free School, on October 21st, 1966, I said that a nation must be built on a firm foundation, as good as that of this school, and that no foundation can stand, no building can stand, the country cannot stand, unless people realise what duties they own to their country, and one of your duties, I said, as boys of the oldest school, with a great tradition behind it, is to help with the implementation of the National Language.

I further stated that the other languages will not suffer, and it is not, I said, in the interest of the Government to allow the other languages to suffer. The Government may even allow more liberal use of other languages as provided by our Constitution and provided, too, that the right attitude is taken by all sensible citizens of this country. It is useless to shout, to scream and to intimidate the Government, because that will not help. It will only lead to trouble, which we as responsible people of this country and leaders of this country must try and avoid or prevent at all costs. The Government will continue to be fair and not unreasonable, but it will not be soft or be easily intimidated.

The Honourable Member for Ipoh in his speech suggested that this Government had not given thought to the demands of the Tamil and the Chinese

chauvinists—he did not say “chauvinists”, he said “people”—for more liberal use of their languages. It was because of this, he said, that Mr Lim Lian Geok was deprived of his citizenship. He even insinuated that the guilds and the associations had appointed a committee to send a memorandum to me but that they received no reply. The case of Mr Lim Lian Geok, I must explain, is so different from what the Honourable Member tried to make out. He had not asked for the liberal use of the Chinese language. What he had asked for is a contravention of our Constitution—by providing that Chinese should be one of the official languages of this country. And so, also, with regard to the demands—so-called—by the Chinese guilds and the Indian and Tamil language associations. They had mentioned nothing new in their memorandum—nothing in there—which requires my meeting with them. But I did instruct my officials to reply to the effect that I see nothing useful in meeting them and trying to work out this problem, because there is no problem in this as the Constitution has made it quite clear and they were among those who had agreed to the Constitution. These people are aware of this provision. As I said, they were consulted earlier on, and the Honourable Member for Ipoh, who brought up this subject, was one of those who had agreed without any comment on this particular provision of the Constitution, as he was at that time a member of the Alliance and won his seat in Ipoh on the Alliance ticket. He did not retire, or resign, because of any issue with the Alliance; he resigned because he demanded more seats for his Party which the Alliance cannot afford to give. So, followed some members of the Opposition—not the Labour Member in front of me here—who were all members of the Alliance before; they found no fault with the Alliance policy, and the only reason they left was because of their unreasonable demand for seats. Now, they have come forward and I am ashamed that they stood here in this House as well as outside this House attacking the Alliance policy in the matter of the National language, when they knew

fully well that this language issue never at any moment threatened the existence of the languages of the others.

The whole country has quietened down, in fact, over this issue, it was brought up some time back by certain members of the Chambers of Commerce and certain members of the Education Committee, but when I had occasion to explain the matter, they had all accepted the fact that there is no threat to their languages, and they have kept quiet. But this Honourable Member had brought it up again in this House, and brought it up in such a way that his intention was obvious to all—that he wanted to stir up the trouble again because peace, according perhaps to him is detrimental to the interests of his party. If there is trouble breaking out here and there, I think he would have the opportunity to exploit this further which, according to him, might bring benefit to his particular Party.

We have seen, or at least we have heard, how things happened over the language issue in Ceylon in 1960, when the Tamil-speaking people demanded that Tamil should be made one of the official languages of the country—and that is in contravention of the Constitution of Ceylon. We have all heard of the result of this trouble—so much sufferings in the country, so much killings, so much injuries caused to the people, and destruction of properties as well. All these happenings were of such a nature that to this day the people, who have suffered, cannot forget the incidents and the horror that it brought about. Now, this Honourable Member, whose country of origin is Ceylon, wanted to bring up this issue here, wanting the same thing, perhaps, to happen here as it happened in Ceylon. I will remind this Honourable Member that as a result of the demand, as a result of the trouble that broke out in Ceylon, the Ceylon Government was forced to introduce emergency measures, the result of which caused a lot of heartache, a lot of pain, to the people of Ceylon, and the result of it is that in the end Singhalese was accepted as the national language of Ceylon, and Tamil was made or was allowed to be used liberally. That was the terms of

the Constitution of Ceylon and the term of the Constitution was that we can see in spite of all trouble, was enforced in that State or in that country.

The last thing this Government wants to do is to introduce any emergency measures of the nature which they had in Ceylon. We knew fully well that the language issue is not a problem with all of us because, unlike Ceylon, most of the people in this country speak Malay as a means of communication in the streets, in the bazaar, between people of different races—those who are not educated in the English language. It was quite different in Ceylon, where Singhalese was not widely spoken by the non-Singhalese people.

As I have said, while we intend to implement Malay as the national or Malaysian language, as official language, we will still allow the use of English as provided for by the Constitution, and we will also allow the liberal use, except for official purposes, as mentioned in the Constitution, or stated in the Constitution, of other languages. Nothing would be lost. Everybody accepts this matter, and peace in this country will be assured. So, I ask the people, responsible politicians, to think and think clearly, the impact their irresponsible utterances would have on the minds of some of the people who have, as I said, little responsibility in themselves, who are here to make trouble, and who are here to try and exploit the situation to break up this country of ours.

Another matter which the Honourable Member for Ipoh has brought up is the question of elections in Sarawak. I would like to say that Sarawak joined Malaysia on their own accord and desire, not only implied but expressed in terms which are clear to all—that they wanted to join Malaysia because they wanted to be free and independent. Teams were sent from Britain to assess their views to find out for certain from every person in that State whether they really wanted to be in Malaysia. After that, a team from the United Nations, a special team from the United Nations, came here

to try and find out, in order to satisfy the wishes of President Soekarno and President Macapagal, the desires of the peoples in this country. Though we could easily have said that it is none of their business whether those people wanted to join us or remain with us in Malaysia or leave us, nevertheless we wanted to prove to the world that the people of Sarawak joined us of their own accord, in order to be free and independent people, as the people of Malaysia are. And nothing has been done by us either to indicate to them, or to show them, that we want to be their bosses, their masters, or that we want to enslave them. They have Members of Parliament, on a proportion much bigger than any State in this country. They have members in the Cabinet, who can express themselves in any way they like; they are free to talk and to bring up matters, which they feel they are dissatisfied with. We have never tried to curb their utterances in this House, or in the Cabinet. Nevertheless, the Honourable Member has suggested that we are trying to keep Sarawak in Malaysia against their will. I say here that if the Sarawak people want their way of life, they are free to have their own way of life. We have never tried to interfere with them. We have officers, Federal Officers, in that State working in order to carry out the various projects, which we have for the betterment of the people of Sarawak. It is not for our own purpose that we have this development in Sarawak; it is but for the good and benefit of the Sarawak people. We are spending millions of dollars on Sarawak in order to give them a life which we consider is something like the life which we enjoy here. We knew fully well that when they were living in servitude as subjects of Britain, they never had been really served, they never had roads, they never had proper education, they never had anything which by right they deserved to have; and when they joined us and became independent with us and treated as our brothers, the first thing we did was to make provision in order to give them something which they never had before.

Now, the trouble which has arisen in Sarawak is just because of a few leaders they have there—leaders who are corrupt, leaders who are irresponsible, leaders who have never attended to the needs of the people, but who serve themselves in any way they can, in every way they can. All the Sarawak people knew about it. There is no need for me to repeat it in this House, although I am privileged to say what I want to say, but I do not want to say it, because it is a well-known fact that those leaders in whom they entrusted the running of the State had not run the State the way it should have been run, but rather run it to enrich themselves. That is where the trouble started. If they want to have their election, they can have their election on the day and time fixed for such election. It is not the intention of this Government to delay this election. What we say is that, if they choose such leaders who have proved themselves incapable and corrupt to lead that country, they cannot expect much help from the Central Government.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification—Since the Honourable Prime Minister has taken great pains to emphasise the corruption, the rot, that exists amongst the quondam members of the Alliance Party, may I ask the Honourable Prime Minister whether these corrupt leaders, these people who served themselves, have not been members of the Alliance Party; and if so, what guarantee is there that this rot also exists not only in Sarawak but elsewhere, and what steps does the Prime Minister intend to take to excise the rotten part from the Alliance Party?

The Prime Minister: They were members of the Alliance Party, and that is why in our interest, we have taken steps to expel them from the Alliance and appoint somebody else who we know would be able to lead that State. For that matter anybody we find corrupt, or who has not been able to do his work, as he should do, it is our duty as the Party in power to remove such people—and we have done

so from time to time. The action we took in Sarawak is nothing new. We have taken the same action on the other members of the Alliance spread out throughout the length and breadth of this country. (*Interruption*). The Socialist Front is running into trouble because of this, the Socialist Front of the Penang Municipality too got into trouble because of this, and some more Socialist Front is going to get into trouble because of this (*Laughter*). It is our duty as leaders of the country to see that the people do their work and discharge their duties to the best of their ability, and in the interest of the people in this country.

The Central Government officers who are posted there in Sarawak are there to help them, and I do hope that the Sarawak people realise that they are free people, free of anybody in the rest of Malaysia, and if they want to return to a life of bondage, life of slavery, then it is up to the British Government whether they want them back; but I say it would be highly dangerous to allow the State to be independent on their own, because before they know where they are, they will find that the communists, whose organisation is the strongest in this part of Malaysia, will soon take over the State. I know those people do not realise the danger into which they have been led, and I can say to the people of Sarawak this: they are in Malaysia, they take no second place to anybody in Malaysia, and that they will remain in Malaysia; they will have all the advantages as are enjoyed by the other people of Malaysia, but they cannot have a freedom which would endanger the existence of the State, the lives and security of the people of the State.

There is another matter which was brought up in the course of the debate, and that is the question raised by the Honourable Members for Johore Tenggara and Muar Utara. I have reiterated on many occasions that the Government is not against communism as an ideology, but we are against communism, or any other "ism" for that matter when the intention or the policy of that "ism" is to carry out

aggression and to threaten the lives and security of the people of the country.

Our policy has been, all the time, for peace. In fact, our policy is a dynamic one, taking cognizance of the political changes in the world—our policy has never been static. We have not made any contact with Russians before, because the Russians were against us. We knew that there had been many conferences in Asia, in Europe, in Africa among countries which call themselves neutral countries, which bar our participation in those conferences, because it was their intention to keep out from their group any country that do not see eye to eye with them, and Malaysia has been banned by the communists from taking part in all these organisations, in all these conferences.

But today, I think, as everybody realises, the Russians are changing, or have changed to a certain extent, their policy. Their policy, as we understand it today, is a policy of co-existence with all other countries, in order to maintain peace in this world. So, when we knew that they had changed their policy of aggression—one of aggression, one of animosity to those countries, who are against them—we also naturally changed our stand, our attitude with regard to Russia, because our intention is to live at peace with the rest of the world. As a result of their change of attitude, as I mentioned to this House, a delegation from Malaysia visited Russia, and their newspapermen had come here and all through the impression had been pretty good, and we were assured that the Russian aim is to be at peace with the rest of the world. As a result of that, I do not see the reason why we should take the attitude, or take the stand, that we refuse to make friends with Russia because of the difference on ideology—as I said, ideology does not count that much, where the peace of the world matters most. A progressive country like Malaysia cannot just live by how one lived in the past. We have to keep abreast of the political trend and this attitude that we have taken in trying to make friend with countries which have been known to be communist does

not in any way reduce our prestige. As I said, having once established diplomatic relations with Russia, and if Russia shows by any act, or by any deed, that they have again reverted to the policy of aggression, there is nothing to stop us from breaking off diplomatic relations with them. This has happened many times with other countries, and it can happen, if the countries with whom we make friends suddenly decide to make enemies of us. There is no difficulty about breaking off diplomatic relations and sending those people back to their country, and they send our people back to our country. The main policy of this country is to be at peace with the world, and I hope our purpose and our intention will pay us its just reward.

Sir, that is, I think, about all that I need reply to some of the statements made in this House which affect my own particular portfolio. My colleagues have their replies ready, and I think they will reply suitably to all the points raised in the course of this debates (*Applause*).

The Minister of Labour (Tuan V. Manickavasagam): Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for Batu had raised a number of points. He suggested that the trade union movement in the country does not have confidence in the Government, or my Ministry, and that the relationship between us had steadily declined. I am not qualified to speak on the feelings of the trade union movement. I do not know whether the Honourable Member for Batu is, but I can say that despite apparent occasional differences of opinion between my Ministry and the trade union movement, we continue to have the co-operation and good relationship with the movement generally. Problems will continue to exist between us, but these should not be interpreted, as far as I am concerned, as a severance of relationship between us. Yesterday, I had discussions with the Malaysian Trade Union Congress members in my house late into the night, till midnight, and today a very cordial meeting between the Malaysian

Trade Union Congress officials and the Minister of Finance and myself. If the question whether the trade union movement has confidence in the Government, or my Ministry is to be judged by press reports, or occasional differences of opinions, however serious, I would suggest that we are on the wrong track.

The Honourable Member also raised the question of Essential Regulations. Sir, I have declared both in this House and outside, the Government will withdraw these regulations. The system of industrial relationship itself is under complete review and it should not be very long before we finalise all these matters.

Concerning I.L.O. Convention No. 87 regarding freedom of association, that is an old story the answer to which I have repeated here at least twice a year. The Government is not against the freedom of association, or the freedom of workers to organise themselves, but it cannot accept the interpretation given to certain provisions of this Convention by certain workers' group. Through experience we have had to ensure that trade unions are formed on the basis of an identifiable group interest. We cannot afford to have general omnibus unions of the type we had during the early years of the Emergency. This is inevitable and, I think, the wisest thing to do, trade unions like any other group of people of associations in this country must comply with the law concerning their registration and keeping of accounts and proper expenditure. This is, I suggest, the most important to protect the interests of the members themselves, or otherwise it is only too easy for both funds and activities to be directed to the personal interests of certain persons.

The Honourable Member drew attention to the labour laws concerning hours of work and to workmen's compensation payment. I am aware of certain deficiencies of these laws and I am now examining their provisions with a view to improvement. In fact, on workmen's compensation, we have an expert now engaged in changing the old basis of

compensation to one of social insurance against employment injury. I think that this would be a more satisfactory way of ensuring that workers, who meet with accidents, or illness, during the course of employment are adequately catered for, instead of seeking to inflate the lump sum compensation payable under the Workmen's Compensation Ordinance. As I have indicated, this matter is under review and I hope to resolve it soon.

Sir, the Honourable Member asked for the reactivation of the N.J.L.A.C. The N.J.L.A.C. is one of those bodies which has gone about its work quietly and without publicity. It is true that the full Council meets but once or twice a year at the most. It must be borne in mind, however, that the Council has three sub-committees which meet as often as desirable, and which in fact has examined all proposals for legislation for the formal approval of the Council itself. During the past month itself, one of these committees has met twice and further meetings are envisaged to clear some of the projected legislations.

Sir, coming to the Honourable Member for Ipoh, he dwelt at length on the question of fragmentation or sub-division of estates. In reply to questions of Members in this House, it has already been indicated that the Government is keeping this matter under review. In fact, the enactment of the new Land Code has made it possible for State Governments, under whose jurisdiction this matter lies, to have some control over the size and nature of sub-division of estates. Honourable Members are already aware that many of the State Governments are already invoking the powers vested in them under the Land Code to examine this question. I am aware that sub-division of estates has led to a fair amount of displacement of long established workers and, where it has been possible, my Ministry has endeavoured to ensure that this did not cause the workers and their families undue hardship. I am sure the various State Governments will not hesitate to step in decisively where a proposed sub-division is going to be done in a wanton manner.

The Honourable Member for Kelantan Hilir alleges that there is racial discrimination against the Malays in employment in mines and factories. Sir, the situation in pioneer industries in 1965 was that more than 45 per cent of the labour force in these industries were Malays. Sir, this is a reasonable ratio, and it cannot be said that there is much discrimination.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah (Kelantan Hilir): Sir, on a point of clarification, will the Honourable Minister of Labour enlighten the House about the number of Malays, who are being employed by the 1,113 tin mines scattered all over Malaysia?

Tuan V. Manickavasagam: Sir, I have just been giving the figures for pioneer industries, which the Honourable Member raised during his speech. Well, if he wants to know the number of Malays employed in mines I need notice of it. I am aware that non-pioneer industries do not always have such a balance in the racial composition of their labour force. Sir, the Government has taken every opportunity to explain to the employers the need for ensuring that employment opportunities are open to all races who constitute the Malaysian population. The Honourable Members for Kuala Trengganu Utara and Perlis Utara had also touched on this subject.

Sir, I understand the Honourable Member, to the specific question he asked, had the answer from my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Lands and Mines.

A number of Honourable Members, including the Member for Johor Tenggara, touched on legislation concerning industrial relations. Whilst I would not agree with some of their comments concerning what needs to be done, I am aware—and I have stated this quite recently—the need to review our industrial relations legislation to ensure that it is more effectively geared to the needs of our national development and is capable of more satisfactorily resolving some of the issues that have been cropping up between employers and workers. Sir, this exercise is being

given priority in my Ministry and I shall soon be discussing my proposals in the National Joint Labour Advisory Council. Thank you.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Dr Lim Swee Aun): Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for Batu and other Honourable Members, including the Honourable Member for Jitra-Padang Terap, have asked me to assure the consumers in this country that traders will not exploit them by charging more than the extent of the new taxes.

Sir, this has become an annual task for me, and I have regularly appealed to the business community not to adopt sharp practices or exploit the consumers, but in a free market economy like ours, it is the consumer who should have the last say—"he who pays the piper calls the tune". If only consumers will assert their rights and "call the tune" they should not be exploited. However, I do see the problem of the rural people, where there is only one shop in the kampong, and, added to that problem, is their indebtedness to the shopkeeper.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification—the Honourable Minister of Commerce and Industry has castigated the consumers in this country, particularly those in the urban areas, by saying that the remedy lies in their hands and that in the rural areas he concedes that there may be difficulties. May I read to him, Mr Speaker, Sir, an article that appeared in the *Berita Harian* of the 24th January, 1967; it is headlined, "Harga gula sekarang 60 sen sa-kati". I would quote just a few lines from it:

"Sejak bersidang-nya meshuarat untuk membentok Jawatan-kuasa tersebut harga beberapa jenis barang makanan telah meningkat naik lagi di-Kuala Lumpur, mithal-nya, ada pekedai² yang menjual gula dengan harga 60 sen sa-kati sedangkan harga-nya dahulu chuma 30 sen sa-kati.

Telor yang dahulu dapat di-beli dengan harga 10 sen atau 11 sen, sekarang harga-nya 14 sen atau 15 sen sa-butir.

Bahan² makanan yang lain saperti ikan, bawang merah dan sa-bagai-nya telah juga

naik harga. Sa-tengah²-nya menjadi sekali ganda lebih mahal.

Dr Lim Swee Aun: Sir, I am aware of that newspaper report and I have read it this morning. I have already taken up the matter, but I cannot see any reason why the price of sugar in Kuala Lumpur should be sixty cents a kati. That is why I am getting it checked. Now, in the whole of Malaya today there are at least 13,000 tons of sugar in the hands of the dealers and in the Kuala Lumpur region there are more than 3,000 tons. So, if one shopkeeper should charge sixty cents, there is no reason for that consumer to buy it at that shop. That is why, Sir, I have set up this Committee to advise me on both the short and the long term measures that can be taken to reduce, if not to stop, this sort of exploitation. As Honourable Members are aware, members of this Committee have been drawn from a very wide cross-section of our community and includes a Professor of Economics from the University, representatives from the Consumers' Association, representatives from the Press who have been making all these reports, and also the dealers, the traders, the retailers and, of course, the Government; and I have even decided to invite representatives from the trade unions. I am certainly very anxious and look forward to their recommendations.

The Honourable Member for Batu has made a very unfair statement by saying that pioneer industries are mostly "packaging" in nature and not manufacturing. Sir, whilst I am prepared to concede that every factory packs its finished goods for sale, they are not given pioneer status merely because they pack their finished goods. No factory has been given pioneer status for pure assembly or pure packaging. Pioneer status is given if there is some degree of manufacturing at the beginning, leading to progressive manufacture later on. Surely, the Honourable Member cannot say that the much maligned Malayan Dunlop Factory is a packaging industry, nor can he say the same of Alcan Malaysia which imports aluminium ingots and

rolls them into sheets. The textile factories import raw cotton, spin it into yarn, weave into cloth and then dye and print. Container industries import steel plates and convert them into cans and drums. The plastic industry imports polyvinyl-chloride crystals for injection-moulding of plastic goods. Chemical factories produce complex compounds out of raw materials. For example, Ajinomoto (Malaysia) Ltd. manufactures monosodium glutamate out of starch flour; Malayan Acids makes Sulphuric acid from Sulphan; the Chemical Company of Malaysia makes fertiliser out ammonia produced by Esso, which is refining crude oil into high octane petroleum. Sir, I can go on describing the manufacturing process of all the one-hundred and more pioneer factories and prove that they are not packaging in nature.

The Honourable Member for Batu has also charged that our industrial development has led to economic enslavement by foreign capitalists because they will not export their products due to market arrangements. Sir, this is farthest from the truth. Due to our present lack of technical know-how and capital, we should instead welcome foreign joint venture to help us launch industrialisation. Many of these foreign joint venture factories have not only supplied the home market, but they have also exported their manufactured goods overseas. In 1965, pioneer companies have exported \$60 million worth of manufactured goods abroad. In 1966, Dunlop (Malaya) has exported its manufactured products worth \$5,875,000 to ten different countries. It is true that Dunlop imports synthetic rubber for the use in the manufacture of passenger car tyres, but this amounts to only 17% of the total content, as compared to 75% of synthetic rubber in the United States of America. Now, synthetic rubber is still necessary to be used in passenger car tyres in Malaya, because our consumers insist that the tyres conform to international standards. However, research is going on the use of oil-extended natural rubber

in motor car tyres, so that there will be a steady reduction in the proportion of synthetic rubber to be used in this country. But Honourable Members must take note that the heavy duty tyres for trucks, for tractors, for bulldozers and for the off-the-road vehicles made by Dunlop (Malaya) use 100% natural rubber.

On the subject of feasibility reports made by Arthur D-Little, they are not collecting dust on the shelves. The truth is that the first reports were draft reports, on which various Government Departments and Ministries concerned have made their comments. Since then, the representatives of Arthur D-Little have discussed these comments with our officials, and we are now awaiting their final report which we shall release to the general public.

I cannot agree more with the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat and Penang Utara that Penang Island is a beautiful Island and should be kept as a holiday and tourist resort. That is why, Sir, my Ministry has always allotted to the Penang Tourist Association the lion's share of the annual grant that is set aside for the Tourist Associations in the whole of Malaysia. In fact, one could almost say that without this grant the Penang Tourist Association would not even be able to pay for its existence. Even the building, in which it has just moved in, was bought from funds given by the Central Government. It has always been and will always be my Ministry's policy to expand the tourist trade in Penang. However, we must not be too carried away by the beauty of Penang Island. There are many beautiful islands in the world situated close to the international tourist markets—that is the importance. The Caribbean Islands are close to the Eastern American tourist market; the Hawaiian Islands are close to the Western American tourist market; Capri serves Europe. We should, therefore, be sober and realistic. Whilst, it is true that Penang is a very beautiful island with lovely beaches and unique temples, it is quite far away from the world's tourist markets, but this does

not mean that tourism cannot be expanded in Penang. It can, but we cannot expect it to be a roaring success so much so that the whole economy of Penang can be wholly dependent upon tourism as is the case in the islands of Caribbeans, Hawaii and Capri.

The Honourable Member for Dato Kramat has suggested several alternatives to boost the economy of Penang. I must congratulate him for his courage when he suggested, as one of these alternatives, that protective tariff on goods made in Malaysia should be extended to the Penang Island. These are his exact words, quoted verbatim—"protective tariff on goods made in Malaysia should be extended to the Penang Island". Sir, a few years ago, when the Rueff Report was published, the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat and his associates in the Penang Socialist Front, now the Labour Party, were loud in their protests. As loyal citizens of Penang Island, dedicated to its free port status, they would not allow any protective duty to be imposed on the people of Penang. They urged all the people of Penang to resist any such move, because they claimed that the cost of living in Penang would arise and the famous shirts would cost the Penang people more by a dollar a piece. I, therefore, congratulate him on his courage for this complete about turn on the economic policy of Penang. I only hope he will be able to persuade the diethards in the Labour Party of Penang that this change of attitude is vital and necessary for the good of the people of Penang.

What the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat has suggested is that Penang Island should retain the free port status for entrepot and tourist trade, but should also have protective duties on goods made in Malaysia extended to cover that Island. Sir, this was exactly what I said at the dinner given by the Lions at the Ambassador Hotel, Penang, on the night of the 14th of this month. The Honourable Member for Ipoh, who is also a "Lion", was also present at that

Dinner, and heard every word of what I said. One of the objects, of the Lion's Club is to serve as a forum for discussion of matters of public interest. As I was the guest speaker that night, I chose for my subject, "The Economic Development of Penang Island", a subject of great public interest to the people of Penang. My theme was that there was no reason why Penang Island should not have a degree of industrialisation and yet retain its free port status for entrepot and tourist trade. This was accurately reported in the *Straits Times* of the 16th January, 1967, but unfortunately the *Straits Echo* chose to distort what I said. Be that as it may, I am glad that there is at least one leader in the Labour Party of Penang, who has publicly stated in this House that protective tariffs on Made-in-Malaysia goods should be extended to Penang Island. He, at least, has seen the futility of burying one's head in the sand and refusing to face realities.

Since the Budget Speech by the Honourable the Minister of Finance, I have received a letter from the Printers and Paper Merchants Association of Penang stating that several thousand workers in Penang Island would soon lose their jobs. Sir, up to the beginning of this year, paper and paper board attracted import duty when imported into the Customs Area of Malaya whilst finished products of paper, that is, printed and converted paper products only attracted a low import duty of 5%. This meant that printers in the mainland had to pay duty on their raw materials and had to compete at a great disadvantage with imported printed finished goods, such as calendars, cards, letter-heads, labels and the like. But as a result of the hearing by the Tariff Advisory Board, the duties have since been changed so that the printing industry in the customs area can expand and create more employment. Imports of paper and paper board which are the raw materials for the printing industry are now imported duty free, whilst the duty on finished printed paper and paper board products, was increased

to 25%. Because Penang is outside the Principal Customs Area, this means that the many printing firms in Penang Island, employing thousands of people, have to compete on equal terms with foreign imports when entering the Malayan Customs Area. They have thus lost the privileged position they enjoyed before. The Penang printer always had the advantage over the mainland printer because of the duty free import of their raw materials of paper and paper board. If the people of Penang will accept our proposals that all finished printed paper and paper board products imported into Penang from foreign countries should also pay a protective duty of 25%, then this will be of the greatest advantage to the printers and their thousands of employees in Penang. These Penang printers would still continue to get duty free paper and paper board and gain an added advantage, in that, their finished printed products can then enter the rest of Malaysia duty free, where before, they had to pay 5% import duty. They would then compete on equal terms with the rest of the Malaysian printers against foreign printers.

The printing industry is only one of the many industries that have been affected as a result of industrialisation of Malaysia. I have explained to this House on many occasions how the soya bean sauce, the metal door, the soap, the oil, the joss-paper, the jewelleryes, the confection, the beehoon and many other factories on Penang Island have lost their business as a result of the stubbornness of the leaders of the Opposition in Penang to agree to extend protective duties to Penang Island.

The next industry will be the three shirt manufacturing factories which employ 2,000 people on Penang Island. With possible introduction of quota on exports to the United States of America, unless protection is given to these three factories on Penang Island, there can be even greater unemployment. Such protective duties on Penang

Island should not increase the cost of living there, unless they insist on buying foreign imported equivalents. The factories are already in Penang—on the Island itself—and their goods are already sold in the Penang market. Protection should not, therefore, by itself cause an increase in the price of goods made in Penang. Such duties should not affect the tourist trade or the entrepot trade. In this way, Penang Island can have a degree of industrialisation, retain their free port status for entrepot and tourist trade. I, therefore, hope the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat can persuade his colleagues in the Labour Party of Penang to accept this move to extend protective duties to Penang Island for the benefit of the people of Penang unless, of course, it is the policy of the Labour Party to create unemployment and chaos, so that they can fish in troubled waters.

Sir, the leaders of Penang should not deliberately misunderstand the good intentions of Federal Ministers when they visit that Island. Instead, they should invite us more often, so that we can widen their outlook (*Laughter*). The recent tour of the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat of Canada and the United States of America, following the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference, has, no doubt, changed his views on protective duties. I am also very glad that the Honourable Member for Tanjong has also stated in this House that he was prepared to see Penang Island integrated into the Principal Customs Area. This, you will remember, Sir, he confirmed when I asked for clarification during his speech. All I ask is that, the people of Penang, as a first step, will agree to protect the factories and industries now existing in Penang. In that way, they would have a degree of industrialisation.

Dr Lim Chong Eu (Tanjong): Mr Speaker, Sir, I think it is only fair for the Honourable Minister to further clarify: in view of the fact that yesterday he sought clarification from me: I think it is only correct that he should

state exactly what I said. I said that we were prepared to consider this question of integration into the Principal Customs Area on condition, and provided, that the Central Government on its part establishes an economic development survey commission and puts up blue-prints for the acceptance of the people of Penang for them to make it possible for this interchangeability of ideas. Sir, that I think was clearly accepted by him and I do not think it is fair for him to quote me only half-way and leave the other half forgotten.

Dr Lim Swee Aun: Mr Speaker, Sir, all that I said was, I am very happy that he is willing to consider that Penang should be integrated into the customs area whereas before he took the stand that Penang should always be a free port.

Sir, whilst it is true that the rate of growth of manufacturing last year was about 16%—a rate that is not insignificant—I am the first to admit that it is not as fast as I would have liked. Due to the present lack of technical know-how and skills and capital, we are still dependent on foreign investments to accelerate the rate of growth of industrialisation. We cannot force people to invest in manufacturing whether they be local or foreign. We can attract, we can persuade. All developing countries are competing for foreign investments so that there can be economic growth, but irresponsible statements from the Labour Party, like the nationalisation of capital made by the Honourable Member for Batu, will drive away not only foreign but also local capital. Similarly, too, with tourism, we cannot force tourists to visit Penang however beautiful it might be. We can induce, we can tempt, but who will come again when the Labour Party of Penang demonstrates in the streets, carrying “Go Home Yankee” posters? It is the rich American tourists that Penang hopes to attract, and yet the Labour Party of Penang carries placards and shouts, “Go Home Yankee”. Such acts attract headlines in the newspapers of the

world. Will this attract foreign tourists to Penang? I have my doubts in the sincerity of the Labour Party in wanting to promote tourism or even industrialisation.

The Honourable Member for Perlis Utara and some other Honourable Members continue to state that pioneer factories are not sincere in giving job opportunities to the *bumiputras*. This has been repeated again and again in this House and I have replied to this many a time. Sir, may I invite the Honourable gentlemen and all other Honourable Members to visit our pioneer factories and count for themselves the number of *bumiputras* employed, from the directors right down to the unskilled labourers. They will find that some factories employ almost 95% of their staff from amongst the Malays whilst, of course, there are also others that employ around 30% and less. But the important thing is, what is the average? And the average is that there are 45.5% of *bumiputras* employed in the total staff of 89 pioneer companies, that is to say, 4,721 Malays as against 5,661 non-Malays out of a total of 10,382 employees. These figures have been checked regularly by the Ministry of Labour and my Ministry.

The Honourable Member for Krian Darat complained that there are still many “Made in Singapore” goods flowing into Eastern Malaysia. Sir, this is perfectly true and it is being looked into by the Tariff Advisory Board, whose duty is to gradually enlarge the Malaysian Common Customs Union. In fact some of the items of goods mentioned by the Honourable Member are now the subject of enquiry by the Tariff Advisory Board. His other suggestion, that more shipping lines for intra-Malaysian trade should be established so as to reduce freight charges, has already been looked into. The problem facing any shipping line is the lack of volume of goods exported from Eastern Malaysia to Western Malaysia. The introduction of containers in ships might reduce the cost of freight.

The Honourable Member for Perlis Utara suggested that, to encourage the

fuller use of the National language, the Government should impose a "Chukai Bahasa" or a "Language Tax" on all shops that have signboards written in a language other than the National language, i.e., if the signboard is written in the National language it would be exempted from taxation, but if written in another language, e.g., Chinese, Tamil or English, a "Language Tax" should then be paid. Sir, I fully support the intention of encouraging the fuller use of the National language—I am sure all non-Malays support that. But I have my doubts if this method is the right method. From the constitutional angle, a case can be made out that "Chukai Bahasa" or "Language Tax" does not conform to the letter, if not to the spirit, of the Constitution. Article 152 (1) of the Constitution states that whilst the Malay language shall be the National language no person shall be prohibited or prevented from using (other than for official purposes) or for teaching or learning, any other language. This means that, except for official purposes, no law can prohibit or prevent any person from using any language he likes, whether it be Chinese, Tamil or English. I submit that the writing of a signboard of a shop cannot be said to be "an official purpose". A Language Tax which exempts the National language but taxes other languages can be said to be aimed at prohibiting, or preventing the use of the other languages, and thus does not conform to the spirit, if not to the letter, of the Constitution. Further, in Article 8 (2) of the Constitution, it states that no law shall discriminate against citizens on the ground of religion, race, descent or place of birth. A case, too, can be made out that "Chukai Bahasa" is discriminatory on the grounds of race, because a Malay citizen who has a shop with the signboard written in the National language is exempted from the tax whilst a Chinese with a similar shop, using a similar signboard but written in the Chinese language, which he is by law permitted to use, is taxed. Sir, even if it is argued that a "Language Tax" can be made constitutionally, I still have my doubts if it would encourage the fuller use of the National language. One must not forget that

every action has a reaction. If the non-Malays feel that the Language Tax on signboards is discriminatory, all they have to do is pay the tax and have the satisfaction of putting up signboards written in the language they choose. In that case the purpose of the tax would be defeated. The shopowners do not suffer, because it will again be the poor consumers—the long-suffering consumers—who will in the end have to pay for the Language Tax because we cannot stop the tax being passed on. Therefore, may I suggest that compulsion is not always the best method of encouraging the fuller use of the National Language.

Honourable Members for Muar Utara and Perlis have criticised the activities of the National Electricity Board and suggested that Government should take back the administration of the N.E.B., so that its policies can be changed and electricity be supplied to all rural kampongs as early as possible, even though it may not be economical. Sir, of late, this type of criticisms and proposals have been voiced and debated in the State Legislatures and echoed in the Press. There were even claims that the National Electricity Board is a foreign-owned company. These unfair criticisms would not have arisen if Honourable Members had studied the First Malaysia Plan, the yearly Development Budgets and the Annual Reports of the Central Electricity Board, now the National Electricity Board, which have been supplied to them. They would have found that since 31st August, 1949, what was once a Government Department, the Electricity Department of the Federation of Malaya, was vested in the Central Electricity Board, a wholly Government-owned corporation to be run strictly on commercial basis. On the 31st of August, 1966, the total issued capital was \$122 million made up of \$119 million from the Government of Malaysia and \$3 million from the Government of the State of Pahang. Due to the great demand for electricity the Board expanded and increased its fixed assets more than 20 times from \$30 million in 1949 to \$685 million on

August 31, 1966. This was financed from the following sources:

	\$ million
Issued capital	122
Board's own resources	224
<i>Loan Capital drawn from:</i>	
	\$ million
(1) Government of Malaysia ..	95
(2) World Bank	169
(3) Commonwealth Development Corporation	61
(4) Commonwealth Development Finance Co., Ltd	4
(5) E.P.F.	10
	339
Total	685

So you will see, Sir, about half of the present fixed assets are financed by loans on which interest has to be paid.

During the First Malaysia Development Plan, 1966-1970, it is anticipated that the demands for electricity would be doubled, that is, whilst in 1965 there was capacity to generate 1,925 million units a year, by 1970 there should be capacity to generate 3,575 million units of electricity per annum. To cope with this very rapid rate of growth of demand of electricity—double in five years—it is planned to spend \$544 million on capital works and the sources for financing these proposed projects are:

The Government of Malaysia	\$100 million
World Bank and loans from other countries	222 "
and N.E.B. internal resources	222 "

This means that the Board itself must earn enough to pay interest on its previous loans and yet put aside \$222 million in the next five years, but it still has to borrow \$322 million to be able to generate enough electricity to meet our growing demands. In the last 17 years, the Board was able to put aside \$224 million for capital expenditure but, in the coming five years, it has been set a task to earn and put aside \$222 million. Unless it is financially sound, it would not be able to raise the huge loans. No one will lend money to anybody that does not run its business on sound economic policies. Therefore, unless the Board is efficiently run on strictly commercial basis, it may not be able to generate enough electricity to meet our demands in the next five years.

However, the Government is fully conscious of the need to ensure that the rural people also enjoy the fruits of economic development. That is why when Rural Development Committees were set up in every District in Malaya, on which Members of Parliament and State Assemblymen could serve, proposals for rural electrification projects were entered into the Red Books. Priority lists were drawn up. Members of Parliament and State Assemblymen had the opportunity to arrange the priorities of rural electricity projects in their own constituencies. As most of these rural electricity projects were not economic, that is to say, the return on the capital outlay is less than the economic return—that is to say, again, the return on the capital outlay is less than the economic return—that was why Government and the N.E.B. put aside money to subsidise the capital costs of projects that were given priority.

In the second Five-Year Malayan Development Plan, Government spent approximately \$12 million whilst the C.E.B. spent \$3.8 million, and the Kinta Electric Department half a million dollars on rural electrification. 422 villages were given electricity; 43,000 houses were connected; and 263,000 of the rural population benefited.

When the First Malaysia Plan, 1966-1970, was prepared, all Members of Parliament and State Assemblymen were again given another opportunity to include new projects in the Red Book. Due to the very large number of proposals, the N.E.B., after careful study, proposed that \$60 million—\$57 million from Government and \$3 million from N.E.B.—should be set aside for rural electrification. That was its proposal—\$60 million should be set aside for rural electrification to subsidise the capital cost. But owing to the size of our Development Plan, which is twice that of the Second Five-Year Malayan Plan, 1960-1965, and the shortage of funds, Government decided that it could only afford to set aside \$15 million for rural electrification during the period 1966-1970—\$12 million to come from the Government and \$3 million from the N.E.B.

It is proposed to supply electricity to 343 villages connecting 27,613 houses to benefit about 166,000 people in the rural areas in the First Malaysia Plan. In allocating funds for the period 1966-1970, the following points were taken into consideration:

- (1) All the eleven States in Malaya should get a fair share.
- (2) As many districts as possible should benefit.
- (3) Priority numbers have been given to all the schemes by the State Development Committees in consultation with the N.E.B. and these priorities have also been considered both from the technical and the economic aspects.
- (4) As a general rule, a scheme can be considered economical if the average cost per consumer is estimated to be not greater than \$500 provided no high voltage extensions are required, in which case the average cost per consumer is \$1,000.
- (5) Greater emphasis has been given to bringing supply to areas without electricity rather than improve those supplies already provided by licencees.

Honourable Members should, therefore, realise that although it is very desirable to supply electricity to all the rural areas, the capital costs are formidable. It is because of the lack of availability of funds that rural electrification has to be phased out, and this is not the fault of the N.E.B.

Taking back the administration of the N.E.B. by Government does not solve the problem of shortage of fund. Instead, we should congratulate the N.E.B. on its high administrative efficiency in running the Corporation on a strictly commercial basis. Not only is it asked to find \$222 million in the next five years for expansion of its power stations, it is also asked to contribute \$3 million as subsidy to the rural electrification scheme. If the N.E.B. cannot find the \$222 million, the Government has to find that money if we want to meet the electricity demands to supply our factories, our

tin mines and the lighting of our houses. As it is, the First Malaysia Plan is short of \$1,900 million in the public sector. The Minister of Finance would be very hard put, if we ask him to find another \$222 million.

I hope Honourable Members will, therefore, explain to their clamouring constituents that there is a limit to the speed of rural electrification due to the shortage of Government funds and not because N.E.B. discriminates against rural people. Because of Government's directive that the N.E.B. should run on strictly commercial basis, it must naturally supply economic projects first. Commercial and industrial users must have priority, because they create employment and contribute to Government revenue. In the towns, all owners of houses and even vacant land pay assessments to the Town Boards, the Town Councils or the Municipalities, who in turn pay for the capital costs of electricity supplies to the area.

Honourable Members, including Government back-benchers, have in the last few days urged Government to be careful in its spending. You have urged that money should not be spent except on economic projects. I, therefore, hope you will explain to your constituents that Government, despite your urgings, is prepared to spend some money on uneconomic projects so that the rural people will enjoy the amenities of modern life. However, there must be a limit to this type of uneconomic spending.

The Honourable Member from Sarawak, Mr Stephen Yong, whilst agreeing that there should be intensive research into the new uses of rubber, criticised the Government for not setting aside adequate provisions for such research. Sir, the Honourable Member may not be aware that the cost of research in rubber is borne by the industry itself, and a move is now afoot to increase the research cess on all rubber exported. It would, indeed, be welcome if the Honourable Member could persuade the Sarawak Government to agree to extend such a Federal research cess to the rubber industry in Sarawak.

The Honourable Member for Temerloh wanted to know more about the distribution of fertilizers to the smallholders in this country. Sir, before the setting up of the Chemical Company Limited of Malaysia Limited (CCM), the suppliers of fertilizers to the Fund "B" Rubber Industry Replanting Board were:

- (a) I.C.I. (Malaya) Ltd;
- (b) Malayan Fertilizers;
- (c) Bian Heng Company Ltd (A Malaysian and not a Singapore Company); and
- (d) The Federal Development Organisation (F.D.O.), a 100% Malay Company.

Each firm was given an equal share—that is one quarter of the volume to be distributed was given to each firm. On the 1st April, 1966, I.C.I. (Malaya) Ltd and the Malayan Fertilisers amalgamated to form I.C.I. Agriculture (Malaysia) Ltd. With this amalgamation, I.C.I. Agriculture (Malaya) Ltd supplied 50% of the fertiliser to the Board, while Bian Heng Company Ltd and F.D.O. continued to supply the Board one-quarter share each. In 1965, the Board purchased 71,533 tons of fertiliser from the suppliers to be supplied to the smallholders. The price of fertilizer supplied to the Board is negotiated between the Board and the suppliers, and the agreed price is always geared to the market price. The present price of fertiliser as debited against the Board by the suppliers is \$183.40 per ton ex godown, whilst the listed price of fertiliser (Mixture Magnesium) is \$191 per ton, also ex godown. Supplies of fertiliser to the Board go through stockists with usual handling charges.

With the setting up of the Chemical Company of Malaysia, the Federation of Malaya Fertiliser Pulp and Paper Co-operative Society, which this House must be very familiar with, was appointed to be a supplier of fertiliser to the Board, i.e., the Replanting Board, on behalf of the Chemical Company of Malaysia. This Co-operative will take the place of the I.C.I. Agriculture (Malaya) Limited which has a 50% share of the total volume of fertilisers required by the Board. Bian Heng

Company and F.D.O. will continue to have one-quarter share each of the volume of fertiliser required by the Board.

In October, 1966 a new firm called the Sharikat Bumiputra Limited applied to be a supplier of fertiliser to the Board as an agent of the Chemical Company of Malaysia. After careful consideration, the Board rejected this application for the following reasons: (i) with the appointment of the Co-operative as a supplier of fertiliser to the Board, 75% of the total volume of fertiliser required by the Board would be supplied by the Bumiputra; (ii) the Sharikat Bumiputra is merely acting as an agent on behalf of the Chemical Company of Malaysia which already has an agent—the Co-operative—supplying 50% to the Board; (iii) it is the policy of the Ministry to encourage Malay participation in business, and that is why we have 75% of the share of the distribution of the Board's fertiliser given to the Malays. The Ministry is of the view that the present structure of suppliers of fertiliser to the Board should be maintained. It is also the policy of the Government and the Board to encourage the greater use of locally manufactured products and, for a start, Chemical Company of Malaysia will be supplying 50% of the fertiliser to the Board.

Sir, the Honourable Member for Bachok during his speech, wanted to know why so much log timber still continued to be exported through Singapore from the East Coast States. Sir, to me the answer seems pretty obvious. The P.M.I.P. Government had already sold more than half the stand of timber in the State of Kelantan to a Singapore firm.

Sir, as the Honourable Minister for Local Government and Housing is away, I am answering some of the points raised in this House on that Ministry on his behalf. Before the Minister replies to the various remarks made by the Honourable Member from Ipoh, in connection with the Ministry of Local Government and Housing, the Minister would like to say that either the Honourable Member has been

grossly misinformed, or that he was deliberately trying to mislead this House by his contortion of facts.

First of all, the Minister would refer to his references to the Town Planning Section of the Federal Capital Commission. Towards the end of 1964, in view of the allegations previously made in this House of inefficiency and inconsistency in the Planning Section of the Federal Capital, the Minister decided personally to examine its workings. Several meetings were held with Senior Officers of both the Federal Capital and the Department of Town and Country Planning, as a result of which the following steps were taken as measures to bring about improvements:

The integration of the Municipal Planning Department with that of the Federal Planning Department under one head, controlled and advised by the Commissioner of the Federal Town and Country Planning Department, which would streamline the whole of the Planning Processing Organisation of the Federal Capital, and at the same time removed the anomaly of having an Engineer heading the Planning Section instead of a highly qualified and experienced Planning Officer as Chief Adviser.

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

Sitting suspended at 5.55 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 6.05 p.m.

(Mr (Deputy) Speaker in the Chair)

THE SUPPLY (1967) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Dr Lim Swee Aun: Mr Speaker, Sir, the second measure was the presentation of a Master Plan for Kuala Lumpur to replace the outdated and outmoded existing approved plan gazetted in 1939. The draft new Master Plan proposal has just been completed for consideration. This will in due course

be gazetted as required by Section 137 of the Town Boards Enactment (F.M.S. Cap. 137).

Thirdly, the Minister also authorised the preparation of a new Town Planning legislation for the whole of Malaya, and this has been completed and is with the Attorney-General for his consideration. This includes the tightening of and improving the existing Municipal By-laws.

Concerning town planning approvals in the Federal Capital, decisions are made by the Pesuroh Jaya Ibu Kota after due deliberation in his Town Planning Committee with the exception of all changes in land-use zoning. In the case of the latter, this follows the process of law laid down in Section 144 of the Town Boards Enactment where, after due advertisement and gazetting procedures having been complied with, the details and recommendations are submitted to the Minister for final decision.

As this Ministry is answerable to the public and this House for the Federal Capital, the Ministry also exercises a supervisory function to ensure consistency and uniformity in planning decisions made by the Pesuroh Jaya Ibu Kota from time to time.

Regarding the licensing of Massage Parlours raised by the Honourable Member for Ipoh, the Pesuroh Jaya Ibu Kota is the competent authority to make decisions, and he issues licences under the Kuala Lumpur Municipality (Massage Establishments) By-laws, 1963. As Massage Parlours can only be licensed in premises zoned for "commercial use", licensing in premises other than those zoned for "commercial use" would involve rezoning, in which case the requirements of the law under Section 144 of the Town Boards Enactment have to be complied with. Unless rezoning is involved, which requires reference to the Minister by statutory requirements, such applications are not submitted to the Minister, and decisions are made by the Pesuroh Jaya Ibu Kota. No question of over-ruling arises in cases where reference has to be made

to the Minister (as required by law where rezoning is involved) because, under section 140 of the Town Boards Enactment, the Minister is required to either approve the application or refuse to approve it, or refer it back to the Pesuroh Jaya Ibu Kota for further consideration and amendment. The Minister should have thought that the Honourable Member for Ipoh, would be fully conversant with all these legalities, both as a lawyer and as one who is himself closely connected with the administration of the Ipoh Municipality. Perhaps, some of the insinuations, he was trying to impute, arise out of what the P.P.P. has been doing in Ipoh.

With reference to the Honourable Member's comment on the Luk Kok Restaurant, the Minister is glad that at least the Honourable Member has disclosed his professional interest in the case between the Shanghai Restaurant and the Luk Kok Restaurant, both of which are in the Town House Hotel. For the benefit of the House, the facts connected with the prosecution of the Luk Kok Restaurant are that there are two separate actions being taken on the owner of the Luk Kok Restaurant, namely:

- (i) Deviation from the approved plan and unauthorised works; and
- (ii) Operating a restaurant without a Municipal Licence.

With regard to the first action, the Luk Kok Restaurant was prosecuted in Court and fined a maximum fine of \$500 on the 2nd of August, 1966. At the same time, the owner was required to demolish the unauthorised works within one month, failing which Mandatory Order would be made. The owner did not demolish the unauthorised works, and so a Mandatory Order was obtained from the Court and served on the owner of the Luk Kok Restaurant on the 5th of September, 1966. The Restaurant was allowed to make an appeal to the Minister for Local Government and Housing within one month from the date of the Mandatory Order. This appeal was subsequently turned down by the Minister on the 2nd of November, 1966.

The Mandatory Order was not complied with. The Municipal officers discussed the possibility of undertaking the necessary demolition themselves. However, it was realised that it is technically impossible to demolish the unauthorised works without affecting those parts of the buildings which are authorised. It is also realised that such demolition might damage the service supplies, furniture, fittings, etc., and thereby expose the Commissioner of the Federal Capital liable to a claim for damage to private property. The Commissioner's legal advisers have been consulted on this issue, and they are in agreement with the technical problems involved.

The normal action taken by the Municipal Architect's Department, after non-compliance of a Mandatory Order, is to prosecute the owner, again, and instruct the Municipal Prosecuting Officer to press for heavy deterrent sentence and daily fine. This action is now being taken against the Luk Kok Restaurant.

The statement that the Luk Kok Restaurant is operating in an unauthorised buildings is not correct as the main hotel building itself complies with the Building Regulations and has a Certificate of Fitness.

With regard to the second aspect of the matter, that is that the Luk Kok Restaurant has been carrying on the business of a restaurant without a licence from the Municipality, Court prosecution has been instituted by the Municipality and as a result the proprietor was ordered to pay a fine of \$200 by the Court on the 22nd of October, 1966. Despite this conviction and fine, the Restaurant still continues business. The Municipality has instituted further proceedings which are still pending.

The prosecution of this Restaurant has been handled by the Solicitors of the Municipality, Messrs Shook Lin & Bok. Because of the indifferent attitude of the proprietors of the Luk Kok Restaurant, the Solicitors of the Municipality have now been instructed to take a High Court injunction restraining the Restaurant from continuing business.

It will be seen, therefore, that there has been no laxity in the prosecution of this Restaurant for not complying with the provisions of the Act.

With reference to the points made by the Honourable Member for Ipoh in regard to the Control of Rent Act, the Minister would like to state that when the Act, in its Bill form, was debated in this House last June, the Honourable Member for Ipoh did not even make a single proposal for amendment and, although after the Bill was passed, the Minister had made repeated appeals through the Press to the public to submit a memorandum on these provisions of the Act they would like amended, neither the Honourable Member, nor his People Progressive Party, have up to date responded to that appeal. He now requests that amendments to the Control of Rent Act be made "here and now", but the Minister would like to ask him what amendments he has in mind and why he considers such amendments should be made and, most of all, why did he not submit his views to the Minister, if he is so concerned over the alleged impracticability of this Act in the light of the Minister's repeated appeals?

Regarding his concern over the possible delays in hearing applications relating to disputes over what is "Fair Rent", the Act already states that if the tenant and landlord are unable to arrive at a "Fair Rent" within a period of one month, they could enlist the assistance of a Rent Officer who, in turn, would determine the "Fair Rent" within one month of the date of the request being made by either party. The Tribunals and Appeal Boards are quasi-judicial bodies, purely and solely to deal with disputes arising out of the Control of Rent Act, unlike the former Rent Control Ordinance under which actions, in the last resort, have to go to the Ordinary Courts of Law which have to deal with a variety of other equally and more urgent cases. There will, therefore, be no question of delays anything like as in the past in dealing with disputes on rent-controlled premises. Therefore, the Honourable Member's contention that it would take five

years to settle a dispute is ludicrous and surprising, coming as it does, from a lawyer of his standing. Perhaps, the Honourable Member has not given the Act the time and study he has given in attempting to discredit the Act for political purposes, i.e., as a champion of the tenants. Furthermore, it is to be pointed out that not all landlords and tenants of controlled premises are likely to resort to the assistance of any one of these bodies, as it is likely that, after the first few cases have been heard and decided by the Rent Officer, Rent Tribunal, or the Appeal Board, the adjoining landlords and tenants would come to an amicable settlement on the "Fair Rent" to be charged. In this connection, the Minister would like to draw the attention of the Honourable Member for Ipoh and of the House to a letter published in the *Straits Times*, "Letters Column", on 26th of January, 1967, in which an Ipoh landlords stated that he has reached agreement with 90% of his tenants.

As regards the allegation that two lawyers of a particular legal firm in Kuala Lumpur were appointed to the same Rent Tribunal, this is not true. Mr Hoffman is the Chairman of the Tribunal whilst Mr Lai is a member of the Appeal Board. For the information and benefit of the Honourable Member for Ipoh, the Minister would like to state that the qualifications required of a Chairman of the Rent Tribunal are spelt out in Section 12 (2) of the Act, which states that he should be selected from any of the following persons, namely:

- (a) a member of the Judicial and Legal Services of the Federation;
- (b) a person being an advocate and solicitor who has been in legal practice for at least five years;
- (c) a District Officer for the area or areas concerned; or
- (d) such other person who has sufficient standing and integrity as the Ruler or the Governor, as the case may be, may appoint. In the case of the Federal Capital, all powers vested in and exercisable by the Ruler or Governor of a State shall be vested in and

exercisable by the Minister charged with the responsibility of Local Government.

Similarly, a member of the Appeal Board shall be a person possessing sufficient standing and integrity.

Mr Hoffman has had a long and distinguished career. He was educated at Raffles Institution and Raffles College and joined the Straits Settlement Civil Service in 1937 and later the Colonial Administrative Service. He was the Permanent Secretary of the Treasury (Establishment), Singapore Government, and has also served in Penang as Assistant District Officer, Butterworth. In 1948, on a Colonial Welfare and Development Fund Scholarship, he took a law degree at Christ Church College, Oxford and became lecturer in law at the University College of Southampton. He was former Assistant Secretary to the Director of Personnel in the Chief Secretary's Office. In 1955, he was Secretary to the then Chief Minister, Mr David Marshall and, in the following year, accompanied the Merdeka Mission to London as Personal Assistant to Mr Marshall. He had also been a Police Magistrate and District Judge in Singapore. Prior to his leaving the Government Service and joining the Federation Bar, he held among others, the posts of Permanent Secretary to the Chief Secretary, Singapore, and to the Ministry of Education. He was also at one time Chairman of the Rent Tribunal Singapore. He is an Advocate and Solicitor of the Supreme Courts, of both Singapore and the Federation of Malaya.

With regard to Mr Lai, he is not as new to Kuala Lumpur as the Honourable Member would make him out to be. He is, on the contrary, born, bred and educated in this country and has been practising in Kuala Lumpur as Advocate and Solicitor since December 1961. It is, therefore, obvious that both Mr Hoffman and Mr Lai are eminently qualified for the appointments. It is regrettable that the Honourable Member for Ipoh has, by imputation, cast such unkind aspersion on these two gentlemen.

It is to be noted that all persons sitting on the Tribunal and Appeal Board are men of standing and integrity and have accepted to serve on these bodies, taking time off from their own occupation, purely out of their own public spiritedness and in their wanting to be of service to the nation. Mr Lai was only one of the final list of twelve, consisting of:

- two lawyers,
- three accountants,
- one secretary,
- two engineers,
- two doctors,
- one dental surgeon, and
- one architect

who have been asked and have accepted the appointments. All these gentlemen are sacrificing their valuable time, and some of them have, by accepting to serve on these bodies, denied themselves substantial remunerations that would otherwise be theirs in their respective professions.

The Act has only come into force on the 1st of this month and, under the law, no request can be made to a Rent Officer to determine the "Fair Rent" until the Act has operated for one month. In other words, disputes to be determined by a Rent Officer can be entertained only in February and the earliest possible case for hearing by the Tribunal will be in March this year. Needless to say, appeals against the decisions of the Tribunal if any, will be heard by the Appeal Board only some time thereafter. As such, the Minister cannot see how anyone can at this stage figure out which provisions of the Act need to be amended. The Minister has said on numerous occasions that he is prepared to consider amending the law wherever deemed fit, but the Act must have a fair chance to operate for at least a reasonable period before any amendments can be contemplated, if such amendments are in fact to remedy any apparent defects.

Sir, the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat said that the Federal Government should not have launched a low-cost housing scheme in Penang but

instead should have put it near the Mak Mandin Scheme area to alleviate the housing position in the industrial area. Perhaps, the Honourable Member is afraid that, by the Alliance Government putting up low-cost houses on the Island of Penang, in the next elections the Socialist Front would have nothing to show for their five years' of rule in the city Council area. However, Sir, I would like to give this information not only to the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat but also to this House that the Ministry of Local Government and Housing has approved a loan of \$1,006,000 to the State Government of

Penang to implement a low-cost housing scheme at the Mak Mandin industrial area, comprising three blocks of four-storey flats, giving a total of 240 units. Planning work for this scheme is now in progress and another project of 620 units of flats has been approved for the Chain Ferry Road in Butterworth. Soil investigation has just been completed.

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: Meshuarat ini di-tanggohkan hingga pukul 10 pagi besok.

Adjourned at 6.30 p.m.