

Volume II
No. 9



Friday
29th April, 1960

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

OFFICIAL REPORT

CONTENTS

MOTIONS—

**Government Statement on Auditor-General's Report on
the Accounts of the Federation for 1958 [Col. 923]**

**Development (Supplementary) (No. 2) Estimates, 1960
[Col. 997]**

PRINTED AT THE GOVERNMENT PRESS
BY THOR BENG CHONG, ACTING GOVERNMENT PRINTER
FEDERATION OF MALAYA

1960

FEDERATION OF MALAYA
DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

Official Report

Second Session of the First Dewan Ra'ayat

Friday, 29th April, 1960

The House met at Half past Nine o'clock a.m.

PRESENT:

- The Honourable Mr. Speaker, DATO' HAJI MOHAMED NOAH BIN OMAR, S.P.M.J., P.I.S., J.P.
- „ the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Defence, TUN ABDUL RAZAK BIN DATO' HUSSAIN, S.M.N. (Pekan).
- „ the Minister of External Affairs, DATO' DR. ISMAIL BIN DATO' ABDUL RAHMAN, P.M.N. (Johore Timor).
- „ the Minister of Finance, ENCHE' TAN SIEW SIN, J.P. (Malacca Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, DATO' V.T. SAMBANTHAN, P.M.N. (Sungei Siput).
- „ the Minister of the Interior, DATO' SULEIMAN BIN DATO' ABDUL RAHMAN, P.M.N. (Muar Selatan).
- „ the Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives, ENCHE' ABDUL AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Kuala Langat).
- „ the Minister of Transport, ENCHE' SARDON BIN HAJI JUBIR (Pontian Utara).
- „ the Minister of Health and Social Welfare, DATO' ONG YOKE LIN, P.M.N. (Ulu Selangor).
- „ the Minister of Commerce and Industry, ENCHE' MOHAMED KHIR BIN JOHARI (Kedah Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Labour, ENCHE' BAHAMAN BIN SAMSUDIN (Kuala Pilah).
- „ the Minister of Education, ENCHE' ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAJI TALIB (Kuantan).
- „ TUAN SYED JA'AFAR BIN HASAN ALBAR, J.M.N., Assistant Minister (Johore Tenggara).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL HAMID KHAN BIN HAJI SAKHAWAT ALI KHAN, J.M.N., J.P., Assistant Minister (Batang Padang).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDUL KHALID BIN AWANG OSMAN, Assistant Minister (Kota Star Utara).
- „ ENCHE' CHEAH THEAM SWEE, Assistant Minister (Bukit Bintang).
- „ ENCHE' V. MANICKAVASAGAM, J.M.N., P.J.K., Assistant Minister (Klang).

- The Honourable ENCHE' MOHAMED ISMAIL BIN MOHAMED YUSOF, Assistant Minister (Jerai).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL GHANI BIN ISHAK, A.M.N. (Malacca Utara).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAUF BIN A. RAHMAN (Krian Laut).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL SAMAD BIN OSMAN (Sungei Patani).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI ABDUL RAOF (Kuala Kangsar).
- „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN ABDULLAH (Kota Bharu Hilir).
- „ ENCHE' AHMAD BIN ARSHAD, A.M.N. (Muar Utara).
- „ ENCHE' AHMAD BOESTAMAM (Setapak).
- „ ENCHE' AHMAD BIN MOHAMED SHAH, S.M.J. (Johore Bharu Barat).
- „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN SAAID (Seberang Utara).
- „ ENCHE' AHMAD BIN HAJI YUSOF (Krian Darat).
- „ TUAN HAJI AZAHARI BIN HAJI IBRAHIM (Kubang Pasu Barat).
- „ ENCHE' AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Muar Dalam).
- „ DR. BURHANUDDIN BIN MOHD. NOOR (Besut).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN CHONG WEN (Kluang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN SIANG SUN (Bentong).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN SWEE HO (Ulu Kita).
- „ ENCHE' CHIN SEE YIN (Seremban Timor).
- „ ENCHE' V. DAVID (Bungsar).
- „ DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI HASHIM, P.M.N. (Jitra-Padang Terap).
- „ ENCHE' GEH CHONG KEAT (Penang Utara).
- „ ENCHE' HANAFI BIN MOHD. YUNUS, A.M.N. (Kulim Utara).
- „ ENCHE' HARUN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Baling).
- „ ENCHE' HARUN BIN PILUS (Trengganu Tengah).
- „ TUAN HAJI HASAN ADLI BIN HAJI ARSHAD (Kuala Trengganu Utara).
- „ TUAN HAJI HASSAN BIN HAJI AHMAD (Tumpat).
- „ ENCHE' HASSAN BIN MANSOR (Malacca Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN TO' MUDA HASSAN (Raub).
- „ TUAN HAJI HUSSAIN RAHIMI BIN HAJI SAMAN (Kota Bharu Hulu).
- „ ENCHE' IBRAHIM BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Seberang Tengah).
- „ ENCHE' ISMAIL BIN IDRIS (Penang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' KANG KOCK SENG (Batu Pahat).
- „ ENCHE' K. KARAM SINGH (Damansara).
- „ CHE' KHADIJAH BINTI MOHD. SIDIK (Dungun).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SECK FUN (Tanjong Malim).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SIOK YEW (Sepang).
- „ ENCHE' LIM JOO KONG (Alor Star).
- „ ENCHE' LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).
- „ ENCHE' LIU YOONG PENG (Rawang).

- The Honourable ENCHE' T. MAHIMA SINGH (Port Dickson).
- .. ENCHE' MOHAMED BIN UJANG (Jelebu-Jempol).
- .. ENCHE' MOHAMED ABBAS BIN AHMAD (Hilir Perak).
- .. ENCHE' MOHAMED ASRI BIN HAJI MUDA (Pasir Puteh).
- .. ENCHE' MOHAMED DAHARI BIN HAJI MOHD. ALI (Kuala Selangor).
- .. ENCHE' MOHAMED NOR BIN MOHD. DAHAN (Ulu Perak).
- .. DATO' MOHAMED HANIFAH BIN HAJI ABDUL GHANI, P.J.K. (Pasir Mas Hulu).
- .. ENCHE' MOHAMED SULONG BIN MOHD. ALI, J.M.N. (Lipis).
- .. ENCHE' MOHAMED YUSOF BIN MAHMUD, A.M.N. (Temerloh).
- .. TUAN HAJI MOKHTAR BIN HAJI ISMAIL (Perlis Selatan).
- .. NIK MAN BIN NIK MOHAMED (Pasir Mas Hilir).
- .. DATO' ONN BIN JA'AFAR, D.K., D.P.M.J. (Kuala Trengganu Selatan).
- .. ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Tanah Merah).
- .. ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Perlis Utara).
- .. ENCHE' QUEK KAI DONG (Seremban Barat).
- .. TUAN HAJI REDZA BIN HAJI MOHD. SAID (Rembau-Tampin).
- .. ENCHE' SEAH TENG NGIAB (Muar Pantai).
- .. ENCHE' D. R. SEENIVASAGAM (Ipoh).
- .. ENCHE' S. P. SEENIVASAGAM (Menglembu).
- .. TUAN SYED ESA BIN ALWEE, S.M.J., P.I.S. (Batu Pahat Dalam).
- .. TUAN SYED HASHIM BIN SYED AJAM, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Sabak Bernam).
- .. ENCHE' TAJUDIN BIN ALI (Larut Utara).
- .. ENCHE' TAN CHENG BEE, J.P. (Bagan).
- .. ENCHE' TAN PHOCK KIN (Tanjong).
- .. ENCHE' TAN TYE CHEK (Kulim-Bandar Bahru).
- .. TENGKU INDRA PETRA IBNI SULTAN IBRAHIM, J.M.N. (Ulu Kelantan).
- .. DATO' TEOH CHZE CHONG, D.P.M.J., J.P. (Segamat Selatan).
- .. ENCHE' V. VEERAPPEN (Seberang Selatan).
- .. WAN SULAIMAN BIN WAN TAM (Kota Star Selatan).
- .. WAN YAHYA BIN HAJI WAN MOHAMED (Kemaman).
- .. ENCHE' WOO SAIK HONG (Telok Anson).
- .. ENCHE' YAHYA BIN HAJI AHMAD (Bagan Datoh).
- .. ENCHE' YEOH TAT BENG (Bruas).
- .. ENCHE' YONG WOO MING (Sitiawan).
- .. HAJJAH ZAIN BINTI SULAIMAN, J.M.N., P.I.S. (Pontian Selatan).
- .. TUAN HAJI ZAKARIA BIN HAJI MOHD. TAIB (Langat).
- .. ENCHE' ZULKIFLEE BIN MUHAMMAD (Bachok).

ABSENT:

- The Honourable the Prime Minister, Y.T.M. TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN PUTRA AL-HAJ, K.O.M. (Kuala Kedah).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI MOHD. SALLEH, A.M.N., P.I.S. (Segamat Utara).
- „ ENCHE' HAMZAH BIN ALANG, A.M.N. (Kapar).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN MOHD. NOORDIN, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Parit).
- „ ENCHE' KHONG KOK YAT (Batu Gajah).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SAN CHOON (Kluang Utara).
- „ DR. LIM SWEE AUN, J.P. (Larut Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' NG ANN TECK (Batu).
- „ ENCHE' TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Malacca).
- „ WAN MUSTAPHA BIN HAJI ALI (Kelantan Hilir).

IN ATTENDANCE:

The Honourable the Minister of Justice, TUN LEONG YEW KOH, S.M.N.

PRAYERS

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

MOTIONS

**GOVERNMENT STATEMENT ON
AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT
ON THE ACCOUNTS OF THE
FEDERATION FOR 1958**

Mr. Speaker: Honourable Members, the debate on the amendment will resume.

Enche' V. David (Bungsar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Government is making a desperate attempt to gain a motion of confidence on the offences committed. Sir, the Government stands charged for breach of trust.

The Minister of Finance (Enche' Tan Siew Sin): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order, I think the Honourable Member is using the most objectionable language without any foundation whatever.

Mr. Speaker: I must warn the Honourable Member to choose words that are usually used in Parliament.

Enche' V. David: I think I have not used any unparliamentary word, Sir; the Honourable Member has not shown under what Standing Order he is calling me to order. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think I will have to use a better term. I charge the Government for breach of trust. If an ordinary citizen commits an

offence, say, a bus conductor is unable to account for five cents, he is charged under criminal breach of trust. Now the Government has not been able to account for \$110 million and it is easily escaping by placing a statement which is contradictory to what has been stated in the annual report of the Auditor-General. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the White Paper itself is argumentative, that means it contradicts the views expressed by the Auditor-General. By this White Paper one is easily driven to the conclusion that the Government is questioning the honesty and integrity of the Auditor-General himself.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to refer to certain sections of the White Paper as well as to the Auditor-General's report where the statements are contradictory and at the same time the Government is also refuting the statements made by the Auditor-General. Paragraph 146 of the White Paper states:

“The Auditor-General states that he is unable to ascertain that these payments were made in accordance with proper authority and were properly chargeable.”

and at the latter part of the same paragraph, it is stated:

“Information was however available in the Ministry, except in the case of payments to Secondary Schools where information was available at the offices of Chief Education Officers.”

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this clearly indicates that the Government is refuting the

statement made by the Auditor-General in his annual report. The statement here adds that the Government departments have made available all documentary evidences for the Auditor-General to be convinced and finalise his report, but the Auditor-General did not seize those opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, coming to Merdeka Stadium, para. 126 of the annual report of the Auditor-General, it is stated in the last sentence that the instruction has apparently been ignored. And in the same page, para. 125 states:

"The audited accounts of the Merdeka Stadium show net profits of \$11,573 and \$47,128 for the years 1957 and 1958. These figures are arrived at after allowing depreciation charges on those assets which were bought from Stadium funds but not on certain other assets which were handed over to the Stadium by the Federal Government and are not reflected in the accounts. The costs of maintaining the Stadium buildings continued to be borne by Federal funds and these costs also have been excluded in calculating the profits mentioned above."

Para. 126 says:

"Questions concerning financial control of the Stadium are still unsettled. At the date of the last Audit Report the intention was to operate it as a Government office under the control of the Prime Minister's Department and a Committee was to be appointed to examine the detailed methods. It appears that the Committee never met and that the Board of Control subsequently revived the request that it should be established as an independent and corporate body. In the meantime the Board was instructed to remit to the Treasury its accumulated funds which, on 31st December, 1958, amounted to \$49,759. The instruction has apparently been ignored."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not think the Government can defend itself for ignoring the remarks and observations made by the Auditor-General. The White Paper is a defenceless document just to inform the people of this country outside this Chamber that the Government has been justified in its expenditure. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Government at no cost will be able to defend itself for the very reason that the Report of the Auditor-General is very clear and is understandable to any common man in this country.

Sir, the suggestion by this amendment to refer to the Public Accounts Committee is in order as the Public Accounts Committee has been appointed

for this purpose and we cannot give any vote of confidence on this White Paper without the matter having been studied by the Public Accounts Committee. The Public Accounts Committee must study this before any attempt is made by this Government to table it at this meeting.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I also state that the Government has been deceiving the people not only on this occasion but on so many other occasions. For instance, the other day the Honourable the Minister of the Interior clearly told this House that no action had been taken to dissolve the Kuala Lumpur Municipal Council, but to-day I find in the press that action has already been taken to commence from 1st of July, 1960.

Mr. Speaker: That is not relevant.

Enche' V. David: I am just making a reference, Sir. We cannot at any rate place our trust and confidence in the Government. The Government has been inconsistent and has been deceiving the public. The expenditure involved here is \$110 million by the Education Ministry. The Ministers usually keep on hopping from one Ministry to another so that they can easily evade the responsibility of answering to the people in this House. The ex-Minister of Education is no more the Minister of Education.

The Minister of Education (Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of explanation, I will take the responsibility to explain.

Enche' V. David: Thank you. However, I do not think the Honourable Minister will be able to explain to this House for the very reason it is glaring that the Government has not been able to account for the \$110 million. Therefore, I charge that the Government has violated the trust of the public and it should be charged for breach of trust.

Enche' Chin See Yin (Seremban Timor): Mr. Speaker, Sir, it has been an admitted fact that the remarks and observations contained in the annual report of the Auditor-General regarding the accounts of the Federation of Malaya for 1958, have caused concern, misunderstanding and allegation. Since

the attention of this House was referred to in a front page headline regarding \$110 million unaccounted for in the report by a national newspaper, it is only natural that the Federation Government will have plenty to explain. This is no doubt unfortunate and, if that is not a cause for alarm, let us ponder for a moment to consider the most appropriate way to clear the clouds. To do this we must do it in a right way. Here in this House we have the Standing Orders which we are in duty-bound to follow. According to Standing Order 77 (1) (c)—I take leave to read, Sir—it says:

“There shall be a Committee to be known as the Public Accounts Committee appointed at the beginning of every session, for the examination of—

(c) reports of the Auditor-General laid before the House in accordance with Article 107 of the Constitution;”

Now, Sir, this Committee is now in existence and the Report will have to be sent to this Committee for examination. Unfortunately, the original motion is, in my humble opinion, putting the cart before the horse, because Standing Order 77 (1) (c) will require the Report to be examined by this Committee. Now, we have before us the White Paper, which explains the various remarks and observations of the Auditor-General; and therefore it is only proper that this Committee should be asked to examine it together with the Report. Sir, since the Report will be submitted to this Committee, I suggest that under Standing Order 77, which I have referred to, the White Paper should also be referred to it and until we are able to obtain the observations or any recommendations made by this Committee, I think it is too early for this House to consider the White Paper. For this reason I rise to support the amended motion and I hope that Government will consider it appropriate to accept this amended motion in view of the fact that Standing Order 77 requires the Report to be examined, and I hope it will be examined side by side with the White Paper.

Enche' Abdul Rahman: Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the amendment to the motion, and in doing so, I would like to reply to the points raised by some

of the Honourable Members from the Opposite side of the House.

Sir, many Honourable Members, in supporting the amendment, stated that the proper place for considering the Auditor-General's Report is the Public Accounts Committee. The Government would agree with this, but it must be remembered that it was the many Honourable Members on the opposite side who at the last meeting of this House brought the Auditor-General's Report under discussion in this House when they tried to persuade the House not to approve a small supplementary provision asked for by my Ministry. They did so before this Report had been examined by the Public Accounts Committee. The Honourable Member for Ipoh, I think, and his friends at that meeting made great play with some of the statements which were made in the Auditor-General's Report in an attempt to discredit the Government. Since then, they have exploited these statements outside this House. Sir, only this morning, we heard the Honourable Member for Bungar accusing the Government of having committed the offence of breach of trust and suspecting perhaps that there was misappropriation of funds in the Ministry in 1958. Sir, if the Auditor-General's Report had led the Honourable Member to believe beyond reasonable doubt that there was breach of trust or misappropriation of funds, I challenge him to institute criminal proceedings against my predecessor . . .

Enche' V. David: Privileged Chamber!

Enche' Abdul Rahman: the Honourable Minister of Commerce and Industry or, for that matter, any officer of the Ministry of Education. (*Applause*).

Sir, after all that has been said . . .

Enche' V. David: Mr. Speaker, Sir, when he challenges me, if he can get sanction from the Attorney-General, we will institute proceedings!

Enche' Abdul Rahman: Sir, after all that has been said inside and outside this House, surely, the Government has the right to defend itself, especially as

it can be shown that many of the Auditor-General's statements are incorrect or misleading, and Government feels that the right and proper place to do so is in this House.

The Honourable Member for Ipoh referred to nine paragraphs of the Auditor-General's Report which relate to the Ministry of Education. In some of these, he pointed out quite rightly that the Auditor-General said one thing and the Command Paper said another. In other words, the Government says that the Auditor-General was wrong. The Honourable Member appears to think that this is impossible, and that the Auditor-General must always be right. Sir, I would if he would take the same view on any matter in which the Auditor-General and the Government were in agreement. Sir, the Auditor-General is no less fallible, and no more immaculate than any other officer striving in good faith and in difficult circumstances to do his duty. That he has made some mistakes in his Report, is, I am afraid, incontestable, and will be demonstrated before the Public Accounts Committee. I am quite sure, Sir, those who prepared this Command Paper, for which the Government takes full responsibility, first satisfied themselves completely that when they said the Auditor-General was incorrect, that further and full investigations had proved this to be the case, I must emphasise to the House that when the Auditor-General says that he has not seen an authority or that he has been unable to satisfy himself about anything, that such a statement, though it may have been true when made, does not always mean that the authority does not exist or that further investigations would not have satisfied the Auditor-General. Sir, my Ministry will demonstrate this to the Public Accounts Committee in a number of cases.

I would like to repeat to the House the statement made by the Honourable the Deputy Prime Minister that there are factual errors in five paragraphs of the Auditor-General's Report relating to the Ministry of Education, and that no less than twenty other paragraphs are incomplete or misleading. I would not waste

the time of the House at this stage, but will go into it in more detail later in the debate on the substantive motion.

Sir, the Honourable Member for Tanjong said that the Auditor-General's Report revealed weaknesses in Government accounting procedure and that the administration of certain Ministries is unsatisfactory. Sir, the Deputy Prime Minister made it abundantly clear that there were special factors affecting the situation in 1958. Don't let us forget that we are talking about 1958. That was two years ago. As far as my own Ministry at any rate is concerned, many improvements have been achieved since that date, and I am sorry that the Auditor-General did not mention these facts, of which he must have been aware when he wrote the Report.

The Honourable Member for Tanjong also referred to paragraph 140 of the Report. What does that paragraph say? It says:

"In the first place, it seems that the accounting staff would in any case have been inadequate to carry out the essential checks. Secondly, the requirements of the Ordinance were widely disregarded and in consequence the controls were severely weakened or destroyed. Thirdly, when the intended arrangements broke down, there was no plan to deal with the accounting requirements of the new situation."

Sir, let me enlighten the House on that particular paragraph. The Auditor-General's first stricture is accepted. But the second is considered by the Ministry to be exaggerated, and the third unwarranted, and it is necessary to say that certain requirements of the Ordinance were widely disregarded only because there was no alternative. For example, in theory, no payment should have been made to any school until that school was registered and the board of managers or governors had been set up. That is the theory. No payments to Local Education Authorities could be made until the Board of Assessment had approved the rates of contribution in accordance with Regulation 7 (1) (ii) (e) of (Financial Assistance) Regulations, 1958. No payment of advances or interim payment to Local Education Authorities or Secondary Schools which could not for

the time being be determined was permissible without the concurrence of the Ministry of Finance. The procedure for obtaining the Minister's concurrence presented many difficulties, and it was not until early 1959 that a practicable method was agreed with Treasury officials. Sir, if schools had been closed while all these difficulties were dealt with, there would, however, have been no grounds for the Auditor-General's reproaches—but the closure of schools would have caused a turmoil in this country—a situation that would have been fully exploited by comrades of some of the Opposition Members.

Sir, the Honourable Member for Seberang Selatan reproached the Government for correcting and judging the Auditor-General's Report. This has been forced upon the Government by the way in which he and his friends have exploited the Report against the Government. It is a fact that there are many mistakes and misleading statements in the Report, and the Government owes a duty to Parliament and to the nation to try to put these matters in perspective.

Sir, I appeal to all Honourable Members to read the Auditor-General's Report only in the light of the Command Paper. It is essential in order to get a correct view of these matters to read both these documents together, though I agree it will be for the Public Accounts Committee in due course to examine them both.

Tuan Speaker, wakil dari Bachok dan Besut juga sa-pendapat dengan wakil² daripada Front Socialist dan Parti Progressive Ra'ayat supaya perkara ini di-rojokkan sahaja kepada Public Accounts Committee. Pendapat mereka itu tidak menghairankan, kerana mereka sa-lalu sa-pendapat dan sa-pendirian dengan Front Socialist dan Parti Progressive Ra'ayat di-dalam banyak hal (*Tepok*) sa-hinggakan Ahli² Dewan ini dan ra'ayat seluruhnya akan tertanya²—parti mana-kah yang jadi pelupor di-sabelah pembangkang? Sa-kian.

Enche' Tajudin bin Ali (Larut Utara): Tuan Speaker, Tuan, saya

bangun dengan dukachita-nya menyatakan ia-itu saya tidak bersetuju dengan pindaan yang di-kemukakan malam. Tuan Speaker, Tuan, sa-bagaimana yang selalu kita dengar di-dalam Dewan yang mulia ini pehak pembangkang chuma hendak membesarkan perkara yang kecil ini, sa-benar-nya perkara ini ta' ada apa² yang tidak betul. Pehak pembangkang telah berchakap dengan panjang lebar mengatakan wang sa-banyak \$110 juta telah hilang, tetapi tidak sa-orang pun daripada mereka itu berchakap lancar yang boleh menunjukkan di-sini—ta' usah-lah berchakap wang \$110 juta itu hilang—kata-lah satu sen hilang—tunjokkan di-mana—tidak ada, perasaan mereka itu was² dan shak wasangka dengan tidak berasas sama sa-kali.

Tuan Speaker, Tuan, sahabat saya dari Ipoh, ia memikirkan ia pandai dan bijaksana dan pendirian-nya itu berguna, tetapi perkara yang di-chakap-nya itu tidak membena langsung. Wakil dari Ipoh itu tahu, kerana satu masa dahulu parti-nya telah berkuasa di-*Ipoh Town Council*, saya tahu perkara² yang berbangkit di-dalam *Ipoh Town Council* itu

Enche' K. Karam Singh (Damansara):

Mr. Speaker, Sir, is that relevant to the debate?

Mr. Speaker: I was about to say that.

Jangan keluar daripada maudzu' yang ada di-hadapan ini.

Enche' Tajudin bin Ali: Sa-malam kita telah mendengar ucapan daripada Timbalan Perdana Menteri yang mengatakan kita telah di-desak oleh ra'ayat membuat bermacam² perkara untuk membena negara kita yang baharu merdeka ini. Oleh sebab itu kita tergesa²-lah hendak mengadakan, umpama-nya, Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka dan beratus² ribu anak² kita hendak sekolah, pehak pembangkang juga mendesak Kerajaan membuat-nya, mereka mengatakan kanak² tidak bersekolah dan sa-tengah²-nya bersekolah di-bawah pokok. Kita ada-lah satu Kerajaan yang bertanggung-jawab, kita bersempati bahawa pelajaran itu mesti-lah di-majukan dengan sertamerta. Dengan sebab itu-lah, Tuan

Speaker, kita terpaksa menukar Vote-nya sahaja, tetapi wang-nya satu sen pun tidak di-pegang oleh mana² Menteri—Menteri Pelajaran jauh sa-kali, semua wang itu di-pegang oleh Office Assistant dan orang² yang biasa memegang wang dan wang² itu semua-nya di-keluarkan dengan cheque tidak dengan cash, semua-nya ada voucher—macam mana wang ini boleh hilang? Pehak pembangkang sa-bagaimana yang saya katakan tadi chuma hendak membesarkan² sahaja perkara yang tidak ada, pada hal satu sen pun tidak hilang, mereka chuma shak wasangka, mereka tidak boleh menunjukkan bukti. Kalau saya kata pehak pembangkang kominis atau bersempati dengan kominis, maka pehak pembangkang pun mengatakan saya kominis, tetapi proof-nya tidak ada, semua perchakapan ini tidak berasas dan tidak bertanggung-jawab, chuma hendak meruntuh, menyusahkan Kerajaan sahaja, tetapi bukan-lah chakapan yang hendak membena negeri ini. Kalau sa-kira-nya mereka itu ada proof yang chukup, mari-lah sekarang bersama² dengan saya berjumpa dengan polis. Polis kita ada-lah satu Department yang bertanggung-jawab yang telah menunjukkan kepada mata dunia, Jabatan-nya lengkap, pentadbiran-nya tidak menyebelah pehak Kerajaan atau pun pehak pembangkang, tetapi mereka yang dudok di-sini tidak mahu mengadu kepada polis, ini chabaran daripada saya, wakil daripada Ipoh berani-kah atau ta' berani?

Tuan Speaker, Tuan, saya rasa ta' usah-lah kita bercherita banyak, wakil dari Ipoh pun tahu ia-itu bagaimana Menteri boleh dapat wang \$110 juta, Bank Negara yang besar itu pun tidak ada capital \$110 juta, ini bukan satu statement yang bertanggung-jawab. Perkara ini berbangkit saperti yang telah di-nyatakan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran tadi maka di-atas desakan mereka kita kemukakan White Paper ini—tidak daripada siapa². Di-sini jangan-lah salah faham, Public Accounts Committee itu satu pehak dan White Paper itu satu pehak. Apabila perkara ini sampai ka-tangan Public Accounts Committee, mereka berhak-lah memereksa receipt² sampai berbulan² barangkali boleh sampai

bertahun², mereka itu berhak telah di-benarkan oleh Standing Orders, Pembangkang² memang tahu hal ini, tetapi mereka buat² bengong dan bodoh sahaja, kerana hendak men-tempelak Kerajaan, itu sahaja. Berkenaan dengan Public Accounts Committee pula dua orang daripada ahli pembangkang menjadi Ahli² Public Accounts Committee. Jadi apa² kesalahan, jangan-lah salahkan Kerajaan, salahkan-lah parti sendiri, kerana ta' tahu buat kerja—itu kebodohan sendiri (*Ketawa*).

Enche' V. David: Mr. Speaker, Sir, unparliamentary language!

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Could that word be withdrawn, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: Belum sampai pada ia lagi.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Tuan, perkataan "bodoh" itu boleh-kah dipakai di-sini?

Mr. Speaker: Perkataan "bodoh" itu tidak boleh di-pakai di-sini, tarek balek.

Enche' Tajudin bin Ali: Saya tarek balek huruf itu, saya kata mereka itu tidak tahu.

Mr. Speaker: Itu boleh. (*Ketawa*).

Enche' Tajudin bin Ali: Tuan Speaker, Tuan, Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bungar menyatakan ia menuduh Kerajaan itu kerana membuat salah, apa kesalahan yang hendak di-tuduh? Perkara-nya tidak ada (*Ketawa*) perkara yang tidak ada di-gaduhkan, ini semua chapak angin dan tidak bertanggung-jawab. Tuan Speaker, Tuan, sahabat saya dari Seberang Selatan menyatakan kita di-sini minta menjadi Hakim berkenaan dengan satu perkara yang telah di-bentangkan oleh Auditor-General. Kita tidak menjadi Hakim, kita bentangkan Kertas Puteh itu di-sini kerana hendak menunjukkan kajalan yang betul, itu sahaja, kita tidak hendak menjadi Hakim. Perkara ini saya telah sebutkan dengan sa-penohnya tadi, memberi segala peluang, khususnya kepada pehak pembangkang mengkaji-nya, kemudian perkara ini akan diserahkan kepada Public Accounts Committee. Tuan Speaker, Tuan, saya rasa kalau pehak pembangkang biasa dalam hal-ehwal pentadbiran Kerajaan,

tentu-lah tahu, kalau wang Kerajaan itu ada hilang 5 sen di-ambil oleh sa-saorang, walau pun orang itu orang Kerajaan atau tidak, Kerajaan akan menchari-nya sa-kali pun hingga dalam nuraka, ambil balek wang yang 5 sen itu (*Ketawa*) ini saya memberi fahaman yang chukup.

Tuan Speaker, Tuan, oleh sebab di-sini telah di-nyatakan dan telah di-titahkan oleh Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong berbunyi demikian :

“Dalam meshuarat Dewan Ra’ayat yang akan datang ini Kerajaan Beta akan membentangkan satu kertas meshuarat yang Beta harap ahli² kedua² buah Dewan Parlimen akan mengkaji-nya supaya mereka dapat membetulkan salah faham” salah faham, pehak pembangkang, jangan lupa! Salah faham, ini saya hendak ulangkan sa-kali lagi “Salah faham” yang harus ada di-sisi orang ramai mendengar tudohan² yang tidak bertanggung-jawab itu. Tuan Speaker, Tuan, saya suka-lah mengambil peluang menyatakan terutama-nya kapada pehak pembangkang supaya mengawasi titah Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong itu. Kita orang² tua sakalian, ia-lah orang² yang bertanggung-jawab di-mana kita hendak negara ini tinggal dalam aman dan ma’mur, bukan pula kita hendak memecah-belahkan perkara yang ta’ ada kebenaran-nya. Yang sa-benar-nya satu sen pun ta’ ada hilang, kalau hendak berchakap tunjokkan di-mana satu sen itu hilang.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah (Kota Bharu Hilir): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pendirian saya ia-lah menyokong di-atas motion yang di-buat kelmarin itu.

Mr. Speaker: Pindaan.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah: Pindaan. Nampak-nya Menteri² dan sakalian pehak daripada Kerajaan menudoh orang² yang membangkang itu semua-nya komunis atau pun pro komunis. Pendek kata orang yang mengeluarkan criticism yang constructive pun juga di-tudoh sa-bagai pro komunis. Sekarang ini Auditor-General kita sendiri telah mengeluarkan criticism-nya di-atas benda perbelanjaan Kerajaan yang telah melanggar Undang² yang mana di-sebutkan

di-dalam report-nya, saya takut pehak Kerajaan pun akan menudoh Auditor-General ini pun komunis atau pro komunis.

Mr. Speaker: Saya ta’ dengar orang daripada pehak Kerajaan ada mengatak-an, “siapa juga menentang Kerajaan, dia jadi komunis.”

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah: Dua, tiga hari ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. (*Ketawa*)

Mr. Speaker: Itu soal lain.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah: Ia, itu soal lain. Sekarang, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada-lah Kertas Puteh yang di-keluarkan oleh Kerajaan, ia-lah satu perchubaaan daripada pehak Kerajaan hendak mengambil atau hendak menghapuskan satu tugas yang besar yang telah di-berikan kapada Public Accounts Committee. Sunggoh pun di-dalam Kertas Puteh di-katakan :

“It is not intended to comment in detail on the Report as this would prejudice the deliberations and findings of the Public Accounts Committee.”

Yang sa-betul-nya Kertas Puteh ini memang akan mempengaruhi tugas yang akan di-jalankan oleh Public Accounts Committee. Kerana di-dalam Public Accounts Committee ini sudah tetapkan beberapa orang daripada pehak Kerajaan. Apabila Kertas Puteh di-keluarkan bagini daripada pehak Kerajaan, dapat-kah Member daripada pehak Kerajaan itu membangkang atau pun melawan akan Kertas Puteh itu? Tentu-lah tidak. Ini, ia-lah satu jalan yang akan menerangkan kapada kita bahawa-sanya ada-lah Kertas Puteh ini memang dia akan dipengarohi pendapat² daripada ang-gota² Kerajaan. Juga kita tengok apa-kah kewajipan Auditor-General. Di-dalam buku ini; saya bachakan :

Public Finance, dia kata—

“His duties are to enforce the regulations which govern the expenditure and to detect and report any waste of irregularities which occurred.”

akhir-nya dia kata—

“Important discrepancies are often commented upon in the Auditor-General’s Report.”

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Auditor-General Report yang kita sakalian telah kaji ini, tidak-lah keluar dari

garisan yang di-sebutkan di-dalam-nya. Pendek kata Parlimen kita mesti-lah ucapkan terima kasih kepada Auditor-General yang telah menunaikan kewajipan-nya dengan begitu beres dan jujur (*Tepok*). Tiba², apabila Auditor-General yang telah menunaikan kewajipan-nya dengan begitu beres, dengan begitu kejujuran, kita telah mendatangkan chabaran kepada Auditor-General. Pendek kata, chabaran ini akan mempe-ngaruhi pula pekerjaan Auditor-General pada masa akan datang. Pada masa akan datang, Auditor-General tidak dapat lagi mengeluarkan keterangan² seperti mana yang di-keluarkan di-dalam ini kerana takut bahawa-sanya pehak Kerajaan akan menchabar-nya kelak. Saya tidak akan memanjangkan keterangan saya di-sini, saya chuma hendak menyebutkan perkara² yang penting sahaja kerana kawan² daripada anggota yang lain telah berchakap di-dalam perkara ini. Oleh yang demikian yang sa-betul-nya hendak-lah kita bagi kuat kuasa yang penuh kepada Public Accounts Committee untuk menerangkan kepada kita pendapatan mereka di-atas report ini. Dan di-sana, Kerajaan akan dapat satu peluang pula untuk menyuchikan pendirian-nya atas tuduhan² oleh ra'ayat atau tuduhan² daripada pehak pembangkang.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr. Speaker, Sir, yesterday when the Honourable the Deputy Prime Minister moved this resolution, we remember he spoke about Merdeka and about certain other things; and he also said that the enemy must be killed—probably referring to the communists. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will say that the mover of this original motion went charging about the country on a rocking horse against a brickwall of facts built up by the Auditor-General; and I say that in that charge on that rocking horse the mover of this original motion broke his lance of reed and himself collapsed at the foot of that wall. This reminds us, Mr. Speaker, Sir, of that great man, Don Quixote, and this charge reminds us of one of the tilts of Don Quixote on imaginary enemies and against windmills. And

on top of that, we find the Honourable the Minister of External Affairs joins in as Sancho Panza joins Don Quixote to hurl abuse and not argument at the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is indeed a very sorry charge. The Government has adopted the tactic of attacking, but why are they attacking us? What has the Opposition done to be attacked? It is their fault that the accounts have been spoilt by their own mismanagement. It is the Government's fault that vast sums have not been accounted for; it is the Government's fault that vouchers have not been produced for vast sums; it is the Government's fault that vast sums have been wrongly allocated; it is the Government's fault that vast sums have been brought on unsupported charges. It is not our fault. So I ask the Government to redirect their efforts against themselves and not against the Opposition which is not responsible for Government's errors.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I say that the Honourable the Deputy Prime Minister should be the last person in this world to bring this motion because the Honourable the Deputy Prime Minister is also the Defence Minister of this country; and I also say that the Auditor-General's Report shows errors and mistakes and mismanagement in the Ministry of Defence. So, how can the Minister of Defence come here and try to clear up his own Ministry, to cover up the errors and mistakes of mismanagement of his own Ministry. How can that be done. In the end this motion of the Honourable the Deputy Prime Minister is nothing but a personal defence, and yesterday . . .

Mr. Speaker: I must warn you that we are on the amendment.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: I am supporting the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I have not heard that. We are going back to the original motion after that; now we are on the amendment.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr. Speaker, Sir, what the Government is trying to do by getting this resolution accepted is to whitewash itself before

the whole country with the aid of its majority; and that is a great misuse of its own membership of this House. We find that the Auditor-General's Report was signed at Kuala Lumpur on the 29th of December, 1959, and then there was a debate—this matter was brought up in this House on the 23rd February, 1960. Mr. Speaker, Sir, less than three hours after this House adjourned on the 23rd February, 1960, the Ministry of Defence issued a statement saying that the Auditor-General was wrong. I ask them, in less than three hours what mistakes could they have checked up? What vouchers could they have seen, and whom could they have called to show that the Auditor-General was wrong? I will say that this statement issued by the Ministry of Defence less than three hours after Parliament closed for the day on which this matter was brought up in Parliament

The Deputy Prime Minister (Tun Abdul Razak): On a point of information, Sir, it was not the Ministry of Defence but the Ministry of Education.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: the Ministry of Education, Sir. In less than three hours they brought out this statement and this statement I say was meant to deceive this country because it is an unfounded statement that the Ministry of Education

The Minister of Health and Social Welfare (Dato' Ong Yoke Lin): Sir, on a point of order. Is that not imputing improper motives?

Enche' K. Karam Singh: I said it is an unfounded statement.

Mr. Speaker: That is all right.

Dato' Ong Yoke Lin: But, Sir, I said

Enche' K. Karam Singh: What did you say? (*Laughter*).

Mr. Speaker: I have warned Honourable Members in this Parliament not to direct remarks against one another. Those remarks must be directed to the Chair; that is why I am here. I would not allow that.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Yes, Sir. The Honourable the present Minister of Education has said that he will take

full responsibility. What about the Minister of Education, during whose tenure of office all these bungling of accounts, all this mis-management, all these mis-allocations, all these unsupported charges took place. Why does he not stand up and acknowledge responsibility for what has happened? Why?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, one Honourable Member—the Member for Larut Utara, I think—has said that not one cent was missing and he said that if we could show that even one cent was missing, he would accompany us to the Police Station (*Laughter*). Sir, I think that instead of the Government Members being arrested the Opposition Members will be arrested just for showing those mistakes, because we know who controls the Police. (*Laughter*).

Mr. Speaker: That is unwarranted!

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will compare the Auditor-General to a policeman who has detected certain mistakes, certain wrong acts, in the accounts of this country. Are you going to believe the Auditor-General or the persons who are shown to be wrong? Whom are you going to believe? I say the Auditor-General, whose word overrules the words of the Government. Mr. Speaker, Sir, just for the benefit of the Government Bench which does not believe that even one cent was lost, I will show them that vast sums were lost not under one Head but under several Heads, sums amounting in the aggregate to several millions, not one or two cents.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, page 1 of the Auditor-General's Report—I do not know whether to call it article or section—section 4

Mr. Speaker: Call it "paragraph."

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Paragraph 4 says that there were unvouched charges for \$570,000. Paragraph 5 says:

"The accounts have further been charged with payments totalling \$106,386.06 for which proper vouchers have not been produced to me and I have not seen authority of the Secretary to the Treasury for their acceptance."

What does this mean, Sir? I will say that this is very diplomatic, very kind

and very courteous language on the part of the Auditor-General towards the Government. What does it mean if money has been spent without vouchers having been produced, without authority from the Secretary to the Treasury? It simply means that the money has simply gone out without any authority, without any voucher which is a very serious thing.

Again, paragraph 6 says:

"Unvouched charges accepted in the 1957 accounts, as reported at paragraph 2 of the Audit Report for that year, included an amount of \$78,057.58 which appeared through the accounts of the Johore State Government. A voucher was subsequently produced but contained insufficient evidence of disbursement."

What does this mean? It means the money was spent without sufficient evidence on how it was spent.

Paragraph 8 says:

"I have not seen certificates from accounting officers as to the existence of numerous cash balances which are included in the asset 'Imprests' and total \$892,402. There are also discrepancies not yet explained to me between the balances in the Accountant-General's books and the amounts certified as held by imprest-holders. Details of these discrepancies have been supplied to the Accountant-General."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in another part of this Report the Auditor-General refers to the very serious nature of discrepancies between accounts which should tally, and this is a very serious state of affairs. What has happened to these vast sums of money about which there are discrepancies? Where has it gone? Can the Government tell us where it has gone, into whose pockets? Because if you cannot account for it, that is what the country will presume. It is not your money. It is the money of the man-in-the-street that is involved in this.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, paragraph 9, third sentence reads:

"Treasury books record balances in the hands of these imprest-holders totalling \$13,359 at 31st December, 1958, but it appears that cash actually held at that date was no more than \$160 and that the difference is largely accounted for by disbursements which were not supported by acceptable vouchers and were therefore disallowed."

A disbursement between \$13,359 and \$160, that is about \$13,200, was disallowed. This disbursement was not supported by vouchers. What happened to that money of more than \$13,000? Where has it gone? Again we have no answer from the Government.

Sir, I would refer you further to paragraph 15 on page 3, headed Inter-administration Current Account:

"As in previous years there are very substantial differences between the balances of the Inter-administration Accounts in the Accountant-General's books and the corresponding balances in the books of State Treasurers. So far as I am aware, the differences have not yet in all cases been resolved and cleared."

The differences have not yet been resolved and cleared and they are very substantial differences. What has happened to them? What has happened to these sums which make up the differences?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I refer now to paragraph 17, under misallocations, which I think is a very suitable heading for such a state of affairs and it reads:

"The balances include credits of more than \$1.25 million held by the Armed Forces for soldiers' pay and allotments, which should have been classified as 'deposit'. They also include debits of approximately \$137,000 consisting of recoverable expenses of the Telecommunications Department which should have been charged to an appropriate 'advance' account. A credit of \$215,000 in the account of the Armed Forces was apparently due to revenue but was not transferred to the Revenue Account until 1959 and there are numerous other balances, both credit and debit, held by the Armed Forces for which I have been unable to find explanation."

This vast sum, about which the Auditor-General says he is unable to find any explanation, is under the Minister of Defence, the mover of the original motion.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, paragraph 18, which deals with our delegation to the United Nations General Assembly, says in the second sentence:

"There is a further debit balance, recording a sum of \$4,300 which was due from delegates who attended a United Nations General Assembly in New York during the previous year, and of which an amount of \$1,600 is apparently still unrecovered at the date of this report."

\$1,600 is still unrecovered and we know whom the Alliance Government sends to the United Nations Assembly. It sends its own Members.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, paragraph 20 itself is headed by the words Unauthorised Charges. Paragraph 22 reads:

"The individual balances of conveyance advances controlled by the Medical Department have not, so far as I am aware, been reconciled with the Treasury account."

The Treasury account says one thing, the individual balances of conveyance advances controlled by the Medical Department say another thing. Again what has happened to the difference? There are also vast Federal sums which have not been given to the Government and we find that paragraph 24 says:

"The liability for deposits includes an amount of \$140,483 in an account under the control of the Police. This is the amount still remaining unrefunded from a total of \$377,303 which was wrongly deducted from rank and file on account of Employees Provident Fund contributions during 1953, as reported at paragraph 166 of the Audit Report on the 1954 accounts. Repayments to the contributors have now virtually ceased and it appears that the remaining unclaimed balances might now be transferred to Federal revenues."

Why have these vast sums amounting to \$140,483 for so many years not been given over to the Federal Government?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, on page 6, paragraph 29 says:

"Actual revenue from Custodian of Enemy Property Fees amounted to only \$17,000 against an estimate of \$2.8 million. It had been expected that interest earned in previous years on the Custodian's investments"

The Assistant Minister of the Interior (Enche' Mohamed Ismail bin Mohd. Yusof): On a point of information, Sir, is the Honourable Member going to read the whole report to this House?

Mr. Speaker: He has the right to refer to the items. He is not out of order. (to *Enche' Karam Singh*) Please make it as short as possible.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: I will make it as short as possible, Sir. But there is so much to touch on (*Laughter*).

Mr. Speaker: I think if you can refer to the paragraphs for which no explanation is given in the White Paper, it

would be better. Because if you refer to a paragraph where explanation is given in the White Paper . . .

Enche' K. Karam Singh: But we do not accept the explanation at this stage.

Mr. Speaker: We are not dealing with the acceptance of the White Paper. I would like to warn you that we are on the amendment to refer it to the Public Accounts Committee. If you do not accept these explanations you can talk on the substantive motion.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am speaking on the amendment so that this matter can go before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. Speaker: If you only refer to the headings it would be better. Do not read the whole thing—only the sentence which you want to touch on.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: The first sentence in paragraph 29—"Actual revenue from Custodian of Enemy Property Fees amounted to only \$17,000 against an estimate of \$2.8 million." The estimated revenue is \$2.8 million. Actually what do we find? We find just a meagre sum of \$17,000. We know, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that some people have made fortunes from the property of the Custodian of Enemy Property. With that in view what do we know of what has happened to this estimated revenue of \$2.8 million—only \$17,000 is shown. More than \$2½ million are simply shown not to have come in. They may have gone anywhere for all we know.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, paragraph 31 says that \$2,402,532 are still due to the Federal Government in respect of school fees. This is very significant because now we are mainly dealing with vast sums of money in the Education Department which have gone to the schools and which have not so far been accounted for. On the top of that we find almost two and a half million dollars have still not come back from the schools which have already received so much money.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, paragraph 34 says that a sum of \$71,500 has wrongly been retained by the Johore State Government—I repeat wrongly been retained.

Sir, paragraph 36 of the Auditor-General's Report says:

"A balance of \$222,633 which remained unspent from amounts borrowed under the 1946 Loan Ordinance has been transferred to revenue from the Consolidated Loan Account. I am not satisfied that the transfer is legally permissible and the transaction is accordingly under query."

When the Auditor-General, from his very high position can say, "I am not satisfied that the transaction is legally permissible", what he means is that as far as the Auditor-General can see, this transaction is not legal and if it is not legal, it is an illegal transaction. (Laughter).

Mr. Speaker, Sir, paragraph 45 says that the Director of Agriculture has not replied to queries on about \$1,500. We ask the Director of Agriculture, who is a very responsible officer, a very high officer in Government, why he has failed to answer queries about this sum of money. Mr. Speaker, Sir, what can we presume from this? What can we not presume from this? A very high officer in Government is asked about vast sums of money and he has not replied. He just keeps quiet and I think there is a belief among the Malays that if you charge a person with something you ask something and he does not reply, then there is a presumption against him. Otherwise he will reply that there is nothing wrong.

The Minister of the Interior (Dato' Suleiman): It is not Malay, Sir.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Again on the Ministry of Education, paragraph 47, the Auditor-General says, under the heading Unsupported Charges, that he is not satisfied that \$1.2 million were correctly charged—not one or two cents.

And paragraph 53, page 10, the Auditor-General says there are sums for which he is unable to find appropriate provision—part of \$16,921, \$13,662 and \$1,680—he does not know under what provision these big sums were expended. And paragraph 57, dealing with \$5,270,000 is worse—by Chief Education Officers through State Treasuries: the Auditor-General says most of these charges were for payments other than the grants for which the vote was intended—the money was

misspent or spent for other purposes than those for which it was intended.

Tuan Haji Abdullah bin Haji Abdul Raof (Kuala Kangsar): Standing Orders 37 (a). Ahli Yang Berhormat yang berchakap itu telah membahath Auditor-General's Report yang mana tidak kena mengena dengan usul yang di-bawa pada hari ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Jadi, kalau kita bahath Kertas Puteh ini, tentu-lah memakan masa yang panjang. Dengan sebab itu, saya rasa, tidak-lah patut benarkan Yang Berhormat itu berbuat demikian.

Enche' K. Karam Singh rises.

Mr. Speaker: He is asking for a ruling, I have not given the ruling. He is quite relevant.

Terpaksa di-benarkan dia berchakap dengan sebab dia memberi sebab² yang dia berchakap itu, chuma sebab fasal apa hendak di-rujokkan White Paper ini kepada Public Accounts Committee, sebab itu dia boleh berchakap.

Tuan Haji Abdullah bin Haji Abdul Raof: Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dia membahathkan satu persatu di-atas Report ini.

Mr. Speaker: Itu boleh.

Tuan Haji Abdullah bin Haji Abdul Raof: Jadi, itu sudah sa-olah² perkara ini-lah yang di-bahathkan pada hari ini.

Mr. Speaker: Itu sebab-nya!

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad (Bachok): On point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Ta' boleh.

(To Enche' K. Karam Singh) Make it shorter.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am forced to go into this, because this is a very complicated subject.

Mr. Speaker: I hope you will not speak again when we come back to the substantive motion.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: I won't, Sir.

Now, Sir, about very suspicious dealings about accounts under Head 37, Chemistry—paragraph 71. It says:

"There are grounds for thinking that the misallocation may have been made deliberately in order to use up otherwise lapsing funds . . ."

It means that some person would have made false allocation so that he could have got money from some other fund and used it for his own benefit.

And paragraph 74 says:

"The misallocation appears to have been made with the intention of concealing expenditure in excess of the authorised provision."

Why should anyone make a misallocation with the intention of concealing expenditure if not for the purpose of concealing his own mistake or his own negligence or his own fault or his own acts which he is frightened to bring before the eyes of the proper authorities? Why should he do that?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, on page 25, paragraph 131, the second paragraph, it says:

"Of the nett issues in 1958, amounting to \$447,415, a sum of \$284,533 was paid to the Perlis Padi Planters Board but the payment was not made until the latter part of the year and less than \$15,000 was in fact issued to the planters before the year-end."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the great sum of \$284,533 was given to the Perlis Padi Planters Board, and out of this only \$15,000 is given to the people—the padi planters—for whom it was intended. There is a difference of about \$270,000. What has happened to that money. These are not small sums of money, Sir. Has the Perlis Padi Planters Board used up the money? Have the members of this Board taken this money for their own purpose, misused it for their own purpose, misappropriated it for their own purpose? What evidence have we that this money has been properly spent? What evidence have we that this money is still in the bank for the use of these padi planters, for whom it was intended?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, if the mover of this original motion and the Members on the Government Bench feel very happy about these accounts, I will refer them to page 17, where it deals with "Thefts, Frauds and Losses" and I will inform them, if they are unwilling to look at these "Thefts, Frauds and Losses" that there are almost three pages dealing with many Government departments about thefts, frauds and losses, and I will ask the Government if frauds do

not include misappropriation, embezzlement, swindling and all that, what does it include? Fraud means cheating, misappropriation, swindling and every other crime in which money is involved.

Paragraph 102, dealing with Secret Service Funds, says:

"The loss of \$9,550 appears to involve forgery and embezzlement by a public officer."

Forgery and Embezzlement!

On page 18, paragraph 102, subparagraph (iv), it says:

"Fraudulent payment vouchers were prepared in the Sub-Treasury at Parit ostensibly for the payment of subsidies to ex-Special Police Officers for the development or improvement of land. The money withdrawn on the vouchers was then misappropriated."

Misappropriated! Some of the Members on the Government Bench said not a word has been mentioned about misappropriation—what is this if not misappropriation?

Then, again, sub-paragraphs (vi) and (vii), dealing with losses—and there was an Honourable Member who had the courage to say that no money was lost.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will not go any further. I think that the House would be convinced that there has been vast fraud, vast misallocation, misuse of money. I will further just add that on page 26, under paragraph 132, it says that there were \$103,000 in bank interest charges which were nugatory and avoidable expenses. They may have been incurred by people who could have avoided them just for the purpose of getting some benefit or some part of this \$103,000.

And about the Ministry of Education, about the sum of \$110,000,000, I will tell the Government that it cannot just conjure away \$110,000,000. What the country wants is not magic from the Ministers: it wants facts, facts, for every cent that was spent or misspent, and I will tell them that the people who voted them into power and voted us into the Opposition are not fools. There is enough civic consciousness, there is enough political consciousness in this country not only for us but for the people outside to watch what the Government is doing and how the Government is behaving.

I will end my speech, Mr. Speaker, Sir, by saying that the Report of the Auditor-General is a Report of an impartial civil servant, a very responsible civil servant, and his word on this is final, and for the Minister of Education to say that it is not correct, to say that the Auditor-General is not always right—I will tell the Minister it is not correct always to say that the Government or the Ministers are always correct and always right. And I tell the Government that if it had been another Government, any other Parliamentary Government anywhere in this world, it would have resigned when it had received a Report of this nature, rather than bring a motion of confidence on itself for its own errors and for its own mismanagement—if it had been an honest Government. But still the Government comes here asking for a vote of confidence! We can judge what sort of Government the Alliance Government is!

Dato' Onn bin Ja'afar (Kuala Trengganu Selatan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, at the last meeting of this House the Honourable Minister of Finance stated to the House the Government's concern over the Auditor-General's Report and said that in due course a statement would be published and tabled before this House. That statement has now been tabled accompanied by a motion for the acceptance of that Government statement or White Paper. I would like this House to consider very carefully just one aspect of this motion by the Government. If the Government motion is accepted, a very grave precedent will have been created, a precedent whereby the Report of the Auditor-General for 1958—maybe for 1959, maybe for 1960, for any year—can be conveniently side-tracked merely by a Government White Paper followed by a motion to accept the Government statement, thereby defeating the purpose of Standing Order 77 (1) which lays down that the Report of the Auditor-General for every year shall be examined by the Public Accounts Committee. I maintain, Sir, that this Government move is putting the cart before the horse. By the acceptance of this motion, this House would be deprived from taking into consideration

the report of the Public Accounts Committee when this Report of the Auditor-General has been examined by that Committee and the report of the Committee tabled in this House. It is this one aspect on which I feel great concern, for if this House accepts the Government action then it will have created a very grave precedent.

The Minister of External Affairs accuses the Opposition of challenging the Government to contravene the Standing Orders. Now, I take this statement from the *Straits Times* of this morning. I submit that the Opposition has been doing nothing of the sort. On the contrary the Opposition is supporting the Standing Orders, and, in particular, S.O. 77 (1). Why should the Government be so reluctant to accept this amendment? Why should the Government be so insistent that its statement should be accepted? If the Government proposes to use its majority to defeat this amendment, then I say this is all wrong. The Government statement says that there is nothing wrong. That may be so. I am not here to judge whether the Auditor-General is right or the Government is right, or the Auditor-General is wrong or the Government is wrong, until the Public Accounts Committee have had an opportunity to examine this Report. The Report for 1958 covers a period for the whole of that year, and that Report has been tabled in this House 1 year and 2 months after the period covered. Why then this indecent haste on the part of the Government to absolve itself of all concern, or credit, or blame? Is the Government afraid that the findings of the Public Accounts Committee may not absolutely absolve it from blame? The Opposition is also aware of the conditions that existed in 1958; it is aware of the shortage of staff; it is aware that the accounting system was not all that it should have been; and it is also aware of the many difficulties consequent upon the implementation of the new education policy. The Opposition is prepared to consider all these factors. It is not the Opposition move to down the Government or to take one back from the Government. The Report of the Auditor-General deals with the Accounts of the Federation as

a whole. Therefore, it is the duty of the Opposition to see that those accounts are in order, that the financial procedure of the Government is in order and that the observations of the Auditor-General are carried out. The amendment is only fair and should, I submit, be accepted. The Government can of course force through this motion, but any such move will leave a sour taste in the mouth of the public. It will be construed as a deliberate and calculated attempt on the part of the Government to whitewash itself against the statements and observations of the Auditor-General. I, therefore, appeal to the Government to see reason and to accept this amendment.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid (Seberang Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun hendak menyokong pehak Kerajaan, kerana pindaan yang dikemukakan oleh Yang Berhormat wakil dari Tanjong itu maksud-nya di-serahkan kepada Public Accounts Committee. Perkara yang berbangkit ini ia-lah timbol-nya manakala Report daripada Auditor-General ini di-bentangkan untuk pengetahuan Ahli² Yang Berhormat sakalian. Di-dalam Meshuarat yang lalu telah berbangkit tuduhan² yang melulu, yang tidak menasabah dan yang mendatangkan salah faham terhadap Kerajaan, sa-hingga menchabar Kerajaan supaya membentangkan satu Kertas Puteh. Jadi dengan sebab itu-lah pehak Kerajaan membentangkan Kertas Puteh ini untuk menghilangkan atau menghapuskan apa² tuduhan yang telah di-kemukakan itu dengan bermaksud seperti yang tersebut dalam Kertas Puteh ini. "The following paragraphs form a commentary on certain passages in that Report and are published to enable those passages to be read in the right perspective." Jadi di-bentangkan Auditor-General Report ini supaya Ahli² Yang Berhormat bacha dengan sempurna-nya. Itu yang pertama. Yang kedua-nya, "It is not intended to comment in detail on the Report as this would prejudice the deliberations and findings of the Public Accounts Committee . . ." jadi bukan-lah berma'ana Auditor-General Report ini tidak akan di-serahkan kepada Public Accounts Committee, ini akan di-serahkan

kapada Public Accounts Committee untuk di-kaji dengan sa-halus²-nya, kerana Public Accounts Committee bertanggung-jawab di-atas hal-ehwal Auditor-General Report.

Tetapi, sayang sa-ribu kali sayang, ayat "this would prejudice" itu tidak di-perhatikan. Yang kita bahathkan ini soal pokok-nya, tetapi Yang Berhormat wakil dari Damansara bangkitkan dari satu clause ka-satu clause, ini berma'ana sudah "prejudice" ahli Public Accounts Committee, kita hendak menyekat tetapi ia sudah membuka-nya; jadi di-sini-lah timbul-nya salah faham di-antara beberapa orang Ahli Yang Berhormat. Kita bukan-lah hendak menghilangkan atau hendak menghapuskan tanggung-jawab Kerajaan berkenaan dengan kewangan, tetapi chuma hendak menghapuskan keraguan atau salah faham yang telah di-tempelak oleh pehak pembangkang—menudoh yang bukan² ada yang mengatakan, konon-nya, Menteri Pelajaran makan duit—Menteri itu makan duit, ada-kah perkara ini menasabah? Kerana tiap² Menteri itu mendapat peruntukan wang-nya daripada Menteri Kewangan untuk menjalankan ranchangan² khas yang ada di-dalam Kementerian-nya. Wang peruntukkan itu di-serahkan kapada pegawai² yang di-bawah urusan Kementerian itu menjalankan kewajipan masing² supaya membuat ranchangan² itu.

Jadi, soalan-nya berbangkit berkenaan dengan penggunaan wang itu. Pegawai² yang di-bawah-nya di-tugaskan menjalankan-nya. Dan pegawai² yang di-bawah-nya itu ta' boleh membelanjakan dengan suka hati-nya atau pun chuba menggunakan wang² itu, atau makan wang itu. Dan sa-kira-nya pegawai² itu pada penglihatan Ahli² Yang Berhormat pembangkang, orang itu salah gunakan atau makan suap, kita ada dua Jabatan² yang meninjau, yang memerhatikan atas perkara ini ia-itu satu Jabatan C.I.D. dan satu lagi Jabatan Anti Corruption. Jadi orang ini jikalau-lah ada kesalahan² atau salah faham atau pun kita katakan shak wasangka, dapat kedua² Pejabat ini mengambil tindakan. Jadi, pada pendapat saya sa-bagaimana yang di-terangkan oleh Yang Berhormat Timbalan Perdana Menteri

berkenaan dengan hal-ehwal ranchangan yang telah kita jalankan itu, adalah ikut kemahuan ra'ayat dan dengan gopoh gapah itu tentu-lah sa-kali ada perkara² yang tidak boleh di-jalankan dengan lichen-nya.

Yang kedua, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ingin menerangkan di-atas kejujoran Kerajaan Perikatan. Jika Kerajaan ini tidak jujur tentu-lah sa-kali sebelum di-bentangkan laporan Auditor-General Kerajaan boleh berchakap atau berpakat dengan Auditor-General supaya di-betulan tentang mana yang ta' betul, tetapi Kerajaan tidak membuat perkara itu. Apa yang di-perbualkan oleh Auditor-General dan apa yang di-katakan

Mr. Speaker: Di-bawah Constitution kita, Kerajaan tidak boleh menyuruh Auditor-General betulkan perkara itu.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid: Sebab itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka menegaskan, kita patohkan kepada Perlembagaan kita dan kita tidak gunakan kuasa kita kepada Auditor-General. Jadi, ini satu parkara yang patut pehak pembangkang itu ambil ingatan. Tuan Yang di-Partua, pehak Kerajaan suka jikalau orang² yang menjalankan kewajipan tidak betul dan jika pegawai Jabatan itu dapati salah, kita suka orang itu supaya diambil tindakan yang munasabah dan dengan ini Kerajaan akan berjalan dengan elok. Oleh sebab itu manakala lepas Report Auditor-General ini dikeluarkan oleh pehak Kerajaan, Kerajaan telah pun meminta laporan dengan sa-jelas²-nya daripada pegawai² yang mana bertanggung-jawab itu. Dengan ada penjelasan² daripada mereka itu maka di-bentangkan Kertas Puteh ini dan ini bukan-lah berma'ana meminta undi keperchayaan atau hendak meminta undi keperchayaan di-atas Kertas Puteh ini. Chuma untuk menghilangkan keraguan atau salah faham yang di-tuduh kepada pehak Kerajaan. Dan manakala telah di-kaji Kertas Puteh ini serta dengan laporan Auditor-General ini kedua-nya akan serahkan kepada Public Accounts Committee yang bertanggung-jawab berkenaan dengan hal-ehwal kewangan.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam (Menglembu): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise in

support of this amendment. Considerations of elementary decency and justice should have prevented the Government from moving this motion at this stage.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this morning the Honourable Minister of Education flung a challenge at the Opposition. He in fact said—"Prosecute us if you have the evidence". The answer is simple, and this is the answer: let the files of the Ministry of Education be opened for inspection by the Opposition and we promise you that there would be enough evidence for several people to stand in the dock on charges² under the Penal Code. That was the challenge, and this is the answer and I hope the answer will be taken up.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this White Paper is a flimsy attempt on the part of the Government to wash away the dirt which the Auditor-General has flung at them quite rightly and properly and in the proper discharge of his duties. Now, what is the Government asking this House to accept to-day? The Government is asking the House to accept what the Government itself describes as nothing more than a commentary. That is what the Government describes its own White Paper as, and I quote from it:

"The Report of the Auditor-General on the Accounts of the Federation of Malaya for the year ended 31st December, 1958, was tabled on 20th February, 1960, as Command Paper No. 6 of 1960. The following paragraphs form a commentary on certain passages in that Report and are published to enable those passages to be read in the right perspective."

Now, what is the purpose of the publication of this Report—to enable those passages to be read in the right perspective. Well, that object is achieved by presenting this Paper to the House and this Paper being laid on the Table. We have read this Paper and we have read the Report. What more does the Government want to do with this Paper? They want this House to accept this Statement. In other words—"Accept the fact that by publishing this Paper we have white-washed ourselves. We have nothing to explain." Then the Government goes on to say—

"It is not intended to comment in detail on the Report as this would prejudice the

deliberations and findings of the Public Accounts Committee."

Now sitting right in front of us in this House are members of the Public Accounts Committee and what are they being asked by the Government to-day—vote in favour of this Paper, accept this Paper, accept this explanation so that nothing more is required from the Government and the Government has cleared its name. Mr. Speaker, Sir, members of the Public Accounts Committee sitting in this House are invited to take a vote in the matter, and what confidence can the public have in any decision that they may arrive at later? Can there be any reasonable doubt in the mind of any reasonable man that when this Public Accounts Committee meets, having approved this Paper, are they going to go back on their words and say that these comments are wrong, that their actions are not satisfactory? What a waste of time and money the meetings of the Public Accounts Committee would be if to-day this Paper is accepted by this House? What does the Government lose, if it were to accede to the Opposition's amendment? After all we are not rejecting this Paper out-right. We only say, refer it back to the Public Accounts Committee and let them study it in conjunction with the Auditor-General's Report and for further information which the Public Accounts Committee can summon—and they have the power to summon. What is the use of publishing a Paper like this and putting it before 104 Members, who have no access to any file and who have no access to any information, and saying, "You approve it."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, a saying has often been used in this House more than once by both sides—"If the cap fits, you can put it on." Throughout this debate—I was not here yesterday—I do not believe that an Opposition Member has charged the Government side with criminal breach of trust.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: This morning!

Enche' V. David: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I did not say "criminal breach of

trust. What I said was "breach of trust."

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Breach of trust or criminal breach of trust, it is the same thing!

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: I am not sure that the word "criminal" was used.

Mr. Speaker: The word "criminal" was not used. You were here.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: This morning I was here, but not yesterday and I am not sure that the word "criminal" was used.

Mr. Speaker: It was not used!

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: Sir, I do not understand why people started to talk about prosecution, because prosecution could only be instituted in a criminal breach of trust; and I do not know why people should talk about police and police station. Criminal proceedings would be the remedy for a criminal breach of trust, but in the particular circumstances where the whole Government is charged with breach of trust, there is practically no civil remedy. But, of course, if my suggestion that the files of the Ministry are laid open to us is accepted, then there will be a real remedy if the Attorney-General is prepared to proceed in the matter, and if he is prepared to sanction somebody else to proceed with the matter.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not think that there is anything further I can contribute usefully to this debate. I really got up to answer the challenge of the Honourable the Minister of Education, and I hope, having thrown out the challenge, he will accept our counter-challenge.

The Minister of Finance (Enche' Tan Siew Sin): Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members of the Opposition, or rather the more vociferous Members of the Opposition, are running true to form. What I mean to say by this is that as usual the amount of noise they make and the output of their oratory is in inverse proportion to the amount of knowledge they have on any

subject. I have, of course, always been forced to the rather sad conclusion that this is so. But in this case I think that they have excelled themselves in that not only have they displayed a lamentable lack of knowledge of accounting, they have also displayed a lamentable lack of ordinary English.

To begin with, I think, I should make my position clear as Head of the Treasury. Normally, it is not the function of a Minister of Finance to come to the rescue of the Government in the event of adverse comments or an adverse report by the Auditor-General; but in this case I think that the circumstances are unusual, because Honourable Members of the Opposition have seen fit to indulge in wild allegations which are not even substantiated by the plain language of the Report itself.

In the first place, a general accusation has been levelled that as a result of this motion the work of the Public Accounts Committee will be prejudiced. I suggest that nothing is farther from the truth. If this motion—in this case I am, of course, referring to the motion moved by the Honourable the Deputy Prime Minister—is approved by this House, both the Report and the White Paper will still go before the Public Accounts Committee, and in due course the Public Accounts Committee will submit its report. And if as a result of the report the Opposition sees fit to bring a motion of censure against the Government then—if my interpretation of the Standing Orders is correct—it is still open to them to do so. In other words, this motion in no way impairs the function or the scope of the Public Accounts Committee to discuss and adjudicate on this Report in the way it would have been able to do, even if no motion had been brought forward. But I submit, Sir, that this unusual procedure—and I admit that it is an unusual procedure—was forced on the Government by the highly irresponsible behaviour of the Opposition itself. (*Applause*). The Government never dreamt of this procedure, but it will be recalled that in a previous Session of this House, the Opposition saw fit, or rather the more

vociferous Members of the Opposition saw fit, to introduce this rather irrelevant matter into a debate—I think on the Development Estimates—and challenged the Government to prove its innocence. The Government, being aware of the misconception which might arise or prevail in the minds of the people, therefore had no alternative but to prepare its defence as soon as possible, so that it will not again be charged with being afraid to present its case by delaying tactics. And this, Sir, is the sole reason why Government has seen fit to adopt this rather unusual procedure.

I would now like to dwell a little on the Government system of accounting. Before any money can be spent at all out of public revenue, a vote has to be created under a sub-head and that sub-head will form part of a head of expenditure. Honourable Members are aware that a Head of expenditure in ordinary language really covers the total expenditure of a Department of Government. Now when a vote has been created, and it can only be created by the sanction of this House, then it is open to the Department concerned to spend up to the limit of that vote on that particular item of expenditure. It, of course, happens in any organisation both large and small, but it applies particularly to organisations such as the Government which is larger than any commercial organisation in the country, that it cannot foresee the future with exactitude and it sometimes happens that you have got to exceed the vote on a certain item of expenditure. Now what happens in that case? In that case it is open to the Department concerned to either ask for an increase to the vote or to ask for what is called “virement”.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew (Dato Kramat): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order, I wonder if this is relevant to the question.

Mr. Speaker: He is giving reasons as to why he is opposing the amendment. It is quite relevant.

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: It is completely relevant, Sir. As I have said already,

it is open to the Department in question to ask for an increase for that particular vote or to ask for what is known in Treasury circles as virement—V-I-R-E-M-E-N-T, under Section 15 of the Financial Procedure Ordinance. Virement means that the Department concerned would be allowed to use any savings under another sub-head of expenditure, provided that that sub-head forms part of the same head of expenditure, in order to make up the deficit under the sub-head which is short of money. And that, in fact, has happened in many cases in respect of items which were commented upon adversely by the Auditor-General and that, in fact, is the sole reason why I have taken care to bring to the notice of this House this procedure known as “Virement”. I have mentioned this too, because the Honourable Member for Damansara showed in his speech that he has got no knowledge whatsoever not only of Government accounting but also of anything connected with accounting.

The Honourable Member for Menglembu got very hot under the collar when he referred to the challenge of my Honourable friend the Minister of Education on the question of criminal proceedings. I am not a lawyer, but as far as I know you do not need the sanction of the Attorney-General to institute criminal proceedings.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: You do.

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Not against the Government. If such proceedings were instituted, I think, the Court would certainly allow relevant files to be produced, so that all the facts relevant to the case can be brought to the notice of the Court. So, I do not see how it can be argued that because the Government is the Government it would not be possible to institute criminal proceedings in case there is ground for such action.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would now like to deal with a few points which have been made by certain Members of the Opposition, in order to show that they really do not know what they are talking about. It is not my intention to deal with every point which has

been made by the Honourable Member for Damansara, because I do not wish to waste the time of the House unduly, but would mention a few instances only to prove my point that, to use a colloquial expression, he is talking through his hat.

I refer to paragraph 29 where the Auditor-General comments on the fact that only \$17,000 has been received in fees against an estimate of \$2.8 million. There is no mystery about this item: all that happened was that there was a miscalculation in the forecast; and that I suggest is human error, because it is not easy to forecast the future and even Honourable Members cannot forecast the future as was evident recently in the conduct of the Constitution (Amendment) Bill. And that is all that has happened. Further, even the Auditor-General has made it clear that the reason why the transfer could not be effected was because the necessary legislation had not been enacted. Therefore, I do not think that there is any mystery about the missing millions of dollars.

Paragraph 30—I think that one of the Honourable Members opposite stated that there was some monkey business, to use a colloquial expression, about this particular item. Even the Auditor-General did not state that any money was missing. All he said was that, to use his exact words, the survey fees are assessed by State Governments. In other words, the assessment made by the State Governments did not come up to expectations. And then he says further on in the same paragraph, “Revenues appear to fall short of the costs of the service.” There was no implication of loss at all, Sir, in this paragraph. All this paragraph meant to say was that the revenues fell short of the estimate—and again, this is a matter of forecast, and we cannot blame the State Governments for being too optimistic; if anything that is all we can blame them for.

The next paragraph is 36. This paragraph really involves a legal technicality. In this connection, there was a slight difference of view between the

Attorney-General and the Auditor-General on a point of law. From the Treasury standpoint, we feel that the Attorney-General probably has a slightly better knowledge of the law than the Auditor-General, and hence we thought that it would be reasonable in the circumstances to accept the view of the Attorney-General rather than that of the Auditor-General on a point of law, and that was what the Treasury did. The Auditor-General, of course, says "I am not satisfied that the transfer is legally permissible", but unfortunately for him the Attorney-General begs to differ from this view.

Paragraph 49, Sir, is an example of virement. Again, there was a difference of opinion as to how this particular expenditure should be charged. The Auditor-General said that it should be charged to one particular sub-head and the Treasury allowed that expenditure to be charged to another sub-head. That was all it amounted to. It is really a matter of accounting—whether it should be charged to "A" or "B"—and I do not think there was loss of funds: certainly, there was no misappropriation.

Paragraph 58, I believe, refers to the Trade School at Temerloh. This, again, is an example of virement and has been explained in White Paper No. 14 of 1960. This virement too, I should add, was made with the consent of the Treasury, which has got legal power under Section 15, sub-section (4) of the Financial Procedure Ordinance to authorise this procedure.

The Honourable Member for Damansara also spoke at great length on this question of fraud. He, of course, omitted—I do not know whether deliberately or otherwise—to mention that all frauds which had occurred during the period under review had in fact been mentioned in the Report. He did not mention that the frauds had been distinguished from the general body of the Report, in that they are quite separate and have no connection whatever with accounting mistakes or differences of opinion on general regulations on finance which, in fact, comprise the main body of the Report.

I think that it was not fair for him to give the impression, and I only hope that it was unintentional, that the frauds formed part of the body of the Report. I mean that if you will go further into them, you will find in many cases that appropriate action has been taken and the officers concerned have been surcharged or convicted. But there is no desire on the part of the Government to gloss over this thing. This thing usually happens all over the world, but the point I wish to make is that appropriate action has been taken in all cases. In any case where delay has occurred, I do not think that the delay can be laid at the door of the Government.

I think that is all I have to say, but I would like to emphasise once again that this procedure has been forced upon the Government by the unfair and highly dubious tactics of the Opposition, and if the motion is agreed to, I do not think that the scope of action of the Public Accounts Committee will have been impaired in any way. (*Applause*).

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I had meant to speak on the main motion, but in view of what the Minister of Finance has said, I feel I ought to reply to him now. He has accused us of being vociferous because of our lack of qualification, but I didn't know the Minister of Finance himself is qualified in finance. I had always thought that the Minister of Finance is a layman, not a qualified man, and therefore I wish to apologise to this House for having under-rated his qualifications. We must say that the Minister of Finance is trying to lead a donkey by the nose. We must not forget that whatever the Government has said, they keep talking of defence, defence, defence. Of course they are trying to defend themselves, and I would now be so bold as to say this—I dare the Government to approve this Report. I challenge the Government to accept this Report! Why? Because this Report is an admission of incompetency, of mismanagement, and of misallocation of funds which, as the Honourable Minister of Finance says, can come

under the head of virements. This whole Report, as I can see it, ought to be referred to the Public Accounts Committee—even if it is to save the face of the Government. This is a packet of whitewash. The Government is trying to whitewash a black cat, but the black whiskers are still showing! (*Laughter*). If we accept this Report, it would amount to a vote of censure against the Government itself for mismanagement of funds and improper accounting by the previous Minister of Education. From that accusation the Government cannot escape. If it is not a vote of censure on the Government, then it is a vote of censure against the Auditor-General. In other words, by not accepting responsibility the Government is trying to find a scapegoat, and since the Auditor-General is not here to reply, of course he is the most convenient scapegoat that the Government has got. Therefore he is blamed. The charge here is this: that there has been misappropriation, that there has been mismanagement, that there has been incompetency, that there has been no proper accounting, and there has been no proper Report. This, as a layman sees it, is the gist of the Report of the Auditor-General. But the Alliance Government keeps wanting to persuade itself that it is virtuous, that its armour is clean and shining, that it has no faults. As I have said, the Government is attempting to lead the donkey by the nose. (*Laughter*). But even the donkey may object and walk out sometimes, and has to refuse the carrot which is dangled before its nose.

Mr. Speaker: I rule that out!

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: I was referring to a symbol!

Mr. Speaker: You can be imputing. Be very careful in this House! Please proceed!

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Now, if we look at this Report, nearly 30 paragraphs out of 71 contains admissions. Let us take the first one.

Paragraphs 3 to 5 says—in answer to the allegation that there had been no authority for expenditure of \$106,000—odd—

“ . . . authority for payment exists and proof of receipt could be shown by the production of paid cheques . . . ”

“Could be shown”—but not shown, therefore the charge is not refuted. Is it a defence or is it an admission to say that there may be cheques, that there may be receipts, which could be shown, but have not yet been shown. This is the language of the Report—not mine. And we have been accused of not understanding English. If that be the truth, then let anybody else contradict me on this point: “could” is not “is”, and I think that if anyone wishes to hurl allegations across the floor, at least he should have some justification. But to accuse us of not understanding the language when the language is that of the Government is something which I cannot understand.

The next one, in paragraph 16, says:

“The implication of mismanagement is not justified by technical imperfection of this kind. However, the method of operation of these Accounts has since been completely revised.”

“has since been completely revised”—has since—has since the Auditor-General's Report—or when? In any case it clearly shows this: that the previous accounting operation was insufficient, perhaps wrong, and has had to be revised, so that again is an admission of incompetency.

Then, we come down to 17 and 18—and I can show example after example—of such instances—which reads as follows:

“It is agreed that the Clearance Account carried some misallocations but these have since been cleared.”

Again, since when have these misallocations being cleared? Since the Auditor-General's Report, obviously. It was not cleared at one time, and therefore warranted this challenge from the Auditor-General.

On paragraph 30, it says:

“This matter is still receiving consideration. The position is as stated by the Auditor-General . . . ”

Here again an admission.

When we get to paragraph 51—we have the same thing. It says:

“The implication that the action taken by the Ministry in order to keep the schools functioning led to payments greater than the schools were entitled to is not correct.”

But it says before this—

“... financial provision had to be made for the schools or they would have to close.”

There the first part of this paragraph contradicts the second part.

Now, we come to the second point, and that deals with the question of closure of schools. That, I say, is the red herring strewn by the Government before the seekers of truth. Why do I say that? You will find that it is stated in this Report on paragraph 140 and so on, the admission that there was no practical method by which payments could be made under the existing laws. The relevant passage reads as follows:

“The procedure for obtaining the Minister's concurrence presented many difficulties and it was not until early 1959 that a practicable method was agreed with Treasury officials.”

In other words, until 1959, the Government was trying to carry out an impracticable measure. Why? Because Regulation 7 (1) (ii) (c) of the Schools (Financial Assistance) Regulations, 1958, says that no payments or advances or interim payment to Local Education Authorities or secondary schools could be made.

On the next page, on paragraph 141, again it says, under (b)—

“The grants payable to primary schools were determined by Ministry officials in 1957 at \$5 per pupil per year.”

Then, it says:

“For reasons partly outside the control of the Ministry the Board could not be convened until October, 1958, and in order that the schools should continue to function, quarterly payments were made to Local Education Authorities at the rate of \$5 per pupil per year, in anticipation of approval of this rate by the Board. There was no practicable alternative.”

I repeat “there was no practicable alternative”! And we come to (d)—

“Other grants payable to Local Education Authorities were in respect of maintenance of buildings. In accordance with the Schools (Financial Assistance) Regulations, 1958, this should be calculated on a ‘per classroom’ basis. This proved impracticable.”

I repeat “This proved impracticable”. Who said that? The Report of course, not the Opposition. The Minister of Education was trying for many years to carry out what was impracticable, and this is now the admission—in black

and white—by the Government that they were, if not incompetent, at least very, very impracticable. Laws were passed which could not be carried out. Money had to be paid up illegally against the laws, as temporary measures. Well, if that does not show incompetency, what does it show? Unless it is incompetency—or, perhaps, laziness, which, again, would lead to incompetency—it must be gross inefficiency.

If, we turn to the next page, page 8, (b), the last line of the sub-paragraph, says:

“The individual discrepancies referred to by the Auditor-General in Penang and Malacca are still under investigation.”

I repeat: “Are still under investigation”—in other words, up to now there are no proper accounts.

The last clause in sub-paragraph (d) on page 10 says:

“... though this does not explain the increase in telephone charges.”

On paragraph 155, the Report states:

“The excess is more than covered by under-expenditure on other items within the same sub-head and has been duly authorised.”

In other words, this means that provision was exceeded—whether covered by other items or not is irrelevant, unless we can cover it by stopping all virements—and it has only now been duly authorised.

Paragraph 158, page 11 says:

“The funds concerned were not derived from Government sources but it is admitted that the action of the State Education Officer was improper.”

So, improper management is admitted.

Paragraphs 159-162 states:

“These paragraphs naturally do not mention the abnormal difficulties which were facing the Ministry of External Affairs in 1958.”

The phrase “not mention the abnormal difficulties” is clear but the paragraph however did mention that there was improper management and that is the point, not whether the difficulties were there or not. By saying that because of these difficulties, we have been improper, the Government admits to impropriety. Why should not the Government admit now that they were improper, but there ought to have been other

circumstances which would explain such which ought to have been mentioned in the Auditor-General's Report? Let the Government say that. Why does the Government now try such oblique explanations and say there were external difficulties without admitting that in fact what the Auditor-General said was correct?

Paragraphs 166 and 172 and 175 say—

"The claims of States and the counter-claims of the Federation are in connection with a great variety of transactions during the period 1956, 1957 and 1958, and are being considered in conjunction with the audited State Accounts."

But this does not answer the charge of the Auditor-General which says:

"... but at the end of 1958 substantial sums were still to be adjusted."

That was what he thought was wrong. He was not concerned with the variety of transactions, only with the need for adjustment.

Paragraph 172 says:

"When it is considered that \$8 million worth of stores are held by the Ministry of Health and that some of these stores are of a fragile and perishable nature, the write off can be seen in proper perspective."

Does that answer the charge in the Auditor-General's report which says, clearly, that

"Some of the commodities had been kept until they were no longer safe to be used and the Department has now agreed to make a periodical examination of all stocks which have expiry dates"

In other words, the charge of the Auditor-General is that if some of the stores are of a fragile, perishable nature, then greater and more constant, more periodic supervision ought to be imposed in order to prevent destruction; and that is what the Auditor-General has suggested and the Government has not answered that charge.

"The failure to collect instalments of the fine was due to the fact that the culprit had absconded to Sumatra."

All right, the man ran away. But from where? From Perak, or from Malacca, or from both? Paragraph 175 of the Auditor-General's Report says that:

"There has been undue delay in the collection of court fines, particularly in Perak and in Malacca."

So the Government explanation would seem a lamentable effort at white-washing—and contains an implied admission that this man who absconded to Sumatra was operating very vastly in Perak and in Malacca—which I don't believe is correct. How can one man operate such a big ring of conspiracy as to cover two States? Maybe, he absconded to Sumatra from Malacca; maybe he was responsible as regards part of the failure to collect all fines in Malacca—but surely he could not have been responsible for the undue delay of collections of Court fines from two States. The Auditor-General says, I repeat:

"There has been undue delay in the collection of court fines, particularly in Perak and in Malacca."

So, does this Government explanation answer the charge? No!

Paragraph 177, says:

"These materials have been brought to proper account since the audit was undertaken."

Now, that is the grand finale—the grand finale—of the failure of the Government to explain itself. I say it because the Government has admitted to improper accounting. This paragraph says in fact that since the audit was undertaken, the Government is beginning to bring about proper accounting. And I say this: If the House dares to accept this, the Government stands condemned by its own statement of mismanagement, incompetency, undue delay, lack of proper control, and probable misappropriation in some cases. The Government cannot deny that the question of \$106 million may not be accounted for, and the Government cannot deny that the question of \$570 million also—or part of \$570 million—may also not be accounted for.

Enche' Liu Yoong Peng (Rawang):
Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think before the House considers this matter of amendment, it should bear in mind that there is a very important principle involved. The principle is that: Should this House be biased before knowing the full facts? Regarding this principle, there are two points I want to raise. First, I would say that the Government cannot be a judge for what the Government

itself is responsible. The second point is that this House just has not the time to check up in detail the accuracy of the statements in the Government White Paper. So, in view of this, if this House would not allow the White Paper to go before the Public Accounts Committee, and if this House would have a preconceived opinion before knowing exactly what the facts are before allowing the Public Accounts Committee to have a chance perhaps to make proper investigations into each and every item of the irregularities that have been pointed out in the Auditor-General's Report as well as in the White Paper itself, then I would say, Sir, that this House is acting as a blind man: a blind man insisting that because he has the power, he can see, that he has visibility. This, I say, Sir, would be a very lamentable affair, in fact I would like to say more, but I better not.

Amendment put, and negatived.

Sitting suspended at 12.00 noon.

Sitting resumed at 2.30 p.m.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

ADJOURNMENT *SINE DIE*

(Motion)

Tun Abdul Razak: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move,

That at its rising this day the House do stand adjourned *sine die*.

The Minister of External Affairs (Dato' Dr. Ismail): Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That at its rising this day the House do stand adjourned *sine die*.

EXEMPTED BUSINESS

(Motion)

Tun Abdul Razak: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move,

That the proceedings on the Government business set down on the Order Paper for this day be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order 12 (1).

Dato' Dr. Ismail: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That the proceedings on the Government business set down on the Order Paper for this day be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order 12 (1).

MOTIONS

GOVERNMENT STATEMENT ON AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT ON THE ACCOUNTS OF THE FEDERATION FOR 1958

Debate resumed.

Question again proposed.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad (Bachok): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, chadangan Kerajaan yang di-hadapan kita ini ada-lah satu chadangan yang menghendaki supaya Dewan ini menerima Comments yang di-kemukakan oleh Kerajaan berkenaan dengan Penyata Auditor-General bagi kira² tahun yang berakhir pada 31 December, 1958. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-belum saya memberi fikiran berkenaan dengan ini, saya hendak menjawab sedikit perkataan Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran yang ia tadi ta' tahu siapakah yang menjadi pelupor di-sabelah pembangkang. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soal pelupor di-sabelah pembangkang ini tidak-lah berbangkit, tetapi elok saya terangkan di-sini bagi ingatan kita bahawa pada Meshuarat Anggaran Belanjawan Tambahan yang lalu, saya telah menerangkan kepada Dewan ini ketika di-minta Belanja Tambahan bagi Kementerian Pelajaran bahawa kita tidak-lah memandang bahawa soal ini boleh di-masokkan dalam soal tuntutan permintaan tambahan yang dahulu itu. Dan dengan yang demikian, saya hairan-lah bahawa ada tudohan² bahawa kita di-sini sengaja membesar²kan perkara ini pada masa yang bukan pada tempat-nya. Sa-malam, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya telah juga menyebutkan kepada Kerajaan supaya jangan-lah latah dalam perkara ini dan mengeluarkan penyata atau kenyataan untuk di-terima di-sini. Mengikut ingatan saya apa yang timbol yang

menjadi besar sangat di-dalam perbahathannya yang dahulu itu telah menchuchok atau mengegetek Kerajaan untuk mengeluarkan Comments ini ia-lah berkenaan dengan wang \$110 juta. Selalunya Penyata² Auditor-General ini tidak-lah di-jawab dengan Comments di-Dewan ini, tetapi dengan wang \$110 juta itu tentu-lah Kerajaan ingin membersehhkan diri-nya.

Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau kita lihat Comments di-hadapan ini nyata-lah bahawa Comments ini meliputi semua soal yang ada di-dalam Penyata Auditor-General ini, dan ini dengan sendiri-nya merupakan suatu procedure baharu yang pada fikiran saya tidak sesuai dengan peraturan. Di-dalam ucapan Menteri Pelajaran nampak-nya ia mengatakan bahawa Persatuan Islam sa-Tanah Melayu menyokong sahaja Socialist Front dan P.P.P. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mengambil peluang di-sini memberi sedikit keterangan. Penyokongan Persatuan Islam sa-Tanah Melayu kepada satu² benda itu tidak-lah didasarkan bersama atau tidak-nya dengan Socialist Front dan P.P.P. Ada kala² seperti yang telah di-buktikan dalam Dewan ini kita menyertai pehak mana² sa-kali pun dengan tidak terikat. Mungkin, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam perbahathannya ini nampak-nya Persatuan Islam sa-Tanah Melayu terkemudian, tetapi bila kami hendak bangkit kadang² Tuan Yang di-Pertua tengok yang jauh, jadi yang dekat tidak nampak, maka tergendala-lah kami hendak berchakap dahulu—ini hanya satu kebetulan, dan saya harap jangan-lah di-gunakan kesempatan itu mengeluarkan satu kesimpulan.

Berbalek saya kepada soal yang di-hadapan kita ini, ia-itu chadangan "That this House accepts". Perkataan "accept" menerima tentu-lah mempunyai ma'ana yang jauh, menurut fahaman saya "accept" di-sini bukan-lah benda ini di-bentangkan, kita menengok dan kita menganggok, tetapi "accept" ma'ana-nya di-bentangkan, kita puas hati dengan apa yang ada di-dalam-nya. Berasaskan itu-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak dapat menerima bahkan membangkang usul Timbalan Perdana Menteri ini.

Apa sebab kita tidak dapat menerima Comments ini? Sebab-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kerana kita rasa Comments ini tidak dapat memuaskan hati kita. Sa-malam saya telah mengabarkan amat-lah susah-nya membahathkan perkara yang seperti ini ka-persidangan yang sa-besar ini, tetapi dengan putusnya undi pada hari ini, terpaksa-lah perkara ini di-bahathkan dan apabila di-bahathkan perkara ini, terpaksa-lah saya membahathkan dengan chara satu persatu. Di-dalam membahathkan Penyata ini dan Comments yang ada di-hadapan kita ini, maka dengan nasihat daripada Comments ini hendak-lah di-bacha Penyata ini dengan penerangan daripada Comments ini. Ta'at-lah saya dan akan saya jalankan penjelasan dan ulasan saya atas asas kedua² itu berjalan sama.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, satu daripada yang nampak pada saya dalam kedua² document yang ada di-hadapan saya ini bahawa document ini tidak chukup, tidak sempurna dan tidak menjawab semua-nya. Ini akan dapat saya tunjukkan kemudia-nya dan nyata-lah oleh kerana tidak chukup, tidak sempurna dan tidak menjawab semua-nya itu, maka tidak-lah kita terima; itu yang pertama.

Yang kedua, dalam usul Timbalan Perdana Menteri ada satu perkataan yang menjadi satu dasar bagi perbahathannya ini di-mana kata-nya—

" having regard to the changed conditions prevailing immediately after Merdeka,"

"after Merdeka" tentu-lah banyak keadaan² yang memberi keistimewaan, tetapi saya boleh memberikan satu pandangan bahawa dalam Report of the Auditor-General ini tidak semua yang di-rungutkan, yang di-salahkan, yang di-fikirkan tidak tepat oleh Auditor-General itu boleh kita katakan sebab-nya kerana "changed conditions after Merdeka". Bukan sedikit, dan akan saya tunjukkan sedikit demi sedikit kenyataan²-nya, timbol di-sini bukan-lah kerana after Merdeka, tetapi kerana memang biasa salah. Biasa salah bukan-lah saya katakan tahun 1958 itu satu keistimewaan, tetapi

memang biasa dalam Pejabat² Kerajaan. Entah-lah kalau benda itu ta' di-kerjakan sekarang ini. Izinkan-lah saya mengambil para. 3 to 5 yang ada di-jawab di-sini. Soal yang besar-nya ia-lah Unvouched Payments without supporting vouchers, kata-nya. Dalam jawapan-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, telah di-terangkan bahawa benda ini tidak-lah terang bahawa Auditor-General itu maksud-nya yang dia tidak melihat-nya benda itu, atau pun tanda penerimaan itu tidak di-keluarkan.

Pada fikiran saya ada-lah terang bahawa Auditor-General bermaksud di-sini yang dia tidak nampak authority for the payments, jadi kita menjawab dengan chara evasive tactic dalam cerita pangkal cheque dan copy receipt yang perkara itu tidak mengubah keadaan apa yang di-katakan oleh Auditor-General. Hal berkenaan dengan Treasury daripada Johor ada-lah satu bilangan yang banyak kewangan-nya dan saya rasa hal yang saperti ini tidak-lah dapat di-jalankan oleh Command ini sendiri, dan tidak-lah dapat di-terima.

Pada para. 6 ada satu masa'alah yang mengatakan "insufficient evidence of disbursement" dan benda ini telah di-hantar ka-Johor dan berbalek pula kepada State Treasurer, Johore tahun 1959, for completion, tetapi it has not yet been resubmitted. Ini amat mendukacitakan kerana tidak betul. Kesalahan dalam kira² ada dua, mahu tak mahu ada dua. Yang pertama kesalahan dalam mengikut peratoran yang di-tetapkan. Yang kedua ia-lah kesalahan kehilangan wang. Yang kedua-nya ini menjadi pandangan dan perhatian kepada kita yang memerhatikan kepentingan kewangan orang ramai negeri ini. Sebab-nya, kalau-lah sa-orang sahabat saya daripada sebelah sana tadi mengatakan duit ta' hilang maka kalau tak hilang sekali pun, kata-lah setengah duit pun tidak hilang, tetapi kalau kita tidak ikut chara accounting yang sa-benar dan tidak di-ikut undang² yang di-atorkan, maka salah juga dan memang patut Auditor-General itu menegor-nya.

Dalam para. 9 Auditor-General telah menunjokkan pula beberapa kesulitan²

yang berlaku dalam Treasury books record yang kata-nya—

"Treasury books record balances in the hands of these imprest-holders totalling \$13,359 at 31st December, 1958, but it appears that cash actually held at that date was no more than \$160 and that the difference is largely accounted for by disbursements which were not supported by acceptable vouchers and were therefore disallowed."

Ini pun dalam perkara 9 saya berasa hairan, sebab Kerajaan tidak menjawabkan hal ini. Dalam membersekan kekeohan yang di-timbulkan oleh pehak pembangkang dan boleh jadi sesiapa sahaja mengadakan tektek tak usah jawab, saya rasa tidak-lah tepat. Sa-benar-nya rasa saya kadang² benda yang tidak di-jawab oleh Kerajaan, rasa saya dengan niat yang baik boleh saya katakan bahawa Kerajaan memandang perkara ini benda yang senang di-jawab dan tak payah di-jawab. Tetapi, berhadapan dengan opposition dan berhadapan dengan kechurigaan dengan orang itu tidak-kah baik benar perkara ini di-layankan dengan baik. Para. 9 telah saya baca tadi dengan menunjokkan perkara² yang sedemikian.

Para. 10 daripada penyata ini Auditor-General dengan chara diplomacy-nya telah meneger Kerajaan—

"As shown at Statement 'E' certain investments have been valued not at market value but at cost."

Bahawa ini tentu-lah berma'ana sepatut-nya-lah valuation atau nilai itu patut-lah di-buat dalam market value, ini pun tidak di-jawab. Saya rasa dengan tak menjawab benda yang saperti itu, maka menjadi kewajiban bagi saya memandangkan bahawa usol untuk menerima ini ada-lah satu usol yang tidak boleh dapat di-terima dan mesti di-tolak.

Para. 18 menerangkan Uncleared Transactions. Para. 17 dan 18 di-jawab di-sini. Hal ini di-jawab oleh Kerajaan—

"It is agreed that the Clearance Account carried some misallocations but these have since been cleared."

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau perkara itu sudah di-persetujukan—agree, saya tidak hendak menambah sedikit pun, tetapi kuat, tegas saya bahawa document ini tidak boleh di-terima. Dalam Command Paper ini banyak kenyataan²

yang menunjukkan bahawa benda kesalahan ini tak betul kedudukannya, salah peratoran semua-nya yang menyebabkan has been corrected. Ini satu tanda yang baik dan kita berharap bila Report of the Auditor-General tahun 1959 terjadi seperti ini kita tidak akan terima lagi, tetapi dalam menerangkan sa-suatu kritik, sa-suatu kechaman "has been corrected", saya rasa tidak-lah berapa chukop dan tidak-lah berapa kuat.

Para. 19 di-mana Kerajaan juga telah membuat pengakuan berkenaan dengan Incorrect Charges dan hal ini tak payah saya panjangkan. Para. 23 berkenaan dengan Contingencies Fund—Delay in replacing advances, pada hal dalam Perlembagaan replacement yang di-kehendakki oleh Auditor-General itu mesti di-buat dengan segera, tetapi telah terlambat. Saya hanya boleh dapat satu kesimpulan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-itu Kerajaan telah tidak menghormati dan tidak mengikut perlembagaan dalam Clause 23 ini.

Para. 28 Arrears of Estate Duty yang belanjanya lebeh daripada \$12.5 million. Hal ini tidak mendapat jawapan daripada Kerajaan dan sepatutnya perkara arrears yang seperti ini di-selesaikan. Saya, sudah itu terpaksa pergi ka-para. 38 dengan chara laju sahaja, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada di-terangkan \$32,657 yang sepatutnya di-kreditkan kepada Development Fund. Para. 38 ini pun tidak di-jawab oleh Kerajaan.

Para. 41, ini laju, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-itu the expenditure of \$52,580. Saya chari jawapan dan saya berjumpa dengan-nya di-mana katanya—

"The expenditure of \$52,580 on the purchase of a motor car is not the full cost of the vehicle. A further amount of \$296 has been charged against the Miscellaneous Advance Account in the Consolidated Trust Account."

Jadi, dalam hal ini di-jawab oleh Kerajaan—

"It is intended to seek supplementary provision for this excess in a Supplementary Supply Act in 1960."

Ini tahun 1958 dan di-bawa pula agar meminta supplementary tahun 1960.

Rasa saya tidak-lah tepat kerja² yang semacham itu. Sepatutnya hal ini di-bawa dahulu daripada ini, tetapi hal ini tentu-lah boleh di-jawab "Kita tidak tahu bahawa baharu ini kita tahu dan hendak di-betulkan tahun 1960." Ini satu jalan yang saya rasa tak kena bagi membetulkan kerja tahun 1958 pada tahun 1960 ini yang mana patut di-hendarkan. Daripada para. 41 kita lihat pula para. 45 dengan tidak ada jawapan pun, pada hal dalam para. 45 The Director of Agriculture yang telah melakukan satu kesalahan yang patutnya di-pertanggung-jawabkan.

Para. 50. Unsupported Charges dalam Kementerian Pelajaran sebanyak \$19 million. Di-sini tidak-lah tanggung-jawab sa-orang dan ini adalah bersangkutan dengan Chief Education Officers yang melakukan, beberapa orang yang telah menjalankan hal ini. Dalam perkara 50 ini Kerajaan telah menjawab berkenaan dengan perkara tersebut—

"Owing to the considerable delay in producing audited accounts the Auditor-General was prevented from completing his audit on sub-head 37. Audited accounts from schools are still being received and checked in the Ministry."

Bahawa kalau kita tengok has been received ini kapada accounts tahun 1958, are still being received now. Jadi, nampaknya lambat benar dan berlawanan benar dengan peratoran yang di-tetapkan itu. Saya suka berhenti sekejap di-sini berkenaan dengan Kementerian Pelajaran. (Batok). Menjadi pokok-lah kapada usul ini bahawa Kementerian Pelajaran tahun yang kita bahathkan kira²-nya dalam masa ini ada-lah satu Kementerian yang benar² menghadapi perubahan. Saya dengan ikhlas-nya menyatakan bagi pehak saya sendiri memberikan pertimbangan pada pokok perubahan ini dan saya rasa patut ada kesislapan² yang berlaku dalam perubahan ini dan dalam membacha Comments ini terutama dalam Kementerian Pelajaran yang mana rasa kita memang ada beberapa keadaan yang terjadi di-lapangan pelajaran tahun itu yang menyebabkan ada kesislapan² dan ada yang tak sempat di-betulkan penyata kira². Kita ra'ayat negeri ini walau siapa pun orang-nya tentu-lah berasa dukachita, kerana hal

ini di-dalam perkara-nya dan banyak wang-nya ada-lah satu hal yang besar. \$110 million bukan-lah sedikit wang negeri ini. Saya tahu bahawa apa yang di-sebutkan oleh Auditor-General di-hujung nanti berkenaan dengan lebeh kurang \$110 million itu bahawa wang² ini tidak semua-nya hilang dan saya tidak dapat menyertai yang wang itu semua-nya telah hilang lenyap, tetapi saya dapat memberikan keyakinan bagi diri saya sendiri bahawa dengan adanya wang itu telah di-belanjakan dengan tidak menurut peratoran sekurang²-nya banyak, kalau tidak semua pun, yang ta' jelas. Sebab apa, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, apabila peratoran ini banyak dan dalam keterangan Command Paper ini ada menerangkan bahawa peratoran itu banyak yang impracticable seperti kata Timbalan Perdana Menteri bahawa kalau hendak di-ikutkan sangat peratoran itu tertutup-lah sekolah², tetapi, walau bagaimana pun, bila peratoran itu telah tidak di-jalankan dengan benar dan di-buat dengan chara emergency sahaja, tidak dapat di-kikiskan dari hati kita kemungkinan yang wang² itu tidak betul di-belanjakan pada tempat²-nya, sekurang²-nya dalam chara, dan bagi diri saya sendiri sa-bagaimana yang saya katakan tadi dalam kira² kewangan, bukan hanya dzat wang yang hilang, tetapi yang menjadikan salah ia-lah perjalanan peratoran juga yang menjadi soal yang besar.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam Paragraph 52 kelambatan ada berlaku lagi, Kerajaan telah menjawab: "The audited accounts of the Institutions referred to were received shortly after the Auditor-General's report was written." Menulis Penyata Auditor-General ini ada-lah di-dalam tahun 1959, kelambatan ini berlaku lagi dan kelambatan ini-lah yang patut kita kesalkan. Paragraph 58 Subhead 41, "Secondary Vocational Schools and Classes has been charged with the cost of equipment bought in 1957 and 1958 for the Rural Trade School at Temerloh. The Trade School was never built but I have not yet been able to ascertain how the equipment was used and am therefore unable to confirm that the allocation is correct." Saya dukachita di-perkara 58 ini, saya rasa patut-nya di-jawab dan

di-terangkan, tetapi Comments ini tidak mengambil peluang yang baik di-sini untuk di-terangkan

Mr. Speaker: Ada di-terangkan.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad: I am sorry, Sir, apabila di-terangkan kata-nya: ". . . However, equipment for the School had already been ordered . . .". Bila? Ta' payah-lah saya panjangkan—bagitu-lah keadaannya dalam soal ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Paragraph 56 saya lihat berkali² tetapi ta' jumpa jawab-nya. Saya lihat Paragraph 61 "Subhead 79 has wrongly been charged with \$19,480 of which \$194 should have been met from Subhead 105, Purchase, Structural Alterations and Furniture of 46/47 Bryanston Square." No reply—ta' berjawab. Jadi tentu-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berat pehak pembangkang ini—kata-lah pembangkang ini jahat, tetapi kalau ia chuba hendak baik pun—berat ia hendak menerima-nya.

Head 27: Ministry of External Affairs, Paragraph 64 "Expenditure, His Majesty's Birthday Celebrations, etc., hujung-nya "was wrongly charged." Saya ambil dari situ kerana ini hendak jadian maudzu'. Ministry of External Affairs ada-lah satu Kementerian yang tersinggong dengan chadangan Timbalan Perdana Menteri ia-itu "changed the conditions after Merdeka". Pendek-nya, kalau di-kira rahmat, ia dapat, kerana keadaan ia timbul sa-sudah Merdeka, tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, walau bagaimana pun banyak di-subhead 65 ini overspent. Jadi dalam hal ini tentu-lah ada yang hendak di-betulkan, dan saya setuju dengan pehak Kerajaan yang mengatakan soal di-luar negeri, dan daripada Comments Kerajaan ini ia-itu soal luar negeri, orang² yang dapat mengikut "Financial Procedure Ordinances" ini tidak banyak yang boleh kita dapat dan ini boleh-lah dapat ticket "after Merdeka". Kemudian, Paragraph 69 Subhead 1 "Personal Emoluments, has been charged with \$855 which was paid to a nurse, not in Government service, for attendance on a member of the Johore Royal Family. The payment is under query." Ini tidak ada jawab-nya, yang susah-nya fasal jawapan ini di-buat tahun 1960, benda ini tahun 1958.

tahun 1960 pun tidak menjawab. Jadi apa-kah harapan kita, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, baharu benda ini hendak dibetulkan, ini menjadi satu soal. Paragraph 70 "The vote has also been charged with certain allowances issued to staff in Kedah for which I have not seen Treasury approval." also, Sir, benda seperti ini di-masokkan, perkara yang saya rasa "this matter has been investigated and cleared" yang 70 tadi ta' juga selesai, yang 71 saya tidak hendak mengesek. Pendek kata, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam membaccha Penyata ini mana yang sudah diterangkan di-situ yang mana di-terima oleh akal, saya right-lah, saya tidak-lah hendak bahathkan lagi, tetapi yang ta' dapat di-terima itu, kerana gigi ta' berapa tajam, maka terpaksa-lah saya kunyah sadikit². Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Paragraph 74 tidak menjawab. Dalam Paragraph 74 ini senang—boleh saya kata ini tidak menjawab, tetapi apabila kita buat begitu akan menjadi routine sangat, jadi biar-lah saya sampaikan apa yang terbuku di-hati saya dan bunyikan sadikit ia-itu Paragraph 74 "Charges against Sub-head 4, Maintenance, are understated by \$1,669 which was incorrectly charged against Sub-head 7, Boats and Motors. The misallocation appears to have been made—ini yang saya hendak bachakan sangat—with the intention of concealing expenditure in excess of the authorised provision." Saya rasa "made with the intention of concealing expenditure" ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada-lah menjadi kebiasaan di-dalam kesalahan bukan kebiasaan dalam amalan. Dalam kesalahan ini saya jumpa satu kebiasaan, perkara virement dan perkara ambil daripada head² sana, masok sini "concealing expenditure in excess" menjadi satu perkara yang biasa di-dalam kesalahan bukan yang biasa di-buat—itu tidak—jangan pula ini merupakan satu fahaman yang lain. Ini sudah ada inclination bagi ketua² pejabat yang kalau payah² sangat itu, di-tarek sana-sini, pusing sini, sudah selesai, authority tidak ada, ini menyebabkan soal yang rasa

Mr. Speaker: Under subhead.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad:
. . . . under subhead, sebab head

tidak boleh, terima kaseh, Tuan, jadi perkara ini bagitu-lah keadaan-nya, dan saya minta-lah dalam membaccha seluroh report ini chara yang seperti ini kita adakan control. Sa-belum saya lupa, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam Comments umum bagi Auditor-General ini mengatakan control ini-lah yang amat kurang di-dalam pejabat, dan ini-lah yang menyebabkan kejadian² ini berlaku. Paragraph 76 juga tidak menjawab, terjadi juga "misallocations" seperti yang saya sebutkan, tidak payah-lah saya sebutkan satu persatu, "misallocations" pula, tidak di-jawab juga agak saya, apabila saya pangkah itu ma'ana-nya tidak ada di-jawab, kalau ada pun di-jawab tidak berapa betul. Paragraph 83 ". . . . misallocation was apparently made, with Treasury approval, because funds had not been provided under Subhead 15 for 1958." Apabila di-jawab "It is correct that Treasury approval was given to this transaction which is not considered to be a misallocation." Sa-perkara lagi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Paragraph 95. "I have not yet seen authority for payment totalling \$924,259.22 which have been accepted by the Accountant-General as charges against the revenues for 1958." detil-nya ada di-sana. Perkara 95 saya rasa patut-lah di-jawab, tetapi Kerajaan daripada Paragraph 94 ia melompat ka-Paragraph 97—Paragraph 95 tidak di-jawab.

Paragraph 95, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tidak di-jawab dan juga paragraph 96 "I have not yet seen authority for payments." Tuan Yang di-Pertua, 101 pun tidak ada jawapan tetapi ada perkataan di-sini, saya sengaja hendak sebutkan sebab hal ini saya rasa Auditor-General ini tidak-lah meluluskan sesuatu melainkan agak-nya dia fikirkan dua kali, sebab dia pun tahu bahawa penyata² ini di-baccha dan akan di-chercha orang. Di-dalam 101 ini, satu perkataan yang tidak sedap di-dengar, kata-nya, "It is not intended to suggest that the situation should be viewed with any degree of complacency but, in my opinion, a feature much more disquieting than the mere increase in the number of detected frauds is the evidence that in at least two of them there has been close and careful conspiracy between public officers and

persons not in Government employ," Bagi "conspiracy public officers" dan orang yang bukan di-dalam kerja Kerajaan ada-lah satu perkara yang sangat berat. Yang tidak di-jawab di-sini, saya rasa patut-lah Kerajaan memberi keterangan² dalam perkara ini. Saya ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bila saya berchakap bagini, saya terasa dalam hati saya benda ini bukan pada tempat-nya hendak di-bahathkan tetapi apa hendak di-buat, benda ini sudah tidak dapat di-terima oleh Kerajaan. Jadi, terpaksa-lah di-katakan perkara ini ada-lah satu perkara yang besar.

The Accounts: General. Paragraph 107, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ini sudah di-jawab. Di-dalam jawapan-nya Kerajaan telah menerangkan: "The recruitment of qualified Accountants has been very difficult in the post-war era and the loss of experienced personnel under the Malayisation scheme has not yet been made up. Measures have been taken to increase the numbers of the directing staff." Jawapan ini saya rasa ada-lah satu jawapan yang menunjak²-kan dan saya berharap benar-lah hal ini di-selesaikan dengan chara demikian. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, walau pun begitu, saya berharap di-dalam perkara ini, Kerajaan memerhatikan paragraph 110 yang di-jawab oleh Kerajaan itu tidak berapa puas hati saya sebab dalam paragraph 110 ini "Control over Expenditure". Jadi "control" sa-macam ini di-jawab oleh Kerajaan, saya mengatakan jawapan ini: "The Auditor-General's remark was apparently intended to indicate the over-expenditure on sub-heads of the Expenditure Estimates and did not mention the greater savings on other sub-heads within most Heads of expenditure which were available to meet the over-expenditure if the Treasury had so authorised." Tetapi kalau ia tidak sebutkan itu, kenapa tidak di-beri tahu kapada dia supaya dia tahu keadaan itu dan dia tidak membuat report ini. Auditor-General bukan-lah sa-orang yang membuat kira² yang bila dia tidak puas hati kita tidak kemukakan tanda²-nya di-situ, tetapi kita kemukakan benda ini bagini—bagini, baharu-lah dia dapat betulkan satu² perkara itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, yang sa-benarnya banyak lagi dan izinkan-lah saya berhenti, sebab saya meminta berhenti ia-lah saya tahu akhir-nya perchakapan ini bagini—bagini bunyi-nya.

Pada akhir-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya rasa tidak-lah dapat di-terima Comments ini dan saya rasa tidak ada mudzarat-nya kalau tidak di-terima sa-kali pun. Sebab-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau di-terima Penyata ini, sudah-kah selesai perkara ini? Tidak selesai! Ini akan di-bawa pula kapada Public Accounts Committee, dan daripada Public Accounts Committee akan di-bawa pula balek ka-Dewan ini. Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, walau pun bagi pehak saya tidak bersetuju menerima Penyata ini, sebab ma'ana "accept" itu ada-lah "certify what has been mentioned there". Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam menyebutkan perkara ini, saya menyatakan dengan ikhlas-nya di-sini, bahawa Kerajaan elok-lah dalam perkara ini memberikan keterangan yang sempurna di-dalam perkara² yang di-sebutkan itu.

Enche' Mohamed Sulong bin Mohd. Ali (Lipis): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya minta kebenaran, mengikut Standing Orders 40 (1) supaya perbahathan di-atas motion ini di-tutupkan kerana perkara² yang di-bahathkan ini berbalek² sa-hingga sampai dua hari.

Mr. Speaker: Saya benarkan.

Enche' Mohamed Sulong bin Mohd. Ali: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menhadangkan, soal perbahathan di-atas motion ini di-tutup dan di-ketengahkan.

Enche' Ahmad bin Arshad (Muar Utara): Saya menyokong chadangan ini.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, before it is put to the House, may I ask for a ruling on the effect of such a motion?

Under Standing Order 40, it says that once such a motion is passed, the question shall be put forthwith and decided without amendment or debate, notwithstanding that the mover of the original motion has had no opportunity to make his reply. My submission, with

respect to the ruling you gave earlier, is that under this Order, once such a motion is moved, the next step the Chair is bound to take under this Order is to put the question. There is no further debate or reply. I ask you, Sir, in view of the importance of this matter, to review your decision, if you are entitled to.

Mr. Speaker: My ruling in the matter is that I must give the right of reply to the mover of the motion, if the motion moved by the Honourable Member for Lipis is accepted or agreed to by the House.

Dato' Onn bin Jaafar: On a point of order—Standing Order 40 (1) says:

"After a question has been proposed a member rising in his place may claim to move, 'That the question be now put,' and, unless it appears to the Chair that such motion is an abuse of the rules of the House . . ."

Then it goes on. I submit, Sir, that this closure motion is being put to the House after the debate on the amendment; very few Members have had the opportunity to speak on this motion, and I submit that it is an abuse of the rules of the House to close the debate at this juncture.

Mr. Speaker: I must give a ruling to you—which is, first, under Standing Order 35 (3) (c):

"in the case of the mover of a substantive motion, only in reply."

No member shall speak more than once to any question except under (c), that is, in the case of the mover of a substantive motion, and then only in reply.

I have already given permission, and I feel that this motion before the House has been debated since yesterday, since this morning, and I think everybody has had a chance to talk on it, and if they do talk further, there may be repetition of what has been said.

I shall now put the question to close the debate.

Question, That the Question be now put, put and agreed to.

Tun Abdul Razak: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bagi menjawab pertanyaan yang di-datangkan oleh Ahli Yang

Berhormat itu saya suka-lah, terutama sekali menjawab pertanyaan² yang telah di-sebutkan oleh wakil dari Bachok. Dalam Command Paper yang di-bentangkan oleh Kerajaan tentu-lah tak dapat di-terangkan semua sekali perkara² yang terkandung dalam Penyata Auditor-General, sebab Kerajaan telah menerangkan bahawa Kerajaan tidak hendak menahan perjalanan Public Accounts Committee bagi menyemak penyata itu, dan juga keterangan² yang saya beri ini. Jadi, tujuan perbincangan ini ia-lah semata² hendak menahan daripada tuduhan² yang tidak berpatutan yang telah di-hadapkan pada Kerajaan terhadap Penyata Auditor-General ini. Bagitu juga saya berharap kepada Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bachok agar memahamkan atas perkara ini yang mana pekerjaan accounting wang Kerajaan ini bukan-lah perkara yang senang, dan bukan-lah perkara yang beribu² orang di-seluruh Tanah Melayu ini yang bekerja dengan Kerajaan. Yang kita ambil satu sebab ia-lah Kementerian Pelajaran di-mana beberapa ribu sekolah² yang ada di-bawah jagaan Kementerian itu yang terpaksa mengadakan accounting-nya. Dengan keadaan itu-lah ada kala-nya khilaf atau tak dapat di-betulkan.

Barangkali wakil dari Bachok sendiri faham semasa dia menjadi Setia-Usaha Muslim College, Klang, betapa susah hendak di-betulkan account Muslim College itu. (*Tepok*). Ahli Yang Berhormat pada masa itu ada bertanggung jawab sedikit sabanyak atas hal ini. Oleh itu, saya berharap dalam memberikan pandangan berkenaan dengan perkara itu, kita hendak-lah mempunyai perasaan timbang rasa kepada pegawai² Kerajaan di-seluruh Tanah Melayu yang mana terpaksa menjalankan peranan mereka itu, tetapi kalau kita hendak mengkritik semua perkara sememang sangat senang. Saya dahulu telah menjadi pegawai Kerajaan, dan saya berasa susah hendak membetulkan peratoran² Kerajaan, jadi kalau semuanya perjalanan pekerjaan Kerajaan itu betul, saya fikir tak payah di-adakan Auditor-General ini. Itu-lah sebab-nya pada masa saya membentangkan usol ini untuk di-terangkan dan saya berharap kepada Dewan ini dan juga

kapada ra'ayat jelata sa-terus agar memandang perkara ini bersama² dengan keadaan² yang berada di-negeri kita pada masa ini, dan jangan-lah dipandang dari segi semata² daripada segi accounting atau procedure Auditor-General, atau sa-bagai-nya, Auditor-General memandang semata² dari segi accounting, atau pun kita semua jangan-lah hendak-nya memandang pada segi² yang lain. Auditor-General Report ada tiap² tahun, bukan sekali sahaja, tetapi tiap² tahun accounting Kerajaan terpaksa di-semak dan di-siasat supaya kita dapat betul dari satu masa ka-satu masa.

Saya suka mengambil perhatian Dewan ini kapada muka 20 Fasal 108 di-mana Auditor-General sendiri ada menerangkan bahawa keadaan accounting dalam tiap² Kerajaan ada-lah beransor elok—

“ improvement or much progress towards simplifying the accounts by removing unnecessary processes.”

Maka itu-lah sebab-nya kita hendak memandang dari semua segi dan jangan-lah memandang dari satu segi sahaja, sebab saya berkata bagitu bahawa banyak Kerajaan² Negeri ada mempunyai beberapa buah sekolah yang ada sekarang ini, oleh itu, saya dan juga Kerajaan berharap pada Yang Berhormat supaya akan menerima usul Kerajaan ini dengan pandangan yang sempurna.

In reply, Sir, to a number of Honourable Members who spoke on this motion, it is clearly obvious to me that since we debated this motion there has been a change of approach from Members of the Opposition. Yesterday and early this morning Members of the Opposition spoke of misappropriation and misuse of Government funds, but later in the debate, after my Honourable friend and colleague the Minister of Finance had explained the financial procedure of Government, Members of the Opposition now seem to be using words like “irregularities”, “incompetence”, “virement” and so on. Obviously, it seems to me that we have been able to enlighten Honourable Members to some extent on this subject and if we have succeeded in doing that, the purpose of this motion has been achieved.

As has been stated, Sir, the Government understands the procedure very clearly—Government understands the existence of Standing Order 77 (1). Indeed, at the last meeting of the House, Government took the trouble to explain to Honourable Members not to comment on the Auditor-General's Report until the Public Accounts Committee had had an opportunity to examine the Report. But Honourable Members opposite, at least some Honourable Members, refused to accept this explanation and refused to accept the appeal from the Government—the Honourable Member for Ipoh himself said, quite clearly, why should the Opposition accept an appeal or a request from the Government. Now, Sir, if that is the attitude of the Opposition—and it was obvious to us in the debates that we have had during the last several days—then obviously the Government had to resort to a procedure, although very reluctantly they have to do so, whereby Government has an opportunity of explaining itself clearly to this House and to the country. In this case, Sir, the Opposition chose to discredit this Government by quoting distorted versions of this Report not only in this House but outside, and therefore Government felt that it must take the earliest opportunity to clear itself to this House and to the country; and as the Government is responsible to Parliament, the highest legislature in this country, obviously the proper place for Government to clear itself is in this House. That is why Government considers it necessary to have this motion. As has been stated, the adoption of this motion will not in any way prejudice the examination of this Report by the Public Accounts Committee; and I have no doubt that the Public Accounts Committee will examine this Report together with the Command Paper and other explanations which the Government will put forward on this subject.

The Honourable Member for Kuala Trengganu Selatan asked: why is the Government in such a haste to take this step? As I have said, some Members of the Opposition made use of this Report to discredit this Government not only in this House but outside.

Therefore, the Government must take immediate steps to defend itself and to clear itself of all those allegations, and I think the right and proper place for Government to do that is in this House. Therefore, Sir, I do hope that this motion will be agreed to, and, as I have said, agreeing to this motion will not prejudice the work of the Public Accounts Committee. And I do not think that acceptance of this motion will create any precedent for the future, each case of course will have to be treated on its merits. As I said, it will still depend on how the Opposition behaves. If the Opposition do carry out what they say—they talk in this House of justice, fair play and so on—then the Government may not have to resort to such methods as this in the future.

Original question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House, having regard to the changed conditions prevailing immediately after Merdeka, accepts the Government Statement on the Auditor-General's Report on the Accounts of the Federation for the year ended 31st December, 1958 (Command Paper No. 14 of 1960).

THE SOCIAL AND WELFARE SERVICES LOTTERIES BOARD ORDINANCE, 1950

(Extension of Period)

Mr. Speaker: Honourable Members, the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Welfare has notified the Clerk of withdrawal of Motion No. 2 in to-day's Order Paper, viz:

"That in accordance with the provisions of Section (1) of the Social and Welfare Services Lotteries Board Ordinance, 1950, the said Ordinance be extended for a period of five years with effect from 11th December, 1960."

The motion is accordingly considered withdrawn, and a note to that effect will be entered on the Votes and Proceedings.

DEVELOPMENT (SUPPLEMENTARY) (No. 2) ESTIMATES, 1960

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move,

That this House shall immediately resolve itself into a Committee of the whole House to consider the expenditure proposed in the

Statement laid on the Table as Command Paper No. 13 of 1960 and to recommend whether the same shall be approved by this House with or without modification.

Sir, the Development (Supplementary) (No. 2) Estimates, 1960, tabled as Command Paper No. 13 of 1960, envisage additional expenditure during this year on development projects of \$8,126,010. If these estimates are approved by this House, the total estimated development expenditure in 1960 will amount to over \$261 million.

Of the total additional expenditure for which I shall seek approval by Resolution of this House under Section 4 of the Development Fund Ordinance, 1958, over \$1,400,000 is in respect of services which have already been approved in previous Development Estimates. Analysing this figure still further, approximately \$1,100,000 is required to provide for expenditure in 1960 on services for which the 1959 approved expenditure was under-spent. In the old days these would have been called revotes. A further \$238,000 is required to finance projects which have already been approved, and on which the rate of expenditure in 1960 is expected to exceed the estimated figure in the main Development Budget.

Apart from these continuation services, I shall seek the approval of this House for expenditure in 1960 of over \$6½ million on new services. Some of the projects under this category are of considerable magnitude and of great interest not only to this House but also to the public at large, and I shall not try to "steal the thunder" of my Honourable colleagues by dilating further on these projects at this stage.

Sir, I beg to move.

Tun Abdul Razak: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Enche' Liu Yoong Peng: These supplementary development estimates bring to light that the Government is resorting to further expenditure over and above what it has already obtained. In considering whether we should approve these supplementary estimates there is one principle which I think it is the duty of the Opposition as well

as Members of the Government to consider. This is whereas we believe that development of the country is of vital importance it is also important for us to remember that in allotting sums for the various projects we should bear in mind that only those projects that require development should be taken into account. In other words, there should be no undue extravagance. But I think there is extravagance on the part of the Government, possibly most of it under the Ministry of Works. Only recently we heard that there is going to be a \$2 million project of road building—that is only for the road leading us to the new Parliament to be built—and I certainly think that to spend \$2 millions for only taking us to Parliament is really extravagant however much we may consider that our Parliament is of immense importance. Therefore, I think money should not be spent on such a tremendous scale on the building up of a new road leading to the new Parliament. There are many roads in our country that need even more urgent attention. For example, we know that those people who may have to come to Kuala Lumpur or leave Kuala Lumpur via the northern roads have to travel through Batu Road; but Batu Road is quite often under a tremendous traffic jam, especially immediately before and after office hours. Therefore, it is even more important for us, even for Members of Parliament, to have better access to Kuala Lumpur by having deviations to Batu Road rather than having a big road to bring us to Parliament itself.

On the other hand, despite this extravagance, the Government is being unduly miserly—to borrow the word of one of our Honourable Ministers—over certain expenditure, even in this very House itself. We can see with our own eyes that it looks as if one of our employees here is undergoing a sort of endurance test: I mean the Interpreter of this House. For the whole session he has been the only one who is sitting there doing interpretation and he has been doing it all through. I should think that it is certainly through superhuman effort on his part that he has been able to last until now.

So, I suggest that we should not be too strict in matters like this. I think that even two Interpreters would not be sufficient if we want to get a good hearing of the remarkable speeches made by the other Members in this House.

There is one aspect under the Ministry of Education on which I wish to remark. I think there is a certain amount of wastage in money under the schools controlled by that Ministry due to the Ministry having a policy that only children who are between 6 years plus and 12 years plus who are allowed admission to primary schools. I know that there are still vacancies available in primary schools throughout Malaya, especially in the rural areas. I can bring one example: the Sungei Buloh New Village School. I see no reason why, when there are still vacancies available in these schools, students of normal intelligence who may not have reached the age of 6 plus should not be allowed admission into these schools. We know for certain according to expert opinion students who are 5 years old are usually quite capable of performing the studies at primary I level, or standard I level as it is now called, and I think that this deliberation on the part of this Ministry is actually going to retard the chance of mental development for many of our intelligent children in Malaya.

Lastly, there is one more point which I want to bring up and that is under the Ministry of Health. With regard to the Tuberculosis Clinic at Pahang Road in Kuala Lumpur, I know that some patients have been on the waiting list for more than a year and still they have not got admission into that clinic.

I therefore think that our money will be best spent if we build more clinics, more homes for the care of those who are sick and in need of help, etc. I would not try to delay this House too long. So, thank you.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I notice in the Development (Supplementary) Estimates that we intend to build an International Airport under the last item—item 22. It is very surprising

that the estimated cost of this Airport has not been put down in these Estimates, because had it been put down it might shock people to think that only a few years ago we had developed the present Airport and now we should require another Airport, which I understand will cost us in the region of \$50 million. I do not know why we should have an Airport here requiring \$50 million and unless it is for political reasons we would like to know what those reasons are.

The other point I would like to point out comes under the title of Ministry of Education. We are spending a lot of money on education. We have got a first-class University, the University of Malaya, and we took over the Malay Department of the University of Malaya from Singapore. I understand that when it was agreed that the Malay Department should be shifted over to the Federation, there was an understanding that there would be no discrimination in the cause of education in this country, and that both branches of the Malayan University in Singapore and Malaya would stand as one unit indivisible for the cause of education and education alone. In other words, as I understand it, the students in the Singapore Division would be able to come to the Federation Division without hindrance. We had not thought that education should be influenced by political reasons. We had not thought that education would be twisted and warped to suit political considerations and the political colouring of our Government. Yet, Sir, I understand, according to the papers, that one person was prohibited from coming into the Federation so that she is now unable to study in the Malay Department of the University, because the Special Branch of our Police considered her to be unsuitable. This is very unfortunate, because I understand that she is the only non-Malay so far in the history of the University of Malaya who would be or who is capable of studying our national language. To prohibit her from entry into the Federation is tantamount to prohibiting her from studying in the University. Surely if the Police consider her politically unreliable, other methods to

restrict her movements could be introduced without restricting her rights to education in the University.

Enche' Tajudin bin Ali (Larut Utara): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order, under Standing Order 36, may I have your ruling? I suppose the Honourable Member is irrelevant.

Mr. Speaker: He is allowed to speak on the principle.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: I am speaking on the principle. We must never forget that learning and education are very holy and sacred things. Had it not been for the liberal tradition of the English authorities and the Museum authorities and the Educational authorities of England, Sun Yat Sen would not have been known to-day, nor would the other great philosophers such as Karl Marx who, though persecuted in his own country, found sanctuary in England. It is unfortunate that political considerations should come so soon and so quickly to the highest institution of learning in Malaya—the University of Malaya. If political reasons are such that we might consider a person should not partake in political activities, then the limitation should only be limited to that and to that alone. But to prevent the University from taking in anybody in order to educate them, in order to prevent them from learning in the name of knowledge by prohibiting them from entry into the Federation is, I think, a thing very much to be deplored.

The other point that I would like now to deal with is the question of Parliament—the new Parliament Building.

Mr. Speaker: Does Parliament Building come under these Development Estimates?

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Sir, Parliament Building comes under Head 137, item 16, Parliament House Approach Road. Well, it is obvious that the Approach Road would lead to something and that thing would be the new Parliament Building. I understand that in Burma the Parliament Building is a very small building, and I understand that our proposed building will

be the biggest in South-East Asia, so that whilst we talk of developing the country we are planning to build big edifices for the sake of impression. It might be wiser if we delayed the building of the new Parliament Building itself and the Approach Roads, which will cost us something like \$8 million. Millions of tons of earth are being shifted to-day outside this House. The waste is fantastic and the number of machine power employed again is something quite fantastic. If our concentration, if our desire is to develop the rural areas, if the Group Settlement Areas Act is to have any meaning at all, surely all these earth moving machines should first be channelled to the kampongs and the rural areas where the people still live off and cleanse themselves in stinking water that is practically stagnant and germ laden. We see all that water on both sides of the main road in Kedah, we see the canals with the stagnant green water where water buffaloes and men, women and children bathe together in Kedah and Perlis; we see along the rivers of Pahang, Trengganu and Kelantan the same conditions that exist in Kedah and Perlis except that there they use the rivers and streams. Surely if we say we want to give the people in the rural areas greater rights, if we want to give them more privileges, if we want to increase their economic strength—the economic position of these kampong people—our money ought to be channelled in that direction instead of erecting another edifice which perhaps in ten years time the Government might consider again as unsuitable.

Sir, the last point I would like to talk about is on the question of National Museum.

Mr. Speaker: Does that come under these Development Estimates?

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: There is provision for money to be spent on the museums. Sir, museums are meant to store things of archaeological interests. Could not the Government see that if there is to be any future excavation in Malaya such excavation be done under the proper control and proper supervision of trained archaeologists?

Yesterday I spoke of the members of a historical society who went to Pekan Lama and excavated a certain site under the supervision and direction of two historical professors both of whom are unqualified in archaeology. Things in the ground if they can be found must be important if they warrant excavation expeditions and they should not be destroyed.

And I would like, Sir, to end by asking the Government to see that in future the things of archaeological or historical interest going into museums and the museum objects already contained in the museums come under the proper control and management of trained archaeologists, instead of amateurs of archaeology.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to make a brief reference to the proposal to build a new approach road to Parliament House costing \$2 million. I feel at this juncture of the development of this country that that is a terrible and inexcusable waste of public funds. We know, and if we go about with the people as some of us do, that we would find outside our hospitals there are people dying without a place to be admitted into the hospitals and they are asked to go home and die because they are too sick and because treatment would be of no use. That is what has been happening to hundreds and thousands of people in this country. In those circumstances, it is the duty of the Government to conserve all the money at its disposal to save the lives of human beings in this country, to save the lives of the citizens of this country and not to squander money on the approach road.

What do we care what foreign dignitaries think about us? Here we are having people going to the graves without proper medical treatment. That is what we should be more concerned with, rather than how we appear in foreign eyes. For my part, I say: Let the foreigners think what they like about us. Let us save the lives which belong to us and are dear to us—that must be the first function of a Government which has got the welfare of its

own people at heart, the welfare of the people who have elected the Government into power.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is conduct of this sort that is going to make the Government stink and that is going to make the Government stink worse than the gutter. They may not like what we say in this House but it is true and notwithstanding the fact, according to my latest information, that Radio Malaya is going to black out the Peoples' Progressive Party's speeches. Nevertheless, what we say in this House is true and truth will prevail and my condemnation of this expenditure is the truth and I hope due consideration will be given to that.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, daripada perbelanjaan dahulu yang kita telah menguntukkan sa-banyak \$250,000,000, dalam perbelanjaan tahun 1960 ia-itu maseh banyak lagi ranchangan² yang belum di-jalankan dan maseh belum dapat menghabiskan wang Kerajaan sa-banyak \$250,000,000 itu. Dalam menjalankan ekonomi bagi perbelanjaan negara, maka saya perchaya Kerajaan dalam mengemukakan Anggaran Perbelanjaan Kemajuan Yang Kedua ini yang mana ada meletakkan belanja² yang tak sesuai dengan dasar itu. Saya rasa bahawa peruntukkan Anggaran Perbelanjaan Tambahan ini besar dan belanja-nya pun besar, oleh itu, saya perchaya apa yang hendak di-buat-nya; walau pun ada fa'edah-nya, boleh-lah kita tanggohkan bahagian tahun 1961 ini yang mana setengah²-nya kalau tak perlu, kita lihat di-sini, umpama-nya Merdeka Stadium. Dalam Jabatan Perdana Menteri—Improvements to Merdeka Stadium, Kuala Lumpur, \$70,000 baharu pun beberapa bulan yang lalu kita telah meluluskan satu Anggaran Belanjawan supaya membayar kepada Indoor Sports Stadium dan sekarang ini kita telah menghadapi satu perbelanjaan baharu bagi Improvements to Merdeka Stadium. Yang kita tahu bahawa Merdeka Stadium ini walau pun banyak fa'edah-nya, tetapi telah menjadi satu perkara yang di-bahathkan dalam Auditor-General's Report baharu² ini di-mana saya juga berpendapat bahawa

Kerajaan tidak patut lagi membelanjakan satu sen pun kepada Merdeka Stadium ini, kerana sudah dua tahun berjalan ia-itu tahun² yang sudah, dan dalam menjalankan dasar yang mulia ini ia-lah hendak menjadikan stadium ini sa-bagai satu badan yang membelanjakan diri-nya dengan hasil-nya. Maka elok-lah dia menchuba satu perbelanjaan itu di-penohkan dengan hasil²-nya sendiri supaya dengan ini tidak lagi bagi Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu memikul bebanan ini.

Waktu kita meminta sa-suatu perbelanjaan, maka kita sebutkan diantara fa'edah belanja itu ia-lah hasil yang timbul, maka kerana Merdeka Stadium itu ia-lah menjadi chontoh pada masa ini sa-sudah sa-tahun dua dia berjalan, maka elok-lah dia menjalankan diri-nya sendiri. Perbelanjaan yang besar di-sini, nampak-nya berkenaan dengan jalan hendak ka-Parlimen

Mr. Speaker: Ramai benar orang² yang sudah berchakap dalam perkara ini.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad: Saya tidak menyebutkan Parlimen ini, sebab kita sudah bahath. Wang \$2 million ini ada-lah satu belanja yang besar yang kita merasa bahawa patut benda yang semacham ini di-kechilkan, sunggoh pun ada ranchangan-nya dan dalam membuat ranchangan itu hendak di-elokkan sangat, tetapi biar-lah perkara itu di-buat pada tahun hadapan, umpama-nya pada tahun 1962, 1963, atau 1964, tetapi kalau sa-tahun hendak kita habiskan \$2 million maka ini ada-lah satu hasil yang banyak.

Menteri bagi Kemajuan Luar Bandar meminta tambahan belanja sa-banyak \$98,988. untok jalan² dan jambatan bagi kawasan² luar bandar. Pada fikiran saya, kalau-lah tambahan kepada jalan² kawasan luar bandar maka lebeh baik daripada kita melebehkan sampai \$2 million kepada jalan² untok mendirikan Parlimen ini; walau bagaimana pun elok Parlimen yang hendak di-buat itu. Di-sini, kita perchaya ulasan yang hendak saya sebutkan ini akan mendapat satu tudohan yang besar, tetapi tidak-lah saya mushkilkan jika saya terangkan di-sini ia-itu Head 139—Sub-head 39. Renovations and

Extensions to Istana Negara, dan ini bukan-lah an Act of disaffection, tetapi ini ada-lah satu perkara yang ikhlas. Saya katakan Istana Negara ini ia-lah Istana Negara yang patut kita hormati, tetapi saya mendapat tahu pada masa sekarang ini; walau bagaimana sekali pun patut yang Istana Negara itu mendapat kedudukan kewangan yang ada dalam negeri ini, saya rasa tidak-lah menjadi 'aib kepada Yang di-Pertuan Agong kalau sa-kira-nya Istana Negara tetap seperti yang ada sekarang ini, sebab dahulu daripada ini, atau pun sekarang ini sudah sah-tahun dua kita berjalan yang sedemikian, oleh itu, saya perchaya tidak akan menjatuhkan maruah Yang di-Pertuan Agong.

Berdasarkan kepada itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bahawa kita menghadapi satu keadaan ekonomi yang dia di-akuī oleh kita sendiri yang maseh belum kuat lagi dalam kewangan-nya. Saya memandang Development (Supplementary) Estimates, 1960, bagi kali yang kedua ini ada-lah di-rangka dengan chara yang besar dengan belanja yang banyak.

Sitting suspended at 4.05 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 5.45 p.m.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

DEVELOPMENT (SUPPLEMENTARY) (No. 2) ESTIMATES, 1960

Mr. Speaker: The debate on the motion before the House will resume.

Enche' V. David: We are almost reaching a close of to-day's session and I am not here to take much of the time, but I would like to make some observations regarding labour lines. Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the field of social services, building of houses for the workers of this country who form the life-blood vein of our nation's economy should receive top priority. I raised this matter also at the last session when we were discussing the Budget. Mr. Speaker, in the estimates I find that \$1 million has been allotted for housing, but I am afraid \$1 million would not be enough to satisfy housing needs.

The Minister of Transport would be aware of the conditions of the labour

lines which have been provided for the railway daily-rated workers. If one sees these labour lines, he will be driven to the conclusion that they are not at all fit for human accommodation, especially Class 11 quarters which have only one door and even at times of emergencies such as fire there is no other exits except the front door. There are no rooms except one where the wife, husband and grown-up children will have to confine themselves. Considerations on humanitarian grounds alone should have prevented this, but I am afraid the Government has not considered this serious situation of inadequate housing for the workers in this country. The claim by the railway workers for improved housing commenced in 1945. Repeated representations by the workers, even through trade unions, have been made to the Government and the Government has been promising since that date of renovating these houses and building new types of houses with modern sanitation. After the Alliance came into power in 1955, the Union again made representation through the General Manager, Malayan Railways. All these attempts met with disappointment. Mr. Speaker, Sir, if the Honourable Minister of Transport during his leisure takes a stroll along Bungsar Road and Sentul, he would ascertain for himself the deplorable condition of these houses.

The Minister of Transport (Enche' Sardon bin Haji Jubir): We are not debating the Budget now, and I think Railway does not come at all under these supplementary development estimates. Under the Ministry of Transport it is only for Civil Aviation that supplementary provision is asked.

Mr. Speaker: Are you talking on any item in the supplementary development estimates?

Enche' V. David: I am talking on housing in general where I will have to make reference to the Railways.

Mr. Speaker: We are now discussing the supplementary development estimates, and Railway is not a Government department.

Enche' V. David: Anyway, I can always point out the defects in housing

generally in this country as far as the workers are concerned. It says here "labour lines". Labour lines can be interpreted as even Railway workers living in labour lines.

Enche' Sardon: Of course not! Railway is not Government, Sir.

Enche' V. David: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am afraid that the Honourable Minister has been irritated because he is unable to admit facts. Now, coming back to the same subject of labour lines, the Honourable Minister of Works should have known by now the housing position of the Public Works Department workers. I do not think he can deny that they are Government workers. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the P.W.D. lines in Kuala Lumpur, Seremban and other parts of the Federation need immediate attention. In my humble opinion, Sir, I beg to submit that the \$1 million provided in the estimates will not be able to satisfy the growing demand for housing by the workers. When new houses are built they should replace the old ones. In an independent country we cannot see the workers still undergoing their present suffering. The workers have a right to live and that right has to be guaranteed by the Government. If the Government is unable to guarantee such conditions, that means—I will deliberately say—that they are ignoring the working class of this country.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would now like to draw the attention of the Honourable Minister of Works to a Government building at Petaling Jaya. I have been informed by reliable sources that the roof of this building is collapsing. We are asked to vote money every time in this House but the money voted has not always been wisely spent. It is spent in a manner which does not benefit the country at all; and if at all it benefits it is only for a short while and additional sums have to be voted again for renovation and repairs. I would like the Honourable Minister of Works to go into this and ascertain the building in question and see what can be done to repair it.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is another item here which calls for an allocation for the Merdeka Stadium of \$70,000. I do not like to dwell on this subject,

but I am forced to do so because the annual report of the Auditor-General, which was debated this morning, states that the Auditor-General does not understand who controls the finances of the Merdeka Stadium. We do not like to vote for money without knowing who is going to control that money, and also who is going to run it. I would like to have a clarification and explanation from the Minister of Finance on this matter.

Coming to the General Hospital, I have heard and read in the papers that the Honourable Minister of Health's policy on medical facilities in this country and it looks very nice. Statements are often published in the papers that the Government is really taking positive action in order to remedy the present situation. But the General Hospital is daily refusing admission to patients due to lack of beds. What we need at the moment is not statements in the Press, but action, action that is concrete, action that will not send away patients back to their houses. I have known cases where mothers after delivery have been sent back home on the very next day due to shortage of beds. The health facilities in this country have received serious allegations from the Opposition and even from members of the Government bench, but up to now Government has not taken any positive action to remedy the deteriorating situation. In Petaling Jaya an outdoor clinic has been built. Vast sums of money have been spent in building this clinic, but there is no medical officer in this clinic and therefore this clinic has been idle for the last six to seven months. Sir, when we are asked to vote money for something we would like to have a positive explanation from the Government as to what purpose this money is to be spent, and we do not want clinics to be built without equipment and without medical officers.

The Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications (Dato' V. T. Sambanthan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of information. That clinic was not built from funds voted from here.

Enche' V. David: The Government is very clever in shifting responsibilities

(*Laughter*). At no time have they shouldered responsibility. Any time, anything is said, they will slowly and systematically shift the responsibility to the other departments or to the corporations or to a local government, and it is nothing surprising to me.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, coming to the estimate for the Kota Bridge at Klang, I have been told that an estimate for a certain amount was approved by Parliament and later on, it was found that the estimate had to be doubled. Therefore, I would call upon the Honourable Minister of Works that when estimates are drawn up let them be drawn up with appropriate technical knowledge and facts and let there not be any need to come back here again for doubling the amount which has already been voted.

Enche' Mohd. Yusof bin Mahmud (Temerloh): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sedang negeri kita yang baharu merdeka ini, maka tak hairan-lah kita akan mendapat tuntutan² Supplementary Budget kerana kemajuan² bagi negeri kita, yang mana kita tidak sedar pada tahun yang sudah. Dalam peruntokan wang yang di-minta ini, saya berasa hairan sedikit, terutama terhadap pehak pembangkang yang mana tidak sedikit pun mahu menerima penjelasan dari Kerajaan terhadap wang² yang di-belanjakan bagi kemajuan² negeri ini. Di-sebalek-nya, kita menerima kutuk, kita menerima tuduhan² yang mengatakan bahawa Kerajaan tak pandai dan sa-bagai-nya.

Saya suka menarek perhatian di atas tegoran yang di-buat oleh Yang Berhormat wakil dari Bachok berkenaan dengan perbelanjaan membaiki, atau menambah, berkenaan dengan perbelanjaan Istana Negara. Jikalau Ahli Yang Berhormat itu memerhatikan dalam estimates ini maka tahun 1958, dan 1959, yang mana pehak kita tidak ada membelanjakan sedikit pun, kerana memperbaiki Istana Negara, oleh itu, rasa saya dengan wang yang sedemikian banyak yang di-minta untuk memperbaiki Istana Negara supaya sesuai dengan kedudukan Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong di-negeri kita ini, maka

saya rasa wang yang \$30,000 itu tidaklah banyak malah ra'ayat negeri ini tidak-lah akan bergaduh berkenaan dengan hal ini.

Lagi satu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berkenaan dengan perbelanjaan sabanyak \$187,500 ia-itu Head 132, Drainage and Irrigation yang mana Kerajaan ada meminta wang sa-banyak yang di-sebutkan itu. Di-sini, saya suka memberi pandangan ia-itu dalam negeri saya (Pahang) Drainage and Irrigation ada satu jalan, atau pun satu chara yang di-buatkan oleh pehak yang tertentu yang tidak lagi sesuai dengan tempat²-nya. Tujuan yang besar Drainage and Irrigation di-sini ia-lah hendak membuat satu ranchangan yang besar² sahaja ia-itu ranchangan yang tak kurang daripada \$50,000. Dengan ini saya berharap-lah supaya Kerajaan mengambil berat, kerana kalau kita hendak membuat ranchangan yang besar² sahaja betapa-kah di-kampong² yang kecil yang mana yang kita ma'alum bahawa kampong² Melayu itu tidak terkumpul. Kalau-lah ranchangan² besar ini di-buatkan di-tempat² yang sa-bagaimana yang kita buat pada hari ini—Group Settlement yang kita bersetuju, tidaklah menjadi gaduh. Pada pendapat orang² kampong semasa saya melawat dahulu semua-nya meminta Ranchangan Tali Ayer yang kecil dan sa-bagai-nya di-tempat² mereka kerana menanam padi.

Saya suka memberi tahu bahawa di-negeri Pahang terutama di-tempat saya kerana untuk menunaikan kehendak ra'ayat berkenaan dengan Drainage and Irrigation yang kecil² ini terpaksa-lah Jawatan-Kuasa Kemajuan Luar Bandar Daerah mengambil wang daripada peruntokkan Kemajuan Luar Bandar Negeri untuk membelanjakan bagi membuat empang ayer yang kecil².

Lagi satu berkenaan dengan perbelanjaan dalam Kementerian Kerja Raya di-mana pada masa meshuarat budget yang sudah ia-itu pada bulan December yang lepas, kalau tak silap saya, saya ada menegor tentang perjalanan atau chara-nya membelanjakan wang saperti mengangkut batu dan tanah yang sepatut-nya di-buat

oleh Pejabat Kerja Raya sendiri, tetapi di-sebalek-nya pula di-berikan kepada kontrekter² yang mana tentulah memakan belanja yang banyak. Sa-telah saya menegor dalam meshuarat yang lalu, di-mana pada masa ini daerah Bentong maseh lagi berjalan saperti lama, dan sa-telah saya menegor tadi maka saya perchaya-lah pehak Menteri yang bersangkutan tidak keberatan lagi sa-bagaimana kejadian² yang dahulu berlaku dan beliau akan mengawasi serta menyiasat perkara itu.

Bagitu juga saya ucapkan terima kasih, kerana ada peruntokkan wang kepada Mentekab Hospital bagi memperbaikki dan menambahkan-nya. Saya suka memberi pandangan terhadap Mentekab Hospital ini di-mana Hospital ini telah di-buat dalam tahun 1920 dahulu ia-itu pada masa itu penduduk²-nya ada seramai lebeh kurang 20,000 orang, tetapi sekarang sudah meningkat seramai 70,000 orang. Dalam Hospital itu ada lebeh kurang 100 katil sahaja. Berkenaan dengan hal perkhidmatan² batok kering di-sini, Hospital ini chuma ada satu ward sahaja bagi pehak lelaki, tetapi tidak ada langsung bagi pehak perempuan. Oleh itu, saya berharap peruntokkan di-buat untuk memberi perkhidmatan batok kering terhadap pehak orang² perempuan itu akan di-adakan juga.

Enche' Ahmad bin Mohamed Shah (Johore Bharu Barat): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya sa-bagai wakil bagi Johor Baharu Barat dan juga penduduk² di-Johor Baharu menguchapkan terima kasih kepada Menteri Kerja Raya, Pos dan Talikom yang telah mengadakan satu peruntokan untuk mendirikan Pejabat Pos di-Johor Baharu. Saya perchaya sa-tengah Ahli² Yang Berhormat di-sini agak-nya ada melihat Pejabat Pos di-Johor Baharu itu, sunggoh pun Johor Baharu satu bandar yang kechil, keadaan di-situ telah mashhor, tetapi malang-nya, keadaan Pejabat Pos-nya amat-lah mendukachitakan. Jadi saya berharap dan meminta kepada Menteri yang berkenaan mendirikan bangunan itu dengan seberapa segera, sa-kira-nya peruntokan ini di-luluskan, dan saya sendiri tahu ia-itu tapak bangunan itu telah pun di-sediakan.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I refer to page 6 under the heading of the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare and note that Labour Lines, Seremban, will get \$1,150. Sir, I have seen these labour lines of the Seremban General Hospital and I find them in the most deplorable condition, so much so that any decent human being, who had another place to stay, would not go there. I do not think that this sum of \$1,150 would be enough to clear up the dirt and rubbish, bugs, mosquitoes and flies and other insanitary things attendant upon the labour lines there. But what I am glad about is that, although it is insignificant, a sum has been provided for the labour lines in the General Hospital, Seremban. I would like to say that the general condition of labourers' lines all over the country is very bad and let this be a symbol of the intention of the Government to improve the labourers' quarters everywhere. For instance, if you have a certain hospital and if you expect the attendants and labourers in that hospital to be clean and hygenic, you cannot expect them to be so unless their houses are clean and unless their houses are free from bugs, mosquitoes and flies. So this is not only in the medical interests of the country but also in the specific interest of the hospital and of the medical facilities provided by hospitals, and I think far greater sums should be devoted to improve the labourers' quarters of our hospital labourers and all labourers in general, because we see that much improvement can be done.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not know whether you would permit me to speak on this, but I would

Mr. Speaker: How do I know? (Laughter).

Enche' K. Karam Singh: But I want to know whether I can bring to the attention of this House about the thirty inmates who are being maintained by the Serdang Bahru Local Council and whom I want the Minister concerned to take charge of.

Mr. Speaker: You cannot do that.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, Sir, under Head 137, Roads and Bridges, we find Parliament House Approach Road, Chamang Quarry, Pahang, Pekan-Kg. Balik Road, Pahang, on which sums totalling \$2,900,000 are proposed to be spent. Sir, when we look at the roads and desire big impressive roads to be built in our capital and all over our country, we must not forget one very basic factor and that is the human element involved in road making. Now, the human element involved is fundamentally the labourers who build the roads. I say with great pride that Malaya's roads are one of the best in the world and I say with far greater pride that Malaya's road workers, who have not been given the credit for their skill, are one of the best road builders in the whole world. What credit have we given to them for their great skill in road building, I would say an unmatched road building skill in the whole world? I would request the Government to consider the question of treating our road builders on the basis of skilled labourers and not on the basis of unskilled labourers. On the basis of skilled labourers I would want more adequate and reasonable salaries to be paid to them.

Sir, that is all I wish to speak and I hope that my appeal to improve the lot of workers in this country would fall on willing ears.

Tun Abdul Razak: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish to reply to a few points raised by Honourable Members. I think a number of Honourable Members spoke on the question of the approach road to the Parliament House, and some of them have said that this money could well be spent or could better be spent on roads in the rural areas. Sir, I say that if we are going to have a Parliament House, and we must have a real Parliament House which can last for posterity—the road leading to the Parliament House should be built, and this project does not affect the rural development programme. Separate provisions, I hope, will be provided for rural development projects and the machines used for building this approach road are not needed for rural

development. So whatever we do with this road it will not affect our rural areas.

Further, a number of Honourable Members raised the question of the Merdeka Stadium. The Merdeka Stadium is a very important place for all of us. It is used for all sorts of purposes. At present the Stadium is a Government building. Therefore, any repair and maintenance must be done by Government. It is controlled by a Board under my chairmanship with the Minister of Finance as member and representatives of State Governments and the Municipality. The Board is responsible for looking after the Merdeka Stadium.

The Honourable Member for Dato Kramat raised the question of excavation in the Kuala Brang District. This excavation is undertaken by Dr. Tregonning and his party. Dr. Tregonning also did the excavation in Kedah four years ago, so it was decided that he should be given permission to investigate the site again. It is understood that this site is not a site of archaeological interest. In general, I would like to say that it is not the policy of the Government that a site of archaeological interest or importance should be excavated except under the supervision of qualified archaeologists.

The Honourable Member for Dato Kramat also raised the question of the University, although the matter he raised was a security matter to which I think I ought to reply. The question whether any person outside this country should enter this country or not is a matter for the Government. If the Government considers that a person is a security risk, that is, if it is considered, if a person enters this country, that he is going to work against the interests of the people of this country or he is going to work for the interest of another foreign power, then obviously the Government must take precaution in the interest of the country to stop such a person from entering the country. Although it seems to me that the object of her entering the country is very innocent,

still the Government must take precaution to see that in carrying out her object she may not be doing harm to the country. This matter has nothing to do with the administration of the University. It is a matter of security, a matter for immigration.

Berkenaan dengan fasal yang dibawa oleh wakil dari Bachok, berkenaan dengan pembenaan Istana Negara, saya suka terangkan, sangatlah mustahak Istana Negara ini diperbaiki. Kerana kita pada masa ini menerima dzib² yang istimewa dari luar negeri dan Istana Negara itu maseh mempunyai bilek untuk hendak mengadakan jamuan² bagi dzib² yang istimewa itu. Itu sebab-nya hendak diperbaiki supaya Seri Paduka Baginda menerima dzib² itu dengan sempurna. Kerana bangunan Istana yang ada sekarang ini bukan-lah dahulu-nya asal di-benakan kerana Istana. Dengan sebab itu, dari satu masa ka-satu masa mustahak-lah di-perbaiki supaya dapat di-gunakan sa-benar² sa-bagai satu Istana.

Enche' Sardon: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish to reply to the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat regarding the proposed building of the new International Airport. The Government has reached the conclusion that a new international airport is necessary in Kuala Lumpur to meet the requirements of the new jet age in air transport. Plans to improve the present airport have indeed been made, but its potentialities are strictly limited. The Federal Capital continues to expand in all directions and taller buildings are springing up both in and around Kuala Lumpur. It is clear that the present airport site will become progressively less and less acceptable to the international airlines. A fresh start must be made and this will naturally cost money. However, an adequate international airport, in these days of the extraordinarily rapid growth of air transport, is a facility which no independent country which reckons to play its part effectively in the international field, can possibly do without.

The decision is a bold one. In the making of it, a predominant part has

been taken by the Honourable the Prime Minister who has displayed, in handling this major issue, that leadership and foresight which we have come to expect of him.

A site for the new airport has been provisionally selected at the 11th mile on the Klang Road and the appropriate notification has been published under the Land Acquisition Enactment. The sum of \$200,000 sought under Head 147, Subhead 22, in these Estimates, is to meet the expenses of preliminary investigations. We believe that the new site is suitable, but we are in the early stages yet. We must be quite sure that the location, design and facilities will meet all the foreseeable needs of a first-class international airport, before we actually go ahead with construction. But once we are satisfied, we shall press on with the project. Firstly tests will have to be made, design problems studied, estimates prepared and so on. The Government plans to enlist expert aeronautical and airport engineering advice to help in planning the project.

Therefore, in order to ensure that there may be no delay in commencing these tasks, funds for preliminary expenses are being required.

Dato' V. T. Sambanthan: A number of Members of the Opposition have asked a number of questions and made some charges or allegations and then walked away without waiting for an answer. However, since the rest of the Members will be interested, I would like to supplement the reply made by the Honourable the Deputy Prime Minister and to say that the Public Works Department's capacity is in no way strained by this road work. At present the Public Works Department is constructing with plant on the ground, 31 rural roads totalling 420 miles. In the past three years 330 miles of such roads have been built. During the next five years 1,500 miles of such roads will be built. Therefore, this places in its correct perspective the road leading to the Parliament House.

The Honourable Member for Bungsar said that we should concede that we are ignoring the working class of the country because a million dollars is

voted for their good. I do not know where he got this logic, but if he had cared to turn over the pages of the Estimates for the last few years he would have known that this in fact is an unprecedented amount. It was only a few months ago that we have voted \$2 million. We are voting another million dollars now, and for all I know we will be asking for further money as our building programme gains in strength. We are fully aware of the conditions of the workers' housing and we are determined to improve them; but making allegations without understanding or seeking to understand or searching to find out the truth before making them is really lamentable.

Another charge was made asking me whether I knew that a Government building in Petaling Jaya had a roof which was leaking. I must admit, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that I do take up palmistry now and then in my spare time. I am not a good palmist, but I do make predictions sometimes. However, I have not taken up crystal gazing yet. Therefore I do not know which building he was referring to. There is quite a number of buildings in Petaling Jaya and since he has not enlightened me as to which building he was referring to, I will leave it at that.

With regard to Johore Bharu post office, I would like to say that we will be progressing as fast as possible. I think that answers fairly adequately the various points that have been raised.

The Assistant Minister of Labour (Enche' V. Manickavasagam): Mr. Speaker, Sir, in reply to the allegations made by the Honourable Members for Damansara and Bungsar on the condition of workers' housing, I wish to state that my Ministry is at the moment making a survey of workers' housing throughout the country. Sir, as I stated two days back in this House, the question of minimum housing requirements for workers will soon be discussed by the National Joint Labour Advisory Council represented both by the workers and by the employers.

The Assistant Minister of Education (Enche' Abdul Hamid Khan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to reply to the view expressed by the Honourable Member

for Rawang who is not here just now. He has expressed the view that children of six years of age and under, should be given places in schools. I would like to say, Sir, that there are age limits for admission and also there are age limits for each and every class. We do not think that babies with milk bottles and so on should be admitted to those classes because it will not be possible to get them the necessary tuition which it is intended to do in our schools, because they would not be of the correct age.

The Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives (Enche' Abdul Aziz bin Ishak): Tuan Pengerusi, bagi menjawab Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Temerloh berkenaan dengan Parit dan Tali Ayer, dasar Kerajaan hendak membuka kawasan² atau tempat² baharu bagi Parit dan Tali Ayer di-mana jika kawasan itu di-fikirkan sangat sesuai, kerana jikalau kawasan itu sangat kecil maka perbelanjaan-nya berlebeh. Mithal-nya kalau satu ekar itu hendak di-belanjakan lebih daripada \$300 atau \$400 bagi membena Parit dan Tali Ayer itu jika di-fikirkan tidak sesuai. Maka itu-lah sebab-nya jika sa-suatu kawasan hendak di-bena dalam Rancangan Parit dan Tali Ayer sekurang²-nya 500 atau 1,000 ekar baharu-lah kita dapat di-mulakan dan jikalau sa-suatu kawasan itu kecil hendak di-buka sa-bagai Rancangan Parit dan Tali Ayer, jikalau kawasan itu di-tanam padi, maka kawasan padi itu tidak akan menjadi baik oleh kerana musoh² saperti tikus, burung dan sa-bagai-nya akan mendatangkan kerugian kapada penanam² padi itu.

Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari: Tuan Speaker, saya bagi pehak Menteri Kesihatan dan Kebajikan Masyarakat suka menjawab perkataan yang di-datangkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Temerloh berkenaan dengan ward Batok Kring bagi orang² perempuan di-Temerloh. Perkara itu saya akan ambil ingatan dan akan membinchangkan kapada Kementerian yang berkenaan.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, my last point is on the question raised by the Honourable Member for Damansara with regard to the labour lines in Seremban Hospital.

The sum asked for is to cover the expenses connected with the general structural improvement to quarters of the attendants in the Hospital. I can assure him that even without his reminding us we are always aware of our duty to the workers of this country. (*Applause*).

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Mr. Speaker, I have very little to add to what has already been said by my Honourable colleagues, and I shall therefore confine myself to one or two general remarks. In the first place, I would like to supplement what has been said on the International Airport by the Honourable the Minister of Transport because, firstly, it is a project of considerable magnitude, and secondly, because I have heard adverse comment on it both outside this House and inside it as a result, I think, of some misunderstanding of this issue.

The figure which has been bandied about in the newspapers is \$50 million. I have reason to believe that the final cost will be considerably less than this. It is of course difficult to estimate what it will cost eventually, but I very much doubt whether it will come to anything near this figure. I think we need a really first-class Airport, and it is generally conceded that whatever money is spent on the present Airport will never turn it into a first-class Airport, for two reasons. In the first place, Kuala Lumpur is, as we all know, surrounded by hills, and in these days of fast-flying jets, it is practically impossible for a jet to operate with any reasonable degree of safety under such circumstances. Secondly, as Honourable Members all know and are aware, this Airport is only three miles outside Kuala Lumpur, and if to-day we were to go ahead with the idea that it should be an international Airport, it would obviously be difficult to build skyscrapers near it in the town, as this would impede the movements of fast flying modern aircraft. And that is the reason why the Government has finally decided that we should take a decision once and for all and build on a site which will last for many more years.

Honourable Members speaking in this debate seem to me to be under

the impression that this is the main Development Budget, because they have asked why this item has not been included, why that item has been left out. It must be remembered that this is only a supplementary Development Budget, and therefore you cannot see things in proper perspective. I would suggest that Honourable Members be a little patient and wait for the main Five-Year Plan wherein they will see that all the priorities which should be given top priority will be accorded their due place in that Plan.

Question put, and agreed to.

Development (Supplementary) (No. 2) Estimates, 1960, considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

Head 100—

The Minister of Justice (Tun Leong Yew Koh): Sir, the supplement of \$8,000 is asked for for the building of the Court House at Selama, Perak. Originally, it was intended to build this Court House as an annexe to the District and Land Office. Unfortunately, we could not get approval in time; the Perak Government could not wait. They have already built their District and Land Office. We have now to build the Court House separately, and this involves the extra cost of \$8,000.

Mr. Speaker: (To Tun Leong Yew Koh) You cannot move a motion, though you can take part in the Debate. A Member of the Senate cannot move a motion in the House of Representatives.

Dato' Suleiman: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I move that the sum of \$8,000 under Head 100, Judicial, for a Court House at Selama be accepted by this House.

Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$8,000 for Head 100 agreed to stand part of the Development (Supplementary) (No. 2) Estimates, 1960.

Head 101—

Tun Abdul Razak: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this amount of \$170,000 under Head 101 be approved.

Sir, under Item 5, a sum of \$100,000 is asked for the National Museum, and as the House is aware, we have only

a temporary Museum at the moment, and it is necessary that we should build a new Museum. That is why this amount of \$100,000 is entered as the first instalment in the acquisition of land, etc:

Under Item 6, Improvements to Merdeka Stadium, I have explained the requirement for this amount. It is necessary from time to time to make minor improvements to the Merdeka Stadium, particularly now since the Stadium is very much used. The money is required to renovate the Royal Box and also the Radio Box, and also to make seating arrangements for distinguished persons who may from time to time visit the Stadium.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam permintaan ini ada masok Museum Negara dan saya amat-lah sukachita kerana perkara ini telah di-bawa dengan tujuan hendak mendirikan sa-buah Museum yang layak dengan negeri yang telah Merdeka ini. Wang yang \$100,000 ini saya perchaya tentu-lah semua-nya tidak untuk ini sahaja, sebab \$900,000 akan di-belanjakan kemudian. Tetapi sa-tahu saya, wang yang \$100,000 itu tentu-lah termasuk belanja² yang bersangkutan dengan membuat pelan bagi benaan Museum dan kalau tidak di-masokkan pun, maka perkara ini saya hendak kemukakan ia-itu bahawa bangunan Museum ini hendak-lah merupakan satu bentuk yang sesuai dengan kebudayaan negeri ini, supaya nyata-lah di-luar Museum itu bahawa Museum ini merupakan satu tempat pusaka bagi bangsa yang ada ini. Itu saya minta mendapat perhatian daripada Timbalan Perdana Menteri yang akan mengendalikan hal ini.

Tun Abdul Razak: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perkara ini tentu-lah mesti diambil berat. Kalau Ahli Yang Berhormat itu suka hendak melihat gambar-nya (plan) ada di-Jabatan Perdana Menteri. Pelan-nya hendak chuba dibuat menurut chara architecture yang ada di-Tanah Melayu ini menurut ke-aslian kebudayaan kita. Kalau Ahli Yang Berhormat hendak memuaskan hati, sila-lah datang di-Jabatan Perdana Menteri melihat pelan itu.

Enche' Tan Phock Kin (Tanjong): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on Item No. 6, we heard from the Minister concerned that the money will be utilised, among other things, for new seating arrangements or new seats for V.I.Ps. As far as I know, quite a lot of V.I.Ps. have been to the Merdeka Stadium in the past, and so far, we have found that the seating accommodation is quite satisfactory. In view of the fact that V.I.Ps. don't visit Merdeka Stadium every week or every month, I was wondering whether the Minister concerned can enlighten us as to why it is necessary, and why present arrangements are not suitable.

Tun Abdul Razak: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have explained the necessary minor alterations. As I said, the Stadium is visited from time to time by distinguished persons, and it is necessary to see that the seating arrangements are suitable. The money is also required to make provision for a V.I.P. Rest Room, and also to provide a trench round the area so as to guard against the possibility of excited spectators. The money is also needed for various purposes connected with special seating arrangements for V.I.Ps., to alter the Royal Box, etc.

Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$170,000 for Head 101 agreed to stand part of the Development (Supplementary) (No. 2) Estimates, 1960.

Head 107—

Dato' Suleiman: Mr. Speaker, I move that a sum of \$50,000 under Head 107 for building a Stationery Store for the Government Printing Office, be approved. The present Stationery Store building is insufficient, and we ask for this sum to improve it. I accordingly move that the House approve this item.

Enche' Tan Phock Kin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Minister of the Interior in introducing to this House for its approval the sum of \$50,000 mentioned rather briefly that the sum is required because the present space is not sufficient. I think this House is not convinced with such an introduction. If a sum of \$50,000 is required, surely

Development Estimates, Sir, a sum of \$132,500 was approved for the construction of a students' hostel and mess, a block of classrooms and a workshop for the Fisheries Department School for fishermen at Glugor. \$195,000 was allocated to the P.W.D. who had undertaken to have the building constructed on the basis of accepted tender. Due to delay in finalising arrangement, work on the hostel was not started. The full balance of the 1959 P.W.D. allocation of \$102,605 is urgently required to replenish the 1960 provision in order that equipment for the School may now be ordered and to enable the required commitments to be met as the building is near completion.

Under subhead 9, Sir, a total provision of \$126,900 was made available for the construction of fish ponds, an office and quarters at Kuala Kangsar. A sum of \$15,000 was earmarked for the construction of a Field Laboratory at the Station and essential items for experimental work on breeding and rearing of fish. This could not be started until the ponds were completed and as a result of delays in the construction of the ponds, the P.W.D. was unable to start work on the laboratory in 1959. It is urgently required this year and the balance of \$15,030 from the 1959 allocation is required for immediate construction of the building.

Under subhead 15, the position with regard to this item is exactly the same as in the case of subhead 7, Marine Fisheries School, Glugor, which I explained just now. Only \$28,170 could be spent in 1959. Work is nearing completion and payments have been made from 1960 funds in order to enable work to continue. Sir, equipment must be ordered in 1960 if the School is to start taking in fishermen trainees and the whole of the balance of \$71,830 is urgently required.

Sir, I beg to move.

Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$376,965 for Heads 132 and 133 agreed to stand part of the Development (Supplementary) (No. 2) Estimates, 1960.

Heads 136-139 and 142-144—

Dato' V. T. Sambanthan: Mr. Speaker, Sir, with your permission I would like to introduce all the Heads under the Ministry of Works, Posts and Telecommunications in these Development Estimates at the same time. The provisions under Heads 136 to 139 and 142 to 144 inclusive totalled \$5,991,500 for which I request the approval of the House.

Under Head 136, I request a total of \$574,500. Of this sum \$30,000 is urgently required under subhead 6 to pay for work on the extension of postal stores, which work was put in last year with a provision of \$72,000 but which had to be largely completed this year due to delays.

Under sub-head 10, \$28,000 is required for a new Post Office at Jementah which serves a wide rural area with a population of around 50,000 people. It is hoped here to try out a new prototype of inexpensive timber design which if successful will enable our money to go further.

Under sub-head 28, the first instalment of \$500,000 for the replacement of the Post Office and Divisional Headquarters, Johore Bahru, is made. The present building which is over thirty years old—it was originally a Rest House—is not only hopelessly out of date as a Post Office but it has also been condemned as dangerous. A replacement at a probable cost of \$1,000,000 will enable a greatly improved service to be given over a wide area of Johore.

The last item of \$500 under sub-head 30 will enable the present lease of the branch Post Office site at Petaling Jaya to be extended from 60 to 99 years which is clearly desirable.

Under Head 137, Roads and Bridges, we have the approach road to the Parliament House which we already discussed. A provision for \$150,000 is required under sub-head 17 for the Chamang Quarry, Pahang; this money is required for the development of the quarry near Bentong in order to provide an adequate supply of stones for rural development road

projects in the neighbourhood, e.g., the Bilut Valley Scheme. Under sub-head 18 a provision of \$750,000 this year—plus \$3 $\frac{3}{4}$ million later—is sought to enable an important rural road to be constructed along the Pahang River to open up a heavily populated area now badly served by communications. It will serve later as a part of the Federal road between Pekan, Rompin, and Endau part of which is already covered in the Development Loan Fund.

Under Head 138, Water Supplies, a provision of \$370,000 is sought—\$70,000 to provide for an important kampong water supply in Negri Sembilan which is given high priority by the Negri Sembilan Government; and \$300,000 is the first instalment of an ultimate commitment of \$9,000,000 for Phase II of the Klang Gates Water Supply Scheme. As I mentioned at the last session of Parliament, the population of Kuala Lumpur is increasing at an unprecedented rate, very much higher than originally anticipated: as a result, the recently completed Phase I of the Klang Gates Scheme is already operating at capacity and immediate steps must be taken to plan for the future to augment the present supply. Phase II of the Scheme will allow some additional maintenance of the Klang Gates dam and for extension to the purification plant. When completed an additional 14,000,000 gallons of water per day will be supplied.

Under Head 139, Government Buildings (Other Than Housing), a provision of \$820,000 is sought to cover three items—\$40,000 under sub-head 2 for extension to the P.W.D. Federal Workshops and Stores to cope with the increasing number of plants, etc., required for development purposes; \$200,000 under sub-head 4 mainly to enable the old existing buildings to be rehabilitated for further Government purposes and to provide badly needed air-conditioning for Radio Malaya; and some money for extension to Istana Negara; the last provision covers a new banquetting hall badly needed, the provision of a lift to supplement the existing staircase and air-conditioning of the main Reception Room.

Under Head 142, Government Housing, a provision of an extra one million dollars is required to enable the overdue programme of rehabilitation and replacement of workers' quarters to be accelerated. The urgency of this is fully appreciated and a survey is now under way to ensure that it is tackled in the most effective and economical manner.

The provision of \$122,000 under Head 143, Emergency Expenditure, represents a re-vote of funds unexpended in 1959 on Emergency road programme in Kedah largely being undertaken by the Federation Army. Delays in land acquisition made it impossible to complete the work in 1959. I should emphasise that these roads have great value in opening up a wide rural area which can be well considered as part of the rural development programme.

Under Head 144, Telecommunications, a supplement of \$205,000 is requested. \$40,000 of this is required to build a car park next to the Headquarters Building as required by the Kuala Lumpur Municipality. The space available within the site has proved insufficient to accommodate both the staff and visitors' cars, especially the large number of those who come to pay telephone bills, and it is proposed to fill in and surface the adjoining ravine, the Department paying a part of its share and the Kuala Lumpur Municipality the remainder. The remaining \$165,000 is requested to purchase teleprinters to be rented out to the Electoral Commission for the preparation of new electoral rolls.

Sir, I beg to move.

Enche' Tan Phock Kin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to seek clarification from the Honourable the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications with regard to Head 137, sub-head 18, Pekan-Kampong Balik Road, Pahang, \$4,500,000. He has explained the reason as to why that road is necessary, but in view of the claim by a lot of people that a road from Tanah Merah to Grik to connect Kelantan with Perak is just as important, if not more important—and I have also heard of

talks that perhaps importance is placed on Pahang because it happens to be a very important constituency of a Member of the Government—I would like the Honourable Minister to explain as to why preference is given to the Pekan-Kampong Balik Road rather than the Tanah Merah to Grik road.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr. Speaker, Sir, regarding the Post Office to be built at Jementah, I think the Honourable Minister has said that it is going to be built of timber. Hence I would like to know, since that Post Office is going to serve about 150,000 people and their savings may be taken to the Post Office, whether any fire-proof arrangements have been made in the Post Office, or is the timber such that it may be able to withstand fire.

Dato' V. T. Sambanthan: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am sure that many Honourable Members have read Omar Khayyam, I would like to introduce a couple of lines in my reply :

“ and heard great Argument about it and about; But evermore came out by the same door as in I went.”

The Honourable Member for Tanjong has heard me say over and over again and evermore he comes out by the same door wherein he went. I regret to note that he has still to understand the problem of the Grik road. I have said before that it would cost more than \$50 million; it goes over difficult terrain; and therefore it is not feasible at the moment. This is a small amount of money compared to that. The extent of improvement resulting from the provision of this money is also considerable. And I certainly dislike the veiled suggestion, the innuendos, and such words as he likes to use,—that we are trying to allocate as we have done because the Honourable the Deputy Prime Minister come from Pahang. I think, Sir, that it is a most unworthy suggestion. We are guided plainly by the requirement of land and we stick to it. I hope the Honourable Member does not again go out by the same door.

With regard to the question as to whether timber houses burn or not. I do

not know. As one who seeks to represent the poorer people, is he going to suggest that workers in kampongs, new villages and others should now start building houses of bricks? I am sure that if he ventures to suggest this to the poor people in the new villages, he will get a brick aimed at him. We are experimenting with the use of Malayan timber. In the history of houses, I do not think that the number of houses that have been burnt down has not been such as to prevent us from wanting to build more wooden houses. In any case, I do not think that there is much danger in the building being burnt down. As to what experiments have been carried out to make timber fire-proof, I am afraid I cannot tell him at the moment. But if he wants to know, I have all the information necessary and we can discuss it over a cup of coffee.

Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$5,991,500 for Heads 136 to 139 and Heads 142 to 144 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Development (Supplementary) (No.2) Estimates, 1960.

Head 147—

Enche' Sardon: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that Head 147, Civil Aviation, totalling \$200,000 be approved. Being the last on the list, I would like to say, Sir, one sentence that the sum sought under this head is to meet expenses of preliminary investigations.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad: Preliminary Investigation itu kalau sudah di-bawa hasil-nya, baharu-lah perkara itu hendak di-buat atau tidak hendak di-buat. Atau pun Preliminary expenses sudah di-buat, chuma Preliminary Investigation hendak di-buat kemudian?

Enche' Sardon: Pada menjawab-nya, kerana kita hendak siasat dahulu—hendak mengesahkan sahaja sama ada tempat itu layak, berapa estimate hendak di-beri. Sa-belum itu, tidak boleh di-jalankan.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think that just a plain statement of “preliminary” expenses is not

sufficient for this House. We want the Minister to inform us what are the items included in these preliminary expenses—whether negotiations for land have taken place, whether any other arrangements have so far taken place and whether the expenditure could be itemised.

Enche' Sardon: I think my Honourable friend has said that he does not understand the word "preliminary". I am afraid, Sir, I cannot tell him now.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not think I have received a satisfactory reply, because even in the case of preliminary expenditure, for instance, it could have been so many things, and for the Minister just to play on words is not a reply to my query.

Mr. Speaker: I understand "Preliminary" means everything. It includes everything.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Sir, we would like to know as to what is included in this "preliminary" word—whether it is survey fee or whether expenses or what. We would like to know all that, and I am afraid that is not forthcoming from the Honourable Minister.

Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari: I think the Honourable Member can only get a satisfactory answer if he raises a satisfactory question.

Enche' Sardon bin Haji Jubir: I just want to explain further, Sir. We need an expert to investigate the matter and report. At the moment I cannot tell him unless the expert has submitted his report.

Mr. Speaker: Such as "other matters, etc."! (*Laughter*).

Enche' Sardon bin Haji Jubir: Yes. Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$200,000 for Head 147 ordered to stand part of the Development (Supplementary) (No. 2) Estimates, 1960.

Resolutions of the Committee to be reported.

House resumed.

Development (Supplementary) (No. 2) Estimates, 1960, reported without amendment.

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move,

That this House doth agree with the Committee in its Resolutions, namely, that the expenditure of \$8,126,010, proposed in the Estimates laid upon the Table as Command Paper No. 13 of 1960 be approved by this House, and accordingly resolves that a sum not exceeding \$8,126,010 be expended out of Development Fund in the financial year 1960 and that to meet the Heads and Sub-heads of Expenditure set out in the Second Column of the Paper aforesaid the sums specified in the Ninth Column thereof opposite such Heads and Sub-heads shall be appropriated for such purpose.

Tun Abdul Razak: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House doth agree with the Committee in its Resolutions, namely, that the expenditure of \$8,126,010, proposed in the Estimates laid upon the Table as Command Paper No. 13 of 1960 be approved by this House, and accordingly resolves that a sum not exceeding \$8,126,010 be expended out of Development Fund in the financial year 1960 and that to meet the Heads and Sub-heads of Expenditure set out in the Second Column of the Paper aforesaid the sums specified in the Ninth Column thereof opposite such Heads and Sub-heads shall be appropriated for such purpose.

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

Adjourned at twenty minutes past seven o'clock p.m.