

SPEECH BY PRIME MINISTER LEE KUAN YEW**AT THE FULLERTON SQUARE RALLY ON 19 DECEMBER 1984****WHY ONE YEAR'S NOTICE OF GENERAL ELECTION?**

In December last year I announced that the elections would be held earlier than 1985 so that there was no need for a by-election in Havelock. Had the US economy taken a downturn, we would have gone into the elections earlier to get a mandate to brace ourselves for the difficulties which will follow. Fortunately, the recession did not come. Because the economy kept on going till Mr Reagan's re-election, we announced elections for December.

You may be curious to know why

National Archives of Singapore

My first reason for giving long notice is to draw out the younger, rational, educated men who may be in the wings, wanting to form a party. In July, I moved an amendment to the Constitution to allow the three highest opposition candidates, in percentage votes, to be returned as non-constituency candidates if no opposition candidate wins any seat. I invited them to come out and participate. I think it is good for them and for the country that they should come

out early, if not to win this time, then to prepare for 1988-89. None did. Maybe they will turn up after I have stepped down.

My second reason is to have a long period for electioneering, arguments, sniping, twisting, barracking by the opposition. As I expected, they ran out of steam, they ran out of issues, arguments and ideas. They repeated themselves. They exhausted themselves.

A third reason is that we can name our candidate early, from February, and place them in their constituencies. We are proud of them. An incompetent opposition kept their candidates secret up to the last moment, nomination day itself. We assumed they were not proud of them. When they were disclosed on nomination day, we knew why. Most were yesterday's men, pre-occupied with yesterday's agenda - old, out-of-date, tired and threadbare. The rest are ambiguous, shadowy figures, improbable representatives of freedom and democracy, feeble champions of stability, security and prosperity.

This election is political initiation for the post-Malaysia generation, the under-30s, the generation that has not personally experienced strife and deprivation. They need to hear about the future policies, ideas, views and vision that the parties have. Those who hold out themselves as leaders must have the

wherewithal to tell this young generation whither they want to take them. The younger PAP team has set out to do this. The opposition has balked at it.

This is the last reason for having electioneering stretched over a whole year - the education of a whole generation of young voters. They have heard the attacks, smears, arguments against the government. They have seen the people who have made these extremist charges of bad intentions or crass stupidities. They have also seen and heard the PAP leaders rebutted these falsehoods and restated the facts. They must judge who are reliable, who are to be believed. It is not difficult. I have never been sued for slander or libel, and never paid anyone any damages for uttering lies. Dr Lee Siew Choh had to pay to me \$50,000 in damages and costs in 1973 for falsely alleging "unlawful or wrongful activities and all sorts of bad things". My Jeyaretnam had to pay \$120,000 and costs in 1982 for falsely alleging corruption on issuing a banking licence to Tat Lee Bank because of my brother's interests.

"One-man one-vote" is a most difficult form of government. From time to time the results can be erratic. People are sometimes fickle. They get bored with stable, steady improvements in life, and in a reckless moment they vote for a change for change's sake. This is the danger for Singapore, not in this election,

because the results cannot be a disaster this time. But it can be in the future.

Only rich and stable countries can survive these upsets and setbacks.

1981 Anson lost - a blessing in disguise

In 1980, at a meeting here, I asked you to endorse the PAP for another term to give me time to get a successor leadership into position. You did. In an unexpected way, the tempering of the successor generation took an unexpected and stronger turn. In October 1981 we lost Anson in a by-election. It was a setback. Psychologically it upset the PAP. In retrospect, we were blessed, without our knowing it. Several latent weaknesses amongst the new guard, young Ministers and MPs were shown up. We had time to move them aside before more damage was done. The adversity of having the ground gone sour was turned to advantage. The young Ministers regrouped in search of solutions.

With the help of some old guards, like Ch'ng Jit Koon, they set off on a walkabout of the 75 constituencies over a period of two and a quarter years.

They developed new frameworks for interaction, and an easy, informal style of contact and communication with people. They have established rapport with the younger generation and with the new community leaders in our housing estates.

And as a fortuitous by-product, because Mr Jeyaretnam is what he is, eager to see Singapore defenceless and prostrate, envious at our large national savings and impatient to give everything away for free, several able and concerned men were moved to take a stand, to come out for elections and serve the country.

In the batch of 26, there are at least six who have the potential to be more than MPs: Ng Pock Too, Mah Bow Tan, Yeo Cheow Tong, Wong Kan Seng, Lee Hsien Loong, Richard Hu.

If the success rate in the class of 1984 is as good as the class of 1980, by 1988-89, the Cabinet for the 1990s will be in place.

IMPORTANT TO RENEW THE COALITION

National Archives of Singapore

This election will see a renewal of the coalition of the four basic segments or groupings of our population that have held Singapore society together - the Chinese-educated and the English-educated, the Malay-educated, the Indians and others. We have never been a homogeneous society. The Chinese were divided into different clans and dialects and between the English and Chinese-educated. It is a division that is still with us, because there are those who are monolingual

and read only the Chinese press and speak no English, and those monolinguals who read only the English press and speak some dialect. Of course the line of division is being blurred as more people have become bilingual over the last 25 years. Eventually the division will dissolve, perhaps in the next generation when most will be bilingual.

The majority of the able men we recruited were English-educated, although some were educated in Chinese schools. When the young Ministers succeeded in identifying and persuading Goh Choon Kang, now MP for Braddell Heights, returned unopposed, and Tang Guan Seng, our candidate in Khe Bong, to stand for election, I was cheered. They are both Chinese-educated, Nantah graduates. They work in the Lianhe Bao. They also read and write English, although their Chinese is better than their English. Their work keeps them in close touch with the Chinese-educated, their moods, their hopes, their fears, and their aspirations. They are valuable members of the young team which must carry the whole ground - both the English and the Chinese-educated.

With the Malay-educated, it was an achievement for the young Ministers to have persuaded Yatiman Yusof and Zulkifli Mohammed to stand for election. Yatiman works in Berita. Though he is a graduate of the University of Singapore he is very much part of the Malay world and his work keeps him in close touch

with the Malay community and their interests. Zulkifli Mohammed is also a University of Singapore graduate. For more than ten years he has been an active leader of several Malay cultural organisations. They have decided to identify themselves with the PAP and to work from within the government to solve Malay problems. Their decisions reflect the positive change in the attitudes of the Malays towards government. As part of the young team, they can ensure that Malay interests are attended to.

The Indian-educated are few in numbers. So we have not been presented with the same problem. Moreover, Indians are well represented in the Government and in Parliament, so much so that we felt comfortable in fielding Vasoo in Bo Wen. He was born in Singapore and he identifies himself totally as a Singaporean.

These are the realities of Singapore society. It is important that we bring this amalgam of the main segments of our society up to date. The young team will be as representative as the original team.

The opposition leaders do not understand that if they do not have this amalgam of the English and Chinese-educated, the Malay-educated and the Indians and other minorities, our national solidarity will weaken. No opposition

party has attempted to offer such a coalition. Indeed, even if we put all the parties and their 48 candidates together, Singapore does not have the basic segments of the amalgam our society needs. Can you imagine Mr Chiam See Tong representing the English-educated, and reaching out in Mandarin, which he cannot speak to the Chinese-educated? Can you imagine Mr Seow Khee Leng representing the Chinese-educated, joining hands with Haji Rahman Zin of PKMS representing the Malay-educated? Can you imagine these three men embracing Mr Jeyaretnam as representing the Indian minority? The opposition is short in quality, short in their ethnic-linguistic mix for national solidarity.

IMPORTANCE OF THIS ELECTION

You may well ask, "Yes, so the government is secure and improved. But what is there in it for me as a voter?" Well, your job, your home, your children's future - they all depend upon good government, stability, expansion and economic growth. These are also improved by the election of these new candidates. An able team that is seen to be able to carry on without me after the next elections in 1988-89 will be reassurance to foreign manufacturers who have billions of dollars invested in Singapore. They have to make annual decisions on

whether to expand their operations in Singapore. And they will do so if they see that you the people support this younger team so that there will be the same secure and favourable conditions for production and profits into the 1990s. This is your stake in these elections. If you send the wrong signals, those which can cause investors to hesitate, you have hurt yourselves. This is what the elections mean to you.

Send the right signals, that Singapore can be as stable and secure and we shall surge into a second era of hi-tech economic growth.

National Archives of Singapore

Let me now give you a programme for the next five years to 1989.

Provided you keep increasing productivity, and there is no world recession, we should be able to make four to six per cent, maybe even six to eight per cent growth a year. It depends on the rate of growth of the developed countries.

I must warn you, however, that behind the glow of Christmas decorations and good cheer, there lurks the menace of a major world economic crisis. It can strike in the next few years, during President Reagan's term, if the huge US budget deficits are not cut back, interest rates go up, the American \$ goes down, and all of these aggravate the strains of world debts on the international banking system. If this were to happen, then all bets are off. We shall also be plunged into the debts of a recession or a depression. The economies of the industrial countries will slow down and international trade will shrink. After such a setback, it will take several years to get the world economy going again. During these few years, we shall have to live on our savings. So let us hope that President Reagan and his advisers will resolve this crisis. It requires doing more difficult things than postponing the eruption of the crisis when it first shook the bankers in August 1982 as Mexico defaulted on payment of its debts.

If there is no recession, then in the next five years we shall build 180,000 units of bigger flats for sale: 45,000 (1985); 40,000 (1986); 35,000 (1987); 30,000 (1988); 30,000 (1989) (Table X & Y). If we make four to six per cent increase in our GDP per annum, there should be no problem in meeting your downpayments and your monthly instalments for the 180,000 units. By 1989, there will be 550,000 HDB homeowners (Table 1).

In the four years since I spoke here in Dec 1989, 133,000 new HDB homeowners have balloted and occupied their flats. The total homeowners is now 373,000 (Table 1). Ten years ago, in 1974, only 75,000 were sold.

The HDB has concentrated on bigger and bigger flats. In 1974, ten years ago, of the 75,000 HDB flats sold, 78 per cent was 3-room; in 1984, 55 per cent 3-room, 30 per cent 4-room. The present waiting list shows: 20.7 per cent 3-room, 43 per cent 4-room, 22.9 per cent 5-room, 11.2 per cent Executive and 2.2 per cent HUDC. Singaporeans are moving upmarket, as they should with higher incomes.

WAGE INCREASES 1980-84

1980-84 were four exceptionally good years. This year we shall make about 8.5 per cent economic growth. And every year salaries have gone up by 8.7 per cent in real terms, after adjustment for inflation. A detailed breakdown for the various educational groups is illuminating (Table 4). Those who never attended school had an annual rate of increase of five per cent per annum in their pay. Those who did attend school, but had no PSLE, six per cent. Those who had primary school had 7.3 per cent, post-primary 9.6 per cent, secondary 9.6 per cent per annum. In other words, the demand, and so the pay, goes up quicker for higher-skilled and better-educated workers. This results from our producing more higher value products. The post-secondary gained 12 per cent, compared to five per cent for the no schooling. This trend will continue. It is therefore crucial that everybody makes the effort to reach the maximum of his educational potential.

National Archives of Singapore

In the last ten years more students have made it into the higher reaches of education. It is the result of streaming better balanced bilingualism, and better teaching. Secondary increased from 38 per cent to 48 per cent, post-secondary increased from 13 per cent to 18 per cent, tertiary from six per cent to eight per cent (Table 4A).

SAVINGS IN BANK AND CPF DOUBLED

Because of higher wages in the last four years, our cumulative savings with banks and finance companies have doubled, gone up by 94 per cent from \$15 billion to \$29.3 billion, an average of 18 per cent per annum. This is your wealth, the savings of people in individual accounts are not government reserves. Cumulative savings with the CPF have gone up from \$9.5 billion by 137 per cent to \$22.7 billion, 24 per cent per annum (Table 2). Adjusted for inflation, the total is just as impressive. Cumulative savings in banks and CPF from \$24.6 billion went up by 81 per cent to \$44.5 billion (Table 3). Savings with CPF went up in spite of the following sizeable withdrawals from the CPF for the homeownership scheme: 1981 \$691 million, 1982 \$796 million, 1983 \$1,112 million, 1984 \$2,719 million, more than double the withdrawal for 1983 to pay for 60,000 flats.

National Archives of Singapore

OWNERSHIP OF CONSUMER DURABLES

Our increased incomes are reflected in the ownership of consumer durables: telephones, cars, motorcycles, TV, air-con, refrigerators, washing machines and video cassette recorders (Table 4A). Growth from 1978 to 1983 has been high. We are past Hong Kong per 1,000 of population for cars 81

compared to 38 (Table 4C); telephones 369 to 292; behind HK TV 170 to 225; near Japan refrigerators 96 per cent of households to 99 per cent of households; half Japan washing machines 47 per cent of households to 99 per cent of households.

OVERSEAS TRAVEL

What does this mean for our lifestyle? People with higher incomes not only live well, they also travel. Returning Singapore residents by air and sea rose from 511,000 in 1981 to a projected 672,000 in 1984, an average annual growth of 9.5 per cent (Table 5). If we include, travel by road to West Malaysia, then from 2.4 million in 1981 it has gone up to 3.1 million in 1984, an annual growth of 8.8 per cent per annum. These figures reflect the changed leisure habits of Singaporeans. It is proof that the vision painted by my younger colleagues is well within your grasp. Higher incomes will enable a fuller life, not only having useful or attractive things, but better use of leisure.

REMINDER - SINGAPORE IS NOT EUROPE

I should add one word of caution. Whilst we have the appearance of a stable, peaceful, prosperous, nearly developed country, we are nowhere like a homogeneous developed European country. Do not assume that you can take liberties with race, language, religion or culture. On 30 October, the Prime Minister of India, Mrs Indira Gandhi, was assassinated by some Sikhs. You will not believe it, but you should know that two Sikh Singaporeans were suddenly assaulted in Singapore by Hindu Singaporeans. Many other were threatened. Some civil disorder could have broken out, if the Police had not advised the organisers of several Indian groups not to go on with their planned condolence gatherings. That would only exacerbate tension between Sikhs and Hindus. Of course, some Indian Singaporeans were upset. One in particular, an Indian born, ranted against the government when he was told that he should give up his Singapore citizenship and go back to India if he wanted to indulge in Indian politics.

National Archives of Singapore

IRON RICE BOWL SYNDROME

Let me mention the momentous happenings in China and their lesson for everyone in the Third World. China stood for the purest, most socialist of egalitarian societies. It did not work. The commune has been dismantled. A responsibility system has been established for farms. Different families work on different plots of land, a part for sale to the government and a portion for private sale. Food is now plentiful. When in a commune, everybody got his more or less equal share of the harvest, production was down. Now, China is extending the same responsibility and incentive system to factories in the urban areas, starting with light industry. The more productive workers will be rewarded with higher wages. The profitable enterprises will keep their profits for expansion and for rewards to their workers. There is a lesson here for those who preach the egalitarian system of equal pay regardless of differences in ability, skills and total performance or output. China found the iron rice bowl led to low performance and poverty for all.

Opposition politicians preach welfare and compassion, like free medicine for the poor Class C patients. By the way Class C patients are 80 per cent of the total in our hospitals, ie 80 per cent of Singapore is technically poor. They do not tell us how we as a society can pay for it.

The British started National Health Plan for free and equal medical services over 35 years ago, when I was a student in Britain. It has failed, miserably. The hospitals and the doctors could not cope with free, non-paying patients. Last year when Mrs Thatcher, the Prime Minister, went for her eye operation, she chose a private hospital and paid for her private surgeon, not on National Health. So also when S Rajaratnam was given a heart by-pass by a top surgeon in a private hospital in London.

Even Communist China could not provide adequate medical services on free state schemes. A few months ago the Chinese government has given doctors and nurses permission to treat and charge patients for medical service on their own free time. This is the beginnings of private medicine. Some people want us to repeat the disastrous mistakes of others and destroy ourselves.

National Archives of Singapore

When people get equal handouts, whether or not they work harder or better, everybody then works less hard. The country must go down. It is when people are encouraged to excel by being able to keep a large part of the extra reward earned by their extra efforts that the society as a whole becomes wealthier and everyone thrives and prospers. Hence we have ensured that your CPF is yours, and your Medisave is yours. If we convert Medisave into a

nameless common medical insurance account, we shall be caught in the iron rice bowl syndrome.

A realistic and courageous leadership in China under Deng Xiaoping has decided that it is time to be honest, and to admit that it has not worked and to abandon it. We are lucky never to have been caught in one. All those who try to sell you the iron rice bowl, are ignorant or stupid and will intend to bring grief upon you.

National Archives of Singapore

Table X**PROJECTED DISTRIBUTION OF FLAT TYPES AMONG COMPLETED DWELLING UNITS IN RESPECTIVE YEARS**

Year	1- Room	2- Room	3- Room	4- Room	5- Room	Exec	HUDC	Total
1985	-	-	14,000	21,000	4,000	3,000	3,000	45,000
1986	-	-	9,000	19,000	7,000	4,000	1,000	40,000
1987	-	-	7,000	15,000	8,000	4,000	1,000	35,000
1988	-	-	2,000	15,00	8,000	4,000	1,000	30,000
1989	-	-	2,000	15,000	8,000	4,000	1,000	30,000

Table Y**PROJECTED % DISTRIBUTION OF FLAT TYPES AMONG COMPLETED DWELLING UNITS IN RESPECTIVE YEARS**

Year	1- Room	2- Room	3- Room	4- Room	5- Room	Exec	HUDC	Total
1985	-	-	31.1%	46.6%	8.9%	6.7%	6.7%	100%
1986	-	-	22.5%	47.5%	17.5%	10.0%	2.5%	100%
1987	-	-	20.2%	42.9%	22.8%	11.4%	2.9%	100%
1988	-	-	6.7%	50.0%	26.7%	13.3%	3.3%	100%
1989	-	-	6.7%	50.0%	26.7%	13.3%	3.3%	100%

Table 1

FLATS SOLD UNDER HOME OWNERSHIP SCHEME (HOS) & RENTAL BY ROOM TYPE

Year	1- Room	2- Room	3- Room	4- Room	5- Room	Exec	HUDC	Total
Dec 64								
HOS	-	354	1,097	-	-	-	-	1,451
Rental	7,923	17,134	25,645	2,115	44	-	-	52,861
Total	7,923	17,488	26,742	2,115	44	-	-	54,312
Dec 74								
HOS	948	3,861	58,692	9,284	2,552	-	-	<u>75,337</u>
Rental	64,317	29,091	17,414	1,688	42	-	-	115,552
Total	65,265	32,952	76,106	10972	2,594	-	-	187,889
Oct 84								
HOS	1,212	5,332	<u>205,428</u>	<u>111,243</u>	<u>39,961</u>	<u>5,306</u>	5,117	<u>373,599</u>
Rental	59,071	43,196	21,605	2,994	402	-	80	127,348
Total	60,283	48,528	227,033	114,237	40,363	5,306	5,197	500,947
Projected 1989								
HOS	0	0	<u>239,000</u>	<u>196,000</u>	<u>75,000</u>	<u>25,000</u>	12,000	<u>547,000</u>
Rental	37,000	49,000	20,000	70,000	0	0	0	113,000
Total	37,000	49,000	259,000	203,000	75,000	25,000	12,000	660,000

Table 1A

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF FLATS BY HOS AND RENTAL

Year	1- Room	2- Room	3- Room	4- Room	5- Room	Exec	HUDC	Total
Dec 64								
HOS	-	24.4	75.6	-	-	-	-	100.0
Rental	15.0	32.4	48.5	4.0	0.08	-	-	100.0
Total	14.5	32.2	49.2	3.9	0.08	-	-	100.0
Dec 74								
HOS	1.3	5.1	77.9	12.3	3.4	-	-	100.0
Rental	57.1	25.8	15.5	1.5	0.04	-	-	100.0
Total	34.7	17.5	40.5	5.9	1.4	-	-	100.0
Oct 84								
HOS	0.3	1.4	<u>55.0</u>	<u>29.8</u>	<u>10.7</u>	<u>1.4</u>	<u>1.4</u>	100.0
Rental	46.4	33.9	17.0	2.4	0.3	-	0.1	100.0
Total	12.0	9.7	45.3	22.8	8.1	1.1	1.0	100.0
Projected 1989								
HOS	0	0	<u>43.7</u>	<u>35.8</u>	<u>13.7</u>	<u>4.6</u>	<u>2.2</u>	100.0
Rental	32.7	43.4	17.7	6.2	0.	0	0	100.0
Total	5.6	7.4	39.2	30.8	11.4	3.8	1.8	100.0

Table 2

CUMULATIVE SAVINGS

(Current \$)							
As at 31 Dec	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984 (Projected)	% Increase 1984/1980	Average Annual Increase 1980 - 1984
1 Cumulative Savings with Banks and Finance Companies (\$ million)	15,091	18,602	22,850	26,568	29,300	94%	18%
2 Cumulative Savings with CPF (\$ million)	9,551	12,150	15,656	19,505	22,680	137%	24%
1 + 2 Total Cumulative Savings (\$ million)	24,642	30,752	38,506	46,073	51,980	111%	20%
Per Capita Total Cumulative Savings (\$/person)	10,141	12,506	15,477	18,305	20,550	103%	19%

Sources: Monetary Authority of Singapore
Central Provident Fund Board

Table 3

CUMULATIVE SAVINGS

(Constant 1980 \$)

As at 31 Dec	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984 (Projected)	% Increase 1984/1980	Average Annual Increase 1980 - 1984
1 Cumulative Savings with Banks and Finance Companies (\$ million)	15,091	17,183	20,321	23,346	25,070	66%	14%
2 Cumulative Savings with CPF (\$ million)	9,551	11,223	13,923	17,140	19,410	103%	19%
1 + 2 Total Cumulative Savings (\$ million)	24,642	28,406	34,244	40,486	44,480	81%	16%
Per Capita Total Cumulative Savings (\$/person)	10,141	11,552	13,764	16,085	17,590	73%	15%

Sources: Monetary Authority of Singapore
Central Provident Fund Board

Table 4

AVERAGE MONTHLY INCOME, CONSTANT 1980 \$

Educational Attainment	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984 (Projected)	Real Increase 1984/1980 %	Average Annual Real Increase 1980 - 1984 %
Never attended school	531	544	568	612	645	21.5	5.0
No Qualifications (Below PSLE)	585	596	682	719	739	26.4	6.0
Primary	580	586	665	717	768	32.5	7.2
Secondary	697	743	825	917	1,006	44.3	9.6
Post Secondary	971	1,065	1,221	1,413	1,527	57.3	12.0
Tertiary	2,718	2,681	3,256	3,580	3,755	38.1	8.4
Total	631	670	763	827	882	39.6	8.7

Sources: Labour Force Surveys, conducted in June each year.

HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF YOUNGER SINGAPOREANS

Educational Attainment	1974	1978	1984
Never attended school	3%	2%	<1%
No Qualifications	23%	20%	12%
Primary	17%	14%	14%
Secondary	38%	42%	48%
Post Secondary	13%	16%	18%
Tertiary	6%	6%	8%
Total	100%	100%	100%

National Archives of Singapore

Table 4B

CONSUMER ITEMS, 1980 - 1983

Item	1973	1978	1980	1982	1983	% Growth 1983/1978	Average Annual % Growth 1978-1983
<u>Per Thousand Population</u>							
Residential Telephone	43	122	159	185	196	60.7	9.9
Cars and Stationwagons	62	59	64	74	82	39.0	6.8
Motorcycles and Scooters	37	42	49	55	56	33.3	5.9
Television Sets	105	150	165	172	186	24.0	4.4
<u>Percent of Households</u>							
Air-conditioners	2.7	7.8	NA	NA	11.2	43.6	7.5
Refrigerators	47.3	87.6	NA	NA	96.1	9.7	1.9
Washing Machines	1.8	15.0	NA	NA	46.8	212.0	25.6
Video Cassette Recorders	NA	NA	NA	NA	27.7	NA	NA

Sources: Department of Statistics
 Telecommunication Authority of Singapore
 Registrar of Vehicles

Table 4C-1

SELECTED INDICATORS OF LIVING CONDITIONS

Items	Number per '000 Population						
	1970	1975	1978	1980	1981	1982	1983
<u>Televisions</u>							
Singapore	76	124	150	165	170	172	186
UK	294	321	331	331	411	NA	NA
USA	413	586	620	624	631	NA	NA
Japan	219	237	242	250	252	NA	NA
Hong Kong	112	190	217	220	225	NA	NA
<u>Private Cars</u>							
Singapore	69	63	58	63	66	73	81
UK	213	252	258	276	278	NA	NA
USA	435	494	524	534	537	538	NA
Japan	85	155	185	203	209	216	NA
Hong Kong	23	26	31	38	41	41	38
<u>Telephones</u>							
Singapore	78	141	229	291	317	345	369
UK	250	361	412	479	495	NA	NA
USA	582	686	755	790	789	NA	NA
Japan	147	272	NA	334	342	NA	NA
Hong Kong	116	190	235	254	268	282	292
<u>Radios /</u>							
Singapore	114	152	174	190	197	201	227
UK	626	698	906	947	963	NA	NA
USA	1,415	1,934	2,036	2,099	2,110	NA	NA
Japan	223	520	NA	678	688	NA	NA

Note : _/ Hong Kong data is not available.

Source : Various official publications.

Table 4C-2

SELECTED INDICATORS OF LIVING CONDITIONS

Items	Percentage of households with selected household durables _							
	1973	1975	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983
<u>Air Conditioners</u> /								
Singapore	2.7	NA	7.8	NA	NA	NA	NA	11.2
USA	NA	52.8	55.4	55.4	NA	NA	NA	NA
Japan	NA	17.2	NA	NA	39.2	41.2	42.2	NA
<u>Refrigerators</u>								
Singapore	47.3	NA	87.6	NA	NA	NA	NA	96.1
UK	NA	85.3	92.0	NA	95.1	96.9	97.5	NA
USA	NA	99.9	99.7	99.8	NA	NA	NA	NA
Japan	NA	96.7	NA	NA	99.1	99.2	99.5	NA
<u>Washing Machines</u>								
Singapore	1.8	NA	15.0	NA	NA	NA	NA	46.8
UK	NA	71.9	75.0	NA	78.7	80.7	81.1	NA
USA	NA	69.9	75.2	77.3	NA	NA	NA	NA
Japan	NA	97.6	NA	NA	98.8	99.2	99.3	NA
<u>Video Cassette Recorders</u> /								
Singapore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	27.7
Japan	NA	NA	NA	NA	2.4	5.1	7.5	NA

Note : _/ Data on percentage of households with selected household durables for Singapore were obtained from The Sample Household Expenditure Survey which is conducted every 5 years. Those for UK, USA and Japan were from various official publications.

_/ UK data is not available.

_/ UK and USA date are not available.

National Archives of Singapore

Table 5

RETURNING SINGAPORE RESIDENTS, 1981 - 1984

Year	Mode of Travel	Air & Sea		Air, Sea and Land	
		Number	% Growth	Number	% Growth
1981		511,786	15.0	2,404,071	14.8
1982		588,738	7.5	2,759,490	10.1
1983		632,748	6.2	3,039,504	1.9
1984 (projected)		672,000		3,097,000	
% Growth 1981 - 1984		-	31.3	-	28.8
Average Annual % Growth 1981 - 1984		-	9.5	-	8.8

Sources : Department of Statistics
Immigration Department