

SPEECH BY THE PRIME MINISTER, MR. LEE KUAN YEW,

IN PARLIAMENT ON 23 FEBRUARY, 1977

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it gives me great pleasure to welcome 11 new Members to this House. It has been my duty to have followed closely what they have said in the proceedings of the last few days. I may not always have been here physically but with the aid of modern electronics, I can assure Members that I do with considerable ease follow what takes place, not only when they speak but when they laugh; not very often; when they jeer; even less often; when they interject; rarely at all. It is a livelier session than it has been.

Perhaps I ought to begin by saying that they ought to take themselves seriously because we, on this side as Members of the Government, take them seriously. Upon us is the burden of finding a successor Government worthy of its responsibilities. It is not an easy job. First, let me explain the shock for new Members. They have been at the hustings. They made different kinds of speeches. They come here, they are bound by Standing Orders and rules of debate which we have inherited, copied, modified, and I believe modified insufficiently for our purposes; copied from the British; Westminster pattern; but modified inadequately. We have got to find our own style. We have got to

be bold enough to experiment. We do not say in approval “Hear Hear” because that is not what Singaporeans say. They are not supposed to clap in the British House of Commons. Maybe, the Australians; the New Zealanders; they do not clap. But I have been in the Lok Sabha which is the Lower House in India. At any one time there are 15 speakers on their feet, literally. The Speaker points to one person and he is the one that goes on the official record. But 14 others are going merrily on at the same time. In 1971, my colleague the Minister for Law, was with me in my journey to India when we met the retired Speaker who had become Governor of the State in which Jaipur is, Rajasthan. He was writing a book about his experiences, the humour and the humourous times he had. His successor was another Sikh, turbaned gentleman, more robust physically. (I do not know if he could have been as robust as the elderly gentleman he succeeded). I asked him in Delhi, December 1971, whether things were better then. He said: “Yes only 12 people speak at the same time”. Maybe the state of emergency in India has made it possible for the Lok Sabha to have one speaker at one time. We must have some order.

But let me explain the problems that we face by first reading an excerpt from a book written by a British left-wing Minister who started the free health service scheme in Britain, Aneurin Bevan. He is dead. I had the privilege of knowing him and he gave me this book. It was published in 1952, entitled: “In

Place of Fear.” On page 6, he described his experience and the dangers of a Britisher or Welshman in his case, going into Parliament.

“His (the MP’s) first impression is that he is in a church the stained glass windows, the rows of statues of great statesmen of the past, the echoing halls, the soft-footed attendants and the whispered conversation; contrast depressingly with the crowded meetings and the clang and clash of hot opinions he has just left behind in his election campaign. Here he is, a tribune of the people, coming to make his voice heard in the seats of power. Instead, it seems he is expected to worship; and the most conservative of all religions -- ancestor worship.

The first thing he should bear in mind is that these were not his ancestors (namely, the working class. He is talking now as a Welsh miner or a descendant of one). His forebears had no part in the past, the accumulated dust of which now muffles his own footfalls. His forefathers were tending sheep or ploughing the land, or serving the statesmen whose names he sees written on the walls around him, or whose portraits look down upon him in the long corridors. It is not the past of his people that extends in colourful pageantry before his eyes. They were shut out from all this; were forbidden to take part in the dramatic scenes depicted in

these frescoes. In him his people are there for the first time, and the history he will make will not merely be an episode in the story he is now reading; (that is him). It must be wholly different; as different as is the social status which he now brings with him”.

The epilogue I read at Fullerton Square when Mr. Roy Jenkins gave up his seat, left the British Parliament to become President of the EEC Commission, when he said that debates and parliamentary triumphs were meaningless, that changes in government do not bring about fundamental changes of economic and social policies that have set in; that a successor government inherits all the mistakes and all the policies of its predecessor and takes a long time to unwind itself; untangle itself, from what has been. But Aneurin Bevan writing this before 1952 was not to know the epilogue. He urges his young Labour MPs:

‘to preserve the keen edge of his critical judgment he will find that he must adopt an attitude of scepticism amounting almost to cynicism; for Parliamentary procedure neglects nothing which might soften the acerbities of class feelings. In one sense the House of Commons is the most unrepresentative of representative assemblies. It is an elaborate conspiracy to prevent the real clash of opinion which exists outside from

finding an appropriate echo within its walls. It is a social shock absorber placed between privilege and the pressure of popular discontent.

The new Member's first experience of this is when he learns that passionate feelings must never find expression in forthright speech. His first speech teaches him that. (That is your duty, Mr. Speaker). Having come straight from contact with his constituents, he is full of their grievances and his own resentment, and naturally, he does his best to shock his listeners into some realisation of it.

He delivers himself therefore with great force and, he hopes and fears, with considerable provocativeness. When his opponent arises to reply he expects to hear an equally strong and uncompromising answer.

His opponent does nothing of the sort. In strict conformity with

Parliamentary tradition, he congratulates the new Member upon a most successful maiden speech and expresses the urbane hope that the House

will have frequent opportunities of hearing him in the future. The

Members present endorse this quite insincere sentiment with murmurs of approval. With that, his opponent pays no more attention to him, but goes on to deliver the speech he had intended to make. After remaining in the seat a little longer, the new Member crawls out of the House with feelings

of deep relief at having got it over, mingled with a paralysing sense of frustration. The stone he thought he had thrown turned out to be a sponge.

I would not have bothered to describe this typical experience of working man speaking in the House of Commons for the first time were it not characteristic of the whole atmosphere. The classic Parliamentary style of speech is understatement, it is a style unsuited to the representative of working people because it slurs and mutes the deep antagonism which exist in Society.'

So we have not, fortunately, inherited the British Empire. We have inherited a very small fragment of it. We have not the deep class antagonism, but if we do not bring out these differences of opinion, and if we had not done so successfully since 1965 when the Barisan Sosialis MPs walked out of this

Chamber, I do not believe that in February, 1968, in September 1972, and again in December 1976, we could have been returned unanimously and completely.

So when in his youthful zest and enthusiasm, the Member for Kim Seng -- and that is also a convention which British newspapers have dropped because nobody knows who the Member of Kim Seng is -- they know Dr. Ong Leong Boon, they know him and they will get to know him better and better as the years go by.

This is a marathon, not a hundred yards spurt. With every passing speech, with

every passing act, the character, the style, the strength, the weaknesses are etched in the minds of the public. You can do a PR job, as has been written in American books after the making of presidents, where you have a vast electorate of 200 million people with over 120 million potential voters with the help of radio and TV, and you suddenly find with a whole host of ghost writers and advisers, that the man becomes scholarly, learned, solicitous in his speech. Catch him at a press conference and a question and answer session, where the ghosts cannot whisper to him, and the man is betrayed.

So, when Dr. Ong Leong Boon, the Member for Kim Seng, invited public debate and public discussion, forums on television, I say, “Choose your partners and pick your opponents”. And I think he even tried. Not very many, but he and a few others, have praised me in their speeches, praised Dr. Toh, never attacked Dr. Goh. The Chinese saying goes: ruan de ai ying de pa (软的欺硬的怕) -
- Bully the soft, keep clear of the tough. Because you can be hurt and he does not want to be hurt. But life consists of both the soft and the hard.

Many issues have been raised. It is the aftermath of an election campaign. I heard my own Minister of State yesterday. He was in good form. He had recovered. I was proud of him. It is the old Ya'acob, whose voice nearly fully restored despite nearly a fatal loss to the oratorical powers that we

have in this House. He may not impress the Gallery up there because the Malay-speaking audience is not there. But if you go down to Geylang Serai, you will need Haji Ya'acob because he has a style -- panache they call it.

What I wish to remind Members is this that we take them seriously, and over a period of time we begin to take some MPs more seriously than others, because they have done their homework. It is a question of getting to know them, familiarity over a long stretch of time. It has its advantages and its disadvantages. I take the Member for Katong seriously when he speaks. He had done his homework. He tries to present it logically, forcefully, humourously. I think Joe Conceicao has now gone through simulated fire. He has won an election. He was returned unopposed in 1968. They were so scared of him in 1972 that he was again returned unopposed. But this time they were foolhardy enough to take him on. I congratulate him.

National Archives of Singapore

And there are a few others like him. It would be invidious but I think I ought to mention Dr. Chiang Hai Ding, the Member for Ulu Pandan, and my own former Political Secretary, Dr. Augustine Tan. "Former" -- I think he knows the reason why, and I do. When he is in form, he is first class. Yes, he is. But I am a hard task-master. I want somebody to be in top form, in top gear all the time because nothing less will suffice. Because if I believe that the engine is working on all 8 cylinders, and when I press it, it is working on 3, I am in deep trouble.

The problem is really so simple, yet it has been solved only a few times in a few countries and only over certain periods of time -- a one-man one-vote to produce a group of men who can provide a continuity in good government, change of policies, flexibility, to reflect the changing moods of an electorate. In other words, you need a wide spread, a wide variety representing all types, reflective and representative of the population. And that is why we are here.

You may not speak the second language well but you understand what is being said. You know what your constituents want. You know what it is all about.

Therefore, I am a little disappointed to find people who have gone through this process questioning the wisdom of demanding minimum pass standards in the second language. This is Singapore. This is not representative. It is Mr. Sia, Member for Moulmein. The Member for Bedok wants a commission of inquiry into schools. And there are quite a few others.

May I explain briefly and simply for the new Members. Language, culture, and religion in a multi-racial, multi-lingual, multi-religious and multi-ethnic society, with one-man one-vote, can lead to great tragedy. As it has, in the case of India and Pakistan -- a division of the country. And again, between East and West Pakistan, both Muslim, but one Bengali-speaking and the other Urdu-speaking. In India itself, as it breaks up into various language provinces, or states. And in Canada, after nearly 200 years of British conquest of Quebec, the Quebecois are talking of separate independence.

Played one-man one-vote, it is very significant. Not one single Chinese educated Member of the House has questioned the wisdom of that move. It is the English educated and the Malay educated. I think it is a great tribute. I take it as a great tribute to my colleagues and myself. And this is not a joke. At every election, the same issue crops up -- the killing of Chinese language culture, civilisation. We have heard it before. Maybe Mr. Tan Soo Khoo, the Member for Alexandra, now 27, would not have known that there were riots: 30,000 to 50,000 Chinese middle school students camped in Chinese High School. The place was surrounded by riot police. Mr. Tan would have been four years old then. I think it is worth recounting that. Oompah! Merdeka! Oompah! Merdeka!, they chanted, and they formed a circle round the policemen and

danced round them. I was their legal adviser. I was legal adviser to the Singapore Chinese Middle School Students Union -- zhong xue lien (中学联). A boy got scalded with a cauldron of boiling hot water. They were afraid -- the comrades were afraid of what would happen if the parents discovered it because the parents would then descend on the campus and pull all their children home. The boy was in great pain. They were wanting me to find a way to smuggle a doctor in. But unlike Mr. G. Raman who very unwisely misconstrued the constitution of the University of Singapore Students' Union, I assumed that the Special Branch then under the control of the British, would have a very shrewd idea of what would transpire between the students and me. I gave them very correct advice. I said the right thing to do would be to ask the police for permission to bring the boy to hospital, failing which to ask for a doctor to go in, but not to smuggle one in. And the best thing to do was to do it quickly before the boy dies.

National Archives of Singapore

I believe that we are beginning to become one people, very slowly, very gradually. Let us not forget that those of us who read the Chinese papers -- (I do not know how many do with the English educated. But if I do not, then I am not fit to be here. I cannot be here) -- that till today the Chinese Chamber of Commerce votes along clan lines, weighted representation. The Hokkiens have the vote, and they count how many Hokkiens and say, "All right, you have that

representative on the committee". The Teochews, the Cantonese, the Hainanese, the Shanghainese and the Hakkas -- they are not one Chinese, they are different Chinese. And gradually the lingua franca, as we got the feedback from the army, was not Nanyang Putong Hua (南洋普通话) but xin jia po fu jien hua (新加坡福建话).

The education policy was a politically red hot potato. It was dynamite.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, before the brief adjournment, in case Members required some sustenance for what they fear may be coming, I was mentioning that the Ministry of Education was not the most popular of portfolios. And I would like to pay a tribute, if I may, to my former Cabinet colleague, the Member for Geylang West, Mr. Yong Nyuk Lin. He took on the job where angels fear to tread. He moved in. I often wondered whether he knew how many land mines there were.

National Archives of Singapore

A great deal of play has been made of the number of Ministers of Education in the last 17 years. I think, after a while, a debating point, if repeated and not rebutted becomes part of the accepted mythology. I think I must rebut it, break this debating point and consign it to the rubbish heap.

Mr. Yong held this office from June 1959 to October 1963, four years and four months. Then Mr. Ong Pang Boon took over because it was a political hot potato and I needed someone with a fair, but not a low, melting point. And Mr. Ong took it on from October 1963 till September 1970 -- seven years he was in charge. It was still a "hot potato". Then he, after seven years, got stale in education. I had Mr. Lim Kim San take over from September 1970 to September 1972, two years. Four years, seven years, two years. Then Dr. Lee Chiaw Meng took over from September 1972 till June 1975, nearly three years. So up till June 1975 there were only four Ministers of Education in 16 years. And not only that.

There was continuity in the Permanent Secretaries. From 1959 to 1963 there was a series of changes. Lee Siew Mong, Hoffman, Ambiavagar, S.C. Thong. Mr.

Yong Nyuk Lin went through four Permanent Secretaries. They probably found the going too tough. Then Kwan Sai Kheong, and William Cheng now in Labour. William Cheng was in the Special Branch before he moved in with Mr. Ong to Education in October 1963. They stayed on right up till 1972. No

change in nearly nine full years. No change in Permanent Secretary of the Ministry.

But let me remind Members of the changes that took place in 1959 the PAP came in -- multilingualism, four official languages. And for Mr. P. Govindaswamy we keep a translator, special for him, in Tamil. The Member for Anson is costing the House more than any other Member of this House. He can speak English. But he exercises his right to speak in Tamil and I respect the right, as we must. It is written in the Constitution, Malay is the national language and four official languages. We were going into Malaysia.

Let me remind Members, if I may, of the percentages of Primary 1 registration figures for the English, Chinese, Malay and Tamil streams. I will not give the total numbers. This will probably be published in tomorrow's papers.

For 1960, the figures were for all races, 51% in the English streams; 39% in the Chinese stream; 8% Malay stream; 0.23% Tamil stream. Then came merger and Malaysia. Remember 1963? Famous day that was. The Malay stream jumped up. It had been going down from 8.6% to 7.8%, it went up in 1962 8.41%, 1964 8.84%, 1965 in Malaysia, 8.94%. Then came separation and independence in 1966, the Malay stream registered a decline from 8.94% to 6.76% -- one-quarter immediately. The Chinese stream went down from 39% in

1960 to 29% in 1963. Then it went down to 27% in 1964. After Separation (1965), in 1966 it was 32% up 5%. But, in terms of Chinese alone, that would be a jump from 37.6% in 1964 to 44.9% in 1966. This is sufficient of the past -- 10 years, 11 really -- for me to talk about it without arousing passions outside.

Ever year, before registration of students, the Chinese press mounts a campaign and we let them. There are two ways of doing this, by edict or by voluntary choice. And had we done the stupid thing by edict and said: "You will learn two languages and you will learn English as one of the two". I think Singapore would have gone a different way. We would be speaking Chinese in this Chamber. And I think my Mandarin would be fairly fluent by now, instead of my Hokkien becoming more fluent than my Mandarin because I have to make speeches in Hokkien outside.

Let me read the figures from 1966 after independence to 1976 -- 10 years English -- from 60% of the students, it has gone up in this year's entrance in Primary 1 to 86%. From 60% to 86%, Chinese went down from a high of 33% in 1967, two years after separation, to 13.75% this year. Malay in 1966 was 6.76%, this year it is 0.19%, that is for the small islands -- Pulau Tekong, Pulau Ubin -- where they cannot get English schools. Tamil since 1975, I regret to

inform the Member for Anson, is 0.0%. But never fear, they are learning Tamil in the English schools.

I have a lot of time for the Member for Anson. Of course, we allow them to register in any school where there is a Tamil teacher. We cannot have Tamil teachers where there are no Tamil student, and we cannot have three Tamil students with one Tamil teacher. So we have got to group the Tamil students in the best schools for Tamil. I assure him that it is our intention that whoever becomes a Tamil orator in this House will always find a following outside.

So when they say “seven Ministers”, it is not true. What happened was, in June 1975, Dr. Lee Chiaw Meng having had three years moved over to Nanyang University, I asked Dr. Toh Chin Chye to take over. But I wanted Mr. Chai Chong Yii to run it under Dr. Toh’s supervision. Dr. Toh said, “Either I am in charge or I am not”. In which case, I said, “Right, I will be in charge”. So after 14 days, I took charge. On 16th June 1975, I had to make an announcement to say that I was in charge. Then I went into it. I had this advantage over all the other Ministers. I had the feedback from the army because I am on a special committee called Defco which monitors what is happening. I am also aware of what is happening in Labour for jobs. But never mind, just Defco alone was enough. We had national servicemen. We had instructors ready in English for

those who spoke English. Mandarin for those who spoke Chinese. Malay for those who spoke Malay, and Tamil for those who spoke Tamil. They failed in large numbers. We did not know why. I used to go round National Day dinners where national servicemen were invited. I spoke to them in Mandarin and in English -- blank. I spoke to them in Hokkien -- Ah ha, their faces lit up. Sometimes even in Hokkien they do not light up: yi si buay hiau kong a-m'ng wei (他是不懂讲厦门话) -- big trouble. So we grouped Hokkien platoons with Hokkien instructors, and immediately the marksmanship went up from 30% to 95% equal to all the others. So the instruction was wrong. Of course, automatic promotion was wrong. I do not know who made that point. I think it was the Member for Katong.

Congratulations. But remember that Mr. Yong Nyuk Lin was having the 4-2-3-3, remember the 3-3-4-2 issue -- three years junior middle, three years senior middle. He wanted to change it and make it equal to the English stream, four years secondary. "O" levels, two years post-secondary. "A" levels, Oompah! Merdeka! Oompah! Merdeka! Strikes -- ba ke (罢课) ba kao (罢考) which means boycott lessons, and boycott examinations. I think we have to publish all these with pictures complete. It should be compulsory reading for all new MPs. I think it should be compulsory reading for all University undergraduates and all teachers because suddenly even I had not realised that in

1954 the Member for Alexandra was four years old! But we could not change. Mr. Yong Nyuk Lin's problem was that we had promised a place in school for every child. So it was a logistic problem. We doubled the schools by a morning and afternoon session, doubled the intake, recruited teachers by the droves. Of course, the standard of English went down. We had lecturers in the Teachers' Training College who spoke English learnt in Madras. The students had difficulty in understanding what the teacher was saying. He could not speak Queen's English, but better some English than no English. Better "Yes, man" than "Buay hiau lah" (不懂啦). That is big trouble. We solved the logistic problem.

Then the political problem in 1963 which Mr. Ong Pang Boon, as Minister, took over. We had gone into Malaysia. Education was a separate State-autonomous subject, and we knew there were going to be problems. Just think what would have happened if we were still in Malaysia? I ask Members to sit back and contemplate. I would not go further. Many Members have been on parliamentary delegations. But how would the State-autonomous authority on Education have fitted in with the overall policy from the Federal capital? How about the employment problem with jobs in government, jobs in the private sector?

So I think this education policy was a resounding success in political terms. This move was long overdue but we were so preoccupied with the problems of survival. As Dr Goh told me happily once, I think it was not very long after independence when our battalion came back from Sabah and they have no camps to move into. Half the battalion were supposed to be our battalion. Dr. Goh said to me. “You know, you are like the British Prime Minister being protected by a regiment that is half Italian. And we do not know what will happen.” We survived that. But gently does it and firmly, I am proud to say we made it. We made it. We have got a Singapore Army which includes Singapore English-speaking, Chinese-speaking, Malay-speaking and a few Tamil-speaking. But they do not have to win votes, so they speak English in the SAF. They all can, as the Member for Anson can.

It was during this period that I went into it and decided no. I had the advantage of the feedback from both Labour and the army. I went into it and sat down for months and sent, with the Chairman of the Public Service Commission, a team of officers to implement a new policy made possible only because our family planning policy had worked.

If Members go back to the 1959 projections, we would be having 70,000 to 75,000 babies born a year today because the rate of increase was 4% per annum. Today it is just over 1%. Last year, the Dragon Year, it went up. I expect this year to show a commensurate decline to make up for last year's excess. I knew that it is not popular with seven Catholic MPs.

It is really remarkable, I only knew when Members took the oath. So I did not count. There are 15 out of 69 who were sworn in on the Bible. 15 out of 69 is 21.75% of the population of this House. I congratulate the Christians. The missionaries did a good job in producing leader men. But in total population the Christians are only about 9%, 21% in this House representing 9% outside. I think the next time we interview candidates we are going to have a closer look. Ah! but that is not the whole story. We have got seven Catholics, and they are all good Catholics. I know the Papal bull -- when I say "the Papal bull", I am not saying that in jest. I think that is the technical term, is it not?

Whatever it is, the Pope issues his interpretation, and the interpretation is that you can only do it by the rhythm method. Well, I wish all Catholics have a good sense of rhythm. Seven Catholics make up 10% of this House, more than 10%. 69 Members and seven are Catholics and they are less than 4% of the population. So the next time we have got to have another question "what

denomination?" before we find ourselves outvoted on a free vote on abortion and sterilisation.

But let me come back to the realities. There was no other way than bilingualism. By edict: one-man one-vote means the Chinese language. This is a Chinese-speaking Singapore with the Malays and the Indians.

I have a great admiration for the three new MPs -- the Member for Kallang (Mr. Dhanabalan), the Member for Kolam Ayer (Encik Sidek Saniff) and the Member for Kampong Kembangan (Encik Mansor Sukaimi). I have approved that they be given Mandarin teachers. But let me tell them what a French, but English-speaking brain surgeon in Canada has written. He wrote this because he was studying the problem of Canadians learning French at the same time as English; it is an article of only 12 pages, and I commend it to the Member for Katong. He is an avid reader and an educated man. My definition of an educated man is a man who never stops learning and wants to learn. I am not interested in whether a man has a Ph.D or not, or an M.A. for that matter, or a diploma. Mao never had one, neither had Khrushchev, nor Stalin. But this brain surgeon, Dr. Wilder, writing in a volume called "Brain", Volume 88 (1965) pages 787 to 798 (12 pages) Dr. Wilder Penfield, a Canadian neuro-surgeon discovered watching his children and doing experiments on other children that in

a right-handed child, the left temporal lobe of the brain cortex is often used to learn the mother tongue and the right temporal lobe the other languages.

Learning of languages by a child must be done before the age of 12 years when the cortex is still uncommitted to other matters.

Every diplomat who has his children educated in various parts of the world, will confirm this -- and I confirm it from my own experience -- that when you get a child to learn a language he picks it up naturally. A language is heard and spoken by a child from the mother, long before he learns to read and write. They are two different functions. You hear and you speak. At a later stage you see the symbol, you read it and you reproduce it, you write -- two separate functions. I learnt some Chinese as a child. But if you do not persist in the language, as diplomats will tell you about their children -- when they get posted out too early, the children lose it and lose it forever. But if the language is learnt till about the late teens, 18 or 16, it is there for life, for keeps. I learnt it the hard way.

The Minister for Culture has the rare and doubtful distinction of writing ghost-writing my first Chinese speech. I stood out at what is now the People's Theater. It was an open field -- qun zhong da hui (群众大会) 20,000 people turned up and I debated whether I should read it in Cantonese or in Mandarin.

Quite a problem. My opponent challenged me to a debate either in Mandarin, Hakka, Cantonese, Hokkien. Name it, he is ready. He is now a very successful textile merchant. You never really learn until you know that you have got to use it. From that day on, I have never ceased to learn. That is more than 20 years, And I had been learning before that. After that, I learnt with a passion, which could not have been there but for the traumatic experience -- 20,000 people to hear my kindergarten Mandarin. Quite a shock.

The difference between my children and me is that when I switch to Mandarin I am like an old valve radio -- you know, the old valve radio or TV? The difference between a transistor TV and a valve TV? An old valve TV, once you switch on, takes two to three minutes to warm up. Then you get the sound. Then you get into the mood. Then you switch on to a new circuit, from AC to DC from 220 volts to 110 volts. But with my children, you switch on, you just press the button it is on, instant. And if they stop at 12, it is compulsory. You cannot get into the secondary school unless you pass your second language. And if they stop and they do, they are bright, they score one's. The present system is simple: you get under 20 points for the five best subjects and you go to Junior College. Am I right?

But it does not include language. So what do they do? They score in mathematics, additional mathematics, physics, chemistry, one other. Does not need swotting. You know, they are bright lads. English, just a pass does not matter, 6, 7 or 8; Chinese fail. Well, all right, it does not matter, it is not included. We have given them three-year's notice. They are now in Sec. 2, now swot. And I bet you, in six years' time we will produce "A" level graduates who will go up to the simultaneous interpreters' room and outdo the simultaneous interpreters. Because I am quite sure. The simultaneous interpreters, after this long interval since our last meeting, they are like valve radios, whereas we are now going to produce students with 'transistors'. And they are bright, they will do it.

Let me explain how sharp they are. Maybe it is good, maybe it is not so good. But this is the younger generation Singaporean. The best scholarship you can get is the President's scholarship. If you are a President's scholar, you are really good. And you do not apply for it. After the examination results are known for the "A" levels, the P.S.C. invites the school principals to recommend those who they think should be considered. They are considered not only for their "A" level results, their "O" level results, their ECA and all the other activities, leadership qualities. No bonds, nothing. They do not have to take it. They still get a few hundred dollars a month a year. Then comes the SAF

scholars. MINDEF has spent billions of dollars in training and in hardware. And the people who have to run MINDEF and make the decisions were never trained as soldiers. I think the highest rank Dr. Goh reached was that of Lance Corporal? Private? A Private in the Singapore Volunteers. And the professional side, 1 and 2 SIR, they were recruited in 1955/56 and again in 1958/59 to be ceremonial guards for the Istana and to help the police when the crowds got out of control -- internal security exercise in other words, there was not the officer cadre that can run and spend the billions. And so men have had to be taken out, put through a crash course so that they know what is cost-effectiveness in terms of weapons, training manuals. So the SAF scholar is critical.

Every year there are some 15,000 to 20,000 men in the reserves and they are in the reserves right up to 40 years. So you start from 18 to 40, that is 22 years. Multiply that by a factor of 10,000 and not 15,000, you have 220,000 men. Multiply that by 20,000, you get 440,000. Who are they being led by?

They are bright men, you know. They are top executives. If they know that the general only barely got two "O" levels, I do not think it is good for morale. Our generals will be some of the most able and some of the most resolute of men with a very high melting point, not wax but titanium. It is in a crisis when the crunch comes, that you make decisions which can cost hundreds of thousands of lives because we are a very compact place.

But let me tell you how attractive it is. If you are a 2nd Lieutenant, you get paid as a 2nd Lieutenant. You can choose any University to go to and you are paid all expenses. Do you know what the students have done? They are brought back every summer vacation for training, but they say, "That is no good. We would like to go holidaying round the continent and see the world." So they choose to take a Colombo Plan Scholarship to Australia. They only do two months training, January and February, as a recruit and then in March they are off. When they come back as engineers they are graduates, and they get paid as graduate engineers. We have cut that off now. Not only that we made it that they go the following years, and not that they pass "A" level last year and they are going this February or March. They are going in 15 months' time. They will complete the officer cadet's course, then go and come back and serve.

Immediately they moved back and said: "Right we will take the SAF". They compete for the SAF scholarship. I have not the slightest doubt that if we carry this on to the next stage at the "A" levels -- that you will have for entrance to the university a good pass in the second language -- they will pass.

Let me tell you the reasons why. Now and for a very long time anybody who has any pretensions or any hope of becoming a leader has got to know a minimum of two languages. I had before me the circulation figures of the English

and Chinese newspapers. I can rattle it off from memory. I will produce the exact figures later. 160,000 for the Straits Times. Nanyang, Sin Chew, Sin Min and Min Pao, 280,000. Assuming that the English educated have less readers per copy -- I mean each copy is read by less people -- it means that if you want to be a Minister and you do not read the Chinese papers, you do not know what the ground is thinking and saying and you are in trouble. Let me say that one of the duties of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Foreign Affairs was -- not now, because I think the Minister (Mr. Rajaratnam) has now made other arrangements more systematically -- to read to the Minister all the politically sensitive items in the Chinese newspapers. So Mr. Rajaratnam was educated into the Chinese mind. Now, of course it has been institutionalised. So the Parliamentary Secretary had got to be found other duties.

But I have a further reason why it must be so. Let me tell the Member for Moulmein and I say, do not be afraid of the argument. I am glad that he raised it. Because he gives me the opportunity to expound this. A lot of thinking went into this. Way back in 1965 we found ourselves suddenly independent. If you lose that Chinese education and you go completely English-educated, you will lose that drive, that self-confidence. That is what is wrong. The danger is, if you are Chinese educated and only Chinese educated, you are monolingual, then your source of literature will be communist. That is big trouble. But if you are

bilingual, you have binocular vision, then you see the world in 3-D. And I will confirm that.

We went to China last year, May. Many members of the party spoke Chinese were Chinese. There was no problem of language. We understood what was being said and what was being written. There is a new diction. Completely different. Of course, the Member for Katong is right, no culture, no civilisation; stands still. Or it dies; or it is mummified. The difference between the Chinese in Peking or Canton and the Chinese in Singapore is so great as to make it a difference of kind. And when the Chinese in Singapore is trilingual and he knows of another different world, a vast world reaching out to Mars and beyond, he listens to all this exposition, understands it, but he says to himself, "Well, that is one way of doing it." But in Singapore we had better do it the simpler way. For us, the easier way is just plug it into the grid. We stand other risks, of course, because the grid is already there. You tap Western science, Western technology, trade with the West. But when they have a depression, recession and unemployment, we get the rigor. We cannot avoid that. Whether America is in recession or Europe has got five or six million unemployed, it makes not the slightest difference to China. Self-reliance.

Zi li geng sheng (自力更生) is that it? You see, you have got to use the phrase everyday to recall it. Therefore, a critical decision was made. And I say, decision is right and must be pursued vigorously -- that if we become a monolingual society, deculturised from our roots, we are in deep trouble.

I will explain to the Member for Moulmein why we are already in trouble in the old days, in the bad old days, we had very good workmanship. Whether as carpenters or as skilled technicians, they were the jobs done by the hard-working industrious, skilled Chinese-educated. They were the best fitters and technicians -- United Engineers, Keppel Shipyard. The Cantonese are the best. But now they have learned English. Like the Member for Ang Mo Kio, he is a Polytechnic graduate. Why should he be doing work which should be done by an English educated boy less competent than he is? So he is a land surveyor. He has gone on to management. Yes, and why not? He speaks English now also plus Chinese. But I think that if he did not start speaking Chinese, he would not have learnt his English. I know very few English educated who can speak Chinese as well as he can speak English. I know of some who have tried very hard. They have to. You take a Malay and an Indian and cut him off from the past -- what have you got to give him? If you take him to America and you say, "I am an American." I do not know how many saw this Alistair Cook series: "Are you a Communist? No, I have never been a member of the Communist

party. Everyday I swear that I will defend America, be loyal to America, I put my right hand on my heart." Well, that is a total complete different value system. Have we got a total complete value system to replace the Confucian system, to replace Malay culture and values and Islam? P. Govindaswamy with 3,000 years of his Tamil scripts, is he going to give that up? I say, "Very big trouble." But if P. Govindaswamy's son decides to emigrate to Canada, which he can as a doctor, well, that is different. Then you plug in into a whole North American civilisation.

We do not know what is going to happen. The end product has got to be partly the decisions we make, but also mainly what the interaction will be between English and a whole world of literature, science, technology, arts, culture, music, the mass media and the lot, and the basic values of your own self. It is critical. They took the African, put him in slave ships and brought him to America. After ten, God knows how many generations, this man wanted to know whence he came from. He wrote about Roots. Joe, have you read it?

You have. They have made a good TV series of it -- an American negro with considerable White parentage spent years to trace his ancestors back in Sierra Leone or some place nearby called Kinta or something, and wrote what he called faction, not fiction, but faction based on facts but in a fictional way,

because he cannot completely establish all that happened. Tremendous impact on both whites and blacks.

And, of course, all the professionals, English educated, want their children to be professionals. And they are very worried when their children cannot make it. Because they have to learn two languages. It is easier to make it if they have to learn one language. Then you score A's. You have to learn Chinese. It is such a difficult language. And the Chinese examiners are so strict, bred in the imperial examination classical system; that to score a 5 in Chinese is five times more difficult than to score a 5 in Malay. And, of course, all the bright young sparks decide after a while. "Really, my mind is not suited for Chinese. I want to learn Malay as a second language." Yes, it is much easier. You can read this. There is no problem at all. It is the same romanised script. And you know, after a while, it says for taxi, teksi (t-e-k-s-i). Well, that is all right. We will just learn that. Taxi in Chinese, what is it? de shi (德士) that is Singapore, you know, onomatopoeic transliteration. But that is not correct. There are no taxis in China. But I will put my bottom dollar on the fact that when China has taxis, it will not be called de shi (德士). The Japanese are prepared, because they have always borrowed. They have borrowed their language from China, they have borrowed their technology from the West -- to their great advantage. But a culture which goes back 4,000 years is too proud to borrow. So the Japanese

says for the atom bomb atomo bombo. But the Chinese translate it, give it their own name -- he zi wu qi (核子武器) yuan zi dan (原子弹) -- nuclear weapon, atomic bomb. You translate the meaning. You called an aeroplane, an aeroplane? No. Fei ji (飞机), flying machine.

It has its advantages. It has got its dangers. Because if the boy is monolingual, then the literature that he has will be more and more only from China. And whether you read the most innocent book on the beauty of Kwei Lin and its stalagmites and stalactites, in between you will get the "Thoughts". Yes, it is part of the new evolving value system. But it is a risk we must take. For another reason, that those who are at a disadvantage, who live in a completely dialect speaking village or home, who are not particularly fast in learning, when they go to school they are learning two foreign, or two new languages, neither of which is their mother tongue. Mandarin and English. When Mr. Jek Yuen Thong speaks Mandarin, I do not have to know that Mr. Jek is Cantonese. I can hear it in the Mandarin. So I can from Mr. Lai Tha Chai -- what they call qiang diao (腔调) accent. Yes, you never get rid of it. It is there for life, like the "Rr" in Tamil. I cannot say "Vanakkam".

Some people are endowed with these things. I can assure the Member for Anson I did try. Because for a few years we were in Malaysia, for two years,

when we did our psephological analysis. In case the press gets me wrong, it is psephology and not psychology. I have a dictionary here. It is the science of how people vote. Just in case they dispute my definition, I have brought the Shorter Oxford Dictionary and it is in the addenda. It is not in the body of the dictionary itself. It is a new science. Psephology -- the study of friends in voting or elections. From Greek psephos (pebble) because when the Greek voted he threw a pebble. And you know, when you want to win votes, the Queen's English is not going to help you.

I had a second shock in my life when in 1961 we had the Hong Lim by-election. Mr. Jek Yeun Thong was our candidate. We trampled Hong Lim for eight weeks and canvassed every house, every cubicle, every corner of every staircase where there was a human being -- six to eight times. And we had lost two Hokkien speakers - orators. One was Lim Chin Siong. He went with Barisan. And then we were fighting the man we built up as our Hokkien orators, Mr. Ong Eng Guan. Now a generation has grown up not knowing him. But he is very good. We taught him how to be an orator. I hear that we have got somebody amongst our 11 new Members who is prepared to teach how to speak Hokkien. Well, I look forward to seeing the panache and style.

Dale Carnegie? Let me tell you that I then learnt Hokkien because we decided if we build another Hokkien speaker and they do this to us, we are in big trouble. So I learnt Hokkien. And let me assure the three Members who are learning Mandarin: learn Mandarin because no soldier, no NSF will say, "No, I cannot speak Mandarin". You know, their name tags are in different colours so we know what language he speaks. Blue for English, pink for Mandarin, red for Hokkien. It is a lucky colour. We gave them red, they said, "No, no, I want pink, I am an educated Mandarin". So you have now to examine them because nobody will concede that he cannot speak Mandarin. And it is a good base from which to learn Hokkien, if need be, I will bear witness to that. Because you know the classical Hokkien is the southern variation as the Chinese went south and got mixed up with a lot of other people who were there and they got a lot of native Hokkien words not to be found in the Chinese character system. Many of them. My mind is cluttered up with them.

National Archives of Singapore

Fortunately, I also read in this article by the brain surgeon that the mind is not like a cupboard and therefore you fill up the space. The more the input and the earlier it is, the bigger the capacity, I thought to myself, what a great shame I did not know that. If I had listened to my grandmother and slotted all these languages, how much easier it would have been.

Let me now meet what I consider is the basic problem. I think Haji Ya'acob bin Mohamed posed that question yesterday. What are we? Is it growth, more growth, more materialism? Just what are we doing? What do we try to be? Does man live by bread alone? Well, we are trying to make a nation, a people -- tolerant, considerate, compassionate but rugged or we will not survive. Because it was never the intention of the British that Singapore should ever be independent. Let me assure all hon. Members that each time I swear the oath of allegiance to the Republic of Singapore, my mind goes back to the 9th of August, 1965. I did not want it. We had independence thrust upon us. And the expectation was that in two to three years we would be so down on our knees and crawling that we would have to go back on any terms. No autonomy in Education, Labour, and all the other subjects. Different terms. Maybe if they were kind, like Penang and Malacca. But we resolved to make this work. Never forget that it was the will, not just of a few men. That was necessary. But the will was in the people. Otherwise it would not have worked. They went through the biggest education Singapore ever got. It was from September 1963 to August 9, 1965. We learnt what life was about. It also caused two riots -- June 1964, late September 1964. During the second one I was away in Brussels as the guest speaker at the centenary of the Socialist International. Then they wanted me to explain how bad communism was -- the Communists were winning in Southeast Asia except Singapore. But alas, the world has changed. Now the Socialist

International has got new activities. They will not invite me to address them.

What is the point of addressing them anyway? They want to dress me down.

They have no use for us.

The Member for Kampong Chai Chee (Mr. Fong Sip Chee) raised a critical question. And I take him seriously. He says, "We cancel each other out."

No. He is wrong. There is big difference between culture and civilisation. First,

I quote from the Shorter Oxford Dictionary and then quote the Chinese for it. I

have got the Chinese definition. "Civilization" that is the broader term, the

modern term civilization -- civilised condition or state. And to "civilise" is to

bring out of a state of barbarism, to instruct in the arts of life, to enlighten and to

refine, to become civilised. Now "culture" -- "the training and refinement of

mind, tastes, and manners, the condition of being thus trained and refined, the

intellectual side of civilization". The intellectual side of civilization, not the

technological side, I now read from Webster's English Dictionary translated into

Chinese. First, the non-communist interpretation, then the communist

interpretation. Because I think Joe's point is a very important one -- that nothing

is static. We are not the same as we were 30, 40 years ago; nor any other

people. Civilization -- Kai hua hua kai hua zhi zhuang tai, wen ming (开化或

开化之状态; 文明). Culture -- xin zhi shang yu dao de shang you jiao yu

er zhi kai ming yu pin ge; de yu zhi yu shi jie guo (心智上与道德上由教

育而得之开明与品格; 德育智育之结果). Let me read from the New Chinese/English Dictionary, which the ISD has prescribed. But, of course, I have taken it out of the ISD library. The Chinese civilization is one of the oldest in the world. Then it says kai hua, jiao hua, wen ming shi jie (开化, 教化, 文明世界). Culture -- jiao yang, siu yang, de (zhi, ti) yu, zai pei, yang zhu, yang yu pei yang (教养, 修养, 德—智, 体—育, 栽培, 养殖, 养育, 培养). Of course, if we went just the old values, then we will be stuck with zi li gen sheng (自力更生). Then we start learning from the steam engine. If we start from Stephenson and the steam engine, by golly, it will take a long time.

The Japanese and the Manchu Chinese reactions to the impact of the West on their ancient civilisations were completely different. The Chinese Manchu dynasty made the Chinese civilisation pay a very heavy price. They thought they could shut off the West. But the Japanese said: "We'd better get these black ships and their cannons quickly." Learn. They found out. They gave their daughters in exchange for gunners on board ships that came, for a sample of the guns. They learned fast. You know the Boxer Rebellion. Why is it called the Boxer Rebellion? It is still practised today. The other day I was reading through the Vigilante Corps magazine. Some instructors say nei gong (内功), where you control your inside and your muscles are so stiff that a car can go over you. Yes,

a car with the weight spread. When they sacked the foreign embassies in Peking 1898, the European powers and the Japanese then sent in an expeditionary force and they thought nei gong (内功), bullet will not go through. But they died like flies. They were pulverised. They were made to pay indemnities. And they never rose until after the war. They went through a whole period of turmoil. All right, so they have with their millions of bare hands paid for the R and D (Research and Development) with the help, of course, of a few scientists and technologists who were trained, and helped in the atomic bomb and hydrogen bomb research in America, and they exploded the first bomb in 1964. Well, they have medium-range rockets, inter-continental missiles, now coming into use but with liquid fuel which is highly dangerous still. That is what the intelligence reports published in military magazines in NATO tell us.

It may be right, it may be wrong, I do not think we want to do that. We want to try, very simply, to allow each individual ethnic, cultural, linguistic, religious group to keep what it can of its past and to acquire what is necessary to make Singapore an industrialised society, or we will never get off the ground. If we go back to a farming community with the changkol or the spade, and to fishing, I do not think we can support a population of 30,000 on three meals a day. This is worth a research, Joe, suggest it to some of your wiseacres at the University. Say, do a model, simulate a computer model -- so much land input,

so much fertiliser, so many man-hours with changkol and women and children. How many tons of tapioca can it produce and vegetables and chicken and goats? You know what happened to the goats in the southern islands? Way back in 1959 we put goats in southern islands? Since it is barren, send goats. The theory was that the goats will roam around the islands, feed off all kinds of wild leaves, multiply and the islanders will have a better diet. We paid to learn the hard way. I think that was the first lesson in economics for me as well as for the member for Kampong Ubi. That is not the way to develop. Far better we have a petrol refinery than goats, hoping they will multiply. Because what happened was that man's hunger was greater than goats' ability to multiply.

I want to touch on a few other items before I complete my, I hope, induction into both mass politics and parliamentary politics for the new Members. The way we conduct ourselves in this Chamber and outside as MPs, as Parliamentary Secretaries, as Ministers, will decide whether in 1981, beginning middle, end, depending on when we think we will get the maximum votes, the elections are fought from now, not in 1981. We did not fight the elections in December, the 23rd. We fought it as from September 1972. We made sure that no MP, no Parliamentary Secretary, no Minister misbehaved or abused his power. Because if you do, it is a very tight and swift compact society, it spreads like wild fire. Dr. Ong, the member for Kim Seng, his generation does

not go to coffee-shops. But let me tell him that he would be surprised to know what is being discussed and debated with very great candour and vehemence and the very frank language with which it is discussed of the weaknesses and follies of MPs, Ministers and others. And when the CP mounts a smear campaign, I have seen sane rational men. Ministers suddenly turn pale because the Branch Secretary came and said: "By God, the whole kampong has switch allegiance. Rumour has it that you've got four wives". The Minister collects a whole bundle of pamphlets, brings his biography and personally distributes it to counter the smear. It took us the best part of 13 years from 1952, before we even founded the party, to 1965; to establish ourselves as people who can be trusted and relied upon regardless of smears. That is why we could allow a deliberate smear campaign of corruption during the campaign and took action only after. We ran the risk that if we took action during the campaign, they would say "Unfair". But after the campaign -- you utter all these falsehoods, knowing that there was no other way in which to shake the confidence the people have in the Government, than alleging corruption, well, matters have got to be resolved. We have to make changes in the election laws. Because if a man is bankrupt it is no use suing him. K.C. Lee, how much does he owe you?

\$36,000. The man returns two weeks before election. Everybody knew that election was coming. He returned one month before, dissolves his party,

joins the Workers' Party and starts off on a campaign. The story is not over yet. Wait for the next instalment. There is something quite interesting coming. Why did he do it? From now onwards, no bankrupt will be allowed to take part in an election campaign. We will change it because the chap says, "I am bankrupt, so what? You sue me." He owes K.C. \$36,000: I now sue him. He owes me \$136,000. How much more bankrupt can he be? These are elementary rules.

National Archives of Singapore

Now, let me just clear a few of the points which nobody else will be clearing because they overlap Ministries. Mr. Dhanabalan said "legislative overkill". That is a fair comment. What is the choice? Your choice is to educate them. Education begins in the home before the child even goes to school. You know what has happened to those who went to school and never learnt? "Yes, man, no man, Buay hiau (不 懂)". The Member now know what that means. So we start off in the schools, but meanwhile people are being killed on the roads. This is a choice we have to make. Wait until we have an educated courteous, considerate generation or start now and say "stop the killing". Maybe it is wrong. But let us see whether it will work.

People have talked about fringe car parks for years. It is not an innovation by Singapore. But nobody had the restlessness, audacity or courage, depending on whether you like us or you do not like us. We said that we cannot allow this as the place will jam up. With every high-rise, just think of the number of floors -- and each floor of a high rise building, you multiply that by 10 cars. My God, what will happen? So we had to do it. We did the fringe car parks. The Singaporean then did his calculation. He is a very sharp character. He said, "No. My car in the sun for the whole day paying, paint rotting? I'll take the bus ride from my house." So the fringe car parks were not used. All right. We had asked. I had asked because the Cabinet committee sat down with the experts.

"What happens if the fringe car parks are not used when we have gone to all this trouble?" They said: "Sir, in that case, we have got \$7 million worth of tarmac." So we have \$7 million worth of tarmac which we will put to other uses. But if we had not done that, and people wanted to commute, we would have been in bigger trouble. But it worked, with adjustments, with modifications. So it is easy to say "legislative overkill". But I ask the Member: is he prepared to wait until we can get the children to be literate first and then to bring home the message to their parents. Because without language you cannot learn anything. If you are deaf and dumb, then you start making signals to each other, there are very few things you can communicate by signals of hand.

Language is the tool to all human thought, human knowledge. And it is because we made the mistake of allowing them to be promoted -- because their mathematics was good so they had the intelligence that they ignored language -- that I now see it in letters that I receive, in Cabinet papers from first-class Administrative Officers. And automatically my ball-point comes up and I correct, and I say to the Cabinet Secretary, "Please show officer who drafted this." I become the school master. It is sad, but it is true. If you say, "Look you will not get into junior college without distinction in your first and second languages." I tell you they will get distinctions in their first and second languages. But if you say best of five subjects, they will say, "All right. Which

are the ones that I can score?" Mathematics, additional mathematics, physics, chemistry and ECA", depending on whether you are the vigorous type like the "rat-catcher". But I think it is a fair point made by Mr. Fong Sip Chee, Mr. Ivan Baptist and Encik Sidek Saniff.

Big Sweep and Toto, it is a problem we face. They face it in Moscow. They have got the sweepstake. If you do not run the Big Sweep and Toto, the chap-ji-kee man who has always swindled the people of their money is still there. It is the history of Singapore. The Chinese who travelled overseas are the biggest gamblers you can find in the world. Because to leave China was to gamble. In Manchu China if you returned you were beheaded. Because you were bringing in dangerous foreign ideas. So to leave China for Nanyang was a gamble.

I discovered once doing a case that the Chinese gambled in New Zealand.

There was a New Zealand case, whether that came under the New Zealand gaming laws. Very interesting. Everywhere they went they gambled. Which would you have? An honest Government: Toto or a dishonest chap-ji-kee? I spent years getting chap-ji-kee operators off. Ten years, and they paid me handsomely. And I decided it was wrong. That is why we are changing the laws of evidence and the laws of procedure. Because I knew it was absolutely

nonsensical. Transferring British ideas of evidence, justice -- a man goes to court and swears. "Yes, I did see him stab the other man." 'Mm si gua ay tai chi, mai ch'ap (不是我的事情, 不管) (In Hokkien: not my business. Don't bother). You have had it. Even in Mandarin, back in ancient China. So we have to make these modifications. I say, yes, there is a contradiction. And I say, if you stop it they will go and sell you the Malaysian sweepstakes. We have got Channel 5 and 8. You stop the advertisement of cigarette lighters, there are Channels 3 and 10. The reception may not be so good. You block a film in Singapore, you have a thriving film industry in Johore. So what is the answer? The answer really is to implant in the child very early, values which will last a lifetime. You are not going to sell me cigarette smoking, however hard you try. I hope I have succeeded in implanting it in three persons I was responsible for bringing out into this world. Touch wood, none of them smoke. Because they saw their father smoke, making campaign speeches, trying to keep himself with a packet of 10 in his pocket. In 1957 we fought the City Council general elections. At the end of it, at the VMH, I could not tell the crowd kam sia kok wei (感谢各位). I lost my voice. That December I said, "No. That is off."

There is no other way. We are an open, exposed society. You want to stop the tourists? It is 1.5 million. You want your hotels empty? You want your shops to look you up? There will be more tourists coming to Singapore than

there are Singaporeans in another 10 years or less than 10 years. There is no other way than to implant the values in. Let us not kid ourselves. No society is static, it either adjusts, adapts, learns how to protect itself or it is debased corrupted and brought down. You can have no society -- mummified unless it is isolated like the Red Indians were, like the Polynesians were. And then the white men came and brought measles, chicken pox, VD, flu and they die like flies. And that is the way they got rid of a lot of them. They gave them chicken pox, and the Red Indians died and there are less Red Indians in the world. There are very few aborigines left in Australia. Or you face up to it. And you face up to it by implanting basic values. That is why however different the various religions, this Government is in favour of a man believing in something than believing in nothing. I would rather have a Muslim, a devout Hindu, than a permissive atheist. And it is because of the problem of atheism in the West that they are in trouble.

National Archives of Singapore

Fortunately the Chinese never believed in heaven and hell for rational behaviour. It is dao te dao yi (道德道义) that to be a civilised society, as I have read just now, "Man must behave" says Confucius, long before Mao, "in a certain way in order that orderly civilised living is possible." Not that you will go to hell if you do bad, or you will go to heaven if you do good. But if you do not do that, civilised living is not possible for anybody. In the West they say "God

will punish you. Thou shall not --" The Bible says so. So when they got to the moon, they said: "Well, this is all not true. It cannot be true. In fact, there is only one life. And if you miss the enjoyment now, you get old, never enjoyed, you have missed it. So let's enjoy now." As the British Prime Minister said, the most hateful slogan he has ever heard was: "What do we want?" And the crowd chants, Everything". Just like so-and-so says "amen." "What do we want? Everything! When do we want it? Now!" Why? Because otherwise you may be dead tomorrow, you would have missed the chance. So let us have a go quickly before we get old and we cannot enjoy ourselves. Very sad.

There are certain values which have preserved us. This is much the oldest civilisation in the world, a bit of what you call chui niu, bu da hao (吹牛, 不大好). It is one of the great civilisation, an old civilisation. Civilisation existed in the Mesopotamian valley, In Mohenjo Daro, and lots of other places. But it is the only one which had a continuous history and survived, more or less with definite links to the past. It is different from what you see of Greece and the people now in Greece. The first principle of any civilisation is orderly living and the rearing of the young. Maternity is a matter of fact, provable fact. Paternity is a matter of opinion. You can have blood tests and so on. Maybe they can find a test to establish it. Yes, it is yours. Nobody else's. How do you know it is not my brother's? And so the Jews accept this fact. And the Jews say, "Never mind

what the father was. But is the mother a Jewess? If she is a Jewess, then the child is a Jew." So Sammy Davies is a Jew. That is where he has got his talent from. First, you see his nose. Then you hear his voice. He got it from his African line, a tremendous big voice. He had the best of both worlds. I think that is critical. I am not saying, "No, let us be celibate." I am not even asking let us all be faithful to our wives, let us have no divorces. I do not ask that. All I ask is, please do not misbehave yourself. Anybody who has a paternity suit against him is out and there will be a by-election. That is all I say. Let us have none of this.

The mass media of the West believes that we ought to be like them. Why? Because we are human beings and they are civilised. They are advanced and, therefore, we must be like them. We are not like them. We are not civilised. But you see, here is my authority. It is the oldest civilisation in the world. It goes back 5,000 years. But actually they go back provable 4,000 years. The 5th thousand is mythology. Whatever it is, that is because you say, "Look, you touch my wife, I kill you." Then there is a pool in which everybody can forage. It may be hypocritical. Maybe it is bad. But it preserved the civilisation for 5,000 years and it had nothing to do with God, heaven and hell. And I say, you lose that, we lose all. You tell me what we have got, she mo lui gen ma? Fei lui fei ma (什
么 驴 跟 马? 非 驴 非 马). Neither donkey nor horse. You do not know who

is the father. That is a very unhappy state of affairs. I am glad P.

Govindaswamy shakes his head. Make sure that your son is as devout as you are, I beg your pardon, I think, Mr. Speaker, we must change our style because I read from Aneurin Bevan it does not become us -- we do not speak that way. We do not think that way. I use the language, but the inside, my value system is different. I understand the Englishman. He knows deep in his heart that he is superior to the Welshman and the Scotsman. That is why the Welshman and the Scotsman now, particularly the Scotsman with the North Sea oil, says, "O.K., I want to be independent on my own." Deep here, I am a Chinaman. Yes, an uprooted Chinaman, transformed into a Singaporean. Because when I went to China, I discovered that I was not a Chinaman. Yes, Mr. Lee Khoon Choy will be my witness. I brought my young daughter with me for political reasons.

Mr. J. B. Jeyaretnam, one of the so-called opposition leaders, questioned.

"Who paid for her fare?" during the elections. I did. She did not travel at

Singapore Government expense.

It was for definite specific political reasons, one of them being to test how a Chinese educated girl, but bilingual, would react to this situation. Completely Chinese educated, from three years kindergarten, Nanyang Nu Zhong you zhi yuan (南洋女中幼稚园). I am glad to say that we will relax our regulations

about young people visiting China. I think we were wrong. Of course, if we let them all go, it grows and grows, all the chaps who join the Equatorial Society, the Chinese Musical Association, Kang Le or whatever it is, and that is a different story. But in small groups, there is no better education for a proper appreciation of Singapore. You come back and kiss the soil.

I think I have the rare distinction. You know, I often meet great statesmen, my privilege, who told me wondrous tales before I went to China. Of course, a lot of it was true. It is a marvellous society compared to what it was. But when we were little boys we used to do that sort of thing (indicating) "Ai cho peng you ma?" (要做朋友吗?) -- "Want to be friends?" Choose which one? "Ch'ia seh sin chia poh." (这是新加坡) -- "This is Singapore." Any time, every time, you can damn the Prime Minister and so long as it is not a lie and a criminal lie, nothing happens to you. You can say a lot of things. You can write books about him, damning him. So long as it is not a libel, go ahead.

I tell you, I have the rare distinction of having two Ministerial colleagues who have brothers in China. I have a perception and I think they have a perception (they have been there) of China and the great sacrifices they are making to turn China into a modern industrial state by the end of this century. To anybody who wants to go, I say I will give him a first class trip by SIA with all

the best of in-flight service. Entry point Hong Kong, if you like, take the train: or Tokyo, and take another aircraft. SIA does not yet go to Peking, but one day, we will when we establish relations. And I am absolutely certain that this can be done, given appreciation that we share a common destiny. Without that appreciation, of course, we are in trouble.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Sir, may I pose the real basic problem facing Singapore, and indeed, the world -- the answer to communism and its spread. Here in Southeast Asia, it is by insurgency, subversion, input of ideology, infusion of weapons and insurgency. If we just take Singapore alone, we would have solved the problem. But we know that it has not been solved, because it is not just Singapore. They say "Malaya" -- Malayan Communist Party -- including Singapore. Bao kuo xinjiapo zai nei (包括新加坡在内).

So what is the answer? The answer of the West -- this was the answer of Europe and America of the Dulles era -- was that if you are not anti-communist, it is immoral. And Dulles said the Indians were non-aligned and so they were immoral. How do they prevent their people from going communist? Their counter ideology was then anti-communism. And in America a witch-hunt, the McCarthy era, if you are a communist, you are out. So if you want to be a naturalised American, you swear that you have never been a member of the

communist party at all, over in your life. But in Britain -- and they used to tell me with great pride and I listened to them and I almost believed them -- they said, "All you have got to do really is to develop. Then you would be like us, where we can have communists running around and they cannot cause any trouble. You see, they have got no followers because we give the good life to the people. So they are treated as cranks, idiots, half-wits."

Those were the 1940s when I was a student. Then came the 1950s when I was a politician and a member of the Singapore Government All-Party Delegation. The government then was a very weak one, not independent, and used to go to London every year to negotiate a new constitution. And I met my old friends. They said, "Yes, that is the way." Morgan Philips, now dead, general secretary of the British Labour Party, said: "Don't worry at all. The Communists are cranks. Look at them, at every election they lose." The TUC said: "Ah, no problem at all. Just a few cranks." Their counter was materialism. "I give you the good life" which means: "With one-man one-vote I seduce you away from the ideology by the good soft life." Did it work? I do not think it has worked.

The Communists have now got into powerful positions in the unions because they work harder. To be a communist, you must have very active glands. If you want a good life, you go into the city and make money like Slater Walker. Or you do it the honest hard way -- be a doctor on National Health or a dentist on National Health. This is also a good way. Or if you have really got active

glands, you think the society is wrong, you are deprived, you never went through a good school that taught you to speak English like an English gentleman, but you spoke English like a working class person whose home was poor, then with active glands you work like a beaver, because your glands are pouring out adrenalin. So now they are in charge of very powerful critical unions and they are setting the pace. They are calling the shots.

What happened here in the 40s, 50s and 60s? I think we have very happy memories of the Middle Road unions -- ge ye? eh? fan xing? ge ye, hen huo puo de (各业? 哦? 泛星? 各业, 很活泼的). Every day they ate there and they slept there. They showed the workers how hard working they were. They denigrated me. They said I had an air-conditioned office and I slept in an air-conditioned room. I was a bourgeois. So were all my friends bourgeois men. They thought we were chicken.

National Archives of Singapore

We learnt how they operated. It is the same modus operandi. They are active. They are working with social democrats or democratic socialists. The social democrat likes his glass of beer, likes to have fun, so he leaves the meeting early. When all the chaps have left, they take the vote at 2 o'clock in the morning and carry the union.

So, in the PAP, we used to squat till 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning, and in this Parliament. For those who were then not here, we used to have marathon sessions that began at 2 o'clock in the afternoon and ended up the next morning at 7 o'clock. On one memorable occasion, the failed candidate for Rochore made a 7½ hour speech. Marvellous. He had ghost writers there, scribbling away. As he finished a whole sheaf, more sheaves came in 7½ hours -- to intimidate us. They made a very grave error of judgement. He gambled, and he is a great gambler, and he lost. We learnt how they operated. We knew how the magician worked. We were not in the audience. We were actually at the back stage, watching the magician and, in fact, helping him from time to time. He said, "You hold this hat for me." So we held the hat and looked inside and saw a hole, it had a false bottom from where he pulled the rabbit. So we said: "Ah, so that's it. Very clever." Hen cong ming. Ji gao xiang dang li hai (很聪明, 技巧相当利害) -- very clever. The tricks are quite skilful. So when it came to our turn and they wanted to operate on us, we said, "Ah, yes." We were not there when they pulled the trigger. We were somewhere else. And what was more important, we never gave hostages to fortune. Keep your hands clean, Gentlemen. If we allow you to put your hand in anybody's till, then we are all dead, politically. That is the first lesson.

That is why it was with great sorrow that we had to prosecute Mr. Wee Toon Boon. I had no choice. He was my friend. He was my comrade, going back to 1957 in the City Council elections. He fought the communists with us. But as Singapore developed and with rapid development, people got rich quickly. His CCC member was a contractor, building the people all sorts of buildings. He lent him Mercedes cars. You start off, first, by lending the man. "Any time you like to use my car, it is there. Why sit in a Ford? You are a Minister." But Ministers used cars only on official functions from the pool. He said, "Use my Mercedes." It started off that way. Then your appetite is whetted. Then step by step you are seduced until finally, why not.? Once you have given a hostage to fortune, it is finished. So, please, Gentlemen, learn this. There are many more lessons which, I hope, I will have the pleasure of imparting in time by which I mean, in time before you are put to the test. That is really the crunch.

National Archives of Singapore

There are some other debating points. The Member for Nee Soon said, we rush through Bills in the House and so on. We have had an impeccable record. In the Third Parliament from 12.10.72 to 24.11.76, there were only five Certificates of Urgency. It is a good debating point that we rushed through the House, all three Readings, without adequate time for study and debate. A

common occurrence? Five times in 4½ years, and every one of them was very urgent, technical ones. Do better next time.

Somebody else wanted the Parliamentary Pensions Act to be amended because, quite rightly, we all feel very sad. I think the Member for Nee Soon also said: "... the Parliamentary Pensions Act (should be amended to see whether our late MP is due for any entitlement under this Act." We all feel and, I feel, I have lost a good friend. But we cannot. We can pass it, but it would be wrong. Because the next step is that the civil servant will say, "Me too." What is your answer? What is our answer? Yes, for me, 69 heroes of Singapore defenders of freedom, but not for you, the 60,000 civil servants plus the statutory boards. 100,000-plus people? We have to pay all the widows? The law says and we follow the law, that if a man dies before he has retired, although he has qualified for a pension, his dependants get one full year's pay without paying estate duty or income tax. That we shall do. And the rest is up to you and me. And I am glad to say that quite a few have written to give more than I have suggested. I am quite prepared for some shocks. Some may write in and say, "Please can I, in view of the harsh circumstances I am in, give less than what you have suggested?" Well, that is our responsibility. We discharge it. And in 1980/81 we can face the people.

Two other matters - PUB bills, PUB tax surcharge. The Minister for National Development and Communications is Chairman of the PUB and quite rightly passes the buck to the Minister for Finance. He is right. (Interruption). Yes, all right. That is fair. Mr. Lim Kim San, his shoulders are broad enough. He will take anything. He does not run from a scrap. I say yes, an adjustment will have to be made. We all know that this was a campaign issue, and probably cost us some votes. All right, the price of oil is going up and adjustments have to be made. Electricity bills will have go up because the cost of oil has gone up. We will adjust it so that all those who live right up to the point-block flats will be out of the tax range. We are working it out. That is for electricity.

But for water, it is a different problem. In the case of water, it is not money that we want. We want to inculcate thrift in the use of water. It becomes a habit. We get a drought that lasts like the one in 1963 when we went to elections -- it lasted six to seven months -- and we were in deep trouble. Then 80% of Singapore were living in houses without the water-closet. And we were having to switch off the water mains without causing trouble. But now if you switch off the water mains, and we are all on the water-closet-system, I ask you, "What will you do?" We tried industrial water. When Mr. Ngeow Pack Hua, the Member for Boon Lay went canvassing, there were complaints. Why? Metal

parts rust and corrode because industrial water has a high content of salt: dui bu dui (对 不 对). Is it not right?

You know the Singaporean. He is a hard-working, industrious, rugged individual. Or we would not have made the grade. But let us also recognise that he is champion grumbler. That is why you see all the University sociologists go round the Housing Board flats asking, "Do you like the government? Do you like to live here?" Of course, they pour out all their woes and all their grouses. Sure win for the opposition. Well, the Barisan Sosialis contested in five constituencies. They had all their candidates in five constituencies like Toa Payoh to test because they know that is the new Singapore. The attap kampong will be over. No place to hide guns, grenades. And every block will have national servicemen, police, army, vigilante corps and Block committees, loyal to the people of Singapore. Never mind whether they vote opposition or vote PAP.

National Archives of Singapore

But once the price of water is not graded in blocks, and people start using water lavishly then when there is a drought, Gentlemen, you tell me how do you go and get a bucket of water -- Affluent water (not "effluent" spelt with an 'e' but "affluent" with an 'a') -- there is a ban. We speak Singapore English. When we water our gardens, we do not use effluent water but affluent water. When I read this, I say, "God bless my soul". Only in Singapore, see! If I were a newspaper

man, I could write quite an article about Singapore, what an affluent society, even their water, in times of drought! The flowers and shrubs are kept alive with affluent water! This and many other things.

You want the income tax reliefs to be increased. Why not? But let me tell you the impact. The argument is sound, yes, it was fixed 30 years ago. Yes, I think the Member for Thomson made the point. shi bu shi (是不是). Isn't it?

National Archives of Singapore

Quite right. The cost of living 30 years ago, er shi san shi nien gien (二十, 三十年前 -- twenty, thirty years ago). I have got the figures which show how much the base will shrink by. You have got to cut for everybody. so the chap at the top immediately gets the benefit, and all the way down. And I think the broader the base the more people pay income tax, the less they are in favour of things for free. I am anticipating Minister for Finance's speech on the 4th of March. I have just had to read it. 41% of revenue is going to come from income tax. You want to cut it down to 35%? Fine. Where do we find the 6%? Any suggestions? And you know that is the most unfair tax. Why do they look for MPs, those people wanting hawker licences? Because you can make \$3,000 a month if you are a good kuay teow man and no income tax. Is it not? Car parks, nobody pays income tax. So we have got to look around and see, "Ah, he has got a Mercedes Benz and a house." Then we catch him. But he is clever. He puts it in his cousin's name, and so on, so that we do not get him. You want to impose an unfair tax on the wage earner who cannot dodge the tax? But the Singaporean is a champion tax dodger. He is a champion grumbler. He is a champion tax dodger. Hawking is one. There are many others. I hate to say this, but I think the medical profession is a very lucrative one, present Members excepting Mr. Speaker, Sir, everybody knows that when you go and see a private doctor, he will give you a jab for anything between \$5 and \$10, depending on whether he adds vitamins or no vitamins, and you do not get a receipt for it. Boh

su yiau, lah (不需要啦 -- no need, la). So you are taxing the honest and making the dishonest wealthier.

The real tax policy for us as a developing country is a tax on expenditure. Yes, value added, which is the way the European Community does it. Their biggest tax comes from value added tax. The more you spend the more money you have, the better the life you lead, the more you can afford to pay for other people's children's education, good health. But here, the higher the income tax, by cutting the base you put the burden on a small group, the more unjust it becomes.

The Member for Thomson is a wage earner. I sympathise with him. So am I. I cannot dodge it. He cannot. But if I am a contractor I can build your house. We are friends, so I will build your house. I will charge you one-tenth the price, or maybe free. You sell me the fridge cheap, and maybe furnish my house for me, since you make furniture. So Income Tax has a transaction in which no money was passed. We know that I practised the law for 10 years and my job -- I am sorry to say -- involved getting dishonest people to avoid paying their taxes. And often (I say this without wanting to be immodest) successfully because the Government lawyer, on a fixed salary, is not as good as the private lawyer with a very high incentive. If a man has got a pay half a million dollars in

tax, he is prepared to give me at least 10% if I get him off. If I take less than 10%, I am a fool, am I not? Can the Government also pay its lawyers 10% on the ½ million dollars? So the Government is always landed with the less sharp legal mind.

The problem is not that we pass too many Bills. It is that there are no good draftsmen and it worries me because laws have to be passed. I do not want to be my own lawyer, but when I flip through it, I know that certain basic draftsmanship laws are being breached. But who is to do it? Nobody who has four As in the HSC takes law. There is engineering, medicine, you name it. But law, what for? You are playing with words. So we know from the point of entry, the University entrance, just what the level of ability is. And at 18-plus, if that is your level, you might work hard and improve. But it is very unlikely that you will have that sharp razor edge. So that is a big problem.

National Archives of Singapore

We will sort out all the other problems. But one major and decisive problem is how do we produce, before the crunch comes, a group of men who will survive the crunch. The last time, in 1959, very fortunately, if my memory is right, we won 43 out of 51 seats. In 1961 when the crunch came and they thought the other side was winning, it became 26-25.

It was quite an experience, and of course, the British were quite

worried too. So they said: “look, keep the communists out at all costs. Have an alliance with -- never mind, whether they are corrupt or not -- the Labour Front, Socialists, whatever it was. Have an alliance with them.” If we had, we would have died. Finally, one dead -- Ahmad Ibrahim. Another good man. He died in 1962. It became 25-25. If Singapore wants excitement, that is real excitement. That is real drama and a real test of nerves. And we had to bring in a sick Member here to vote at all odd hours of the day and night. From mid-1962, when Ahmad Ibrahim died, till September 1963, over one year, it was a test of nerves. So we knew what the melting point was, at what degree of temperature. It was a process of elimination.

Among the Gentlemen of that generation, there are only ten left in this House. Of the 1955 generation, when I was sitting in the Opposition debating with first, Mr. David Marshall, and then Mr. Lim Yew Hock, there were four of us -- three PAP and one Independent. Ahmad Ibrahim is dead. Goh Chew Chua is dead. Lim Chin Siong is in Britain, I hope living comfortably and happily. He also made the wrong choice, but at least he was courageous enough to say, “Well, I call it quits.” And I respect him. I am the sole survivor of the 1955 generation.

There are nine others from 1959. Harrowing days they were! Let me read their names. I go back to 1955. Mr. Chan Chee Seng (Jalan Besar) 1959; Mr. Chor Yeok Eng (Bukit Timah) 1959. He will bear witness that Barisan went to look for him in the middle of the night. He lived in Bukit Timah in a lonely place, and they were going to fix him. If he crossed over, then it would become 25-26. If I had to go to battle and I had to choose one other, I will pick him.

(Applause). Goh Keng Swee, Lee Khoon Choy, Ong Pang Boon, S. Rajaratnam, Toh Chin Chye, Haji Ya'acob and Yong Nyuk Lin. I am not a Muslim. I do not know where Haji Ya'acob got his strength from, maybe from Islam. But if I am in a tight corner, I think I would like to have Haji Ya'acob around because together we had gone through some very tough times. (Applause). The real test was when there were race clashes and the police were not in our hands from 1963 to 1965. It was so easy for the Malays just to flip over and fix Ya'acob. He was offered a vast sum of money. Berapa banyak?

National Archives of Singapore

Ten years' salary and allowances just to switch over. You can buy, you can fix, you can threaten, you can do all kinds of things. We have gone through all that.

Now, I give you the 1963 generation that went to the elections with us, not knowing whether we were going to get hammered or not. The communists were running around. Rahim Ishak, E.W. Barker, Fong Sip Chee, P. Govindaswamy -- may I pause here? Congratulations! He made Mr. David Marshall lose his deposit in Anson (Applause). When the communists backed Mr. David Marshall in the by-election in 1962, Mr. Marshall won. When the communists fielded their own candidate, Mr. Marshall lost his deposit. You beat Barisan. We want to make sure that we have got men like him. Ho Cheng Choon, Ho See Beng, Jek Yeun Theng, who was my Political Secretary in 1959. I am glad that I lost only my Parliamentary Secretary and not my Political Secretary. My Parliamentary Secretary, when Mr. Jek had guaranteed had given up communism, suddenly walked over to the other side. I woke up one morning to find he was anti-Malaysia, anti-merger. You know this was a very deep conspiracy. Jek (I give no secrets away) was the leader of the cell under which Chan Sun Wing, my former Parliamentary Secretary was. But Jek did not know that his former superior turned up and told Chan Sun Wing to switch. So Jek's order was countermanded. Chan Sun Wing thought that the other side was going to win, so better take the other side's orders. God bless Chan Sun Wing. I hope, if he is alive somewhere in the Rhio Islands or in Indonesia or some place, that he is living peacefully and happily because if he comes back the police would like to ask him a few questions.

1963 -- Lim Kim San, Ng Kah Ting (Punggol), my congratulations. We did not expect to win. The Member was then 23, a very young man. He probably also did not expect to win, but fought and won. Ng Yeow Chong -- I am sorry to say, Mr. Speaker, Sir, he has not been able yet to attend our Sittings because he is receiving treatment in hospital for his eye. Othman Wok and Rahmat Kenap, I pause there and say -- Ta' nampak songkok awak. It is hidden by the microphone. Yes, he has not got a Ph.D. He has not even got a B.A. I go further here, Ada School Certificate? Ada Sijil "O" level?

Ta'ada. But I tell you what he has got: courage, loyalty and steadfastness in a crisis. After the riots in Geylang Serai, it was like that, each time I went down to face the mob. It was easier for me but tougher for him because he was then treated as a traitor, kafir. In fact, in the last elections he was nearly called a kafir. For those who are not familiar with this word or phrase, that is the worst thing you can call a Muslim -- an infidel. He is a good Haji. This time he survived the smear because he had learned, without a School Certificate, what is required of an MP.

Sia Kah Hui, Teong Eng Siong -- 1963 generation: 24 out of 69 -- just over one-third. If we can pass to you, the other two-thirds, an idea of what it was like, then maybe we will be all right. I am not saying that you (the two-thirds) are not all right. All I am saying is that you would not know until the guns open fire. You can put soldiers through: what they call, the fireworks -- where they knew that they are firing blanks and thunder flashes, and there is so much smoke and so on. But when an army goes in like the American army landing in North Africa in 1943 for the first time, they got really slaughtered. It was only after that first shock that they got over the combat shock, and became warriors. You can stimulate it but it is not the same. When he knows it is a real live bullet, because it goes zing and is meant for him, that is the time when you know--you look at his pants and you know whether he is a man or he is not.

Then we have the 1966 generation -- the by-elections when Barisan Sosialis walked out. Ho Kah Leong, Lim Guan Hoo. He went to fight Bukit Merah, which was first won by Barisan. Well, he won.. But we shall miss him. I hope he can recover but the chances are very slender, and his wife and family are facing a tremendous ordeal. Mr. Tang See Chim, Dr. Yeoh Ghim Seng.

Then the 1967 generation. Mr. Ang Nam Piau, Mr. P. Selvadurai. I think the 1967 generation is not quite the same, because then they knew they were winners. In 1966, maybe we could still have lost. But in 1963 when we fought we knew that we could not only lose our pants, but we could lose our lives. And those who were at the counting centres at Bukit Timah, where they lost -- Mr. K. C. Lee for Bukit Panjang and Mr. Chor Yeok Eng for Bukit Timah -- if we had lost and Barisan had won, I think they would have come out of the counting centre pretty bashed up. Oompah! Merdeka! Oompah! Merdeka! and the crowds were there. They have the technique, and I admire this.

You know, in 1957 when I was at the Vatican, St. Peter's, the first time the Pope was being televised, as he came out from the aisle, my God, I watched it. Having watched the communists, know some of the modus operandi of this, the mass reaction. As the Pope came down carried on the palanquin, the crowd lifted their arms and said: "Viva il Papa, Viva il Papa." I said: "Boy, this is strange." I hope this is not blasphemy, I have got seven Catholic Members here. I am on their side. I said: "Where are the cheer leaders?" I looked around and there up on the walls, the pillars, were choir boys. As the Pope passed the choir boys said: "Viva il Papa, Viva il Papa" and the nuns below said "Viva il Papa" and the crowd went "Viva il Papa". Two thousand years of sound, tried and tested techniques, and, of course, we know a lot more.

So you see when one opposition leader went to Fullerton Square and said: “We want to be heard”. I said it is kindergarten stuff. If we had wanted to intimidate the opposition we would have carried on with our Party conference on 12th December. Let us be frank, we called off our Party conference slated for December the 12th, 13th was Nomination day. We said: “No. We would intimidate the opposition. That is bad”. We could have packed that meeting. We were going to win. We had the organisation. We could have scared the opposition. They did not have to believe me. We knew that the Western press wanted them to win and would say, “Well the PAP demonstrated. They had a huge crowd of 50,000 and intimidated them.” We said: “No, cancel it.” We won. We won because we gave no hostages to fortune. We governed fairly, honestly, and justly.

Sir, one last word of advice, if you like to call it, or just plain fact. If you want to be popular, do not try to be popular all the time. Popular government does not mean that you do popular things all the time. We do not want to be unpopular or to do unpopular things. But when they are necessary, they will be done. Popular representative government means that within each five-year period, your policies have demonstrably worked and won popular support. That is what it means. And if we flinch from the unpopular, we are in deep trouble.

Of course, the Area Licensing Scheme was unpopular. Of course, car taxes were unpopular. But, Gentlemen, which would you have? A jammed up Singapore with car owners exasperated, bus passengers exasperated, or 20,000 to 30,000 car owners having to lay up their cars and hundreds of thousands going through in buses or in shared cars? We made that decision, and it was right. Of course, if we had an election period, like the New Zealanders and the Australians have for three years instead of five years, that is more difficult. But Sir Robert Menzies, in spite of three-year periods, won and stayed in office for 12 years. But he knew that popular representative government means that sometimes even when 51% (he once told me up till 55%) are against you, if it is right, proceed. When it works out all right, they will swing back. But if you flinch, then that 55% becomes 65% and you are out.

I leave you with a final rider. This is psephology. All of you are pressing to do popular things and, of course, it is right -- more and better homes, more and better amenities. But let me pose you this problem and you think it out. I am not going to give you the answer. I am not going to tell anybody the answer. Take two similar constituencies, both Housing Board estates. One is Marine Parade and the other is Buona Vista. I have got the figures here. Both are new constituencies. Marine Parade has no one-room flats. Buona Vista -- I think Dr. Ang Kok Peng can tell us -- has got 1,300 one-room flats. (I am speaking from

memory. My papers are in a jumble but I will find them.) The Member for Buona Vista won 80.65% of the votes. The Member for Marine Parade, with the mostest five-room flats, with the mostest four-room flats, with no one-room flats, got 76%. Right? Now, Gentlemen, you are to succeed us. At least, I hope you do, otherwise you should not be here. Tell me the answer. Both were new MPs. Both were new constituencies. Is it because Dr. Ang Kok Peng was better known after being in Crawford?

No, next to Ulu Pandan. Part of Ulu Pandan. Is it because the Member for Ulu Pandan looked after it better than the Member for Joo Chiat? Both faced candidates who were unknown. Can somebody solve it? The team who can sit down and solve that riddle has got one of the qualifications to succeed us. Only one of the qualifications -- solve it. I think I know, and I will tell only a few people. I do not believe in telling university researchers where they go wrong.

They write all kinds of spurious silly articles or books. They get M.A.'s and Ph.D's for them. I read them and I know them to be wrong. I laugh away. But I never tell them why they are wrong. Because I am an Asian. I am not a Westerner. This is an Asian situation, and do not be clever. Why show them how clever we are. Be modest. Just keep quiet. If they want to be wrong headed, wish them luck. I must apologise, Mr. Speaker, Sir, because my papers must have got stuck. But I promise to get the figures published. The facts are

there. I am publishing known facts. How many five-room point-blocks? How many four-room blocks? How many one-room, two-room and three-room blocks? And on all counts, and at every stage, the Member for Marine Parade had the better constituency. By the seaside, you get sea breeze. What more can you ask for? Higher income. Those of you who do not get from the Minister for Finance your swimming pool or your sports stadium, take heart. Do not worry. That is not the magic. The magic is a combination of factors which go more than just beyond income and creature comforts and a good home. But I will lay my bottom dollar -- I am not a betting man, as a rule, I never buy the Toto. I never buy the Big Sweep.

Because the first lesson I learnt in mathematics was the law of chances. If we each buy one ticket, one in 10 gets a chance to win \$10. But if we each buy one ticket and the winner gets \$7, I say, "No. Count me out". Because the

Government takes 30% as tax. Why should I buy? It is silly. But there are silly people. So we cater for them. But I will bet one bottom dollar that in the next elections in 1980/81, the Member for Marine Parade, given six to eight per cent growth between now and 1980/81, will improve his margin. Not only because he will get a playing field after the school is built, but because he would have learnt part of the formula. And, Gentlemen, when Western educated academics want to visit your constituencies, say, "Please by all means". But if you ask my opinion,

my advice to you is, let me find out the old formula, which they will discover long after we have gone on to new formulae. That away, you will live long, happily in office, and in retirement, with a government ticking to ensure that you enjoy your pension. And the way to enjoy your pension is to ensure good stable, fair, just government which commands the trust and respect of the people. No more, no less. Singaporeans have been accustomed to high standards of effective government. They deserve nothing but the best. And it is our duty to ensure that they continue to receive the best. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Sir.

National Archives of Singapore