

EIGHTH PARLIAMENT OF SINGAPORE

Second Session

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

**Complaint against Representatives from the
Singapore Democratic Party**

Parl. 6 of 1996

**Presented to Parliament on
22nd November, 1996**

COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

Mr Speaker (Mr Tan Soo Khoon) (*Chairman*).

Mr Abdullah Tarmugi, Minister for Community Development.

Mr Davinder Singh.

Assoc. Prof. Ho Peng Kee, Senior Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Law and the Minister for Home Affairs.

Prof. S. Jayakumar, Minister for Law and Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Mr Low Thia Kiang.

RAdm Teo Chee Hean, Minister for the Environment and Second Minister for Defence.

Mr Wong Kan Seng, Minister for Home Affairs.

CONTENTS

Pages

| | |
|--------------|---------|
| Report | i-xxiii |
|--------------|---------|

Appendices

| | |
|---------------------------------|---------|
| A Memorandum of Complaint | A 1-8 |
| B Replies | B 1-6 |
| Joint Reply | B 1 |
| Mr S Kunalen | B 2 |
| Mr Wong Hong Toy | B 3-4 |
| Mr Kwan Yue Keng | B 5 |
| Dr Chee Soon Juan | B 6 |
| C Minutes of Evidence | C 1-176 |
| D Minutes of Proceedings | D 1-6 |

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

The Committee of Privileges ("the Committee"), to whom was referred the complaint made by the Minister for Health, BG George Yong-Boon Yeo ("the Minister") for contempt of Parliament against the representors from the Singapore Democratic Party (SDP), namely Mr S Kunalen, Mr Wong Hong Toy, Mr Kwan Yue Keng and Dr Chee Soon Juan ("the representors"), have agreed to the following Report.

INTRODUCTION

1. By a letter dated 21 May 1996 from the Clerk of Parliament to Dr Chee Soon Juan, Secretary-General of the SDP, the SDP was invited to appear before the Select Committee on Verification of Health Care Subsidy of Government Polyclinics and Public Hospitals ("the Select Committee") on 15 July 1996 to give oral evidence supporting or supplementing the SDP's written representation. By a letter dated 7 June 1996, Dr Chee, on behalf of the SDP, informed the Clerk of Parliament that the SDP will be present on 15 July 1996 to give oral evidence. By a letter dated 9 July 1996, the SDP was asked by the Clerk of Parliament to provide the names of SDP's representatives who will be appearing before the Select Committee. By a letter dated 11 July 1996, Dr Chee, on behalf of the SDP, informed the Clerk of Parliament that the SDP will be represented at the Select Committee by Dr Chee, the Secretary-General; Mr Wong Hong Toy, the Vice-Chairman; Mr Kwan Yue Keng, the Assistant Secretary-General; and Mr S. Kunalen, Head, the Research and Planning Department.

2. The SDP in its Written Submission at page 1 made the following statements:-

Statement 1

"... Between 1970 and 1990, the Government's share of total health expenditure fell from 40% to 5% with the sharpest drop within the last 10 years (see Chart 1)."

Statement 2

"In addition, the amount of Government spending on health care as a percentage of GDP has been falling to the present level of less than 1%. This compares to 7% for Japan, 13% for the US and an average of 9% for the OECD countries (see Chart 3)."

3. Chart 1 appears at page B42 and Chart 3 appears at B44 of the Report¹ of the Select Committee which was presented to Parliament on 30 September 1996.

4. On 15 July 1996, the four representors appeared before the Select Committee where they were questioned, inter alia, on Statement 1 and Chart 1, and Statement 2 and Chart 3.

¹ Part. 5 of 1996.

5. At that hearing, Dr Chee informed the Select Committee that Chart 1 was obtained from his book, *Dare to Change*, and that the source of his data in Chart 1 was a journal which he then called "*Asia Research*". Dr Chee said that he would forward a copy of the journal to the Select Committee. After the question was put to him several times, Dr Chee confirmed that the SDP panel members had independently verified the accuracy of the data contained in Chart 1, "as far as we can".

6. When asked what Chart 3 showed, Dr Chee informed the Select Committee that Chart 3 "compares percentage of GDP on health care". When he was asked whether the term "health care" referred to the total health care in the economy, Dr Chee said that it referred to Government health care expenditure. When asked for clarification, he repeated, more than once, that Chart 3 shows "the budget allocation for health as a percentage of the GDP". Dr Chee said that the number 0.8% in Chart 3 referred to the statistic on Singapore and that the numbers in Chart 3 for Japan, OECD and USA were a comparison of "apples with apples". Dr Chee said that he had obtained the numbers for Japan, OECD and USA from the *White Paper on Affordable Health Care*². When one of the members of the Select Committee, Dr Kanwaljit Soin, drew Dr Chee's attention to the fact that there was a discrepancy in the figures in Chart 3 in that the figures for

Singapore referred to the Government health expenditure, Dr Chee said that "if we want to talk about the national health expenditure, then the percentage is 3.1% ". Dr Chee did not accept that a mistake had occurred.

7. Although Dr Chee said that he would forward the journal to the Select Committee, he did not do so until after two reminders were sent to him by the Clerk of Parliament. These reminders are dated 19 July 1996 and 30 July 1996. The second reminder informed Dr Chee that the journal should be sent to Parliament by 4 pm, Thursday, 1 August 1996.

8. By a letter dated 1 August 1996, with SDP's letterhead, Dr Chee forwarded a copy of the article "Social Security in Singapore: Redrawing the Public — Private Boundary" by one M. Ramesh from a publication called the *Asian Survey*. In that letter, Dr Chee stated as follows:-

"Regarding the *Asian Survey* article, the SDP's Chart is derived from the figures in the article on page 1098 as presented by the author. We would also like to add that there is a typographical error in the SDP graph. For the year 1990, the figure of the Government's share of health care expenditure should be 25% and not 5% (the digit "2" is missing). The calculation is based on the same method used by M Ramesh in his article based on figures published in the *Yearbook of Statistics 1990 ...*"

9. On 5 August 1996, the Clerk of Parliament issued a Summons To A Witness pursuant to Section 13 of the Parliament (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act to each of the four representors. The Summons required the representors to attend before the Select Committee on 12 August 1996 to testify in respect of the purported error referred to in Chart 1.

² Cmd. 16 of 1993.

10. On 12 August 1996, the four representors were individually examined by the Select Committee upon affirmation. At that hearing, the representors took the following positions with respect to the alleged error in Chart 1.

11. Dr Chee said that the typographical error occurred a couple of years ago in *Dare to Change*. According to him, the error was carried over into the Written Submission. He also said that while he prepared the text of *Dare to Change*, he did not prepare the graph in that book which also reflected the figure of 5% for the year 1990. According to him, he gave the text to the person who drew the graph. That person drew it according to the numbers that were in the text. Dr Chee was unable to remember who did the graph. Dr Chee said that he did the calculation for the year 1990 using the *Yearbook of Statistics 1990*. When asked how he calculated the figure 25% for the year 1990, he explained that he had used the 1985 market price time series for the 1990 private consumption expenditure figure and the current price time series for the 1990 figure for Government health expenditure. His evidence was that he used this method because that was how M. Ramesh derived his numbers for the years 1985 and 1989, and he followed M. Ramesh's methodology. When asked why he had used M. Ramesh's methodology when it was wrong, Dr Chee said that he followed M. Ramesh because he was citing M. Ramesh's research and wanted to extrapolate the figures from those that M. Ramesh had used.

12. Mr Wong also maintained that a typographical error had occurred. He said that he helped Dr Chee to calculate the figure for 1990, and obtained the figure of 25%. According to him, he did the calculation when the Written Submission was prepared in March or April 1996. He also said that Dr Chee helped in the calculation, that the person who was most directly involved in making the calculation with him was Dr Chee, and that he worked with Dr Chee in making the calculation. When asked how the error was discovered, Mr Wong said that it was discovered by both Dr Chee and him. According to Mr Wong, after the hearing of 15 July 1996, when Dr Chee and Mr Wong looked at Chart 1, both of them were surprised that there was a sharp drop. Mr Wong took a closer look and discovered that it was a typographical error. He asked Dr Chee why the digit "2" was missing and said it should be 25%. According to him, Dr Chee agreed.

13. Mr Kunalen said that he was not involved in the preparation of Chart 1. His evidence was that he did not look at the primary materials and the Charts were all prepared by Dr Chee. According to Mr Kunalen, he was given a copy of the draft Written Submission in which the 5% figure already appeared. When asked about his conversation with Dr Chee when the error was discovered, Mr Kunalen said that Dr Chee had said "somebody had made a typographical error".

14. Mr Kwan also said that the mistake was a typographical error. According to him, although he was a member of the SDP Research Committee, his role in the Written Submission only extended to helping in compiling the text, checking what was prepared and ensuring that they were properly compiled. He also made copies for some of the other members of the Research Committee to read. He said he was not involved in doing the calculations or in preparing the Charts, except to photocopy them. He explained that he was not involved in looking through the statistical data books to establish numbers and calculate percentages. According to him, he read the final draft of the Written

Submission before it was submitted to Parliament and was familiar with the details when he attended the hearing on 15 July 1996. He thought it was a surprising fact that Government health expenditure in Chart 1 had plunged from 27% to 5%. It seemed odd to him. But he did not raise this point because, according to him, this was already in *Dare to Change*. Although he had some reservations, he did not raise it with Dr Chee or any of the Research team members. He accepted that on hindsight, the error should have been corrected. According to Mr Kwan, after the hearing on 15 July 1996, in the car on the way home, Mr Kwan asked Dr Chee whether he was sure the figure was 5%. Mr Kwan said that he had not read M. Ramesh's article.

15. By a letter dated 27 August 1996, the Minister made a written complaint against the four representors to the Speaker of Parliament pursuant to Standing Order 96(7)(c) ("the Complaint"³).

16. The Complaint is that the four representors had acted in contempt of Parliament by fabricating data and presenting false and/or untrue documents with intent to deceive the Select Committee. Further, that in giving evidence before the Select Committee to cover up the false and/or untrue documents which they had submitted, members of the SDP team committed further contempts by:

- (a) committing perjury;
- (b) wilfully giving false answers;
- (c) prevaricating; and
- (d) misconducting themselves.

17. This Complaint was followed by specific complaints against each of the four representors. The specific complaints elaborate on how all of the representors committed perjury and/or wilfully gave false answers and/or prevaricated and/or misconducted themselves.

18. On 27 August 1996, the Speaker informed the House that he had received a letter dated 27 August 1996 containing the Complaint from the Minister. The Speaker, being satisfied that the matter complained of, *prima facie*, affects the privileges of Parliament and that it had been raised at the earliest opportunity, referred the matter to the Committee.

19. On 28 August 1996, a copy of the Complaint was sent to each of the four representors. Each of the representors was asked to send his response to the Complaint by 4 September 1996. The representors sent in a joint response⁴, as well as individual responses⁵. The joint response is dated 3 September 1996, and was signed by all the four representors. The individual responses from Mr Kunalen, Mr Wong, Dr Chee and Mr Kwan dated 30 August 1996, 1 September 1996, 2 September 1996 and 4 September 1996 respectively, were received on 4 September 1996.

³ Appendix A.

⁴ Appendix B1.

⁵ Appendix B2 - 6.

20. The Committee held its first meeting on 8 October 1996 where it was resolved that the evidence of the four representors be taken on oath or affirmation. The Committee heard the oral evidence upon affirmation from the four representors on 24 October 1996.

FINDINGS

21. The Committee have conducted a full and thorough investigation of the matters complained of. The Committee have reviewed all the relevant documents referred to at the hearings before the Select Committee on 15 July 1996 and 12 August 1996, and at the hearing before the Committee on 24 October 1996. The Committee have carefully evaluated the quality of each representor's evidence at the Select Committee hearings and on 24 October 1996 when they testified before the Committee. The Committee have also tested their evidence against uncontroverted facts and inherent probabilities (or improbabilities).

DR CHEE SOON JUAN'S EVIDENCE ON STATEMENT 1 AND CHART 1

22. It is not in dispute that Dr Chee wrote *Dare to Change*. *Dare to Change* contains the following sentence:

"The Government's share of total health expenditure fell from 40% in 1970 to 37% in 1985 to 27% 1989 to 5% in the 1990s (see Figure 3)".

Figure 3 is a chart on Government health expenditure from 1970 to 1990. It contains points for 1970 (40%), 1985 (37%), 1989 (27%) and 1990 (5%).

23. Dr Chee's evidence to the Select Committee on 12 August 1996 was that the "5%" was a typographical error. Dr Chee said that he did the calculation for the year 1990 using the *Yearbook of Statistics 1990*. When asked how he arrived at the figure 25% for the year 1990, he explained that he had used the 1985 market price time series for the 1990 private consumption expenditure and the current price time series for the 1990 Government health expenditure. His evidence was that he used this method because that was how M. Ramesh derived his numbers for 1985 and 1989, and he followed M. Ramesh's methodology. When asked why he used M. Ramesh's methodology when it was wrong, Dr Chee said that he wanted to extrapolate from the figures that M. Ramesh had used.

24. Dr Chee testified on 12 August 1996 that while he prepared the text of *Dare to Change*, he did not draw the graph in Figure 3. According to Dr Chee, he gave the text to the person who drew the graph. That person drew it according to the numbers that were in the text. Dr Chee was unable then or at the hearing on 24 October 1996 to remember who drew the graph in Figure 3.

25. Dr Chee testified on 12 August 1996 and 24 October 1996 that he did not calculate the figure for 1990 early this year when he was preparing the Written Submission. According to Dr Chee, he carried over the 5% from *Dare to Change* into the Written Submission.

26. The central issue which the Committee must resolve is whether there is any truth in Dr Chee's claim that he calculated the figure 25% which, because of a typographical error, became 5% when he wrote *Dare to Change*.

27. The Committee consider it of primary significance that in the text of *Dare to Change*, Dr Chee did not in anywhere assert that the figure for 1990 was 5%. The Committee had expected to see a figure for 1990 in the text when Dr Chee claimed that he had carried over the 5% (which appears in the Written Submission and Chart 1) from *Dare to Change*. There is no figure for 1990 in the text of that book. However, there is a figure for "the 1990s". In *Dare to Change*, Dr Chee claimed that "The Government's share of total health expenditure fell from 40% in 1970 to 37% in 1985 to 27% 1989 to 5% in the 1990s" (emphasis added).

28. Dr Chee has testified that the reference to "the 1990s" should be "1990" and that this was another typographical error. He did not make that claim either on 15 July 1996 or 12 August 1996, but only on 24 October 1996. It seemed to the Committee that it was more an afterthought on Dr Chee's part than anything else. The Committee are satisfied, for the following reasons, that it could not have been a typographical error.

29. First, the reference in *Dare to Change* is not to "1990s" in which event it might be said that the "s" had been inadvertently typed in. The reference is to "the 1990s" (emphasis added). The word "the" would not have been used if Dr Chee, who wrote *Dare to Change*, had intended to refer to a single year. Dr Chee did not explain how the word "the" could have been a typographical error.

30. Secondly, in the same sentence, Dr Chee refers to a number of years in the singular. He referred to 1970, 1985 and 1989 in the singular. But the reference to "the 1990s" is in the plural. The distinction was clearly intended.

31. Dr Chee appreciated the inherent difficulties in his assertion that he had made the calculation for 1990, when it became apparent to him that the text referred to "the 1990s". On 24 October 1996, he attempted to explain that the figure for the 1990s was "25% approximately". Dr Chee was trying to show that the figure for the 1990s was also 25% which, in the typing of *Dare to Change*, became 5%. But this evidence stood in stark contrast to his evidence on 12 August 1996 that he did not calculate the figures for the 1990s.

32. On 24 October 1996, he claimed that 25% was an "approximation" for the 1990s based on the figures for 1989 and 1990; that they were "ballpark figures". It was quite apparent to the Committee that Dr Chee was struggling to find, *ex post facto*, some basis for having related the 5% figure to the 1990s.

33. Dr Chee has said, on more than one occasion, that he did not calculate the figures for 1991, 1992 and 1993. As the Committee see it, this poses a dilemma to Dr Chee. If, as he said, he did not calculate the figure for 1990s, it must follow that his statement in *Dare to Change* that the Government's share of total health expenditure fell to "5% in the 1990s" is false. He could not have known or believed that the figure for

the 1990s was 5% or, for that matter, anything else because, by his own admission, he did not do the necessary calculations. The 5% would have been' a contrived figure.

34. On the other hand, if he did the calculations for the 1990s, he would have known that the figure for the 1990s was not 25.4% or 5%, in which event the statement in *Dare to Change* that the figure fell to "5% in the 1990s" is also false. The 5% figure would also have been contrived in that event.

35. The Committee are satisfied that Dr Chee did not make any calculation for 1990 or the 1990s when he wrote *Dare to Change* but made up the figure 5%. The Committee are fortified in the view by Dr Chee's other conduct (described below) which is strongly suggestive of the fact that he has an inclination to invent, or misuse figures.

36. Dr Chee admitted, on 24 October 1996, that he did not calculate the 1970 figure in *Dare to Change*. Dr Chee first said that the 40% figure in *Dare to Change* and in the Written Submission was taken from M. Ramesh's article. When his attention was drawn to the fact that M. Ramesh's article did not have any figure for 1970, Dr Chee then said that the 40% was an "approximation".

37. This was the second time that Dr Chee had, by his own admission, "approximated" figures. He admitted that he did not calculate it but assumed, by "interpolation", that it was 40% based on M. Ramesh's figures for 1960 (39%) and 1985 (37.4%). The Committee find it extraordinary that Dr Chee was able to interpolate between 39% and 37.4% to produce a higher figure of 40% in his approximation. He confirmed that he did not verify the 40%. Yet when asked whether it was a responsible thing to do to assume a figure, put it in a chart and lead people to believe that it was the correct figure, Dr Chee said "yes".

38. Another instance of misuse of figures came to light at the hearing on 12 August 1996. In *Singapore, My Home Too*, Dr Chee wrote "for example, at a time when costs are increasing, the Government is shifting the burden of medical expenses to the private individual. The total health expenditure has been reduced from 40.1% in 1970 to just 0.9% in the 1996...". Dr Chee claimed to have obtained the figures from M. Ramesh's article. When it became apparent that M. Ramesh's article could not have been the source of all the information in that sentence, Dr Chee said that he had relied on M. Asher's article, *Planning for the Future: The Welfare System In A New Plan of Development*.

39. In his article, M. Asher said that "the increased cost recovery in the health sector comes at a time of declining contributions by government to total health expenditure from 40.1% in 1970 to 27.4% in 1989 while government health expenditure as a proportion of GDP remained essentially constant at 0.9% between 1980 and 1989".

40. It would be immediately apparent to anyone reading the two statements that Dr Chee conflated the two separate points made by M. Asher. The 0.9% referred to by M. Asher in his article relates to Government health expenditure as a proportion of GDP. But Dr Chee cited the 0.9% figure as representing Government health expenditure as a percentage of total health expenditure. Dr Chee then compared it with the 40.1%

figure, knowingly giving the false impression that Government health expenditure as a percentage of the total health expenditure had fallen "from 40.1% in 1970 to just 0.9% in the 1990".

41. But that was not all. Dr Chee also ignored the fact that M. Asher related the 0.9% to the years 1980 to 1989. Dr Chee related the 0.9% to "the 1990".

42. In this connection, the Committee should point out that although Dr Chee used the figure 5% for the 1990s in *Dare to Change*, he used the figure 0.9% to refer to the same type of expenditure for "the 1990" in *Singapore, My Home Too*. Dr Chee must have known, when he wrote *Singapore, My Home Too*, that in *Dare to Change*, a book written just a year earlier in 1994, he had asserted that Government health expenditure as a percentage of the total health expenditure was 5% in "the 1990s". Yet one year later, in *Singapore, My Home Too* he dropped the 5% and used 0.9%.

43. This leads the Committee to the next point. Dr Chee claimed that when he wrote the Written Submission, he carried the 5% over from *Dare to Change*. Between *Dare to Change* and the Written Submission, he wrote *Singapore, My Home Too*. The second book made the point that Government's share of total health expenditure was down to "0.9% in the 1990". The 0.9% figure is substantially different from the 5% figure for the 1990s (in *Dare to Change*). He must have known, in early 1996, when he prepared the Written Submission, that he had two different figures for the 1990 period in two different books authored by him. He must (at the very least) have known that one could not have been correct. In fact, both were incorrect. Yet he inexplicably selected the 5% for the Written Submission, and related it not to the 1990s (as he did in *Dare to Change*) but to 1990.

44. There is also another facet of Dr Chee's evidence which has troubled the Committee. Dr Chee told the Select Committee on 12 August 1996 that the person who drew the graph in Figure 3 in *Dare to Change* relied on the text in that book to plot the graph. Dr Chee did not speak to the chartist. But it is apparent that anyone looking at the text would have immediately seen that it does not refer to 1990 but to the 1990s. Any sensible chartist would have asked Dr Chee which year in the 1990s the 5% referred to. Or how he or she should reflect the 5% in the graph, having regard to the fact that Dr Chee was talking about a number of years in the 1990s in the text.

45. Dr Chee was unable to say why or how the chartist assumed that Dr Chee meant to refer to 1990 only. On 24 October 1996, Dr Chee took the position that the person who prepared the graph instinctively knew in his or her mind that although the text referred to the 1990s, it actually meant 1990. Despite being asked on 12 August 1996, and again on 24 October 1996, Dr Chee claimed that he cannot recall the identity of the chartist.

46. The only possible explanation for the fact that Figure 3 in *Dare to Change* had the figure 5% for 1990, when the text talks about the 1990s, is that Dr Chee was the chartist himself. The Committee are satisfied that no one other than Dr Chee could have plotted the point for 1990 in Figure 3 in the way it was plotted.

47. In fact, Dr Chee was also concerned about revealing the identity of the person who prepared the charts in the Written Submission. He denied that he drew the charts. But two of his fellow representors, Mr Wong and Mr Kunalen, were very clear about the fact that Dr Chee prepared the charts. The Committee accept the evidence of Mr Wong and Mr Kunalen. They were not involved in writing *Dare to Change* or the Written Submission. They had no reason to lie on this issue. The Committee can only conclude that Dr Chee did not want to admit that he prepared the charts in *Dare to Change* and in the Written Submission because he knew that he would then have great difficulties explaining how he could have missed the 5% figure.

48. The Committee consider that it is necessary, in determining the veracity of a witness's version of what transpired, to examine his background and training. Obviously, the Committee's conclusion on this issue would be affected if they were dealing with a person with little or no education or training in research and statistics. But Dr Chee has a PhD in Psychology. He has written 2 books, both of which have sections on health care in Singapore. He has researched and written a number of articles, two of which, according to him, have found their way into international journals. He agreed with the Committee that very careful research went into his PhD dissertation. His research work involved having to draw charts and graphs, which he agreed had to be accurate. He claimed that he took his research work very seriously.

49. He knew how to calculate the figures correctly. He was aware that the proper methodology dictated the use of the same set of prices for both the numerator and denominator. The Committee therefore do not believe his evidence that he used M. Ramesh's (incorrect) methodology. In the circumstances, the Committee are satisfied that even if Dr Chee did the calculation for 1990 (which the Committee do not accept), it is not possible that he arrived at the figure of 25.4%. The correct figure, based on the *Yearbook of Statistics 1990*, is 23.6%.

50. The Committee cannot believe that if the 5% was a typographical error, it would have escaped his detection. A draft of the Written Submission which contained Chart 1 (in its present form) was discussed for between two and three hours by Dr Chee and some of the other representors. If the 5% was a typographical error, Dr Chee could not have missed the dramatic plunge to 5%. It was a key chart and the 5% figure was a key point, as conceded by Mr Kunalen.

51. If Dr Chee had calculated the figure for 1990 as 25% when he was writing *Dare to Change* (which the Committee do not believe), it would have been immediately apparent to him that there was not much change between 27% in 1989 and 25% in 1990. Upon seeing the completed chart produced by the chartist, the steep plunge from 27% to 5% from 1989 to 1990 should have caught the attention of Dr Chee even if he did not prepare the chart himself. He admitted that the chart was very dramatic. It is highly improbable that Dr Chee could have escaped noticing the error, particularly when it is in graphical form. Further, it is not unusual for several proof readings for a book to be done by the author before a book is finally printed. Dr Chee had admitted checking the proof but tried to explain that he did not notice the error. That explanation is difficult to accept. The Committee are driven to the conclusion that no typographical error whatsoever had been made both in the text in *Dare to Change* and in the chart in that book.

The chart was clearly intended to show the plunge to 5% in the year 1990 and the text was meant to read as it had been printed "5% in the 1990s".

52. When Dr Chee prepared the Written Submission for the Select Committee hearing, he would have had to re-read the relevant part of the text and study the chart in *Dare to Change* carefully before deciding to replicate the chart in the Written Submission. He would have had ample opportunity to discover the error, if it had been a genuine error as he had claimed. There is no good reason why the error was not apparent to him if in fact he had calculated the figure to be 25%.

53. In fact, the error was so obvious that it was noticed by Mr Kunalen and Mr Kwan, both of whom, as they claimed, were not involved in the preparation of the Written Submission or in verifying the data in it. Mr Kunalen remembered the steep plunge from the discussion of the first draft. Mr Kwan thought the plunge odd and surprising when he read the Written Submission. It is highly unlikely that the person who prepared the Written Submission could have missed the 5%, if it was a typographical error.

54. There is also no satisfactory explanation why Dr Chee did not detect the 5% on 15 July 1996 when his attention was specifically drawn to Chart 1 by the Minister.

55. The failure to pick up the alleged typographical error is also puzzling when the Committee consider Mr Wong's evidence that when he and Dr Chee looked at Chart 1 after 15 July 1996 they immediately realised that the figure should not have been 5%. If it was so apparent after 15 July 1996, it would have been equally obvious on all the earlier occasions referred to above.

56. There is a conflict in the evidence of Mr Wong and Dr Chee on this issue. Mr Wong said that both he and Dr Chee realised the error when they looked at the chart. But Dr Chee said that he had to go into the figures and recalculate them to determine that there was an error. The Committee are inclined to accept Mr Wong's evidence on this point. There would have been no need for Dr Chee to recalculate the figures to determine if an "error" had been made. Dr Chee faces another dilemma. If Dr Chee had calculated the figure for 1990 when writing *Dare to Change*, he would have known, without having to do fresh calculations, that the 5% was incorrect. If he invented it, he would have known that the figure was false. The Committee are therefore unable to accept that Dr Chee did not detect the so-called "error" till after 15 July 1996, or that it took two reminders from the Clerk of Parliament for M. Ramesh's article before Dr Chee "discovered" it.

57. All the evidence points in one direction: the 5% could not have been missed by Dr Chee if it was truly a typographical error. Dr Chee carried the 5% into the Written Submission with the knowledge that it was a fabricated figure.

58. The Committee shall now deal with Dr Chee's assertion that the Written Submission was verified. Dr Chee testified on 15 July 1996 that the Written Submission was verified, "as far as we can". Dr Chee, the Committee assume, hoped to persuade the Select Committee that the representors had been very careful in the preparation of the

Written Submission. According to his 2 September 1996 response to the Complaint, Dr Chee said (and repeated upon affirmation on 24 October 1996) that he had given the Written Submission to the other representors for independent verification of the contents.

59. But the other representors have testified that they were not asked to verify the contents of the Written Submission. The Committee have no reason to disbelieve them. It appears from the evidence of all the representors that Mr Wong, Mr Kunalen and Mr Kwan had very little to do with the Written Submission. In fact, Dr Chee admitted, on 24 October 1996, that he did not ask or expect the other representors to verify the Written Submission. In the circumstances, the Committee find that Dr Chee was not telling the truth when he testified on 15 July 1996 that the Written Submission was verified or, when he said on 24 October 1996, that he gave it to the other representors for independent verification. The Committee are satisfied that Dr Chee had no intention of having his figures verified. He gave the Written Submission to the other representors. But he did not expect them to, and they did not, verify his figures.

60. In the circumstances, the Committee have come to the conclusion that Dr Chee's claim that the "5%" in Statement 1 and Chart 1 was a typographical error which had been carried over from *Dare to Change* is untruthful. His evidence on this issue is inconsistent with the undisputed facts and is highly improbable. The Committee are satisfied that Dr Chee fabricated the "5%" in *Dare to Change* and carried it into the Written Submission in the knowledge that the "5%" was an incorrect figure.

61. The Committee's views, in summary, are as follows:-

- (1) Dr Chee did not calculate the figure for 1990 or the 1990s when he wrote *Dare to Change*.
- (2) He contrived the "5%" figure, as he did the figure "40%" for the year 1970, and other figures in *Singapore, My Home Too*.
- (3) Dr Chee carried over the "5%" from *Dare to Change* into Statement 1 and Chart 1, knowing that the "5%" was false.
- (4) If it had been a typographical error, it would have been picked up on any one of a number of occasions: when he was proof reading the book *Dare to Change*, when he was preparing the draft Written Submission, when the draft Written Submission was discussed by three of the representors (with others), and when the representors appeared before the Select Committee on 15 July 1996 when their attention was drawn to Chart 1.
- (5) Contrary to Dr Chee's claim, the Written Submission was not verified. Dr Chee had no intention of having his figures checked.

62. In the result, the Committee find as follows:

- (1) **Dr Chee fabricated the data in Statement 1 and Chart 1 and presented false and untrue documents with intent to deceive the Select Committee. The Committee reject his claim that the 5% was a typographical error which had been carried into the Written Submission from *Dare to Change*.**

- (2) **In giving evidence before the Select Committee and the Committee, Dr Chee committed perjury, prevaricated and wilfully gave false answers to cover up the fact that he fabricated the data in Statement 1 and Chart 1.**
- (3) **Dr Chee committed perjury and prevaricated at the hearing on 12 August 1996 when he denied that he prepared the graph in *Dare to Change* and the charts in the Written Submission.**
- (4) **Dr Chee wilfully gave a false answer that the representors had independently verified the accuracy of the data in Chart 1.**

MR WONG HONG TOY'S EVIDENCE ON STATEMENT 1 AND CHART 1

63. The Committee have carefully considered Mr Wong's evidence and observed his demeanour. Mr Wong claimed that when the Written Submission was being prepared earlier this year, he did the calculation for the year 1990, and that Dr Chee helped him in the calculation. According to Mr Wong the calculation that he made was 25.4%. He wrote it on a piece of paper and gave it to Dr Chee.

64. The Committee are unable to accept that Mr Wong did the calculation for 1990 when the Written Submission was being prepared. There was no need for a fresh calculation to be done as Dr Chee had all along intended to, and did, use the same chart that he used in *Dare to Change*. Figure 3 in *Dare to Change* ended in the year 1990. Chart 1 likewise ended in the year 1990. The two charts have identical points for 1970, 1985, 1989 and 1990.

65. Mr Wong's evidence on this issue was so inconsistent that it was wholly unreliable.

66. Mr Wong testified on 12 August 1996 that Dr Chee helped him do the calculation for 1990. However, he changed his evidence before the Committee. He denied that Dr Chee helped him in the calculation.

67. At the hearing on 24 October 1996, Mr Wong initially said that Dr Chee had told him to look for the figure for 1990. A few questions later, Mr Wong claimed that Dr Chee did not tell him to get the figure for 1990. What had apparently happened, according to Mr Wong, was that Dr Chee gave Mr Wong M. Ramesh's article, Mr Wong read it, found that there was no figure for 1990 and therefore went to look for it. The Committee are not persuaded that Mr Wong could have known that Dr Chee wanted the figure for 1990 when they did not discuss the issue at all. In fact, Dr Chee testified that he did not tell Mr Wong to do the calculation.

68. Mr Wong was not familiar with the method of calculating Government health expenditure as a percentage of total health expenditure. He did not understand the statistical implications of using different base lines in the calculations. On 12 August 1996, Mr Wong was asked to demonstrate how he computed the figure 25.4%. Mr Wong initially used the time series in current prices for private consumption expenditure. When he realised that he had to use a different time series to justify the figure of 25.4%,

he promptly changed his method of calculation. He then went on to make a calculation using two different time series. If Mr Wong did the calculation early this year, he would have known how he did it. He would not have had to change his evidence on the methodology.

69. On 12 August 1996, Mr Wong agreed with the Minister that the time series for Government health expenditure in the *Yearbook of Statistics 1990* (at page 255) was in current prices. A few questions later, he claimed that there was nothing at page 255 to suggest that the figures there were in current prices. On 24 October 1996, Mr Wong said that he knew that the figures in current prices were available. When asked why he did not use those figures, he changed his evidence and said that only the figures in 1985 prices were available. When it was shown to him that the current prices were available, and that he had earlier accepted that he knew that those figures were available, he changed his evidence yet again and this time said that he had to use the figures in 1985 prices for consistency with the rest of the figures in Chart 1. But Mr Wong did not, contrary to his claim, use 1985 prices only. In his demonstration on 12 August 1996, he added figures in 1985 prices to figures in current prices. These inconsistencies reinforce the Committee's belief that Mr Wong could not have done the calculation early this year.

70. Mr Wong also tailored his evidence on the question of how many calculations were done this year. He told the Select Committee on 12 August 1996 that his job when the Written Submission was being prepared was to get the information and "we had fixed a point. So all our calculations were based towards this point". However, not all the calculations in the Written Submission and in the charts were calculated towards the same point.

71. The Committee are satisfied that Mr Wong did not know how to calculate the figures and did not do the calculation early this year. The Committee are also satisfied that Mr Wong agreed to commit perjury on 12 August 1996 at the behest of Dr Chee so as to give the impression that he too, like Dr Chee, had calculated the figure 25.4% for the year 1990. The Committee regard as implausible the notion that both Dr Chee and Mr Wong could, at different times, have used the same erroneous method to arrive at the same erroneous figure of 25.4%, and that the same typographical error occurred on two different occasions in two different documents without being detected by either of the two persons who did the calculations.

MR WONG HONG TOY: PREVARICATION

72. Mr Wong prevaricated when asked why he did not notice that Chart 1 looked very different from what would have been the case if the 25% figure as allegedly calculated by him had been plotted on the chart. When asked by the Minister whether he agreed that the 5% plunge was very dramatic, Mr Wong avoided answering that question. He said that when the chart was shown to him, he "just took a glance and I passed it without looking deep into it".

73. When pressed, he said that he assumed that the figure was 25% and did not look into it. When it was suggested to him that if the figure was 25%, the chart would have looked very different, Mr Wong claimed that he did not notice it because he was confident that he had done the calculation and because of that, he did not look at it.

74. The Committee were puzzled by the explanation. It is clear that Mr Wong looked at Chart 1 on more than one occasion. Certainly, on 15 July 1996, he had more than a fleeting glance at it. The Committee are satisfied that he avoided answering the question because he considered the truthful answer to be adverse to Dr Chee's claim that there had been a typographical error.

MR WONG HONG TOY: MISCONDUCT

75. Mr Wong also misconducted himself by not informing the Select Committee on 15 July 1996 that the figure was not 5%. When he was asked on 12 August 1996, why he did not speak up or point out the error on 15 July 1996, Mr Wong first said that nobody had asked him. But that was not the case. The Chairman of the Select Committee had informed all the representors on 15 July 1996 that they were not precluded from expressing their views on any of the questions. In any event, the answer implied that Mr Wong understood the exchange in English and appreciated that there had been an error, but did not point it out because nobody had asked him. When he was pressed, he changed his answer and said that he did not notice the error. Again, this was an admission that he understood the proceedings but, in a shift of ground, he claimed that he did not notice the error.

76. It is obvious that Mr Wong could follow the proceedings in English. He conceded to the Chairman of the Select Committee that he could follow most of the proceedings in English. The video tapes of the hearing, which the Committee have reviewed, indicate that Mr Wong had no trouble following the proceedings, which were being conducted in English. He admitted that he had read M. Ramesh's article, which is in English. He corrected a translation error by the interpreter. At the hearing on 24 October 1996 he answered the first few questions in English. Even when the questions were translated to him thereafter, he was prepared, at times, to answer questions even without any translation. Also, on at least two occasions, he corrected translation errors.

77. In any event, Mr Wong did not need to have a complete grasp of the English language to have noticed the plunge. All he needed to do was to look at Chart 1 and the plunge would have been apparent. In fact, Mr Kwan suggested that if he had been involved in the preparation and the calculations, he would have detected the error. Mr Kunalen agreed with the Committee that if it had been apparent to Mr Wong after the hearing on 15 July 1996 that an error had taken place, it would have been apparent to Mr Wong before 15 July 1996 when the draft Written Submission was being discussed.

78. In the result, the Committee find that in giving evidence before the Select Committee, Mr Wong committed perjury to cover up for Dr Chee. He also prevaricated and misconducted himself as a witness.

DID DR CHEE SOON JUAN HAVE A COPY OF M. RAMESH'S ARTICLE WITH HIM AT THE HEARING ON 15 JULY 1996?

79. The Minister has also complained that Dr Chee lied and prevaricated at the hearing on 12 August 1996 in connection with whether Dr Chee had in his possession a copy of the article by M. Ramesh during the hearing of 15 July 1996. The Committee

examined Dr Chee on this issue on 24 October 1996, and reviewed the video tape of the hearing on 12 August 1996. When Dr Chee was asked on 12 August 1996 whether he had a copy of the article at the hearing during 15 July 1996, Dr Chee asked "You are not talking about the hearing itself?" meaning that he wanted to be sure that the Minister was asking if he had the article with him at the hearing. When the Minister answered in the affirmative, Dr Chee said that the article was "in one of the stacks of my files", gesturing with his left hand to a place to his right on the table where he was seated.

80. But when asked why he did not produce it at that hearing, Dr Chee then changed his evidence and claimed that what he meant was that he had it in a stack of files "at home", this time pointing with his right hand over his shoulder to some point behind him.

81. The two gestures carried distinctly different messages. The first (left hand pointing to a place to his right on the table) clearly indicated that the files were at the hearing on 15 July 1996 and on the table where Dr Chee was seated. The second (pointing him with his hand over his shoulder to some point behind him) meant that the files were not in the room on 15 July 1996. Dr Chee could not have been telling the truth with both gestures. One of the suggestions (in the gestures) was false.

82. However, the Committee have to be very careful to ensure that the representors have the benefit of any doubt. The Committee have reviewed Dr Chee's answers to the Select Committee on 15 July 1996. It appears that he informed the Select Committee that he did not have the article with him when asked for its specific reference. More importantly, it is difficult to now establish whether the article was physically in the room on 15 July 1996. As such, the Committee have decided, notwithstanding Dr Chee's unconvincing shift in evidence, to give the benefit of the doubt to Dr Chee. The Committee therefore find that the complaint on this issue has not been made out.

DR CHEE SOON JUAN'S STATEMENT ON STATEMENT 2 AND CHART 3

83. The Committee shall now set out their findings on Dr Chee's defence that, in relation to Statement 2 and Chart 3, there was a "misunderstanding of the figures". The central issue which the Committee have to resolve is whether Dr Chee could have, as he claimed, been confused about the figures which were cited in the various source materials that he read when preparing the Written Submission.

84. At the hearing before the Committee on 24 October 1996, Dr Chee confirmed that he was aware, before the Written Submission was prepared in March or April 1996, of the distinction between Government health expenditure and total health expenditure.

85. He was also aware that Government health expenditure refers to what the Government spends out of its budget allocation for health care and that the amount budgeted by the Government every year for health care is subject to debate in the Committee of Supply.

86. Dr Chee had a number of source materials with him when he prepared the Written Submission. These included the *White Paper on Affordable Health Care; Planning for the Future: The Welfare System In A New Phase of Development* by Mukul Asher; the *Ministry of Health's Annual Report, 1993*; and Dr Soin's speech which she made in Parliament on 15 March 1996.

87. The reference to and distinction between Government health expenditure and national or total health expenditure in these materials are clear and unambiguous.

88. Dr Chee accepted that he knew that the figure 3.1% (for Singapore) in the *Affordable Health Care* referred to national expenditure as a percentage of GDP. But when he realised the consequences of the answer, he claimed that there was confusion. Despite repeated attempts by the Committee to determine what the alleged confusion was, Dr Chee prevaricated. He claimed not to have read the materials carefully.

89. Dr Chee claimed not to have understood M. Asher's article, but was unable to say what he did not understand. In fact, he even denied having M. Asher's article with him when he prepared the Written Submission. But it is an uncontroverted fact that he had the article with him from 1995, when he wrote *Singapore, My Home Too*. The article was cited in that book. When this fact was drawn to his attention, Dr Chee claimed he could not "grasp" one of the sentences in M. Asher's article. He could not say why he could not "grasp" it.

90. Such lapses of memory characterised his evidence throughout. He agreed with the Committee that when he read Dr Soin's speech in March or April this year, he knew that she was referring to Government health expenditure as a percentage of GDP. He then claimed that it was not clear to him on 15 July 1996. A few questions on, he denied he knew what Dr Soin meant when he read her speech earlier this year. He claimed he did not know what she meant. When questioned further, he said he thought she was referring to national health expenditure. Dr Chee gave three inconsistent versions of what he thought Dr Soin was referring to. He seriously undermined his own credibility by these shifts in position.

91. Dr Chee had no trouble understanding the unambiguous language of the source materials when he was asked to read them at the hearing on 24 October 1996. The meaning was self-evident. He has a PhD. He has an impressive command of the English language. The Committee are therefore not persuaded that Dr Chee misunderstood the source materials.

92. When he was asked by the Committee to explain what he meant by his claim that there had been "a misunderstanding of the figures", he referred to the 5% figure in Chart 1. But the "misunderstanding" which Dr Chee mentioned in the joint defence referred to Chart 3. The Committee are left wondering whether Dr Chee had truly considered his defence before signing it and affirming it on 24 October 1996.

93. If he was truly confused, Dr Chee could easily have pointed out the words or figures which confused him. He was unable to do so. The words and figures were unambiguous. The distinction between Government health expenditure and total health expenditure in these materials is all too clear.

94. Dr Chee's claim that he was confused about the source materials does not address a more fundamental flaw in the Written Submission. The Committee have studied Statement 2 and Chart 3 very carefully. The Committee have compared the proposition and figures therein with the evidence of the representors. The Committee concluded that Statement 2 is, whether or not Dr Chee was confused, inconsistent with Chart 3. Statement 2 and Chart 3 are therefore, on any view, misleading. The Committee shall now explain how this is so.

95. Statement 2 claims that the figures referred to therein and in Chart 3 are figures on Government health expenditure. But Chart 3 contained 3 figures (for Japan, USA and OECD) on national health expenditure.

96. If, as Dr Chee said on 24 October 1996, he believed Dr Soin to be talking about national health expenditure as a percentage of GDP when she referred to the figure 0.85%, then it is odd, to say the least, that he should have used Dr Soin's figure for a chart (Chart 3) which, according to Statement 2 and his evidence on 15 July 1996, represented Government health expenditure. He stated, on no less than three occasions on 15 July 1996, to the Select Committee that Chart 3 showed the budget allocation for health i.e. Government health expenditure.

97. If, as is implicit in Statement 2, he believed that Dr Soin's 0.85% figure referred to Government health expenditure as a percentage of GDP, then it is surprising that he chose to put that figure in the same chart alongside figures for Japan, the OECD and USA which indisputably represent national health expenditure as a percentage of GDP.

98. It is clear to the Committee that Chart 3 is not, contrary to Dr Chee's assertion on 12 August 1996, a comparison of "apples with apples". In fact, neither are Statement 2 and Chart 3 between themselves "apples and apples".

99. Dr Chee informed the Committee that he found out that there had been a misunderstanding during the hearing of the Select Committee on 15 July 1996, but after the segment where the Minister questioned him on Statement 2 and Chart 3. The Committee have reviewed the record of that hearing. It is apparent that Dr Chee did not once inform the Select Committee on 15 July 1996 that there had been a misunderstanding. He was asked on many occasions whether a mistake had occurred. He had ample opportunity to say that it was a mistake. Indeed, when questioned on 15 July 1996, not only did Dr Chee refuse to concede that a mistake had occurred, he said it was a matter of interpretation.

100. The Committee are satisfied that if there was truly a "misunderstanding of the figures", that "misunderstanding" would have been put right before the Written Submission reached the Select Committee. Dr Chee agreed with the Committee that

he had to be accurate in his presentation, that he would have wanted to ensure that the Written Submission was based on sound and correct information. He admitted that one of the purposes of putting up the Written Submission and appearing before the Select Committee was to get to the bottom of the figures. He took the trouble to read many articles when preparing Chart 3. Dr Chee understood all the concepts. The Written Submission was the subject of a two to three hour discussion between Dr Chee and some others, including Mr Wong and Mr Kunalen.

101. The Committee are of the view, having heard his evidence and observed his demeanour, that Dr Chee knew that he had combined the Government expenditure figure for Singapore with the national expenditure figures for Japan, USA and OECD, to make the comparison look worse for Singapore. The Committee also find that Dr Chee lied in his attempt to explain away the falsehoods in Statement 2 and Chart 3 when he gave evidence on this issue on 15 July 1996 to the Select Committee and on 24 October 1996 to the Committee, when he claimed that there was a "misunderstanding of the figures".

102. To summarise, the Committee's reasons for their finding are:

- (1) Dr Chee understood the meaning of the concepts of Government health expenditure and total or national health expenditure.
- (2) Dr Chee had a number of source materials when he prepared the Written Submission. All these articles are in clear and unambiguous language.
- (3) Dr Chee could not have been confused. If confused, he would have been able to point to the source of the confusion. He was unable to do that.
- (4) On any view, Chart 3 deliberately presents two different types of expenditure as the same type of expenditure. Chart 3 is also inconsistent with Statement 2.
- (5) If there had been a misunderstanding of the figures, it would have been detected at the time the draft of the Written Submission was discussed by some of the representors (with others), and/or when it was discussed at length during the hearing before the Select Committee on 15 July 1996.

103. **In the result, the Committee find as follows:**

- (1) **Dr Chee fabricated the data in Statement 2 and Chart 3, and presented false and untrue documents with intent to deceive the Select Committee. The Committee reject his claim that there was a "misunderstanding of the figures".**
- (2) **In giving evidence before the Select Committee and the Committee, Dr Chee committed perjury, prevaricated, and wilfully gave false answers to cover up for the false claim that there was a, "misunderstanding of the figures".**

MR WONG HONG TOY'S EVIDENCE ON STATEMENT 2 AND CHART 3

104. It is clear that Mr Wong did not understand Statement 2 and Chart 3. On 24 October 1996, he was unable to comment on what Chart 3 stood for, and why there were inconsistencies. Mr Wong also prevaricated when questioned about Chart 3 on 24 October 1996. After many questions, he finally said that Chart 3 represented national health expenditure. When asked to read Dr Soin's speech, he accepted that the 0.85% figure referred to budget allocation for health as a percentage of GDP. He could not explain why Dr Soin's figure for government health expenditure had been used in a chart which he believed represented national health expenditure.

105. He too resorted to the defence of a "misunderstanding". Yet he could not say what the misunderstanding was or how it arose. More importantly, he could not explain why he thought (as he claimed) that Chart 3 represented national health expenditure when Statement 2, which was approved by him, said it represented Government health expenditure.

106. The Committee do not understand how Mr Wong could have signed off on (and affirmed) the joint defence dated 28 August 1996 which said that there had been a "misunderstanding of the figures". He could not have honestly believed in that defence.

107. The Committee are of the view that Mr Wong was untruthful and prevaricated when questioned about Statement 2 and Chart 3 on 24 October 1996.

MR S KUNALEN

108. Mr Kunalen claimed not to have been involved in the preparation of the Written Submission. Mr Kunalen received a draft of the Written Submission from Dr Chee. Mr Kunalen chose not to verify it. He was involved in a two to three hour discussion of the draft Written Submission, but chose not to question its contents. As the head of the SDP research team, and as a representor, he was under a duty to acquaint himself with the Written Submission and satisfy himself that the contents of the Written Submission were accurate. He was also obliged to point out any errors to the Select Committee. He failed to discharge any of these duties. He did not draw the Select Committee's attention to the error in Chart 1 even though he was struck by the plunge to 5%.

109. The Committee consider that Mr Kunalen has been reckless in connection with the preparation and submission of the Written Submission. He never took the trouble to understand certain key figures in the Written Submission, as was apparent from his answers to the Committee. For example, he did not know what the figure 0.8% in Chart 3 stood for. Yet he felt able to sign off on the joint defence dated 28 August 1996 (which he affirmed) which stated that there was a misunderstanding of the figures in Chart 3.

110. Mr Kunalen prevaricated and misconducted himself as a witness in his evidence before the Select Committee by his evasive and impertinent answers. He refused to answer questions directly. Instead, he evaded a number of questions and made

rude and impertinent remarks. The Committee consider it wholly unacceptable for a representor to behave in such a manner.

111. Mr Kunalen said that he did not discuss the source materials for the Written Submission. This evidence is inconsistent with Dr Chee's claim, on 15 July 1996, that the Written Submission had been verified.

112. The Committee have found that the Written Submission was not verified. In the circumstances, the complaint against Mr Kunalen that he wilfully gave a false answer to the Select Committee on the issue of whether the Written Submission was verified has not been made out.

113. One of the complaints against Mr Kunalen is that he prevaricated when he said that Dr Chee had told him that "somebody had made a typographical error". The Committee have also found that Dr Chee lied to Mr Kunalen when Dr Chee told him that "somebody had made a typographical error". As such, the complaint against Mr Kunalen on this issue has also not been made out.

114. **In the result, the Committee find that Mr Kunalen:**

- (a) misconducted himself as a witness by allowing unverified and false data to be presented to the Select Committee;**
- (b) prevaricated and misconducted himself as a witness by his evasive and impertinent answers.**

MR KWAN YUE KENG

115. Mr Kwan claimed that his role in the research team was a minor one. The Committee have no reason to disbelieve him. But he had a copy of the Written Submission. He could have but did not verify the contents of the Written Submission.

116. As the Assistant Secretary General of the SDP and as a representor, Mr Kwan was duty bound to acquaint himself with what was being submitted to the Select Committee, to satisfy himself that the Written Submission was factually correct, and to bring any errors to the Select Committee's attention immediately. He failed to discharge any of these duties.

117. In fact, he thought the 5% figure odd. Yet he remained silent when the issue was raised on 15 July 1996. By his omissions, he has abetted the presentation of false and untrue documents, and the fabrication of data by SDP.

118. Mr Kwan accepted responsibility for the contents of the Written Submission. He agreed that had he been in charge of preparing the Written Submission, he would not have conducted himself in the way that Dr Chee had. He said that he felt, to a certain extent, let down by Dr Chee.

119. The Committee were inclined to be lenient to Mr Kwan because he was forthcoming and immediately accepted responsibility. However, an event has since

occurred which has caused the Committee to question Mr Kwan's motives. After the press reported that Mr Kwan had said he felt let down by Dr Chee, Mr Kwan issued an undated press statement to the effect that he has "complete faith in my research team under the leadership of Dr Chee Soon Juan". This was reported by the Lianhe Zaobao on 26 October 1996. He was in effect repudiating his sworn testimony before the Committee of Privileges. The press statement was obviously politically motivated.

120. In the result, the Committee find that Mr Kwan abetted the presentation of false and untrue documents and fabrication of data by Dr Chee and Mr Wong.

VIEWS OF THE COMMITTEE

121. It is an offence under the Parliament (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act ("the Act") to fabricate data with intent to deceive Parliament. It is also an offence for a witness to lie, prevaricate or misconduct himself when giving evidence to Parliament or any of its committees.

122. Penalties for contempt of Parliament are not designed to restrict or discourage the presentation of facts or the expression of honest opinions which advance or serve the public purpose. Indeed, the Committee consider it vital to reaffirm that every citizen of Singapore has the right to present his point of view to any Select Committee which is constituted by Parliament and which invites representations. This right, however, carries with it the corresponding obligation to be truthful in the presentation of one's case or view.

123. Any legislature which tolerates dishonesty will lose its moral authority in the eyes of the people. It will also be unable to function effectively and efficiently.

124. The Committee have to be astute to guard against any act which might cause the authority of Parliament to be undermined. The public interest dictates that the Committee take a serious view of any act or omission which brings Parliament or its processes into contempt.

THE RELATIVE CULPABILITY OF EACH OF THE REPRESENTORS

Dr Chee Soon Juan

125. The Committee are satisfied that of the four representors, Dr Chee was, by far, the most culpable. He prepared the Written Submission and the charts.

126. He was aware that:

- (1) a submission to and the giving of oral evidence before the Select Committee are serious matters;
- (2) the Written Submission and the evidence of the representors are matters of public interest;
- (3) the information and data in the Written Submission are matters of importance;
- (4) it is imperative to cite correct figures so as not to mislead;

- (5) a submission to the Select Committee should be based on sound and correct information;
- (6) he was duty bound to speak the truth before the Select Committee;
- (7) he had been invited to give evidence to the Select Committee to support the information and figures in the Written Submission.

127. Dr Chee disregarded these duties and obligations. He fabricated data and falsified documents with the sole purpose of misleading the Select Committee. When he was challenged on his figures, Dr Chee wilfully gave false answers on 15 July 1996, and committed perjury on 12 August 1996, to avoid his deception from being detected. He concocted the explanation that there had been a typographical error and a "misunderstanding of figures". Dr Chee continued to be untruthful on 24 October 1996.

128. Dr Chee persuaded his fellow representors to take positions which they could not have honestly believed to give credence to his contrived explanations. Dr Chee enlisted the assistance of Mr Wong to lie on 12 August 1996 and 24 October 1996 to cover up for him. He procured the signatures of Mr Wong, Mr Kunalen and Mr Kwan to a defence which they were unable to back up with any conviction when they gave evidence.

129. Dr Chee's attitude to the Select Committee and the Committee also calls for comment. He was impertinent to members of the Select Committee. On one occasion, he even accused one of its members of being disingenuous. He often disregarded the advice of the Chairman of the Select Committee to answer questions directly and to the point.

130. In the circumstances, the Committee recommend that of the four representors, Dr Chee be punished the most severely.

Mr Wong Hong Toy

131. Mr Wong was not involved in the preparation of the Written Submission and therefore did not fabricate data. Nevertheless, he willingly agreed, at Dr Chee's request, to lie upon affirmation. It is apparent to the Committee that Mr Wong did not fully understand the Written Submission. Yet, he claimed to have been involved in the calculation of the 25.4%, and put his name to a defence (which he affirmed on oath) which said that the 5% was a typographical error and that Statement 2 and Chart 3 resulted from a misunderstanding of the figures.

132. Mr Wong also prevaricated and misconducted himself as a witness. He lied when he said he could not follow the proceedings in English when the evidence overwhelmingly suggests that he could.

133. The Committee have taken two other factors into consideration in recommending the penalty for Mr Wong: firstly, that Mr Wong made an entirely unsubstantiated and frivolous allegation that the Select Committee hearing on 12 August 1996 was illegal and that he had been interrogated; secondly, that this is not the first time that Mr Wong has been referred to the Committee of Privileges. He appeared before the Committee on 13 April 1987 over a complaint against the Editor, Publisher and Printer of "The Hammer". As a consequence of that complaint,

Parliament imposed a fine of \$5,000 on the Publisher of "The Hammer", which was the Workers' Party Executive Council, and Mr Wong was then the Chairman of the Workers' Party Executive Council.

Mr S Kunalen

134. Like Mr Wong, Mr Kunalen was not involved in the preparation of the Written Submission and therefore did not fabricate data to mislead the Select Committee. However, like Mr Wong, he signed off on a joint defence (which he affirmed) which he had no personal knowledge of, and therefore did not believe.

135. He could have prevented the presentation of false data to the Select Committee. As head of the research team, he should have verified the information, especially when he was struck by the plunge to 5% in Chart 1. He did not do anything to satisfy himself that the Written Submission and the charts were factually correct. By his omissions, he has abetted Dr Chee in the presentation of fabricated data and false charts.

Mr Kwan Yue Keng

136. Mr Kwan appeared to have had the smallest role in the affair. He was not involved in the preparation of the Written Submission. However, like Mr Wong and Mr Kunalen, he testified upon affirmation that the 5% was a typographical error and that there had been a misunderstanding of the figure in Statement 2 and Chart 3. He could not have known that. He should have been more vigilant, especially since he thought the 5% plunge odd and surprising.

137. His omission to verify the information enabled Dr Chee to present false documents to the Select Committee.

138. The Committee were inclined to be lenient to Mr Kwan in view of his forthright and candid answers to the Select Committee and the Committee. However, he has since sought to distance himself from some portions of his evidence to the Committee which he perceives as being adverse to Dr Chee's political interests. In this, Mr Kwan has been motivated by a collateral purpose. The Committee have decided to record its disapproval of such conduct.

RECOMMENDATIONS

139. **In the circumstances, the Committee recommend that:**

- (1) Parliament impose on Dr Chee Soon Juan a fine of \$25,000;**
- (2) Parliament impose on Mr Wong Hong Toy a fine of \$13,000;**
- (3) Parliament impose on Mr S Kunalen a fine of \$8,000; and**
- (4) Parliament impose on Mr Kwan Yue Keng a fine of \$5,000.**



**MINISTER FOR HEALTH
SINGAPORE**

27 August 1996

Mr Tan Soo Khoon
Speaker
Parliament

**COMPLAINT AGAINST REPRESENTORS FROM THE
SINGAPORE DEMOCRATIC PARTY:**

1. MR S KUNALEN
2. MR WONG HONG TOY
3. MR KWAN YUE KENG
4. DR CHEE SOON JUAN

As indicated by me on 12 August 1996 at the hearing of the Select Committee or Verification of Health Care Subsidy of Government Polyclinics and Public Hospitals (*hereafter "the Committee"*) I now set out my written complaint against the abovenamed persons pursuant to Standing Order 96 (7) (c).

MEMORANDUM OF COMPLAINT

2. My complaint against Mr S Kunalen, Mr Wong Hong Toy, Mr Kwan Yue Keng and Dr Chee Soon Juan is that they had acted in contempt of Parliament by fabricating data and presenting false and/or untrue documents with intent to deceive the Committee. In giving evidence before the Committee to cover up the false and/or untrue documents which they had submitted, members of the SDP team committed further contempts by

- (a) committing perjury;
- (b) wilfully giving false answers;
- (c) prevaricating; and
- (d) misconducting themselves.

3. The evidence in support of my complaint against the abovenamed 4 persons is found in the following:

- (a) "Written Submission" by the Singapore Democratic Party dated 12 April 1996 (see *Appendix 1*).
- (b) Proceedings of the Committee at its sitting on 15 July 1996 (see *Appendix 2*: paras 136 - 566).
- (c) Letter dated 1 August 1996 from Dr Chee Soon Juan, Secretary-General, Singapore Democratic Party to the Chairman of the Committee (see *Appendix 3*).
- (d) Proceedings of the Committee at its sitting on 12 August 1996 (see *Appendix 4*: paras 1037 - 1703).

4. The abovenamed 4 persons from the Singapore Democratic Party appeared as representors before the Committee in their following capacities:

- (a) Mr S Kunalen : Head, Research and Planning
- (b) Mr Wong Hong Toy : Vice-Chairman
- (c) Mr Kwan Yue Keng : Assistant Secretary-General
- (d) Dr Chee Soon Juan : Secretary-General

5. The Committee had three terms of reference. One of them was as follows:

"(iii) To verify the figures and statements given

- (1) in the article "The Truth About Health Care Costs", published in the New Democrat 1996 Issue No. 1, and
- (2) in Mr Ling How Doong's speech in Parliament on 11 March 1996, substantiating the SDP's claim that "health care costs are hardly subsidised at all".

6. The Singapore Democratic Party in its "Written Submission" at page 1 made the following statements:

Statement 1

" Between 1970 and 1990, the Government's share of total health expenditure fell from **40% to 5%** with the sharpest drop within the last 10 years (see Chart 1)."

Statement 2

" In addition, the amount of Government spending on health care as a percentage of GDP has been falling to the present level of less than 1%. This compares to 7% for Japan, 13% for the US and an average of 9% for the OECD countries (see Chart 3)."

7. The 4 representors stated categorically at the Committee hearing on 12 August 1996 that as members of the SDP research team, they took responsibility for the "Written Submission". They admitted having discussed the "Written Submission" before the same

was forwarded to this Committee. In addition, Mr Wong Hong Toy and Dr Chee Soon Juan separately testified that they had both calculated the figures for Chart 1.

Statements of Mr S Kunalen

8. He was involved in the discussion of the "Written Submission" prior to submission: paras 1045 - 1058; 1156; 1165 - 1171;

9. He acknowledged responsibility for the "Written Submission": paras 1199 - 1207;

Perjury/Misconduct as a witness

10. Mr S Kunalen knew that the "Written Submission" was a serious document as he asserted that he took care to advise and explain to members of his team the legal consequences that would follow from the contents of "the Written Submission" and the effect of the Sivadas case [para 1199]. He was thus aware of the need to ensure that documents presented to Parliament must not contain any material that is not true. As such, he would have either checked the figures used for the "Written Submission" himself or asked the other members to do it. As the Head of the SDP Research team, he would have verified what he acknowledged as a key statistic, a key point in Chart 1 showing that Government health care expenditure has plunged [para 1091]. But he claimed otherwise. In any event, he miscondacted himself as a witness by allowing unverified and false data to be presented to the Committee.

Prevarication and perjury

11. He also prevaricated in his evidence before the Committee in saying that the team had discussed the 'contents' of "the Written Submission" but that did not include the source materials in support of their submission [paras 1157 - 1160; 1111]. This prevarication when considered in the light of Dr Chee Soon Juan's statement on the matter at the sitting on 15 July 1996:

"Q: ... Has the SDP panel members independently verified the accuracy of the data contained in Chart 1?

A: As far as we can, we have. I think that is a straightforward answer, Mr Chairman." [para 202 and also paras 186 - 201]

also amounts to Mr S Kunalen wilfully giving a false answer to the Committee on a material issue.

Prevarication

12. Mr S Kunalen's evidence that Dr Chee Soon Juan had told him that "somebody had made a typographical error" [para 1131] is contradicted by Dr Chee Soon Juan's claim that he had himself made the typing error. [para 1502]

Prevarication and misconduct as a witness

13. Further he also prevaricated and miscondacted himself as a witness in his evidence before the Committee by his evasive and impertinent answers. [paras 1103 - 1105; and 1219 -1234].

Statements of Mr Wong Hong Toy

14. He was directly involved with Dr Chee Soon Juan and worked with him in making the calculation: para 1262.

15. He participated in the discussion of the "Written Submission" prior to submission: para 1294.

16. He also acknowledged responsibility for the "Written Submission" when he passed the same: para 1321.

Perjury

17. Mr Wong Hong Toy's evidence contradicted Dr Chee Soon Juan in many respects. He played an extensive role in the preparation of the "Written Submission". He lied when he confirmed to the Committee that the error in Statement 1 and Chart 1 was a "typographical" error and that both he and Dr Chee Soon Juan had done the calculation in March/April 1996.

18. The following extracts from the record of proceedings show that Mr Wong Hong Toy and Dr Chee Soon Juan had contradicted each other on who made the calculation and when the calculations were made, if at all.

I Mr Wong Hong Toy's evidence:

"Q: Which calculation did you make in Chart 1?

A: The figures prior to 1989 were available from a magazine known as the *Asian Survey*. But the figures after 1989 were not available. Therefore, I helped to make some calculation for 1990.

Q: Mr Wong, were you the one who made the calculation for 1990 then?

A: Yes. I did make some calculation.

Q: What was the figure that you obtained?

A: The figure I obtained was 25%.

Q: When did you do this calculation, Mr Wong?

A: When we were preparing this submission.

Q: That would have been in March or April this year?

A: Yes.

Q: Who were the others who helped you in the calculation?

A: It included Chee Soon Juan and a few others whom I do not think it would be necessary for me to name.

Q: Mr Chairman, can Mr Wong name the people that he can now remember?

A: The person who was most directly involved was Chee Soon Juan because *I worked with him in making this calculation.* (emphasis added)"
[paras 1250 - 1262)

II Dr Chee Soon Juan's evidence:

"Q: Can you explain to us how the figure of 25% was obtained?

A: From the Yearbook of Statistics 1990.

Q: Who did the calculation?

A: I did.

Q: You did the calculation?

A: Yes, I did."

[paras 1455-1457]

Q: In other words, in your mind the figure was 25%, but somehow when you were typing the figure which came out was 5%?

A: I see what Mr Yeo is trying to get at right now. Let me put it in perspective. This piece of research was done a couple of years ago and the typographical error occurred during that time in *Dare to Change*." [para 1504]

19. Mr Wong Hong Toy could not have done the calculations because he could not understand the proper methodology or the statistical implications of using different base lines in the calculations [para 1270 -1287].

Prevarication

20. Mr Wong Hong Toy initially claimed that he had taken a glance at Chart 1 when the draft report was circulated for discussion. On being questioned why he did not notice that the graph had looked very different from what would have been the case if the correct 25% figure as had been calculated by him were plotted on the chart, Mr Wong Hong Toy prevaricated and said that he did not notice it as he just did not look at it (paras 1295 - 1297).

Misconduct as a witness

21. If Mr Wong Hong Toy's claim that he had made the calculations of 25.4% together with Mr Chee Soon Juan and others [paras 1255 and 1256] is true, then he miscondacted himself as a witness before this Committee as follows:

- (a) by not informing the Committee on 15 July 1996 that the correct figure for 1990 was 25.4% and not 5% when he was afforded every opportunity to do so, and further,
- (b) by giving a false excuse for not doing so by claiming that he could not follow the proceedings in English.

22. The record of proceedings shows that Mr Wong Hong Toy understood the proceedings in English without any difficulty as he sat through most of the proceedings on 12 August 1996 without the need for an interpreter. He was not only capable of correcting the English translation of his evidence by the Mandarin interpreter during the hearing, but could also understand the contents of the article by M Ramesh in Asian Survey. At the hearing on 15 July 1996, the Chairman had specifically reminded him and the other representors as follows:

"Chairman:

Can I use these few moments to add that the other members of SDP research team are not precluded from stating their views in response to any of the questions. For the benefit of Mr Wong, we have arranged an interpreter. If you want to express your views, please let me know?

Wong Hong Toy:

Thank you." [para 368]

Statements of Mr Kwan Yue Keng

23. He was aware of the contents of the "Written Submission": paras 1395 - 1398.

24. He also assumed responsibility for the "Written Submission": paras 1428 -1430;1432.

Misconduct as a witness and abetment of false evidence

25. Mr Kwan Yue Keng claimed that his role in the research team was a minor one. However as he readily accepted responsibility for the contents of "the Written Submission", his role was not as minimal as claimed by him. He doubted the accuracy of the figure of 5% which appeared in the book "Dare to Change" and in the SDP's draft submission. But at no time did he raise his doubts with his research team or to the Committee [para 1399-1401; para 368]. He thereby abetted the presentation of false/untrue documents and fabrication of data by his team.

Statements of Dr Chee Soon Juan

26. He did the calculation and prepared the "Written Submission": paras 1456 - 1457; 1501 - 1503; 1618.

27. He participated in the discussion of the "Written Submission" prior to submission: paras 1682 - 1687.

Perjury

28. Dr Chee Soon Juan masterminded the whole exercise. He claimed that as regards **Statement 1** and **Chart 1** the figure 5% was a "typographical error" which had occurred two years ago when he wrote his book "Dare to Change". The figures for Chart 1 were allegedly from an Article by M Ramesh in a journal called Asian Survey and he not only used these figures but also used the same methodology to calculate the figure for 1990. He reached a figure of 25.4% for 1990, which became 5% due to a "typographical error". His evidence was false for the following reasons:

- (a) He would have realised the error in the methodology used by M Ramesh if he had gone to the original sources cited in the Article;
- (b) He would not have replicated the error in the methodology by Mr Ramesh;
- (c) He would have discovered the typographical error during the various stages of proof reading for his book "Dare to Change";

- (d) He would have discovered the "typographical error", at the latest, during the three hour discussion by the SDP research panel members before the "Written Submission" was submitted to the. Select Committee;
- (e) If, as he claimed he had calculated and obtained the figure of 25.4% for 1990 in Chart 1, he would have known all along that the "correct" figure was 25.4% and not 5%. However, at no time during the hearing on 15 July 1996 did he correct the error when he was extensively questioned on Chart 1 and the plunging figure of 5% was brought to his attention.

29. His explanation of how the typographical error occurred shows that he had presented to the Committee false documents with intent to deceive [para 1503 - 1519].

Prevarication and perjury

30. He prevaricated in his answers to the Committee. Mr Wong Hong Toy had admitted that Dr Chee Soon Juan prepared the Charts [para 1322 - 1326]. Dr Chee Soon Juan on the other hand denied preparing the graph in his book and claimed that he could not remember who prepared it [para 1519 - 1533]. He also denied that he prepared the chart in "the Written Submission" [para 1626]. This shows that he wilfully gave false answers to questions put by the Committee.

31. Dr Chee Soon Juan also lied and prevaricated at the hearing on 12 August 1996 in connection with the question whether he had in his possession a copy of the article by M Ramesh during the hearing on 15 July 1996. His initial statement was, "it was in one of the stacks of my files". He gestured with his left hand to indicate that the stacks of files had been beside him during the hearing [videotape of hearing]. When asked why he had not produced the article then and there, he said that the article was in a stack of files at home [Paras 1654 - 1661].

Wilfully giving false answer

32. Dr Chee Soon Juan wilfully gave a false answer that the SDP panel members had independently verified the accuracy of the data in Chart 1 as far as they could. Had they done so, the alleged "typographical error" would not have arisen. It is clear that none of the SDP panel members including Dr Chee had verified nor checked the accuracy of the data in Chart 1 prior to its submission to the Committee.

Prevarication and presenting false/untrue documents

Statement 1 and Chart 1

33. The excuse of a typographical error made two years ago having been carried forward to the "Written Submission" of 12 April 1996 defies logic and credence.

34. The 4 representors had clearly committed contempt of Parliament when they were responsible for the fabricated data presented to this Committee to mislead and deceive the members of this Committee. The significant contradictions between the individual representors confirm that the errors were not mere typographical errors but a

brazen misrepresentation to the Committee of data which was crucial to the issue of health care subsidy.

Statement 2 and Chart 3

35. At the hearing of the Committee on 15 July 1996, it was established that **Statement 2** and **Chart 3** in the "Written Submission" were untrue. Dr Chee Soon Juan on behalf of the research team had asserted that the information on national health expenditure as a % of GDP of the following, namely, Japan, OECD and USA which formed the basis of their statement and their Chart 3, was taken from the "White Paper on Affordable Health Care". However, the figure for Singapore was taken from another source which had a different basis. By deliberately combining all the figures into one Chart and making them appear to be on the same basis, **Statement 2** and **Chart 3** were therefore false. The "Written Submission" made a selective use of data from the "White Paper on Affordable Health Care". When challenged to support **Statement 2** and **Chart 3**, Dr Chee Soon Juan deliberately and wilfully prevaricated in his testimony before this Committee: paras 266 - 306; 313 - 342.

36. In the circumstances, I am duty bound to make this complaint against all 4 representors, who have taken responsibility for the contents of the "Written Submission", for serious contempts of Parliament.

BG GEORGE YONG-BOON YEO.



From: Singapore Democratic Party
1 Magazine Road #05-22
Central Building
Singapore 059567

Dated: 3 September 1996

Received: 4 September 1996

COMPLAINT AGAINST REPRESENTORS FROM THE
SINGAPORE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

In response to the Minister's complaints, we wish to state that we had made the SDP's representation in good faith and had no intention of deceiving anyone. It was unfortunate that a typing error was made. Nonetheless, it was a genuine error which was brought to the attention of the Select Committee before the 12 August hearing.

As for the Statement 2 and Chart 3, there was a misunderstanding of the figures and there was no intention of deceiving anyone. We, therefore, deny all the allegations made by the Minister for Health in his letter of complaint dated 27 August 1996 (please refer to the letters of response).

CHEF SOON JUAN
Secretary-General

WONG HONG TOY
Vice-Chairman

KWAN YUE KENG
Asst. Secretary-General

S KUNALEN
Head, Research and Planning

From: Mr S Kunalen
Head, Research and Planning
Singapore Democratic Party

Dated: 30 August 1996

Received: 4 September 1996

**COMPLAINT AGAINST REPRESENTORS FROM THE
SINGAPORE DEMOCRATIC PARTY**

I refer to your letter of the 28th August 1996 and the following is my response to the complaint by the Minister for Health, BG George Yeo.

Firstly, I wish to put on record that I categorically deny the allegations made by the Minister in his complaint dated 27th August 1996 to the Speaker. In justifying my denial of the allegations I would direct the Committee of Privileges attention to paragraphs 1037 to 1238 of the minutes of evidence wherein I was questioned extensively by the members of the Select Committee.

In respect of the allegation made at paragraph 11, page 4 of the Minister's complaint under the heading, 'Prevarication and perjury' it is alleged that I 'wilfully' gave a false statement to the Committee on a material issue. I wish to add here that at no time during the proceedings on the 12th August 1996 when I was questioned by the Committee was Dr Chee Soon Juan's statement referred to in the complaint put to me. Now that it has been put to me, I have the following response. I did not personally verify the accuracy of the data contained in chart 1.

On the allegation under the heading, 'Prevarication' at paragraph 12 on page 4 of the Ministers' complaint I wish to respond to that namely that my answer is as per what I gave which is — Dr Chee Soon Juan had told me that 'somebody had made a typographical error'. I want to add further here that his answer was merely a response to my question to him in respect of whether Dr Chee had responded to the request by the Clerk of Parliament to send a copy of the article. I had at no time asked Dr Chee as to whether he had typed out the representation to the Select Committee.

In conclusion I wish to add that I had answered all the questions put to me to the best of my abilities and would want to quote part of my answer to Dr Aline Wong at paragraph 1236 of the minutes of evidence 'I am here to answer a question and I will answer it to the best of my abilities. And the answer is I went by the chart and the text [which] was consistent with the chart that there was a drop.' At no time was there any information before me to put me on notice that any figures in the charts accompanying our representation was false.

S. KUNALEN

From: Mr Wong Hong Toy
Vice-Chairman
Singapore Democratic Party
c/o Block 423, Jurong West Avenue 1 #07-200
Singapore 540423

Dated: 4 September 1996

Received: 4 September 1996

COMPLAINT AGAINST REPRESENTORS FROM THE SDP

I deny all the allegations made by Mr George Yeo in his complaint dated 27 August 1996.

Perjury: Para 17 - 19

In respect of the charge at para 17 of Mr Yeo's letter which he accused me of lying, I wish to state that what I said at the hearing of 12 August was the truth and not contradictory to Dr Chee Soon Juan's statements.

When I said: "I worked with him (Dr Chee) in making this calculation", I meant that I worked out the calculation myself and later gave it to Dr Chee. This was clearly what I said at the hearing on 12 August in paras 1289 to 1291 of the Minutes of Evidence.

In respect of the complaint that I could not have done the calculations as stated in para 19, I wish to refer to para 1335 of the Minutes of Evidence where the complainant himself acknowledged that I had done the calculations.

Prevarication: Para 20

In respect of the charge in para 20, I wish to state that I had glanced at Chart 1 but did not look into it. This was exactly what I said: "So when the Chart was shown to me, I just took a glance and I passed it without looking deep into it." (para 1295 of the Minutes of Evidence).

Misconduct as a witness: Para 21 - 22

In respect of Mr Yeo's charge at para 21, I wish to state that I had already explained at the 12 August hearing in para 1335 of the Minutes of Evidence that the proceeding was conducted in English and I could not fully understand everything.

In respect of the charge at para 22, I have already given my explanation in para 1337 of the Minutes of Evidence. When questions are put to me, then I require an interpreter to make sure that I understand fully what was being said to me. Reading an English article is very different from listening to English because I can take my time when reading English whereas when listening, the proceeding may go very fast and I cannot fully follow everything.

That is all I wish to say.

WONG HONG TOY

From: Mr Kwan Yue Keng
Assistant Secretary-General
Singapore Democratic Party
c/o No 1 Youngberg Terrace #07-14
Avon Park
Singapore 357741

Dated: 4 September 1996

Received: 4 September 1996

**COMPLAINT AGAINST REPRESENTORS FROM THE
SINGAPORE DEMOCRATIC PARTY**

I deny all the allegations made by Minister Yeo in his letter of complaint dated 27 August 1996.

As a member representing the Singapore Democratic Party to the Select Committee, I am honour bound to accept responsibility for its contents, even though my involvement in the preparation of the written submission was minor.

Regarding his allegation that "at no time did he raise his doubts with his research team or to the Committee", I have already stated to the Committee the reason as to why I did not raise my doubts — see Para 1405 and 1406; and further in Para 1437, 1438 and 1439. As I have stated, since my involvement was minor, I did not go into the details in the written submission and therefore could not have abetted the alleged presentation of false evidence.

KWAN YUE KENG

From: Dr Chee Soon Juan
Secretary-General
Singapore Democratic Party

Dated: 2 September 1996

Received: 4 September 1996

COMPLAINT AGAINST REPRESENTORS FROM THE
SINGAPORE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

In response to the complaint dated 27 August 1996 made by the Minister for Health against me, I categorically deny all the allegations.

Complaint of perjury

I deny the allegation that I had presented false documents to the Select Committee with the intent to deceive. As I said during the hearing on 12 August 1996 (paras 1451 to 1697 of the Minutes of Evidence), there was a typographical error in the SDP's written submission. This error had originally occurred in *Dare To Change* and was carried over to the present submission. I had informed the Select Committee of the error prior to the 12 August hearing and had requested to re-appear before the Committee to explain the matter. A genuine human error was made which was not noticed for a period of time.

Complaint of prevarification [sic.] and perjury

I deny the allegation that I had prevaricated in my answers to the Select Committee. As I stated, I was not the one who prepared the charts (para 1520).

I deny the allegation that I had lied and prevaricated to the Committee that I had the article by M Ramesh but said that I did not. I had told the Select Committee on the 15 July hearing that I did not have the article with me and would send it to the Committee.

On 12 August, I was asked whether I had the said article in my possession to which I said yes because I did have the article in my possession. But I told the Committee that I had the article in my possession thinking that it was clear to the members that I had told them on 15 July that I did not physically have it with me at that particular hearing. The stack of files I was referring to was at home and not at the 15 July hearing (paras 1654 to 1660).

Wilfully giving false answer

I deny that I wilfully gave a false answer. I had given copies of the draft of the written submission to members of the panel for independent verification of the contents. When no one brought to my attention the error, I assumed that everything was in order and that, as far as we could, we had verified the accuracy of the contents including Chart 1.

CHEE SOON JUAN

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

| <i>Representors</i> | <i>Pages</i> | <i>Columns</i> |
|--|--------------|----------------|
| <i>Representing the Singapore Democratic Party:</i> | | |
| Dr Chee Soon Juan, Secretary-General | C 1-108 | 1-216 |
| Mr Wong Hong Toy, Vice-Chairman | C 109-141 | 217-282 |
| Mr Kwan Yue Keng, Assistant Secretary-General | C 142-155 | 283-310 |
| Mr S. Kunalen, Head, Research and Planning Department | C 156-176 | 311-352 |

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

THURSDAY, 24TH OCTOBER 1996

9.00 a.m.

PRESENT:

Mr Speaker (*in the Chair*)

| | | |
|--------------------------|---|--------------------|
| Mr Abdullah Tarmugi | : | Mr Low Thia Kiang |
| Mr Davinder Singh | : | RAdm Teo Chee Hean |
| Assoc. Prof. Ho Peng Kee | : | Mr Wong Kan Seng |
| Prof. S. Jayakumar | | |

1

24 OCTOBER 1996

2

Chairman] The Committee of Privileges is meeting today to consider the memorandum of complaint dated 27th August 1996 by the Minister for Health, BG George Yong-Boon Yeo, against four representors from the Singapore Democratic Party, namely, Mr S Kunalen, Mr Wong Hong Toy, Mr Kwan Yue Keng and Dr Chee Soon Juan, alleging contempt of Parliament by the aforesaid four persons. On 28th August 1996, a copy of the complaint was sent to each of the representors for their responses by 4th September 1996. The representors, jointly as well as individually, responded on 3rd September 1996. At its meeting on 8th October 1996, the Committee decided to hear oral evidence from the four of them. This morning, we have decided that the witnesses are to be examined individually. We will now call in the first witness, Dr Chee Soon Juan. Serjeant-at Arms.

Examination of Witness

Dr Chee Soon Juan, Secretary-General, Singapore Democratic Party, was called in and examined under oath.

Chairman

1. Good morning. For the record, could you please state your name, address and the position you hold in your organisation? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) My name is Chee Soon Juan. Address is 87 Jalan Pergam, Singapore 488363. I am the Secretary-General of the Singapore Democratic Party.

Chairman] Dr Chee, the Committee of Privileges is looking into the complaint made by the Minister for Health, BG George Yeo, for contempt of Parliament against the four representors from the Singapore Democratic Party, namely, Mr Kunalen, Mr Wong Hong Toy, Mr Kwan Yue Keng and yourself. Dr Chee, the evidence which you give today will be taken on oath. If you so

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

3

24 OCTOBER 1996

4

Chairman (cont.)

desire, you can make an affirmation. I will now ask the Clerk to the Committee to administer the oath. [*Dr Chee Soon Juan made an affirmation.*] All right. We will commence with the examination. We will start first with Mr Wong Kan Seng.

9.15 am

Mr Wong Kan Seng

2. Dr Chee, in response to the complaint by Minister George Yeo, you wrote to the Speaker giving your response to the complaint in your letter dated 2nd September. There is a copy of that letter in the folder there. Can you please read that letter that you wrote to the Speaker? Read the whole letter? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) This letter that I had written?

3. Yes. The letter you had written on 2nd September? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*)

"Dear Sir,

In response to the Minister's complaints, we wish to state that we had made the SDP's representation in good faith and had no intention of deceiving anyone. It was unfortunate that a typing error was made. Nonetheless, it was a genuine error which was brought to the attention of the Select Committee before the 12th August hearing.

As for the Statement 2 and Chart 3, there was a misunderstanding of the figures and there was no intention of deceiving anyone. We, therefore, deny all the allegations made by the Minister for Health in his letter of complaint dated 27 August 1996."

4. This is the letter that you wrote jointly. But you have also written a letter yourself, the letter dated 2nd September? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That is correct.

5. Can you please read the letter too? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*)

"In response to the complaint dated 27 August 1996 made by the Minister for Health against me, I categorically deny all the allegations.

Complaint of perjury

I deny the allegation that I had presented false documents to the Select Committee with the intent to deceive. As I said during the hearing on 12 August 1996 ... there was a typographical error in the SDP's written submission. This error had originally occurred in *Dare To Change* and was carried over to the present submission. I had informed the Select Committee of the error prior to the 12 August hearing and had requested to re-appear before the Committee to explain the matter. A genuine human error was made which was not noticed for a period of time.

Complaint of prevarification [sic.] and perjury

I deny the allegation that I had prevaricated in my answers to the Select Committee. As I stated, I was not the one who prepared the charts.

I deny the allegation that I had lied and prevaricated to the Committee that I had the article by M Ramesh but said that I did not. I had told the Select Committee on the 15 July hearing that I did not have the article with me and would send it to the Committee. On 12 August, I was asked whether I had the said article in my possession to which I said yes because I did have the article in my possession. But I told the Committee that I had the article in my possession thinking that it was clear to the members that I had told them on 15 July that I did not physically have it with me at that particular hearing. The stack of files I was referring to was at home and not at the 15 July hearing.

Wilfully giving false answer

I deny that I wilfully gave a false answer. I had given copies of the draft of the written submission to members of the panel for independent verification of the contents. When no one brought to my attention the error, I assumed that everything was in order and that, as far as we could, we had verified the accuracy of the contents including Chart I."

6. These two letters that you have just read, under oath means that they are taken just as seriously as the evidence that we are now trying to take from you.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

5

24 OCTOBER 1996

6

You have a PhD? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I am sorry.

7. You have a PhD. Can you please listen to the question carefully? Do not ask us to repeat the question. Do you have a PhD? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes, I do.

8. Where did you get the PhD? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) University of Georgia.

9. It is quite a remarkable thing to get a PhD? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Thank you.

10. Do you have to do a viva voce examination, an oral examination? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Oral examination is the term that is used in the United States.

11. No examination? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Oral examination.

12. Oral examination. You have to do an oral examination? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) As well as written examination.

13. So after preparing your. PhD thesis you appeared before an oral examiner? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

14. And therefore you have to answer the questions arising from your research? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Most certainly.

15. It requires a good memory to answer all those questions from the oral examiner, would it not? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Not exactly. You cannot remember your entire dissertation that you have written, especially if it runs into a couple of hundred pages.

16. But it does require good memory in order to do that? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I think it requires a good understanding, appreciation of your research line and the study that you have done.

17. So a lot of very careful research work has gone into your PhD? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I would say so. Yes.

18. Very detailed work? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) We try to actually put in as much effort as we can.

19. And in your research work, you also have to draw charts and graphs, and put up tables before you come to certain conclusions? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

20. And these charts, figures and tables were all very accurate, I presume? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) As accurate as they can be.

21. But you have to ensure that they are accurate before you present to the examiners? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) As much as possible, yes.

22. You have also published many articles, many research publications? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) A couple that were published in international journals, yes.

23. When you were at the University of Singapore or NUS, you had also written a number of publications? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) A couple, I think, were published.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

7

24 OCTOBER 1996

8

Mr Wong Kan Seng (cont.)

24. These also contained charts and figures? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

25. And you also made sure that you have the charts presented as accurately as possible? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) As accurately as possible.

26. You are always very serious with your research work? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I take it very seriously.

27. Always very careful to ensure that the publication is accurate? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I try to as much as I can.

Mr Davinder Singh

28. Dr Chee, good morning? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Good morning.

29. I intend to ask you a series of questions which I hope are common ground between us. Would you accept that a submission to the Select Committee is a serious matter? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Very serious.

30. Would you accept that giving oral evidence to a Select Committee is a very serious matter? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Just as serious.

31. Would you accept that the submission that the SDP put up and the evidence that your panel of members gave was and remains a matter of public interest?—(*Dr Chee Soon Juan*)Very much so.

32. And would you also accept that the information including the data in your submission are matters of importance? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) We would not have submitted it or brought it up, if it were not.

33. The answer is yes? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes it is.

34. And you would have expected, would you not, that when you put up that submission that it must withstand close scrutiny? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

35. It must withstand analysis? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

36. And you were aware, were you not, that it is imperative that you needed to put up correct figures so as not to mislead anybody? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

37. And indeed you were aware that one has to be very careful in the presentation of figures because, as you said in your evidence to the Select Committee, percentages can be very misleading? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Correct.

38. Is there any difficulty on your part in understanding the meaning of the word "accurate"? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No.

39. Is there any difficulty on your part in understanding the meaning of the word "verify"? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No.

40. Would you accept that verification means an investigation to confirm that it is correct and true? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

9

24 OCTOBER 1996

10

41. You would have wanted when you made the submission and appeared to give evidence to ensure that your submission was based on sound and correct information? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That is correct.

42. And you would also agree that whether or not you were on oath, you were duty bound to speak the truth? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Certainly.

43. And you were duty bound to answer whatever questions that were put to you directly and to the point? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

44. Do you say that that is what you did on 15th July 1996 and 12th August 1996? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) To the best of my ability, yes.

45. Do you say that you answered the questions directly and to the point, Dr Chee? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

46. Thank you. I believe that when you appeared at the hearing on 15th July 1996, you took the position that the SDP stood by the figures presented to the Select Committee? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I beg your pardon. Can you repeat that question?

47. When you appeared before the Select Committee on 15th July 1996, you took the position that you stood by the figures that you presented? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

48. And indeed, one of the purposes for you putting up the written submission and appearing to give evidence was to get

to the bottom of the figures? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Surely.

49. In other words, you wanted to determine which figures were accurate? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) We wanted to determine, as laid out in the terms of reference, what was the whole situation behind health care subsidy in Singapore.

50. My question was, you wanted to determine which figures were accurate. That is a simple question and it either calls for a yes or a no, and I would ask for that? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Which figures are you talking about?

51. The figures presented by you, on the one hand, and the figures presented by the Government, on the other? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right up to the Select Committee, the Select Committee we were there to have this hearing and have figures presented and then to look at it.

52. Dr Chee, I prefaced my question by saying that on 15th July, that is what you wanted to do? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

53. I am not interested in the period before 15th July? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That is exactly what I am talking about, the hearing of 15th July.

54. Would you agree with me that on 15th July, you wanted to get to the bottom of the figures? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

11

24 OCTOBER 1996

12

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

55. And that means you wanted to ascertain which of the figures that have been presented on the one hand by you and on the other by the Government were accurate? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right.

56. Thank you. And you were aware, were you not, that when you were invited to give oral evidence one of the reasons for the invitation was for you to support the information and the figures contained in your written submission? You have to speak up because the record does not pick up the knot? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Correct.

57. Mr Wong has asked you some questions about your qualifications and your background. You have written two books, as I understand it? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

58. One, *Dare To Change*, and the other *My Home Too*? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) *Singapore, My Home Too*.

59. Thank you. And in those two books, you dealt with the question of health care? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

60. It follows, does it not, that you know the distinction between these two terms, the first term being Government health expenditure, and the second being total health expenditure? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right. Yes.

61. And it would be fair to assume that you knew the distinction between these two terms before you put up the

written submission, I think, in April of 1996? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

62. Could you tell me what your understanding is of Government health expenditure? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) What the Government spends on health care in Singapore.

63. And that would mean what the Government spends from its budget allocation for health care? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right.

64. Thank you. And would you tell us what your understanding is of total health expenditure? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) As a national health expenditure.

65. Which means Government plus private? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right.

66. Thank you. You were also aware that the amount budgeted by the Government on a yearly basis for health care is subject to debate in the Committee of Supply? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Could you repeat that question?

67. You were also aware that the amount budgeted by the Government every year for health care is debated in the Committee of Supply? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right.

68. You have read out your defence, the Joint defence that you have in the bundle with the blue spine. I am intrigued by the words "misunderstood the figures". Could you tell us what you meant? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Which letter are you referring to?

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

13

24 OCTOBER 1996

14

9.30 am

Mr Wong Kan Seng] The joint response of 3rd September. It is the first letter that you read out.

Mr Davinder Singh] The shorter letter signed by the four representors. The second paragraph uses the words, "a misunderstanding of the figures".

Mr Wong Kan Seng

69. Look at flip 3? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right. I have got it here.

Mr Davinder Singh

70. You have got it. Look at the second paragraph, please? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

71. My question is: could you explain what those words mean? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) If I may bring the Committee back to the second hearing that we had, during that time we had discovered that we made an error in as far as the typographical error was concerned. And when we did that, we brought to the attention of the Select Committee, and it was then that it was cleared up that the 25% was mistyped as 5%.

72. Is that second paragraph a reference to the typographical error that you just spoke of? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Let me refer back to —

73. Could you please answer that question before you go on? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, let me just refer to Statement 2 and Chart 3.

Chairman] Could you answer that question? A question has been put by a Member.

Mr Davinder Singh

74. You heard the question. Did you hear the question? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Could you repeat the question, please?

75. Is the reference in the second paragraph to "a misunderstanding of the figures" a reference to the typographical error that you just spoke of? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

76. It is. How can the typographical error be relevant when the second paragraph talks about Statement 2 and Chart 3? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That is why I wanted to refer back to the statement before that, Mr Chairman, before I actually answer Mr Davinder Singh.

77. Dr Chee, before we do that, I would like to ask you to explain how is it that the typographical error that you just spoke of relates to Statement 2 and Chart 3? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That is why I wanted to refer back to it, Mr Chairman.

78. Without referring back, you were quite ready to tell us that that misunderstanding referred to the typographical. Having told us that, I would like to know how is it that that typographical refers to Statement 2 and Chart 3. It is an easy question? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, I have not seen this letter since I wrote it. And I think when I am referred to it, I would like to refer back to it.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

15

24 OCTOBER 1996

16

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

79. Dr Chee, if you have not seen the letter since you wrote it, did you not just read it a few minutes ago when you were invited by Mr Wong to do so? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

80. Did you not see it when you read it? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes, but then when I went through it, I wanted to come back to it when Mr Davinder Singh asked me again. So I would like to refer back to it.

81. Dr Chee, when I asked you to explain what the misunderstanding of the figures was, you were quite content to and in fact answered that it referred to the typographical, without a reference back to the figures? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) A sone of the figures that we presented.

82. Are you now saying that the typographical refers to Statement 2 and Chart 3? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, I am not.

83. So do you withdraw your earlier answer as incorrect and inaccurate? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I would first like to look at Statement 2 and Chart 3 before I go on, Mr Chairman. I think that is not unfair for me to want to request to look at Statement 2 and Chart 3 before I go on and answer the question.

84. The witness has answered a number of questions before this. He was quite content to answer those questions. And now I am seeking verification of those answers? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*)

Yes, Mr Chairman. I would like to go back and look at Statement 2 and Chart 3 which Mr Davinder Singh has referred me to.

85. Dr Chee, does the second paragraph refer to the typographical or does it not? It is a very simple question. Please answer it? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, I did not look at the phrase preceding "misunderstanding" before I answered the question. Now that I have, I would like to look at it, refer to it and then answer from here.

Chairman

86. Dr Chee, I would like to direct you to answer the question. The Member has asked you whether the misunderstanding referred by you in your letter refers to the typographical error. Could you answer that question? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, yes.

87. Is it a yes or a no? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, I would like to go back and refer to it before I answer it further. He has referred me to it. Let me look at it again, refresh my memory what Statement 2 and Chart 3 are and then I will give you the answer.

Mr Davinder Singh

88. Dr Chee, are you telling this Committee that you do not know what Statement 2 and Chart 3 are? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Would you permit me to refer to it right now so that I can refresh my memory, Mr Chairman?

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

17

24 OCTOBER 1996

18

89. Could you answer the question? Are you telling this Committee that without refreshing your memory, you do not know what Statement 2 and Chart 3 are? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I cannot remember specifically what Statement 2 and Chart 3 say.

90. You remember receiving a copy of a complaint against you? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes, I remember.

91. Do you remember that the complaint refers to two statements and two charts? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Offhand, I would like to refer to it because my memory of the charts and statements that were referred to or that were published together in the complaint, I cannot remember.

92. Are you suggesting that although you received the complaint last month, you have completely forgotten what Chart 3 and Statement 2 are? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I cannot remember exactly what Statement 2 and Chart 3 say.

93. Thank you. So are you therefore also saying that you continue to maintain that the typographical error may refer to Statement 2 and Chart 3? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes, it may.

94. Yes. Now, could you refer back? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) To —

Mr Wong Kan Seng

95. Statement 2 and Chart 3? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Which is at?

Mr Davinder Singh] Could we put it up?

Mr Wong Kan Seng] Statement 2 and Chart 3, in BG George Yen's complaint.

[*Chart 3 was put up on the board.*]

Mr Davinder Singh

96. There, Dr Chee, is Chart 3 of, by the way, your own submission. Are you saying that the typographical that you spoke of a few minutes ago refers to this chart? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No.

97. So do you withdraw your answer as being inaccurate? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) What I said earlier on? Is that what you are referring to?

98. The question is very simple. I think you understood it, Dr Chee? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I did not understand your question. If I did understand your question, I would answer it.

99. You earlier said that Statement 2 and Chart 3 refer to the typographical. Now you are saying it does not. So do you withdraw that answer that you gave earlier as inaccurate? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes. Right.

100. As being inaccurate? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That I was not referring to Statement 2 and Chart 3, before I was shown this chart.

101. And, therefore, it is an inaccurate statement? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I would not say it is inaccurate. I would

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

19

24 OCTOBER 1996

20

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

like to say that having referred and been shown Chart 3, it is now clear what is being referred to. And therefore when I say there was a misunderstanding of the figures, looking at Chart 3 right now, I know what I am referring to presently.

102. Was it a correct statement when you said that? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, that was not correct.

103. If it is not a correct statement, you must accept that it was an inaccurate one. Would you at least accept that, so that we can move on? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right. OK. Let us move on, Mr Chairman.

104. Do you accept that it is inaccurate? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes, I will accept it.

105. Thank you. Now, could you tell us what is the meaning of the words "misunderstanding of the figures"? And in case you have forgotten what the complaint is against you and in case that you have forgotten your own statement that you put up in the submission, would you like us to put up for you Statement 2? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes, please, so that it will be more complete.

Mr Davinder Singh] Can we have Statement 2, please?

Mr Wong Kan Seng] Can you refer to the blue spine folder that is in front of you?

Mr Davinder Singh

106. Can you read Statement 2? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) "In addition, the amount of Government spending on health care as a percentage of GDP has been falling to the present level of less than 1%. This compares to 7% for Japan, 13% for the US and an average of 9% for the OECD countries."

Mr Wong Kan Seng

107. What about the words following the words "OECD countries"? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) "(see Chart 3)."

Mr Wong Kan Seng] Right, that is Chart 3.

Mr Davinder Singh

108. Dr Chee, could you now be good enough to tell us what the misunderstanding of the figures was? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) As I mentioned during the Select Committee hearing, we had taken the figures there as the national health expenditure.

109. Which figure did you take as the national health expenditure? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) 0.8%.

110. And when did you realise 0.8% was not the national health expenditure? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) At the Select Committee hearing itself.

111. Right. If that was what you realised at the Select Committee hearing, why is it that you did not say that there

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

21

24 OCTOBER 1996

22

was a misunderstanding? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I would like to refer back.

112. Please do? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes, Mr Chairman. Would Mr Davinder Singh repeat his question then?

113. Yes. Why did you not say at that hearing that it was a misunderstanding? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) At the hearing itself, we were going back to and fro and things were not as clear then during the hearing itself.

114. Were you not given an opportunity to say it was a misunderstanding? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) We did at the end of it clarify, if my memory serves me correctly, that the figure that was used should have been 3.1%.

115. I would be grateful if you would answer the question. Were you given an opportunity at that hearing to say that it was a misunderstanding? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, we were going back and forth at the hearing itself.

116. Are you saying that there was absolutely no opportunity for you to say? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, I did not say that.

117. So could you answer the question? Were you given an opportunity to say that? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) It was there. Yes, we had this discussion and we had a debate.

118. So you agree with me that you had the opportunity? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Oh, yes.

119. And you also agree with me that although you had that opportunity, you did not say it was a misunderstanding? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I may not have used those exact words. But at the end of the hearing itself, or at least at the end of that session itself, it was clear that we had clarified that it was supposed to be another figure instead of 0.8%.

120. Yes. You said that you may not have used those words. Are you saying that you may have used the word "misunderstanding"? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I cannot remember.

121. Would you like to refresh your memory? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) How so?

122. Look at the record? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Do you want me to go through it and check whether the word "misunderstanding" appears? I do not know what you are —

123. I will make it easy for you. I have looked at the record. It does not appear there? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Then it does not appear there. As I said, it may have appeared.

124. So do you agree with me that despite the fact, first, that you knew at that hearing that it was a misunderstanding and despite the fact, second, that you were given an opportunity to say that it was a misunderstanding, you did not say that? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, would Mr Singh like to break his question up, one component at a time, because there are two in there? I would like to answer it one at a time.

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

125. I think you have accepted that at that hearing you knew that it was a misunderstanding? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) It was after that particular session of discussion that we had that it became clear that the figures there were not correct.

126. I think you have just changed your answer, Dr Chee. A few moments ago you said that it was at that hearing that you realised that it was a misunderstanding. Do you wish to correct yourself? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) And how has that changed?

127. Because you are now saying that it was after that hearing? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) It was after that session during that hearing. Did you hear me correctly?

128. I think we all heard you correctly, Dr Chee. You are now drawing a distinction between what? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) At that hearing itself, after that session that we had when we were discussing these figures.

129. But earlier on you said that at that hearing you knew it was a misunderstanding? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) And how is that different from what I am saying right now?

130. You said it was after the hearing now? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Oh, no, I am not saying that it was after the hearing. It was during the hearing.

131. Good. At least, we are on common ground there. So during the

hearing, you appreciated that it was a misunderstanding? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Correct.

132. And during the hearing, you have accepted that you had an opportunity to say that it was a misunderstanding? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

133. And despite the two, you did not say that it was a misunderstanding? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I may not have. I repeat myself. I may not have used those exact words. I am taking from what you told me a little while ago that that be correct and therefore I did not use the word "misunderstand".

9.45 am

134. Yes, indeed, Dr Chee, you were asked on a number of occasions on that hearing whether it was a mistake. Do you remember that? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Vaguely.

135. Despite having been asked whether it was a mistake, you refused to say it was a mistake? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*). It was in the ensuing conversation, the argument, the debate that we had, that things were moving back and forth.

136. Would you pick up that Select Committee Report, please? Could you please turn to paragraph 282? Do you see that you were asked whether it was a mistake? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

137. Do you see that you did not say that it was a mistake? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

25

24 OCTOBER 1996

26

138. Would you now look at paragraph 283? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

139. Do you see the suggestion that there was an error? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

140. Do you also see that you did not say that it was an error? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

141. Would you now turn to paragraph 302? Do you see that again you were asked whether it was a mistake? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

142. And do you also see that you did not say that it was a mistake? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

143. Would you now turn to paragraph 304? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

144. Do you see there that you were asked whether a mistake had taken place? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

145. Do you also see there that you did not say that there was a mistake? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

146. Now, if it was a misunderstanding, why did you not say that despite being given so many opportunities — ? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) To say that there was a misunderstanding?

147. Yes?—(*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) As I said, I did not use those exact words. But if you look at the ensuing discussion when we came at the end of it, after looking at the figures and some of the comments that were made by the

Members during the hearing itself, we came to the conclusion — let me take a look at the Report and see if I can find it.

148. Can I help you? Is there something that you are looking for? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I am going through the Report here, Mr Chairman, if I am permitted a couple of minutes.

Chairman

149. Dr Chee, can you tell us what you are looking for? Perhaps we can assist you? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I am looking for the part where at the end we had said the figure should have been 3.1% or something of that nature.

Mr Davinder Singh

150. Do you want to look at paragraph 303? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) And paragraph 304 as well, Mr Chairman.

151. Yes. The exchange at paragraphs 303 and 304 was really this. You were asked whether a mistake had occurred. You refused to concede that a mistake had occurred and instead said that you would put the percentage at 3.1% as pointed out by Dr Soin. Right? Is that an accurate summary of what happened? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No. When we had a discussion in there, things were pointed out. The word "misunderstand" may not have been used. But at the very end of it, it was very clearly stated that we would use the figure of 3.1%.

152. Yes. If it was very clearly stated that you would use the figure of 3.1%,

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

27

24 OCTOBER 1996

28

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

why is it that at paragraph 344 you said and I quote: "I did not say we should put it at 3.1%"? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I think let us look at it in its entire context. It says, "Mr Chairman, I do wish that Mr Yeo would not keep putting words into my mouth. What I said is, "if you want to put it at 3.1%."

153. Read on? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) "I did not say we should put it at 3.1%. Those are totally different. The semantics is important." In this situation here, I am referring to what Mr George Yeo had said and he had said, "Yes, we should put 3.1%, 3.2%, instead of 0.8%."

154. Dr Chee, you said the words "I did not say we should put it at 3.1%, if you want to put it at 3.1%." Is that not right? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

155. In other words, what you were saying is that if the Committee wants, they can put it at 3.1%. But you did not say it should be 3.1%? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*). Well, I said that, let us put it at 3.1%.

156. Right. Then why did you go on to say, "I did not say it."? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Because it was in the context of what Mr George Yeo had said and I just want to make it clear.

157. Let us be clear. At that hearing did you or did you not say, "Let us put it at 3.1%"? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

Mr Davinder Singh] You did. So when you said at paragraph 344, "I did not say

we should put it at 3.1%," that again was an inaccurate point?

Mr Low Thia Kiang] Mr Chairman, Sir, maybe Dr Chee would like to refer to paragraphs 323 and 324 in which I think Dr Chee explains the way he used the figures.

Mr Wong Kan Seng] Before Mr Low refers Dr Chee to paragraph 323, can he just answer the question that Mr Davinder Singh asked him when we were talking about paragraph 344, otherwise we get side-tracked to paragraph 323 and forget about paragraph 344. Can you please look at paragraph 344 first and answer Mr Davinder Singh's question?

Mr Davinder Singh

158. Would you like me to repeat it? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Please.

159. I had asked you whether at that hearing you said, "Let us put it at 3.1%." Do you remember? Please say yes or no? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

160. If that is the case, then the statement that you made at paragraph 344, which is, "I did not say we should put it at 3.1%," is another inaccurate statement. Would you at least accept that? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

161. Thank you. Would you also accept, and I think this admits a yes or no answer, that you did not once at that hearing say that it was a mistake? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Again, I am taking that I have not gone through this text myself, not gone in and pick up the word

"mistake". So if you are saying that the word does not appear, then based on what you have seen and read, I will go along with that.

162. Yes. Thank you. When the complaint was made against you, one of the complaints related to the figures in Statement 2 and Chart 3. In the joint defence, which you have just read, you very neatly encapsulated your answer in three or four lines by saying it was a misunderstanding of the figures. If you could say that in your joint defence, you could have said that at the hearing on 15th July? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) As I explained, Mr Chairman, I think at the 15th July hearing, we were going through a series of charts and figures and by the time when we got to it we had gone through a few hours already, and in the ensuing debate, things were said very quickly and it was difficult to remember at that point in time the exact words and, I repeat, the exact words that were said earlier on.

163. Dr Chee, if I ask you now, was it a mistake, would you say yes? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) A mistake, I am not sure what you are referring to right now.

164. If you said that you had a misunderstanding of the figures, then a mistake occurred, is it not right? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

165. So if I ask you now whether a mistake occurred, you would say yes? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

166. Why was it so difficult for you to say yes when a similar-question was asked no less than four occasions? — (*Dr Chee*

Soon Juan) Mr Chairman, at that point in time, while we were at the hearing itself, things were presented at that point in time, at that moment, and without being given time to go and look at the figures and take a second look at how it was presented again, it was difficult for us to say categorically then that it was a mistake.

167. You did not have to look at the figures because you knew at that meeting, as you have just said, that it was a misunderstanding. Is that not right, Dr Chee? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) You are referring back to this letter that we wrote that there was a misunderstanding.

168. No. You just said that it was difficult for you to concede that it was a mistake because you needed to have another look at the figures. But a few moments ago you said that at the hearing itself you knew it was a misunderstanding. So there was no need for you to go back to look at the figures? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I said after the entire session, meaning these few paragraphs that you were referring to.

169. Dr Chee, you just agreed with me, when I asked you, I think the second time round, that the misunderstanding occurred to you at the hearing itself, not after? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Correct.

170. Yes? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) After the session that we had. Did I not say that, Mr Chairman?

171. Let us just settle on the word "hearing" because that is all I am

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

interested in, the 15th July hearing? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Then that is inaccurate. It is not a reflection of what I have said.

172. Are you now saying that you did not say a few moments ago that you appreciated that it was a misunderstanding at the meeting itself? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) At the hearing after this discussion that we had on this particular topic.

173. Do you remember you asked me to break up my questions into two parts? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

174. The first part was, despite the fact you knew at that hearing that there was a misunderstanding you did not say so. Your answer was yes. Are you now changing your answer on oath? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Could you repeat that, please. Repeat what you have just said.

175. I was just reminding you of my earlier question? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes, could you repeat that particular question?

176. My earlier question was, despite the fact that you appreciated at the 15th July 1996 hearing that a misunderstanding had occurred, you did not say so. And your answer was yes. Now, you are saying that the appreciation came after the hearing? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, I cannot remember the two questions that Mr Singh is asking now and the one that he asked when I wanted him to split up the components of his question. Is it possible for me — I do not

know — to refer back to that question earlier on and see whether it was the same question or not.

Mr Davinder Singh] We will do that.

Chairman] Can you read out? Can we arrange for an immediate transcript?

10.00 am

Mr Davinder Singh

177. We will come back to that, Dr Chee, as soon as we get the record. So really the figures in that chart or rather that chart was not a comparison of apples with apples? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) It was not.

178. And despite the fact that it was not, you said that it was? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) At that point in time, yes.

179. Now, refresh my memory, what did you say was your misunderstanding? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Misunderstanding as I have said in this cover letter?

180. Yes? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Of this 0.8%?

181. Yes. What was the misunderstanding? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Of this 0.8%.

182. What was the misunderstanding of the 0.8%? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That was not the figure.

183. For the national health expenditure? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

33

24 OCTOBER 1996

34

184. So you are telling us that when you prepared the submission, when you discussed it, when you had it verified, and when you appeared on 15th July, your impression was that the 0.8% was the percentage of national health expenditure? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Correct.

185. Or rather national health expenditure as a percentage of GDP. Is that right? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

186. Could you please re-confirm that when you were preparing the submission, you had the White Paper on Affordable Health Care with you? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

187. You did have it. Could the witness be given a copy of the White Paper, please? [*Copy of White Paper on Affordable Health Care handed to Dr Chee.*] Would you please turn to page 12? Could you read out the right-hand column of page 12, the second paragraph? Read it out loud, please? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*)

"Currently, Singapore's national health expenditure (NHE) is 3.1% of GDP. Government subsidies for health make up 0.7% of GDP. Medical costs form only 2.5% of household expenditure. This is much lower than the developed countries. The US spends 13% of its GDP on health, the OECD countries between 6-9%, and Japan 6-7%."

188. Yes. It is clear from that paragraph, is it not, that the figure 3.1% is a percentage of the national health expenditure as against GDP? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Would you repeat that?

189. It is clear from that paragraph, is it not, that the 3.1% is a percentage of GDP on national health expenditure? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right, yes.

190. You knew that? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) As a percentage of GDP, national health expenditure.

191. You knew that? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I did. Let me refer back to the hearing itself.

192. No? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) There was confusion there.

193. Answer my question. Did you not know when you read this? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) It was not clear.

194. What is the part which is not clear? Could you read the first two lines? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) "Currently, Singapore's national health expenditure (NHE) is 3.1% of GDP."

195. What is not clear? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, if —

196. No. I want to know what is not clear from those two lines. What is the ambiguity to you in those two lines? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) The ambiguity arises when we actually had a discussion at the Select Committee hearing itself when the whole situation was brought up with, if you recall correctly, Dr Kanwaljit Soin's presentation, and a confusion arose from there. So if you want to talk about confusion, you have to take it into context what transpired during the entire discussion at the hearing itself.

197. Let me take you back, Dr Chee, to the time when you were preparing your submission. Let us forget for a moment the hearing on 15th July. We will come to it. When you were preparing

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

your submission, you had the White Paper. Correct? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

198. And you read this paragraph? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

199. At that time, what was the ambiguity, if any? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) When we prepared our submission, we had looked at also Dr Soin's —

Mr Abdullah Tarmugi

200. Mr Chairman, perhaps Dr Chee could just answer the question directly, whether there was ambiguity? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, things have to be taken into context. If you look at the transcript and go back to what was said at the hearing itself, the whole thing was confused together with Dr Soin's presentation, what she said in Parliament.

Mr Davinder Singh

201. My question is: what was the ambiguity in these two lines? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Certainly, when you look at it right now, there is no ambiguity.

202. It is quite clear, as you said just now, that there is no ambiguity. Is there? If there is no ambiguity now, there could not have been any ambiguity when you read it, when you prepared for the submission? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That is a little different, Mr Chairman.

As I said, when I prepared the submission, this is not the only document that we referred to.

203. Could we just deal with this document? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, let us take things into context, what I said at the hearing itself. That is important as well. Because if you take it out of context, then it makes things very different.

204. I assure you, Dr Chee, we will come to what you said at the hearing? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes. But —

205. Now I am asking you to go back to when you were preparing the submission. My question is: there could not have been any ambiguity in these first two lines of the second paragraph in the right column of page 12? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) We were also referring to what was said by Dr Kanwaljit Soin.

206. Could you answer the question? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I don't understand your question in order to understand it.

207. The question is: when you read these words, "Currently, Singapore's national health expenditure is 3.1% of GDP.", was there an ambiguity to you? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Looking at it right now, no.

208. Looking at it then, was there? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Together with Dr Soin's. That was when the confusion arose.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

37

24 OCTOBER 1996

38

209. I assume from your answer that your answer is no, there was no ambiguity, looking at it by itself? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right now.

210. And looking at it by itself, when you did the submission, was there —? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) We did not look at it by itself when we prepared the submission. That is what I want to clarify.

211. Dr Chee, you read more than one document at the same time, do you? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) We read it altogether.

212. You mean you put it all on a table and you look at it at one go? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, I think Mr Singh knows what I am talking about when we said we were reading together in total.

213. I am afraid, not on the same second. I am afraid you got us at a loss. So if it is not at the same time, in other words, you would read one document and immediately after —? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I may have read this other document first.

214. Yes? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) And then not look very carefully at these figures that were presented over here.

215. Yes. But you read this paragraph? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

216. And when you read this paragraph, you were reading in those few seconds —? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) We may not have read it carefully. I may not have read it carefully.

Chairman

217. Order. Can I ask the witness to listen to the question first? You seem to have the habit of asking the Member to repeat his question. But at the same time, you are not allowing the Member to finish his question. Could you allow Mr Singh to complete his question before you give the answer? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right, Mr Chairman. What Mr Singh was asking, and I am very clear on that, was whether we read this document or not, and I said yes. Then he said at that point in time, was it not clear? And I said no, it was not, because at the same time, not at the same precise second, at the same period of time, what we were doing was looking at another document, and that together caused the confusion.

Mr Davinder Singh

218. It is interesting you used the word "we". Could you tell us who else were looking at another document? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I, or at least the people that were helping together with the document. Right now, if you are asking me who it is, I cannot remember offhand. But let us take it that I did, I read this document.

219. I am amazed, Dr Chee, you just said "we" were looking at the documents and —? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Let me change that.

220. All I ask you was who was looking at the documents? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*). Mr Chairman, let me correct that to "I".

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

39

24 OCTOBER 1996

40

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

221. So again when you said "we", that was an incorrect statement? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Let me put it that I said "I".

222. No, no? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, when we talk about "we", it is all the time when we talk about the party.

223. We are not talking about the royal 'we', are we? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) We are talking about — you see, Mr Chairman, there you go — did he not use the word "we"?"

224. That's right. We are not talking about the royal 'we', are we? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right. But you are asking the question.

225. That's right? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Can it be "we"? I don't see anyone here asking the question.

Mr Abdullah Tarmugi

226. Mr Chairman, I think we are again diverting from the question. I think he should answer Mr Singh's question? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right, Mr Chairman.

Mr Wong Kan Seng

227. Dr Chee, there are only two persons taking part in this — yourself and Mr Davinder Singh. So when he said "we", it means the two of you? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes. But I did not ask the question. He asked the question.

Mr Davinder Singh

228. You said when "we" were looking at the documents. My question was very simple. Who is "we"? Please tell us? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) The party.

229. Who in the party? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Whoever actually takes part in looking at the preparation and who ever reads the documents.

230. Dr Chee, I suggest to you that two questions ago you knew my intent was to ask for the names of the persons. So could you please answer that question? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) And therefore I corrected it to "I".

231. You corrected it to "I" only because you do not want to give us the names? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No. Because I cannot remember who are the ones that actually read these documents, who actually did and who actually did not.

232. So although you said "we", because you cannot remember who the "we" were, you have decided to change the evidence to "I". Is that what you are saying? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No. I am not changing the evidence to "I". What I am saying is that when, for example, you say "we", we are all actually talking about a collective term, not necessarily implying everyone else that you are representing them. For example, when you said, "Are we clear about this?", you are asking the question. Correct?

233. Dr Chee, when you said "we" looked at the documents, "we" I assume means more than one person. Do you

agree with that at least, or don't you? -
(*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, no. Sometimes
when I speak as the Secretary-General
of the party, I use the term "we", not
necessarily saying that everybody has
done everything that I have said in that
particular statement.

234. So are you now saying that when
you said "we" looked at the documents,
what you meant was "I" looked at the
documents? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*)
Correct.

235. And therefore when you use the
word "we" -? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*)
It means -

236. You didn't mean "we"? -
(*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I represent the
party and that "we", when you talk
about; as I said, a collective term, it does
not necessarily mean that everyone has
done everything or said every word in
that particular statement.

237. Right. So "we" does not mean
"we"? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right.

238. We will move on. Let us go back
to the paragraph in the second column of
that page. When you were reading that,
was there any ambiguity in those first two
lines? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) When
I read it now, there is no ambiguity.
When we were reading it then, it was
again in context.

239. It would be helpful if you say,
"When I was reading it then". Because
you just said, "When we were reading
it ..."? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I am

sorry. There it goes again. I am referring
to "I" when I said "we". I mean the
party.

240. Right. So if it was only you, you
could only read one document at a time.
Therefore, at the time when you were
reading this document, was there any
ambiguity in the first two lines? -
(*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) At that point in
time, I did not read it the way that I have
read it now or at a later point in time.

241. The words are - there are 10
words - "Currently", is there any ambi-
guity in that word? - (*Dr Chee Soon*
Juan) Mr Chairman, would you like
me to go through this one at a time?
"Currently", no ambiguity; "Singa-
pore's", no ambiguity; "national", no
ambiguity; "health", ditto; "expenditure
(NHE) is 3.1% of GDP", no ambiguity.

10.15 am

242. So there would have been no
ambiguity when you read it in March
or whenever you were preparing the
submission? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*)
Mr Chairman, I think I have explained
this repeatedly and I say it again that
when we were preparing the submission,
we did not only read this document but
together with another set of figures or
statements that were presented, thus
causing the confusion.

243. Mr Chairman, Sir, the witness is
deliberately not answering the question?
- (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman,
I do not know how else I can answer this

Dr Chee Soon Juan (cont.)

question when Mr Singh is asking me right now. At that point in time, was there any ambiguity when I read it?

244. Let me suggest this. If you do not understand my question, ask me and I will clarify. When you read it early this year, for the purposes of preparing your submission, was there any ambiguity in the first two lines? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Let me repeat what I said. When we read this document at that time, it was not by itself. When we went through it together, we did not go through it carefully and together with another set of statements, the confusion arose.

Prof. Jayakumar

245. Mr Chairman, I think the witness should answer the question which Mr Davinder Singh had asked, ie, whether when preparing for the submission, in reading this document and that part of the document, did he understand it and was there any ambiguity? Do I take it that the answer to that is there was no ambiguity when he read this document? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) We did. Mr Chairman, if I had read it carefully —

246. My question is: reading that document, by itself, was there any ambiguity? I think the answer is no? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, when we were reading it through, if we read it carefully, then it would not have been ambiguous.

Prof. Jayakumar] Thank you.

Mr Davinder Singh

247. Are you suggesting therefore that you did not read it carefully? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That is what I said a couple of minutes ago.

248. You agreed with me earlier this morning that the preparation of a written submission is a very serious matter? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

249. And you agreed with me that it was very important for you to be accurate? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes, as much as we can be.

250. And you agreed with me that your written submission was based on sound information? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

251. And you would have us believed that when you read these two lines, you did not read them carefully? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

252. Now reading them carelessly, what was the impression you got? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Together?

253. No. Just this document? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, Mr Chairman, there was no impression. So we did not get any impression from reading this other one sentence.

254. So when you read the words carelessly "Currently, Singapore's national health expenditure is 3.1% of GDP", the moment you read it carelessly, it disappeared from your mind because no impression stuck? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, when we read a

document, there are things which we read and then together with other documents, things can become confusing. And as I said very clearly, that is when the confusion arose and that is when the error arose.

255. Please turn to page 1 of the White Paper? Could you read the first sentence? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) —

"National health expenditure in Singapore is currently 3.1% of GDP."

256. Is that vague? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, it is not vague.

257. Thank you. So we have settled on this fact. You have the White Paper with you when you were preparing the written submission and the White Paper said in two separate places that national health expenditure as a percentage of GDP is 3.1%. You also had with you a copy of Mr Mukul Asher's article, did you not? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, I did not.

258. You did not have that article with you when you prepared your written submission? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, I did not.

259. But you had it with you in 1995? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, I did not.

260. You did not? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, I did not.

Mr Low Thia Kiang] Mr Chairman, Sir, before we go on, can I ask Dr Chee two questions regarding Chart 3?

Chairman] Mr Low, I believe we are now moving on to a different point. I will

allow Mr Singh to finish his question and you can then have your turn. Mr Singh.

Mr Davinder Singh

261. You did not have Mr Asher's article which appears at tab 6 in the bundle with the red spine? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I do not have the bundle with red spine with me.

262. I am sorry? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I have the bundles with blue and green spine.

263. You look at the one with the green spine. It may be that yours is green. What is your tab 6? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) It says "Singapore Changes Guard".

264. That is right. You wrote a book in 1995 called *Singapore My Home Too*? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

265. Can the witness be given a copy of the book? Could you turn to page 145? Could you read out your footnote 3? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) M. Asher?

266. Yes? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) —

"Planning for the Future: The Welfare System in a New Phase of Development, in Singapore Changes Guard, 1993."

267. Yes. When was this book published, *Singapore My Home Too*, your book? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) This was published in 1995.

268. Right. So why did you say that you did not have that article with you in 1995? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Which one are you referring to again? I thought you

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

were referring to the article that was in our submission.

269. Which article was in your submission? Could you please assist us? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) M. Ramesh's article, *Asian Survey*.

Mr Wong Kan Seng

270. Let me remind you that just now you said you did not have the article by Mukul Asher with you in 1995? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No. I was referring to M. Ramesh's article.

271. No. That was not what Mr Singh's question was. Mr Singh's question was: did you have Mr Asher's article with you? You said no? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No. Then I did not hear it clearly.

272. Please listen to me first before you jump in. Then he asked you: did you have it with you in 1995? You said no. And that is the reason why we ask you to look at this book which you published in 1995 which had the footnote that showed you referred to it? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, I have always thought that I had in mind that he was referring to M. Ramesh's article, in which case I said, during the hearing itself, I did not have with me the article but I had it with me at home.

273. That was not our question? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes. I thought you were referring to M. Ramesh's article.

274. So I would advise you, Dr Chee, not to jump into a question, in between a question, without listening to it first and answer? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I apologise.

275. Just answer us when we finish our question? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, I think at that point of time Mr Singh had actually finished asking his question and I misheard him and my mind was always on the fact that it was the Ramesh's article he was referring to.

276. So do not cut into a question until the questioner has finished? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I do not think I cut into the question, Mr Chairman. I misheard it, but I did not cut into his question.

Mr Davinder Singh

277. I suggest to you, Dr Chee, that you did not mishear my question. I did not say Asher. I said Mukul Asher. You remember me saying that? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right.

278. Thank you. So if you remember me saying Mukul Asher, why did you say that you did not have that article with you in 1995? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I thought you were referring to M. Ramesh's article.

279. Well, you could not have thought that I was referring to Ramesh's article because I had given you the name of the author? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes. But I told you I misheard what you said. I thought you were referring to

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

49

24 OCTOBER 1996

50

M. Ramesh's article because that was the article that was in question all the time.

280. But I did not only refer to the name of the author. I asked you to turn to tab 6 of the book? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I did not, and after I looked at it, you asked me what was the article in there. I said it was *Singapore Changes Guard*.

281. And who wrote that article? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) It says here "Edited by Garry Rodan".

282. If you turn the page? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mukul Asher.

283. Thank you. You had this article with you when you were preparing the submission? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) This particular article?

284. Yes? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

285. Could you turn to page 160 of the article? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

286. And could you read out loud the second paragraph? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) —

"The increased cost recovery in the health sector comes at a time of declining contribution by government to total health expenditure from 40 percent in 1970 to 27.4 per cent in 1989, while government health expenditure as a proportion of GDP remained essentially constant at 0.9 per cent between 1980 and 1989."

287. And not only did you have that article with you, you read it? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I am sorry.

288. Not only did you have the article with you, you read it. You read the article? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes. Just a second, I am not sure if I have actually read this article because there were a couple of times when it was referred to in Ramesh's article when he made reference to this particular article. No, it could not have been. I am sorry. Let me take a look at it.

289. You read it? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

290. Did you understand the last three lines of that paragraph which you read, which reads, "While Government health expenditure as a proportion of GDP remained essentially constant at 0.9% between 1980 and 1989."? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Again, at that point in time, it was not clear, Mr Chairman, when we went through it.

291. I see. Could you tell us what in that line that I just read was not clear? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) At that point in time, as I said, Mr Chairman. If you are asking me right now, which is not clear, I will tell you that it is clear. But at that time when I was reading through it, which is what Mr Singh is asking, it was not clear.

292. What was not clear when you read it? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) The fact that the total health expenditure is not what it appears. It is actually -

293. The words "total health expenditure" do not appear in the line which I asked you to read or which I read to you and my question is: what is it in that line,

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

which I just read, — ? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) What line did you just read?

294. Well, I will repeat it for your benefit. "While Government health expenditure as a proportion of GDP remained essentially constant at 0.9% between 1980 and 1989." Now what was ambiguous in that line? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Now?

295. No. At that time? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) At that time, I did not really at that point in time grasp what the sentence actually meant, what it actually said.

296. You have a PhD? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes, Mr Chairman.

297. Now perhaps you can tell us what in that line you could not grasp? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I did not read it carefully.

298. All right. So this is the second document that you did not read carefully? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, as I said, the whole thing must be taken into context, together with what was presented or what we thought that Dr Kanwaljit Soin was presenting and that was read in total with all these articles.

Chairman

299. Dr Chee, could you just answer Mr Singh's question? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

300. This is the second document that you did not read carefully — yes or no? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) You are talking about the entire presentation or submission.

301. Mr Singh just asked you a question? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right.

Mr Davinder Singh

302. The question does not need clarification. I asked you, with your PhD, what in that one line which I read was ambiguous. And your answer was, "I did not read it carefully." So I am asking you now: Are you saying that this is the second document that you did not read carefully? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That is correct.

303. That is correct. And these are among others, two documents which you and the SDP rely on to make a solemn submission to the Select Committee? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Two of the many.

304. Yes. And therefore you are saying that in your research to make that solemn submission, you were quite content to carelessly read documents for the purposes of substantiating your submission? — (*Mr Chee Soon Juan*) No. Mr Chairman, when we read this — we have read this document, as I said — we tried to read it in its entirety and it was together with Dr Kanwaljit Sam's few statements that were made, that there was a confusion there.

305. Let us stick, to this document, Dr Chee. You carelessly read the White Paper or, at least, that is what you tell

us. You carelessly read this document. Correct? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, we did not. Mr Chairman, as I said, we come back to this point again, we read it together, or, at least, I read it together with what Dr Kanwaljit Soin said, and so on.

306. I think we have past the stage of accepting and we are on common ground here, that you could not have read two documents at the same time. You might have read one after the other? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right.

307. Yes? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) In that same period.

308. Of course. But while you were reading this article from Mr Asher, you are saying to us that you read it carelessly? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

309. And because you read it carelessly, you would never think of relying on it? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I do not understand the question.

310. Because you read it carelessly, you would not rely on it because you do not really know what it says. Isn't that right? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) We did not scrutinise it.

311. Yes. Unless you scrutinise it to your satisfaction, you would not rely on it? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Well, in this presentation, we did rely on it.

312. Did you rely on it in your written submission? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, I am sorry.

313. So why did you say that you rely on it? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I am confused now. What was your question?

314. You are not confused, with the greatest of respect, Dr Chee. You said, in our submission, you put your hand there, and you said, we rely on it. So I am asking you: did you rely on it in your submission? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) We relied together with what was said by Dr Kanwaljit Soin. I made it very clear during the hearing itself.

315. Could you show us where in your written submission you relied on Asher's article? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I am totally confused. I really don't know what Mr Singh is talking about. Where in our written submission have we said that we have totally relied on Asher's article?

316. I did not use the word "totally". I just repeated your words. You said "we rely on it"? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) But I thought in our submission it was clear that I had said that we were referring to M Ramesh's article.

317. So do you withdraw your evidence that you rely on it in your submission? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) On which article? On Asher's article?

318. Yes? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) We did not refer to it in our submission.

319. So do you withdraw your evidence that you rely on it? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I did not, did I? I don't know if I said that we relied on Asher's article.

Mr Davinder Singh (cons.)

320. You did? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) If I did, then I did not refer to Asher's article.

321. Then you withdraw it? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I am not even sure if I said it, Mr Chairman. Can I have the transcript to see whether I have said what Mr Singh said that I said?

322. We will come back to that? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Thank you.

323. When you read this article carelessly, was there any other opportunity for you to have read it carefully? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Well, we went through it together with Kanwaljit Soin's statement, as I said.

324. No. My question is very simple? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) We read it through once and we did not come back to it if that is what you mean.

325. How about before 1996? Did you get any opportunity to read this article, in particular this line, carefully? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Again.

326. Before 1996, did you have any opportunity to read this article carefully? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) After I have referred to it, no, I did not read it again.

327. No, no. At any time before 1996, did you have an opportunity to read the article carefully? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I cannot remember whether I had gone back to it or not.

328. Okay. In 1995, did you read it carefully? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) This article here?

329. Yes? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) As much as I did, I tried.

330. Did you read it carefully? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No. As I said, we have said it a little while ago. I said a little while ago.

331. So in 1995, you did not read it carefully? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No.

332. And in 1994, you did not read it carefully? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, when we are talking about carefully, I read books and I do not remember or I do not go through everything. When you said "carefully", do you mean you remember every word, try to go through every word and verify every figure that is presented, every chart that is drawn -

333. I used the word "careful" because you used it? Did you understand what it meant when you read it in 1995? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Not in its entirety. No.

334. Did you read it in 1994? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I cannot remember.

335. Right. If you did not understand this in its entirety in 1995, why did you use it as a source for one of your propositions in *Singapore, My Home Too?* - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Well, reference was made to it.

336. Why? If you did not understand it in its entirety, why did you see fit to use

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

57

24 OCTOBER 1996

58

it as a source? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, at that point in time, what happened was that we had thought, or at least I had thought, that it was a figure in my mind that reflected what I thought was reflected, and thus I put it down in the book.

337. Although you did not understand it in its entirety? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, no.

338. So although you did not understand it in its entirety, you were quite content to use it as a source in your footnote and then make a proposition based on it. Is that what you tell us? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Would you repeat that question?

339. Was there any difficulty in understanding that question? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes, I did not. Obviously I did not understand your question.

340. I will repeat it again. Although you did not understand this article in its entirety, you were quite content to rely on it and make a proposition in your book based on it? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

341. Would you please turn to page 145 of *Singapore, My Home Too*? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, I know it is of very little use, but I would like to go on record and say that *Singapore, My Home Too* was not part of the complaint that was made against me.

Chairman

342. Could you just refer to the page indicated by Mr Singh? - (*Dr Chee Soon*

Juan) Mr Chairman, I would like to go on record as saying that this book was not referred to in the complaint made against me.

Mr Davinder Singh

343. Before you open the book, it is interesting that you made that remark. Are you concerned about anything in this book? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, Mr Chairman. But I have been acutely aware, have been told, that the hearing should refer to what was made in the complaint or the material that was presented in the complaint.

344. Are you concerned about scrutiny of this book? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, certainly not.

345. And you stand by what you stated in this book? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) For most of the things, yes.

346. Tell me what of the things you did not stand by? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Obviously, you are referring to the health expenditure, the part on health expenditure in this book.

347. So you have written a book and on health care expenditure you do not stand by it? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I stand corrected on some of the figures presented in there.

348. Have you published the correction? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No. I have not had the opportunity to.

349. So you have published the book. You do not stand by some parts of it? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, as

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

I said, I stand corrected on some of the figures that were presented in the book.

350. Right. And although you stand corrected on it, you have not seen it fit to publish your correction? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I have not had the opportunity.

351. Since when? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Since it was brought to my attention.

352. Right. So for a couple of months now you have not had the opportunity of putting right what is wrong? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I have not had the opportunity to go into another print of this book. Is that what you mean? Maybe to answer your question, if I were to run another print of this book, then I will go in and correct those figures in there.

353. Only in that instance? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Well, I suppose I cannot re-print the book while I still do not have the opportunity to do so.

354. Yes. So, in other words, for a few months now, you have not put right what you now know and, in fact, knew two months ago was wrong. Now, tell me: you said that you stand by most parts of this book. Apart from health care, what else do you not stand by? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I have not gone through the book in greater detail to be able to tell you exactly which word, exactly which number that I do not stand by.

355. It is your book? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

356. And you were prepared to say that you stood by most of it. So I assume when you said you stood by most of it, you know what you are standing by? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, then let me answer it this way. That if you were to point out to me where the errors are, then I will be most happy to have a discussion on that. And if you prove yourself correct, then I will be happy to make any amendments.

357. Right. So your philosophy is, you print, let someone find out an error and bring it to your attention? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Not true.

358. Could you go to page 145? Is the paragraph, under the heading *Health care*, something that you do not stand by? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) The figures there I stand corrected.

359. Could you read out the first paragraph, right up to the word "savings"? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*)

"For example, at a time when costs are increasing, the Government is shifting the burden of medical expenses to the private individual. The total health expenditure has been reduced from 40.1% in 1970 to just 0.9% in the 1990 while money from CPF accounts have been retained for Medisave savings."

360. What do you not stand by? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) The total health expenditure has been reduced from 40.1% in 1970 to just 0.9% in 1990.

361. And why is it that you do not stand by what you wrote? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I am sorry.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

61

24 OCTOBER 1996

62

362. Why is it that you do not stand by what you wrote, published and circulated to Singaporeans? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* That the figure there of 0.9% is incorrect.

363. And why is it incorrect? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* That was the wrong figure.

364. And why is it wrong? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* It does not reflect what the total health expenditure is as a percentage.

365. Right. And how do you know that that is the wrong figure? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Because it was brought to my attention during the Select Committee's health care subsidy hearing.

366. And had it not been brought to your attention, you would not have known that that was an error? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Yes.

367. Could you confirm that the footnote that you cited for that sentence is Ramesh's article? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Yes.

368. Could you show us where in Ramesh's article the figure 0.9% appears? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No, it is not there.

369. If it is not there, why did you cite Ramesh as the authority or source for that proposition? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Because as I was going through the article in there, again, there was confusion as to what the actual figure was.

10.45 am

370. Could you show us which figures in Ramesh's article led you to believe that it is 0.9% and therefore confused you? If you want Ramesh's article, it is in the folder? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* There was no figure in Ramesh's article.

371. So how did the confusion arise between the figures in Ramesh's article and the figure that ultimately found its way into *Singapore My Home Too*? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* As I said, there was confusion. Otherwise, it would not be in there.

372. So what is the confusion? Please show us Ramesh's article, draw us to the relevant portion and explain how this confusion arose? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Mr Chairman, if I could cite you the number in Ramesh's article, then there would have been no confusion, would there?

373. You said that there was a confusion and we are really interested to understand what the confusion is. You said the confusion arose out of Ramesh's article. Please, for your convenience, Ramesh's article is in the bundle with the blue spine. It is at tab 9. Tell us how the confusion arose? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* It was, as I said, when I read through the article, there was not a clear understanding of what total health expenditure was.

374. We will come back to that proposition in a moment. But you said there was a confusion which led you to put 0.9%. So please show us what that confusion is? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* The confusion is precisely because we

Dr Chee Soon Juan (cont.)

misunderstood what this whole total health expenditure was and therefore the figure appeared.

375. Tell us where the misunderstanding arose from, please? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) From the fact that we did not refer to some of these articles carefully enough.

376. Dr Chee, I do not read a legal article and then say I was confused that that legal article led me to believe that health expenditure is 0.9%, unless there is something in that article which led me to be confused. So now you say it was Ramesh's article that confused you. So please educate us because we might have missed something which you did not, and tell us where it is or what is it in that article which confused you? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) As we went through this entire article in there, there were times when the figures were cited at 0.8% of total health expenditure, 0.9%, less than 1%. And we took it in total.

377. Where did you get 0.8%? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) From the chart that we presented.

378. No. We are talking about the confusion when you read Ramesh's article? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Exactly. But as I said -

379. So 0.8% did not appear in Ramesh's article? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I read a couple of articles and the confusion arose from there.

380. Which are the couple of articles? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Ramesh's article, Mukul Asher's article, what Dr Kanwaljit Soin presented, the White Paper.

381. So you read Dr Kanwaljit Soin's speech when you were preparing *Singapore My Home Too*? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Not the only one. It was also in the White Paper, and so on.

382. The speech was in 1996. You wrote the book in 1995. You read that speech before you wrote the book? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, hold on. Mr Chairman, what happened, as I said, I read the whole series of articles which I cannot remember.

383. I asked you what they were, you said Kanwaljit Soin's speech. So I am having this difficulty - again I may be wrong, so correct me please - if a speech is made in 1996, could it have been read when you wrote the book in 1995? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, Mr Chairman, when I was referring to this, I was going to the preparation of the submission. When we talked about this book over here, I also said, if you would like to refer back to the transcript, I was also referring to the White Paper.

384. Dr Chee, you knew and you know that the last few series of questions were directed at *Singapore My Home Too* and why is it that the proposition was made and supported by your footnote reference to Ramesh? You said, "When I read Ramesh, I was confused." I said, "Oh, show us where in Ramesh." He says 0.9% or anything which could have confused you. And then you said, "No. We read a number of articles." I said,

"What are these articles?" And then you said, "Dr Kanwaljit Soin's speech was one of them." Let us get a few basics right. I think this admits a yes or no answer, please? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, -

Chairman] Order. Would you allow Mr Singh to finish.

Mr Davinder Singh

385. I think this admits a yes or no answer? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No. Mr Chairman, -

386. I am afraid we have to go into the basics. But is it not true that Dr Kanwaljit Soin did not make a speech until well after you wrote *Singapore My Home Too*? Is that yes or no? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, I cannot answer in a yes or no fashion, Mr Chairman, because -

Chairman

387. What is the difficulty in answering the question of Mr Singh? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, what I am trying to show, right now, in this whole preparation of the submission, articles were dragged in. I cannot remember right now by sitting here when I read what and that is why I put, Mr Chairman, -

Chairman] Dr Chee, I do not see what is the difficulty of answering Mr Singh's question. Could you just give an answer to his question? Listen to the question very carefully. I have already warned you earlier on this morning that you appeared

to have the habit of not being able to comprehend simple questions put forward to you. You have the habit of jumping in before questions are completed. And I will tell you once again to listen to questions carefully. Mr Singh, could you put the question again to Dr Chee, and answer the question, Dr Chee.

Mr Davinder Singh

388. Would you not agree with me that it was not possible for you to have read Dr Soin's speech when you were writing *Singapore My Home Too*? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No.

389. And therefore, when you said that you have read Dr Soin's speech a few minutes ago, you were not telling the truth? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, Mr Chairman, I object to that because I said that I was referring to the whole series of or, at least, a collection of articles that we were reading in making this submission. And in the process you dragged in *Singapore My Home Too*. In the course of this conversation that we are having right now, when we keep going back between submission, *Singapore My Home Too*, and so on, I cannot remember when I have read what and in which specific reference to which specific book or article that I had written for.

390. So although you said that you had read Dr Kanwaljit Soin, you now said that you did not read her when you wrote *Singapore My Home Too*? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Obviously, it cannot be done, can it?

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

391. Yes. Thank you. So come back to this point that I am still confused about. To use your words, what is it in Ramesh's article which confused you and therefore led you to put 0.9%? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Again, as I said, it was together with some of the figures that were presented in the White Paper, and so on, in the Mukul Asher's article, and everything was dragged in and confusion arose from there.

392. You cited Ramesh for that proposition in *Singapore My Home Too*? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

393. You did not cite Asher or the White Paper? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) In that particular statement?

394. Yes? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) But Ramesh's article was there.

395. Now, Dr Chee, I would like to give you the opportunity, with Mr Chairman's permission, to look at Ramesh's article and tell us how did you get 0.9% from the article which you cited in the footnote? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I did not get the figure from over there. Let me, Mr Chairman, refer to Ramesh's article?

396. Oh, yes. Please refer to the article and tell us how you were confused? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) In which bundle is Ramesh's article?

397. Have you had a chance of reading it? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes. I have got it in front of me right now.

398. For our benefit, please tell us how you were confused about that 0.9%? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I look at this and the figures did not appear.

Mr Davinder Singh] Could you read out that sentence?

Mr Wong Kan Seng

399. Read out the whole paragraph "Singapore's health system is ... expenditures."? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) -

"Singapore's health expenditure is, for the most part, a privately financed fee-for-service system in which patient payments account for more than two-thirds of expenditures. Indeed, the government's share of total health expenditure in Singapore fell from 39% in 1960 to 37.4% in 1985 and then rapidly to 27.4% in 1989. This is in contrast to most other countries, which have witnessed continuous growth in government's share of health expenditures."

Mr Davinder Singh

400. So how is Ramesh's article authority for the proposition that the figure is 0.9%? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Let me have a couple of seconds to take a look at the article by Asher. Mr Chairman, I think what is in this reference that was written in *Singapore My Home Too* should have been referring to Mukul Asher's article instead of Ramesh's.

401. Right. So your earlier answer that you were confused by Ramesh's article is not correct? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) It is incorrect.

402. Right. Why then did you say that you were confused by Ramesh's article? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) As I said, Mr Chairman, you are asking me about something that I wrote a year or two ago.

If errors were made in the text, then I cannot remember how it happened or why it happened.

403. I am not asking you how it happened or why it happened. You said you were confused. So you certainly remember you were confused. So I want to ask you why did you say you were confused. I am just interested to understand why you make a certain statement or not. You said that you were confused by Ramesh's article. Now you say that, "No. I was not confused by Ramesh's article." So having now conceded that you were not confused by Ramesh's article, my question is why did you in the first instance - ? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Mr Chairman, I did not say that I was not confused by Ramesh's article. I said that looking at this book right now, this reference was wrongly referred to. Reference should have been made to Mukul Asher's article instead.

404. Did you not say that it was incorrect for you to have said that you were confused by Ramesh's article? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* We were using double negatives and then you are throwing me completely out. Would you rephrase the question?

405. Yes, I will. I said, therefore, it is incorrect for you to have said earlier that you were confused by Ramesh's article and you said yes? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I recall, Mr Chairman, what I said was that Ramesh's article did not have this figure in there.

406. So my question is: were you or were you not confused by Ramesh's article because honestly, I am confused

by your evidence. So were you or were you not confused by Ramesh's article? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Ramesh's article does not refer to this at all. A wrong reference has been made. And therefore going back and taking a look at this reference, when you go in and look at Ramesh's article, obviously the figures are not there and the reference should have been made to Mukul Asher's article instead.

407. So were you or were you not confused? You have still not answered that question. Were you or were you not confused by Ramesh's article? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* With reference to this book?

408. Yes? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No, I was not.

409. So earlier when you said you were confused, that is inaccurate? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I did say that in Ramesh's article, when we were referring to it in our submission, the errors were in there as well.

410. No. I am talking about the 0.9%, Dr Chee? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* In that case, then it is not. I have to make it clear.

411. So your evidence that you were confused by Ramesh's article is inaccurate because you have just said that you were not confused. Would you agree with me at least on that? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Yes.

412. If it is inaccurate, why did you knowingly make an inaccurate statement? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Would you run that by me again?

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

413. Why did you knowingly say that you were confused when you were not? (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I do not know what you are asking right now because it just does not seem to tally with what I said earlier on.

11.00 am

414. I will take it through the series. Earlier you said, with reference to the 0.9% figure in *Singapore, My Home Too*, I was confused by Ramesh's article. And then we went through the whole rigmarole of trying to understand where the confusion was and we ultimately came to the conclusion that there was no confusion and you said - ? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That we had not read it carefully.

415. No? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That we had a confusion.

416. We will come to that in a moment. You did not read it carefully for the purposes of another submission, but we are talking about *Singapore, My Home Too*. First, you said, "I was confused." Few minutes later, you said, "Well, when I said I was confused, I gave inaccurate evidence." So now I want to know: why did you say you were confused when it was inaccurate? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Why did I say that I was confused when it was inaccurate?

417. You yourself have just said - ? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I suppose the answer would be that because our figures were wrongly referred to, that was where the confusion arose.

418. But you just said that there was no confusion because your earlier evidence that you were confused is inaccurate. Therefore, you are saying that there is no confusion? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, I am not following any of this. What Mr Singh asks and what I said earlier on, I cannot make the connection there. If someone would care to repeat the whole line of questioning and try to make the connection between the question and what I said earlier on, I will appreciate it.

419. I will be very happy to go through it again. When I referred you to *Singapore, My Home Too*, page 145, I asked you: how is it that you got from Ramesh the proposition that the figure was 0.9%? Your answer was: I was confused. And then we discussed at length how that confusion could have arisen, why it did arise, and ultimately - I think about 4 or 5 questions ago - you said: No, I was not confused? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No. I did not say that. What I meant was that at a later point in time I referred to it, I said that a wrong reference was made.

420. Did you not agree with me that your earlier evidence that you were confused is inaccurate? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Run that by me again.

421. You agreed with me? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right.

422. When I asked you this question? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right.

423. Is it not correct that your earlier evidence that you were confused is inaccurate? You said, yes, I agree. Do

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

73

24 OCTOBER 1996

74

you agree? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Maybe it would be more helpful if we have a transcript because I cannot remember any of what you said that I have said and that I have agreed with what you said that I said.

424. All right. Let me now ask you one more time - I think this is the third time. Were you confused by Ramesh's article into coming to that 0.9% figure? Please answer that question. Were you confused by Ramesh's article into coming to that 0.9% figure? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Reading it, having read it, yes, I was confused by it as well.

425. I am trying to get the answer because it will give us an opportunity to go through it again. Please pick up Ramesh's article and tell us how, reading it, you were confused into coming to that 0.9% figure? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Reading it, I said "as well" together with Mukul Asher's article, that was when the whole confusion arose. I did say "as well".

426. My earlier question was: reading Ramesh's article, were you confused? You said yes. That is why I asked you the next question? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, I think what we have done was to later clarify the confusing line of questioning, so when Mr Singh asks me again: was I confused when I read Ramesh's article, I replied that reading it as well I was confused by it. Am I correct in saying that?

427. No, you did not say that earlier. But now you are saying it? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Then maybe we can get the transcript out, Mr Chairman, because

Mr Singh is denying what I said and I am trying to establish what I said.

428. Dr Chee, why then did you cite Ramesh as the footnote for that proposition? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I said it was wrongly cited there.

429. Right. What are the articles which when read together led to the confusion? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) The articles in its entirety? All the articles?

430. Yes? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Well, figures were presented there in Mukul Asher's article. There was also this 40.1%. Let me read it out to you again. Where is Mukul Asher's article?

431. The other bundle at tab 6? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) In that paragraph in there: "The increased cost recovery in the health sector comes at a time of declining contribution by government to total health expenditure..." , and so on until the entire paragraph that is.

432. Yes, read on. What is it in that paragraph which confused you? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Well, I suppose it is the percentages in there and what they were referring to.

433. Right. Could you read the percentages in the context of what they were referring to? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) "... declining contribution by government to total health expenditure from 40.1 per cent in 1970 to 27.4 per cent in 1989 ...".

434. Stop there. What did you think that was referring to? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Total health expenditure.

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

435. That is right. Contribution by government to total health expenditure?

— (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right.

436. And you knew that was what that sentence referred to. So there is no confusion about that. Next line: "... while government health expenditure as a proportion of GDP remained essentially constant at 0.9 per cent between 1980 and 1989 ..." - what was the confusion there? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right now, looking at it, it is not confusing.

437. What was the confusion there? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I cannot remember what was the confusion. But obviously there was an error in there. Confusion arose and an error was made but if you are asking me right now, at that point in time what was the confusion, I cannot give you a clear answer.

438. Well, try. Could you tell us, looking at that three lines, how could a confusion have arisen? If the words are "while government health expenditure [you know what that means, we have settled that] as a proportion of GDP [and I assume you know what that means] remained essentially constant at 0.9 per cent between 1980 and 1989" - what could you have read into that which is not there? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) You are asking me then what could I read, I cannot remember what I thought at that point in time, what was going through my mind at that time. But if you are asking me for the here and now, yes, I will tell you that it is clear, that contribution by government to total health expenditure declined from 40.1% in 1970

to 27.4% in 1989. Then, when we go on, "government health expenditure as a proportion of GDP remained essentially constant at 0.9 per cent".

439. Yes. So you are saying that someone who is a Ph.D and who has lectured may not have understood that sentence: "while government health expenditure as a proportion of GDP remained essentially constant at 0.9 per cent between 1980 and 1989"? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, we are all human beings. We are fallible, we make mistakes. Confusion sometimes comes along.

440. Yes? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) And when we make mistakes, the important thing is to correct them. And that is what we are trying to do over here. Now, if you keep going back to the fact that, "Oh, you are a Ph.D.", I think even the man holding the highest office in the world - except for I don't know who - as long as you are a human being, as I said, we are prone to errors. And therefore when Mr Singh keeps leading back to the fact of Ph.D, I don't deny. The Ph.Ds do make mistakes.

441. Yes. But when Ph.Ds make mistakes, they must know why they make those mistakes surely? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) As at that point in time, what were you thinking chronically.

442. That's right? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) The next minute what were you thinking chronically. Mr Chairman, not wanting to belabour this point, I am sure all the Members, everyone in this room here, have made mistakes before. And if I were to direct you back right now to a

couple of years ago when you made a certain mistake and asked you at that minute or a couple of minutes after that —

443. Dr Chee, please answer that question. The question is very simple? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, I think I have answered already. I told you I cannot remember, but Mr Singh persists in asking this question and I am trying to draw the rationale.

444. Let me summarise it, as I see it, from your answers. You read the White Paper but you read it carelessly. And although the two sentences are as clear as can be, you did not understand them. You read Mukul Asher's article and although the sentence is as clear as can be, you did not understand it. But you cannot explain, either for the White Paper or for this article by Mukul Asher, how is it that you could not understand it whereas now, just looking at it at a glance, one immediately knows what it means? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, may I -

445. Let me go further, please. Although you read Asher's article carelessly and did not understand it, you pick out a figure of 0.9% from that article, not fully understanding what it meant, and put it in *Singapore, My Home Too*, a book that you published last year. And you put it in a sentence which talks about a different thing altogether. Not only did you do that, you then cited as authority for that sentence not Mukul Asher but Ramesh. And Ramesh does not mention a 0.9% figure. So when I asked you how is it that you cited Ramesh, you said you were confused. And when I asked you

what is it in Ramesh's article which led to that confusion *which* led to the 0.9%, you said it was a totality of the articles. And what are the totality of the articles - it is Ramesh's article and Mukul Asher's article. And now you cannot explain how is it that while Ramesh talks about one thing and Mukul Asher talks about two separate things, that confusion could still have occurred. That summarises it, doesn't it? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Pretty much, yes.

446. Thank you. Now, you also had with you when you prepared the written submission the Ministry of Health Annual Report 1993, isn't it right? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I don't know which one you are referring to right now.

447. In fact, I think you referred to it at paragraph 371. If you look at paragraph 371. Could the witness be given a copy of the Annual Report? [*Copy of Annual Report handed to Dr Chee.*] Would you confirm that you had this at the time when you prepared the written submission? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

448. And that you read it? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) We read through it.

449. You read it? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Not in its entirety.

450. Yes. Again, when you said "we" read it, could others have read it? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) They could. I don't know.

451. Yes. And who are these others who could have read it? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I suppose people that were involved with the preparation of the

Dr Chee Soon Juan (cont.)

submission or people that might not even have been involved with the preparation of the submission.

11.15 am

452. And the people who were involved in the preparation of the submission were you and the other panel members? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes. They could have read it.

453. In fact, you asked them to verify your submission and charts? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I handed the submission to them.

454. Yes. Obviously, you asked them to independently verify it? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes. With the understanding that they would independently verify it.

455. Yes. Of course. And to enable them to independently verify it, you would have directed them to the source materials? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No.

456. How would they independently verify it? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That is what the whole thing is, independently provided everything and presented everything. Then they will independently be verifying it.

457. I see. So you give them the submission which did not cite any sources in the text of the submission? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) The submission was presented to them. They were given a copy of the submission.

458. Right. You asked them to independently verify it? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I did not specifically ask them to independently verify. I gave them the copy of the submission with the expectation, of course, that they would read it and if there were any questions, they would want to bring it up or raise it with me.

459. Surely you have the expectation that they would independently verify it? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I just gave them a copy. I expected them to go through the copy and what they did with it, that is something that I -

460. Did you have an expectation that they would independently verify it? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No. To what degree and to what extent?

461. No. Did you have an expectation that they would independently verify it? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I would have expected them that if there were any question, they would bring it up..

462. That is not my question. My question is: did you have an expectation that they would independently verify its contents? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Not exactly. I do not think so.

Mr Davinder Singh] The answer is no.

Mr Wong Kan Seng

463. Can I refer you to your response on 2nd of September? You have a copy there which I asked you to read out earlier on? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Which one?

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

81

24 OCTOBER 1996

82

464. Your letter of 2nd September to the Speaker of Parliament giving the response? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Which bundle?

465. The one in green or blue? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Right.

466. Can you refer to the second last line? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* What page is that?

467. This is your letter, flagged 7? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* The green bundle does not have a flagged 7.

468. It is the blue one. Can you read the part on "wilfully giving false answer"? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* -

"I deny that I wilfully gave a false answer. I had given copies of the draft of the written submission to members of the panel for independent verification of the contents...."

469. So you did give it to them for independent verification of the contents? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Yes. Otherwise, I would not have given them a copy.

470. But you just told us you did not ask them to verify? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No. I gave it to them. I did not say that I asked them to go and independently verify all these figures.

Mr Davinder Singh

471. You say now that you did not tell them expressly to independently verify it. A few minutes ago, I asked you: did you have the expectation that they would independently verify it? You said no. So what is the meaning of the sentence in your sworn defence that you gave it to

them for independent verification? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Yes. But that is different from what I expect of them.

472. You gave it to them for independent verification but had no expectation that they would independently verify it? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* They did.

473. They did? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* They did what they wanted to do, Mr Chairman. Let me not be taken out of context. I think it is important that Mr Singh does not cut me off half way through my sentence. What I said was when I gave them the copies of the submission and what I expected them to do is going to be very different from what I gave them the copies for. Is that clear? I think that is important to establish.

474. Yes. Thank you. When you gave it to them, you did not say anything to the effect that they should independently verify it. Right? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I did not say, please go and independently verify the figures in the submission.

475. Right. And when I asked you, did you have the expectation that they would independently verify it, you said no. So - ? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* And, Mr Chairman, let me -

476. I have not finished my question. If you did not tell them to independently verify it, if you did not expect them to independently verify it, why had you said in your sworn defence that you gave it to them for independent verification? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I gave them the article, the submission and they could do to whatever degree that they wanted to do with the submission, asked questions

Dr Chee Soon Juan (cont.)

about it, made corrections, made amendments to it. Now when you are actually talking about independent verification, as what we have been referring to, as I understand, who we have been referring to all the time, that is, going back, digging up Mukul Asher's article, looking at Ramesh's article and so on, no, I did not expect them to go to that degree of verification. But if you are talking about asking me, are we saying what it is supposed to say, or are we on the right track here and soon and so forth, that also constitutes verification, would it not? And that would be independent, would it not? Because if I actually gave them one copy and asked them all to discuss it and then give me a collective report, then it would not be independent. And that is what we mean by independent verification. That is why I hope that it will not be taken out of context.

Prof. Jayakumar

477. Mr Chairman, can I ask the witness, Dr Chee, to read out the last sentence of his individual defence beginning with "I deny"? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I am sorry. I need you to refer me to the document.

478. Your individual and separate defence. Can you read the entirety of the last paragraph? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) -

"I deny that I wilfully gave a false answer. I had given copies of the draft -"

479. Slowly, please? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) -

"...I had given copies of the draft of the written submission to members of the panel for independent verification of the contents."

480. Continue? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) -

"... When no one brought to my attention the error, I assumed that everything was in order and that, as far as we could, we had verified the accuracy of the contents including Chart 1."

481. In reply to Mr Davinder Singh's question as to whether your expectation was that they would have independently verified, your answer was no. You did not have that expectation? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Not to the degree -

482. No. Your answer to his question was - ? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No. My answer to his question was also what I said about a couple of minutes ago.

483. No. What was the answer you gave to his question? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) My expectation was that I did not.

484. Correct? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That I did not finish and end over there, Mr Chairman, so I just would appreciate it if Members would stop taking things I said out of context. I also continued on and I did clarify what I meant by independent verification. Now would you like me to repeat that or are you quite clear of what I said already?

485. Can I proceed to ask Dr Chee? This defence was a defence to Mr George Yen's complaint, am I right? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

486. In that complaint, BG George Yeo had made - ? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I beg your pardon.

487. In his complaint, Minister George Yeo had raised several important complaints, complaint of perjury, complaint of prevarication, complaint of wilfully giving false answer and had given details to support his complaint. This defence that is submitted together with the joint defence was your collective as well as your separate and individual defence on the matters complained of in Minister George Yeo's complaint. Am I right? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right.

488. You have prepared this defence carefully? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

489. Thank you. When you crafted this last paragraph and you said "I deny that I wilfully gave a false answer" and when you said, "I had given copies of the draft of the written submission to members of the panel for independent verification of the contents" you have told us you did not specifically tell them to go and independently verify? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That is correct.

490. What do you mean by "independent verification"? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I thought I have just said this a couple of minutes ago.

491. Repeat it. What do you mean by "independent verification"? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) The fact that if they were given a copy and they wanted to bring anything up to me, they could do so. But at the same time, I did not expect them to go into the kind of detailed and independent verification of figures, of articles, going back and digging up Ramesh's article, Asher's article. That is what I meant. That is what I said.

492. If you did not intend that, then why did you say you had given copies to the members of the panel for independent verification of the contents? The contents mean the contents of the submission? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right.

493. If that was not your intention, why did you put this sentence in your defence? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That was not my intention. I do not think you understood what I said a little while ago, do you?

494. I am asking a question. Why did you put this sentence in your defence that you have given the draft? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I take it that you are talking about the statement that I had given copies. Is that what you are referring to?

495. Yes? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right.

496. Why did you put that in your defence when you said you did not intend that they go and investigate and verify the details of your submission? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Let me just go ahead and answer your question again. I said earlier on that when I gave the submission to the rest of them, I gave them so that if they wanted to raise anything with me, they could do so. That in itself is, to me, independent verification. I also said I did not expect them to go in to dig up articles and if that were, I suppose, referred to in the submission they should be able to go in and therefore verify to the extent of getting the author of the article, M Ramesh, and so on, to independently verify the figures.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

87

24 OCTOBER 1996

88

Prof. Jayakumar (cont.)

497. Then the next part of that paragraph, you said, "When no one brought to my attention ..." - ? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* The next sentence?

498. The next sentence of that paragraph, when you said "When no one brought to my attention the error [of course we are talking about different errors] I assumed that everything was in order and that, as far as we could, we had verified the accuracy ..." How do you expect a member of the panel to bring to your attention an error, any error, if you had not expected him to check against any sources? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Would you repeat that question?

499. I thought my question is very simple? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No. Your question is not simple at all.

500. You have said, "When no one brought to my attention the error, I assumed everything was in order and that, as far as we could, we had verified the accuracy of the contents ...". How do you expect a member of your panel to have brought to your attention an error, any error, if they had not checked with the sources? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* How do I expect them?

11.30 am

501. Yes? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* To have brought to my attention the error?

502. Any error? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* If they had not checked?

503. Yes? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I would have left it to them. I would not have directed them - please check. At least I did not direct them to please check and independently verify these figures and come back to me if they found any errors. I did not tell them that.

504. But you had assumed that if they had not brought to your attention any error they would have, as best as they could, verified the accuracy of the contents? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* That is exactly what I said.

Prof. Jayakumar] Thank you. We can move on.

Mr Davinder Singh] Therefore, although you did not tell them, you say that they should independently verify it and although you had no expectation that they would verify it, it is your defence that you gave it to them for verification. I move on now -

Assoc. Prof. Ho Peng Kee

505. Can I just ask Dr Chee, Mr Chairman? You said in your defence that you had assumed that everything was in order and that, as far as they could, they had verified the accuracy of the contents including Chart 1. Is that a reasonable assumption, Dr Chee, given the fact that you had no expectations that they would verify the contents, you never asked them to verify the contents? And yet when they came back to you without saying anything, you assumed that they had verified and that everything was in order? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Mr Chairman, I think I have answered this the third or

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

89

24 OCTOBER 1996

90

fourth time already. Would you like me to answer that again?

Chairman] Yes.

Assoc. Prof. Ho Peng Kee

506. Yes? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I have already said that when I gave them the copy of the submission, it was for them to tell me if there was anything wrong with the submission in however great detail. But I certainly did not expect them to go in and if you want to use the words "independently verify" for this particular subject in as far as figures are concerned, references/articles are concerned, no, I did not expect them to do that.

507. You took the lead role in writing the submission? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Yes.

508. The others had minor roles? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Well, define it how you want but I -

509. We have it on record, before the Select Committee hearing, Mr Kwan saying that he had a minor role. Mr Kunalen said that he did nothing more than just make sure that the references tally with the charts and the language is all right? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* If you want to say that that is a minor role, yes, then it is a minor role.

510. So when you gave them the submission for independent verification, without any expectation that they would do more, and when they came back, given their minor roles, yet you assumed that

they had verified and everything was in order? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Mr Chairman, if what the Member is referring to is, did I tell them, go and photocopy this, you check the graph to see whether it tallies, no, I did not tell them that.

511. Would you say therefore that in fact your assumption is not a reasonable one? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* My assumption is not a reasonable one?

512. Your assumption that as far as they could, they had verified the accuracy of the contents, including Chart 1. If you had told them to do it, if you expected them to do it and they came back without any further comments, perhaps your assumption is reasonable. But you did not tell them to do anything, you did not expect them to do anything, they came back, they did not say anything, and yet you assumed that everything was in order, including the accuracy? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* The submission was given to them. And then they went ahead and did whatever verification they wanted to do. I did not tell them what to look for. I did not tell them of the different roles or what they should be doing. I just handed it to them.

Mr Wong Kan Seng

513. Can you tell us exactly what did you tell them when you gave them the submission? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* What I told them exactly? I cannot answer you that question. Can you tell me what you said exactly on that day, the time when you had a meeting?

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

91

24 OCTOBER 1996

92

Mr Wong Kan Seng (cont.)

514. You gave them the submission to verify. What did you tell them when you said "verify"? What did you exactly tell them? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I cannot remember what exactly I told them.

515. That is what you said? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I am sorry.

516. In your letter here, you said you gave them to independently verify. So what did you say when you gave it to them? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I cannot remember what I told them or whether I told them anything at all.

517. Each one of them was given a submission, all the panel members? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I think that is abundantly clear, isn't it?

518. Also a copy was given to Kwan Yue Keng? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Yes, copies given to Mr Kwan.

Mr Wong Kan Seng] Okay. We move on.

Mr Davinder Singh

519. I just want to settle one issue before I move on. I had suggested that you had said in evidence that it was at the hearing on 15th July that you realised the mistake, the 0.8% for Singapore, and you took issue with me and you said that it was only after the hearing. Do you still say that it was only after the hearing you realised that 0.8% was a mistake? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* It was after the session.

520. After the hearing? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* The discussion that we had which was during the hearing. The hearing did not end until sometime around 11 o'clock that evening.

521. So you realised the mistake after the hearing? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* At 11 o'clock?

522. You tell us, please? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* But I just told you.

523. When did you realise the mistake - during or after the hearing? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Mr Chairman, how much clearer do you want me to get? Which part of my statement earlier on that you did not understand?

524. So please repeat it for my benefit? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* All right. We came to the understanding or to the realisation after that particular session during that hearing which did not end until 11.00 pm that day.

525. What do you mean by "session". You said after the session? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* That session when we were talking about this particular subject.

526. Right. So the hearing on 15th July lasted many hours. One segment of it dealt with this issue. Are you saying that you realised the mistake after that segment but during the course of the hearing? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Correct.

527. You did not at any time during that hearing therefore say that it was a mistake or a misunderstanding? -

(*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) What happened was that, after that, we moved on.

528. Yes. Are you saying that because you moved on, there was no opportunity for you to say, "Wait a minute, Mr Chairman - ? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I was not in control. Mr Chairman, I was not in control of what subject to bring up at what time. So I could not have moved on willingly.

529. So you could not have said at any time, "Wait a minute. We have realised a mistake. Please let me point it out."? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) As I said, it was after that session of that discussion that we had.

530. Yes? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) At the end of it. And then at the end of it, after that, we moved on.

531. Right. Now, you agreed with me this morning that it is the honourable thing to do that when a mistake is discovered to correct it immediately? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Most certainly.

532. You did not correct it on 15th July? And you did not - ? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I would like to respond to that, Mr Chairman.

533. Yes? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I have already made it very clear that it was during that session. It was at the end of that session and then we moved on. If you talk about 15th July, we had already moved on and I did not come back to this point again.

534. Yes. Although you had ample opportunity to do so, you did not write a

letter to the Speaker to say that an error had been made? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I am sorry.

535. You did not after the session write a letter to the Speaker to say that during the hearing we realised an error had been made? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) After the session?

536. After the session on 15th July? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right. We were summoned to appear before the Select Committee again at a later point in time.

537. So between 15th July and 12th August, for a period of one month, although you knew there was an error, you did not see it fit to draw the Speaker's or the Select Committee's attention to it? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That is not true at all. Because at the end we made a correction and said that 3.1% would be the figure.

538. I just drew your attention to that section where you said: "I did not say ... put it at 3.1%"? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) But I also said, let us put it at 3.1%.

539. So you gave two inconsistent answers? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No. As I said -

540. Let us move on? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, I think I would like to respond. Mr Singh -

541. Let us move on? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) May I, Mr Chairman?

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

95

24 OCTOBER 1996

96

Chairman

542. All right. I will allow you to respond? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I drew your attention to the fact that it was said in context to what Mr George Yeo had said in that particular paragraph. So it should not be taken out of context again.

Chairman] Mr Singh.

Mr Davinder Singh

543. Yes. I just like, for the record, to confirm that at no time during that session or at any time thereafter, including the session on 12th August, did you say it was a mistake or a misunderstanding and the first time you said it was when the complaint was lodged against you and you responded in the defence. Now, if you look at the Ministry of Health Annual Report 1993 -? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, I think we did —

Chairman] If you will allow Mr Singh to finish. Mr Singh.

Mr Davinder Singh

544. At page 9 of that report. You have it with you? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, I think Mr Singh actually has finished that comment earlier on.

Chairman] Let Mr Singh continue. I am not so sure what he is leading to. So I will allow him to finish first.

Mr Davinder Singh

545. For the purposes of the preparation of the submission and at that session itself on 15th July, you had the Ministry of Health Annual Report 1993? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Are you referring to this report [*indicating*]?

546. Yes. Could you please turn to page 9, under the heading *Health Care Expenditure*? You see that? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

547. Could you read the first sentence of the second paragraph? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) "The total expenditure of the Ministry for Financial Year 1993 was \$766 million or 0.9% of GDP."

548. Could you now read the first sentence of the first paragraph, under *Health Care Expenditure*? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) "The national health care expenditure in 1993 was \$2,600 million or 2.9% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP)."

549. Was there any ambiguity in that sentence when you read it, when you prepared the submission? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I think I have answered that already and in the same context when you referred me to Mukul Asher's paper and so on. My answer would be -

Chairman

550. Dr Chee, please answer the question. But do not give answers that you have given before. Please answer the question? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) My answer would be that in reading all the

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

97

24 OCTOBER 1996

98

articles in its totality, the confusion arose from the figures that were presented in these articles.

Mr Davinder Singh

551. Yes. What was the confusion when you read this article? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) The same thing that I said a little while ago. If you ask me now, what went through my mind at that particular point in time, I cannot tell you. Because I cannot remember.

552. So you were confused about the White Paper, Mukul Asher, Mr Ramesh, and now this report, and you cannot tell us what the confusion was about, although you read all these documents for the purposes of putting in your submission to the Select Committee sometime in April 1996. Then I assume you also had Dr Kanwaljit Soin's speech with you when you were preparing the submission? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

553. Were you confused about that speech? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Separately. Let me get one thing clear, Mr Chairman. I keep coming back to the point, you read it in its totality.

Mr Wong Kan Seng

554. Can you please answer the question first? Were you confused when you read Dr Kanwaljit Soin's speech? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Together with the rest of the articles -

555. Before you answer that, please explain? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I read all the articles together.

Mr Davinder Singh

556. No. My question is -? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Not at the same second, if I have to clarify that again, but during the same period.

557. When you read Dr Kanwaljit Soin's speech, were you confused? Just reading that speech? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Together with the rest?

558. Yes, just reading that speech? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes, obviously, I would have confused it together with the rest of these articles.

11.45 am

559. Dr Chee, my question is very simple. Just reading the speech itself, were you confused? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

560. What were you confused about in that speech? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) In that particular speech, as I mentioned during the hearing itself, I thought that Dr Soin was referring to a figure that she was apparently not referring to, and she cleared it up during the hearing itself.

Mr Davinder Singh

561. Could the witness be given a copy of Dr Soin's speech in the *Hansard*? [*Copy of Dr Kanwaljit Soin's speech given to witness.*] Is it in front of you? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

562. Could you please read the first paragraph appearing against her name, beginning with "Thank you."? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) "Sir, would you like me to take all my cuts together?"

563. Then it goes to, "**The Chairman:** Yes." Then, "**Dr Kanwaljit Soin:** Thank you."? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) "My first cut, Sir, is on health expenditure. I would like to read out the budget allocation for health:".

564. All right, stop there. " ... budget allocation for health" means Government expenditure, you agreed with me earlier today? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

565. Yes, you understood that. Please read on? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I understand that.

566. Oh, you did not understand that in March? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I did not read it when we went through it, as I said. It was all together with the rest of the figures in the rest of the report.

567. Are you saying that you understood what "budget allocation for health" means but that you did not pick it up when you read it? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No.

568. What are you saying? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) What am I saying referring to what?

569. You said that you now know what "budget allocation for health"

means. What was your understanding of the words "budget allocation for health" in March or April this year? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Repeat that, please.

570. What was your understanding of the words "budget allocation for health", in March or April this year? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) With reference to the figures there?

571. The question is really quite straightforward. What was your understanding of the words "budget allocation for health" when you were preparing your submission in March or April this year? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That it is Government expenditure.

572. Thank you. Let us read on. From "FY94," could you please read on? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) "FY94, 1.18% of GDP; FY95, 1.15% of GDP; and FY96, 0.85% of GDP".

573. Right. You therefore knew in March or April this year that the first few sentences which you just read out and which you read in March or April this year meant Government expenditure as a percentage of GDP? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

574. Right. If you knew that in March or April this year, why did you need Dr Kanwaljit Soin to clarify it at the hearing on 15th July? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Because at that point in time, it was not clear to me.

575. But you just said you understood it in March or April of this year to mean

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

101

24 OCTOBER 1996

102

Government expenditure as a proportion of GDP? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) As I was preparing the submission, Mr Chairman, when I went through this article over here, I was not clear of what she was referring to.

576. But you just said that in March or April this year, you understood these four lines to mean Government expenditure as a percentage of GDP? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, I said I understand what you are referring to right now. But at that time when I was preparing the submission -

Mr Wong Kan Seng

577. We will play back the tape? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) In the meanwhile, Mr Chairman, may I go to the restroom?

Chairman] All right. I think it is an appropriate moment for us to take a short five-minute break. We will resume at 11.55 am.

Hearing accordingly suspended at 11.50 am until 11.55 am.

Hearing resumed at 11.55 am

[Mr Speaker in the Chair]

Chairman] Order. We will resume examination of Dr Chee. Mr Davinder Singh, you may continue.

Mr Davinder Singh] Thank you, Sir. I wonder whether we could have that relevant portion replayed on the video.

The following text was replayed:

"568. What are you saying? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) What am I saying referring to what?"

569. You said that you now know what "budget allocation for health" means. What was your understanding of the words "budget allocation for health" in March or April this year? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Repeat that, please.

570. What was your understanding of the words "budget allocation for health" in March or April this year? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) With reference to the figures there?

571. The question is really quite straightforward. What was your understanding of the words "budget allocation for health" when you were preparing your submission in March or April this year? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That it is Government expenditure.

572. Thank you. Let us read on. From "FY94," could you please read on? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) "FY94, 1.18% of GDP; FY95, 1.15% of GDP; and FY96, 0.85% of GDP".

573. Right. You therefore knew in March or April this year that the first few sentences which you just read out and which you read in March or April this year meant Government expenditure as a percentage of GDP? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

574. Right. If you knew that in March or April this year, why did you need Dr Kanwaljit Soin to clarify it at the hearing on 15th July? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Because at that point in time, it was not clear to me."

[End of video tape replay]

Mr Davinder Singh

578. But you just said you understood it in March or April of this year to mean Government expenditure as a proportion of GDP? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, may I request for the tape to be played further back?

Chairman

579. At which point you want the tape to be played further back? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) There was one part when I was asked whether I understood and I said that I understand and that was said not without a purpose.

Mr Davinder Singh

580. Yes. Subsequently, I clarified with you whether you understood it in March or April this year when you were preparing the submission? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, questions were put repeatedly to me and I keep answering them. There are times when sitting here and questions are asked repeatedly, sometimes you can mishear things.

Chairman

581. Dr Chee, it appears that Mr Singh's question was very clear? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Why was it then that my answer was not clear and that Mr Singh had to persistently ask me what he said. Could we play that portion back, Mr Chairman? I think it would make things very clear what I said.

Mr Davinder Singh

582. Dr Chee, did you not just see and hear that you said "Yes" when I asked you whether you agree that in March or April this year you understood budget allocation for health to mean Government expenditure? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, I would also

like to see that portion when Mr Singh asked the same question and I answered it, very differently. May we see that portion, Mr Chairman? Then I can actually show what I am trying to say right now.

583. Whether or not you answered it differently, and I will come to that in a moment, you did say, did you not, that you understood it in March or April this year to mean Government expenditure? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) What I said earlier on was that I understand it, and that, as I said, is not without a purpose.

584. I want your own answer? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, I would like to request for it to be played back to that portion where I said what I said, and that would make it very clear. As I have already pointed out, questions are put repeatedly to me and in the most confusing of ways, and when that happens, sometimes, you do answer them very differently if you misheard things.

Mr Abdullah Tarmugi

585. Mr Chairman, I am not sure what was confusing about the second question whether it was in March or April. What was so confusing about it? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) There was nothing confusing about it. As I said, he has asked repeatedly. After a little while, sometimes you lose your attention for a minute and you think you hear what the questioner asks.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

105

24 OCTOBER 1996

106

Chairman

586. Dr Chee, the question that was put to you by Mr Singh, in my opinion, was very clear? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* To you, Mr Chairman, but I am sitting right over here, hearing the questions over and over again.

587. Dr Chee, I have been very patient with you the whole of this morning. In the interest of being fair to you, I have given you a lot of leeway. I do not want you to trifle with the Committee or any Member of the Committee. I have already said that the question put to you by Mr Singh is very clear to all of us here. We have played back the tape for you. You had the benefit of listening to the question that has been asked. You heard for yourself what you have said and I do not see any need for you to go further back when the point had been made very clear? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* What point has been made very clear, Mr Chairman?

588. The point that you just said in reply to Mr Singh? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Mr Chairman, did I not already also respond? That to you it may have seem very clear. But I have to listen to every question that is put to me. And if you go back and look at every question and count how many questions have been put to me, Mr Chairman, grant me the fact that sometimes I can mishear questions.

Chairman] Dr Chee, I warn you again not to trifle with the Committee. Your conduct borders on the contumacious and I want you to conduct yourself from now on in a manner befitting a hearing of a

Parliamentary Committee. I would have to insist that you stop trifling with the Committee. We have established a point. Mr Singh asked a question. You denied having said certain things. We played back the tape for you. I think the point is very clear. We will move on. Mr Singh.

Mr Davinder Singh

589. Thank you, Sir. Dr Chee, you understood Dr Soin to be talking about Government expenditure because when you prepared Chart 3, you had the intention that Chart 3 should reflect budget allocations. Is that not right? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Repeat that question.

590. You knew, when you prepared that submission, that Dr Soin was talking about Government expenditure because -? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I knew as in which period.

591. When you prepared the submission? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No, I did not.

592. Right. If now you say, contrary to your earlier answer, that you did not know that Dr Soin was talking about Government expenditure, why then did you put her figure into Chart 3? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Can you repeat that question?

593. The question is very simple? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Mr Chairman, as I said, I have to make it absolutely clear and I am asking you to make sure that I have heard him correctly.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

107

24 OCTOBER 1996

108

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

594. If, contrary to what you said earlier, you were not sure what Dr Soin was referring to when she talked about 0.85%, why did you put that figure into Chart 3? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Obviously, I had assumed that that was the correct figure.

595. And you assumed that that was the correct figure for what? National health expenditure? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* For whatever that was presented in the submission.

596. Did you assume that it was the correct figure for national health expenditure as a proportion of GDP or Government expenditure as a proportion of GDP? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* For what was presented in the submission. If you like, let us refer back to the submission.

597. Could you please answer the question? What did you think it was the correct figure for Government expenditure as a percentage of GDP or national health expenditure as a percentage of GDP? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* At that point I was making the submission?

598. When you were preparing the Chart? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* When I was preparing the chart?

599. Yes? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* As I said, can I refer back to the Chart Mr Chairman?

600. Yes, you can look at the Chart. There is a Chart right up there which you

can take a look? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Right. And your question again?

Chairman

601. Dr Chee, you seem to have a problem understanding questions, even though they had been repeated to you. In order not to waste the time of the Committee any further, can I suggest that if you do have this problem, take out your pen and write the question on a piece of paper so that you can have the question right in front of you instead of constantly asking for questions to be repeated. Now please do that. Do you require any paper and pencil? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Yes.

Chairman] Yes, we would provide you with the papers and pencil. The Clerk will arrange for this. [*Paper and pencil given to Dr Chee*].

Mr Davinder Singh

602. In March or April this year, what did you think 0.8% was the correct figure of? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Mr Chairman, I have said it and I will say it again, I do not know. I cannot remember at that point in time. What happened was that I took the figure. I put it down as the figure that was presented in the submission. How much clearer can I get on that point there?

RA dm Teo Chee Hean

603. Dr Chee, you have a Ph.D? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* We have

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

109

24 OCTOBER 1996

110

established the point over and over again.
Shall I answer that?

Chairman

604. Just answer yes or no? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) But it is these questions that make it very tiring for me sitting here. You must understand. That you ask questions one at a time. I have to respond to each and every question. That is what I am saying. For example, if you ask me now -

605. Dr Chee, you are the one being summoned to answer charges? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I understand. Exactly.

Chairman] Do answer the questions put forward to you. Dr Chee, there is a question being put forward to you. Could you answer it?

RAdm Teo Chee Hean

606. Dr Chee, you have a Ph.D. Is that correct? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That is correct.

607. You carried out your research thoroughly and carefully? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That is correct. Which research are you referring to?

608. When you researched for the submission, you look for supporting material? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) As far as I can, yes.

609. You were quite thorough in looking for supporting materials? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I try to be as and when I can.

610. In fact, you were quite thorough. You found Asher's article, you found Ramesh's article, you looked up health care cost in the Government White Paper. You even looked up Dr Kanwaljit Soin's speech in the *Hansard*. Is that correct? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) These articles were sometimes given to me rather than me going to the various places to look for them and so on, if that is what you mean.

611. Nevertheless, you had all these articles. You looked at them thoroughly? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That is right.

612. And yet you say that you did not read the articles carefully? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I also said that reading in totality the figures presented were confusing. As a result, the figures were wrongly put in the submission.

613. But in your defence, you were saying that you did not read them carefully. I heard you say that a number of times just now. You looked for all these materials. You found all these materials. You went through quite a lot of trouble to look for it, and yet you did not read it carefully when you went to all these troubles to find these materials. How can you explain that, Dr Chee? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I explain it by the fact that I am only human and I have said it so many times, Mr Chairman. I think we are all very aware of the fact that it does not matter if you are sitting there or I am sitting here. We are all humans and we make errors. There were also errors made by officials from the Ministry of Health.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

111

24 OCTOBER 1996

112

12.15 pm

RAdm Teo Chee Hean (cont.)

614. Dr Chee, you were very thorough when you looked for the material? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I try to be as much as I can and I think -

615. Nevertheless, after having found the material, you say that you did not read it carefully. I cannot reconcile the two, Dr Chee. Can you help me to reconcile the two? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Unless you tell me that you are not human, then I suppose that it will be easy for me to tell you.

616. But you were quite thorough in looking for the material? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Human errors do occur.

617. And when you found the material, you did not read it carefully? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* As I said, the confusion had arisen from the articles that I read.

RAdm Teo Chee Hean] I see. Thank you.

Mr Davinder Singh

618. Dr Chee, what did you think in March or April of this year when you were preparing the submission and the chart was 0.8% the correct figure of? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* On the chart that we presented, that was the national health expenditure.

619. Right. So in March or April this year, you believed that 0.8% was the

percentage of the national health expenditure over GDP? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Run that bye me again.

620. You believed honestly in March or April this year that 0.8% was a percentage of the national health expenditure of the GDP. Is that right? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Right.

621. If that is correct, why then did you put a national health expenditure percentage into a chart which was meant to deal with, budget allocations? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Why did I -

622. Why did you put a figure for national health expenditure into a chart which was meant - ? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Let me write it down.

623. Why did you put a figure reflecting the national health expenditure percentage in the chart which was meant for budget allocations? In other words, meant for Government expenditure? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Would you refer me to the chart?

624. Chart 3? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* That is the national health expenditure.

625. I see. So if I were to say to you that this chart is on budget allocations, I would have no basis for saying that? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Right.

Mr Davinder Singh] Right. Could you pick up the Select Committee Report and could you read out loud paragraphs 262, 263, 264 and 265? Read out loud, please.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

113

24 OCTOBER 1996

114

Mr Wong Kan Seng

626. It is at col. 146? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) "The "health care" refers to total health care in the economy? ... Government health care expenditure."

Mr Davinder Singh

627. No. I think for our benefit, if you could read the name of the questioner and then the name of the answerer, and then the question and the answer, as you read it? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I read:

"262. BG George Yong-Boon Yeo: The "health care" refers to total health care in the economy? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Government health care expenditure.

263. BG George Yong-Boon Yeo: Does it show net government health expenditure? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Let me get the figures in just a moment. It is the budget allocation for health as a percentage of the GDP.

264. BG George Yong-Boon Yeo: Can you repeat that, Dr Chee? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) It is the budget allocation for health as a percentage of the GDP."

Any other paragraph?

628. Paragraph 265? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) "So this would reflect government health expenditure as quoted in the Supply Bill? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I repeat, it is the budget allocation for health."

629. Thank you. Put that away, please. So were you lying when you told the Select Committee on 15th July that the chart reflected budget allocations? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No.

630. But a few moments ago, I put the question in this way. If I were to say that

that chart reflected budget allocations, I would have had no basis. You said, yes? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) You have no basis for what?

631. For saying that? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) For comparing Singapore to Japan, OECD and USA.

632. Dr Chee, just to-?- (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Would you like to play that segment back? I do not think Mr Singh actually -

Prof Jayakumar] Mr Chairman, I think it is not for Dr Chee to tell us to play it back. Eventually, the Committee will have the full verbatim transcript of what transpired and I guess the Committee will eventually have to form its own conclusions. I think we should move on.

Chairman] Yes. Mr Singh.

Mr Davinder Singh

633. Thank you, Sir. So when you gave the answer on 15th July that the chart reflects the budget allocation for health as a percentage of the GDP, were you telling the truth? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Would you repeat that question, Mr Singh?

634. Were you telling the truth when you said on 15th July 1996 that the chart reflected the budget allocation for health as a percentage of GDP? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That chart over there?

635. Yes? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Represented the -

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

115

24 OCTOBER 1996

116

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

636. Represented the budget allocation for health as a percentage of GDP? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* The chart represented budget allocation as a percentage of GDP.

637. Yes. Those figures were budget allocations as a proportion of GDP? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* For the one on Singapore, yes, it is. That is why there was no basis for comparison.

638. Dr Chee, at the hearing, you said you were comparing apples with apples. Is that right? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Right, Mr Chairman. As a result, a clarification was made. And I keep saying if we look at it in its entirety -

639. Just a few moments ago, you said that that chart was to reflect national health expenditure. Did you not say that? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* That chart over there?

640. Yes? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Obviously, it does not represent either one, because it is comparing two different sets of figures.

641. Thank you. But I asked you a moment ago what was 0.8% meant to reflect and you said national health expenditure. Then I said, if I were to tell you that that chart reflects budget allocation for health as a percentage of GDP, would I have a basis for saying that? You said no. But that is exactly what you said on 15th July that the chart reflected budget allocation for health as a percentage of GDP? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Right.

642. So would you now accept that when you said that the chart reflected the budget allocation for health as a percentage of GDP, you were not telling the truth? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No. Mr Chairman, I am thoroughly confused right now of what Mr Singh is asking. Like I said a little while ago, I have been answering questions for the last 3-4 hours. And after a little while, your attention's span is not as acute and it is difficult for me to follow questions repeatedly and phrased in different ways. I am not grasping it at all. And it is difficult for me simply because humanly it is difficult just to be able to answer question after question and phrased in different forms. Sometimes I do not understand the words being asked, the essence of it.

Chairman] Please continue, Mr Singh. Put the question again to Dr Chee.

Mr Davinder Singh

643. Were you telling the truth on 15th July 1996 when you said that the chart was the budget allocation for health as a percentage of GDP? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* At that point in time?

644. Were you telling the truth? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* At that point in time, with what was given to me, I answered to the best of my ability. I answered it, given the information that was put before me.

645. Right. So if you were telling the truth that the chart represented the budget allocation for health as a percentage of GDP, you must have

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

117

24 OCTOBER 1996

118

known that 0.8% was not national health expenditure but budget allocation? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) At the hearing itself?

646. Yes? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) It was later cleared up, was it not?

647. I am asking you about what you said at paragraphs 262 to 265? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) There was some confusion at the beginning and later on it was clarified.

648. But you just said that you were telling the truth. If you were telling the truth - ? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) What was I saying and telling what truth and when? I am not following what you are saying at this point in time. You say that I said the truth. Are you referring to the truth of what I am saying right now? Maybe the Members here would like to clarify what Mr Singh is referring to exactly.

649. Dr Chee, I suggest you understand what I was asking and let me ask you again. Because I have a difficulty following the answers you gave at the 15th July hearing and your defence. On 15th July, you were asked what did Chart 3 represent. Do you understand this so far? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right.

650. Your answer, repeated on three or four occasions, was that it was the budget allocation for health as a percentage of the GDP. Do you understand that so far? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Correct.

651. Yes. Just pausing there, when you gave that answer, were you telling the

truth or not? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) As much as I have at that point in time. There was no deliberate attempt. Is that what you mean?

652. Was that a truthful or a false statement? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That was what I was referring to. It was a budget allocation for health as a percentage of GDP.

653. You honestly held the view that the chart represented the budget allocation for health. Is that correct? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Because in paragraph 266, the question was, "This refers to the number on Singapore? This 0.8% refers to the statistic on Singapore?" Yes, obviously, we would not be talking about another country in the situation.

654. Please answer the question? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right. That is what I am trying to say. At that point, I was given that situation over there. Given those figures, I tried as best as I could to confirm the figures in there.

655. Were you telling the truth when you said that Chart 3 represented the budget allocation for health as a percentage of GDP? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) If I am wrong, then it is not correct. That is different from whether we were telling the truth or not.

Chairman

656. Dr Chee, I repeat again. Stop trifling with the Committee? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, I have no intention of trifling with this Committee.

Chairman (cont.)

657. A question that has been put forward is: were you telling the truth or not? And I think that is a question that requires a simple yes or no. But you are going into some kind of elaborate explanation and, on the other hand, you are complaining that you are faced with a barrage of questions from Members of the panel. In this case, it is a very straightforward question. Just answer yes or no. So could I have an answer from you, yes or no? Were you telling the truth, yes or no? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Mr Chairman, my answer would be that the answer given there as referred to that chart there was incorrect.

658. Thank you? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* That is different from whether I was telling the truth or not. And, Mr Chairman, I asked for some fairness in this proceeding here as I do not have counsel representing me at this point in time. And that is why sometimes I do not know about the legality of words used. But it is very different when I say something is incorrect versus whether I am telling the truth or not. I hope you can understand that part of it. And as best as I can, I am trying to answer the questions. But when questions are put in such a way as to force me to answer yes or no, then I am afraid I cannot answer it because the answer is not there.

Chairman] Dr Chee, I have been more than fair to you in giving you a lot of leeway for the whole of this morning. Mr Singh.

Mr Davinder Singh

659. Thank you. Now that you concede that you made an incorrect statement to the Select Committee, let me ask you this. You must have honestly believed that Chart 3 represented budget allocation as a percentage of GDP? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No, no.

12.30 pm

660. Thank you. If you thought that Chart 3 was the budget allocation for health as a percentage of GDP, why did you put in the national expenditure figures for Japan, the OECD and the USA? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* The question is why. And I have repeatedly answered, to all the questions, Mr Chairman, that this is a human error. You ask me now, how did that human error occur? Why did the chicken cross the road? I do not know. What I am trying to say, Mr Chairman, is that when human errors occur, sometimes you go back and you try to trace, ask the question, why did you think the way you did, or how did you come to that conclusion. If I could, I would tell you. But this happened, I do not know, months ago. I am sorry, this had actually happened years ago, in some of the graphs that we put up, and I honestly could not remember how these errors occurred or why they occurred.

661. Did you have any doubt that the figures 7, 9 and 13 on the Chart reflected the national health expenditure as a percentage of the GDPs of the respective countries? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Again, could you just repeat the first part of the question?

662. Did you have any doubt that the figures on Chart 3 for Japan, the OECD and the USA reflected national health expenditure? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Did I have any doubt at that point in time?

663. Yes? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I did not, obviously.

664. So if you did not have any doubt that those figures reflected the percentage of national health expenditure over GDP, why did you put it into a chart which was meant, as you say, for budget allocation for health? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, Mr Singh is asking the question again why. I told him already, and that is what I mean. These questions are repeated over and over again. He asked me earlier on why. I answered the question. Then he is asking me again why. I keep saying the same thing. Human error. You ask me why again. I cannot answer you any more.

Mr Abdullah Tarmugi

665. Mr Chairman, I do not really understand how it can be a human error when you understand both terms and you know that both terms are different and you put the figures on the same chart. I do not understand? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Is that a question, Mr Chairman?

Chairman

666. Yes? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Let me respond to that, Mr Chairman. Mr Tarmugi has said that he does not understand how this error could have occurred.

Mr Abdullah Tarmugi

667. No, I do not understand, as you have said, that it was a human error when you understood both terms and you put them on the same chart? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Okay, let me explain in this way. The same thing as how the entire Ministry of Health made that error.

668. Mr Chairman, I thought I - ? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I am trying to explain how this error could have occurred, that I know a certain set of figures and then still make an error. I am trying to help you to understand how that error could occur, if you allow me to finish. An error was made by the Ministry of Health, as pointed out in the Select Committee. That was \$225.

669. Mr Chairman, can I have your ruling here? I am not too sure whether it is worth going into all these arguments again? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, he has asked me how and I am trying to respond. May I have this fair opportunity of responding?

670. Dr Chee, you are a scholar, as has been pointed out. I am sure you are used to countless charts, countless tables, analyzing them, making them and calculating them, time series, whatnots. And for this particular chart, you fully understood, as has been established earlier, both terms, and yet you persisted in putting them on the same chart, when the two terms are different, and you said that it was human error. I do not understand? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Tarmugi has, as I said, used words like "persisted".

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

123

24 OCTOBER 1996

124

Dr Chee Soon Juan (cont.)

There was no persistence. There was human error in there. How did that occur?

671. Mr Chairman, I just - ? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Mr Chairman, I keep getting interrupted when I want to make my response. I would ask you to let me have this opportunity to respond.

Chairman] I think we will move on.

Mr Abdullah Tarmugi

672. Yes, Mr Chairman. I do not think this kind of answer will - ? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Will you allow me to respond?

Chairman

673. I think there is no need to. You have already responded? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I have not responded, Mr Chairman. Mr Tarmugi asked me a question and I want to answer in full.

Chairman] Yes, I understood what you have said perfectly. Mr Singh.

Mr Davinder Singh

674. Dr Chee, you know the difference between a time series in current dollars and a time series in 1985 dollars? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No, I do not.

675. Could you please pick up the Report before you. Turn to paragraph 1489. Could you read that paragraph out

loudly? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* What paragraph was that again?

676. Paragraph 1489. This is BG George Yeo asking you a question. Could you first read the question, and read it slowly, please? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* "Sir, I would like to ask Dr Chee whether he knows the difference between a time series in current dollars and a time series in 1985 dollars. In statistical terms, does he know the difference between the two?"

677. Stop there. Then you answered the question. How did you answer it? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* "Yes."

678. Yes. So now that you have given two inconsistent answers, could you tell us when is it that you were lying? Then or now? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Mr Chairman, again, let me put it in context. During that hearing, we had that Chart with me at that point of time. That chart, if I recall correctly, was the Yearbook of Statistics. In that chart there were two different -

679. Mr Chairman, Sir, the question is a very simple question. An identical question was asked on 12th August to the one that I had just asked. Two different answers were given, both of which are inconsistent? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Then let me answer, Mr Chairman.

680. Dr Chee could not have been telling the truth on both occasions. So the question really is a very simple one. On which occasion did he lie? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Mr Chairman, let me answer again. It is things like that. First, are you telling the truth? Yes or

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

125

24 OCTOBER 1996

126

no? Are you lying? Yes or no? Mr Chairman, I am trying to answer this question. I would appreciate it if I was not interrupted while I am trying to give my response. May I have that permission, Mr Chairman?

Chairman

681. Yes, you have to respond but your response is not in answer to the question? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes. But you have not heard it in its entirety. How can you determine that it is not in response to Mr Singh's question? I am trying to answer, and it does lead up to what I am trying to say. In this chart here, during this time, when I was presented the chart, we had the chart before us and over there, there were two sections. And at that point in time, it was pointed out that there was a difference between the two. The question here is, "Sir, I would like to ask Dr Chee whether he knows the difference between a time series in current dollars and a time series in 1985 dollars. In statistical terms, does he know the difference between the two?" I said, "Yes." But you look at the chart, obviously you had two different sets of figures. Obviously, my question would be, yes, because if you were to refer me to that chart, and when I saw the difference between the two sets in it, obviously I would have said yes.

Mr Davinder Singh

682. Dr Chee, if by 12th August, having been shown the chart, you came to know of the difference, why did you answer no to my question? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Because if you ask me to

explain now, what a time series in current dollars is, a time series in 1985 dollars is, I would not be able to tell you what were the definitions of the two.

683. I did not ask you to explain or to define. I asked you, and I was very careful to use the words that BG George Yeo used, whether you knew the difference between a time series in current dollars and a time series in 1985 dollars. Your answer on 12th August was "Yes." I have asked you that question today and your answer is "No." Please help us. When were you lying? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, I repeat my answer. When it was asked during the hearing itself, the chart was before me. Do we have a copy of the chart here? Maybe I can explain it in a better manner.

684. That is not necessary. The question is a general question and as it was put on 12th August - ? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, it was not.

685. It was a general question. The question, again I repeat, Dr Chee, for your benefit, that BG George Yeo put to you is, "Sir, I would like to ask Dr Chee whether he knows the difference between a time series in current dollars and a time series in 1985 dollars. In statistical terms, does he know the difference between the two?" Your answer was an unequivocal yes. Today, I have asked you: do you know the difference between a time series in current dollars and a time series in 1985 dollars, your answer was an unequivocal no. So it seems to me that the two are inconsistent? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, it is not inconsistent.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

127

24 OCTOBER 1996

128

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

686. Thank you. We move on? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Mr Chairman, I think when a question was put to me, I would like to answer it.

687. You have answered it. You said, "No, it is not."? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No, it is not inconsistent.

688. Thank you. When you do calculate the percentage of Government health expenditure over national health expenditure, you should use current dollars for both the numerator and the denominator. Is that not right? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Mr Chairman, let me refer now again to what I said at the hearing itself.

689. No, I am asking you now, Dr Chee, it is a question to which you can honestly answer. Is it not right that when you calculate Government health expenditure as a percentage of total health expenditure, you should use the same time series for both the numerator and the denominator? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Mr Chairman, the question must be referred to the author of the article because I was not the author of the article. I was referring to the article and, as I said at the hearing itself, those figures in there were based on what the author had actually written and actually calculated and computed.

690. I would like you, for a moment, to forget the fact that you wrote a book and there was an author cited and that you have given us a written submission. I am asking you, as a Ph.D who had done numerous research papers involving

charts and statistics, that is it not right that when you do calculate percentages you should use the same time series for both the numerator and the denominator? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I use figures to calculate. You are referring to the figures that were -

691. I have not referred to any figures. I have not referred to the chart and I have not referred to the written submission. I want to know what your honest belief is when you calculate percentages. Is it not correct that you used the same time series for the numerator as well as the denominator? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Correct.

692. Yes. And you knew in March this year that that is the correct way of doing it? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No.

693. Are you saying that having written two books, published many research papers, two of which you tell us have found their way into international journals, some of which carry charts and the reference to the statistics, you did not know six months ago that you have to use the same time series for both the numerator and the denominator? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I used the exact way of calculation that the author calculated.

694. I am not talking about the author? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Then I did not go into the analysis, as it were.

695. If I had asked you in March or April this year whether it is correct to use the same time series for both, your answer would have been yes, because it is obviously so? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)*

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

129

24 OCTOBER 1996

130

You would not have. No, because you did not ask me that question.

696. Had I asked you that question, your answer would have been yes? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Is that not hypothetical now that you are asking me?

12.45 pm

697. Now that I am asking you, would you not accept that it is a given - ? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) What is given?

698. That you have to use the same time series for both the numerator and the denominator? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) But at that point in time, Ramesh was actually using a set of figures and then I was extrapolating from his set of figures. And I based my calculation on his figures and his computation.

699. But you are deliberately misunderstanding my question, because I have not even referred to Ramesh and I have not even referred to your submission. In fact, I have told you to put it aside for a moment? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) All right.

700. I am asking you: is it not correct that in March or April this year, you would have known that you have to use the same time series for both the numerator and the denominator if you were to do calculations? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, because I answered the question that you put to me earlier on.

701. When did you then - ? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) You asked me the question whether I understood the difference between the time series, 1985 market

prices versus current market prices. I told you, no. And the only reason why I said yes during the Select Committee hearing was that the chart was in front of me and visually you had two different sets of figures, one denoting current prices and one denoting 1985 prices.

702. Are you saying that when you looked at Ramesh when you were writing *Dare to Change*, you thought that Ramesh's methodology was the correct one? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I cited his figures.

703. You have not answered my question. My question is: are you saying that when you looked at Ramesh when you were writing *Dare to Change*, you believed that his methodology was correct? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I believed that he had a reason for using the figures that he had used.

704. Did you believe that his methodology was the correct one? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

705. You did? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

706. And therefore it was not a matter of just adopting Ramesh's methodology, you were using what you actually believed was the correct methodology? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Based on what he did in that particular article.

707. No. You have just said that you believed that Ramesh's methodology was the correct one? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Based on what he had written in that article.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

131

24 OCTOBER 1996

132

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

708. No. Dr Chee, did Ramesh, in your mind, use the correct methodology for calculating Government health expenditure as a percentage of total health expenditure? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Yes, based on what he had written in that particular article.

709. And if you had written an article without citing any sources, would you have used that methodology? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I am sorry. Can you repeat that again?

710. If you had written an article without citing Ramesh as a source, would you still use that methodology? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I would not have written an article using those calculations.

711. Please answer the question. If you had written an article — ? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I cannot write an article of that sort simply because this was probably written by an economist. I am merely citing the figures in there. There is a difference. Correct? What if I were to ask you right now, Mr Singh, if you were doing a research paper on psychology —

712. Dr Chee, I want an answer to my question. My question is this. If you were to write a paper without citing Ramesh as a source, would you nonetheless use his methodology? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I cannot answer that question, simply because I do not know enough in that area to be able to talk about methodology. I cited the figures in there.

713. But you wrote a written submission without citing Ramesh and used his

methodology? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I wrote that article, not in the submission. It was written way back in 1994 in *Dare to Change*.

714. There was no citation of a source in the written submission? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* But I made it abundantly clear. Was there a regulation that sources had to be cited in a written submission?.

715. Is not the answer to my question, yes, there was no citation of a source in the written submission? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No, there was not.

716. Yes. So if you had written an article without citation of a source, would you use Ramesh's methodology? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Run that bye me. One more time.

717. If you wrote a paper without citing Ramesh as a source, would you still use Ramesh's methodology? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Without citing Ramesh's source? Why without citing Ramesh as a source?

718. Please answer the question? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I do not understand your question. I want to answer it only if I understand it.

719. You wrote the written submission without citing Ramesh as a source? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* And —

720. And you used his methodology? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I used his methodology not for the submission. I used the methodology earlier on in *Dare to Change*.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

133

24 OCTOBER 1996

134

721. But in the submission, you did not cite Ramesh as a source. Is that not right? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) What has that got to do with me using the methodology?

722. We will come to that in a moment? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) But they are two separate things.

723. Would you agree that there was no citation of a source in the written submission? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

724. Right. Would you not agree with me that when you do not cite the source, it is a different ball game altogether? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) What are you —

725. In other words, if you do not cite the source — ? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That it is a different ball game altogether.

726. In other words, you have to use the correct methodology? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No.

727. You do not. Can you please pick up the Report in front of you? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I have it here in front of me.

728. Yes. Could you look at paragraph 1495? Could you read out the question and the answer, please, aloud? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) "Is Dr Chee saying that if M. Ramesh had made a mistake, he is quite happy to extrapolate upon his mistake? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No. Again, Mr Chairman, Mr Ramesh has written an academic article and this has been submitted for academic scrutiny. When he chooses to use a certain method and if I were to take that

study and to cite that study, then it is only appropriate for me to base my calculations if I am citing his study. By not citing his study, then it is a different ball game altogether."

729. Could you just go back and just re-read those few words from "it is only appropriate"? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) "... it is only appropriate for me to base my calculations if I am citing his study."

730. Right. And then read on? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) "By not citing his study, then it is a different ball game altogether. But since I am citing his study, it is only appropriate for me to base my calculations on his calculations."

731. Therefore, on the basis of that evidence, you would accept that if you did not cite his study, it would not be appropriate to use his calculations? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I did cite his study.

732. Please answer the question. We will come to the citation in a moment. Is it not your evidence that if you do not cite his study, then it is a different ball game altogether? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I repeat, I did cite his study.

733. Answer the question? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I will answer your question. I did cite his study.

734. Did you not say that if you did not cite his study, then it is a different ball game altogether? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes, but I did cite his study.

735. Right? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Are we clear on that?

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

736. Did you cite his study in the written submission? Yes or no? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) My written submission was based on what was written in *Dare to Change*. And *Dare to Change* has cited his study. Mr Chairman, I honestly hope we will not go through this yes and no question, because I cannot answer it in a yes or no fashion.

737. Did you cite Ramesh's study in the written submission? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No.

738. No? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) But it was cited in *Dare to Change* in which this submission was based upon.

739. Did you cite *Dare to Change* in your submission? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I am sorry.

740. Did you cite *Dare to Change* in your submission? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I had alerted the Select Committee at the hearing.

741. Did you cite *Dare to Change* in your submission? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) It was taken from *Dare to Change*. I have said that before.

742. Did you cite *Dare to Change* in your submission? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No.

743. Thank you. And therefore, following from your own evidence, by not citing his study - and I am using your words, Dr Chee - then it is a different ball game altogether? - (*Dr Chee Soon*

Juan) If you are going to take it out of context, there is nothing I can do about it.

744. Now, could you tell us how did you calculate the figure for 1970 in Chart 1? Can we have Chart 1, please? How did you get the figure for 1970? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) For 1970?

745. Yes? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) It was taken from the article by M. Ramesh.

746. Ramesh's article referred to 40% for 1970? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I had extrapolated it from Ramesh's article. Let me refer back to Ramesh's article. Which bundle is it in, Mr Chairman?

747. Let me help you. It is the blue spine, tab 9? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) "Indeed, the government's share of total health expenditure in Singapore fell from 39% in 1960 to 37.4% in 1985 and then rapidly to 27.4% in 1989." Based on an approximation of the figure there, 40% in 1960, and then it began to gradually decrease to 37% in 1985. Rather than have the whole chart going all the way back to 1960, it was begun in 1970.

748. Yes. And how did you get that 40%? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Basically, an approximation of 39%.

749. I see. You are saying that you did not calculate the 40% but just assumed that it was 40%? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) It was taken from 1960 and the next point that was given here was 1985.

750. So because Ramesh said that the Government's share of total health expenditure in 1960 was 39% and that it was 37.4% in 1985, you assumed that the figure for 1970 was 40%? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Was about 40%, the figure that was last drawn.

751. Yes. Did you verify it? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* As to going in and doing the calculations, no.

752. When we began this session, you agreed with me that a submission to the Select Committee is a very serious matter? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Yes.

753. You also agreed with me that it should be based on sound information and data? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Yes.

754. You also agreed with me that it is a matter of public interest? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Yes.

755. And you are now telling us that the SDP threw in a figure at 1970 by estimation only? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No. Do you want me to continue?

756. Yes? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* We were trying to show Government's share of health expenditure in Singapore was steadily declining since 1960, from about 40% to 20% or even lower in the late 1980s or 1990.

757. I appreciate that is what you were trying to show. But is it a responsible thing to do to assume a figure and put it in a chart without verification? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Right. Mr Chairman, again —

758. Could you answer that question and then you can explain? Is it a responsible thing to do to assume a figure, put it in a chart and then lead people to believe that this is actually the figure? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Yes.

759. It is a responsible thing to do? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I do not see what is not responsible about it. We did not calculate a new figure. And if I may continue to respond to that question, what happens is that if you look at some of the figures that you try to calculate, it depends on what figures that you are trying to use or that you want to refer to. The Ministry of Health, looking at some of the data in there, publishes a different figure from the Department of Statistics. Therefore, when you try to use figures in there, they may not be absolutely accurate to the decimal point.

1.00 pm

760. Dr Chee, you agreed with me this morning that the figures you cite must withstand close scrutiny? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Yes.

761. You agreed with me that one of the reasons you appeared before the Select Committee was to get to the bottom of the figures? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Yes.

762. And you are telling us today that you prepared the chart and inserted a figure without calculation or verification but purely on assumption? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* The chart was drawn according to the figures that were presented.

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

763. That answer is, with respect, vague. You have presented a chart to which you say "includes a 40% figure" which was taken from the air? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, it was not taken from the air. It was there.

764. Where was it? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) With the figures that were presented in M. Ramesh's. When you take the figures -

765. Was 1970 in Ramesh? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, it was not.

766. So if it was not from Ramesh, and if, as you say, you assumed it and did not verify it, it must have been taken from the air? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, it is not. Because the statement here says, "indeed the Government's share of health expenditure in Singapore fell from 39% in 1960 to 37.4% in 1985". Therefore, when you actually chart out the two points, it would hover from 40% to 1985 to about 37% over.

Mr Abdullah Tarmugi

767. Mr Chairman, if I could ask a question here. You were mentioning 39% in 1960 and 37.4% in 1985. How do you arrive at 40% for 1970? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Interpolate.

768. You interpolate? If you interpolate, how do you get 40%? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) It was an approximation.

769. On what basis do you get 40%? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I am sorry.

770. How do you arrive at 40%? If you interpolate -? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I have just explained it.

771. If you try to interpolate between 39% and 37%, then the answer for 1970 could not be beyond 39%. So my question is: how do you arrive at 40% for 1970? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) In 1960, 39%, approximately 40%. Or am I too far wrong in saying that? It is an approximation for 40%. Then you actually try to draw the line right through to 1985, which is 37%. Would you not be hovering about 40%?

Mr Davinder Singh

772. Never mind, Dr Chee. You have told us now that you have just assumed this figure and put it in, and you did not verify it. Could you tell us who came up with this 40% figure? Was it you, Mr Wong, Mr Kunalen, Mr Kwan or somebody else? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) It was drawn in there.

773. Yes, I know. But who put it? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I cannot remember who put it.

774. It just happened a few months ago. It is a figure that was, you say -? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, I think we have to get this clear. This chart, happened, as I have mentioned, in 1994.

775. I see. So who put it in *Dare to Change*? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I cannot remember. I made that very clear during the hearing itself.

776. So this portion of *Dare to Change* was prepared without verification? - (Dr Chee Soon Juan) I do not understand the question.

777. You have agreed with me that the 40% figure was not verified. Therefore, this portion of *Dare to Change* was also not verified? - (Dr Chee Soon Juan) No. It was based on what was published in this article here, Ramesh's article.

778. No, my question is a simple one. Did you verify it? - (Dr Chee Soon Juan) No.

779. Thank you. You have said that this chart was taken from *Dare to Change*. Do you have *Dare to Change* in front of you? [Copy of *Dare to Change* given to Dr Chee]. Would you please turn to page 85? — (Dr Chee Soon Juan) Yes.

780. The last paragraph above the subheading "Shirking Responsibility", could you read that out please? - (Dr Chee Soon Juan) I am sorry, I think we might have a different edition.

781. Oh, really. What page would yours be? - (Dr Chee Soon Juan) I have got it here. But it is on a different page.

782. Is yours on page 82? - (Dr Chee Soon Juan) Yes, it is.

783. All right, let us go ahead with the earlier edition. Could you read that paragraph please, "Shirking Responsibility"? — (Dr Chee Soon Juan) "In keeping with its philosophy, the Government has embarked on an exercise to privatise hospitals to further reduce Government

spending in this sector. Privatising health care means that medical costs would be determined by market forces which means that the industry becomes a profit-oriented one."

784. I am sorry. Could you please read the paragraph above? - (Dr Chee Soon Juan) "In pushing the responsibility to private bodies, the Government is shirking its most fundamental task of looking after all segments of its society especially those who are unable to look after themselves. The Government's share of total health expenditure fell from 40% in 1970 to 37% in 1985 to 27% 1989 to 5% in the 1990s (see Figure 3) while the proportion of GDP with regards to Government health expenditure between 1980 and 1989 remained below 1%. In contrast, most other countries' government health care expenditure have increased."

785. Yes. Then appears footnote 4, and footnote 4 is at page 154. Footnote 4 is M Ramesh's Social Security in Singapore. Were you citing the entire paragraph? - (Dr Chee Soon Juan) No.

786. Then what? - (Dr Chee Soon Juan) "In contrast, most other countries' government health care expenditure have increased."

787. Thank you? - (Dr Chee Soon Juan) But the figures used were based on his article.

788. But on 12th August, you said that you used Ramesh's methodology and figures because you cited Ramesh

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

143

24 OCTOBER 1996

144

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

as a source? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Yes. And what was that?

789. Could you tell us where in Ramesh's article is the figure below 1% for the proportion of GDP with regard to government health expenditure? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* It is not in there.

790. It is not in there. So you obviously did not cite Ramesh for that portion? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Correct.

791. And that portion appears after the figures that you took from Ramesh? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Run that bye me again.

792. That portion appears after the figures that you say that you took from Ramesh - 40, 37, 27? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I would like to go back. You are referring to Ramesh's article.

793. You see, Dr Chee, if the footnote 4 was meant for the entire paragraph, then it must follow that footnote 4 supports what is in that entire paragraph. Is that not right? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Yes.

794. But you had just told us that footnote 4 is not for the entire paragraph? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Right.

795. Footnote 4 would just be for the last sentence? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Correct.

796. If footnote 4 is just for the last sentence, as you have just confirmed,

then you were not citing Ramesh for the figures 37%, 27% above? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No. I refer to the figures in his study there. But as I pointed out later on, the proportion of GDP with regard to government health expenditure in 1980 to 1989 remained below 1%. That was not taken from Ramesh's article. So it would not have been appropriate for me to say that citation 4 was for the entire paragraph.

797. You have jumbled it all up, have you not? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* In as far as writing this is concerned, we have taken the numbers based on published studies. But as and where it is necessary and appropriate, what we have done was to try to put the citation down as much as possible.

798. No, Dr Chee. You said in your evidence on 12th August that you cited Ramesh for these figures. But it is quite clear now, reading that paragraph, that you were only citing Ramesh for another sentence? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Then where did I get these figures from?

799. No, no. Please answer the question. Were you citing Ramesh for the figures as well? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Yes.

800. So you are saying that you were citing Ramesh although the footnote does not appear there? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Right.

801. If you look at the same page in *Dare to Change*, could you tell us what the 5% figure was for which year? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* For 1990.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

145

24 OCTOBER 1996

146

802. Could you repeat that? -
(*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) For 1990.

803. For 1990. Having said that, could you read those years loudly? 5% for what year? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) 5% in the 1990s.

804. Sorry, I miss that? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I think you heard me.

805. 5% for? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) 1990s.

806. 1990s. I see. So which is the correct answer now, Dr Chee. Earlier you said 5% was for 1990 and now you say 5% is for the 1990s. Surely there is a difference between the two? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) 5% for 1990. I am sorry. The figure there was referring to 1990. It is correct.

807. For? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) 1990.

808. But the figure was referring to the 1990s in the text. Is that not right? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) You are right. That is correct.

809. So, would it not be right to say that you used the 5% figure in the text, not to refer to the year 1990, but to the 1990s? Is that not right? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) In this book, yes.

810. Since you are the author of that book, could you tell us for which years in the 1990s was that 5% a reference to? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I have already said, the 25% referred to 1990.

811. Your words in your book are "in the 1990s". So I assume, and I think you will agree, that means more than one year, more than 1990. So I would like to know, based on what you yourself authored, what are the years in the 1990s? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) They are supposed to be referring to 1990 and not 1990s. I think that is clear enough.

812. Dr Chee, is it not correct that you authored the book? Did you not? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) My name is on this book.

813. Yes. Are you saying someone else wrote it? You did write it, did you not? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I just told you.

814. You said your name is on the book. So I assume that you also wrote it? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

815. You wrote "1990s". Is that not right? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) It is correct.

816. Yes. So when you say "1990s", I would like to know, and please assist us, which are the years in the 1990s which the 5% refers to? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I have already said, the 25% here would refer to 1990 and not 1990s.

817. There is no 25% at page 82, and neither is there a "1990" in page 82. Could you please help us? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I think you know what I am referring to and I bring you back to the Select Committee hearing just in case you miss it. There was a typographical error in it.

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

818. Yes, you said there was a typographical error which resulted in the figure "2" being dropped with the result that 5% remained? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Right.

819. But whatever it is, whether it was 25% or 5%, that figure was a reference to the Government's share of total health expenditure in, according to you, the 1990s. So please help us, in which years in this decade were you referring to? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I was referring to the year 1990 and not 1990s.

820. You could not have been referring to the year 1990 because, in the same sentence where you intended to refer to a single year, you did so, for example, 1970, 1985 and 1989. But when you came to the 1990s, you made a reference to it in the plural form and not in the singular form. So please tell us when you referred to it in the plural form, which years were you referring to? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I was not referring to any of the years. I keep saying. I was referring to 1990.

821. But how can you say that you are referring to 1990 when the book talks about the 90s? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I was referring to the 1990, and not the 1990s.

822. Dr Chee, are you saying that we have now another typo? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Right. You have an error in there. Sorry. 25%.

823. Are you saying now that we have here another typo? - *(Dr Chee Soon*

Juan) This whole thing was referring to the 1990s. Sorry, 1990. It was incorrectly put as 1990s.

824. You just said that it was incorrectly put as 1990. But it was put as the 1990s? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* What I actually was referring to, Mr Chairman, I think at this stage is that what we were trying to show was that it had dropped from 40% in the 1960s, it had begun to slowly decline to 25% approximately in the 1990s. It had never gone back up to 40%. Now if you are asking me then in 1970, there was no 40%, it was only 39%. I think in the spirit of this graph over here, Mr Chairman, this is not an academic journal. This is actually a book written more as a popular reading, if you will, not for academics.

825. I see. It is a novel. Right? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Mr Chairman, just a second -

826. Dr Chee, - ? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No. Just a second, let me finish. Mr Chairman, I have started speaking.

827. Are you going to answer my question? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Yes, I am.

828. My question is really are you now saying that there is another typo in this book meant for popular reading? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No. What I am saying is that in the spirit of this graph over here, I was trying to show that in 1960s, perhaps 1970s, Government's share of health expenditure had been declining, had been about 40%. And it started to decline until, of late, in the 1990s, it hovered about 25%. Now if you

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

149

24 OCTOBER 1996

150

ask me whether we went in to calculate the year at the time, no, we did not. But the general gist of the graph of what we were trying to show is there is this declining share, as far as the Government is concerned, on health care.

829. So you are saying that you wanted to show that it had declined to 25%? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Or thereabouts in the 1990s.

830. In the 1990s. But you did not calculate the average? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No.

831. Right. So like the 40% that was also about to be thrown in for the 1990s. Is it not what you said? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I do not get you.

832. Like the 40%, you did not calculate the average for the 1990s? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Like the 40%, yes. Like the 40%, it was an approximation.

833. So the 25% was an approximation for the 1990s? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Thereabouts, yes.

834. Tell us how did you get this 25% being an approximation for the 1990s? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Looking at some of the figures.

835. Right. Which figures did you look at and for what years which give you this approximation of 25% for the 1990s? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Looking at 1989 and calculating for 1990.

836. So you only looked at 1989 and 1990 and based on the 1990 figure, you approximated it for the 1990s? -

(Dr Chee Soon Juan) It had never come back up to over-30% or 40%.

837. No. That is not my question? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I know that is not your question. But then why did you use the graph over here?

838. If you know that is not my question, why did you answer it? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Because I know what you are trying to get at. I am trying to answer it in the sense that this graph was shown to approximate the Government health expenditure in the period between 1960 to 1970 and in the 1990s.

839. You know it did not go back up to the 40s. Right? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Right.

840. So you must have calculated it? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I have taken a look at it. I did not calculate it.

841. Where did you look at to find these figures? Because my understanding is, to get these figures, one needs to calculate them. Do you have some book which tells you these figures right off? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Right. It is the *Yearbook of Statistics*.

842. They tell you right off, you do not have to calculate them? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* You just look at it cursorily and it does not tell you that it has gone up to 40%.

843. Dr Chee, you have to look at page 205 - ? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* If you do not think so, then let us refer back to the *Yearbook of Statistics*.

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

844. Page 202 and you have to flip back to 92. You have to calculate, have you not? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Mr Chairman, the figure that was presented for 1990 to 1995, net Government health expenditure as a percentage of national health expenditure ranged between 22% and 28%.

845. But you only knew that when the chart from MOH was given to you? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No. Looking at the figures, you would not be far wrong.

846. So you did calculate the figures for the 1990s. It must follow from your earlier answer? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* You can conclude in the way you want. But as I said -

847. No. Dr Chee, you said that it did not go back after the same position. And I asked you how did you know that, and you said, "Well, looking at - ?" - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Looking at it, you would not say that it had gone back.

848. Looking at the *Yearbook of Statistics, Singapore 1990*, it is apparent? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No. I did not say looking at the *Yearbook of Statistics, 1990* because you and I know the *Yearbook of Statistics, 1990* would not have figures.

849. That is what I just told you? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* For 1991 to 1995.

850. That is what I just told to correct you? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No. But I did say. What I said was *Yearbook of Statistics*. I did not mention the year.

851. Now we have gone on separate journey. Let us come back and tell me which years for the 1990s were you referring to in this book? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I was referring to the general trend in the 1990s.

852. Right. And to refer to the general trend in the 1990s, you would have to do some calculations for the 1990s? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No. You would just be looking at the figures in getting ballpark figures.

853. Right. So what were the years that you looked at to get ballpark figures? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* From 1991, I suppose 1992, 1993.

854. And when did you look at those figures? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I beg your pardon. When did I look at those figures?

855. Yes? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Of course, obviously, when I was preparing to write this book.

856. What was the range of these figures in the 1990s? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Just about 25%.

857. 25%. And you had calculated it at that time and got 25%? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I told you. I did not calculate it. For 1990, yes.

858. If you did not calculate, how could you have got the 25% for the rest of the years? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* You look at 1990 and you look at some of the rest of the figures and they fluctuated about 25%.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

153

24 OCTOBER 1996

54

859. Right. So you did look at the rest of the figures and realised that they fluctuated. So to realise that they fluctuated, you must have calculated them? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, not necessarily. It is not hard to see something is a quarter or the difference is quite great between a quarter and 40%.

860. So you just looked at these aggregate figures of private consumption, Government expenditure and then calculated it in your mind or aggregated it and then come to an estimation? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) In the 25% range.

861. That is what you did? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right. In the 1990s.

862. And so now you say that when you were writing *Dare To Change*, you did look at the figures right up to 1993 but you only sat down and calculated 1990. But you did not calculate the others? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right.

863. Why not? Why did you just stop at 1990? You have the figures for the other years? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right.

864. Why did you not just calculate them? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Because I was trying to show the 25% of the 1990s.

865. But to be sure, you have to calculate them? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes. But I was not trying to show specifically from 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994.

866. But you were trying to show that it remained, at least what you said, 25% in the 1990s? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Correct.

867. So why did you not calculate them? Why did you not calculate the figures for 1991, 1992, 1993? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Because I was trying to show that it hovered around 25%.

868. Without calculating them? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Without calculation.

869. And without knowing for sure what the figures were? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Am I far wrong?

870. No. I am asking you what happened then. You did it without being sure what the figures were? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I did it knowing the figures would not be very far off from 25%.

871. But you did it not knowing what the true figures were? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) What the exact figures were?

872. Yes? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I did not calculate it.

873. Right. You have told the Select Committee that another person prepared Chart 1 in *Dare To Change*. Is it not right? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

874. Do you remember who that person is? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I cannot remember who that person is.

875. And that person having read your text, then plotted it accordingly to 5%? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right.

876. Did that person speak to you before plotting it? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I cannot remember who it was. If I could remember who that person was,

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

155

24 OCTOBER 1996

156

Dr Chee Soon Juan (cont.)

then I remember whether the person spoke to me or not.

877. Do you recall any conversation by anyone about this 5% figure? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No. I cannot remember:

878. No. It is important. Was this 5% brought to your attention? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No. It was not.

879. So therefore not even by the chartist? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

880. Let me get this correct. You said that the chartist or the one who drew the graph looked at the text and then plotted it accordingly. Correct? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

881. How can that be right, Dr Chee, because the chartist would have looked at the text and seen not 1990 but the 1990s? So why would the chartist assume that you meant 1990? Strange, is it not? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) It was drawn 1990. 25% represented 1990.

882. That means in your text represented the 1990s? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I am sorry. 5% represented 1990.

883. 1990s? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) 1990s.

884. Right? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) The figure was calculated for 1990.

885. And you would say your evidence on oath is the person who prepared the graph instinctively knew in her mind or his mind that although you

talked about the 1990s, you meant 1990 and so accordingly plotted that plunge to stop at 1990? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes. It must have been his or her assumption.

Chairman

886. I think this is an appropriate time for us to stop for a lunch break. I will adjourn the hearing and we will resume again at 2.15 pm. The witness will be escorted to a waiting room and I would like to remind Dr Chee that he is not to discuss the proceedings with anyone else? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Am I coming back again?

Chairman] Yes. You will be escorted to a waiting room and lunch will be provided for you. You will return here at 2.15 pm. Order.

*Hearing accordingly suspended at
1.28 pm until 2.15 pm*

Hearing resumed at 2.15 pm

[Mr Speaker in the Chair]

Chairman] Order. We will continue with the examination. Mr Singh.

Mr Davinder Singh

887. Good afternoon, Dr Chee. In your opinion, is Mr Wong Hong Toy an honest man? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

888. As I understand the evidence that you gave on 12th August, you said

that you had prepared Chart 1 when you were writing *Dare to Change* and then this Chart was carried over, if you like, to the written submission? — (Dr Chee Soon Juan) Yes.

889. And that is how you say the typo was carried over? - (Dr Chee Soon Juan) Yes.

890. Right. When you were preparing your written submission in March or April this year, you had, as a ready source, the information on percentages of Government health expenditure over total health expenditure in *Dare to Change* and in Chart 1 in *Dare to Change*. Correct? — (Dr Chee Soon Juan) Yes.

891. And so for that part of your written submission, in other words, for Statement 1 and Chart 1, all you needed to do was to look back to *Dare to Change* and then carry what you have there into the written submission? — (Dr Chee Soon Juan) That is what I did when I prepared the submission.

892. Yes. And because *Dare to Change* said 5%, you carried that into the submission and, of course, the chart was also carried into the submission. Is that correct? — (Dr Chee Soon Juan) That is correct.

893. There was therefore no need for you to have calculated the figures afresh? — (Dr Chee Soon Juan) I did not calculate afresh.

894. There was no need for it to be done afresh because you were using *Dare to Change* - (Dr Chee Soon Juan) Correct. So I did not do it.

895. Yes. There was no need for anybody to do it because you were carrying the information from *Dare to Change*? - (Dr Chee Soon Juan) I left it to whoever. If you are referring to Wong Hong Toy, I did not specifically tell him to do it or not to do it.

896. So you did not give anybody instructions to make calculations? - (Dr Chee Soon Juan) I just told whoever was helping me to prepare the submission to do some of the preparations. I cannot remember. There were a few people who were helping me to do the submission. I cannot remember who helped me to do what.

897. That is very odd. You cannot remember who was helping you in the preparation of the submission? — (Dr Chee Soon Juan) I did not say that.

898. Then what did you say? - (Dr Chee Soon Juan) I said that I cannot remember who I asked to help me prepare what.

899. I see. But as you said earlier, you did not tell Wong Hong Toy to do these calculations in Chart 1? - (Dr Chee Soon Juan) I cannot remember specifically, as I said, who I asked to do what.

900. Well, there was no need for you to have told Wong Hong Toy or anybody to do the calculations because the information, as you say, was readily available from *Dare to Change*? - (Dr Chee Soon Juan) How do I respond to that? I already told you.

901. Is that not correct? - (Dr Chee Soon Juan) I have already told you.

Dr Chee Soon Juan (cont.)

Mr Davinder Singh

I cannot remember. Whether there was a need or not at this point in time, how would I tell you there was any need or not?

902. Well, you have the information you say in hand, because it was in *Dare to Change*, and so there was no need for you to instruct anyone to calculate the figures for you. Would that not be right? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, not exactly. How would there not be a need to verify some of the figures in there?

903. So did you ask anyone? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I cannot remember. I have already told you that.

904. Dr Chee, you remember very distinctly taking these figures from *Dare to Change*. You remember that it was the chartist in *Dare to Change* who did the graph for you relying on the text. How is it that you remember some things and how is it that you cannot remember other things which are in fact closer to this date? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Can you remember everything? Does your memory allow you to remember everything?

Chairman

905. Dr Chee, please answer the question. It is not for you to put questions to the Member? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I understand. He has asked why I remember certain things and why I do not remember certain things. And my answer to that is: can anyone remember everything?

906. No. I just want to ascertain why is it that the memory is selective. You gave an account of what happened in 1994. You typed *Dare to Change*. You looked at the proofs. You missed the 5%. Someone else did the graph and then the book came out. And then early this year, you prepared the submission and in your defence you said that you gave it to the others for independent verification of the contents. Now, it just seems to me logical that if what you say is right, ie, that you were going to take Chart 1 from *Dare to Change*, there would have been no need for a calculation of the figures to be done. All you had to do was just to photocopy or "xerox more or less" which I think were your words on 12th August. Would you agree with me? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) About what?

907. That there would have been no need for anyone to do the calculation? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) You come to your own conclusion. I have already told you I cannot remember.

908. Well, you remember that you did not specifically tell Wong Hong Toy to do the calculations? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I told you I cannot remember who I told to do what.

909. You mean to say that the events surrounding the preparation of a submission have now suddenly become a total blank? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No. But specific events of who I told what, no minutes were taken. There was no official meeting where minutes were taken that I can jog my memory.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

161

24 OCTOBER 1996

162

910. Mr Kunalen tells us that the 5% plunge is a key point and that Chart 1 is, like other charts, a key chart. You were subject to some examination on 15th July and on 12th August about the plunge. A complaint has been made against you about the plunge and you would tell us that you cannot remember anything about the calculations of this figure in March or April - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* That is a very different question. Which one are you asking?

911. I am asking you, can you remember whether this figure of 5% or 25% was calculated in March or April this year? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* That was not what you asked. Mr Chairman, what was the question again? First, it was whether I remember telling Wong Hong Toy to do the calculation and now it is a different question.

912. Let me put it to you this way. Were the figures calculated in March or April this year? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I did not calculate them.

913. Did you ask anyone to calculate them? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I cannot remember whether I asked anyone to calculate them or not.

914. If you had asked someone to calculate, then you would have remembered it? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* If I did.

915. Thank you. Now, the figures were in fact calculated in March or April 1996? Do you know that? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Come again.

916. Do you know that the figure of 25% was calculated again in March or April 1996? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Not by me.

917. Do you know that the figures were calculated? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Wong had informed me that he had done so.

918. Right. Wong would not have calculated the figures unless you told him to do so? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* You come to your own conclusion. I have already said it over and over again.

919. You typed the representation? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I cannot remember who I told to do what.

920. Yes. So now it appears that although you cannot remember who you told to do what, Wong says that he did calculate. Mr Wong Hong Toy did say that he did calculate the figures? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Right, correct.

921. And would it not be right that he would only have calculated the figures if you had asked him to do so? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I cannot remember whether I asked him to do or not.

922. Dr Chee, as I recall, you gave each and every one of them the first draft of your submission? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Correct.

923. Correct. And by that time, the figures had already been inserted in the draft? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* That is correct.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

163

24 OCTOBER 1996

164

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

923. Yes. So if you were the one responsible for typing the draft, you would know whether calculations were done for Statement 1? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, I would not.

925. If you do not know whether calculations were done for Statement 1, how is it that you know - ? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) By someone else, I take it that you mean to do calculations.

926. Right. And how is it that you know that Chart 1 was taken from *Dare to Change*? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Because I took it from *Dare to Change*.

927. Right. So if you took it from *Dare to Change*, you took it for the purpose of preparing your submission? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Correct.

928. And if you took it from *Dare to Change*, you would have known in March or April this year that you already had the figures for Chart 1 from *Dare to Change*? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right.

929. Yes. So you would not have asked anyone to calculate? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I might have. As I told you, I cannot remember.

930. Why would you have asked someone to calculate? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Why not?

931. So there is a possibility that you asked them to calculate? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Did I not say that I might have? I cannot remember.

932. OK. And what did you ask them to calculate, if you might have asked them to calculate? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I am sorry.

933. What were the others asked to calculate? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I told you I cannot remember.

934. You do not remember anything about this? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I do not remember. I repeat, I do not remember who I asked to calculate what in that period of time.

935. Would you remember if the calculation was done by you and Mr Wong Hong Toy? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I am sorry.

936. Would you remember the event if the calculation was done by you and Mr Wong Hong Toy? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I would have remembered if I did that with him.

937. Yes. And I think you would remember if you had actually helped Mr Wong Hong Toy in the calculation? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I cannot remember.

938. If indeed you helped Mr Wong Hong Toy with the calculation, you would have remembered? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right, I would have remembered.

939. Yes. Now, what if I were to tell you that you did help Mr Wong Hong Toy in the calculation? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Then I would tell you that could have been the case, but I might have forgotten.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

165

24 OCTOBER 1996

166

940. You just said that you would have remembered? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

941. Now I am telling you that you did do the calculation with Mr Wong Hong Toy? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) And I am telling you that I cannot remember that I did the calculation with Mr Wong Hong Toy.

942. Dr Chee, a moment ago, I asked you whether you would remember if you did the calculation with Mr Wong, you said "I would remember"? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) If I did that calculation with him, sat down in the same room, go through it, then I would have remembered that something like that would have occurred.

943. If you helped Mr Wong Hong Toy in the calculation, you would remember, as you said earlier? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I cannot remember any of this that happened months ago and what happened at what stage. In this particular event, I cannot remember.

2.30 pm

944. Would it be right to say, therefore, that you cannot remember because you did not help Mr Wong in the calculations? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Let me put it this way. I calculated it years ago. I did the calculation years ago. And when it came to the preparation for this submission, I took the figures and used it in the submission.

945. Yes? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) During the preparation.

946. Right. That being the case, you had a ready made source for the figures? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right.

947. You would not have asked anyone to - ? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Are we going through the grounds again, Mr Chairman?.

948. You would not have gone through the trouble of asking someone to do a fresh calculation? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) You make your own conclusions.

949. Right. I ask you a moment ago whether you would remember it if you helped Mr Wong Hong Toy in the calculations and you said yes. What would you say if I told you that you did help Mr Wong Hong Toy in the calculations? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Then you show it to me. Prove it to me.

950. No. Would you agree with me or would you say that I have no basis for saying that? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Would I agree with you about what?

951. You have forgotten my question? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) You have asked so many and in so many different ways and repeatedly. I am asking you to repeat your earlier question.

952. What would you say if I told you that you helped Wong Hong Toy in the calculations? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Then you show it to me.

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

953. What would you say? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I would say, you prove it to me that I helped Wong Hong Tong to do the calculations.

954. Would you say that I am making an accurate statement or an inaccurate one? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I do not know.

955. I am talking about an event in which you were or were not involved. So you should know whether you were or were not involved? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I told you already. If I had done it, I think I would have remembered it.

956. That is right? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) But I am telling you that I do not remember it.

957. Yes. So at least we are now agreed that if you had helped Wong Hong Toy in the calculations you would have remembered it. But you do not remember helping Wong Hong Toy in the calculations? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That is not to say whether I helped him or I did not help him. I cannot remember what happened to events that did not occur to me as very major.

958. Was it not an important event to verify figures that you were going to put before a Select Committee? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, I think there are so many figures that we have put up. It was not only in this submission. We have written reports. I have written two books. I have written to newspapers. It is hard to really pinpoint at what stage you

asked who to help you do what and remember it at that point who told you what.

959. We have gone through your books and your other Chart 3 and have shown that you have reached the point where you do not stand by some of the figures that you put in? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I said I stand corrected on some of the figures.

960. If you stand corrected it means you do not stand by them as they now stand? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Not true.

961. Okay. Mr Wong Hong Toy would only have calculated the figures for Chart 1 if you had told him to do so? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Do I have to answer that again, Mr Chairman? As I repeated it, I do not remember telling who to do what. Are we going to repeat this question over and over again, Mr Chairman?

Chairman

962. Dr Chee, I will be the one to decide on the relevance of the questions. It is not for you to decide? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I understand. In that case -

963. Dr Chee, you answer the questions put to you? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes, I will.

964. Mr Singh? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) But the whole thing is that we keep repeating the same point and then when I get confused -

965. Dr Chee, I will decide on the relevance of the questions? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) So be it, Mr Chairman.

Mr Davinder Singh

966. Mr Wong has told the Select Committee on 12th August that there were a few people doing the calculation and the checking. When he was asked who were the others who helped in the calculation, he named you as one of them. You have just said that in your view Mr Wong Hong Toy is an honest man? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right.

967. So it appears that Mr Wong Hong Toy did do the calculation with you? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Calculation of what?

968. We are talking about the 25% figure. And you know that we are talking about that? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I told you that I cannot remember who calculated what or who I told to do what.

969. Yes. Let us proceed on the basis of the evidence of Mr Wong Hong Toy who you say is an honest man. He has given evidence on oath that you helped him in the calculation. If that is the case, you would have known that the calculation threw out a figure, according to Mr Wong, of 25.4% for 1990. Would you agree? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Can you repeat that question?

970. If you helped Mr Wong Hong Toy in the calculations, you would have known in March or April this year that the figure that was calculated was 25.4%? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right.

971. Therefore, you would continue to suggest, would you, that although you knew the figure as 25.4%, there was still an error that you carried over from *Dare To Change* at 5%. Is that your evidence? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) How do you want to phrase that question?

972. Is it your evidence that although the calculation in March or April this year produced the figure of 25.4%, nonetheless that was forgotten, ignored and the 5% from a book published two years ago was carried over? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That is not the evidence.

973. Excuse me? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That is not what I am saying.

974. If Mr Wong Hong Toy, who you say is an honest man, has given evidence that you helped him in the calculations, then you must have known it was 25.4%? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) You have to ask him that question.

975. On the basis of what your Vice-Chairman says, you must have known therefore that in March or April the figure was not 5%, but 25.4%? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I have told you already, you form your own conclusions. That is not the case.

976. Do you take issue with what Mr Wong Hong Toy has said? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No.

977. Thank you. Mr Wong also told the Select Committee that he thinks he did the calculation for 1991. What do you say to that? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I would say that you ask him that question.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

171

24 OCTOBER 1996

172

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

978. I am asking you? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I do not know what he thought.

979. Did you ask him to do the 1991 calculation? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, let me just repeat this very standard reply that I have given to you. I cannot remember who I asked to do what.

980. So you cannot remember anything that you might have asked whoever to do whatever. But what you do remember is that you carried an error from a book published two years ago into this paper. That you remember? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That is exactly correct.

981. Yes. That is the only thing you remember about this 5% figure? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes, that is right.

982. Why was it necessary for you to go to *Dare To Change* for these figures? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Because I had written it.

983. That would have been the latest available source for you? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

984. Did you not say something about this in *Singapore My Home Too*? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Say something about what?

985. Health care? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

986. In *Singapore My Home Too*, you have this: "The total health expenditure

has been reduced from 40.1% in 1970 to just 0.9% in the 1990 while money from CPF accounts have been retained for Medisave savings." So you could have gone back to Singapore *My Home Too*? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right.

987. And that was your latest source? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right.

988. So why did you skip that source and go back to one earlier? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) The reason is that *Dare To Change* sticks in my mind more.

989. Oh? Tell us why? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Because that was the first book that I wrote.

990. But in your second book you referred to the same figure, and I had suggested earlier that you had gone back to *Dare To Change* because that is the latest source, you said yes. But now I have shown you that the latest source indeed is not *Dare To Change*? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) But the latest source is in the 5%.

991. You had the figure 40.1% in *Singapore My Home Too*, and now you are saying that the reason you went back to *Dare To Change* is because "it sticks in my mind". Did you say it? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) And the point being?

992. It is extraordinary, is it not, that you would skip one book, a latest book and go back to an earlier book? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) You form your own conclusions.

993. You say that Chart 1 was xeroxed more or less from *Dare To*

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

173

24 OCTOBER 1996

174

Change. Wong Hong Toy says he calculated, with your help, 25.4%. So what this Committee has, therefore, is this. That while you said that you carried the 5% from *Dare To Change*, you nonetheless continued to use that 5% although a calculation of 25.4% had been made with your help in March? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Did I say that?

994. That is what Mr Wong says? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Then why do you not ask Mr Wong?

995. That is why I said this is what the Committee has as the evidence? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right. In which case, would the Committee then also like to refer back to that portion which transpired at the Select Committee hearing for the sake of accuracy, Mr Chairman?

996. Tell me, Dr Chee, did you have to work towards a target date? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

997. And what was the target date for the written submission? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) For the written submission, the target date was stated, I think, in one of the newspaper columns that called for and invited submissions

998. I beg your pardon. Did you have a point to which you were working your calculations? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) The submission date, I suppose.

999. You did? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

1000. Right. If you had a point to which you were working your calculations and if that point was the

submission date, why is it that Chart 1 stopped at 1990 five to six years before that target date? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I am referring to the target date for the submission.

1001. I think you understood my question? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I did not understand your question. What are you referring to? Which target date are you talking about?

1002. The target date which you agreed with me earlier was the date of the submission? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Which is?

1003. The date to which all your calculations would have been made. Is that not right? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) The date to which we handed over our submission.

1004. Dr Chee, you must know that I am not asking you when you submitted the submission? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I do not know what you are asking any more.

1005. Dr Chee, I have asked you: did you have a target date to which you worked your calculations? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

1006. You said yes? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes, I did.

1007. Tell us what was that target date to which you worked your calculations? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) The date itself? I thought earlier you were not asking me for the specific date.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

175

24 OCTOBER 1996

176

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

1008. Answer the question now that you know what the question is? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) You are talking about the specific date.

1009. Yes? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Then it was a date that was stated when invitations were called for.

1010. So that was the date to which you worked your calculations? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right.

1011. And that was? In early 1996? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) It could have been sometime - I do not know - in the first half of 1996.

1012. Yes. So you would have worked your calculations up to the first half of 1996? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) As much as we could, the available data.

1013. Right. So why does your Chart 1 stop at 1990? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I have already told you it was in the 1990s.

1014. Excuse me? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) We were just showing the trend that was up in the 1990s. That was hovering about 25%.

1015. This Chart does not show 25%, neither does it show the trend in the 1990s. So why is it, if you were working your calculations up to the first half of 1996, we do not see points for 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right. Because I have mentioned earlier.

1016. Why? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) We were talking about the fluctuation of the figures in the 1990s hovering at about 25%.

1017. So you did the calculation for 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995 in March? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, we did not.

1018. Then how did you know that 5% was representative of the 1990s? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Again, we are going back and looking at figures that I have mentioned to you earlier on.

1019. Which figures are these? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That we were looking at figures that hovered around 25% and not getting in to do the calculations simply because we were trying to show that the entire trend of government's share of health care expenditure had been dropping from 40% to 25% in the 1990s.

2.45 pm

1020. So you knew it was 25% and yet you allowed the submission to go in which said 5%? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) As I explained already earlier on and during the Select Committee hearing itself, there was an error, typographical error.

1021. So the position as we understand is this. When you did *Dare To Change*, you looked at the figures for 1991, 1992, 1993 and maybe 1994 and you knew that the figure was in the 20's. Yet it appeared as 5% in the text of your proofs which after reading and proof-reading resulted in the same figure 5% being in the final book. According to you,

you did not pick it up, although the 5% in the book is a reference not to the 1990 but to the 1990s. And the person who drew the graph, whom you also now cannot remember, did not ask you any questions about how to plot the plunge for the 1990s as opposed to the 1990 year. And then come 1995, you wrote another book where you had figures for health care which you ignored for the purposes of your written submission. You then did your written submission. Mr Wong Hong Toy tells us you helped him in calculating the figure. And the figure was 25.4%. Despite that, the 5% was still retained in the text and in Chart 1. That is the upshot of the evidence? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Is there a question in there somewhere?

1022. And you cannot remember whether you calculated the 25% in March this year with Mr Wong Hong Toy. That is correct, isn't it? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

1023. Yes. But you confirmed that in March or April this year you knew that the figure for the 1990s was in the 20's? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That is correct.

1024. So if Mr Wong Hong Toy is to be believed, you calculated it at 25.4%? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Which I did back in 1994.

1025. No. If Mr Wong Hong Toy is to be believed, you helped him calculate 25.4% in March or April this year, you knew the figure was in the 20's. You were working towards a target point up to the first half of 1996 and despite all of that, you allowed a chart only up to 1990 with the 5% plunge to be sent in to Parliament. Now, when did you first discover

the error? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) When it was later on highlighted after the first hearing.

1026. When was it first highlighted or drawn to your attention? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) If I recall correctly, I think it was the period between the first and the second hearings. It, must have been before the second hearing and I recall it was after the first hearing that I started looking for the article because I had told the Committee that I would send them a copy.

1027. Right. Did anyone express reservations to you about the chart? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Prior to that?

1028. No. Either on 15th July or at any time up to the time you sent in your letter of 1st August? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) What period was that again?

1029. On 15th July and any time after that, right up to the time you sent in Ramesh's article on 1st August? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Correct.

1030. Did anyone express any reservations to you about this chart? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) If they did, I could not remember.

1031. We are talking now about the period July, Dr Chee? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I know.

1032. You know. You said that you cannot remember what happened in March, in April? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Can you remember who said what to you during that period of time, if I were to ask you?

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

179

24 OCTOBER 1996

180

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

1033. Well, appearing before a Select Committee is a serious matter. Your chart and your representation are scrutinised. You were invited to support it and you were seeking to defend it. Are you saying that you cannot remember if someone had expressed reservations to you about this chart which was the subject of scrutiny on 15th July? Are you saying that? You cannot remember? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I cannot remember. Not what happened on 15th July which was actually the first hearing.

1034. Yes. Forget the hearing proper itself. After the hearing, at any time? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* After the hearing it was about 11.00 pm. We had been in the hearing since 2 in the afternoon and whatever were said to me, people had told me things, unless I have got a RAM chip in my brain, it is impossible for anyone to go back to that time and recall who said what to you.

1035. If you cannot recall that, tell us how did you discover the error? Take us through it, step-by-step, please? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Well, I picked up the article, looked at it again -

1036. No, wait. Why did you pick up the article? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Because I was looking for it.

1037. And why were you looking for it? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Because I was going to send it to the Select Committee hearing.

1038. So you looked for it because you were asked for a copy by the Select Committee? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Right.

1039. You picked it up and you looked at it. And then what happened? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* And I discovered the error.

1040. How did you discover the error? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I looked at it again. I did my calculations again and it was not 5%.

1041. Yes? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* As was typed in the submission.

1042. Right. So to discover the error, you had to do the calculations again? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Right.

1043. Were you by yourself when you picked up the article and calculated it and discovered the error? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Yes.

1044. You were. And did you inform any of your panel members that you had discovered the error? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Not all of them.

1045. Who did you inform? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I cannot remember again offhand.

1046. Well, there are only three other panel members? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Correct, there were three other panel members. But other than the three, there were also others.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

181

24 OCTOBER 1996

182

1047. I am only interested in the three? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I cannot remember who I told what.

1048. Did you tell Mr Kunalen? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I cannot remember what I told them. I don't believe I did.

1049. You don't believe you did? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Right.

1050. Did you tell Mr Wong Hong Toy? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I cannot remember.

1051. Did you believe you did? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I cannot remember. To tell you the truth, I really cannot-remember.

1052. Did you tell Mr Kwan? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I cannot remember.

1053. Is Mr Kwan an honest man in your opinion? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Almost certainly.

1054. Mr Kunalen? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Almost certainly too.

1055. If I were to tell you that someone had expressed reservations about this chart immediately after the hearing, what would you say? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* If anyone had?

1056. Expressed to you reservation. That someone had expressed reservations about this chart to you immediately after the hearing, what would you say? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I would say that, if I can remember the words being said to me, then I would look into it.

1057. But you said that you looked into it because the Select Committee wanted the article? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* How does that contradict with the fact if somebody had referred me to this chart here and that I said, if the person did, then I would look at it. How was that contradictory?

1058. Well, your evidence was not that you looked at it because someone had expressed reservations to you? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No. That is correct.

1059. Yes. Mr Kwan had told the Select Committee that he suggested that there could be an error in Chart I immediately after the hearing on 15th July. He suggested to you. What you have to say to that? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Why don't you ask him that question?

1060. Well, you were party to that conversation, at least if Mr Kwan is to be believed. So I want to know: did he say that to you or not? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* He said a lot more other things.

1061. He might have said a lot more other things? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Right. And I am telling you right now -

1062. Did he say this? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I cannot remember if he had referred me to this chart or not.

1063. What are the other more things that he said to you? Give us some examples, please? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Maybe - "Can I send them home?" "Where his car was parked?"

1064. Thank you? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I don't know.

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

1065. So you remember Mr Kwan telling you where his car was parked and asking you for a lift but you cannot remember something as important as Mr Kwan telling you that there might be an error in Chart 1? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I am saying that I cannot even remember whether he has asked me where his car was parked and so on, because all I remember was that I drove him home that evening. What he said to me in between, I cannot remember.

1066. Well, Mr Kwan has given evidence that immediately after the hearing at night on the way home, he told you to check the figures again? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Is that a question?

1067. Yes. What do you say to that? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I will repeat my statement. Why don't you ask him that question? Because I would not know whether he had actually asked me certain questions or not.

1068. You would not know whether he asked you a question? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I told you I cannot remember.

1069. This happened three months ago, and you cannot remember? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Which part of the statement was not clear to you?

1070. That is fine. You cannot remember what happened? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Touche!

1071. Now, Mr Wong has given the evidence that the error was discovered by both of you and you have just given

evidence that you discovered it yourself. Tell us, since the two answers are inconsistent, is he lying? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I do not know. Why don't you ask him?

1072. Let me put it this way. Are you telling the truth? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I think I can answer that question, Mr Chairman, by referring back to the hearing itself. I would like to look at the section where Mr Wong had indicated that —

1073. Had said that? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

1074. Please look at paragraph 1341. Could you read that out loud, please? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) "Who discovered it first? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) At that time when we were looking at this chart, we found that there was this sharp drop from 27% to 5%. So both Chee Soon Juan and I discovered this."

1075. Right. So Mr Wong had said that he discovered it with you. And you have told us today that you were alone when you discovered it? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right. And then let me go on.

1076. Please? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Because he said some more.

1077. Yes? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) "Yes. When I looked at it" - this was actually what Mr Wong said.

1078. Paragraph? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) 1346.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

185

24 OCTOBER 1996

186

1079. Yes? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*)

"Yes. When I looked at it I was surprised because it was ... clear to me that it was 25% and why it was reflected here as 5%."

"1347. And Dr Chee was also surprised by the sharp drop? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I believe I had asked him but I cannot remember exactly. He said that it was a typographical error."

"1348. Mr Wong, earlier you said that when you and Dr Chee saw the chart, both of you were surprised that there was a sharp drop. That is what alerted you to the mistake. Was that what happened? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes. When I looked at it, I noticed that there was a sharp drop and I took a closer look and I discovered that it was a typographical error."

"1349. In other words, Mr Wong, Dr Chee knew that the correct number was 25%, and not 5%? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I do not know whether he noticed this at that time. I cannot answer for him."

1080. Read on paragraph 1350? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*)

"But when you discovered this error together, which was what you said earlier, both of you were surprised that there was this sharp drop? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) At that time when I took a look at this and I discovered that there was a sharp drop and I saw that it was given here as 5%, I asked him why was the "2" missing? It should be 25%. He said yes."

1081. Dr Chee, is it not clear that Mr Wong Hong Toy's evidence is that you discovered it together? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No.

1082. Really? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Because what happened was that he had said that he had discovered it and he might have informed me about it. Now I think it would be better, given what I said, for you to ask him.

1083. No? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) What was said.

1084. I am asking you? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) And why he said what he

said. Because I am telling you right now that this discovery I made was in between the period.

3.00 pm

1085. Dr Chee, it is clear from what we have read and from paragraph 1353 that Mr Wong did say that you discovered it together? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) You got to ask Mr Wong. Many things occurred in between. I really cannot remember.

1086. So that is inconsistent with your evidence that you discovered it yourself? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That is not true. I discovered it myself. Whether he had actually done it together with me again, as I said, I cannot remember.

1087. You were very clear in your recollection when you said that you were alone when you discovered it? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes, I discovered the error.

1088. Correct. And you calculated it? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) And when Mr Wong said that he had actually discovered together with me, I cannot remember whether we did it together again or not.

1089. You were not prepared to say even that Mr Wong's answers and your answers are inconsistent? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No.

1090. Right. Your evidence was that you calculated the figures and then realised the error. Correct? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Correct.

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

1091. But according to Mr Wong, one look and the error became apparent. So tell me who is telling the truth here? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* You have to ask Mr Wong on this. If that had been apparent to me, I would have corrected it. But to me, the error did not occur until in between the first and the second hearings.

1092. In fact, Mr Wong said that it was immediately apparent to you too? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Then ask him why he said what he said.

1093. So he is not telling the truth? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I do not know. Why do you not put it to him?

1094. Was it immediately apparent to you? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No, it was not. If it was -

1095. Thank you. And you are not willing to even agree that Mr Wong's evidence that it was immediately apparent to you is inconsistent with your evidence that it was not immediately apparent to you. You are not even willing to agree to that? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I cannot remember when it occurred. And when I did the calculation again and discovered the error versus what Wong said, when he said that he discovered it together with me. He might have done the calculations there. He might have tried to alert me to it. But that does not necessarily mean that I was there and I had heard what he said and therefore taken into consideration what he said. Along the same lines, as what Mr Kwan would tell me, when we are together and then, right now, please do the things that

he has alerted me to, meaning that I have heard him and I deliberately had not gone ahead, made the corrections, amended the errors, and so on, and then continued to present the data as it is. All I am saying, right now, is that I discovered the error. And upon discovering the error, I alerted the Select Committee to this error. What happened in between, I cannot remember, who said what to me, when was it said and what did I do in response to what was said to me.

1096. Have you finished? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Mr Chairman, I would appreciate that the Members of the Select Committee also listen to the responses that I have given.

Chairman] Members are listening.

Mr Davinder Singh

1097. All I know, Dr Chee, is that you are not willing to acknowledge what is quite obviously blatant inconsistency between two versions of the same event? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Untrue. As I said, Mr Chairman, -

Mr Davinder Singh] I will now move on, Dr Chee, to ask you this question.

Chairman

1098. At this point, I would like to warn Dr Chee not to be insolent and not to show any disrespect to the Committee? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Mr Chairman, you have warned me not to be insolent but at the same time when I was giving my response to the question that Mr Singh had asked he was turning round and talking to someone else.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

189

24 OCTOBER 1996

190

1099. Dr Chee, I am making the ruling here. I am making the decisions on such matters? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I understand.

Chairman] All right. You understand perfectly. Thank you.

Mr Davinder Singh

1100. Dr Chee, you told the Select Committee that you typed *Dare To Change* and the submission. That is correct, is it not? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Can you say that again?

1101. That you typed the text of *Dare To Change* and the text of the submission. Why is it then when the error was discovered or what you called the error was discovered, you told Mr Kunalen that somebody had made a typo? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) What I told Mr Kunalen and what Mr Kunalen said he heard may be two different things. At that point in time, it was a whole series of meetings and I cannot remember what I said to whom.

1102. Mr Kunalen had no difficulty in recollecting that you said to him that somebody had made a typographical error? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) And I did not say it.

1103. So Mr Kunalen did not tell us the truth? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That is not exactly true either. Mr Kunalen might have heard what he heard. That does not necessarily mean that I can remember everything that I said or I told everyone.

1104. So you might have told Mr Kunalen that somebody made a typo? -

(*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I might have. I cannot remember.

1105. And if you might have told, why would you have told Mr Kunalen that somebody made the typo, if you indeed made the typo? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I did not specifically go up to Mr Kunalen and categorically said, "Listen, Kunalen, somebody made that error."

1106. But that is what Mr Kunalen tells us? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No. That is not what Mr Kunalen said. What Mr Kunalen said was that he heard me saying that somebody had made an error.

1107. No. He did not say that. His answer is "He said (meaning you, this is Kunalen speaking) that somebody had made a typographical error."? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right.

1108. Why would you have told him that if you made the typographical error? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) And I cannot remember myself telling him that.

1109. So this is another instance where your memory fails you? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) There were so many things that happened and I said so many words in that period of six or seven months and I do not recall every word that I said.

Mr Davinder Singh] Mr Chairman, I have no further questions.

Mr Wong Kan Seng] May I, Mr Chairman?

Chairman] Yes.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

191

24 OCTOBER 1996

192

Mr Wong Kan Seng

1110. Dr Chee, you are trained as a psychologist? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No.

1111. You are not. Your degree is in psychology? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

1112. Your PhD is in psychology? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) My PhD is in psychology. I deal with psychology.

1113. Apart from being the SDP's Secretary-General, what else do you do? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I am sorry.

1114. Apart from being the Secretary-General of the SDP - ? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I am a husband. I am a son. I am a brother.

1115. Do you work? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes, I do.

1116. What do you do for a living? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I see patients every now and then.

1117. You see patients as what? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) As a psychologist.

1118. As a psychologist. I have just asked you whether you are trained as a psychologist or not and you said you are not? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I was trained as a neuro-psychologist.

1119. Oh, you are trained as a neuro-psychologist? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That is right.

1120. My little understanding of a neuro-psychologist is that he studies how

behaviour is related to brain functions in very simple form. Am I right? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes. You are correct.

1121. Can I ask you to look at paragraph 1654? It is in column 633? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

1122. Can you please read for me the part which BG George Yeo asked you the question? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) 1653.

1123. 1654? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) -

"Mr Chairman, Sir, can I ask, Dr Chee, when he met the Select Committee on 15th July, did he at that time have a copy of M Ramesh's article in his possession? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) You are not talking about - "

1124. I did not ask you to read the answer yet. Just stop there. Minister George Yeo asked you when you met the Select Committee on 15th July, is that very clear? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) That is very clear.

1125. Did he (which means you) at that time (that time refers to 15th July) have a copy of M Ramesh's article with you? That is very clear? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Correct.

1126. What did you say to him? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Do you want me to read the answer?

1127. Yes, please? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) "You are not talking about the hearing itself."

1128. About the hearing itself, meaning? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) At the hearing.

1129. At the hearing on? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) 15th July.

1130. 15th July. Indeed, that was what Minister George Yeo said. And he asked you, "Yes, 15th July." and your answer? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) "It was in one of the stacks of my files."

1131. So it was in one of the stacks of files on 15th July? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Correct.

1132. Then subsequently, what did you say when he asked you in paragraph 1657? Read 1657? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) "Why did you not refer to that article when we asked you for the source?" And I said "M Ramesh's." He said, "Yes." And I said, "I did."

1133. Then can you go down to 1659? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) -

"We asked for a copy. You said, "Well, it was *Asia Research*" You were not quite sure. You said, "At the top of my head, maybe it was *Asia Research*". But you told us that it was a refereed journal and so on and so forth. Why did you not on the 15th July just rummage through your bag, produce that article and give it to us, when you had it in your possession? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Because I did not have it with me during the hearing itself."

1134. So this seems to be rather contradictory to what you said in paragraphs 1654, 1655 and 1656? - (*Dr Chee Soo Juan*) Are you looking for my response?

1135. Yes? - (*Dr Chee Soo Juan*) Okay. Let me explain it to you. At the hearing, I had it in my possession.

1136. That is not what you said here? - (*Dr Chee Soo Juan*) Mr Chairman, at the hearing, I had it in my possession. But

it was not there physically with me because I had indicated it already. In the previous hearing, I did not have it with me and that is why I vaguely remember that the journal was called *Asia Research*. It turned out to be *Asian Survey*. When the question was put to me, was it in my possession at the hearing, yes, it was in my possession. Because I had it with me, but at home. I could not have said no. If I said no, then how do you use that article in your submission. And therefore, I said yes, I had the article, but whether it was with me physically at the hearing itself, no, it was not. When I said that it was in a stack of files, I was referring to files at home.

1137. Can I just go back to 1654? The question by Minister Yeo was quite clear, as you said. Right? - (*Dr Chee Soo Juan*) Right.

1138. What is your answer? - (*Dr Chee Soo Juan*) "You are not talking about the hearing itself?"

1139. About the hearing itself. It is quite clear. The hearing itself means? - (*Dr Chee Soo Juan*) At the time of the hearing, to me.

1140. At the hearing itself? - (*Dr Chee Soo Juan*) At the time of the hearing, I had it with me.

1141. That is very different. At the hearing itself? - (*Dr Chee Soo Juan*) How so? At the hearing itself, at that point in time, I had it with me.

1142. You had it with you at that time. And it was in one of the stacks of your files? - (*Dr Chee Soo Juan*) Correct.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

195

24 OCTOBER 1996

196

Mr Wong Kan Seng] Can I ask the technician to play Tape 2? Just take a look at this which shows what transpired during that time and stop at the point where he pointed to his stack of files.

The following text was replayed [12th August 1996]:

"Mr Chairman, Sir, can I ask, Dr Chee, when he met the Select Committee on 15th July, did he at that time have a copy of M Ramesh's article in his possession? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) You are not talking about the hearing itself?

Yes, on 15th July? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) It was in one of the stacks of my files."

[*End of video-tape recording*]

Mr Wong Kan Seng

1143. Stop there, please. Did you see your hand signal? Did you see your hand signal at the stack of file? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes. Let us go back in time. Are you all going to turn, right now, and follow my gesture and say that time is over there? What I am trying to indicate to you, Mr Chairman, right now, is that sometimes hand gestures are made but it does not mean that just because I placed my hand on something, it means that physically the article is over there. I repeat myself. The article was with me. But it was not at the hearing itself.

1144. As you told us just now, you are a neuro-psychologist studying brain functions and behaviour. So when you look at it, at the hearing itself, "in my stack of files", the ordinary conclusion would be that you have it right with you? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Would you also ordinarily conclude when I go back

in time that time is really behind me, physically behind me?

3.15 pm

1145. If the document was not with you, why did you not say, "No, I have it at home." instead? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I said that I had it at home.

1146. That was subsequently after being questioned? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No. I think it was made very clear at the first hearing and also at this particular hearing that I did not have the article with me. If I had, I would have showed it to you. I would have brought it out and confirmed the -

Mr Wong Kan Seng] Let us play the remaining part of the tape.

The following text was replayed:

"BG George Yong-Boon Yeo

1654. ... did he at that time have a copy of M Ramesh's article in his possession? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) You are not talking about the hearing itself?

1655. Yes, on 15th July? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) It was in one of the stacks of my files.

1656. So you had that article with you? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Oh, yes, I had that article with me.

1657. Why did you not refer to that article when we asked you for the source? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) M Ramesh's?

1658. Yes? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I did.

BG George Yong-Boon Yeo] We asked you on 15th July to cite the source, the actual date?

Mr Lim Boon Heng] We asked for a copy.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

197

24 OCTOBER 1996

198

BG George Yong-Boon Yeo

1659. We asked for a copy. You said, "Well, it was *Asia Research*." You were not quite sure. You said, "At the top of my head, maybe it was *Asia Research*". But you told us that it was a refereed journal and so on and so forth. Why did you not on the 15th July just rummage through your bag, produce that article and give it to us, when you had it in your possession? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Because I did not have it with me during the hearing itself.

Mr Lim Boon Heng

1660. You said it was in the stack? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No. I said it was in a stack of files and it was not in the stack of files over here. It was in a stack of files at home."

Mr Wong Kan Seng

1147. Did you see that gesture? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

1148. So if you had it at home at that time, your first answer would be, "I have it, but at home."? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right.

1149. You would not have said, "I have it in the stack of my files here," and later on when pressed, you said, "I have it at home." They are two very different hand gestures? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Exactly.

1150. Being a psychologist, you would know? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) By the same token, Mr Chairman, would my home be behind me?

1151. Your home behind you? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Would my home be physically behind me?

1152. It must be somewhere else when you point at this direction, is it not?

— (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) You made my point for me.

1153. That is right? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) So why are we having this discussion if we agree?

1154. One is, when you say "I have it in my stack of files", pointing here? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Correct.

1155. And next is "I have it at home"? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No.

1156. They are two very different positions? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I agree.

1157. Thank you? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) If I want to make the point that my home was behind me, I would not have gestured it to my back. By the same token, my hand gesture is placed on the files. It indicates that it is in the stack of files, not necessarily that particular stack of files right beside me at that hearing.

1158. Did you have a stack of files with you at the hearing? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I had a stack of papers. I did not have a stack of files. What I mean by "stack of files" was files that had been placed accordingly. And at home, I do have a stack of files. At the hearing, I did not have a stack of files.

Mr Wong Kan Seng] That was not the answer. Thank you.

Prof. Jayakumar

1159. Mr Chairman, I just have a few questions for Dr Chee. This is arising

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

199

24 OCTOBER 1996

200

Prof. Jayakumar (cont.)

from the questions which Mr Davinder Singh asked about the charts. Am I right that I understand you that your position is that the charts which accompanied the submission to the Select Committee were not prepared by you? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Were not drawn by me.

1160. Were not drawn by you? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* That is correct.

1161. And you cannot remember who prepared it? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I cannot remember.

1162. And that is your position at the Select Committee hearing on 12th August? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* That is correct.

1163. It is also your position now? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Yes.

1164. Could I ask you to comment on this? If I were to put it to you that you indeed were the person who prepared the charts, do you think I would have a basis for saying that? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No.

1165. Can I ask Dr Chee to please look at paragraph 1045 of the Select Committee Report? This is the evidence given by Mr Kunalen. This is a question asked by Minister George Yeo about the submission when it was prepared. Right? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Right.

1166. Could you please read the answer by Mr Kunalen for me? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* "As I said earlier on, and I just want to repeat this, a draft was

actually done of the submission, in terms of what was going to go in. The accompanying charts were all prepared by Dr Chee."

1167. Can you repeat that again, the last sentence? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* "The accompanying charts were all prepared by Dr Chee."

1168. OK. Can I now ask Dr Chee to read from paragraphs 1324 . These are the responses given by Mr Wong Hong Toy to Minister George Yeo? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* "1324. Who did it?"

1169. Yes. Can you start with paragraph 1323? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)*

"Mr Wong, do you know who drew the graph? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* It was done by another person.

1324. Who did it? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Is it necessary for me to tell?"

1170. Let us pause there. Minister George Yeo asked, "Who did it?" Mr Wong Hong Toy's answer was a question, "Is it necessary for me to tell?" He is very reluctant to tell the Committee. So Minister George Yeo answered. Can you read, please? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* "Very much so?"

1171. "Very much so?" He has to tell the Committee. Then the answer? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* "Chee Soon Juan".

1172. Mr Wong Hong Toy said "Chee Soon Juan". On 12th August, the answers of Mr Kunalen and Mr Wong Hong Toy were on oath and affirmation, were they not? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I presume that it was because I was not there when

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

201

24 OCTOBER 1996

202

they presented their findings or their understanding.

1173. Let me inform you that as the record will show, they gave their evidence on affirmation or oath. Would you be asking us to believe that both Mr Wong Hong Toy who very reluctantly gave the answer and Mr Kunalen were lying? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No.

1174. Thank you. I have one further question on this point, Mr Chairman. Since 12th August, the date of the sitting, and now, some time has lapsed. Is that not so? It is more than two months. Have you made any efforts during this intervening period to ascertain who prepared these graphs? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No.

1175. Why not? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Because it was something that to me was not relevant to me.

1176. It might not have been relevant at that time but it was a very big issue in the Select Committee? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* It was not to me.

1177. It was not to you? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No, it was not.

1178. And that is the reason why you made no effort whatsoever to find out - ? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Between the hearing and now?

1179. Yes? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* That is correct.

Prof. Jayakumar] Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Mr Wong Kan Seng

1180. Mr Chairman, can I just ask one more question? Dr Chee, Prof. Jayakumar asked you whether you remembered who prepared the charts and you corrected him. You said "not prepared" and you did not draw the charts. You did not draw the charts. So there is a difference between preparing and drawing the charts? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* That is right.

1181. In your PhD thesis, did you have charts? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Yes.

1182. Many charts? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Yes.

1183. How many? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I do not have my dissertation here with me.

1184. Would you say five, 10? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I cannot remember.

1185. Eight? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I cannot remember.

1186. You cannot remember. More than five? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I cannot remember.

1187. That thesis was done in 1990 and you cannot remember? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I cannot remember.

1188. But it is an important part of your life when you finally got a PhD and it is an important phase of your life? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Yes.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

203

24 OCTOBER 1996

204

Mr Wong Kan Seng (cont.)

1189. And having done a PhD and having spent many years, you cannot remember how many charts you had? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No, I cannot remember how many charts.

1190. What if I were to say to you that you had 10 charts in that PhD thesis? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Then I say your guess is as good as mine.

1191. I am not guessing? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Then you go ahead and tell me how many charts.

1192. You had 10 charts? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* OK.

1193. Did you draw those charts? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I cannot remember whether I drew those charts or not.

1194. Oh! Even for your PhD thesis, such an important document which gave you a PhD, you cannot remember who drew those charts? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* There were charts in there. Whether at that point in time I physically went in there and drew it to the point where the presentation as you see it now, I cannot remember. But if you are talking about making sure that the chart was prepared, then yes, I did it.

1195. So you prepared the charts for somebody to draw or you drew them yourself? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* It could have been the case:

1196. Normally, you would draw out something before you give it to a chartist

to prepare a chart? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Not necessarily.

1197. Otherwise you would have done it yourself - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* It depends on which one you are talking about. What are you talking about? My dissertation?

1198. Yes? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* In that case, I probably had actually drawn it myself or at least drawn it and then get somebody to draw it properly on the computer.

1199. So there are 10 charts and you probably would have done the first draft yourself and then later on passed it on to another person? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I cannot remember.

1200. You cannot remember. Can you remember that you also wrote an article called "The Effects of D-amphetamine on Arousal"? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Yes.

1201. Are there many charts in there? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I cannot remember.

1202. Would it be more than 10? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I cannot remember.

1203. If I tell you there are 16 charts in it, would there be 16? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* If you have that document with you, then you would be able to count it.

1204. There are 16 charts in there? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Very good.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

205

24 OCTOBER 1996

206

1205. Did you draw those charts? -
(*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I cannot remember.

1206. But that is a more recent article than your PhD thesis? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right. I cannot remember who drew the charts when.

1207. Did you prepare the charts for somebody to draw? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I might have.

1208. If you did not prepare, the person could not have drawn those charts? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Probably.

1209. So you would have prepared the charts? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Probably.

1210. In your PhD thesis and this particular article which I quoted, there are more than 10 charts. In this submission to the Committee, how many charts are there? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Eight charts, I think.

1211. Eight charts. And you did not remember whether you prepared the first draft or not? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) As in the first draft in *Dare to Change*?

1212. No. I am referring to the submission? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, the submission was taken from *Dare to Change*. You asked me this question, I have to go back to *Dare to Change*.

1213. I am referring to the eight charts in the submission. Let us deal with that first? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

1214. Do you remember who prepared the eight charts in the submission? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I cannot remember who drew what chart.

1215. You cannot remember. In your book *Dare to Change*, how many charts are there? You cannot remember? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) I cannot remember.

1216. Take a look at it? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Figures, charts and tables, three or four.

1217. Three or four? How many? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Four.

1218. Four charts in that book? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, I did not say charts. Tables, figures, charts, four.

1219. Tables, figures, charts, altogether four? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Not counting the appendix.

1220. I am referring to just figures and charts? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) You are not referring to tables?

1221. I am just referring to figures and charts? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Four, as I can see it now.

1222. Yes. This book was written by you, as you said. When you wrote the book, you have charts in the book. Did you prepare those charts? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Yes.

1223. You prepared those charts? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Right.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

207

24 OCTOBER 1996

208

Mr Wong Kan Seng (cont.)

1224. So you drew the charts yourself then? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* That is very different.

1225. Oh, so you prepared the draft, passed it to somebody else and that person just does it up nicely? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Some of them. For some of them, the person drawing the charts would have taken straight from the text itself.

1226. From the text? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Right.

3.30 pm

1227. *Mr Wong Kan Seng*] Thank you.

Mr Abdullah Tarmugi

1228. Mr Chairman, can I ask a question. It is about Chart 1 again. Before you made the submission to the Select Committee, did you look through again before you made the submission? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Yes.

1229. In other words, you read through and you tried to relate the text with the charts? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Right.

1230. And you found nothing amiss between the charts and the text? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Not during the submission.

1231. Even after you checked it? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Right.

1232. It did not occur to you that the sharp drop from 27% -? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No, it did not.

1233. It did not. And that was a very crucial point in your submission? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I beg your pardon.

1234. That was a crucial point in your submission? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* What was the crucial point.

1235. The sharp drop? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* It was in one of the tables.

1236. In that chart at least. It was a crucial point? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Right. It was. I agree.

1237. And yet you did not notice that there was anything unusual about it? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Let me repeat myself. The chart was actually prepared in *Dare To Change*.

1238. I know. I am not talking about *Dare To Change*? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* And right through until the submission, I have not discovered that the error was in there. Whoever prepared the chart prepared it. I do not think when I said I prepared the chart, I also mean that the entire submission was prepared by me. Who knows what I did, whether I personally drew the charts or not, or just prepared it for somebody else to draw, or whether I stand in front of the computer to draw it and so on and so forth, no one knows exactly. An assumption would have to be made that I had drawn it, and that I prepared it.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

209

24 OCTOBER 1996

210

1239. No, I was not even going into who drew the charts? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Right.

1240. My question was, when you looked at the chart, you found nothing amiss? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No, I did not find anything amiss.

1241. You did not. Would you say that Mr Kwan is a scholar like you, who is used to charts and statistics? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I am sorry.

1242. Would you say that Mr Kwan is a scholar like you, who is used to looking at charts and statistics? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I think that question would be better put to him. I would not want to say whether Mr Kwan is or is not a scholar. What is your definition of a scholar, Mr Tarmugi?

1243. For one, at least a Ph.D is a scholar? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Then he is not by that definition of a Ph.D.

1244. He is not. All right. And yet Mr Kwan, who is not as scholarly as you are, found the chart very odd immediately when he saw it the first time? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Do you want to go back to the Select Committee hearing of what he said?

1245. Maybe you should read from paragraphs 1399, 1401 and 1403. What I am trying to establish, Dr Chee, is that despite the fact that he is not as scholarly as you are, he found that something was amiss immediately when he saw the chart the first time round. And yet you, who are so used to charts and figures, did not see anything amiss?

— *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Mr Chairman, when you write books, you would expect, if it was possible and if you have the resources, to get someone to proof read for you, to do, I suppose the editing and the corrections, and sometimes it is hard for the author to be able to pick up the mistake that is there. Therefore, when I write something, it may become very clear to that person that a mistake has been made, but when you are the author, you may be reading through it ten times and you still miss out on the mistakes.

1246. In other words, there is a blind spot? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Yes, I suppose if you want to describe it that way.

Mr Low Thia Khiang

1247. Mr Chairman, can I have SDP's Chart 3? I refer to paragraph 271, column 148, of the Select Committee's Report. Dr Chee, could you please read out the third line starting from "What this chart ..."? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)*

"271. May I ask Dr Chee what is the chart trying to tell us? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Thank you, Mr Chairman. What this chart is trying to show is that compared to some of the developed countries, first world economies, and I think this is what Singapore is aspiring towards, that we are spending a whole lot less than these other countries in taking care of their citizens in terms of their health care."

1248. Was this the original intention of Chart 3? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Yes, it was.

1249. Would it make any difference or would it serve the same purpose if the figure is 3.1% instead of 0.8%? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* It would still show that

Dr Chee Soon Juan (cont.)

Singapore is spending a lot less than the other developed countries, the first world economies. I would say to that.

1250. Therefore, would it be necessary for either you or your team to use a smaller figure to make the point? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No, it would not.

1251. I refer you to paragraph 324 of the Select Committee's Report. When the question of 3.1% was asked, you said that "it was a matter of interpretation when we are talking of percentages here." Would you explain further on that? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* At that point in time, if you remember, Mr Chairman, we were actually having this discussion about what Dr Kanwaljit Soin presented in Parliament and what I had written in. At that point, things were going back and forth. It was not precisely clear and what I thought at that point in time was the reference not to Government expenditure, and hence the confusion that arose.

Mr Low Thia Khiang] That is all, Sir.

Assoc. Prof. Ho Peng Kee

1252. Just one point. Would you not agree, Dr Chee, that even though 3.1% is lower than 7%, the difference between 7% and 0.8% would be more graphic and may make a point? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* The difference between what and 0.8% again?

1253. 7% and 0.8%. Even though, as Mr Low had said, the point is still made by you that Singapore is spending less,

but if the figure was 0.8%, that point would be more graphically made than if it were 3.1%. So there is a difference? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* There is a difference between 0.8% and 3.1%. Yes.

1254. So even though it is still there, the message is stronger if it were 0.8%? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* That was not what I was trying to show.

1255. But the message would be stronger? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* No, it is not. It depends on how you chart the graph. If you want to put the Y axis and scrunch it, then the bars would not be as stark as if you try to elongate and make the indices further apart.

1256. But in terms of the difference in the numbers, 7% and 3.1%, as between that and 7% and 0.8%. The point that you are trying to make, which you read out in the passage just now, that Singapore is spending far less than the other countries, would be more telling a point if it was 0.8% as opposed to 3.1%? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Not necessarily.

1257. You do not think so? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Not necessarily.

Mr Wong Kan Seng

1258. Just to follow up on this. When you were describing the X and Y axis, and that depends on how you draw that, it shows that you do know how to draw charts? — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Yes, most certainly.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

213

24 OCTOBER 1996

214

1259. This difference of 0.8% and 3.1%, is it a significant difference? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Statistically significant?

1260. Statistically, is it significant? Just a difference of 0.8% and 3.1%? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, I do not mean to be rude, but I would like to ask Mr Wong Kan Seng this. Do you mean, when you say "statistically significant" do you understand -

1261. No. I am not getting the statistical calculations? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Then you should not have said there was a statistical significance.

1262. I am just asking whether it is a significant difference? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) We are not talking about statistical significant difference?

1263. No. 0.8% and 3.1%, is the difference significant? — (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) You are talking about the graph?

1264. No, just these two figures? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) In terms of numbers?

1265. Yes? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) They are different.

1266. They are different and the difference is quite significant? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) "Quite" and "very", these are all qualitative terms.

Mr Wong Kan Seng] All right. For the purpose of the Committee, perhaps I would just like to remind Mr Low that when he was asked by the Chairman

whether the figure was significant or not he said, "Yes, the 1% change is significant."

Mr Low Thia Kiang] Perhaps for the record, for clarification purpose, I was asked in terms of percentage to GDP. The point which I asked Dr Chee just now was whether the chart as a whole serves the purpose of explaining what the SDP intended to use and whether the difference in the figures of 0.8% and 3.1% would make a difference to serve the purpose which the charts were intended to be used. So it was a totally different situation and in a different context.

RAdm Teo Chee Hean] Mr Chairman, may I say something? Could I ask Mr Low whether it is important or not in his view when you are using figures to be accurate?

Mr Low Thia Kiang] Of course, it is important for figures to be accurate. I do not understand how this is related to the question.

RAdm Teo Chee Hean] If the figure should be 3.1%, should not that figure be used rather than the figure of 0.8%? If I could ask Mr Low that question?

Mr Low Thia Kiang] My point was, if that was the original intention, as explained by Dr Chee, of this chart, it still shows 3.1% or even 5%, the chart would still explain that Singapore is spending less.

RAdm Teo Chee Hean] What Mr Low is saying is that it does not matter what figure you use. It does not matter whether

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

215

24 OCTOBER 1996

216

RA dm Teo Chee Hean (cont.)

the figure is accurate or not, as long as it creates the right impression. How can that be? If there is a figure, it must be accurate. The figure that was used was a wrong figure.

Chairman

1267. At this point, I would like to proceed on with the next witness. Dr Chee, you would be escorted to the waiting room. I would like to remind you that you are not discharged from the hearing yet and you will remain there until such time, as we may ask you to return to this room. Thank you, Dr Chee? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Mr Chairman, I have one question, if I may ask.

1268. What is it about? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* In the course of the hearing

being conducted and at the end when a decision is made, if a decision is made, is there an avenue for us in terms of an appeal?

1269. Dr Chee, we have not come to that stage yet? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* I am just asking you. If there is not, I am just happy to accept it.

1270. The Committee will issue its Report in due course. Thank you very much? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* But is there an appeal or any form of redress or another avenue where we can have our views heard? If there is not, I will just be happy to accept that.

1271. I think you have to wait for the Report of the Committee? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Chairman] Serjeant-At-Arms, could you escort Dr Chee to the waiting room.

(The witness withdrew.)

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

217

24 OCTOBER 1996

218

Examination of Witness

Mr Wong Hong Toy was called in and examined under oath.

Mr Lee Hui Huan, Parliament's Simultaneous Interpreter (English/Mandarin), assisted in the interpretation.

3.45 pm

Mr Wong Kan Seng

Chairman

1272. Please be seated. Good afternoon. For the record, could you state your name, address and the position you hold in your organisation? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) My name is Wong Hong Toy. I am the Vice-Chairman of Singapore Democratic Party. I stay at Block 423, Jurong West Avenue 1, Singapore 640423.

Chairman] Mr Wong, the Committee of Privileges is looking into the complaint made by the Minister for Health, BG George Yong-Boon Yeo, for contempt of Parliament against the four representors from the Singapore Democratic Party, namely, Mr Kunalen, Mr Kwan Yue Keng, Dr Chee Soon Juan and yourself. The evidence which you give today will be taken on oath. If you so desire, you can take an affirmation. I will now ask the Clerk to administer the oath. [*Mr Wong Hong Toy made an affirmation in Chinese.*] Mr Wong, we have arranged an interpreter for you and we will start with the examination now.

Mr Wong Kan Seng] May I, Mr Chairman?

Chairman] Yes.

1273. Mr Wong, you on 3rd September in your written defence to the Speaker of Parliament signed a letter together with the other three representors. Can you look at the copy, please, which is on the blue spine, flag 3? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1274. Can you please read your response which you signed? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

"In response to the Minister's complaints, we wish to state that we had made the SDP's representation in good faith and had no intention of deceiving anyone. It was unfortunate that a typing error was made. Nonetheless, it was a genuine error which was brought to the attention of the Select Committee before the 12 August hearing.

As for the Statement 2 and Chart 3, there was a misunderstanding of the figures and there was no intention of deceiving anyone. We, therefore, deny all the allegations made by the Minister for Health in his letter of complaint dated 27 August 1996 (please refer to the letters of response)."

1275. So, Mr Wong, you understand the meaning of this defence? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes, I do.

1276. Can you also look at flag 5? This was the letter that you wrote to the Speaker of Parliament explaining your part and defending your position. Can you please read your letter of 4th September? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*)

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

219

24 OCTOBER 1996

220

Mr Wong Hong Toy (cont.)

"I deny all the allegations made by Mr George Yea in his complaint dated 27 August 1996.

Perjury: Para 17-19

In respect of the charge at para 17 of Mr Yeo's letter which he accused me of lying, I wish to state that what I said at the hearing of 12 August was the truth and not contradictory to Dr Chee Soon Juan's statements.

When I said: "I worked with him (*Dr Chee*) in making this calculation", I meant that I worked out the calculation myself and later gave it to Dr Chee. This was clearly what I said at the hearing on 12 August in paras 1289 to 1291 of the Minutes of Evidence.

In respect of the complaint that I could not have done the calculations as stated in para 19, I wish to refer to para 1335 of the Minutes of Evidence where the complainant himself acknowledged that I had done the calculations.

Prevarication: Para 20

In respect of the charge in para 20, I wish to state that I had glanced at Chart 1 but did not look into it. This was exactly what I said: "So when the Chart was shown to me, I just took a glance and I passed it without looking deep into it." (Para 1295 of the Minutes of Evidence).

Misconduct as a witness: Para 21-22

In respect of Mr Yee's charge at para 21, I wish to state that I had already explained at the 12 August hearing in para 1335 of the Minutes of Evidence that the proceeding was conducted in English and I could not fully understand everything.

In respect of the charge at para 22, I have already given my explanation in para 1337 of the Minutes of Evidence. When questions are put to me, then I require an interpreter to make sure that I understand fully what was being said to me. Reading an English article is very different from listening to English because I cannot take my time when reading English whereas when listening".

1277. Can you read that again? Because the word is not "cannot". It is "can"? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*)

"Reading an English article is very different from listening to English because I can take my time when reading English whereas when listening, the proceeding may go very fast and I cannot fully follow everything.

That is all I wish to say."

1278. Thank you, Mr Wong, for reading this. This response is written in English? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1279. You signed it because you understood what is written there? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Surely.

1280. Just like the earlier statement you signed together with the other three, also in English, you understood what you signed? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) You mean the first one I was reading?

1281. Yes? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1282. On 15th July hearing, you asked for an interpreter? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1283. And the Speaker told you that an interpreter would be made available? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1284. Can you read out paragraph 368 of this blue book? Para 368 is on column 189? You found that paragraph? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) 368.

1285. Yes. From that paragraph, the third last line onwards, starting with the words "Can I"? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) "Can I use these few moments".

1286. This is the Chairman speaking at that time. Can you read that sentence? Can you read it aloud, please? Read it for us? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) You want me to read which part?

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

221

24 OCTOBER 1996

222

1287. Can you read the part where the Chairman said: "Can I use these few moments"? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)*

"Can I use these few moments to add that the other members of the SDP research team are not precluded from stating their views in response to any of the questions. For the benefit of Mr Wong, we have arranged an interpreter. If you want to express your views, please let me know? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Thank you."

1288. You said "Thank you". Right? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* I don't know whether I said or -

1289. Well, your name is just before that? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Yes.

1290. So you said "Thank you" to the Chairman when he made the offer. To all the Members? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Yes.

1291. Can I ask you to turn to paragraph 1337. 1337 is on column 570? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Yes. I have got it.

1292. Good. Just go to column 571 and you see your name there? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Yes.

1293. In the middle. Somewhere further down in the middle, you said: "However, during the proceedings". Can you read that for us? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Yes.

1294. Can you read, please? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)*

"However, during the proceedings, the exchanges between the Minister and Dr Chee Soon Juan were all in English. At that time, nobody asked me any questions. So it did not occur to me that I should enlist the help of the interpreter."

4.00 pm

1295. You understood what you said. Right? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Yes, because this was translated from Chinese.

1296. Yes. So earlier on, when the Chairman said that if you wanted to express your views in response to any of the questions, please let him know. And you thanked him. Correct? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Yes.

1297. In other words, he asked all the panel members at that time that they could speak up on any of the questions. Am I right? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* No.

1298. Why not? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* At that time, there were exchanges between Minister George Yeo and Dr Chee Soon Juan and the proceedings at that time were such that we were not permitted to interrupt the exchanges between the Minister and Dr Chee. We could only speak when the others were not speaking.

1299. This is not what the Chairman said in paragraph 368. He said,

"Can I use these few moments to add that the other members of the SDP research team are not precluded from stating their views in response to any of the questions."

— *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* I believe at that time, when the Chairman said this, it was because the other three panel members did not say anything from the beginning to the end.

1300. So you chose not to speak rather than nobody asked you any question? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Because

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

223

24 OCTOBER 1996

224

Mr Wong Hong Toy (cont.)

at the proceedings, from the beginning until the end, Minister BG George Yeo was asking questions and I was not asked any question. That was why I did not say anything.

1301. You did not say because you chose not to say anything to any of those questions that were being asked at that time? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) No. Not true.

1302. But you know what they were talking about? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I knew what they were talking about. However, during the exchanges, I could have missed something. That was possible.

1303. But you did follow the proceedings quite well? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) In the beginning, I was following quite closely. But later on, when I found that I was not being asked any questions, I laxed a bit and I did not follow 100%.

1304. But you are a member of the panel. Right? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1305. And therefore you were here at that time invited by the Select Committee to give oral evidence. Right? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I do not agree because at that time, when we were here, our duty was to assist the Select Committee in finding out the truth about the health care subsidy in Singapore. We were not there to debate the issue.

1306. Were you part of the SDP panel? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1307. SDP put up a submission to the Select Committee? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1308. It was a serious submission? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) At that time, when we submitted this representation, we felt that we were duty bound to do so.

Mr Wong Kan Seng] That was not my question. My question was -

Chairman] Order. Just to be sure that the witness understands everything this time, could I ask the Interpreter to interpret every question put by the Members of the Committee to the witness. Mr Wong.

Mr Wong Kan Seng

1309. My question was: the SDP put up a submission and it was a very serious submission? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) As I said just now, since we had made the statement, we had to make a submission to prove our point. As to whether or not it was a serious submission, you can form your own opinion.

1310. So you do not care whether it is a serious submission or a cavalier submission. Please translate that first before he jumps to conclusion? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I do not agree because whoever submits a representation, he would not just do it at random. Just as whenever a person writes a letter, he must believe what he writes is true and correct.

1311. I was not asking whether it is true or correct. I was asking whether you treated that submission seriously or not?

— (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I do not know why you would ask me whether it is serious or not. Since we have submitted this representation, we believe that it is a very important document.

1312. It is an important document to you then? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) But I am not saying whether it is important or not. What I am saying is we do it seriously.

1313. So when the panel attended the hearing in July, you also did your work seriously and approached the whole hearing seriously? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1314. So you must be following the discussion very closely and listening very carefully. I think it requires a very simple answer? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) At that time, I was participating in this process. When we were discussing our submission, I was quite familiar with what we were discussing about.

1315. So you can follow the discussion when the discussion was whether the figure should be 25% or 5%? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) As far as I can remember, at that time, we did not go through the items, item by item.

1316. But we went through the first one, Chart 1. I think the Committee talked about Chart 1 at that time and you knew that they were talking about Chart 1? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Are you referring to our discussion when we were preparing the submission or are you talking about our discussion on 15th July?

1317. I am talking about 15th July. On 15th July, at the hearing, were you listening to the discussion carefully? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) As I said just now, in the beginning, I was paying much attention to what was happening at the hearing. But, subsequently, there were quick exchanges between the Minister and Dr Chee. So I laxed a bit and I did not follow 100%.

1318. Is it very difficult to follow the discussion when they were talking about whether the figure should be 25% or 5%? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) At that time, there was no mention about 25% or 5%.

1319. They were talking precisely about that question whether it is 25% or 5%. For 20-25 minutes, they were talking about that chart and they went on for 20-25 minutes? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) At that time, we talked not only on this chart but we also discussed other charts as well.

1320. No. I am just referring to that one chart at that time when they talked about that chart for 20-25 minutes, Chart 1? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) If the Minister would look at the tape, he would discover that during that time, Minister George Yeo had also presented his own charts and for almost 90% of the time, he was talking about his own chart rather than our chart.

1321. At that time, they were talking about Chart 1. Could you follow the discussion at the time when they were talking about Chart 1? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) As I said just now, at the discussion at that time, Minister George Yeo presented his charts and then he

Mr Wong Hong Toy (cont.)

went on to explain his charts and he said that his charts were correct and ours were not correct. He did not specifically mention a figure.

4.15 pm

1322. Mr Wong, you did the calculation of 25%? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1323. You remember the 25% very well? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1324. Can we have Chart 1 to refresh the memory of Mr Wong? When the Committee was discussing Chart 1, for 1990, Chart 1 showed 5%. Am I right? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) As I mentioned just now, when we were discussing Chart 1, Minister George Yeo immediately presented his own chart. We had no chance at all to discuss our chart.

1325. We are not talking about discussing your chart or his chart. We are talking about following the discussion? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) As far as I can remember, Minister George Yeo presented his chart and he said that his chart was the correct one. That was what I can remember.

1326. So you do remember this figure of 5% being discussed at the hearing? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) He did not specifically mention the figure of 5%. Or perhaps I could have missed it.

1327. For 20 or 25 minutes, you were discussing this figure of 25% or 5% and you were listening to it very carefully and

you said you have missed it? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) At that time, this figure of 25% did not appear at all. How could we even discuss whether it was 25% or 5%.

1328. You did the calculation of 25%? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) But it was not in the mind of Minister George Yeo. How could he know that there was a 25%?

1329. So when you saw this chart which shows 5%, straightaway it must occur to you that that figure was wrong? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) At that time, this chart was not shown to us.

1330. Do you have a copy of the chart at that time? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) No. I did not have a copy of the submission. I did not bring a copy of our submission at that time.

1331. But Minister George Yeo distributed Chart 1 to everybody. You must have a copy? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) As far as I can remember, he distributed copies of his chart.

1332. So which Chart was with you at that time? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I cannot remember whether Minister Yeo distributed both charts at that time. I would like to add that in the process of the hearing that day, some of the representors had to ask the Chairman for copies of the documents to be distributed to them. So it shows that not all of us had received copies of the documents at that hearing.

1333. But did you have a copy? Did they give you a copy? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I cannot remember whether I was

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

229

24 OCTOBER 1996

230

given a copy. On that day, there were a lot of charts. There were 10-20 charts being presented that day.

Mr Wong Kan Seng] Can I help Mr Wong to refresh his memory? Let us play a tape which shows Chart 1 being distributed. It is the tape on paragraph 179.

Chairman

1334. Before we come to that point, can I just ask the witness whether he agrees with me that on that day, all charts and documents were readily made available to everybody present, Members as well as representors? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Perhaps the person who was distributing the charts had missed one or two persons. I believe the Chairman would remember that it was either Mr Kunalen or Mr Kwan who had asked you for a copy of the document.

Chairman] I want to leave no doubt in the minds of all the Members here that all documents and charts were distributed to everybody. Please proceed, Mr Wong.

Mr Wong Kan Seng

1335. Can we play the tape on paragraph 179? Before we watch the tape, can I ask Mr Wong to confirm again? Did you have Chart 1 with you at that time on 15th July? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I cannot recall.

1336. It was not very long ago. It was only in July? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*)

Since there were so many charts, I do not know whether I had Chart 1 with me or not.

1337. Maybe you are confused about the number. Do you have the chart with you at that time? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I may have it. But there was one copy which appeared to be quite blur. I am not sure whether that was the particular chart. I remember very clearly that we had a chart on the total national health expenditure in comparison with other countries.

Mr Wong Kan Seng] Can we play the tape, please? Please look at this tape, Mr Wong.

The following text was replayed:

"BG George Yong-Boon Yeo] ... the SDP has put up a voluminous report to justify the position it took that healthcare costs are hardly subsidised at all. The arguments are based upon data contained in a number of charts in the report. Can I seek your permission, Mr Chairman, to distribute those Charts to Members of this Committee and to members of the media so that they can follow the proceedings here on?"

Chairman] All right. You may proceed.

BG George Yong-Boon Yeo

179. Mr Chairman, Sir, can I ask Dr Chee from where the SDP got its information for the chart? I am referring to Chart 1, which shows Government health expenditure from 1970 to 1990 as a percentage of total Government expenditure, showing it at 40% in 1970, reducing to 37% in 1985 and plunging to 5% in 1990?"

Mr Wong Kan Seng

1338. Whose hand was that helping Dr Chee to look for the chart, Mr Wong? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) That was mine.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

231

24 OCTOBER 1996

232

Mr Wong Kan Seng (cont.)

1339. So you already know. In fact, you already found the chart before even Dr Chee found it? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I did not have a copy with me. That was Dr Chee's copy. I was helping him because he was turning the pages.

1340. What were you looking at? It was a copy of Chart 1 right in front of you which you found. That is why you could so quickly find Chart 1 for Dr Chee? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) This was subsequently.

1341. No. This was the time when Minister George Yeo distributed the chart and he was asking Dr Chee to refer to the chart? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I could not remember how many sheets there were. Otherwise there is no need for Dr Chee to search for it.

1342. Yes, there could be several charts there but you found Chart 1 for him? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes, that is correct. I found it for him but it did not mean that I was looking at the same chart with him or sharing the chart with him.

1343. You are looking at the chart yourself now? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I cannot remember whether I was looking at that particular chart. Most of the time I was looking at the charts and some documents which were before me.

1344. It is quite convenient. From that point on until they finished with Chart 1 was a discussion of 20-25 minutes, including of course Chart 1A that Minister George Yeo circulated? -

(*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) As I said, on that day, most of the time was spent on discussing Chart 1A distributed by Minister George Yeo.

4.30 pm

1345. But you could follow the discussion that they were talking about two different charts. They were talking about 5% in one chart and 25% in another chart? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I heard some parts of it. Perhaps, there were some parts that I did not pay attention to.

1346. But you did the calculation of 25%. So it got stuck in your mind? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes. As I have explained at the hearing on 12th August, since I had the figure in my mind, I did not pay particular attention to the chart and I did not check whether it was correct.

1347. Is there a big difference between 5 and 25? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) When we are just talking about these two figures, there is a big difference. Sometimes, when we are very familiar with the figures we did not pay particular attention to them.

1348. Can you take a look at paragraph 1346, column 573? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes, I found it.

1349. So Minister George Yeo said, "When Mr Wong Hong Toy took a close look at Chart 1, he was surprised by the drop?" What do you say? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) This does not refer to what happened at the hearing. This was referring to what happened subsequently, after the hearing of 15th July.

1350. So after 15th July, you took a look at this Chart, you were surprised by the sharp drop? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* My answer appeared in paragraph 1346.

1351. Yet when you looked at that Chart on 15th July, you were not surprised? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* It was subsequent to the hearing. A few days after that, I was alone. So I took a look at the Chart and I noticed that there was this drop and I was surprised.

1352. Yet 15th July was barely three months from the time the submission was put up to Parliament? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Right.

1353. When you look at that chart on 15th July, you were not surprised? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* At that time I did not pay particular attention to the figures. As I said, I was very familiar with this figure. So there was no need for me to look at it closely.

1354. So you did not pay attention to the proceedings? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* It is not that I did not follow the proceedings, but the fact remained that this was a very simple figure. Because it was so simple, I did not pay particular attention to it.

1355. But you did follow the proceedings very well at the time? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* As I said just now, I did not pay particular attention to it.

1356. Which means you did follow the proceedings? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* But I cannot say that I followed 100%.

Mr Wong Kan Seng] Maybe we can look at another tape here. Can we have Tape 5, please.

The following text was replayed:

"Mr Chairman, Sir, in the paragraph which Dr Chee has just cited, it says in the first sentence that Singapore's national health expenditure is 3.1% of GDP. Instead of putting that number into the graph, into Chart 3, Dr Chee and his SDP research team have put in 0.8%, which was not from this paragraph. Mr Chairman, Sir, I think this must lead us to suspect whether there is a deliberate attempt by the SDP to mislead the Select Committee by putting in data, which are not comparable, on to the same chart?"

Mr Wong Kan Seng

1357. Do you follow the proceedings? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* I can remember Chart 3 being referred to in the proceedings because at that time Dr Sooin also spoke and there was some reference to the speech in Parliament.

1358. So you were following the proceedings quite closely? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* You are putting words in my mouth.

1359. No, I am asking you? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Some parts I paid attention to, and some parts I did not. I could remember this part because of what happened at that time.

1360. For this particular part which I just played back, do you remember the proceedings? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Yes.

1361. You followed the proceedings very well at that time? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* It is the same question.

Mr Wong Kan Seng (cont.)

1362. No, what is your answer? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* I have said so. I may not follow completely, but if something were to happen, it would help me to jog my memory.

1363. I was not talking about other parts of the proceedings. I am talking about this part which I just showed you. Could you follow that? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* As I said, I can remember this part.

1364. Good. Thank you. Can I come to Chart 1 that we were talking about earlier on? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* I have already told you.

1365. I have not asked the question yet? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* All right.

1366. When the discussion was going on about 5% and 25%, you said you did not follow that very well? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* As I said, I did not follow 100% of the proceedings.

1367. But there is a difference between 5 and 25? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Are you referring to the discussion on Chart 1 or are you just talking about the difference between the two figures?

1368. The difference between the two figures? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Yes, of course, 25 and 5 are a world of difference.

1369. A world of difference? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Yes.

1370. So when they were discussing 5 and 25, and it is such a world of difference, and you did the calculation barely three months ago, you did not point out that world of difference to the Select Committee? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* We could have forgotten something that happened even three weeks ago, not to mention three months.

1371. Yet a few days after 15th July when you looked at the chart, it surprised you that the figure was 5%? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Because at that time I was looking at the submission and the Chart. There is a difference between reading it myself and listening to people discussing it.

1372. But did you not just say that the figures of 5 and 25, even during the discussion on 15th July, were a world of difference? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Minister, I think we should not lump the two things together. There is a difference between 5 and 25, but whether or not I was following the discussion at that time, this was an entirely different matter.

1373. But you were looking at Chart 1 when I just played back the tape. You were referring to Chart 1 for Dr Chee and you looked at that Chart right in front of you? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* I do not want to give you the impression that I am trying to defend myself. But what happened at that time was that I was helping Dr Chee to look for the document. Perhaps, he could have found it but he turned it over. I was just helping him to sort out and get the right document. Just like what the interpreter was doing just now, he was helping me to find the right column and there was confusion

over 1346 and 1364. So something like that could have happened.

1374. But to help Dr Chee find the right chart, you must be able to recognise the chart? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* There were words written on the chart, but it did not imply that when I helped him to look for Chart I, I would understand all the details in the chart.

1375. I was not asking for the details. I was asking you whether or not you recognised the chart? By helping Dr Chee to flip the chart means you recognised the chart? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Yes. I know you are not asking me about the details. But I am only trying to explain. Will you allow me to explain?

4.45 pm

1376. I asked you a simple question. When you flipped the chart for Dr Chee, you must have recognised the chart, did you not? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* When we were looking at the chart, we were not looking at the figures. We were looking for the caption: SDP's Chart 1. So when I found SDP's Chart 1, I pointed it out to him.

1377. So you know and recognise SDP's Chart 1? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* I was looking at it. When he was looking for it, I do not know whether I had a copy with me. Perhaps I did not have. Otherwise, I would not have looked into his copy.

Mr Wong Kan Seng] Thank you.

Mr Davinder Singh

1378. Mr Wong, could you pick up that bundle with the blue spine and turn to tab 3, please? You signed off on this statement? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Yes.

1379. And you confirm of your own knowledge that this is true and accurate? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Yes.

1380. Mr Wong, what was the misunderstanding referred to in the second paragraph? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* This misunderstanding referred to Chart 3 because at that time we thought that Dr Soin was referring to the national health expenditure but in fact she was referring to the government expenditure. This was the misunderstanding.

1381. How did you think, Mr Wong, that Dr Soin was referring to the national health expenditure? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* As far as I can remember, during the exchanges between Minister George Yeo and Dr Chee, Dr Soin intervened and she explained the position.

1382. That is not my question, Mr Wong? How did you misunderstand? Did you misunderstand Dr Soin to refer to the national health expenditure? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* At that time we thought that Dr Soin was referring to the national health expenditure.

1383. At which time? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* At the time when we were preparing the chart.

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

1384. Who was the "we"? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Of course, it means the research team and some other people as well.

1385. Including Dr Chee? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Yes, of course.

1386. Mr Kwan? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* At the time when we were preparing, I do not know whether he was involved.

1387. Mr Kunalen? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* I think he did not.

1388. Mr Wong, you said "including the research team". Mr Kunalen is head of research? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Are you saying that because he is the head of research, he has to participate?

1389. You said the "research team"? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Does it mean that when a Committee under a Ministry is going into the details when formulating some policy or something, the Minister has to be involved too?

1390. Please answer the question? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Can you repeat the question?

1391. You said that the research team was involved. Mr Kunalen is head of research? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* But the research team is not confined to the four of us. There were also other people who helped us.

1392. So name me the people who had this misunderstanding? - *(Mr Wong*

Hong Toy) The four of us signed this statement. So naturally it means the four of us had a misunderstanding of these figures that we had submitted.

1393. That's right. So now you accept that Mr Kunalen was one of the four or one of the team who had a misunderstanding? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* At that time each of us was given a copy of the submission. So I believe he must have read it. He could have read it. But I cannot guarantee that.

1394. Mr Wong, you understand my question and I would ask you to please answer it. You just said that four of these persons, including you, signed this statement. So the four of them must have had a misunderstanding. Based on what you just said, it follows, does it not, that Mr Kunalen and Mr Kwan were involved? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* No. It does not mean that they were involved. Then they signed this. This letter was in reply to the complaint. After 15th July, after Dr Soin had explained, we realised that there was a misunderstanding in our submission. So it was not a question of misunderstanding at that time when we made this presentation. After Dr Soin's explanation, all the four of us knew. No need to participate.

1395. Mr Wong, again you have not answered my question, but never mind. You have said that because all four have signed, then all four must have had a misunderstanding. And I will proceed on that basis. When did your misunderstanding arise? Your misunderstanding? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* After Dr Soin had explained and when we were making this reply to Mr Speaker.

1396. So what was your understanding of Statement 2 and Chart 3 before Dr Soin explained? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) At that time we thought that the figure was correct.

1397. What was your understanding? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) As I said just now, at that time our understanding was that this figure represented the national health expenditure.

1398. Right. How did you come to the conclusion? How did you, Mr Wong, come to the conclusion that the figure 0.8% represented national health expenditure? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) According to some data appearing in the newspapers. At that time Dr Soin made some mention of this in Parliament.

1399. So you read Dr Soin's speech? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes. We read all the speeches reported on Parliament proceedings.

1400. And who is the "we"? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Most of our Party members. Most of the CEC members.

1401. Including Mr Kwan and Mr Kunalen? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I think anyone who is participating in politics should pay attention to this.

1402. And he should pay attention to my question? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) This is my answer to your question.

Mr Davinder Singh] Point of order, Sir. The witness is not answering the question at all.

Chairman] Can you make your point again, Mr Singh?

Mr Davinder Singh

1403. Mr Wong, I asked you who is the "we" and you said "members and CEC members". I want to know who are these? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) As I said, CEC.

1404. That therefore Mr Kwan read it? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes, he should.

1405. Thank you. Now, what other documents or articles did you read for the purposes of preparing Chart 3? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Chart 3? I cannot remember. I did not prepare Chart 3.

5.00 pm

1406. But you read Dr Soin? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes. I read that part when she spoke in Parliament.

1407. And why did you read that part? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I read whatever is reported on the speeches by Ministers and MPs.

1408. You would have read Dr Soin in connection with Chart 3? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I cannot remember who prepared this chart. Dr Chee would know. At that time, this figure was already there.

1409. Dr Chee has given us certain answers and we would like to know what your answers are. Mr Wong, you could only have read Dr Soin in connection

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

243

24 OCTOBER 1996

244

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

with Chart 3? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*)
I read the speech during the Budget
debate. I cannot remember which part of
the debate it was.

1410. Yes. And you read it for the
purposes of Chart 3? - (*Mr Wong Hong
Toy*) Not true. This chart was prepared
by someone else.

1411. Right. So to whom did you
communicate your understanding of what
Dr Soin was saying? - (*Mr Wong Hong
Toy*) Normally, I would just leave it as it
is after reading, unless there is a matter of
importance, then we would discuss it.

1412. So in this case, was the 0.8%
figure or Dr Soin's speech discussed with
you when the submission was being
prepared? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) As
I said just now, each one of us was given
a copy of the submission.

1413. You have not answered my
question? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) This
is my answer to the question.

1414. Did you discuss Dr Soin's
speech or the figure of 0.8% in the course
of preparing the written submission? -
(*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Which occasion
were you referring to?

1415. In the course of preparing the
written submission? - (*Mr Wong Hong
Toy*) As I said, I did not prepare this chart.

1416. That is not my question. Did
you discuss Dr Soin's speech or the 0.8%
figure in the course of preparing the
submission? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) As

I said, each one of us was given a copy
and whether or not they read it, I do not
know.

Mr Davinder Singh] You understand
the question -

Chairman

1417. Order. Can I direct the witness
to answer the question? You are
obviously evading the question? - (*Mr
Wong Hong Toy*) No. I am not evading.

Chairman] Answer the question.

Mr Davinder Singh

1418. Yes or no. Mr Wong, was the
figure of 0.8% or Dr Soin's speech
discussed? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) For
me, no. But we were talking about "you"
in the plural -

1419. If you did not discuss it - ? -
(*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I cannot speak for
others.

1420. I am only asking about you.
If you did not discuss Dr Soin's speech
or the figure of 0.8% in the course of
preparing the written submission, did you
discuss it after it was prepared when the
submission was discussed? - (*Mr Wong
Hong Toy*) Are you talking about the
period prior to 15th of July.

1421. Yes? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*)
After the submission, no.

1422. Right? - (*Mr Wong Hong
Toy*) And before 15th July, there was no
discussion.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

245

24 OCTOBER 1996

246

1423. And before the submission, during the discussion, did you discuss it? Before SDP submitted the written submission, there was a discussion between you and your fellow panel members on the submission, was there not? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) As I said just now, each one of us was given a copy of the draft submission and after that, a series of discussions were held. I cannot tell for sure whether there was specific discussion on this point. But I believe there was.

1424. Right. So at no time before 15th July, did you tell any of your panel members what your understanding of Dr Soin's speech was? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) After Dr Soin had mentioned the figure in her speech, we all knew that there was such a figure. But we did not make it a particular point to remember.

1425. That is not my question. At no time before 15th July, did you tell anyone of your panel members what your understanding was of Dr Soin's speech? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) No. I did not.

1426. And when you saw Chart 3 in the draft that was given to you, where did you think the 0.8% came from? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) My impression was that this figure came from Dr Soin.

1427. Right. Where did you think the other figures came from, 7, 9 and 13? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I did not pay attention to them because this chart was not prepared by me.

1428. And you believed that this chart represented national health expenditure? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1429. And this was told to you by Dr Chee Soon Juan? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) It was clearly indicated on the chart. It was not necessary for him to tell me.

1430. Really. Where does it say on the chart that this is national health expenditure? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) It was stated there - GDP.

1431. Are you saying that because of the words "GDP", that means national health expenditure? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) There were also other countries, USA, OECD and Japan.

1432. So why could not this chart have represented Government expenditure as a percentage of GDP? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I think this is not important. This is to show a comparison between the Government's expenditure with other countries'.

1433. Right. So if this is the comparison of Government expenditure with other countries', why did you say a moment ago that you believe this chart was a comparison of national expenditure? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Did I say Government expenditure?

1434. You just said so? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I am sorry. I think I have made a mistake. All along, my understanding is that this represented national health expenditure.

1435. So you knew the distinction between Government expenditure on health and total expenditure on health? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes, of course.

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

1436. And you know and knew in March 1996 that a certain amount is allocated by Government for expenditure on health? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1437. And that is called the budget allocation for health? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1438. And the budget allocation for health is Government expenditure on health, not total expenditure on health? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) That is correct.

1439. Could the witness be given a copy of Dr Soin's speech, please? [*Copy of speech given to witness.*] Could you please turn to column 1351, fourth paragraph where Dr Kanwaljit Soin's name appears. Left hand column, 1351, starting with "Thank you. My first cut, Sir, is on health expenditure." Do you have that? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

5.15 pm

1440. Could you read out loud, Mr Wong, the first four or five sentences. Please start and I will tell you when to stop? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) "Thank you. My first cut, Sir, is on health expenditure. I would like to read out the budget allocation for health: FY94, 1.18% of GDP; FY95, 1.15% of GDP; and FY96, 0.85% of GDP. Thus, for the last three years, the amount budgeted by the Government for health has been falling as a percentage of the GDP. It has fallen to below the 1% level to a mere 0.85%."

1441. Thank you. This is the speech from which you thought the 0.8% in

Chart 3 came from, is that not right? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1442. And you told us a moment ago that you believed that Chart 3 referred to national health expenditure? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1443. Mr Wong, you have also told us that you fully understood that budget allocation for health means Government expenditure? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1444. And Dr Soin uses the words "budget allocation for health" in that speech. Correct? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1445. And the figure 0.85 is the percentage of GDP on budget allocation for health? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1446. So, Mr Wong, there could not have been any way in which you could have misunderstood Dr Soin to be talking about national health expenditure? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I did not say I misunderstood her speech. At that time, when he prepared this chart, I did not distinguish between national health expenditure and Government expenditure when this 0.8% appeared.

1447. Mr Wong, you did tell us earlier that you thought Dr Soin was talking about national health expenditure. You told us earlier that as far as you were concerned, this chart was on national health expenditure. You also told us that it was only when Dr Soin clarified the matter on 15th July that you understood the 0.8% to refer to Government expenditure? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1448. That cannot be correct, Mr Wong, because from your own evidence, it is clear that you knew from the moment you read Dr Soin that she was talking about Government expenditure? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* At that time, when I read Dr Soin's speech at the Budget debate, I did not read just her speech alone but I read many other speeches as well. So when this chart came out and I saw this figure, I thought it referred to the national health expenditure. I did not check it. This is a very natural thing.

1449. Mr Wong, whether you read one speech or a hundred speeches, it makes no difference to the meaning of the speech? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* At that time, I did not pay attention as to whether she was talking about the national expenditure or the Government budget. *[In English]* No, no. *[In Mandarin]* What I meant was that, at that time, when I read this, I understood what Dr Soin said. But after some time, I cannot remember very clearly whether she was talking about the national health expenditure or the Government expenditure.

1450. I just would like to put it on record that Mr Wong has corrected the translation because, obviously, he understood the English that was being exchanged between the interpreter and me. Mr Wong, it does appear very clear from your evidence that although you knew that Dr Soin's speech referred to Government expenditure, and knew or was told that Chart 3 is for national health expenditure, you allowed the 0.8% figure to remain in there? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Let me answer in two parts. The first part was that when Dr Soin made the speech in Parliament, it was

reported in the newspaper. I read it. At that time, I was very clear that she was referring to national, correction, Government expenditure.

Mr Davinder Singh] I do not understand. I am sorry. At what time was he -

Interpreter] Mr Chairman, can I explain?

Chairman] Yes.

Interpreter] The witness said first that he understood that it was the national expenditure. That was why I stopped him and ask him to repeat the answer. And when he repeated the answer, again he said it was national expenditure. Then he corrected himself by saying that it was Government expenditure.

Mr Davinder Singh

1451. That is very useful. Thank you very much. I would like to put on record another point that the witness fully understood my question and was on the verge of answering it before you began the interpretation? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* I have not finished my answer. My second part of the answer is: this chart was prepared some time later. At that time, I knew that this figure of 0.8% existed but I did not specifically check again as to whether Dr Soin was referring to the national expenditure or the Government expenditure.

1452. Mr Wong, you just said that you knew that the figure of 0.8% came from Dr Soin's speech. Is that not right? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Yes.

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

1453. And I suggest to you that on your own evidence, there could not have been any misunderstanding on your part of what Dr Soin was referring to in her speech? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) As I have said, at the time when this chart was prepared, I did not check this again. I believe that when this chart was submitted to Parliament, there was a misunderstanding.

1454. And so when you saw this chart and when the submission was put in to the Select Committee, you believed that the 0.8% figure was a figure on national health spending? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1455. And I think a few moments ago you informed us that drafts of the written submission were circulated to you? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1456. You were familiar with the contents and approved the draft? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1457. And the version approved by you was submitted to the Select Committee? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes. Let me explain. I think the confusion is between the national health expenditure and the Government expenditure on health. The figure is correct but the only confusion is whether this was the national health expenditure or the Government health expenditure.

1458. I just want a very short answer to this question that the draft approved

by you was submitted to the Select Committee? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1459. And it was only, you say, on 15th July, well after the draft was submitted, that it became clear to you that the figure 0.8% really reflected Government expenditure? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes. That was after it was brought up and corrected by Dr Soin.

1460. Yes. Could you please pick up the blue book? At page B 36, this is your submission. Could you read the second paragraph of the submission which you took responsibility for and approved. Please read aloud for us? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Which paragraph?

5.30 pm

1461. "In addition ..."? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) "In addition, the amount of Government spending on health care as a percentage of GDP has been falling to the present level of less than 1%. This compares to 7% for Japan, 13% for the US and an average of 9% for the OECD countries (see Chart 3)."

1462. Mr Wong, it is clear from this paragraph, is it not, that according to the submission, Chart 3 represents Government expenditure on health? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) As I mentioned just now, at that time the confusion was over the national health expenditure and the Government expenditure.

1463. Mr Wong, please answer the question. Is it not clear from this paragraph in your written submission that

Chart 3 was referring to Government health expenditure? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Yes.

1464. A few minutes ago, you said that until 15th July 1996, you believed that Chart 3 related to national health expenditure? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Prior to the explanation by Dr Soin I thought that this represented the national health expenditure.

1465. You could not have honestly thought that it represented the national health expenditure if your own submission, which you read, approved and submitted to the Select Committee, said that it represented Government expenditure on health? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* This written submission was not put together with the Chart.

1466. Mr Wong, you saw Chart 3 and you saw the written submission before it went in. Yes or no? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* I did not read very carefully, 100%, the contents of this written submission.

1467. But you approved it nonetheless? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* I approved it. I take responsibility. I am not pushing away my responsibility. I think it was exactly what happened at that time.

1468. I suggest to you that because of the paragraph that you have just read, it was clear to you that the 0.8% was a figure for Government health expenditure? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* As I said, this written submission and the Chart are two different matters.

1469. So are you saying that the written submission says that Chart 3 is

about Government expenditure whereas Chart 3 is about national health expenditure? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* What I mean is that I did not read this written submission carefully 100%, but this chart was a very simple one. So I had a look at it. I am not saying that these were two entirely different matters.

1470. Would you at least agree with me that these two statements are inconsistent? First, that the chart is on national health expenditure. Secondly, that the chart is on Government health expenditure? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* No. At that time, this statement and the chart, those are figures.

1471. Are the two statements inconsistent? Would you at least agree with that? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* At that time I did not read it very clearly and I did not study it.

1472. You are on oath, Mr Wong. Would you please agree or disagree whether the two statements are inconsistent? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Yes, the two statements are different. But, the problem is -

1473. Would you confirm that you have made one statement orally today and you have made a totally different statement in writing to the Select Committee? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* I do not agree. I have already explained very clearly that this was a misunderstanding.

1474. Mr Wong, can I take you now to Chart 1? But before I do that, could I ask you to which point did you all do your calculations for all the Charts? -

(*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) This chart was not prepared by me.

1475. But there must have been some understanding amongst those in the research team about the point to which you would do your calculation? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) As I have explained, at the Select Committee hearing on 12th August, each of us had a different job to do.

1476. Yes. And your job was to calculate the figures in Chart 1? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I only calculated the figure for 1990. The other figures were not calculated by me.

1477. Who got the figure 40% for 1970? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) You have to ask Dr Chee for that.

1478. Do you know who got that figure? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) At which point of time?.

1479. At the time the submission and the chart were being prepared? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) As far as I know, Dr Chee had taken this figure from the *Asian Survey*.

1480. The *Asian Survey* does not have the figure for 1970? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I think there was.

1481. Could we show the *Asian Survey* article by Mr Ramesh? It is in the blue spine bundle. It is at tab 9. Look at page 1098 of the article, please. Please point out the figure for 1970? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) That is true. This figure

does not appear in this article. But I have the impression that it was from this article.

1482. You have the impression because Dr Chee told you? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) As far as I can remember, he told me that the figures given in this article were only up to 1989. So he asked me to look for the figure for 1990.

1483. When did he ask you to look for the figure for 1990? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I cannot remember. But he did ask me to look for the figure.

1484. This would have been at the time the written submission was being prepared. It has to be? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) It should be.

1485. But the reason he asked you to do the calculations for 1990 was because Dr Chee did not have the figure for 1990? It is a very simple question? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I do not know.

1486. You just said that Dr Chee said that he had the figures up to 1989 and asked you to get the figure for 1990? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) At that time, the book had only figures up to 1989.

1487. Which book? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) The *Asian Survey*.

1488. Yes. So you said that Dr Chee said that he had the figures up to 1989 and he needed the 1990 figure? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Let me think about it. [Pause] Oh, at that time he showed me the book *Asian Survey* and I found that the figures were only up to 1989. So

I went to look for the figures for 1990. He did not tell me that.

5.45 pm

1489. But I thought you just told us that Dr Chee said he had the figures up to 1989 and that he needed the figure for 1990. Are you changing your evidence? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes, to the best of my recollection. At that time he asked me to look for a lot of information and I thought he had told me what I said just now. But having looked at the article now, I believe at that time I read the figures in this article. That was why I went to look for the figure for 1990.

1490. So Dr Chee gave you the article and asked you to get the figure for 1990? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) No. I remember now. It was not like that. He gave me this book. I read it and I found that there was no figure for 1990. So I went to look for it.

1491. Mr Wong, this is quite incredible. When he gave you the article, it must be in connection with something. He could not have given you the article without saying anything. What did he say? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) We were at that time preparing the submission. He gave me a copy of this article. He did not ask me specifically to do anything.

1492. Mr Wong, this cannot be a silent movie? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) But I am telling the truth.

1493. If you are preparing the submission with Dr Chee, you must know why he gave you the article. Was it in connection with a chart that he wanted to draw up? Was it in connection with a statement

he wanted to make? What did he want you to do with that article? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) But normally when he had read some news or some information, having read that, he would pass it to me.

1494. How did you know that he wanted a point for 1990? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) At that time when we were preparing the chart, we had with us a Government statistics book which was up to 1990. So at that time when I read in this article that the figures were up to 1989, I took the statistics book and made the calculation to follow on.

1495. So this is the story. First, you said Dr Chee said that he had the figures up to 1989 and asked you to get the figure for 1990? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) At that time I thought that was what happened. But I have to think over what happened at that time.

1496. Then after a very long pause where you thought about your evidence, you decided to change it? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I did not think for a long time. It was a short time.

1497. And you then said that Dr Chee handed his article to you, said nothing. You then divine or realise that he wanted you to do the 1990 figure. You then realise, without a word being spoken, that he wanted it for a Chart 1. Then you went to the 1990 Department of Statistics book, calculated the figure for 1990 and gave it to him. So essentially what you are telling us, Mr Wong, is that you read his mind? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) We were then working in cooperation. So I roughly knew what he wanted at that time.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

259

24 OCTOBER 1996

260

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

1498. Yes. How did you roughly know? Something must have been said? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* This is common occurrence. For example, when we are defending an attack by the PAP, so naturally our members would collect all sorts of information such as newspaper cuttings and supply them to us. This is a very natural reaction, nothing unusual about it.

1499. But now that you have had your say, would you please answer the question? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Answer what question? I have already answered.

1500. You said, "I roughly knew". So my question is: how did you roughly know? Something must have been said? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* This is like going to a battlefield. When a gun is given to me, the person does not need to tell me that I have to shoot the enemies. So when a gun is given to me, naturally I will go to the battlefield and shoot the enemies.

1501. So you read his mind? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Yes.

1502. Now, you did the calculations for 1990 and gave it to Dr Chee? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* That time, I think I ... [pause]. After I had made the calculation, I think I put it together with some other information on his table.

1503. What was the other information? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* I cannot remember. There were some related documents for the submission.

1504. Please try and remember? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* There were some newspaper cuttings, a lot of them. Whether they were useful or not, I do not know. But I gave them to him.

1505. Yes. You just said a moment ago that this calculation for 1990, together with other documents, were put on Dr Chee's table? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Yes.

1506. It was not given to him by you? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* At that time he was very busy. Usually, I would just put it on his table. We are not always together.

1507. Did you give it to him? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* I left it on his table. I did not give it to him personally. But it was left there, together with other information.

1508. So you did not give it to him? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* No. I did not hand to him personally.

1509. No. My question is: did you give it to him? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* What I did was I left it on his table.

1510. So you did not give it to him? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* I did not hand it personally to him.

1511. Please answer the question? Did you give it to him? Yes or no? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Are you saying that I gave it personally to him and say, "Dr Chee, I am giving this to you.", or I left it on his table? When I left it on his table, it was also meant to be given to him.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

261

24 OCTOBER 1996

262

1512. My question is very simple, Mr Wong. You did not give it to him, did you? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) If what you meant was whether I had given it personally, handed it personally, to Dr Chee and say, "Dr Chee, this is for you.", then I did not. I did not give it to him.

1513. When I said "give to him", surely you must understand it to mean giving it to the person, isn't it? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) No, I did not.

1514. So if I ask you whether you give it to him, your answer would be no? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) That is correct.

1515. Please read paragraph 1288 of the blue book. Please read 1288 and 1289? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

"Can I ask Mr Wong whether he gave the figure of 25.4% to Dr Chee? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes. I did.

Was this in a written document? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes. It was written on a sheet of paper and given to him."

1516. Thank you. So when were you telling the truth? When you told the Select Committee on 12th August that you gave it to him or now when you said that you did not give it to him? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I have already explained very clearly just now. All I did was I left it on the table for him. That was what I meant by giving it to him. But if you insist that giving to him meant I must hand it to him personally, then I go along with you and I say I did not give it to him. There is no contradiction.

1517. Mr Wong, you worked with Dr Chee in making this calculation, did you not? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*)

I would like to ask you what you mean by working with him. I am working with him in every aspect.

1518. You worked with him when you made this calculation. In other words, the two of you made the calculation? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) At that time, I made the calculation and I left it on his table. Whether or not he made the calculation that was entirely his business.

1519. But that evidence that you have just given is inconsistent with what you told the Select Committee on 12th August? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Why is it different?

1520. Because on 12th August, you said and your words were, "I worked with him in making the calculation."? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Can you point out which paragraph?

1521. Paragraph 1262? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) When I said this, it must be read in context with the preceding paragraphs.

1522. Precisely. Please read paragraph 1255 now and please read it aloud? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) —

"Mr Wong, did you do this calculation by yourself or did someone help you to do it? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) At that time, I did make the calculation and the checking. But there were a few of us.

Who were the others who helped you in the calculation? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) It included Chee Soon Juan and a few others whom I do not think it would be necessary for me to name."

1523. So your sworn evidence was that Dr Chee Soon Juan helped you in the calculation? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) No. It does not mean that he helped me.

Mr Wong Hong Toy (cont.)

I said that there were other people. So when I was asked to name who the others were, I did not mean that we were sitting together and doing the calculations together.

1524. Mr Wong, your evidence on oath was that Dr Chee Soon Juan and a few others helped you in the calculation. And according to paragraph 1262, the person who was most directly involved was Chee Soon Juan because I worked with him in making this calculation. So the evidence, the truth, is it not that you and Chee Soon Juan worked out the figure? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) That was what I said. Correct. But the point you are trying to make is that when I said I was working with him, it meant that he and I, the two of us, were together doing the calculation. That is not correct.

1525. The question was so simple. The question was: who were the others who helped you in the calculation? You understood the question, indeed it was interpreted to you? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes. I was very clear.

1526. And you said that it included Chee Soon Juan? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1527. In other words, your evidence is that Chee Soon Juan helped you in the calculation. And furthermore, you go on to say that the person who was most directly involved was Chee Soon Juan because I worked with him in making this calculation? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Right. Based on what you said, there are already two contradictory

versions. First, you said he helped me to do the calculation and now you say that I helped him.

1528. Mr Wong, I am only reading your evidence? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) What I meant was that I worked most directly with him.

1529. In the calculation? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) He made his calculation. I made my calculation.

1530. So he made his calculation for 1990? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) (*In English*) The person most directly involved in this, he was the one. He was making the submission.

1531. So he made the calculation for 1990? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) (*In English*) What is wrong with that? What I said contradict myself?

1532. Could you please confirm this? Chee Soon Juan made the calculation for 1990? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) As I have already said, on my part, I made the calculation and I put it on his table and whether or not he made his calculation, that was his business.

1533. Just a moment ago, you said he made his calculation? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) What I meant was if he had made the calculation, that was his business. I did not see him doing it.

1534. Mr Wong, that is not what you said. You said he made his own calculation? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I did not see him doing that.

1535. Are you changing your evidence again? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I did not say I saw him doing the calculation. (*In English*) I did not say that.

1536. I never said that you said that you saw him making the calculation. You said that he made the calculation? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) (*In English*) I assume that he did it.

1537. Not only did you assume that he did it, he helped you in doing it as you told the Select Committee on 12th August? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) How is it possible? He was the main person responsible for the submission. How could he be helping me? I was helping him, not the other way round. Are you saying that I wrote the submission? I am Chinese-educated.

1538. Please read paragraph 1256. The question was: who were the others who helped you in the calculation? You did not protest and say that, "I would be helping him. He would not be helping me. It is not my submission." Instead your answer was it included Chee Soon Juan? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) At that time, I said in Chinese that it included Chee Soon Juan. It did not mean that Chee Soon Juan was also involved in the calculation.

1539. Although that was what you said? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1540. So now you are denying having said that Chee Soon Juan was involved in making the calculation? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) No. I did not say he did not make the calculation. I was only saying

that Chee Soon Juan was one of them who made the calculation.

1541. So your calculation - ? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) No. Let me finish. At that time, I was asked who else helped me in the calculation. I said there were some others. At that time, I was asked to name those who helped me. So I said Chee Soon Juan was one of them. But in Chinese, it meant that this person was also included.

1542. In the calculation? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1543. Thank you. So Chee Soon Juan being included in the calculation would have known that the figure that you calculated was 25.4%? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I already said in the last hearing that I did not know whether Chee Soon Juan was aware of this figure or not. Whether he compared this figure or not, I do not know.

1544. So the evidence is that Chee Soon Juan gave you the *Asian Survey* article, did not say a word, you read his mind, you calculated it, although on 12th August you said, Chee Soon Juan helped you and was most directly involved in making the calculation, you now do not know whether Chee Soon Juan knew the figure? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) What I said was that Chee Soon Juan was responsible for the preparation of this submission. So he must have made the calculation.

1545. Mr Wong, you knew in March or April that when you made the calculation you got to use the same time

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

series for both the numerator and denominator? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1546. And could the witness be given a copy of the 1990 *Yearbook of Statistics*? [*Copy of document given to witness.*] Please turn to page 92. Keep a finger on that page and turn to page 255. At page 92, you have a time series at current market prices and at the bottom at 1985 market prices. Do you see that? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

6.15 pm

1547. Yes. And at page 255, you knew that that time series is in current dollars? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1548. Yes. And despite the fact that you knew that the time series at page 255 is in current dollars, you chose a figure from page 92 from a time series at 1985 prices? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1549. And although you knew that the correct way of doing it is by using the same time series for both the numerator and denominator? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) In this chart, all the other figures for 1970, 1975, 1980 and 1985 were calculated on the market price at that time. So how could I use the current price for this calculation?

1550. Even the 1970 figure? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) As I said, I did not make the calculation on the figure for 1970.

1551. So how do you know and why did you say that all these figures used the 1985 market prices? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) It is stated here the market price at 1985. This chart was up to 1985.

1552. I am asking you about the 1970 figure? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) In the case of 1970, a figure prior to 1985 would have been used. It is not possible to use the current market price.

1553. Yes. And for the figure for 1970, do you know whether they use current prices for both the numerator and denominator? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) For calculations of all the figures before 1985, the 1985 market price would be used. So it is not possible that they would use the current prices.

1554. Do you know whether for the year 1970, the then current prices were used for both the denominator and the numerator? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I do not know. But I infer that the 1985 prices would have been used.

1555. So when you calculated the 1990 figure, you used different time series because different time series were used for the 1985 and 1989 figures? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) In 1990, there was no 1985 market price.

1556. Mr Wong, the book in front of you tells you at page 92 that they are 1985 market prices? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) No, in the table of current expenditure, there was no 1985 market price.

1557. But you agreed with me that the figure at page 255 was in current dollars? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

269

24 OCTOBER 1996

270

1558. And at page 92, you have the figures for both current as well as 1985 prices? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I have already clearly explained. When I was making this calculation, I used the 1985 market prices to calculate the earlier figures. So in order to compare, we have to use 1985 value.

1559. So how do you know that the earlier figures used the 1985 value? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Because this was before 1985. So it would have used the 1985 value.

1560. But the figure for 1989? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) For 1989, the earlier value was used.

1561. What value was that? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) For 1989, the market price for 1985 was used.

1562. How do you know that? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) From the Government's current expenditure.

1563. Which is in current dollars? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes, current price plus the 1985 market price divide by the expenditure for 1989.

1564. I am sorry. Private consumption plus Government expenditure divide by private consumption? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1565. And that gives you 37% or 27%? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Can I have a calculator?

1566. Before the calculator is given to the witness, can I ask the witness why did he think, when he did the calculations,

that the 1989 figure was based on 1985 market prices? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) At that time, my view was that calculations for 1970, for 1985 and 1989 were based on the 1985 market prices.

1567. How was it that in 1970 there were 1985 prices? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) As I said, I did not have the figure for 1970. I did not say that I made the calculation.

1568. So why did you think that the 1970 calculation was based on 1985 prices? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) All the years before this would have to use the earlier year's market prices.

1569. So you just assumed that. Is that right, Mr Wong? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1570. Yes. How did you know in March or April that the 37% for 1985 and the 27% for 1989 were based on 1985 market prices? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) As I said, when it was in 1985, of course, they would have used the market price for that time.

1571. Who would have used? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) When they were calculating the figure for 1985, of course, they would have used the 1985 market prices. How could they be using the 1990 current prices?

1572. Who are "they"? Please answer the question? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I am saying everybody.

1573. Everybody would use that for 1985 and everybody would use that for 1989 although there are current prices

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

271

24 OCTOBER 1996

272

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

available for both? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) This is a continuation from the earlier years. Anybody would have thought so because this came from that year. So it would have been a continuation.

1574. But Mr Wong, how could 1989 which appears in the 1990 book be based on 1985 market prices? Because 1989, in the Yearbook 1990, at pages 92 and 255, are written in current dollars as well? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) As I said, the figures for the years prior to 1985 were calculated based on the 1985 current prices. So in order to have a comparison, we would have to stick to the 1985 market prices. How could we use the current prices?

1575. Mr Wong, please show me at page 255 where is the 1985 market price? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) That is precisely because there was no current market price for 1990. That is why I have to use the 1985 figure.

6.30 pm

1576. All right. Now it is clear. Because there was no current market price for 1990, you had to use the 1985 figure? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1577. Thank you very much. That is very important. Please remember what you have just said. Because there was no current market price available for 1990, you had to use the 1985 figure. Please look at page 92. Do you see at the top

there the figures at current prices? Please answer yes or no? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1578. Please turn to page 255. You accepted a few minutes ago that these figures are in current prices? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes. But I want to compare -

1579. Mr Wong, I have not finished my question. It is not true that there were no figures for current prices for 1990? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) But this is not private consumption, you know? Sorry, not current expenditure.

1580. So would you please at least agree, Mr Wong, that current prices were available for 1990? — (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) No. Page 255 refers to Government current expenditure for 1990. In order to compare, I will have to use the lower table - the 1985 prices.

1581. Mr Wong, you just agreed with me a few minutes ago that the figures at page 255 are in current dollars? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1582. That being the case, you would have known in March this year that the proper way to calculate was to use the current price from page 255 and the current price from page 92? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) I am sorry, I was wrong. What I meant to say was that in 1990 there was no figure for 1985.

1583. Mr Wong, you agreed with me that the proper way to calculate is to use the same time series for both the numerator and the denominator. Is that not right? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

273

24 OCTOBER 1996

274

1584. You said that you believed that the 37% and the 27% were based on the 1985 market prices? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1585. Are you now telling us that because there are no 1985 market prices for Government expenditure for the year 1990, you mixed the two? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Can you repeat the question?

1586. For 1990 you used the current market price for Government expenditure and 1985 market price for private consumption? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes.

1587. Although current dollar figures were available for the year 1990 for both Government expenditure and private consumption? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) When I did the calculation I based it on the Government's Statistics Book published by the Government. I did not fabricate the figure. This is your Government's report.

1588. Mr Wong, I suggest to you that you knew the correct way of calculation. You knew that the figures at page 255 were in current dollars. You knew that for 1990 the figures in current dollars were available for both Government expenditure and private consumption. And you did the correct calculation in March or April, which is not 25.4%? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) As I have already explained just now, I realised that the figures did exist at that time. However, when I looked at the chart there were figures for 1985 and 1989. So, in order to compare, I would have to use the 1985 market prices to make the calculation.

1589. Mr Wong, the record speaks for itself about your inconsistencies. Mr Wong, when did you first discover the error? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) A few days after 15th July.

1590. According to the evidence you gave at the Select Committee hearing on 12th August, you discovered this together with Dr Chee? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) If I had discovered the figure and I showed it to Dr Chee, then it can be taken as the two of us having discovered the mistake together. But I cannot remember exactly what happened.

1591. At the hearing on 12th August you said, "when the Committee asked us to present this article from *Asian Survey* we looked into it, and we looked at the Chart, we discovered this typographical error"? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) The hearing on 12th August was very unfair to us. At that time we were not told that such a thing would happen. Even in a court of law, when a person is going to be charged, he would first be warned. So he would be careful in what he said. At that time we thought that it was just a public hearing. So we would just answer whatever questions that were put to us. If we had been warned, then we would be very careful in the use of words such as "I" or "We".

1592. Mr Wong, did you give evidence truthfully at the hearing on 12th August? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes. True. Even now I am in the habit of saying "we". Minister Wong would know that for the Chinese-educated, we have the habit of saying "we" instead of "I". But, in law, sometimes -

Mr Davinder Singh (cont)

1593. But you said "we" in some places and "I" in other places? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes. Sometimes "I" and sometimes "we".

1594. So you know the distinction between "we" and "I" - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) In my mind, we do not have to be very precise in the use of "I" or "we".

1595. Although you were under oath? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Even just a minute ago, I was saying "we" instead of "I".

1596. Your evidence on 12th August is that you and Dr Chee looked at it and the moment you looked at it, it became apparent that there was an error? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) At that time, I discovered the mistake. I cannot remember how I told him at that time. I cannot remember whether we discussed the matter. But the fact was that I was the one who discovered the mistake.

1597. Yes. When you told Dr Chee he said, "Yes, there was a typo."? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) He might have answered in this manner. But I cannot remember exactly.

1598. So I get the impression, Mr Wong, that you wished to walk away from the evidence that you gave on 12th August where you said that you discovered it with Dr Chee? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) What do you mean "I did not say"? I said I discovered, and I told him.

1599. Could you please read paragraph 1356? Read it out loud please? -

(*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) "So when you both found out that there was a mistake, surely Dr Chee would have asked you how you made that mistake?"

1600. "So when you both found out that there was a mistake, surely Dr Chee would have asked you how you made that mistake?" And this is your answer: "The moment we discovered this, we knew it was a typographical error and the figure "2" was missing. So it is not necessary for him to ask me."? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) Yes. At that time when I discovered it, I told him. So this became "we". Both of us knew it and it was a typographical error. There is no mistake about it.

6.45 pm

1601. Correct. And if Dr Chee immediately knew that it was a typographical error, he would also have known on the 15th July 1996 sitting, when the chart was given to him? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) No. You are wrong. This happened after 15th July, after the hearing, as I have said.

1602. The point I am making is this, Mr Wong. If on looking at the chart after the 15th it became immediately apparent that there was an error, it would also have become immediately apparent looking at the chart on the 15th? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*) On this occasion, I discovered the mistake, and I pointed it out to him and he realised that it was a mistake. On 15th July when he looked at the chart, I do not know what was his response to it. Nobody brought this to his attention.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

277

24 OCTOBER 1996

278

1603. Yes. The point I am making is that he - ? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* That nobody pointed it out to him.

1604. Yes. The point I am making is that it was immediately apparent that it was not 5%? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Because I told him.

1605. Yes? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* If nobody had told him, then how would he know that there was a mistake here?

1606. Mr Wong, before the written submission was sent in to the Select Committee, a draft of it was given to you for independent verification of the contents? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Well, it was circulated to everyone of us. So it was understood that each of us will have to look into it.

1607. And do you consider yourself to be a responsible office-bearer in the party? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Yes.

1608. And so therefore you would have independently verified it? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Yes. I looked at it.

Mr Davinder Singh] Thank you. I have no further questions, Mr Chairman.

Chairman] Yes, Mr Wong.

Mr Wong Kan Seng

1609. Mr Wong, on 12th August when you came for the hearing you were on oath and promised to tell the truth? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Minister Wong, I am not a lawyer and I am not an expert in constitutional law, but I am not sure

whether the public hearing on 12th of August was legal or not.

1610. Which part of it is illegal? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* The Select Committee was appointed by Parliament with specific terms of reference. It is not meant to take on the role of a police officer investigating cases, like what Minister George Yeo did. It is not the duty of the Select Committee to find out whether we were lying or not. If you care to look at the record that whole day, we were being interrogated like criminals.

1611. I think Mr Wong is digressing? — *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* No.

Chairman

1612. Mr Wong Hong Toy, I am not sure what is the relevance of this point you are making. Mr Wong Kan Seng has asked you a question. Could you answer him, please? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* I have the right to talk about what happened on that day because he mentioned 12th August -

1613. Mr Wong, I will ask Mr Wong Kan Seng to repeat the question again for your benefit and can I ask you to - ? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* No, I have my right to raise this point -

1614. Mr Wong, let me finish. I will ask Mr Wong Kan Seng to repeat the question and I will direct you to answer the question. Mr Wong? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* OK. When I answer his question, will you allow me to talk -

Chairman] Order. Mr Wong Kan Seng.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

279

24 OCTOBER 1996

280

Mr Wong Kan Seng

1615. Yes. Thank you, Sir. On 12th August, when you came before the Select Committee on Health Care Subsidy, you made an affirmation to tell the truth? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Yes.

1616. So can I ask you to look at paragraph 1323, column 567. You found paragraph 1323? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Yes.

1617. All right. Before you look at it, let me ask you one question. On that day you affirmed that you will speak the truth. Am I right? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Correct.

1618. Can you read paragraphs 1323 to 1325? Read, please? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Yes.

"Mr Wong, do you know who drew the graph? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* It was done by another person.

Who did it? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Is it necessary for me to tell?

Very much so? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Chee Soon Juan."

1619. So can you confirm that that is true? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* *(In English)* I tell the truth!

1620. If that is true that Dr Chee Soon Juan drew the graph? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* *(In English)* Yes. What I know. *(In Mandarin)* To the best of my knowledge.

1621. Thank you. Can I ask you another question? Just now, about an hour ago, when you said that, "Well, if somebody gives me a gun and there is a

war, I will know that I will go and shoot." Did you say that? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Yes.

1622. Right. Have you fought in a war? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* No.

1623. So how do you know that that is what people will do in a war? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* This is human behaviour. Everyone knows.

1624. Have you done national service? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* No.

1625. So you have got no experience, no idea at all about how soldiers are trained for war? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* I have heard about it. I have read in the books.

1626. No. The point is: have you done national service? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* No.

1627. So when Dr Chee gave you the Ramesh's article, without saying a word to you, straightaway you could read his mind and you knew that he wanted you to calculate the 1990 figure? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* The 1990 figure was not in the article.

1628. Did Dr Chee ask you to calculate the 1990 figure? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* No, not at that time.

1629. He did not ask you. So you read his mind, just as you guessed just now about how people were given a gun, go to war, will be asked to shoot? - *(Mr Wong Hong Toy)* Yes.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

281

24 OCTOBER 1996

282

Mr Wong Kan Seng] Quite remarkable.
Thank you.

Chairman

1630. Any other Members have any
questions? If not, Mr Wong Hong Toy, at
this point of time there are no more

questions for you but you are not yet
discharged from the hearing and I will
ask the Serjeant-at-Arms to direct you to
a waiting room where you will remain
and await my further instructions. Thank
you, Mr Wong? - (*Mr Wong Hong Toy*)
Yes.

(The witness withdrew.)

Chairman] I propose at this stage to take a short tea-break and I will ask everyone
to return to this room at 10 minutes past 7. Order.

Hearing suspended at 6.56 pm until 7.10 pm.

Examination of Witness

Mr Kwan Yue Keng, Assistant Secretary-General, Singapore Democratic Party, was called in and examined under oath.

Hearing resumed at 7.10 pm.

[Mr Speaker in the Chair]

Chairman

1631. Order. We will now resume our hearing. Can we have Mr Kwan Yue Keng? Good evening. For the record, could you please state your name, address and the position you hold in your organisation? — *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* My name is Kwan Yue Keng. I am the Assistant Secretary-General of the Singapore Democratic Party.

1632. Your address? — *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* I live at No. 1, Youngberg Terrace, #07-14, Singapore 357741.

Chairman] Mr Kwan, the Committee of Privileges is looking into the complaint made by the Minister for Health, BG George Yeo, for contempt of Parliament against four representors from the Singapore Democratic Party, namely, Mr Kunalen, Mr Wong Hong Toy, Dr Chee Soon Juan and yourself. Mr Kwan, the evidence which you give today will be taken on oath. If you so desire, you can take an affirmation. I will now ask the Clerk to the Committee to administer the oath? [*Mr Kwan Yue Keng made an affirmation.*] Thank you. We will now start with the examination of Mr Kwan. Mr Tarmugi, would you like to start first?

Mr Abdullah Tarmugi] Mr Kwan, I have two questions. The first one -

Mr Wong Kan Seng

1633. Excuse me, Mr Chairman. Before questions are asked, can I ask Mr Kwan to read out the joint defence as well as the one he sent in on his own? Do you have a copy of that? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes. There is one which is jointly signed and one is signed by me alone. Which one are you referring to?

1634. Can you please read the first one which was signed jointly? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* I read:

"Speaker Parliament
Parliament House

Dear Sir,

**COMPLAINT AGAINST REPRESENTORS
FROM THE SINGAPORE DEMOCRATIC
PARTY**

In response to the Minister's complaints, we wish to state that we had made the SDP's representation in good faith and had no intention of deceiving anyone. It was unfortunate that a typing error was made. Nonetheless, it was a genuine error which was brought to the attention of the Select Committee before the 12 August hearing.

As for the Statement 2 and Chart 3, there was a misunderstanding of the figures and there was no intention of deceiving anyone. We, therefore, deny all the allegations made by the Minister for Health in his letter of complaint dated 27 August 1996 (please refer to the letters of response)."

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

285

24 OCTOBER 1996

286

And this is followed by the letter signed by myself alone. I read:

"Speaker of Parliament

Mr Speaker, Sir,

COMPLAINT AGAINST REPRESENTORS
FROM THE SINGAPORE DEMOCRATIC
PARTY

I deny all the allegations made by Minister Yeo in his letter of complaint dated 27 August 1996.

As a member representing the Singapore Democratic Party to the Select Committee, I am honour bound to accept responsibility for its contents, even though my involvement in the preparation of the written submission was minor.

Regarding his allegation that "at no time did he raise his doubts with his research team or to the Committee", I have already stated to the Committee the reason as to why I did not raise my doubts - see Para 1405 and 1406; and further in Para 1437, 1438 and 1439. As I have stated, since my involvement was minor, I did not go into the details in the written submission and therefore could not have abetted the alleged presentation of false evidence."

Mr Wong Kan Seng] Thank you.

Mr Abdullah Tarmugi

1635. Mr Kwan, my first question, after completion of the draft submission of the SDP, it was circulated to the research team including you, I presume? — (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) Yes.

1636. What was the brief when the draft was distributed? - (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) When I was given a copy, I was told to read it over.

1637. To read it over? - (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) Yes.

1638. And that is all? What else? - (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) There was nothing.

No further instructions were discussed, as far as I was concerned.

1639. I see. And you proceeded to read the report? - (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) Yes, I read it.

1640. Did you check any of the figures with any other authorities or any other references? - (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) No, I did not.

1641. So you took the figures in the report at face value? - (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) Yes, at its face value.

1642. OK. You did mention also that the moment you saw Chart 1, it seemed odd to you. Let me give you the exact words. They are in page C 297, paragraphs 1399 to 1401 of the Minutes of Evidence. You could refer to the blue book. You used two words to describe the Chart. One was the surprising fact when you read it, and that it did occur odd to you. Could you elaborate on those words, please? - (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) When this was brought up at the Select Committee hearing and the fact that it had dropped from 27% to 5%, it did occur odd to me at that time.

1643. During the hearing itself? - (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) Yes.

1644. Not before? - (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) No.

1645. But in paragraph 1397, you said that you had read the final report before it was submitted to Parliament? - (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) Yes, I read it.

Mr Abdullah Tarmugi (cont.)

1646. Which means before the hearing? — *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes.

1647. And your answer was yes? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes, I read it.

1648. OK. Following that paragraph, in paragraph 1398, the question was asked whether "you were familiar with the details when you came to see us on 15th July?" And your answer was "yes". In paragraph 1399, a question was asked: "did it surprise you that Government health expenditure should have plunged from 27% to 5%?" And your answer was, "It was a surprising fact when I read it." When you said, "when you read it", was it at the sitting itself or before you came to the hearing? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Before I came to the hearing.

1649. Before you came to the hearing? — *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes.

1650. So it was not at the hearing itself that you found that it was odd? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* No. I read it before I came to the hearing.

1651. But you only found that it was odd? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* It did not occur odd to me before.

1652. So what made you feel that it was odd? What was it about the chart that made you think so? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* When you are reading it alone and when you are reading it after several hours of discussion, your perception of the matter changes. When I was reading it alone, it did not occur odd to me. But after being at the hearing and when

you are made to think deeper into the question, I felt odd.

1653. What was it exactly that made you feel odd? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* At the hearing?

1654. At the hearing. What about the chart that made you feel odd? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* I just felt odd that some figure can drop so significantly.

1655. Plunge? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes.

1656. Are you used to reading charts, graphs and statistical analysis? — *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* I do read charts but not so much on statistical analysis. But I do read charts, yes.

1657. You do read charts. So you understood the meaning of the drop? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes.

1658. And it was odd. To you, it was odd, at least at that moment in time? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* That is right.

1659. And you informed Dr Chee later, as mentioned in your evidence? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes.

1660. And you asked Dr Chee to correct the error? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* No, I did not ask him. I said words to the effect, "Chee, why don't you go and check it?"

1661. And what did he say? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* He said he would do it.

1662. He said he would? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

289

24 OCTOBER 1996

290

1663. And you did not pursue it? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* I did not pursue it further.

1664. Why? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* I thought he would look into it. I knew that he would look into it. After nine hours of discussion here and under such pressure from the Select Committee, I am sure he would have looked into it.

1665. You also said, in the evidence in paragraph 1407, "Now, speaking on hindsight, it should be corrected." You said those words? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes.

1666. How do you suggest that it should be corrected? In what way? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Because at the hearing, it was pointed out that the figure was not 5%. So he should have made a correction if there was an error.

1667. And how do you suggest that the correction ought to be made? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* I did not make any suggestion to Dr Chee as to how to correct it.

1668. How do you suggest it should be made? I am asking you? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* The correction could be made by double checking on the figures and the calculations leading to the chart.

1669. And if the figures were established to have been wrong, how do you suggest it can be corrected? In what way? — *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* If the figures were calculated and an error was found, I think another chart should have been presented to Parliament.

Mr Abdullah Tarmugi] No more questions, Sir.

Assoc. Prof. Ho Peng Kee

1670. Mr Kwan, from your testimony just now, you are telling us that you found it a surprising fact that there was a drop from 27% to 5% and you felt that it was odd only at the hearing? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes.

1671. Can you read from your testimony given at the hearing of 12th August? It is paragraph 1395 onwards. I will ask you to stop as and when? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)*

"1395. I take it you were familiar with the submission? — *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes. I was.

1396. You had read drafts of it? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes.

1397. You had read the final report before it was submitted to Parliament? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes.

1398. And you were familiar with the details when you came to see us on 15th July? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes.

1399. On Chart 1, did it surprise you that Government health expenditure should have plunged from 27% to 5%? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* It was a surprising fact when I read it."

1672. "... when I read it", and you had read drafts of it before. OK. Let us go on to paragraph 1401? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* "But when you saw the draft, you were surprised by this plunging statistic? — *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* It did occur odd to me. There was a sharp drop in Government expenditure. Basing on this Chart, there was a sharp drop in Government expenditure."

1673. All right. Let us stop there. So it would seem to me from reading your

Assoc. Prof. Ho Peng Kee (cont.)

testimony that in fact you were already feeling a bit disturbed when you read the draft of the submission before coming for the hearing on 15th July? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* No. I felt odd at the time when sitting next to Dr Chee and all these facts were brought out. I felt very odd at that time.

1674. But you have read drafts of it. And your testimony is that when you read it, you felt "it was a surprising fact". It is at paragraph 1399. Is that not right, Mr Kwan? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes.

1675. Read paragraph 1402? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* "Did you raise this when you discussed among yourselves in the research team? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* No. I did not raise this point."

7.30 pm

1676. All right. So your answer is not, "Oh, I did not know about it beforehand", but you did not raise this point? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* I did not raise it because I did not feel odd. I did not feel anything odd about it at that time.

1677. But the question was asked after the fact that you said you felt that it was odd. Your answer would have been, "Oh, I did not know it was odd at that time. I only knew that it was odd on 15th July," if what you are saying today is true. But rather you said, "Oh, I did not raise this point." Is that not right? Then in paragraph 1407, can you read that paragraph? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* "But on hindsight, it should have been

corrected? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Now, speaking on hindsight, it should be corrected."

1677A. In other words, are you not telling the Select Committee at that time that you read the draft, you felt it was a surprising fact, you felt odd, but you did not do anything about it? But, now on hindsight, you should have alerted somebody to correct that mistake.? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes.

1678. Which contradicts what you said earlier on that you did not see anything surprising before you went for the Select Committee hearing. It was only at the Select Committee hearing that you found that it was a surprising fact and you felt odd? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* That is right. It was pointed out that on hindsight it should have been corrected.

1679. Corrected when? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* After it was so thoroughly discussed at the Select Committee.

1680. Not because you felt odd or you felt that it was a surprising fact? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Because, as I said, on reading it in isolation, I did not feel that it was odd. In fact, I only took a casual glance at the charts. I read through the written aspect of it. I did not really go through the graphs as such.

1681. Yet on the very night, after the hearing, on the way home, you felt disturbed and you suggested to Dr Chee, in fact, that there was an error. In other words, it must have been operating on your mind at the hearing that something was amiss. It could not have been the case that you just felt odd at the hearing.

Could it be that you went into the hearing already a bit uneasy because it was a surprising fact, you felt odd at the hearing, as you said just now, the accuracy of Chart 1 was being tested, and after the hearing, immediately in the car, on the very night, you told Dr Chee casually that it was an error? In other words, you felt strongly enough even to suggest to him, your Secretary-General, who drafted it, that it was an error. How would you respond to this? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* My suggestion to him was basically to make sure that should there be an error he should correct it or double check it, although I did not go into detail as to how he should re-submit it. I was merely trying to alert him to correct it or to double check it if there was an error.

1682. So you did not ask him whether or not there was an error? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* No, I did not ask him.

1683. You said, according to your testimony, "Are you sure it was 5%? I told him casually that it was an error." In other words, arising from what happened in the Select Committee, you were alerted to a possible error which in your mind seemed to be an error? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Because I was not in possession of all the calculations. I really would not know that it was truly an error. I personally felt disturbed that there was a sharp drop. I wanted to point out to him to make sure that he goes back and double check the figures. That was my only intention.

1684. Could it be that the drop was so sharp that when you were reading the draft submission you were alerted to this fact, you felt it was very odd, it was a

surprising fact but, as you have explained in your testimony, because it had appeared in *Dare To Change*, you did not do anything about it? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* That is right.

1685. That is right? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* It was something which was published before. So I did not question it.

1686. So at the hearing, if you were feeling uneasy, why did you not surface your doubts at that time and help the Select Committee along? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* But I was not in possession of all the data and all the calculations which gave rise to this chart. So if the Select Committee questioned me, then I would have no basis because I was not in possession of the data. If I raise something for which I have no possession of the facts at that time, then would I not be seen to be suggesting something frivolous? If the Committee questioned me, "Are you in possession of the facts, did you do a calculation?" which I did not, and yet I raised it, would I not look very foolish? So I kept the doubts to myself and pointed out to Dr Chee.

1687. But you must have shown doubts because after that Select Committee hearing you, in fact, told him that it was an error. So your doubts were not just figments of your imagination but strong doubts? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* It was a possible error. When you talk to a friend, you are not so careful with words. I was just saying, "Chee, why don't you check the error?" meaning it was a possible error, but not a definite error.

Assoc. Prof. Ho Peng Kee

Mr Wong Kan Seng

1688. You had a minor role in the preparation of the submission? — (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) Yes.

1689. Because you just did compiling and photocopying and distribution? — (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) That is right.

1690. Yet you felt uneasy because you spotted something wrong with the chart? — (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) Yes.

1691. Even more so, other members of the research team who did more should have spotted the mistake earlier? — (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) They could have. Yes.

1692. They could have? — (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) They could have.

1693. They did. Do you know? — (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) I am not sure. As I said, I was not involved in those discussions involving the deliberations leading to the chart.

1694. Nevertheless, Mr Kwan, you accept responsibility for the wrong data in the submission? — (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) But I do accept responsibility as a member of the team making the presentation.

1695. Despite your minor role? — (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) Yes.

1696. Thank you? — (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) As I said in my submission, I am honour bound to accept responsibility.

1697. Can I raise one point? It is very honourable of you, Mr Kwan. You said to Prof. Ho that you were not in possession of figures, data, calculations. So you cannot really say with certainty that the figure "5" was correct or not? — (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) That is right.

1698. What about your understanding of the terms "national health expenditure" and "Government health expenditure"? Is there any difficulty understanding those terms? — (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) No.

1699. So you could explain those terms to the Committee? — (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) National health expenditure is the total expenditure of the nation for both private and public sectors. Government health expenditure is the expenditure on health by the Government, ie, arising from public funds.

1700. Can I refresh your memory if you look at paragraph 368, column 189? Can you read from the third last line onwards to the word "questions"? — (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) "Can I use these few moments to add that the other members of the SDP research team are not precluded from stating their views in response to any of the questions. For the benefit of Mr Wong, we have arranged an interpreter. If you want to express your views, please let me know?"

1701. Yes, in other words, the Chairman at the time did remind the members of the panel that they could respond to any questions, they could say

anything and give their views to the Select Committee? — *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes.

1702. You heard that clearly? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes, I heard that.

1703. Can I now take you back to paragraph 302, column 158? At this point, the Committee was discussing the definition, discussing Chart 3, discussing national health care expenditure and Government health care expenditure. Can you read what Dr Chee said in response to Minister George Yeo's question, "Does Dr Chee now agree that it was a mistake?"? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* "Dr Chee Soon Juan: No, Mr Chairman. I think it is important for us to realise here that the percentage of the national health expenditure (NHE) - I am sorry, let me get the figure - the figure that we derived was from Dr Kanwaljit Soin when she mentioned in her budget speech [*Hansard*, 15 March 1996, col. 1351]: budget allocation for fiscal year 1994, 1.18% of GDP, and so on and so forth, and she said "for the last three years, the amount budgeted by the Government for health has been falling as a percentage of GDP. It has fallen to below 1 % level to a mere 0.85%.""

1704. So you understood those terms and those figures at that time? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes.

1705. Just before this part was discussed, the Committee was actually discussing the figures and talking about national health and Government health care expenditure for quite a few minutes? — *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes.

1706. Why did you not point out to the Select Committee at that time that you were talking about Government health care expenditure and not national health care expenditure when you referred to Chart 3? Can we put up Chart 3, just to refresh Mr Kwan's memory? You see the three bars on Japan, OECD and USA refer to national health care expenditure as a percentage of GDP. The bar on Singapore refers to Government health care expenditure as a percentage of GDP. Right? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes.

1707. You understood that very well? — *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes, I understood it.

1708. At that time, why did you not inform the Select Committee that there was a mistake despite the fact that Dr Chee continued to deny that there was a mistake? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* I felt that the discussion was undertaken by him as Secretary-General. I would rather let him be the spokesman.

1709. What is your role in the Party? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* I am the Assistant Secretary-General.

1710. So it is an important position - to assist the Secretary-General? — *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes, in principle.

1711. Therefore, when the Secretary-General said, "No, it is not a mistake," and you knew that it was a mistake, you did not want to inform the Select Committee that he made a mistake? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* My understanding of it was that at that point in time, basically because I was not in possession

Mr Kwan Yue Keng (cont.)

of all the facts, and therefore I did not want to jump in and say something which he might have reasons for doing so. If he had a reason for putting up 0.8%, I left it to him to explain himself. Because, again, I was not in possession of the facts that produced these charts. So I really did not feel that it was proper for me to jump in and correct him if he had other facts to present. I did not know whether he had had other facts to back him or not. So I did not feel it was proper to jump in then.

7.45 pm

Mr Wong Kan Seng] Can I ask the gentleman there to play Tape 5 for us? Take a look at this replay of the hearing on this particular paragraph.

The following text was replayed [15th July 1996]:

"BG George Yong-Boon Yeo

301. Mr Chairman, Sir, in the paragraph which Dr Chee has just cited, it says in the first sentence that Singapore's national health expenditure is 3.1% of GDP. Instead of putting that number into the graph, into Chart 3, Dr Chee and his SDP research team have put in 0.8%, which was not from this paragraph. Mr Chairman, Sir, I think this must lead us to suspect whether there is a deliberate attempt by the SDP to mislead the Select Committee by putting in data, which are not comparable, on to the same chart? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) Mr Chairman, there is no deliberate attempt to mislead anyone.

302. Does Dr Chee now agree that it was a mistake? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, Mr Chairman. I think it is important for us to realise here that the percentage of the national health expenditure (NHE) - I am sorry, let me get the figure - the figure that we derived was from Dr Kanwaljit Soin when she mentioned in her budget speech [*Hansard, 15 March 1996, col. 1351*]: budget allocation for fiscal year 1994, 1.18% of

GDP, and so on and so forth, and she said "for the last three years, the amount budgeted by the Government for health has been falling as a percentage of GDP. It has fallen to below 1% level to a mere 0.85%."

1712. *Mr Wong Kan Seng*] That is the part that you leaned over and whispered to Dr Chee that it is Government health care expenditure. [*Replay of the aforesaid video-tape recording*] There was one part that showed him. Yes, that is it. I think if it is a bit louder, it could probably come out.

The following text was replayed [15th July 1996]:

" ... Dr Kanwaljit Soin when she mentioned in her budget speech: budget allocation for fiscal year 1994, 1.18% of GDP, and so on and so forth, and she said "for the last three years, the amount budgeted by the Government for health ...".

Mr Wong Kan Seng] Rewind and a bit louder, please.

The following text was replayed [15th July 1996]:

"Does Dr Chee now agree that it was a mistake? - (*Dr Chee Soon Juan*) No, Mr Chairman. I think it is important for us to realise here that the percentage of the national health expenditure (NHE) - I am sorry, let me get the figure - the figure that we derived was from Dr Kanwaljit Soin when she mentioned in her budget speech [*Hansard, 15 March 1996, col. 1351*]: budget allocation for fiscal year 1994, 1.18% of GDP, and so on and so forth, and she said "for the last three years, the amount budgeted by the Government for health has been falling as a percentage of GDP. It has fallen to below 1% level to a mere 0.85%."

Mr Wong Kan Seng] Can I ask RAdm Teo to proceed first while I look for that particular part?

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

301

24 OCTOBER 1996

302

RA dm Teo Chee Hean

1713. Thank you. Mr Kwan, you are a member of the SDP research team? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes.

1714. How many members are there in your team? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* There were the four of us.

1715. There are more than that? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* We have also members contributing from the PKMS of which we have a joint memorandum of understanding.

1716. So there are more than four members in the research team? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes.

1717. How many more - three more, four more, five more? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* I do not know the exact figure.

1718. How did you come to be one of the representors for this particular submission, Mr Kwan? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* It was the party's decision.

1719. So the party decided to select you to be one of the representors? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes, to come as a representor.

1720. And you are the Assistant Secretary-General of the party. So you hold a fairly important position in your party? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes.

1721. And yet you said that you had a minor role to play in this whole submission? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* In the health subsidy matter, yes.

1722. In fact, you cited that twice in your written submission in your defence? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes.

1723. As an excuse for - ? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* It is not an excuse. It is a fact.

1724. That you played a minor role? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes.

1725. But then you said that there were several people more in the research team, that you were one of the four people who was selected to come and represent and present the findings to the Select Committee. And you are also the Assistant Secretary-General of the party, an important and senior post in the party. And yet you say that you have a minor role to play in these proceedings. How is that possible, Mr Kwan? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* In so far as my role as Assistant Secretary-General is concerned, I have other roles to play. But in so far as this particular report, the health subsidy report, is concerned, I have a very minor role. I have other important roles to play.

1726. And yet there would have been other people in the party who were not selected to come and make the presentation to the Select Committee. Yet you were one of those who was selected. Is that correct? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes. Because of my position as Assistant Secretary-General.

1727. I find that very difficult to square - that you are one of the more senior members, you are a member of the research team, there are many other members that probably have a bigger part

RA dm Teo Chee Hean (cont.)

to play than some of the other members in the research team, you are one of the four selected, and yet you claim that you have a minor role in the submission, and that is an important basis for your defence. I find these two very difficult to square. Would you care to comment on that? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* I am the Assistant Secretary-General and it was the Central Executive Committee's thinking that I should represent the party at such an occasion.

RA dm Teo Chee Hean] Thank you.

Chairman] Mr Wong, please proceed.

Mr Wong Kan Seng

1728. I was looking for Tape 5. Just to refresh your memory, I asked you about your understanding of Government health care expenditure, national health care expenditure and I referred you to the discussion that BG Yeo had with your panel. They talked about this particular chart (Chart 3) and about whether it was Government or national health care expenditure when the Singapore figure was put up at 0.8% and you were clear at that time and you were following the discussion? — *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes.

Mr Wong Kan Seng] Can I ask the gentleman there to play Tape 4, please?

The following text was replayed [15th July 1996]:

"261. Mr Chairman, Sir, I refer the Committee to the SDP's Chart 3 - Comparison of GDP

percentage on health care. Can I ask Dr Chee what this chart shows? What does it mean? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* It compares percentage of GDP on health care.

262. The "health care" refers to total health care in the economy? - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Government health care expenditure."

Mr Wong Kan Seng] Did you hear a voice? Can you just run that two or three seconds before that, a bit louder?

[Replay of video-tape recording.]

" - *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Government health care expenditure."

Mr Wong Kan Seng

1729. That was what you said to Dr Chee? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* I cannot recall what I said already.

Mr Wong Kan Seng] Okay. Why not you go nearer the speaker and just retrace the steps, that is about two or three seconds before that. Please proceed. *[Mr Kwan Yue Keng proceeded to the TV monitor to listen to replay of video-tape recording.]*

" — *(Dr Chee Soon Juan)* Government health care expenditure."

1730. That is exactly what you said. Play that again. *[Replay of aforesaid recording.] [Mr Kwan Yue Keng resumed his seat.]*? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* I still cannot recall really what I said. Really I cannot recall.

1731. Can you hear what was said? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* I heard Dr Chee but the background noise -

1732. Before Dr Chee said, "Government health care expenditure", your

voice came through and you said, "Government health care expenditure". You can listen to it again? - (Mr Kwan Yue Keng) Okay.

1733. Will you accept that? Will you listen to it again? [Mr Kwan Yue Keng proceeded to the TV monitor to listen to replay of the aforesaid part of the video-tape recording.] All right. One more time. Have it louder? [Replay of the aforesaid part of the video-tape recording.] [Mr Kwan Yue Keng resumed his seat.]- (Mr Kwan Yue Keng) It sounds like "Government health care expenditure".

1734. So you prompted Dr Chee these three words "Government health-care expenditure". So indeed you followed the discussion and you pointed out that particular definition to him and therefore you could have at that time informed the Committee that you were referring to Government health care expenditure? - (Mr Kwan Yue Keng) I pointed it out to him but I do not know whether he really heard it or not.

1735. He repeated after you? - (Mr Kwan Yue Keng) Well, I just make sure that he heard BG Yeo clearly.

1736. In other words, my earlier point that you could have interjected and informed the Committee that there was an error? - (Mr Kwan Yue Keng) I could have if I were in possession of all the facts.

1737. This is not a question of facts because you understood it, because you have told Dr Chee that was Government health care expenditure. You do not need the facts. You knew it? - (Mr

Kwan Yue Keng) I knew it as just the three words which were being bandied around during that discussion as such. The full significance -

1738. No. The other words were "national health care expenditure". So it is more than three words being bandied around? - (Mr Kwan Yue Keng) That particular moment, I mean.

1739. It is obvious that you would not have been misled if you had played a major role in the submission? - (Mr Kwan Yue Keng) Can you repeat that?

1740. It seems obvious to us that you would not have been misled by Dr Chee if you had played a major role in the submission? - (Mr Kwan Yue Keng) I would not have been misled by Dr Chee if I had played a major role in the submission.

1741. Had you been in charge of the submission, you would know everything yourself? - (Mr Kwan Yue Keng) If I was in charge.

1742. Yes. Then do you not feel that Dr Chee and some of the other members of the panel have let down the SDP? - (Mr Kwan Yue Keng) How could they have let down the SDP when they made a presentation based on what at that time were facts?

1743. You knew that there were many errors in the submission. Had you been in charge of that submission, you would have done it better? - (Mr Kwan Yue Keng) But all these came to me, as I said, only during the deliberations

Mr Kwan Yue Keng (cont.)

of the Select Committee. If I had pre-knowledge of it, so to speak, I would have alerted him. But I did not have it at that time.

1744. So now that you know, are you sanctioning what they have done? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Are you asking me to say that I am guilty?

1745. No, no. I am asking you whether you are sanctioning what they have done? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* At the point in time when they made the submission, it was made in good faith, based on, I think, what the Committee had facts available to them at that time.

1746. But you would not have known -? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* At that point in time I sanctioned it.

8.00 pm

1747. But you would not have known that it was done in good faith because you played such a minor role in it? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes.

Mr Wong Kan Seng] Thank you.

Mr Davinder Singh

1748. Mr Kwan, if you were directly responsible for the submission, you would have taken great pains to ensure that the submission and the charts were in all respects accurate? — *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* Yes.

1749. And you would expect the same from Dr Chee Soon Juan, Mr Wong Hong Toy and Mr Kunalen if they were in charge of the submission or were involved in its preparation? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* I would expect that.

1750. If you had been in charge of preparing the submission and the charts, you would not have put the figure 5% as it now appears in Chart 1? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* That is very hypothetical.

1751. I am asking you that question. It is a simple question. Would you agree with me that if you were in charge of that submission, you would not have put that 5%? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* I really cannot say that, because it depends on the scope of facts available. Let us say, I went upon one avenue of search, thinking that this avenue of search was correct, and had taken whatever findings from this avenue and made it into a report, it was made with a good intention to present facts based on that avenue of search, although that avenue of search may not be absolutely and completely thorough. But the intention, if I were in charge, and if I were given the time and unlimited resources to explore all data, ie, the time and all the resources to do that, then definitely I could say that I could not have made such a mistake.

1752. And are you suggesting that Dr Chee Soon Juan did not have the resources available to him all the time? - *(Mr Kwan Yue Keng)* I was not involved. I did not know how much avenue or sources of data had he explored really.

1753. No. I am interested in what you would have done? - *(Mr Kwan Yue*

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

309

24 OCTOBER 1996

310

Keng) I would have explored as many avenues of information as possible.

1754. Yes. And you would have verified the information that you were going to use? - (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) Yes.

1755. Because a submission to a Select Committee is an extremely serious matter? — (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) Yes.

1756. And if the information that you get from your source is known to you to be incorrectly worked out, you would correct it in your submission? - (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) Yes.

1757. As a serious man, you would be honour bound to admit an error as soon as it was brought to your attention? - (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) Yes.

1758. If you had been in charge of the preparation of this submission and the charts, you would have on 15th July, as an honourable man, admitted to the errors? — (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) If I had prepared those charts, yes.

1759. And that would have been the honourable thing to do? - (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) Yes.

1760. Dr Chee Soon Juan who was in charge of the submission and the preparation of the charts claims to have used an incorrect method for submission to Parliament and despite being in charge did not admit to the errors either on 15th July or 12th August, and when he did so, sought to explain it away as opposed to admit that it was wrong. Personally, do you feel let down by that kind of conduct? - (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) That is a very personal question.

1761. And that is why I am asking you that question. Do you feel let down by such conduct? - (*Mr Kwan Yue Keng*) To a certain extent, yes.

Mr Davinder Singh] Thank you.

Chairman] Are there any other questions from Members? At this point of time, there are no questions. But Mr Kwan, you are not yet discharged from the hearings. I will ask the Serjeant-at-Arms to direct you to a waiting room where you will remain until such time as the Committee requires your attendance again. Thank you very much. Can we call in Mr Kunalen?

(The witness withdrew.)

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

311

24 OCTOBER 1996

312

Examination of Witness

Mr S. Kunalen, Head, Research and Planning Department, Singapore Democratic Party, was called in and examined under oath.

8.08 pm

Chairman

1762. Good evening, please be seated. For the record, could you state your name, address and the position you hold in your organisation? - (*Mr S Kunalen*) Yes. My name is S Kunalen. My address is 10 Anson Road, #46-05 Singapore 079903. I am Head of Research and Planning, SDP.

Chairman] Mr Kunalen, the Committee of Privileges is looking into the complaint made by the Minister for Health, BG George Yeo, for contempt of Parliament against four representors from Singapore Democratic Party, namely, Mr Wong Hong Toy, Mr Kwan Yue Keng, Dr Chee Soon Juan and yourself. The evidence which you give today will be taken on oath. If you so desire, you can take an affirmation. I will ask the Clerk now to administer the oath. [*Mr Kunalen made an affirmation.*] Thank you. Prof. Ho will start with the examination.

Assoc. Prof. Ho Peng Kee

1763. Mr Kunalen, can I first ask you to read out your defence submitted to this Committee, both the joint defence dated 3rd September as well as your individual defence? — (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes. I will start with 3rd September 1996. This is

addressed to the Speaker of Parliament and it states:

"Dear Sir,

COMPLAINT AGAINST REPRESENTORS FROM THE SINGAPORE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

In response to the Minister's complaints, we wish to state that we had made the SDP's representation in good faith and had no intention of deceiving anyone. It was unfortunate that a typing error was made. Nonetheless, it was a genuine error which was brought to the attention of the Select Committee before the 12 August hearing.

As for the Statement 2 and Chart 3, there was a misunderstanding of the figures and there was no intention of deceiving anyone. We, therefore, deny all the allegations made by the Minister for Health in his letter of complaint dated 27 August 1996 (please refer to the letters of response)."

1764. Thank you? - (*Mr Kunalen*) And now, I shall read my individual response which is dated 30th August 1996 addressed to the Clerk of Parliament and it is headed:

"Dear Sir,

Complaint against representors from the Singapore Democratic Party.

I refer to your letter of the 28th August 1996 and the following is my response to the complaint by the Minister for Health, BG George Yeo.

Firstly, I wish to put on record that I categorically deny the allegations made by the Minister in his complaint dated 27th August 1996 to the Speaker. In justifying my denial of the allegations I would direct the Committee of Privileges attention to paragraphs 1037 to 1238 of the minutes of evidence wherein I was questioned extensively by the members of the Select Committee.

In respect of the allegation made at paragraph 11, page 4 of the Minister's complaint under the heading, 'Prevarication and perjury' it is alleged that I 'wilfully' gave a false statement to the Committee on a material issue. I wish to add here that at no time during the proceedings on the 12th August 1996 when I was questioned by the Committee was Dr Chee Soon Juan's statement referred to in the complaint put to me. Now that it has been put to me, I have the following response. I did not personally verify the accuracy of the data contained in chart 1.

On the allegation under the heading, 'Prevarication' at paragraph 12 on page 4 of the Ministers' complaint I wish to respond to that namely that my answer is as per what I gave which is Dr Chee Soon Juan had told me that somebody had made a typographical error. I want to add further here that his answer was merely a response to my question to him in respect of whether Dr Chee had responded to the request by the Clerk of Parliament to send a copy of the article. I had at no time asked Dr Chee as to whether he had typed out the representation to the Select Committee.

In conclusion I wish to add that I had answered all the questions put to me to the best of my abilities and would want to quote part of my answer to Dr Aline Wong at paragraph 1236 of the minutes of evidence 'I am here to answer a question and I will answer it to the best of my abilities. And the answer is I went by the chart and the text [which] was consistent with the chart that there was a drop. At no time was there any information before me to put me on notice that any figures in the charts accompanying our representation was false.'

1765. Thank you, Mr Kunalen. Mr Kunalen, you had asked Dr Chee whether he had responded to the request by the Clerk of Parliament to send a copy of Ramesh's article? — (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes.

1766. What did he say? — (*Mr Kunalen*) As I stated, he said that someone had made a typographical error.

1767. Somebody had made a typographical error? — (*Mr Kunalen*) That is right.

1768. He did not say, "I made a typographical error."? — (*Mr Kunalen*) No. Can I just answer in terms of the background, the situation in which I posed the question?

1769. No. Just answer my question. He said somebody had made a typographical error? — (*Mr Kunalen*) That is right.

1770. Which implies that somebody else typed the submission and made the error? — (*Mr Kunalen*) This is what he just said to me that somebody had made a typographical error.

1771. He had told the Select' Committee that he typed the submission. So if he typed the submission, the typographical error must be his? — (*Mr Kunalen*) I am just giving you truthfully the answer which he gave to me and there is nothing more.

1772. You are sure. You have no doubts at all that — ? — (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes. I have got no doubts in my mind.

1773. He said somebody had made a typographical error? — (*Mr. Kunalen*) That is right. In fact, that, is why I wanted to go on to the background to show the circumstances in which he said it, because it was in response to my question.

1774. But the assertion is very clear — somebody had made a typographical error. He did not say, "I made a typographical error."? — (*Mr Kunalen*) He did not say "I".

1775. So he tells you one thing and yet, he himself typed the submission.

Assoc. Prof. Ho Peng Kee (cont.)

Is there somebody therefore not telling the truth? - *(Mr Kunalen)* I can only say what I heard in response to my question.

1776. You are telling the truth? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes.

1777. So Dr Chee is not telling the truth? — *(Mr Kunalen)* I do not know about that. I am just telling you what I heard.

1778. You are clear that that was what he said to you? - *(Mr Kunalen)* That is what was said to me.

1779. You do not doubt the veracity of what he said to you? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Not at that time. And since you asked me the question about what had happened at that time, that was the answer that was given to me.

1780. How about now? Do you doubt the veracity of what he said to you? - *(Mr Kunalen)* When you said now, meaning after the complaint, after our appearance before the Select Committee?

1781. Now? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Now, at this moment.

1782. Now that we know that he typed the submission himself, that is on the record? - *(Mr Kunalen)* If you ask my opinion now, I am only expressing my opinion, I heard that answer and now, of course, he said something else when he was questioned, and I think I have to leave it to the Committee to decide.

1783. Thank you. Mr Kunalen, the complaint also has been made against you that you had misconducted yourself as a witness by being impertinent. Can I ask you to read the record of the hearing of 12th August, paragraph 1105? — *(Mr Kunalen)* Paragraph 1105. Could you please tell me the page number?

1784. It is at page C 263, column 518, paragraph 1105. Can you read that? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes, I shall. It has got a heading there. "Chairman". The paragraph reads as follows:

"Order. I would like to warn the witness not to be impertinent? — *(Mr Kunalen)* All right, Mr Chairman, I take that back."

1785. So Mr Speaker, the Chairman, warned you not to be impertinent? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes. That is what it says in paragraph 1105.

1786. It means that he would only have said it if he found you to be impertinent? — *(Mr Kunalen)* Can I just respond to that question? My response is: this is what the Speaker had said with regard to my conduct and I responded by saying, "All right, Mr Chairman, I take that back."

1787. Which means you accepted that you were impertinent, you apologised for it and you took it back? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes.

1788. But your taking it back is premised on your admission that you were impertinent, would you agree? - *(Mr Kunalen)* My understanding is that because the Speaker is in the Chair, and if the Speaker has now warned me not to be impertinent, I actually reciprocated by

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

317

24 OCTOBER 1996

318

saying, reciprocated - meaning to be polite - "All right, Mr Chairman, I take that back." So I did not want to go any further. I treated it as a warning.

1789. But you were warned not to be impertinent? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes, I was warned.

1790. It was good of you to take it back. But the taking back is prefaced on your prior conduct which was that Mr Speaker had found you to be impertinent? - *(Mr Kunalen)* My words in paragraph 1105 are, "All right". That was after a warning was given.

1791. But no warning would have ensued if the conduct had not warranted the warning? - *(Mr Kunalen)* That is the decision for the Speaker. Mr Speaker was in the Chair.

1792. The Speaker found you to be impertinent? - *(Mr Kunalen)* This was what he said to me and I said, "All right, Mr Chairman, I take that back."

1793. All right. Another complaint against you, Mr Kunalen, is that you were evasive in your answers. If you look at paragraph 1219 - ? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes, I am just getting to it. Yes, paragraph 1219 is at column 539. Do you want me to read out paragraph 1219?

1794. Just the question that was asked. Who had asked the question and what was the question that was asked at paragraph 1219? - *(Mr Kunalen)* I am now looking at paragraph 1218 at column 538, at the bottom.

1795. All right? - *(Mr Kunalen)* The question was being put to me.

"Can I ask Mr Kunalen, now that we established that the figure 5 % was wrong and it should have been 25% and that if you have done the calculation for 1991 to 1994, you would have seen that there was no plunge in the graph, as the head of the research, would that alter your conclusion? - *(Mr Kunalen)* On what?"

1219. That health care costs are hardly subsidised at all?"

1796. So that was the question that was asked of you by BG George Yeo? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes, that is right.

1797. And the exchange went on for about 15 questions. 15 questions were asked by the Minister subsequently ending at paragraph 1234? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes, that is at column 541.

1798. That is right. And the question remained unanswered, during which time you went on a long discourse as to what you felt health subsidies were. You went to talk about the British position? - *(Mr Kunalen)* That is right.

1799. You talked about what the common man in Britain would think? - *(Mr Kunalen)* That is right.

1800. So you gave evasive answers? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Can I go back to the question which the Minister posed and I am referring now to paragraph 1218? He said, "Can I ask Mr Kunalen, now that we established that the figure 5% was wrong and it should have been 25% and that if you have done the calculation for 1991 to 1994, you would have seen that there was no plunge in the graph, as the head of research, would that alter your conclusion?" So his conclusion that

Mr Kunalen (cont.)

he is asking me to consider is whether it is hardly subsidised. He is asking my opinion and I expressed my opinion.

1801. But in expressing your opinion, you gave evasive answers. Can I ask you to read paragraphs 1227 to 1229? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes, I am now reading paragraph 1227 at column 540:

"1227. But there is transfer, is there not, Mr Kunalen, from those who are wealthy who pay more taxes to those who pay less or no taxes? - *(Mr Kunalen)* The answer to that is those who pay high taxes will actually use private health care or they take up medical insurance."

1802. You did not answer his question. Until he had to ask you again at paragraph 1228? - *(Mr Kunalen)* "But they still pay taxes, do they not? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes, they do pay taxes."

1803. Go on? - *(Mr Kunalen)* At paragraph 1229, "Then out of those taxes they are used to subsidise B2 and C class wards? - *(Mr Kunalen)* You use the word "subsidise" from a different way I use the word "subsidise"." Can I pause there and say at that stage, I am actually expressing my opinion in terms of an interpretation of a word which he used in his question.

1804. Even in trying to explain what you meant by "subsidy", BG George Yeo was engaging you on your definition. For example, at paragraph 1229, he said, "out of those taxes they are used to subsidise B2 and C class wards?" In other words, those who use B2 and C class wards pay less or do not pay because the monies that are used to build and run the hospitals come from those who are

wealthy and pay more taxes. But you did not respond. You just said, "Oh, I use the word "subsidise" from a very different way you use the word "subsidise"". Would you not agree that you were not engaging the Minister. You were not answering him. You were straying. You were evasive? — *(Mr Kunalen)* My response to that is as follows. If we go back to the beginning, a particular case was put to me.

1805. Mr Kunalen, just answer my question, on those passages that I read. You were not answering the Minister directly. You were straying? - *(Mr Kunalen)* I would like to actually say here that you took me through various paragraphs, from paragraph 1218. We started with paragraph 1218 and you said that the Minister was engaging me. And so I was expressing my opinion on the word "subsidise" because we got to a stage at paragraph 1229 where there was a question of what we meant by "subsidise".

1806. Right. Let me bring you further down where you talked about the British position? — *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes. Do you want me to read paragraph 1234?

1807. Paragraphs 1233 and 1234? - *(Mr Kunalen)* "1233. He may pay more or less than what he is getting from? - *(Mr Kunalen)* That is a matter of opinion now. But that is what the British person will tell you, "I pay my taxes."

1808. Paragraph 1234? — *(Mr Kunalen)* "No. I am not asking about the opinion of the common English man. I am asking about what it means in financial accounting terms?"

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

321

24 OCTOBER 1996

322

1809. And your response? - (*Mr Kunalen*) "Exactly, you use two words "financial accounting" terms. I do not think that is acceptable to the citizens who pay taxes."

1810. Let me put it this way, Mr Kunalen. You could have been more forthright in responding to the Minister's questions. Would you agree? - (*Mr Kunalen*) Are you asking me now in hindsight?

1811. Yes, in hindsight? - (*Mr Kunalen*) I would say that is a matter of opinion.

1812. In your view, having gone through certain of these passages? - (*Mr Kunalen*) In my view, I stand by the answer which I gave in those paragraphs which I just read out. I have got nothing further to add.

1813. You could not have been more forthright even in trying to expound on your term? - (*Mr Kunalen*) I did expound on what I had to say. I think it was in a forthright manner. It could not be any more forthright. But that is what the British person will tell you, "I pay my taxes."

1814. Even though, for example, the Minister brought you back down to earth and said, "I am not asking about the opinion of the common English man, I am asking about what it means in financial accounting terms". And your response, "Exactly, you use two words "financial accounting" terms. I do not think that is acceptable to the citizens who pay taxes."? - (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes, that is forthright.

1815. That is forthright? - (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes.

Assoc. Prof. Ho Peng Kee] No more questions, Sir.

Prof. Jayakumar

1816. Mr Kunalen, can I ask you a few questions by way of background. First, about yourself, because I know that you are a legally trained person? - (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes.

1817. Are you in practice? What is your occupation? - (*Mr Kunalen*) I used to be in practice and later a consultant to a firm, not any more. I am involved in teaching.

1818. Right now you are engaged in teaching? — (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes.

1819. How long were you in practice, may I know? - (*Mr. Kunalen*) From 1984-85.

1820. Was it in your own firm? - (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes, and later as a consultant to a firm.

1821. How big was the firm, may I know? - (*Mr Kunalen*) It was a sole proprietorship.

1822. And where are you teaching now? - (*Mr Kunalen*) I run a school. It is the Advanced Law Tutors.

1823. Would you agree that, one of the things that lawyers are taught is to be meticulous with facts that they set out in a document, that the facts are accurate?

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

323

24 OCTOBER 1996

324

Prof. Jayakumar (cont.)

- (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes, that is one of the things that is taught.

1824. And I remember that you informed one of the Members of the Committee that you had done very well in the Bar, am I right? - (*Mr Kunalen*) It is not the Bar. It is my Masters.

1825. Your Masters. I think it was also publicised in Singapore? - (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes.

1826. So it will be fair for me to assume that you have done much better than most of the students who did in the Bar? - (*Mr Kunalen*) It is not the Bar again.

1827. In the Masters? — (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes, that is right.

1828. This is the Masters degree from where? - (*Mr Kunalen*) From the University of London.

1829. University of London. Now, I come to the submission of the SDP. I believe you did inform the Select Committee that in your view, submissions made to Parliamentary Select Committees are very serious submissions and must be taken seriously? - (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes. Can I add to that? Yes, I did actually say that, but I want to actually present a little bit of the background. Or do you want me to just answer that question?

1830. Did you inform the Committee that, in your view? - (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes, I did.

1831. Right. In fact, Minister George Yeo asked, "So you knew then it was a document that had to be carefully drafted because it was going to be a serious document and it is going to be submitted to Parliament." So you knew it was going to be a serious document. You gave a lengthy answer but you did say that you knew it was a serious document from various perspectives, defamation and so on and so forth? - (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes.

1832. So you said that as a representative before the Select Committee? - (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes.

1833. You are also head of the SDP research and planning? - (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes.

1834. Can you please let us know what is your concept of "research"? - (*Mr Kunalen*) My concept of research is this. That was the first time.

1835. What is your concept of "research"? - (*Mr Kunalen*) My concept of research is this. You could have various people sometimes being involved in research, as far as this representation is concerned.

1836. What do you understand by "research", leave aside this representation? — (*Mr Kunalen*) You want me, just in abstraction, to look at the concept of research.

1837. Yes? - (*Mr Kunalen*) Research would mean that if you got any particular individuals who are involved in research, then they would actually try and accumulate data. It could be from other sources. They themselves could carry out some

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

325

24 OCTOBER 1996

326

research on their own, accumulate data and then they would evaluate the data and come up with certain conclusions.

1838. Thank you. Obtain the data, evaluate the data and come to certain conclusions? — *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes.

1839. As head of research, is that what you did in your role in this preparation of the submission? — *(Mr Kunalen)* You remember I started off in my answer just now by saying "in abstraction" -

1840. Yes? - *(Mr Kunalen)* - and I was going to say what I really did, particularly in this particular representation. I think you are more interested in this particular representation, not in my abstract answer. In this particular case -

1841. Did you obtain data, evaluate data? - *(Mr Kunalen)* No, I did not.

1842. You did not? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Not me.

1843. In fact, you told the Select Committee, did you not, that you did not read Mr Ramesh's article? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes, that is right. I did not.

8.30 pm

1844. Did you read Mr Asher's article? - *(Mr Kunalen)* No, I did not.

1845. Did you read the statistical data from the Ministry of Health and the Department of Statistics? - *(Mr Kunalen)* No, I did not.

1846. Now, I take you to your individual defence? — *(Mr Kunalen)* That is my letter of 30th August.

1847. Can you please read out the last sentence of the third paragraph? - *(Mr Kunalen)* The last sentence of the third paragraph says, "I had at no time asked Dr Chee as to whether he had typed out the representation to the Select Committee."

1848. Okay. That is the fourth paragraph. Read the last sentence of the third paragraph, please? - *(Mr Kunalen)* "I did not personally verify the accuracy of the data contained in chart 1."

1849. "I did not personally verify the accuracy of the data contained in chart 1." Can I ask you to look at Dr Chee Soon Juan's defence? Do you have a copy with you? It is flagged no. 7 in the document with the blue spine on your left? — *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes. Thank you. Do you want me to read out?

1850. Hold on. It is Dr Chee Soon Juan's individual defence on 2nd September. At the bottom of the page, he says, "I deny ...". Could you read the second sentence of the paragraph at the bottom of that page? - *(Mr Kunalen)* The second sentence?

1851. Yes? - *(Mr Kunalen)* "I had given copies of the draft of the written submission to members of the panel for independent verification of the contents."

1852. Yes. "I had given copies of the draft of the written submission to members of the panel for independent

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

327

24 OCTOBER 1996

328

Prof. Jayakumar (cont.)

verification of the contents." And Dr Chee Soon Juan has submitted this defence to this Committee that he had given to you and other members of the panel the draft of the submission for independent verification of the contents. Who is telling the truth? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Right. Let me just explain here, and you will see when I gave my evidence at the Select Committee hearing that I was just given a copy of the submission. In fact, a copy was made in the Select Committee of my copy which was given to me by Dr Chee. So I was just given a copy of it before it was formally submitted. I was just given a copy.

1853. You were not asked to independently verify. Is that what you want us to believe? — *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes. I was not actually asked to go and independently look at those figures or the charts. I was just given a copy.

1854. With no comment? - *(Mr Kunalen)* In fact, interestingly, I actually handed up my own copy of that document to be photocopied at the hearing of the Select Committee. And there is nothing else there.

1855. No, I just want to know this. Dr Chee has told us that he had given copies of the draft of the submission to each member of the panel, which includes you, for independent verification of the contents? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes. I was just given a copy of what was going to be the submission.

1856. You are telling us that that is not true? - *(Mr Kunalen)* I was not specifically asked to verify the details.

1857. If you were not specifically asked, were you asked in any other non-specific role? — *(Mr Kunalen)* No, it was just a copy of what it was going to be in terms of the submission.

1858. Were you asked to do anything at all? — *(Mr Kunalen)* No, just to look at it, as a copy for my information, as what was going to be submitted.

1859. It was given to you only for your information? - *(Mr Kunalen)* What I mean by that is that I was not asked in any way to verify any facts.

1860. Were you asked to do any other thing with regard to the document? - *(Mr Kunalen)* No, I was just given it as what it was going to be the submission.

1861. Mr Chairman, obviously, one of the two statements is patently untrue. But let me move on. I would like to ask you another question on another matter. This relates to the preparation of graphs. Can I take you to paragraph 1045, column 507, of the Select Committee Report? Minister George Yeo asked you, "Mr Kunalen, when was the submission prepared? Was it in March or April?" Could you please read your reply? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes. "As I said earlier on, and I just want to repeat this, a draft was actually done of the submission, in terms of what was going to go in. The accompanying charts were all prepared by Dr Chee. I do not know who else was actually involved with him, and then we went through the

contents mainly. As I said, I was not involved actually in getting any materials, in terms of primary material sources as far as the charts were concerned."

1862. So in the middle of that response, you said, "The accompanying charts were all prepared by Dr Chee."?
— (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes.

1863. Can I take you to paragraph 1062, column 509? Minister George Yeo asked you, "How is it you were not acquainted with the details of the tables in the charts?" What was your answer? - (*Mr Kunalen*) My answer was, "Let me once again answer the way I answered it earlier on. When the representation was compiled, we actually looked at the contents and the charts. But I said that although I am head of the research section, in terms of gathering the primary materials and the details in terms of how the charts were actually compiled, this was left to Dr Chee."

1864. Yes. When you made that statement in response to those questions on 12th August, you were also under affirmation, were you not? - (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes.

1865. You stand by those statements that you made on that date? - (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes. But can I just explain?

1866. No. Do you stand by those statements that you made? - (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes, I do.

Prof. Jayakumar] Thank you.

Mr Davinder Singh

1867. Mr Kunalen, you teach the law?
— (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes.

1868. If a student of yours were to write an article on the law and use as a footnote an article which contains an incorrect proposition of the law, would it be acceptable for that student to perpetuate that incorrect proposition in the text of his article? - (*Mr Kunalen*) It is an abstract question. You want to know my response whether it is correct.

1869. Yes. Is it correct and honest to do that? - (*Mr Kunalen*) No. If I know that the proposition of law which is referred to from the text of some other academic work which is quoted in the footnote, then I would say that if the student misinterpreted it -

1870. If he knew that it was wrong? — (*Mr Kunalen*) If he knew that it was wrong. If I knew that he knew that it was wrong, then if you ask my opinion whether I would accept it, I would not accept it.

1871. If he knew it was wrong, it would be totally unacceptable? — (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes. On the basis that there is no doubt that he knew that it was wrong and if there is no doubt that he knew that it was wrong and I was aware of that, then it would be unacceptable.

1872. Right. It would be likewise unacceptable to use as authority a methodology which the author knows is wrong? - (*Mr Kunalen*) Can I just ask? In the area of the law, when you say

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

methodology, can you give me an example so that I can -

1873. I am not talking about the law?
- (*Mr Kunalen*) You are not talking about the law now.

1874. The proposition must apply to anything. When you cite something and you know that that citation contains an incorrect methodology, it would be unacceptable to perpetuate that incorrect methodology. Do you agree with me? - (*Mr Kunalen*) No, I am just trying to think about the methodology because you are not now dealing with the law. So what you are actually saying is that if someone uses some methodology, which is clearly incorrect.

1875. Yes? - (*Mr Kunalen*) In other words, very obviously incorrect.

1876. Which the author knows is incorrect? - (*Mr Kunalen*) Which the author knows is incorrect. That means the student who is actually doing the article?

1877. Yes? - (*Mr Kunalen*) Not the original author.

1878. That is right? - (*Mr Kunalen*) If the student knows it, then that would also be unacceptable.

1879. Yes. Dr Chee Soon Juan has told us that he used, for his calculations of Chart 1, the methodology used by Mr Ramesh in his article and he also accepts that if he did not use Ramesh's methodology, he would have calculated it differently. In other words, that Ramesh's

methodology was not in accord with the right methodology. Would you say that using Ramesh's methodology was acceptable in those circumstances? - (*Mr Kunalen*) Well, I am not familiar with Ramesh's methodology. But if you are asking me now as to what my opinion is, with regard to what Dr Chee told you, that means - let me just get this right - he told you that he knew that Ramesh's methodology was wrong.

1880. No, he did not say he knew it was wrong. But he said that because you cite an article in your footnote and because that article uses a certain methodology, it is all right to continue to use that methodology even though if you were to do it yourself you would do it differently? - (*Mr Kunalen*) All right. We have moved away from the legal example you used earlier on. Now we have moved into statistical methodology, any methodology of calculation. Now you are asking me to deal with Dr Chee's response because he refers to a methodology which was used by M. Ramesh.

1881. My question is fairly straightforward. I really appreciate an answer. Would that be acceptable in your view? Do you sit there under oath and say that that is acceptable? - (*Mr Kunalen*) Dr Chee following Ramesh's methodology?

1882. Yes? - (*Mr Kunalen*) Well, he followed Ramesh's methodology. That is what I understand from you.

1883. Yes. And that methodology used two different time series? - (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes.

1884. Dr Chee has said that if he did not cite Ramesh, then it would be a different ball game altogether. In other words, he would use a different methodology. Is it acceptable that just because you cite in your footnote an article, you are justified in perpetuating a methodology which you would not have used if you did it yourself? - *(Mr Kunalen)* I would want to know why that was cited. Because if that is the only available study, then you just cite it. Then you are straightaway trying to be consistent with the methodology.

1885. Even though he knows that that methodology is done in a different way from the correct way? - *(Mr Kunalen)* I am not sure about that.

1886. I am asking you? - *(Mr Kunalen)* If it is actually clearly shown to be wrong.

1887. If the answer is no, please say so under oath that you consider that unacceptable conduct. If the answer is yes, say it is all right? — *(Mr Kunalen)* I am just trying to understand the question, if you would bear with me. I want to answer the question and I am trying to get the question clear in my mind before I give a "yes" or "no" answer. If he had some reason for putting forward that methodology, then I would not say that that is unacceptable also.

8.45 pm

1888. Let me be specific. In calculating the figures for this Chart, Ramesh used figures for 1990 for the numerator and a combination of 1985 and 1990 figures for the denominator. Do you

consider that correct? — *(Mr Kunalen)* If he is trying to follow something that was in Ramesh's article.

1889. Well, that is what Ramesh did? — *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes.

1890. Do you consider that a correct way of calculating? In other words, you used a figure representing 1990 prices for the numerator and for the denominator you used a combination, a conflation of figures representing 1985 prices and 1990 prices. Do you consider that acceptable? That is all I want to know? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Personally, I cannot answer that question because I do not understand the methodology.

1891. It is very simple. You do not need to understand the methodology. When you calculate matters or anything, do you not use consistent figures for both the numerator and denominator? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes, you do.

1892. You do. And if consistent figures are not used by the author whom you cite in your footnote, is that justification to perpetuate use of the inconsistent figures? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Well, the answer to your question, it would not be consistent to use two different time series.

1893. Oh, well - your words "time series"? — *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes.

1894. So you know what I am talking about? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes.

1895. So it would not be justification to perpetuate that method? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes, citing his study. So you are

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

335

24 OCTOBER 1996

336

Mr Kunalen (cont.)

asking me whether it is right to continue to cite his study?

1896. No. Even if you cite his study, is it justification to perpetuate that method of calculation? - *(Mr Kunalen)* It would not be.

1897. Thank you. Were you involved in Statement 2 and Chart 3? - *(Mr Kunalen)* A statement.

1898. Making the Statement 2 and Chart 3. Do you know what Chart 3 is about? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes. Can I just quickly refer to it?

1899. We will put it up for you. [*Chart 3: Comparison of GDP % on Health Care displayed.*]? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes.

1900. Were you involved in the preparation of this Chart or in any discussion relating to it? - *(Mr Kunalen)* No. In terms of actual preparation, no.

1901. Discussion? — *(Mr Kunalen)* Discussion. You mean looking at all the details or figures.

1902. Yes? - *(Mr Kunalen)* No.

1903. Are you in a position to say whether or not the Chart was prepared as a result of a misunderstanding? - *(Mr Kunalen)* I am not in a position to say that. I will make that very clear.

1904. Then why did you just swear that that was so? - *(Mr Kunalen)* No. With regard to what?

1905. Please, do you remember that after you made an affirmation, you read the joint defence? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes.

1906. And could you re-read the second paragraph of the joint defence? - *(Mr Kunalen)* "As for the Statement 2 and Chart 3, there was a misunderstanding of the figures and there was no intention of deceiving anyone. We, therefore, deny all the allegations ...". So you are asking me about the misunderstanding.

1907. You made a statement? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Oh, yes.

1908. Under oath? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes.

1909. That there was a misunderstanding? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes. That is at the time we did this, having gone through a Select Committee hearing where this matter was actually brought out.

1910. But, Mr Kunalen, I ask you: are you in any position to say that there has been a misunderstanding in the preparation of this Chart, and your answer was an unequivocal no? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes. The reason is because when I was sitting at the time of the Select Committee representation in the Select Committee and there was this discussion about the figures. That was with Dr Chee and the other Committee members and I saw it as a misunderstanding.

1911. Yes? - *(Mr Kunalen)* But you asked me about the details. I was not involved in the details.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

337

24 OCTOBER 1996

338

1912. And you saw it as a misunderstanding during the discussion, I think, it was on 15th July? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes.

1913. Why did you see it as a misunderstanding? — *(Mr Kunalen)* Because we were taking figures from Parliament and then there was reference to a Government White Paper.

1914. And those two figures from the White Paper and Parliament referred to two different things? — *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes. The problem with the figures in Parliament was that it was not clear. That is my understanding when the Nominated MP Kanwaljit Soin actually came in.

1915. I should tell you that Dr Chee Soon Juan and Mr Wong Hong Toy were asked to read what Kanwaljit Soin said and had no difficulty understanding it? - *(Mr Kunalen)* That may be their evidence. But from what I actually gathered on that day there was a misunderstanding.,

1916. On whose part? — *(Mr Kunalen)* Well, on the part of the representors.

1917. Which representor? - *(Mr Kunalen)* That was Dr Chee, to start off with.

1918. And to end up with who? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Then I was there and I witnessed that. So there was a misunderstanding.

1919. On your part as well? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes.

1920. What was the misunderstanding on your part? - *(Mr Kunalen)* In

terms of whether it was a total or government expenditure.

1921. When did your misunderstanding arise? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Only on that day.

1922. And when did your understanding of the Chart arise? It should be before that, right? - *(Mr Kunalen)* No, not before that day.

1923. So the first time you thought about this Chart, it was immediately a misunderstanding? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes.

1924. To have a misunderstanding means that prior to that you had an understanding of this Chart, which was subsequently shown to be inaccurate? - *(Mr Kunalen)* That is not the way I am answering the question. My answer is that the figures were different. So there was a misunderstanding. The figures were altered on 15th.

1925. No. Mr Kunalen, you said that you had a misunderstanding on the 15th? — *(Mr Kunalen)* On the 15th, yes. The reason is because when we submitted our -

1926. Would you accept that for you to have had a misunderstanding on 15th, you would have had to have, prior to that, a certain understanding of this Chart? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Only the number. I understood the number.

1927. Which number did you understand? - *(Mr Kunalen)* On the left, right at the bottom [*referring to the Chart displayed*]. On the extreme left.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

339

24 OCTOBER 1996

340

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

1928. 0.8? — (*Mr Kunalen*) That was the figure that was later changed on the 15th.

1929. Yes. What was your understanding before the 15th July of the figure "0.8"? — (*Mr Kunalen*) That it was 0.8. That's all. Purely in numerical terms.

1930. And what did it represent to you? — (*Mr Kunalen*) I only learned on the 15th.

1931. So before the 15th, you did not - ? — (*Mr Kunalen*) I only saw the figure "0.8".

1932. So before the 15th, you did not know what "0.8" stood for? — (*Mr Kunalen*) No.

1933. So you had no understanding of what "0.8" - ? — (*Mr Kunalen*) No. I had an understanding of the figure "0.8".

1934. Mr Kunalen, we all can see that the figure is 0.8? — (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes. That is what I understood. But on the 15th, a change was made during the Select Committee.

1935. Mr Kunalen, what did you understand the "0.8" to refer to? — (*Mr Kunalen*) Just "0.8".

1936. So you understood the "0.8" to refer to nothing? — (*Mr Kunalen*) As "0.8".

1937. Of what? — (*Mr Kunalen*) Of the comparison with the other countries.

1938. What was the comparison? — (*Mr Kunalen*) That Singapore's expenditure was 0.8.

1939. Singapore's health expenditure? — (*Mr Kunalen*) Well, exactly what it says there — "0.8".

1940. Total or Government health? — (*Mr Kunalen*) That was only later elaborated upon on the 15th.

1941. So you did not have any understanding of what "0.8" represented? — (*Mr Kunalen*) I understood that there was a figure "0.8" which was later changed. And after that we did this statement. There was a misunderstanding.

1942. Mr Kunalen, we all know that there is a figure "0.8". There is nothing to understand. Any child can see a figure "0.8"? — (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes. A child would also compare it to the other figures. And that is my understanding. This is "0.8" and the other figures.

1943. Yes. And a child can also see the "7", the "9" and the "13". But can I just get this confirmed: that you had no clue what the "0.8" referred to, ie, whether it referred to Government health expenditure or total health expenditure? — (*Mr Kunalen*) Well, if you don't mind, I just want to have a closer look at that.

1944. Please? — (*Mr Kunalen*) My understanding was that it was actually "0.8" compared to the other figures.

1945. You said that many times, Mr Kunalen. My question is a very clear

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

341

24 OCTOBER 1996

342

question. You had no clue what "0.8" stood for - ? - *(Mr Kunalen)* The details.

1946. Whether it was Government health expenditure or total health expenditure? - *(Mr Kunalen)* As set out there.

1947. You did not know? - *(Mr Kunalen)* As set out there, I understood the figure to be "0.8".

Chairman

1948. Mr Kunalen, I would like to warn you not to trifle with the Committee? - *(Mr Kunalen)* I am not, Mr Chairman.

1949. You are? - *(Mr Kunalen)* I am just answering the question to the best of my ability.

1950. You are avoiding a question which Mr Singh has put to you? - *(Mr Kunalen)* I have answered the question.

1951. No, you have not? - *(Mr Kunalen)* I understood the figure "0.8" in comparison to other figures.

Mr Davinder Singh My question is: did you know whether it stood for Government health expenditure or total health expenditure?

Chairman

1952. Can you answer that? - *(Mr Kunalen)* As it was stated in the -

1953. Can you answer the question? — *(Mr Kunalen)* Sorry.

1954. What did it stand for? - *(Mr Kunalen)* I cannot read the words at the bottom because of my eyesight.

Mr Davinder Singh

1955. The words are: "Singapore", "Japan", "OECD", and the "U.S.A."? - *(Mr Kunalen)* That's right. That is how I read it. Just the Chart in itself.

1956. Now, please answer the question? — *(Mr Kunalen)* Comparison of GDP % On Health Care. That is how I understood it. That is the heading.

1957. What did you understand health care to mean - Government or total? — *(Mr Kunalen)* I just understood it in terms of reading the heading of that Chart - GDP percentage.

1958. Are you telling us that you had no clue of the distinction between Government expenditure and total expenditure? — *(Mr Kunalen)* Not till after the 15th.

1959. So you had no clue before the 15th? — *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes.

1960. Right. And yet you turned up on 15th July to support the submission? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes, I did turn up on 15th July.

1961. Without any idea as to the difference between total expenditure and Government expenditure. Now, what was it on 15th July that suddenly threw light on the true meaning of "0.8"? What happened that threw light on it? - *(Mr Kunalen)* As I said, there was an

Mr Kunalen (cont.)

exchange in the Select Committee where Brigadier-General George Yeo took the representors through that Chart and then actually got Dr Chee to look at it again, and then we got to a stage where reference was made to what was said in Parliament by the Nominated MP. And she then started explaining.

1962. Yes. And so what was the explanation that struck you as being correct? - *(Mr Kunalen)* At that time what was being highlighted was a distinction between total and Government expenditure.

1963. And what did she say "0.8" was? - *(Mr Kunalen)* She was referring to, if I remember, that actually was the total - I am sorry - Government expenditure, yes.

1964. Mr Kunalen, the truth of the matter is you did not know what it stood for before and you did not know what it stood for at the hearing. So you could not have misunderstood anything? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Well, the figure was actually changed. That is my indication of misunderstanding.

1965. And if you did not misunderstand, let alone understand, the Chart, why did you affirm that there was a misunderstanding? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Because the figure was changed on the 15th.

1966. So just because the figure was changed, therefore there was a misunderstanding? — *(Mr Kunalen)* Misunderstanding, yes.

1967. But certainly not on your part because you had no clue what it stood for before you came to the hearing. So you could not have misunderstood it before the hearing. Is that right? — *(Mr Kunalen)* No. That is your interpretation.

1968. Do you agree or disagree? - *(Mr Kunalen)* I do not agree with that because I was going by the figures.

1969. Did anyone tell you that there was a misunderstanding? Did Dr Chee, Mr Kwan? - *(Mr Kunalen)* No.

1970. Mr Wong? - *(Mr Kunalen)* No. But I read it in terms of some of the exchange, that there was a misunderstanding.

1971. And it was very clear to you on 15th July that someone had a misunderstanding? — *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes.

1972. Yes. And the honourable thing to have done was to immediately concede that a mistake had been made? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Nobody put any questions to me on the 15th.

1973. I did not ask you about questions to you. But the honourable thing to have done was to concede that a mistake had been made. What do you say to that? — *(Mr Kunalen)* To concede now?

9.00 pm

1974. No? - *(Mr Kunalen)* On the 15th?

1975. Yes? - *(Mr Kunalen)* But no question was actually specifically put to me about the details of that chart.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

345

24 OCTOBER 1996

346

1976. Could you look at paragraph 368 of the Select Committee Report, at column 189?

"I think we wait [this is the Chairman speaking] for BG George Yeo to return in a few moments. He may have some other questions for you. Can I use these few moments to add that the other members of the SDP research team are not precluded from stating their views in response to any of the questions."

— (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes.

1977. So you knew and you were invited by the Chairman to state your views on any questions that were being asked by the Minister. Yes? - (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes.

1978. So whether or not questions were directed at you, you were at liberty to say that a mistake had taken place, you are sorry. Correct? - (*Mr Kunalen*) What had happened was that Dr Chee was the spokesman at that time when he was left to deal with the proceedings.

1979. You mean to say that even though it is the honourable thing to say that a mistake had occurred? - (*Mr Kunalen*) It did not occur to me to make that decision whether something was honourable or not, honestly at that time.

1980. But is it not given that the honourable thing to do is, if a mistake has taken place, to say so at the first available opportunity? - (*Mr Kunalen*) But at that time, it did not occur to me. I have no views about whether what I was doing was dishonourable. You are putting it to me.

1981. Are you saying that although Minister George Yeo had asked Dr Chee

on more than three occasions whether it was a mistake and, although Dr Chee refused to say it was a mistake, it never occurred to you to say that there was a mistake? - (*Mr Kunalen*) No. It never occurred to me.

1982. Although the word "mistake" was used more than three or four times?

— (*Mr Kunalen*) It never occurred to me.

1983. And although you said that, at that hearing, you realised it was a mistake? - (*Mr Kunalen*) I do not like to be impertinent but what I want to say is that, earlier on, I said it was only after the exchanges on the 15th that I realised that there was a misunderstanding. But it did not occur to me that what I was doing was in any way honourable or dishonourable.

1984. I thought you said that when Kanwaljit Soin explained her speech - ?
— (*Mr Kunalen*) The figure was changed, to make it more representative.

1985. That is right. So at that hearing, it occurred to you that there had been, you said, a misunderstanding? - (*Mr Kunalen*) But, in terms of whether it was a honourable or dishonourable thing to do, it never occurred to me.

1986. It never occurred to you that the honourable thing to do was to admit the mistake at the first opportunity? - (*Mr Kunalen*) No.

1987. Right. Did you ask Dr Chee thereafter why he put 0.8% in his chart?
— (*Mr Kunalen*) No.

1988. Did you ask Wong Hong Toy, Mr Kwan? - (*Mr Kunalen*) No.

Mr Davinder Singh (cont.)

1989. And you accept that, as far as they are concerned, it was also a misunderstanding? — (*Mr Kunalen*) Some of my observation of what was going on in the exchanges. That was my position.

1990. But Mr Kwan and Mr Wong did not speak in the exchanges? - (*Mr Kunalen*) No. But nobody asked me and I never asked them.

1991. So without asking them, you are quite content to share a joint defence with them to say that it was a misunderstanding on everybody's part without knowing whether it was a misunderstanding on their part. Is that not right? - (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes.

1992. I have just one last series of questions. I remember your evidence at the hearing on 12th, I think, that you did not do anything more than try to number the charts as they were, correlate the charts with the text and then to number the charts? - (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes.

1993. So what had been done was that a draft had been given to you, that draft, I think, you made copies for everybody? — (*Mr Kunalen*) No. Because the copies were given to us and taken back.

1994. Oh, so there was an earlier draft? — (*Mr Kunalen*) No. That particular draft was distributed to me and then taken back.

1995. But you had, what you called, a draft? — (*Mr Kunalen*) In my possession.

1996. That is right? - (*Mr Kunalen*) When we were renumbering, and so on, of the charts.

1997. No. We will take a step at a time. On how many occasions were you given drafts? — (*Mr Kunalen*) Only one occasion.

1998. Right? — (*Mr Kunalen*) That was the only occasion that you were referring to.

1999. So the draft was given to you by Dr Chee and then there was a discussion of that draft? — (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes. As I said in my evidence, and it is not my perfect recollection but I will try my best, what I said was that we were looking at the language, we were looking at charts and we were dealing with the best way to number the charts. That was what we were doing.

2000. And at that discussion which I think took two to three hours, was Mr Wong Hong Toy, Mr Kwan and Dr Chee there? — (*Mr Kunalen*) I cannot be sure about Kwan: In fact, I said that during my evidence. But definitely, Dr Chee was there and Mr Wong Hong Toy was there.

2001. Yes. And you looked at the text and every time a certain mention was made of the chart, you would go straight to the chart? - (*Mr Kunalen*) Yes.

2002. Right. For example, in the submission, there is a statement about declining Government expenditure as a percentage of total expenditure (Chart 1), you all would go straight to the chart. And what would you do then, when you looked at the chart? - (*Mr Kunalen*) Just

to see whether or not we should actually refer to them as tables because some were referred to as tables, others as charts to have some consistency, in terms of labelling them.

2003. Right. It was a 2-3 hour discussion. You must have spent some time? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Most of it was really looking at how medical bills were going to be compared.

2004. But when you looked at the charts, it was immediately apparent that certain figures and certain graphs were drawn in a certain manner. Is that not right? — *(Mr Kunalen)* When you said certain manner, that means in accordance with the text.

2005. Yes? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes.

2006. Mr Wong Hong Toy was present? — *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes.

2007. Mr Wong Hong Toy said that after the hearing on 15th July, he went back, looked at Chart 1 and immediately realised an error had occurred because of the plunge to 5%. If he was present at that discussion and if he were looking at the charts, including Chart 1, that would have been apparent to, would it not? - *(Mr Kunalen)* To whom?

2008. To Mr Wong? - *(Mr Kunalen)* First of all, I must make it clear here that I do not know when Mr Wong said this.

2009. You take it from me that he said it? - *(Mr Kunalen)* In today's hearing?

2010. Yes. And at the hearing on 12th August? - *(Mr Kunalen)* He never said anything to me.

2011. No. I am putting it to you that if it became apparent to him after the hearing of 15th July by looking at the chart that an error had taken place, then by looking at the chart when you were discussing it, it would have been apparent to him as well. It must follow, Mr Kunalen? - *(Mr Kunalen)* That is apparent to him?

2012. Yes? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes.

2013. It would be apparent to him? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes, as you put it.

2014. Thank you. Just a clarification on the drafts. You said you were given one draft? - *(Mr Kunalen)* What I mean by one draft is that various people were given just a copy.

2015. Yes, one copy. It was not like there was Draft A and then subsequently Draft B, Draft C? - *(Mr Kunalen)* No.

2016. And that one draft was brought by you to the hearing on the 12th where you said that you had the first draft and Minister George Yeo said, "Can we have a copy?" - *(Mr Kunalen)* Oh, yes. Let me just explain that. That which I had was not the original draft which I had with me on the 15th. That was actually what was sent in as a submission.

2017. But why did you call it the first draft? — *(Mr Kunalen)* The reason I called it the first draft was because the first one which we were discussing was one where the chart had to be relabelled.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

351

24 OCTOBER 1996

352

Mr Kunalen (cont.)

And what I had with me at the time of the Select Committee was after we had brushed up on that.

2018. No one hurried you to give an answer. And you said that you had a draft, you asked everybody whether they wanted a copy, and then in paragraph 1124, the Minister asked you for a copy of the first draft? - *(Mr Kunalen)* I actually had something in my possession. That was what I had in my possession when I looked through my file and that was exactly what was given to me by Dr Chee which later ended up as being the submission.

2019. So this was not the first draft that you discussed? - *(Mr Kunalen)* No. That was not it. Because this is something which I held with me physically when I was giving evidence on the 15th.

2020. I see. So the first draft that was discussed had the same charts, Chart 1? — *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes. They had the same charts. But they were sort of tables and charts, some were referred to as tables, others were referred to as charts.

2021. So your memory is such you remember that this plunging chart was

there at the discussion? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes. There was the plunging chart which you are referring to Chart 1.

2022. And the plunge is so striking that you remember that it was there in the first draft. Is it not right? - *(Mr Kunalen)* No. I know that there was a first chart. Being the first chart, it is easy for me to recollect, not the other charts. It is easier for me to recollect this and I noted the plunge.

2023. You did note the plunge? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Note the plunge.

2024. And you have remembered that plunge? - *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes.

Mr Davinder Singh] Thank you. That is all, Mr Chairman.

Chairman

2025. Are there any other questions from the other Members? No other questions. In that case, I will ask the Serjeant-at-Arms to escort Mr Kunalen to a waiting room and you remain there until I give instructions for you to be discharged? — *(Mr Kunalen)* Yes, I will. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

(The witness withdrew.)

Chairman] Can I ask Members if they would like to recall any of the witnesses for further examination? If there are none, I think that completes our examination. The Clerk will inform the Serjeant-at-Arms that the witnesses are discharged. The media will now vacate the room so that the Committee can continue its deliberations.

[Members of the media withdrew.]

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

1st Meeting

Tuesday, 8th October, 1996

2.15 pm

Present:

Mr Speaker (*in the Chair*)

Mr Abdullah Tarmugi

Mr Davinder Singh

Assoc. Prof. Ho Peng Kee

Prof. S. Jayakumar

Mr Low Thia Khiang

RArm Teo Chee Hean

Mr Wong Kan Seng

1. The Committee deliberated on the matter referred to them on 27th August, 1996, namely, the complaint made by the Minister for Health, BG George Yong-Boon Yeo, against four representors from the Singapore Democratic Party, namely, Mr S Kunalen, Mr Wong Hong Toy, Mr Kwan Yue Keng and Dr Chee Soon Juan, alleging contempt of Parliament by the aforesaid four persons.

2. Ordered, that the four representors from the Singapore Democratic Party, namely, Mr S Kunalen, Mr Wong Hong Toy, Mr Kwan Yue Keng and Dr Chee Soon Juan, be summoned to attend before the Committee on Thursday, 24th October, 1996 at 9.00 am.

3. Agreed, -

(a) that the evidence of the four representors from the Singapore Democratic Party be taken on oath;

- (b) that at proceedings of the Committee (other than the deliberations of the Committee), admission of strangers for the purpose of television and other media coverage be allowed; and
- (c) that the Committee do meet again at 9.00 am on Thursday, 24th October, 1996.

Adjourned till 9.00 am on
Thursday, 24th October, 1996.

2nd Meeting

Thursday, 24th October, 1996

9.00 am

Present:

Mr Speaker (*in the Chair*)

Mr Abdullah Tarmugi

Mr Davinder Singh

Assoc. Prof. Ho Peng Kee

Prof. S. Jayakumar

Mr Low Thia Khiang

RAdm Teo Chee Hean

Mr Wong Kan Seng.

1. The Committee deliberated on the matter referred to them on 27th August. 1996, namely, the complaint made by the Minister for Health, BG George Yong-Boon Yeo, against four representors from the Singapore Democratic Party, namely, Mr S Kunalen, Mr Wong Hong Toy, Mr Kwan Yue Keng and Dr Chee Soon Juan, alleging contempt of Parliament by the aforesaid four persons.

2. *Agreed* that the evidence of the four representors of the Singapore Democratic Party be examined one at a time.

3. Dr Chee Soon Juan was examined on affirmation.

4. Mr Wong Hong Toy was examined on affirmation.

5. Mr Kwan Yue Keng was examined on affirmation.

6. Mr S Kunalen was examined on affirmation.

7. The Committee further deliberated.

Adjourned to a date to be fixed.

3rd Meeting

Monday, 18th November, 1996

9.00 am

Present:

Mr Speaker (*in the Chair*)

Mr Abdullah Tarmugi

Mr Davinder Singh

Prof. S. Jayakumar

Mr Low Thia Kiang

RAdm Teo Chee Hean

Mr Wong Kan Seng

Absent:

Assoc. Prof Ho Peng Kee.

1. The Committee deliberated.

Report

2. The Chairman's draft report brought up and read the first time.
3. Resolved, "That the Chairman's report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph."

Paragraphs 1 to 27 inclusive read and agreed to.

Paragraph 28 read:

"Dr Chee has testified that the reference to "the 1990s" should be "1990" and that this was another typographical error. He did not make that claim either on 15 July 1996 or 12 August 1996, but only on 24 October 1996. It seemed to the Committee that it was more an afterthought on Dr Chee's part than anything else. The Committee are satisfied, for the following reasons, that it could not have been a typographical error."

Amendment proposed, in line 4, after "else.", to insert "However, the Committee noted that Dr Chee was not asked to clarify the issue either on 15 July 1996 or on 12 August 1996." - (Mr Low Thia Khiang).

Amendment negatived.

Paragraph 28 agreed to.

Paragraphs 29 to 45 inclusive read and agreed to.

Paragraph 46 read:

"The only possible explanation for the fact that Figure 3 in *Dare to Change* had the figure 5% for 1990, when the text talks about the 1990s, is that Dr Chee was the chartist himself. The Committee are satisfied that no one other than Dr Chee could have plotted the point for 1990 in Figure 3 in the way it was plotted."

Amendment proposed, in line 3, after "himself.", to insert "unless the chartist whom Dr Chee mentioned was only given the figures for the years 1970, 1989, 1990s and not the text itself". - (Mr Low Thia Khiang).

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Paragraph 46 agreed to.

Paragraph 101 read:

"The Committee are of the view, having heard his evidence and observed his demeanour, that Dr Chee knew that he had combined the Government expenditure figure for Singapore with the national expenditure figures for Japan, USA and OECD, to make the comparison look worse for Singapore. The Committee also find that Dr Chee lied in his attempt to explain away the falsehoods in Statement 2 and Chart 3 when he gave evidence on this issue on 15 July 1996 to the Select Committee and on 24 October 1996 to the Committee, when he claimed that there was a "misunderstanding of the figures".

Amendment proposed, in line 4, after "Singapore.", to insert "The Committee noted that if the correct figure was used for the chart, it would have been also shown that Singapore's national health expenditure was substantially lower compared to other countries on the chart. It was therefore no need for Dr Chee to use an incorrect figure to serve that purpose." - (Mr Low Thia Khiang).

Amendment negatived.

Paragraph 101 agreed to.

Paragraphs 102 to 138 inclusive read and agreed to.

Paragraph 139 read:

"RECOMMENDATIONS"

In the circumstances, the Committee recommend that:

- (1) Parliament impose on Dr Chee Soon Juan a fine of \$25,000;
- (2) Parliament impose on Mr Wong Hong Toy a fine of \$13,000;
- (3) Parliament impose on Mr S Kunalen a fine of \$8,000; and
- (4) Parliament impose on Mr Kwan Yue Keng a fine of \$5,000".
 - (i) Amendment proposed, in line 3, to delete "\$25,000" and insert "\$5,000".
- (Mr Low Thia Khiang).
Amendment negated.
 - (ii) Another amendment proposed, in line 4, to delete "\$13,000" and insert "\$2,500". - (Mr Low Thia Khiang).
Amendment negated.
 - (iii) Another amendment proposed, in line 5, to delete "\$8,000" and insert "\$1,000". - (Mr Low Thia Khiang).
Amendment negated.
 - (iv) Another amendment proposed, in line 6, after "(4)", to delete "Parliament impose on Mr Kwan Yue Keng a fine of \$5,000" and insert "Mr Kwan Yue Keng be reprimanded at the Bar of the House by the Speaker". - (Mr Low Thia Khiang).
Amendment negated.

Paragraph 139 agreed to.

4. The Committee further deliberated.
5. Resolved, "That this report be the Report of the Committee to Parliament."
6. Agreed that the Chairman do present the Report to Parliament when printed copies thereof are available for distribution to Members of Parliament.

Adjourned *sine die*.