



# DEBATES

## SESSION OF 1942.

### CONTENTS:

	PAGES
Supplementary Estimates, 1942-43 ... ..	2547-85
(Ceylon Government Representative in India ... ..)	2547, 2548-84)
Amendment of Standing Orders ... ..	2585
Rent Restriction Bill ... ..	2585
War Prisoners Food and Clothing (Exemption from Customs Duty) Bill ... ..	2586
Lands Resumption (Amendment) Bill ... ..	2587
War Damage (Immovable Property) Bill ... ..	2587
Thoroughfares (Amendment) Bill ... ..	2587
Private Members' Motions ... ..	2587

PRINTED BY ORDER OF THE GOVERNMENT OF CEYLON

AT THE

CEYLON GOVERNMENT PRESS, COLOMBO.

*"Copy" received : February 25, 1943.*

*Proof sent : March 9, 1943.*

*Proof returned : March 16, 1943.*

*Published : March 29, 1943.*

# STATE COUNCIL OF CEYLON.

Friday, November 20, 1942.

The Council met at 10 a.m., MR. SPEAKER [THE HON. SIR WAITIALINGAM DURAISWAMY] in the Chair.

## SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1942-43.

Pursuant to order, the Council resolved itself into a Committee of the whole House further to consider in detail the following Supplementary Estimates presented for the approval of the Council [November 19]:

(Chief Secretary.)

### †(1) Supplementary Estimate, 1942-43.

Head 5, Chief Secretary.  
New Sub-head 14, Expenses of Ceylon Government Representative in India.  
Amount: Rs. 52,295.

### (2) Supplementary Estimate, 1942-43.

Head 6, Civil Service.  
Sub-head 1, Personal Emoluments.  
Amount: Rs. 10 (token vote).  
Nature of Service: To obtain authority to meet from savings the acting salaries of officers in Class II. of the C.C.S. acting in posts classified as Class I. posts in the amended Civil Service Minute.

*Observations of the Chief Secretary.*

Clause I. of the Civil Service Minute provides for twenty-one Class I. appointments, i.e., for 8 officers in Grade I. and 13 officers in Grade II. Clause 6 however contains a list of only eighteen posts to be normally filled by Class I. officers. This is because the three posts of District Judge, Jaffna; District Judge, Galle; and Postmaster-General, have been deleted with the authority of the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

2. The Secretary of State has now approved the replacement of these three deletions by the three following posts:—

Commissioner for Development of Agricultural Marketing.

Public Trustee.

Secretary to the Governor.

The combined post of Registrar-General and Director of Commercial Intelligence

[Note.—An asterisk (\*) against the name of a Member indicates that his remarks have not been revised by him.]

† For the Observations of the Financial Secretary and the report of the Board of Ministers, see HANSARD of November 19, 1942.

which was in Class I. of the Civil Service has been divided into the two posts of Registrar-General and Director of Commercial Intelligence, the former remaining in Class I. of the Civil Service while the latter has been removed entirely outside the Civil Service.

3. The new list of Class I. posts is therefore as follows:—

Land Commissioner.

Government Agent—

Western Province.

Central Province.

Southern Province.

Northern Province.

Eastern Province.

North-Western Province.

North-Central Province.

Province of Uva.

Province of Sabaragamuwa.

Principal Collector of Customs.

Registrar-General.

Settlement Officer.

Excise Commissioner.

Controller of Labour.

Commissioner of Local Government.

Registrar, Co-operative Credit Societies.

Deputy Financial Secretary.

Commissioner for Development of Agricultural Marketing.

Public Trustee.

Secretary to the Governor.

4. It has been the practice in the past to treat the postings of Class I. Civil Servants to special duties of more than ephemeral duration as secondments creating vacancies to be filled substantively by promotion from Class II. The large number of special war postings has compelled a reconsideration of this practice, and it has now been decided that postings of this type should only be treated as creating vacancies which can be filled substantively in the case of such special postings as by their permanence require a transfer of the appointee outside the Civil Service. All other temporary posting will be treated as creating vacancies which can be filled on an acting basis only and provide no room for substantive promotions.

5. Though provision is made under Head 6 in the current year's estimates for the full 21 posts exclusive of 3 special postings, the posts mentioned in paragraph 2 are shown under their respective heads as held by Class II. officers. A token Supplementary Estimate is therefore necessary to enable acting pay to be

paid in respect of these posts in accordance with the Financial Regulations.

*Observations of the Financial Secretary.*

The Financial Secretary concurs.

*Report of the Board of Ministers.*

The financial implications are as explained in the Observations of the Chief Secretary. The Board of Ministers approves.

**(Financial Secretary.)**

**(3) Supplementary Estimate, 1942-43.**

Head 3, State Council.

Sub-head 3, Travelling.

Amount: Rs. 36,000.

Nature of Service: Payment of allowances to State Councillors for Colombo travelling on account of the temporary withdrawal of trucking of motor cars.

*Observations of the Financial Secretary.*

On account of the temporary withdrawal of trucking facilities for motor cars on the Railway, outstation Members of the State Council who have to attend meetings of Executive Committees, Standing Committees and of the State Council are unable to bring their cars to Colombo by rail for their travelling whilst in Colombo. It is proposed that all Members who have been affected by the temporary withdrawal of the concession should be paid on application an allowance of Rs. 75 a month from the date of withdrawal of the concession till wagons are again made available for trucking cars. It is estimated that a sum of Rs. 36,000 will be necessary for this purpose in 1942-43 if trucking facilities are not available for the rest of the year.

*Report of the Board of Ministers.*

The financial implications are as explained in the Observations of the Financial Secretary. The Board of Ministers approves.

**(Agriculture & Lands.)**

**(4) Supplementary Estimate, 1942-43.**

Head 63, Land Commissioner.

Sub-head: 8, Expenses in connection with the working of the Debt Conciliation Ordinance.

Amount: Rs. 2,136.

Nature of Service: Payment of remuneration to the part-time Secretary and the Stenographer-Clerk of the Debt Conciliation Board.

*Observations of the Minister of Agriculture and Lands.*

The Secretarial functions and the clerical work of the Debt Conciliation Board were hitherto performed by two officers of the Land Commissioner's Department. As these arrangements are no longer possible it has been decided to give the Board a separate staff consisting of a part-time Secretary and a Stenographer-Clerk. In view of this decision a supplementary provision of Rs. 2,136, as indicated below, is necessary.

*Details.*

	Rs.
(1) Remuneration to part-time Secretary at Rs. 250 per mensem ...	3,000
(2) Remuneration to Stenographer-Clerk at Rs. 78 per mensem ...	936
	3,936
Deduct the allowances provided to part-time Secretary and to Clerk in the Estimates for 1942-43 under Head 63, Sub-head 8 ...	1,800
	2,136

*Observations of the Financial Secretary.*

The Financial Secretary concurs.

*Report of the Board of Ministers.*

The financial implications are as explained in the Observations of the Minister of Agriculture and Lands. The Board of Ministers approves.

*In Committee—*

MR. SPEAKER presided as Chairman.

**(1) Ceylon Government Representative in India.**

Consideration of the following Supplementary Estimate, 1942-43, was resumed:

Head 5, Chief Secretary.

New Sub-head: 14, Expenses of Ceylon Government Representative in India.

Amount: Rs. 52,295.

**Mr. G. A. H. Wille (Nominated Member):** Sir, I would like to say a few words to explain why I do not intend to vote in favour of this resolution.

I feel very strongly that it would be very much better for this country as well as for Sir Baron Jayatilaka's own sake that he should remain in Ceylon rather than be in India. We are told that his main business will be to promote good feeling between Indians and Ceylonese, amongst other problems that will arise, and that he may have to tackle the rice problem or that of food supplies generally is mentioned incidentally.

Now, as to the main task that is to be assigned to Sir Baron Jayatilaka, I think I shall have to resort to a classical analogy to describe it adequately, and call it a Sisyphean task. Members will remember, Sir, how Sisyphus, King of Corinth, was doomed in Hades to push a stone up a hill; and as soon as the stone reached the top, down it came, so that he was confined to everlasting labour.

**Mr. B. H. Aluwihare (Matale):** That is the point.

**Mr. Wille:** It is all very well to expect Sir Baron Jayatilaka to push up the stone of Ceylon's goodwill towards India, but we know that whatever he does in India, the next day the stone will be rolled down here. I wish to know what control he will have over the attitude that will be taken up in Ceylon in regard to Indo-Ceylon matters. For instance, we have had even Members of the Board of Ministers sometimes speaking in a very truculent tone with regard to Indians.

I do not know what really Sir Baron Jayatilaka is expected to do in the face of these circumstances. Of course, everybody in favour of the proposal seems to rely on his personal prestige. To me that seems in the circumstances a broken reed. We know that we had a very distinguished deputation from India here. There was Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai accompanied by the Dewan of Mysore and a well known retired Advocate-General. Now, Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai is a man of even higher stature than Sir Baron Jayatilaka. He is a Knight Commander of the Order of

the British Empire, besides being a Commander of the Order of the Indian Empire. He is one who is chosen as a member of Imperial Conferences and even International Conferences. Now will anybody frankly say that because of his prestige, if he urges a certain view here, if he is appointed Agent in Ceylon, his view will be readily accepted? What effect will even Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai have on the adamant heart of, say, the Minister of Local Administration?

Sir Baron Jayatilaka went to India on a very short visit and he gave us a report, and I think he has done all that could be expected of him. So that it is not necessary that we should send him again on an errand on which he will not be successful.

What are we told in that report? That he went over first to Madras and there arranged for a new scheme for the taking over of stocks and their transport to Ceylon. And he found such good feeling amongst the authorities there that he went on to say:

"Ceylon has reason to be very grateful to the Governor of Madras and his Advisers for the action they have taken in regard to our supplies from that Presidency."

Then, he went over to Delhi, and there he assures us that the Commerce Member told him that there was no question of ill-feeling against Ceylon, that the difficulty was India's own trouble with regard to food supplies. India, I think, used to obtain over 1,000,000 bushels of rice from Burma. That supply has ceased. So the Commerce Member gave him the assurance that the deficit in the supply to Ceylon was not due to any unwillingness on India's part to provide the agreed quantity, but to shortage of stocks in India coupled with other commitments.

Sir, the Commerce Member went on to say that he would not only assure us of 20,000 tons a month at least, but that he would also assist, as far as possible, by releasing for Ceylon a portion of any surplus that might become available. Sir Baron Jayatilaka winds up by saying:

From His Excellency the Viceroy I received full consideration of the needs of Ceylon. To

[Mr. Wille.]

their Excellencies the Governor of Madras, Bengal, Orissa and Bombay, we owe a debt of gratitude for their sympathetic attention to our needs. The Ministers of the Central Government, and the Ministers and Advisers of the Provincial Governments were always ready to examine our difficulties with very great care, and with a sincere desire to help."

So, Sir, what room is there for Sir Baron Jayatilaka to go again.

We are of course told that questions might suddenly arise. I wish to know whether, if questions suddenly arise and Sir Baron Jayatilaka takes up a certain attitude, what he does or what he says will be readily endorsed here. You see the complications that will be created both for him and the Ceylon Government if Sir Baron Jayatilaka's words and acts are not endorsed here very cordially.

Now, Sir Baron Jayatilaka did one specific thing when he went on his visit, and that is, he suggested to the Government here the necessity of establishing a well-organized Department in the matter of food supplies. That has been done, and we have that Department presided over by Mr. Vaithianathan, a *persona grata* to Indians as well as to ourselves. I think where racial feelings are concerned, a man like Mr. Vaithianathan is likely to be more successful than even Sir Baron Jayatilaka, however eminent Sir Baron may be in respect of his qualities in general.

Not only is Mr. Vaithianathan by his personality and by his race likely to be more successful than Sir Baron Jayatilaka, but he has organized a Department which will be quite sufficient to give effect to what Sir Baron Jayatilaka himself has done. Sir Baron Jayatilaka has, so to speak, laid the foundation, a very good foundation, and it remains only for Mr. Vaithianathan to build on that foundation. I have no doubt whatsoever that Mr. Vaithianathan will be very successful, if any emissary from here can be successful in a matter of this kind.

If we want somebody, besides the Head of the Supplies Department, to see to our supplies, perhaps it will be more advisable to select a man like Mr. Mamujee. I just mention him because he is an Indian and he is also one well known to Ceylonese and in sympathy

with Ceylonese. I say a man like that is more likely to be successful than a man going from Ceylon, especially a Sinhalese.

I wish to ask a further question. Whatever Sir Baron Jayatilaka may say, however persuasive may be his words, do you think the Indians will dissociate him from Ceylonese, especially the Sinhalese? The feeling in India seems to be that the dominant part of the population here are responsible for anti-Indian measures, and whatever Sir Baron Jayatilaka—

**The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake (Minister of Agriculture & Lands):** I would like to know what authority the hon. Member has for saying that the Sinhalese are responsible for anti-Indian measures. He started by saying that there is good feeling with the Sinhalese, and in the next sentence he says there is anti-Sinhalese feeling in India. He is definitely making the statement that the Sinhalese are the people who are responsible for creating anti-Indian feeling if any such feeling does exist. I should like him to substantiate that statement.

**Mr. G. G. Ponnambalam (Point Pedro):** What is this? Is it a personal explanation?

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** It is not a personal explanation. It is a point of order. I do not know when my hon. Friend became Speaker.

**Mr. Ponnambalam:** On a point of order. Is the Hon. Minister in order?

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** When I have risen to a point of order the hon. Member cannot also rise to a point of order.

**The Chairman:** Let the Hon. Minister continue.

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** I say that the remarks of the hon. Nominated Member (Mr. Wille) are improper and out of order. By his remarks my hon. Friend is casting a sort of slur on the people of Ceylon.

**Mr. Ponnambalam:** Is that a point of order?

**The Chairman:** Order, please. The hon. Nominated Member (Mr. Wille) will please continue his speech.

**Mr. Wille:** I am saying what the Indian attitude is. I do not know whether they are right or wrong in that attitude. I am speaking of the improbability of Sir Baron's success in his mission.

Will the Indians dissociate Sir Baron from the Sinhalese who, rightly or wrongly, have been charged with bringing in anti-Indian measures? I am not taking up that attitude myself. I do not want to go into questions that are not relevant at the moment.

**The Hon. Mr. G. E. de Silva (Minister of Health):** But you are creating racial animus.

**Mr. Wille:** Is it not a fact that the Indians are charging the Sinhalese with having anti-Indian feelings?

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** No. They charge the Ceylonese with it.

**Mr. Aluwihare:** Are you going to deny the fact that the Sinhala Maha Sabha raised the cry "Ceylon for the Sinhalese"?

**The Hon. Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike (Minister of Local Administration):** I have never done that. It is a false statement. It is thoroughly inaccurate and false, probably deliberately false—

**The Chairman:** Order. The Hon. Minister must withdraw that remark. He should not have said that it was deliberately false. Furthermore, that interruption was uncalled for.

**The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike:** That interruption was necessary.

**The Chairman:** The Hon. Minister should withdraw that statement. He should have put it in milder form.

**The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike:** I can put it mildly but with the same meaning.

**Mr. Wille:** A little while ago, before the Hon. Minister of Local Administration came here, I referred to his adamant heart. You will now see how adamant his heart is—[*Interruption.*]

**The Chairman:** I think I will have to take some steps if conversations of this kind are carried on across the Floor of

this House. I would appeal to hon. Ministers and others not to interrupt Members when they speak to a motion.

**Mr. Wille:** I do not mind those interruptions, Sir.

Well, that is the Indian attitude. The Indians are charging, I will say, the Ceylonese with anti-Indian feelings. I need not specify against which section of the Ceylonese they make that charge. My point is this, that they will not dissociate Sir Baron from the Ceylonese in general who are adopting anti-Indian measures. They will perhaps regard Sir Baron in the light of that famous definition of a diplomat, as an honest man sent abroad to lie for his country. That will be the effect of all that Sir Baron may do.

I am afraid the thread of my arguments has been broken by the unwarranted interruptions a while ago.

As I said, for Sir Baron's own sake—I have the greatest respect for him—I should like to see him here. Want of confidence in Sir Baron has been shown in some of the speeches made.

**Mr. S. Abeywickrama (Udugama):** Then, why do you want him?

**Mr. Wille:** I am not in sympathy with what has been said of him, although I am not in support of the motion. Sir Baron has been condemned because of age. The British Prime Minister, who is the most hard-worked man in the world to-day and with an incomparable burden to carry is only six years younger than Sir Baron. I therefore do not see the reason why age should necessarily be a disqualification.

**Mr. Ponnambalam:** That is the hon. Member's disqualification also.

**Mr. Wille:** Old age can always stand on its merits, however vociferous the young may be.

**The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike:** Old age cannot stand.

**Mr. Wille:** Sir Baron is also suspected by some of being too moderate a man to represent Ceylon in this matter. His sanity and moderation will be against him. I do not know whether he is going to enhance his prestige by going

[Mr. Wille.]

to India on this very delicate mission. And when important questions suddenly arise, is Sir Baron going to act on his own, or is he going to consult the Ministers here before taking any action on them? What will Sir Baron do in India when emergencies arise? The matter that will primarily receive his consideration will be the unsatisfactory relations between Indians and Ceylonese. The question of food supplies seems to be an incidental matter.

Then, there is the question of cost. You will see what a large sum of money is to be appropriated for this very doubtful mission; and it is not going to end here. We know from what we have heard—and we can infer from the inherent nature of this organization—that it will be very prolific of expensive off-shoots. We shall have interpreters added to the staff, and we shall also have further secretaries added to the establishment.

If Sir Baron is really going to influence the minds of the masses all over India from Delhi, he might remain in Ceylon, which is very much nearer Madras than is Delhi, and influence the minds of the people of Madras, which is much more important to Ceylon from the point of view of food supplies than any other part of India. If he is here he can use the radio, the Press and the platform to assuage Indian feelings generally.

I do not think that this mission is going to be a success at all. I say that at the present time Sir Baron is required more in Ceylon than in India, and that sufficient reasons have not been afforded us for supporting this new departure.

**Mr. H. R. Freeman (Anuradhapura) :**

What I would like to know is who first started this idea? Did India or did Sir Baron himself when he was there? Speeches of Sir Baron were reported in the Press here contradicting alleged ill-feeling in Ceylon against Indians. But everybody here knows that HANSARD is full of bias against Indians amongst others. It has been so for several years. It was the fashion amongst patriotic, nationalist politicians. But do those expressions in HANSARD reflect opinion outside? I do not think they do.

In an evening paper yesterday, the following question is asked: when his

colleagues and camp followers went about denouncing Indians and creating alarm and despondency in Indian breasts, did Sir Baron by word or deed help to correct this? He certainly did not, though a Correction Slip does appear in HANSARD about one of his own speeches: July, 15, 1941.

Coming to the future, it seems to me that two types of mind are needed for this job in India: one mind is needed for the food affair, the mind of a grocer; the other is the mind of a diplomat. The grocer's mind will be represented by Public Servants who have understanding of food matters, and as for the diplomat, to my mind there is no doubt that Sir Baron would represent Indo-Ceylon matters in India better than the biased speeches here.

**Diwan Bahadur I. X. Pereira (Nominated Member) :** I do not wish to give a silent vote on this proposal. Any arrangement that will facilitate the early removal of misunderstandings between neighbouring countries ought to be welcomed; and any arrangement between two countries so intimately connected, geographically, culturally and economically as India and Ceylon is particularly welcome.

It has been my privilege to have worked with the Hon. Leader in the Legislature of this country for the last 18 years. I have no hesitation in endorsing fully all the high encomiums lavished on him by the Hon. the Chief Secretary when he introduced this money vote last afternoon.

Criticisms have been offered by several hon. Members as to the suitability of the person for this high office, the high salary and other expenses. No one can question the yeoman services which the Hon. Leader has rendered to this country. I think the severance from active, public leadership and from the field of labours which he has loved and served so well throughout a lifetime can never be properly compensated, and if the presence of an ambassador of such high personal status can achieve the object contemplated, the expenses involved, I say, should be considered negligible. But I have very grave misgivings about any substantial achievement.

I have the greatest regard for the Hon. Leader, and his failure to achieve fruitful



results will be due, not to any lack of capacity on his part, but to the absence of conditions necessary to cultivate a friendly and cordial relationship between these two estranged countries.

The hon. Member for Colombo South (Dr. de Zoysa) referred yesterday to the powers of diplomacy on the part of the Hon. Leader. Diplomacy, as is commonly understood, implying polite simulations, may help in preserving a precarious peace between countries which are really at heart afraid of the armed might of each other. But happily Ceylon and India are not in that unenviable position. The good relationship that should exist between two peace-loving countries like India and Ceylon can only be based on true, genuine, incere goodwill, on the solid foundation of real understanding. It is most unfortunate that the basis for goodwill and good understanding is lacking at the moment.

The history, the record of the past dozen years in Ceylon is strewn with incidents and measures that have been an ever-increasing cause of strain between the two countries. It gives me no pleasure to refer to this sad record. It has been to me the most painful part in my life as a Member of this House. These problems which have arisen relate to the sons and daughters of India who have settled down in this Island and who have contributed so much to the welfare of Ceylon. Cultural links and connexions of a similar kind can be the cementing factors. But the foundation for real goodwill, for lasting goodwill, must be the actual treatment which the people of one country receive at the hands of the people of another. Judged by this test, which I consider the most essential—the only correct and the vital test, if I may say so—the picture is gloomy, very gloomy indeed.

Sir Baron has met the difficulties created by this recent history by flatly denying the existence of any discrimination against Indians. I have been staggered by this simple argument of Sir Baron. Such a statement is unbecoming of a Leader of such high repute and eminence.

**Mr. Aluwihare:** In fairness to Sir Baron, I would like to remind the hon. Member that in his speeches he said

that there was no discriminatory legislation. We would all be very interested to see the hon. Member point out the discriminatory legislation as against Indians.

**Diwan Bahadur I. X. Pereira:** The previous speaker (Mr. Freeman) has asked the House to refer to the pages of HANSARD, and I would ask the hon. Member to be so good as to do so.

**Mr. Aluwihare:** That is not legislation.

**Diwan Bahadur I. X. Pereira:** No amount of legislation which is purely discriminatory—

**Mr. Aluwihare:** Point to one.

**Diwan Bahadur I. X. Pereira:** It serves no purpose at this stage to narrate—

**Mr. Aluwihare:** Nothing.

**Diwan Bahadur I. X. Pereira:** The several—

**Mr. Aluwihare:** Give us one instance.

**Diwan Bahadur I. X. Pereira:** The hon. Member will have an opportunity to speak, and if he thinks that he has not been a party to these discriminatory measures, I trust that he will be good enough to give up his claim to be the Gandhi-sami of Matale.

I said that the Hon. Leader of the House has made use of a very simple argument, by flatly denying the existence of any discrimination. If there is one person in this country who knows all about the Indo-Ceylon problem, it is the Hon. Leader.

The hon. Member for Matale (Mr. Aluwihare) was very persistent in asking for a single illustration of discrimination. Take the Village Communities Ordinance. It is true that on paper they have cleverly removed all idea of discrimination. But was it not the Hon. Leader who once proclaimed that although it is true that the Sinhalese labourers who were resident on estates are deprived of the vote under the Village Communities Ordinance, they will actually and truly get the right of voting in their respective villages? Does that not amount to discrimination?

**Mr. Aluwihare:** How?

**The Hon. Mr. C. W. W. Kannangara (Minister of Education):** It is a very peculiar kind of argument.

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** What is it?

**Diwan Bahadur I. X. Pereira:** That is the only inference I or any reasonable person can draw. Either the hon. Member or the Hon. Leader or the Board of Ministers, which he represents, sees nothing wrong in the many discriminations that are enforced to-day in Ceylon.

**Mr. Wille:** May I rise to a point of order? Is it relevant to refer to the Indian grievances?

**Mr. R. C. Kannangara (Morawaka):** You started it.

**Mr. Wille:** I merely referred to the Indian feeling. I did not start it at all.

**Mr. Ponnambalam:** You cannot raise a point of order now.

**The Chairman:** The hon. Member for Point Pedro (Mr. Ponnambalam) interrupts every speaker. I am very sorry about that. The hon. Burgher Nominated Member (Mr. Wille) has risen to a point of order. I want to know what the point is.

**Mr. Wille:** I want to submit that you may refer to the feelings of Indians with regard to their grievances merely alleged or true. That feeling may be correct or incorrect. You cannot discuss Indian grievances in connexion with this Estimate.

**The Chairman:** I should think so. I hope the hon. Member will not touch on the Indian grievances.

**Diwan Bahadur I. X. Pereira:** The hon. Burgher Nominated Member is impatient. But for him—

**The Chairman:** It is better not to go into these details.

**Diwan Bahadur I. X. Pereira:** I know that it is unpleasant. In deference to you, Sir, I will not dwell any more on that aspect of the matter.

But I would like to impress on this House that while it is good to send an ambassador to India, it is useless sending anyone without at the same time

removing the causes of irritation between the two countries.

India, or for a matter of that, any country in the world, can never tolerate its sons and daughters being used as mere creatures of convenience, to be used when needed and ignored and pushed out when not needed.

Once it was said that Indians with permanent settlement in Ceylon would be welcome. But now it is the avowed policy of the Board of Ministers to discourage permanent settlement of Indians. If during a period of war Indians in Ceylon do not feel assured that they will receive fair and equal treatment in Ceylon, it is natural, in times of stress, that they will be anxious to return to their motherland.

It has been painful to me to notice that in recent years the contributions made by millions of humble Indians to the prosperity of this country have been belittled, nay even described as something harmful or despicable merely because these poor Indian labourers—

**The Chairman:** Is it necessary to go into all these questions? General remarks may be made.

**Mr. Aluwihare:** It is best that the problem be fully stated.

**Mr. Ponnambalam:** May I be permitted to ask a question?

**The Chairman:** Yes.

**Mr. Ponnambalam:** In view of the remarks of the Hon. the Chief Secretary, that outstanding questions between the Indian Government and Ceylon require a speedy settlement, do you rule out reference to these outstanding questions?

**The Chairman:** The hon. Member refers in detail to these outstanding questions. I only want a general comment on these questions. The gentleman who goes as the representative will go into all these outstanding questions.

**Mr. Ponnambalam:** We will have to deal with this question. The hon. Member for Matale (Mr. Aluwihare) has challenged the Indian Nominated Member (Diwan Bahadur I. X. Pereira) to quote a single instance of discrimination.

**Diwan Bahadur I. X. Pereira:** It may be unpleasant to hear the honest truth. Truth is sometimes very unpalatable to certain people. But as I mentioned earlier it is not pleasant for me too to get on my feet and narrate these sad instances.

What I would urge on the House is that it is useless sending anyone to India unless simultaneously an honest endeavour is made to remove the causes that have led to this unfortunate deadlock. I can tell the House that one simple friendly gesture just now will work wonders, and it will be better than sending missions to India. But I see no change of heart on the part of the Board of Ministers.

**The Hon. Mr. G. E. de Silva:** Question!

**Diwan Bahadur I. X. Pereira:** Well, there is always a silver lining to the darkest cloud. The new Minister who has joined the Board may be able to convert the others. I am always optimistic, and I do believe that the Hon. Minister of Health will succeed where others have failed, in converting his colleagues on the Board. I would bring the fact to the notice of the Hon. Minister that world-events are daily bringing more and more to the forefront the natural and traditional ties between the two countries, India and Ceylon, and their utter dependence on each other, making clear to both of them the urgent need for taking stock of the present situation and rectifying past mistakes.

When I was interrupted I was referring, Sir, to the part played by the Indian labourers and how attempts were made to belittle their contribution. There were a number of Ministers who went about the country giving expression to disquieting views, and it is very consoling to see the very same Ministers who gave expression to such views now striving very hard to help the war effort; I do hope some honourable amends will be made to these humble workers who are in services now declared to be essential for war purposes. I, as an Indian, feel proud that many thousands of Indians in Ceylon are participating in the production of tea and rubber which is so vital for this war.

**Mr. Abeywickrama:** What about Indians in India? Are they also helping the war effort?

**Diwan Bahadur I. X. Pereira:** I wish hon. Members will not interrupt me.

I hope some appreciation will be shown of the contribution of these workers no matter how humble they may be, and that what they have done and are still doing in spite of very little material benefit to themselves will be gratefully remembered.

I do strongly submit, Sir, that while it is good to send responsible representatives of Lanka to India, all the effort and all the expense will prove futile so long as India is made to feel that the men and women of India are subjected in Ceylon to discriminatory legal and administrative measures. It will serve no purpose to call Indians in Ceylon who complain mischief-makers. You cannot delude India, and you cannot delude the Indian public, although India is magnanimous and is generously prepared to come to the assistance of Ceylon at a time of need without imposing any conditions, by supplying food and clothing which are needed by the inhabitants here. I fear the proposed mission will only embarrass the venerable Leader of the House.

I am prepared to support this vote if immediate steps are taken to remove all the grounds of bitterness between the two countries, and if I do object to this vote, it is only because I do not see signs anywhere for the success of this mission.

**The Hon. Mr. G. E. de Silva:** Sir, I should like to say a few words with regard to this vote which is before the House. There is no question that even among members of a family there are differences of opinion, differences of feeling sometimes, and sometimes you find those differences leading to disastrous results.

Now, assuming that the Indians in Ceylon have a grievance, is it not the most reasonable thing under the sun to do something to remove all those misunderstandings and bring India and Ceylon together? Is there one man in this country who says that Sir Baron Jayatilaka has carried on any kind of anti-Indian propaganda personally? I have yet to know, Sir, that he has done anything of the kind during the time that I have been in contact with him. If you ask me, there are differences, and those differences can be reconciled, but

[The Hon. Mr. G. E. de Silva.] every time an attempt is made, subversive methods are adopted and no chance given for matters to be discussed and settled.

As we all know, if a slight wound is left unattended, gangrene will set in.

**The Hon. Colonel J. L. Kotalawala (Minister of Communications & Works):** Amputate!

**The Hon. Mr. G. E. de Silva:** I ask hon. Members of this House to realize the harm that is being done, not only to this country, but also to India as a result of their taking up a perverse attitude and not considering the far-reaching effect of the mission that we intend to send and carry on.

Sir, hon. Members know that I am not a communalist. The one thing that makes me see red is communalism. I want everybody living in this country to feel that so long as they are here they should take an abiding interest in the welfare of the people of this country. It is very easy for rich people now, whether they be Indians or Ceylonese, to get up and say, "I am pro-Indian. I am now doing everything I can to heal these differences". But hon. Members know my career—what I did to liberate the Indian labourer when all the other people were amassing wealth, seated in their chairs. With Sir Ponnambalam Arunachalam, the one man who fought for abolition of penal legislation in the years 1920 and 1941 was myself, and I incurred the displeasure of all the other people.

**Mr. Ponnambalam:** Then send George!

**The Hon. Mr. G. E. de Silva:** I want hon. Members to listen to me. I am not going to say anything further on that point than that, from the very beginning I have fought for bringing in the Indians and giving them equal status in this country. Everywhere, as I said, even in family circles, even among relations there are differences, but why should we accentuate these differences?

I want hon. Members to bear in mind what I have done within the last three months. When the question of sending Sir Baron Jayatilaka to India came up

for discussion on the Floor of this House in September last, there was a full-dress debate on that Supplementary Estimate.

**Mr. Ponnambalam:** No. That was after he went.

**The Hon. Mr. G. E. de Silva:** No, Sir; a Supplementary Estimate was passed.

**Mr. Ponnambalam:** That was after he had gone.

**The Hon. Mr. G. E. de Silva:** The Supplementary Estimate was passed in September this year.

**Mr. Ponnambalam:** After the horse had bolted!

**The Hon. Mr. G. E. de Silva:** When Sir Baron was in India, events took such a turn that the Board of Ministers wanted to find out what was actually happening, and he was asked to come to Ceylon. He came to Ceylon and made certain representations. He was in India for only one month or one and a half months. Can you expect anybody to do anything in a vast country like India within that short period?

However, this much is perfectly clear, that well-informed Indians have taken a great liking to Sir Baron Jayatilaka, and their one idea is that, if a representative is to be sent, he would be the most capable and most appropriate person—that is their point of view—and that being so, we found that it was necessary to come to an understanding with the British Government and India, and, as the Representative of a self-governing country we had to give a decent status to Sir Baron or any representative whom we sent. [*Interruption.*] There were many people, Sir, who laughed when I was fighting with other people for the rights of this country.

**The Chairman:** That is another matter.

**The Hon. Mr. G. E. de Silva:** I hope hon. Members will not interrupt me, because I am not going outside my brief.

**Mr. Aluwihare:** Who gave you the brief?

**The Hon. Mr. G. E. de Silva:** I know that there was a time, when the Reforms question came up, when there was criticism of those people who tried to create revolutions in the country.

**The Chairman:** We cannot reopen the Reforms debate.

**The Hon. Mr. G. E. de Silva:** I say that everywhere there are people who do not understand anything. They will sit and try to enjoy the fruits obtained through the labour of others, that is all. There are very few people who will sacrifice all they have for the ideals that they wish to attain.

In this case the Board of Ministers had to take various steps. We have taken those steps and clothed the representative of this country with a certain amount of authority recognized by England as well as India. Is not that what we should have done as Members of the Board of Ministers? Are we going to send a Representative from this country without considering all those questions?

Once a newspaper, either the *Daily News* or the *Times of Ceylon* starts an agitation, there are people who are always willing to ally themselves with that paper. Yesterday there was an editorial in the evening paper, and one hon. Member quoted from it. They must also sell their paper, and they will not do that unless a "living" subject is brought up, whether it be good or bad, which creates some amount of feeling in the country. This subject is one that is close to the minds of people who have the welfare of the country at heart.

We should not take up an attitude of pique or of disparaging people who want to do something for their own country. The Board of Ministers left it to Sir Baron Jayatilaka himself to decide whether he would care to go to India as our Representative or not. I can understand it if we forced this appointment upon him; but it was our suggestion that he should go. [MEMBERS; Hear! Hear!] When he went to India and came back, he was consulted with regard to this appointment, and his reply was, "If the Council is willing to send me, I am willing to go". Is there anything wrong in that?

**Mr. Aluwihare:** Not at all.

**The Hon. Mr. G. E. de Silva:** It was not a question of other people forcing him! to go, Sir. I want that fact to be borne in mind. After he had been in India and had studied the question on the spot, and when we found that he could be of service to the country, we asked him whether he was prepared to go, and he said that if we wanted him to be of service again to the country, he would go. He later stressed the fact that if the country wanted his assistance, he was willing to give up the Leadership and go to India.

Is that not an attitude that every hon. Member of this Council should appreciate? [Interruption.] Of course, I cannot stop the hon. Member for Matale (Mr. Aluwihare) from making rumbling remarks. I am not responsible for it. This is a serious occasion, and I would ask whether, when the Hon. Leader of the House says that if the country wants his services, he is willing to go to India as our Representative, the House could have selected a better person than he.

**Mr. Ponnambalam:** When did you find out that the country wanted his services?

**The Hon. Mr. G. E. de Silva:** What he said was this: "I am at your disposal. If the country selects me, I am prepared, at a sacrifice, to leave my country and do something for it from India". The statement that some people make, that we are going to send him to India without consulting him and without his consent is incorrect. The Board of Ministers did not force him to go. It is the country that wants him to go, and as a citizen of the country, as a Member of the Board and as a Member of Council who represents a very important constituency, I feel that it is my duty to send a man of the type of Sir Baron Jayatilaka as our Representative to India.

He was in India only for a short time. He discussed various questions with various people, and he said that neither anti-Indian feeling nor discrimination against Indians exists in this country. He may disagree with certain legislation passed, or I may disagree with his point of view, as most hon. Members disagree here on vital subjects, but that does not prove that there is an anti-racial feeling

[The Hon. Mr. G. E. de Silva.]  
in this country. I think most hon. Members of this House, however much they may feel communally, are of one mind on the question that India and Ceylon must come together.

As I suggested at the outset, even in families, amongst brothers and sisters, there are differences; and even if there are little differences between India and Ceylon, it should be our endeavour to try and efface such little differences. I ask you, is there a better person than Sir Baron Jayatilaka to achieve that object? It may be that when Sir Baron Jayatilaka goes to India, he may find that further members from this country are needed to help him to bring us more closely together, and he will advise us accordingly. [Interruption.] Surely not the Ministers. There are a number of people outside the Board, in the Council and outside the Council who can be of assistance.

If we work together in that way, do you think it would not be possible to bring about a better understanding between the two countries? I should only like to say this, that whatever differences we may have, when we send a gentleman of the status of Sir Baron Jayatilaka as our Representative in India, we should do so with our blessing.

**Mr. Aluwihare:** Why?

**The Hon. Mr. G. E. de Silva:** If you have the interests of this country at heart you will realize why. We want the best results achieved. Of course, the hon. Member never sees the matter from that point of view. I may disagree with his point of view, but it cannot be helped. But my endeavour is to see that any small differences that there may be are not allowed to widen the gulf between the two countries.

Apart from other questions, the immediate question at the moment is that of food, and there again Sir Baron will be on the spot and be able to do a very great deal to remove any misunderstanding with regard to the matter and get the work done expeditiously. So unless we have a person who will be able to commune with the Government of the day, however much we may try to obtain rice we will never be able to do so. Even in Ceylon, you can see for yourself the

difficulties that we are experiencing in trying to transport our own produce from one place to another. How much more must the difficulties be in a country like India?

After all, the sum that is asked for is a small amount, and if hon. Members feel that it should not be spent, then I might as well say that we need not do anything else but remain as we are, and not blame the Board of Ministers in the event of a famine overtaking the country. We have done our very best and we are doing our very best.

Even in 1914-15, without the war being brought to this country, hon. Members will remember what the position of the country was. But to-day, I would ask hon. Members to realize that there is harmony and goodwill, and everything is being done to protect the interests of the people living in this country. It is because everything is being done so quietly that hon. Members are able to enjoy the fruits of such labours to-day.

I would, therefore, beg of hon. Members to vote for this motion, because we will be doing the justice that should be done to one who has practically lived his life in this country and has rendered yeoman service; we should not at this time throw him aside and say that he is unfit for this post.

**Mr. Aluwihare:** The Hon. Minister of Health said that we should want results from whatever action we take in this matter. I mean to make that, Sir, the touchstone for the proposal of the Hon. Ministers. In the first place, let us consider whether we are entitled to have very much confidence in the action of the Ministers in regard to this Indian question. There was a deputation to Delhi which produced no results; there was a second conference in Ceylon which, again produced no results; indeed both those conferences seemed to have created a very vital difference amongst the Members of the Board of Ministers themselves.

Then, there was the mission of the Minister of Agriculture and Lands. We had promises but no results. There was the mission of the Minister of Labour, Industry and Commerce and, I believe, his mission realized for us some of the promises made to the Minister of Agriculture and Lands. Then, thirdly, there

Nov. 20, 1942]

## Debates.

2559

was this last mission of the Hon. Minister of Home Affairs which, to my mind, enabled the Indian Government to reduce the promise to the Minister of Agriculture and Lands by one half. Where they had promised the Minister of Agriculture 38,000 tons of rice a month, the Minister of Home Affairs brought back what he called a firm promise of 20,000 tons.

To-day, if you judge by the alteration of the ration, you will find that we are in the main dependent, so far as foreign supplies are concerned, on the wheat that arrives from Australia and not so much on the rice that arrives from India. That has been the way in which the whole Indian problem has been dealt with.

The Minister of Local Administration said that I was lying—

**The Chairman:** He did not say that.

**Mr. Aluwihare:** Whether I was lying or not, it does not matter. It is a violent form of disagreement. He said that I was not speaking the truth when I said that the Sinhala Maha Sabha wanted Ceylon for the Sinhalese. I say that if I was wrong in what I said, the Hon. Minister was perfectly entitled to make the retort that he did, and I for one would not have the slightest grievance.

But what is the impression that has been created by a good deal of agitation in regard to the Indian question? I would refer the Hon. Minister to the statements he made, during the conversations at New Delhi, which have been published as a Sessional Paper. His whole point at one stage was that he wanted somehow to repatriate a huge population that we were quite unable to absorb. He visualized the repatriation of that population as a matter of policy. If that is the adopted policy, I think, we ought to stand by it. It is a matter of vital importance; and I do not say that we want to whittle it down.

I am not discussing that policy at the moment, but what I say is that whatever attitude we may have taken up, our Representative in India must stand firmly by it. That, I think, is the point that the hon. Indian Nominated Member (Diwan Bahadur I. X. Pereira) makes. I do quarrel with him; I have

a very great quarrel with him. He says that there is discriminatory legislation but I would like to point out that there is no discriminatory legislation against Indians *qua* Indians. As a matter of fact, the State Council has endeavoured to avert such action.

It is true that in the effort to preserve the character of Village Committees, our legislation resulted in excluding a large class of foreigners who were Indians, just as much as in the Motor Car Bill passed the other day, by the steps we took we did exclude from transport competition a class who, I believe, are mostly Europeans—English; that is true. As a matter of fact, what we feared in the case of the Motor Car Bill was that European capital would drive Ceylonese capital from an industry that was entirely Ceylonese. But when I have said that, I come to the end of my disagreement with the hon. Nominated Member.

We have to admit that there have been things said in this country which may have been as a lash to the Indians. After all, we have said very insulting things. We have said things that no decent people really will endure.

Now, when we send a Representative to New Delhi we should not try to send someone who will attempt to camouflage the position to Indians. That will give us no value, and we cannot do it. We have to send a man who will stand up to the attitude adopted by this Government, to everything said by the Government of this country, and try to explain it to the Indians. It is a most responsible task. It is a task, Sir, that needs the utmost energy and the utmost resourcefulness. It is a task that demands of a man the greatest capacity, the greatest industry and the greatest energy. It is a task that requires of a man the best energy of the best time of his life.

That is the background against which I would ask hon. Members seriously to consider this proposal. There is not the slightest doubt that Sir Baron has been one of the most distinguished people in this country. I should say that he is the most distinguished amongst the Sinhalese certainly of the century. His record of public service is not only that of service in political agitation. The whole regeneration, for instance, of Buddhist education has been his work. But then

[Mr. Aluwihare.]

We are not putting up a monument to someone who has done that. Now, for instance, the speech of the Chief Secretary sounded almost like a funeral oration. We are not here, Sir, to make speeches of the passing of Sir Baron; that is my point. I feel that, as a matter of fact, this vote should really be called "the passing of Sir Baron".

There are two aspects of this question. I have put before you the first issue. Granting that the work in New Delhi is of the most responsible kind, granting that it demands of any man his utmost energy and his best endeavour, is Sir Baron at this time of life capable of giving of his best to any job? Is it right to us, by the country and by ourselves, to forget that the general complaint is that in his own Ministry there is an insufficient study of the files by the Hon. Minister? It is no use exclaiming "sh". It is a question of facing up to a fact. Is it not an accepted fact that he has been judged by his subordinates, his colleagues, and by the country as a whole as being too old to carry on the particular duties of the Home Office?

It is true that there has not been a vote of censure against him; and I do not think, however much I may feel, that the House would have the heart to pass a vote of censure against him. But nevertheless we have to face the fact of his incompetence to carry on the arduous job of Home Minister. It was in reference to the last Acting Minister of Home Affairs that someone was telling me the other day, "You know, after many years we have at last got a man who reads the files that are put before him". That was in praise of the hon. Member for Jaffna (Mr. Mahadeva). And what is the implication of that? Sir, at 84—[*Interruption.*]—at 75 you want to send Sir Baron Jayatilaka to New Delhi on this job.

I will give another instance that occurred only yesterday, which gives an indication of the mental energy of the man. The Excise Ordinance went before the Committee, and it was so altered that it was not worth proceeding with the Bill. The Hon. Minister of Home Affairs disagreed with the amendments which were effected, but yet he appended his signature to the report without dissent.

not only did he do that, he came here and said that the Bill should be thrown out. That is the mental energy of the man. He, as Home Minister, had not the mental energy when he was signing that report to say that he did not agree with the Committee; and having signed that report as he did, surely the implication was that he agreed with it. Whenever a Member dissents, there is a dissent with his signature. That speaks for the mental capacity of the Hon. Minister. And at 75 I doubt whether any one of us would have even that amount of capacity. Nevertheless there is that natural decay. Delhi has meant the ruin of seven Empires. New Delhi is built on the ruins of seven Empires. And now you are going to send Sir Baron there at 75. That is the mental energy of the man, as I said.

Then, I would ask another question, apart from the question of mental capacity. The Hon. Minister's statements in India are going to be challenged in the most determined manner as was done to-day by the hon. Indian Nominated Member (Diwan Bahadur I. X. Pereira). Sir, the point is that his statements are going to be challenged in the most determined manner; every statement of his is going to be taken up and challenged. With the resourcefulness and determination with which I know he will be opposed, is it not natural that, when it is sought to challenge his credit, there will always be thrown against him the fact that he was disbelieved by a Commission appointed by this Government?

**Mr. R. S. S. Gunawardana (Gampola):** You argued the case for him!

**Mr. Aluwihare:** The more I study that report—I have studied it over and over again—the more I am convinced that he spoke the truth. But in a foreign country as an ambassador he is not going to get away from the fact that there was a bench of 3 judges, 3 of the most distinguished lawyers, who refused to believe him.

As you know, so far as a good many people are concerned, they say that the State Council was wrong in passing a vote of confidence in the Hon. Minister. I personally think we did the right thing, because it was a question of our action.



But we have to consider the attitude of other people. Although we study a matter and we refuse to dismiss a man from our service, the question we have to ask is whether on a question of the credit of a man another country is not entitled, or the Governor is not entitled, to accept the verdict of that tribunal. Sir, whatever we may say, however we may justify it, it will be put down to political motives.

But Sir Baron will not be able to answer that challenge in India. [*Interruption.*] The Hon. Minister of Health says that he will be the best man to defend it. That is exactly why I do not want him to go, because in India he will have to defend, vindicate the elementary quality that is demanded of an ambassador. He will have to vindicate his capacity to speak the truth in difficult circumstances. That is why I feel that you should not send Sir Baron to a foreign country as your ambassador. I cannot see how this House can accept that position.

I would ask hon. Members to treat this question seriously. We have not been happy in our choice of ambassadors. We sent a Trade Commissioner to India; we did not cover ourselves altogether with glory. We have had a Ceylon House in Bombay; we are still trying to find out which side spoke the truth. Those gentlemen were gentlemen who in this country were reputed to be gentlemen of the highest standing. And now, on this, the third occasion, I ask you not to send a gentleman whose veracity can be challenged, whose vitality is at its ebb. That, Sir, is a very serious matter. On that test, I feel we ought not to send Sir Baron.

Then, there is the other issue. Are we sending him to India to get rid of him? I do not want to deal with that question at length. I have met a son-in-law of 40 who felt that the father-in-law of 80 should retire from a directorship in the company to make way for him. That is always the way of the world: the younger men want the older men either to die or to depart to some other place.

I do not think we need consider that point of view, because I think there is sufficiently grave objection to take to the proposal of the Ministers at its face

value; on the reasons they urge for the appointment of Sir Baron, I think there are sufficient grounds for us to reject this proposal, on the most grave issue I have raised. Sir, if hon. Members really feel that this is a proposal which would enable them to get rid of Sir Baron, I have only one answer: we must have a cheaper way of burying our dead!

**Mr. R. S. S. Gunawardana:** I am sorry that even a single discordant note should have been struck over the question under discussion. I am greatly pained in mind that this should have been made the occasion for uncharitable personal insults and for mud-throwing. That is certainly a matter for very great regret.

As Members know, I do not believe in hero-worship. I have most violently disagreed with the Leader of the House on many a political issue. I have even had punishment at his hands. In one of my election campaigns he opposed me most strenuously. But one must take a broad view, a reasonable view, of matters that come before this Council.

There are really two questions that this Council is called upon to decide: first, whether a useful and desirable purpose would be served by sending a special representative to India; second whether Sir Baron, the Leader of the House, is the most competent person to fill that responsible post.

It is surprising that the second point should loom so large in the eyes of some Members who have spoken, and that there should be any lack of unanimity in the matter. We have by our own verdict made Sir Baron the Leader of this House. At a time when there were so many political factions and parties, all parties were united in accepting Sir Baron as their accredited Leader. His political acumen was recognized, and his election as Leader was a great tribute to his diplomacy. I do not think a greater diplomat was born in this country. That is the type of man we want for this work, a man of refinement, of culture and learning, a person who can secure the maximum amount of co-operation and goodwill among various fighting factions.

Surely such a man is best suited to fill an office of this nature?

[Mr. R. S. S. Gunawardena.]

It is most unfortunate that the hon. Member for Matale (Mr. Aluwihare), of all people, should have referred to the fact that three Judges had disbelieved Sir Baron. This Council, and the whole country, was behind Sir Baron in that matter. The whole country accepted the position that Sir Baron was truthful, and that his version was correct. Never was a greater tribute paid to a man, and the hon. Member was the greatest advocate of that position. We are all grateful to him for the very clear and lucid exposition he gave of the finding of those Judges and for the merciless way in which he attacked those findings. This Council came to the reasonable and irresistible verdict that Sir Baron was right. We went further and passed a vote of confidence in him.

Having passed that vote of confidence, for the hon. Member, who played such an important part in the vindication of Sir Baron, to unearth that ugly episode is certainly most distressing. The hon. Member felt strongly at that time—and he says that he still feels strongly—that the veracity of the Leader of the House should never have been questioned. If that is the case, why are we trying to supply an argument to the Indian Government for holding that Sir Baron is a person who cannot be believed? The Indian Government have already warmly welcomed the proposal to appoint Sir Baron to this office. They are happy that a man of his pre-eminent position should have been called upon to fill this office in India.

Why should we now say that Sir Baron may not be acceptable to the Indian Government because he has failed to vindicate his honour in this country? Are these arguments worth consideration? It is an insult to the intelligence of this House to adduce the argument that whoever is sent, Sir Baron, of all people, would have to fight hard to vindicate his honour. No fight is required of him to vindicate his honour in this country or in any other part of the world. We may differ on certain political questions, but no one would be uncharitable enough to say that as a man Sir Baron is not the most honourable man one can think of.

The hon. Member laboured hard to prove that Sir Baron is lacking in mental

energy. What then is Sir Baron's eminence due to? I am surprised that an Advocate of the standing of the hon. Member should adduce arguments of this kind, on the flimsiest material that he could produce before the House.

He told us that a Member had remarked to him, "What a refreshing change has occurred since the hon. Member for Jaffna (Mr. Mahadeva) took the place of Sir Baron. The hon. Member for Jaffna reads the files". I do not know whether the hon. Member for Matale (Mr. Aluwihare) has had much to do with the Minister of Home Affairs, but I have had to deal with Sir Baron on a great many occasions. I know of an instance where he had to go through a file of 600 pages, although it was over a potty, little matter. I found that he had read every word of the file, although he was not prepared to agree with me about the ultimate finding. But that is neither here nor there. A man is entitled to his own opinions. We may not always agree with a man's views, but that is no reason why we should unjustly attack him.

Sir Baron Jayatilaka may be conservative in his outlook; he may not be prepared to run as fast as some of us would like him to. But, because he is not prepared to see eye to eye with us, we must not say that he is lacking in mental energy, or that he could not even read through a file. That is hardly a fair statement to make.

Is it only at this stage that Sir Baron's failings have been discovered? Did not the hon. Member know that Sir Baron is all over the country, that he addresses all kinds of meetings, in addition to attending to all his official duties? Surely that gives no support to the charge that he lacks mental energy? Perhaps the hon. Member thinks that in his own case when he reaches the age of 75 years he might be an absolute imbecile, but it does not necessarily follow that another person would suffer the same fate.

The hon. Member also referred to the fact that Sir Baron had appended his signature to a report on a Bill that he was not prepared to support in this House. If a majority of my Executive Committee, for instance, thought in a certain way, I, if I were the Chairman of that Committee, would feel bound to

Nov. 20, 1942]

## Debates.

act with them. That is one way of looking at it. You cannot base an argument against me on that. If the Minister of Home Affairs, in the instance quoted, felt that the majority of his Committee thought in a certain way and that as the spokesman of that Committee he had to subscribe his signature to their report—

**Mr. Aluwihare:** What I said was that he put his signature to the report and opposed it here.

**Mr. R. S. S. Gunawardana:** The Hon. Minister is entitled to express his personal views, although as Chairman he might have signed a report giving some other view.

**Mr. Aluwihare:** He was not the Chairman of the Committee in question.

**Mr. R. S. S. Gunawardana:** It is not fair to impute imbecility to a man because of that. That is a flimsy argument, and I am surprised that this kind of trivial, trifling argument should have been adduced at all.

This is an important occasion. There is no denying that the time is now ripe for the appointment of a special representative in India. We should have made that appointment many years ago. India is a great country, and we have at all times to turn to India for assistance and relief. It is desirable that we should cement a lasting friendship between the two countries.

It cannot be denied also that in India there is a strong feeling that a good many of our public men are anti-Indian in outlook. Whether they are right or wrong in holding that view is beside the point. That feeling does exist in India. I myself was in India for a short period—about two weeks—and I met a number of people who expressed that point of view. Many other Members of this Council who have been to India will endorse my statement that there is a general belief in India that there is a certain amount of anti-Indian feeling in this country. The existence of that belief in India is a serious drawback to the efforts of those engaged in any work in India on behalf of this country.

There is also a certain amount of propaganda going out from this country, insidious propaganda emanating from this country, to fan the flame that al-

ready burns in India. It is therefore important that we should do something to counteract that propaganda. The Indian politician is a reasonable man; if the facts are placed before him, I am sure we can always expect him and the Indian people to play the game by us.

When there is serious misunderstanding between the two countries, should we not send an accredited representative to India who can at least clarify the position? There is no one who knows the course of public affairs in this country more intimately than Sir Baron Jayatilaka. He has served this country a whole lifetime; he has been intimately connected with every political movement in this country, and he is the most competent person to provide the necessary information to the Indian people. One does not know of any instance when Sir Baron has failed to rise to the occasion. He has always acquitted himself well, and I think he has proved worthy of the high responsibilities that we have placed on him. He has always proved worthy of any responsibility placed on him.

Sir, it is true that he has not the impetuosity of youth, like the hon. Member for Matale.

**Mr. Aluwihare:** I am not a youth, Sir.

**Mr. R. S. S. Gunawardana:** He has not got the impetuosity of youth. He may certainly not wish to do some window-dressing, an expression which the Hon. the Legal Secretary used two days ago. The Hon. Leader may not be capable of political somersaults like many others. But he has been thoroughly consistent in his attitude. He has always had the best interests of the country at heart. He has been considered a servant of the people of this country, and I think, with his wide experience, his ripe experience and intimate knowledge of the affairs of this country there is no person better fitted to fill this very important post than Sir Baron Jayatilaka.

Some hon. Members seem to imagine that we are sending a commercial traveller to India. Certainly not. The hon. Member for Colombo South (Dr. de Zoysa) asked whether we were sending a spy or a hostage. Surely we are sending the Hon. Leader for one particular pur-

[Mr. R. S. S. Gunawardana.]  
 pose. There are a large number of outstanding questions on which perhaps it may be that our best efforts have failed. It may be that conferences between this country and India have not succeeded. But is there any reason why we should say that there are no questions for which we would want somebody at hand in India, to place the problems of Ceylon before the Indians? Would it not be convenient for this country and for the Board of Ministers to deal direct with a Representative in India so that active steps may be taken? That is not the position of a travelling agent. He is not expected to meet all the *Bhais* and discuss the question of a measure of rice or a yard of cloth with them. Those are not the functions of the Representative of this country.

Sir, one thing that is clear is that this country feels that it is essential that Ceylon should have a special representative in India. This Council has felt that need, and I think we should have seen to this very much earlier. The Indian Government has consented to it and the Secretary of State has consented to it. Why do we need to talk of procedure?

The Board of Ministers have come to the conclusion that a supplementary vote for this purpose is necessary; they have placed before us all the facts appertaining to this question, and the country has had sufficient notice of this matter. I do hope that in spite of all the views that have been expressed in this House, we will unanimously support the motion to send Sir Baron Jayatilaka as our Representative in India and that he will have the benediction and blessing of this country.

**Mr. T. B. Jayah (Nominated Member):** Sir, two speakers, besides the mover, have spoken in support of this motion. One of them adduced certain arguments which I think I should mention at the very commencement. He said that the motion deserves support because the Board of Ministers is always doing its best. He said that he himself had taken a prominent part in getting the Penal Clause against Indian labourers abolished, which at that time he considered most offensive to the Indian community. He stressed that there was no anti-Indian feeling in this

country, but, if there was, he was the most qualified person to say that there was anti-Indian feeling in the country. Those were about all the arguments he urged in support of this motion.

Then, the other speaker made a very vehement speech, but he confined himself to singing the praises of Sir Baron Jayatilaka. I do not think Sir Baron needs any kind of laudation from any hon. Member of this House. He is certainly great enough to stand on his merits. There is no doubt that he is the most distinguished Sinhalese of this generation. There is no doubt that he has played a notable part in raising the political and educational status of the Buddhist community of this Island. There is also no doubt that he is regarded very highly by those who have the good fortune to come in close contact with him, particularly in view of the fact that he is one of the most cultured men in this country.

Sir, in considering a question of this kind, all this is beside the point. I do not say one word against Sir Baron. I am prepared to go to the length to which the hon. Member for Gampola (Mr. R. S. S. Gunawardana) went in praise of Sir Baron Jayatilaka.

But I still have no hesitation in declaring from my seat that the motion of the Hon. the Chief Secretary does not deserve the support of this House. We must not mix up this mission to India with the greatness or the demerits of Sir Baron. The question we ought to ask ourselves is whether we should have a Representative in India at this juncture to bring about understanding between India and Ceylon and to secure the speedy settlement of all outstanding problems. That is the position. If we decide that we should have a Representative in India, then it does not matter whether we decide to send Sir Baron or any other distinguished person to India.

I think we should consider this question apart from the merits of any particular individual. Those who vote for this motion should not do so because they cannot make up their minds to go against Sir Baron. That would be a wrong way of dealing with the matter.

Sir, the question is whether we require a Representative in India at this juncture in order to bring about a settlement of

these problems. What are the problems? Some speakers have gone minutely into them. You did not want them to go minutely into these matters because you felt that there was no need to deal with them at length. But, at the same time, I am sure you will admit that it is impossible for us to discuss this motion without going into these questions which vitally affect those outstanding problems.

At the time Sir Baron went to India, it was said that our food question was important and that it was absolutely necessary to send a person of his distinction to bring about a change of heart in the Indian Government so that the food supply to this country might be assured. That was more or less the sole reason urged for sending Sir Baron to India. At that time the idea of bringing about an understanding was not stressed.

We know that Sir Baron spent over one and a half months in India. We know that there is a report on his mission to India as to what he was able to achieve there and the difficulties he had to encounter. It may be that during his sojourn in that country he had to face very inconvenient situations. It may be that he was questioned on all sides as to why this had been done and why that had not been done. It may be that he was confronted with certain facts which he found very difficult to answer at the time. It may be that he had even to answer questions in a manner which would escape contradiction from responsible quarters. I do not say that he deliberately misrepresented matters there, but from what appeared in the papers, it was quite clear that he was trying to answer questions to suit the questioners without reference to actual existing conditions in this country.

When he said that there was no difficulty for Indians to secure Government appointments in this country, I do not think he understood the implications of what he said. Some Indians who read the news simply laughed at the idea. They could not believe that Sir Baron could have been so innocent.

**Mr. Aluwihare:** Did Sir Baron say that?

**Mr. Jayah:** Yes; that was a statement he made at a Press Conference, and

Sir Baron has not thought it fit to contradict what he might have said in the belief and conviction that he was doing the right thing. But then, it was so obvious to those who have studied these matters in Ceylon that what he said did not tally with facts. So I do not think Indians who badgered him with questions were satisfied with his explanation.

I believe that even before Sir Baron returned from India, the Board of Ministers had made up their minds to send a Representative to India. It is my opinion that they had made up their mind, even before Sir Baron left this country, to send a permanent representative to Delhi, and perhaps, they had also made up their mind that Sir Baron himself was the best person to fill that post.

**The Hon. Mr. Kannangara:** That is not correct.

**Mr. Jayah:** I say it for what it is worth. At least it will serve the purpose of removing a wrong impression. Whatever it is, Sir Baron has returned and said that he found certain insuperable difficulties. The difficulty with regard to food supply was not only the question of food shortage but something more serious.

**The Chairman:** The sitting is suspended until 2 P.M.

**Mr. Jayah:** Sir, on Fridays usually we adjourn at 12 o'clock, but owing to the advanced time we cannot return before 2.30 P.M. Muslim Members will not find it possible to come back at 2 P.M. Even Government has thought it fit to change the time to meet the convenience of Muslim Government Servants. So it would be better if we adjourned till 2.30 P.M.

**The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike:** We are in Committee. Some other Member can speak at 2 P.M., and the hon. Member can continue his speech at 2.30 P.M.

**Mr. Jayah:** We have a right to expect to be here in time. I do not see any reason why the proceedings of the House should commence in our absence.

**The Chairman:** The hon. Member can continue his speech after other Members have spoken.

**Mr. Jayah:** I will not be in a position to be here at 2 P.M.

**Mr. Aluwihare:** May I suggest that we go on till 12.30 p.m.

**The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike:** The suggestion of the hon. Member does not meet the point. Whether we go on till 12.30 P.M. or not, the hon. Nominated Member (Mr. Jayah) will still want to come at 2.30 P.M.

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** Sir, one of the Muslim Members did speak to me about this matter, and I wanted to move that we adjourn at 12.30 P.M. and meet at 2.30 P.M. I therefore move that we go on till 12.30 P.M. and meet again at 2.30 P.M.

Question put, and agreed to.

**Mr. Jayah** rose.

**The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike:** The hon. Member has forgotten where he left off.

**Mr. Jayah:** Naturally, when unwarranted interruptions are made.

**The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike:** I object to the word "unwarranted". Surely, the hon. Member is old enough to understand the meaning of words. What is there unwarranted in pointing out that it is 12 o'clock and time for the House to adjourn?

**Mr. Jayah:** I was going to say that Sir Baron found himself in a quandary there now and again, and when he returned, he must have explained to the Board of Ministers that there were certain difficulties which had to be cleared if our mission, especially with regard to food supplies, was to succeed. I think that is exactly what would have been expected of a person of the standing of Sir Baron. He did not want to treat lightly the difficulties he had to face. He must have emphasized them to the Board of Ministers, and I think even in the statement that he has issued, he makes that point clear.

Now the question is, what is the most important matter which we ought to tackle if the most important problem of food supplies is to be promptly solved?

It is the settlement of outstanding problems of mutual concern for both India and Ceylon.

It was stated by the hon. Nominated Member (Diwan Bahadur I. X. Pereira) that it is not possible to bring about a settlement unless there is a change of heart, unless the Government of this country is prepared to remove the causes which have led to this misunderstanding. As far as I am concerned, Sir, I quite sympathize with the position taken up by the hon. Nominated Member. I may say that I myself have raised my voice in support of that position. I did it not only in the State Council, but even in the Legislative Council. I made it perfectly clear to Members that unless good relations between India and Ceylon continued, it was not India that was going to suffer, that it was Ceylon that would ultimately suffer.

But now that this want of understanding prevails, are we going to keep quiet? Are we going to be pessimistic, and say that we are helpless and nothing can be done? I do not think it is right for us to take up that attitude; nor can we at this juncture, knowing that all kinds of difficulties are in our way, take up the position that all the causes which have brought about this misunderstanding should be removed before any attempt is made to bring about a better understanding. I think the hon. Nominated Member (Diwan Bahadur I. X. Pereira) will be the first to admit that if at this juncture it is sought to remove the causes, whatever they may be, that have brought about this situation, this effort to bring about an understanding will be indefinitely put off and no good will accrue to the country.

I know, the hon. Member for Matale (Mr. Aluwihare) will say that there is no discrimination against Indians and that there is not any discriminatory legislation. There are some who may agree with him. They sincerely feel so. But there are Indians who are competent to speak with authority on this subject, Indians who have been in this country for various periods of time, Indians of great eminence—statesmen and politicians—who have been watching the trend of affairs in this country who are almost unanimous in their opinion that there exists discriminatory legislation.

We may not agree with them. We may sincerely declare that there is no discriminatory legislation, but such declarations on our part would not remove the misunderstanding that has arisen.

Let us admit that, according to the Indian point of view, there is discriminatory legislation, as also from the point of view of those who take a sympathetic interest in solving the difficulties facing this country—[*Interruption*]. I do not think, in view of that, that it is right for us to insist at this juncture that certain Ordinances should be repealed in order to show the Indians that there is a change of heart.

From 12.30 p.m. MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER [MR. SUSANTA DE FONSEKA] presided as Chairman.

**Mr. Jayah:** So then, we have to accept that position. Any attempt to remove the causes at this juncture will bring about so much difficulty that delay might ensue. It is necessary to bring about an immediate understanding between the two countries, and therefore it is better for us not to look too deeply into the causes that have brought about this situation.

If that is our attitude, if that is our conviction, then how best can we bring about an understanding between the two countries? It is quite clear from the speeches that have been delivered that we must, somehow or other, bring about good relations between India and Ceylon. Now, can that object be achieved by sending a representative—a permanent representative—to India? That is the crux of the question—can we bring about that situation by having a permanent representative at Delhi? I do not think it is possible to achieve our object by that means.

On the admission of Sir Baron himself, during his one-and-a-half months' stay in India he had to answer all sorts of inconvenient questions. He therefore felt that there were enormous difficulties to be surmounted and he suggested, naturally, that something should be done to clear up the misunderstanding between India and Ceylon. It may be that he even suggested that there should be a permanent representative in India. Being a great patriot himself, he was prepared to sacrifice his own political career in this country by accept-

ing a post like that. It may be that he was prepared to go to any length if he could be of any service to the country. All credit to Sir Baron for all his altruistic endeavours.

But then we ought not to think of any particular individual. We ought to think only of a solution that will enable us to bring about an understanding between the two countries, such an understanding as will pave the way for any representative who may have to work thereafter in that country. I do not think there will be any real harm if there is a permanent representative there, once we are assured that all these difficulties are cleared. But if we are going to have a permanent representative and expect these difficulties to vanish, I think we are setting about it in the wrong way.

In the circumstances, I think it is best for us, instead of sending a permanent representative just now, to send to Delhi a representative deputation from this country to bring about an understanding and to secure the speedy settlement of outstanding problems which will enable the two Governments to carry on their negotiations without any kind of difficulty whatsoever.

After all, even the Indian Government will be helpless if the Indian public are hostile to the Ceylonese; I would not say Sinhalese. After all, in India I do not think they discriminate as between one race and another race. Every Ceylonese to them is a Ceylonese unless, of course, we explain matters to them. I know that, because I had an unpleasant experience in India, when I was there somewhere about the middle of last year. Some very intelligent men, some leading Indians took it for granted that we all had worked against the Indians in Ceylon. In spite of explanation, some of them could hardly believe that it was necessary for them to differentiate as between community and community.

So that I do not think the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Lands need take umbrage at the remarks of the Burgher Nominated Member (Mr. Wille) when he specially referred to one community. That being the case, it is all the more necessary that a representative deputation should go which will be in a position to convince the public and the Indian leaders and the Indian Government that at any rate during this

[Mr. Jayah.]  
 period of stress it is the desire and the determination of the people living in this country that the relations between India and Ceylon should be cordial, and that whatever differences there might have been in the past the Indian public and the Indian Government should co-operate with the Ceylon Government in helping the people of Ceylon in this matter of food supply.

That was done during the last war. During the last war there was a rice crisis in Ceylon; there were also riots. It was called a food crisis. It was felt that something had to be done. The Indian Government was not disposed to send rice to Ceylon. A deputation representative of the communities in this country had to go from Ceylon, and that deputation succeeded in convincing the Indian Government that Ceylon deserved their amplest sympathy. The result was that the food difficulty was solved.

Why cannot something similar be done now? I think, if it is the intention to bring about good relations, if it is the idea of this House to bring about a good understanding between India and Ceylon, it must be realized that that object cannot be brought about by the appointment of a permanent representative at Delhi, however distinguished he may be. There is another reason, Sir, why such a step is objectionable. Why should we, even if we do send a representative, send the most distinguished person in the country? Take for granted that Sir Baron, is the most distinguished man in Ceylon, the most distinguished citizen, that he is a man who will be received with all respect and regard in the neighbouring country. But if he fails to bring about an understanding and the difficulties continue, then all our hopes will be dashed to the ground.

The only solution as far as I can see is to send a representative deputation to Delhi to bring about the desired state of affairs and therefore, Sir, I should like to move as an amendment, that this vote be referred back to enable the Board of Ministers to recommend to this House the appointment of a representative deputation to India to bring about an understanding between India and Ceylon and to secure the speedy settlement of problems that concern both countries.

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** I rise to a point of order. I do not think the amendment is in order.

**The Chairman:** It is in order to refer back the vote for further consideration.

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** Yes, it can be referred back for a further consideration of the subject of the Supplementary Estimate itself. This Supplementary Estimate is for creating the post of a permanent Representative in India and not for the temporary purpose for which a deputation is contemplated. Deputations have gone before, and Supplementary Estimates have been passed. But this is meant for the creation of a post, and that is a different matter.

**The Chairman:** The amendment that can be moved, in the case of a Supplementary Estimate, is only to refer it back for further consideration. The hon. Member explained why he wanted it referred back, but the actual amendment is to refer it back "for further consideration". In the circumstances, the amendment is in order.

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** The only point is that when an Estimate is referred back, I presume it is necessary to indicate the reasons for referring it back.

**The Chairman:** Not in the case of a Supplementary Estimate under Article 68.

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** But I would like to bring this fact to your notice. The proposal of my hon. Friend was that this Supplementary Estimate be referred back to enable the Board of Ministers to make provision for a deputation to be sent instead of Sir Baron Jayatilaka. What I would submit is that as the amendment relates to a different subject, it is not in order.

**The Chairman:** The only question is whether I can construe the hon. Member's words as words of the amendment or purely explanatory and in support of the reasons why he wants this Estimate referred back. The normal amendment, in the case of a financial measure, is to refer it back for further consideration.



**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** I listened to the hon. Member's amendment; he gave all his reasons for moving the amendment which made me feel that it was out of order. If the hon. Member merely moved the reference back of the Estimate then it would have been quite a different matter.

**The Chairman:** I think the substance can be taken into account. It is only to refer back the Supplementary Estimate for further consideration.

Does any hon. Member second the amendment?

**Dr. M. C. M. Kaleel (Colombo Central)** seconded.

**Mr. H. W. Amarasuriya (Galle):** What is the amendment?

**The Chairman:** The amendment is to refer back the Supplementary Estimate for further consideration.

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** I would like to say, Sir, that this amendment will not serve any useful purpose, for the simple reason that the object that we have in view is to appoint a permanent Representative in Delhi for the purpose of meeting situations that may arise from time to time. It is not an appointment where we expect a job to be done after which the person appointed can come back. The hon. Member himself said, when moving the amendment, that there is a great deal of misunderstanding in the country, and since there is this misunderstanding it is necessary that the appointee should have the confidence of the people of this country before he is sent as our permanent Representative.

Sir, I would ask my hon. Friend and other Members of the House to consider whether it is possible for a deputation, in the course of a short period, to go round the country and convince those people that something here is not what it is painted to be. Another thing is this: I wonder whether the deputation is to be merely sent to that country without knowing with whom they ought to discuss matters, or whether they should just roam about the country in search of people who have wrong views or right views and convince them that the views they hold are right or wrong. When a deputation is sent, I presume, it is

necessary for the deputation to interview certain persons or the Government. It is definitely somebody whom they go to interview.

According to my hon. Friend, that deputation is to go, not to interview the Government of India, but to roam about the country—

**Mr. Ponnambalam:** A goodwill mission.

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:**—and then find out what has to be done. I do not think it is possible for any deputation to go round like a travelling circus and try to find out what has to be done.

I would submit that the object that the hon. Member has in view is not capable of achievement. It is an impossible task to ask a deputation to undertake a task of that kind. Therefore I feel that the Board of Ministers would not be able to accept the amendment, and I am sure the House will reject it.

May I know whether it is your intention, Sir, to dispose of the amendment first?

**The Chairman:** I think I will put the amendment at the end of the discussion on the whole matter.

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** Well, if the amendment is to be put at the end of the whole discussion, I feel that we might adjourn now and reassemble at 2.30 P.M.

**The Chairman:** The sitting is suspended till 2.30 P.M.

*Sitting accordingly suspended until 2.30 p.m. and then resumed.*

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** Sir, just before we adjourned, I was referring to the amendment that was moved; I was trying to point out that it would serve no purpose, that a mission to go all over India to interview people and find out who suspect us of ill-treating the Indians, and to try to convince them to the contrary, would be a futile mission and an impossible task for anyone to undertake. I do not think I need say any more on the amendment; and as it is your intention, Sir, to put the amendment as well as the motion to the House at the very end, I would like to say something on the motion itself.

[The Hon. Mr. Senanayake.]

I would like to point out that under normal circumstances in the case of a Supplementary Estimate there would be nothing but observations as to the need for the particular vote asked for. Here the Supplementary Estimate is for a sum of Rs. 52,000 to meet the expenses of the Ceylon Government Representative in India. It is not usual, when a post is created, to inform the House that that post is to be filled by any particular individual. But in this instance that information is included in the Observations as the Ministers desire to keep the House fully informed.

Sir, it is really regrettable that so much time of the House has been spent by some Members in saying some very nasty things about the Leader of the House who rendered very valuable service to this country even before many of us were born. I feel pained that any Member should think it fit to make such remarks. I do not wish to say anything about those remarks, because I would rather allow those Members to think over what they have said, and I feel that when the time comes their conscience will tell them that they have done wrong.

Sir, with regard to this mission, we must realize that although the question of food is the immediate problem, it is not the only problem or the chief problem that has to be solved between these two countries. The question was asked: "What is an Ambassador going to do, or a Representative going to do? Cannot these things be done in writing?" I would ask those Members to consider what any representative of any other Government is going to do, what an Ambassador in France or England is going to do. If you ask such an Ambassador such a question before he actually went there, perhaps he will find it very difficult to give an answer. You might even ask those countries, "Cannot these things be done by correspondence?" After all, if that is the view that is held by hon. Members, I do not think any country could have an Ambassador or Representative in another country, because you cannot indicate beforehand what things would have to be done.

But in this instance, perhaps, we have more reasons than most countries for sending such a representative to India.

We know that Ceylon and India must continue to be the best of neighbours, and there must always be good feeling existing between the two countries. We know that there is a great deal of misunderstanding now.

It may be that my good Friend the hon. Nominated Member (Diwan Bahadur I. X. Peréira) feels that there is reason for the Indians to complain. They feel that they have been treated badly and are likely to be treated badly. But at the same time he would admit that as far as personal relations between Indians and Ceylonese go, there cannot be more cordial relations between any other two peoples anywhere in the world. Whatever our political views may be—they may differ—still, he will admit that in this country there is the greatest goodwill towards the Indian people. I am sure that if the people of Ceylon were hostile to the Indians, his family would not have lived in this country for many generations, and he himself would not spend more time in this country than in his own homeland. The very fact of his being here shows that this country is not such a bad country for the Indian people to live in.

If that is so, and the personal relations between Indians and others in Ceylon are good, then there is something wrong somewhere for the hon. Nominated Member to feel, as he did appear to suggest in his speech, that there is ill-feeling between these two sections and that the Indians do not get what they deserve. As far as we are concerned, we feel that we are doing all that it is possible for us to do to maintain good relations, not only between the two countries, but between the Indians who are here and ourselves.

I wonder whether, if the people of Ceylon were hostile, or if they had any bad feelings towards Indians, there could be individual Indians all over this country prospering to the extent that they are prospering just now. Go to any village; go to any place in this country, and you will see the Indian trader there; and when they are engaged in other occupations, they are not treated any differently from the people of Ceylon.

But still if there is that feeling in India, do you not think that it is very much better for a Representative from here to go to India and tell the Indians

what our feelings towards them are? That is our object in sending a Representative to India. If there is any one object in view in bringing forward this proposal, that is the object—to convince the Indian people of our desire and the necessity to be on the best of terms with them at all times and to be in the closest contact with them. I feel that that is the desire of the people of Ceylon.

When my hon. Friend (Diwan Bahadur I. X. Pereira) wants a gesture from us to allay the feelings in India, I should like to ask him whether the gesture that we are now making is not sufficiently worthy of his support. Is it not right that he should support us in our attempt to bring about good feelings between Indians and ourselves?

When we send our Representative to India, the Indian Government will also send their Representative here. That is one of the things they wanted us to consent to. The Indian Representative who may be sent will not have the prejudice or the imaginary grievances that exist among the people here. He will be able to take a detached view of matters, and perhaps he will be able to bring into closer agreement the viewpoints of the two countries. For that reason alone, I think it is only proper that the hon. Nominated Member (Diwan Bahadur I. X. Pereira) should support this proposal.

The hon. Nominated Member told us that before we send our Representative to India there are many matters to be settled. Does he say that any person of prominence acceptable to Ceylon is not likely to settle affairs in India, that it is he and his company alone who can settle matters there? I am sure the hon. Member himself will feel that it is very much better for a third party to be here and bring about a better understanding than for us to squabble over these matters.

One of the reasons why we want a Representative in India is this: when an Indian here feels that he has a grievance, and when we consider that it is an imaginary grievance, he goes to India and tells his people there that we ill-treat the Indians here. By that means a prejudice against Ceylon is created in that country, without this country being even afforded an opportunity of explain-

ing matters. Would my hon. Friend grudge us the opportunity of explaining matters to the Indian people when allegations of ill-treatment are made against us? Let the Indians see for themselves whether we are such bad people.

As far as I am concerned—I feel I am speaking for the people of Ceylon—I can definitely say that the people of Ceylon have the highest regard and affection for the Indians; but, at the same time, we have an affection for our own people. We want to live in this country as we have no other country to go to. If we make an effort to get through any scheme that will benefit the people of this country, we do so because of our desire to improve the condition of the people of Ceylon.

Ours is a small country and we cannot accommodate the whole world in it, however hospitable we may be. The 400,000,000 people in India cannot be accommodated in Ceylon. I am sure India will realize that. Ceylonese have no other place to go to. We only want an opportunity to live in this country and to maintain a standard of living that is worthy of any people, without being unfair or unjust to anyone, be he Indian or otherwise. At the same time, we wish to continue that long and traditional friendship we have with India. Our desire is to continue that friendship, and this attempt is made for the purpose of allowing it to continue.

There is one other remark that I should like to make. There was a reference made to Sir Baron during the course of this debate. I am not at the moment speaking of the unkind remarks made about him. There is a sort of impression formed by some Members that Sir Baron wants to go to India for some personal benefit, something unknown to me or to anybody else—that this is something of his own seeking.

I can tell the House what the attitude of Sir Baron with regard to this proposal is. From the time he left school, Sir Baron wanted to be of service to the people of Ceylon. He never thought of the inconveniences he would suffer or the positions he would reach in the course of rendering that service. All that he wanted to do was to serve the people; and that he has done all his life. If he feels that he can be of service to this country in any capacity whatever, it is

[The Hon. Mr. Senanayake.]  
not his convenience or his position that he considers but the opportunity to serve.

You will remember how, when Sir Baron Jayatilaka was not a Member of Council but only an ex-jail bird in 1915, when he was out of jail along with myself and others, when the war was on and the seas were infested with submarines and ships were being torpedoed and there were all kinds of dangers, and when the country wanted him to go to England and place our case before the English people, he went to England at great personal risk and sacrifice. He went to England, and he was there for three years, and that too not as an elected representative but as the chosen representative of the people, the representative of the people chosen to place before the English people the grievances of the people of Ceylon.

When there was this food shortage and he was asked whether he would go to India and plead our case, he agreed to do so. What he said then, and what he says now, is, "If it is necessary that I should go, I am ready to go. It is of very little concern to me how much inconvenient it is to me to leave the country". I wonder how many Members of this House would agree—not the aged; the young men—would be willing to leave Ceylon, to give up country, to banish oneself and do service among strangers. I do not think there will be many people who will be willing to do that. Even if there are Members who are willing to do it, I wonder how many of them will be received in the way Sir Baron will be received.

I have not the slightest doubt that this arrangement was possible because of the fact that there was a leader trusted by the people in Ceylon, trusted by the authorities in England, and trusted and acceptable to the Government of India available. It is because there was such a person that this arrangement was possible.

The House knows that, according to our Constitution, it is not possible for us to communicate with any other Government except through the Secretary of State. Actually we had nothing to do with regard to communication; we knew only the results! Now, when it comes to a Representative of ours going to

India to convey our views and plead with them and do everything necessary on our behalf, without interference from anyone, it is a great advance in our political life.

**The Hon. Mr. G. E. de Silva:** That is what they do not want.

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** I hope hon. Members will realize that it is not only a political advancement that we have made by this move, but that we have achieved something of great benefit to this country. We should realize the advantages that we would derive, the great advantage that we would derive. I hope that what we are going to obtain is not a few measures of rice but the re-establishment of the old friendship that existed between this country and India. That is more important than the few measures of rice that we may secure, although, of course, it is true that we are very short of rice just now.

There is just one matter to which I would like to refer before I sit down, and that is to give you the reason why I interrupted my hon. Friend the Burgher Nominated Member (Mr. Wille) when he stated that the Sinhalese were more or less hostile to the Indians, and that the—

**Mr. Wille:** May I make a correction? I said that that was the Indian impression, and they resented it.

**Mr. Abeywickrama:** Anglo-Indian!

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** I was just about to explain why I interrupted the hon. Member. He thought that there was such an impression abroad. In fact, when my hon. Friend referred to it, I was anxious that that impression should not be allowed to continue, not because we feel that there has been any act done by any section of the community which we consider has been unfair to the Indians, but because we feel certain that if there is any community that desires closer contact with the Indian people, there is no such community that is more anxious than the Sinhalese. By that I do not mean that the other communities do not share that anxiety. I only know that as far as the Sinhalese are concerned—I am myself a Sinhalese—they are very anxious to continue that friendship.

In fact, when I mentioned it I happened to turn round and, by accident, I managed to catch the eye of my hon. Friend the European Nominated Member. When I saw his face, it struck me at once that I should ask, "Why, oh, why, do you object to many things?" I only wish that, as good neighbours, we would rather not like to be (sort of) dragged into a controversy. We would like to be friendly neighbours; we do not want even the Indians to be in the position that they are in in Ceylon. I do not want to say anything more than that.

The Indians are in Ceylon because of circumstances, and if I speak of those circumstances, I am sure the Indians themselves will feel that it is not the Sinhalese or the Ceylonese who have placed them in this position but the powers that be of the time. They came to arrangements which have placed the Indians and ourselves in a most unenviable position. I do not want to say anything more on that point.

I hope the House will accept this Supplementary Estimate, and will consider the advantages of this proposal. As far as I can see, there is no disadvantage in accepting this proposal. I feel that it has very great advantages. I trust that the House will not make unkind remarks against the person who is willing to serve us, merely because we have given the fullest possible information on this proposal.

3 P.M.—

**Mr. Abeywickrama:** I move that the question be now put. Thirteen Members have spoken on this Supplementary Estimate. [MEMBERS: No! No!] I would ask that a division be taken. Today is Friday, and we have other business to get through.

**Mr. Ponambalam:** I should like to make a few observations on this vote.

**The Chairman:** Order, please!

**Mr. Ponnambalam:** I want to bring that fact to your notice, Mr. Chairman.

**The Chairman:** I accept the closure motion. The only ground on which I can refuse to entertain it is if it appears to me to be an infringement of the rights of a minority. I find that 12

speeches have been made, 4 in support of the proposal, 2 by Ministers, 1 by an Officer of State and 1 by a Private Member; and 8 speeches have been made by Private Members opposing the motion. In the circumstances it cannot be said—

**Mr. Ponnambalam:** Before you rule, Mr. Chairman, might I make an appeal? There are certain Members who are opposed to this proposition, but who, although we are in Committee, have so far not spoken. We have just heard a speech from a Minister who might well be called the Acting Leader of the House. We think it calls for a reply. Might I appeal to you, in the name of safeguarding the very minority you mentioned as contemplated in the Standing Orders, that you do not accept the closure motion, Mr. Chairman?

I do not think that this House has wasted the time at its disposal in considering this question. It is a question which is exercising the minds of the people at large. There is a section of opinion that has not expressed itself. Might I still appeal to you, Mr. Chairman, that there have been far less important questions which have occupied much greater length of time of the House? Might I appeal to you and to the Ministerial benches that this is the most inappropriate time, to move the closure motion? Might I also appeal to the hon. Member who moved the closure not to press for it, because it will almost mean that we are going to have recourse to the guillotine.

**The Chairman:** I maintain that, in view of the number of speeches that have been made by Private Members, the acceptance of the closure motion is not an infringement of the rights of a minority.

**Mr. S. Natesan (Kankasanturai)** rose.

**The Chairman:** Order, please!

**Mr. Natesan:** I wish to appeal to you, Sir.

**The Chairman:** I am sorry; the hon. Member for Point Pedro (Mr. Ponnambalam) has made an appeal.

**Mr. Natesan:** I wish to appeal on different grounds.

**The Chairman:** The only ground on which I can refuse to accept such a motion is if in the opinion of the Chair it is an infringement of the rights of a minority, and I have held that it is not an infringement.

**Mr. Natesan:** Sir, might I make my appeal—

**The Chairman:** Order.

**Mr. Natesan:** With regard to the amendment moved by the hon. Nominated Member (Mr. Jayah), some of us are very anxious that that aspect of the matter should be considered. You will have noticed that so far no expressions of opinion have been made on that amendment.

**The Chairman:** I have accepted the closure motion.

**Mr. Ponnambalam:** Might I appeal that you apply the closure at a given time? It is 3 o'clock now. Might I say that you do it at 3.30 P.M.?

**The Chairman:** I cannot accept the closure in the middle of a speech. I would not like to do it.

**Mr. Ponnambalam:** I did not mean that. You can accept the closure motion moved by the hon. Member for Udugama (Mr. Abeywickrama), but apply it at 3.15, 3.30 or 3.45 P.M.

**The Chairman:** If a Member is in the middle of a speech then, how can I ask him to stop?

**Mr. Ponnambalam:** As soon as he has finished?

**The Chairman:** I accept the closure motion. Twenty Members must support the closure motion.

Question put, "That the question be now put".

*Fifteen Members voted in support of the motion.*

Motion accordingly declared not carried.

**Mr. Ponnambalam:** Mr. Chairman, I must confess that I feel highly gratified that there is a section of Members in this House who are prepared to listen to views with which they might not be

in complete, or partial agreement, and I am more than grateful—I think you will permit me to give expression to that view, Mr. Chairman—that this attempt to burke discussion has proved completely abortive, and I hope it will prove to be a lesson to those who try to carry out the edicts of their Ministerial masters not to try such tactics in the future. I am moved, because I have been carefully following the debate. There is a volume of opinion strongly opposed to the measure before the House, and here, without the slightest notice given to anybody, the motion for closure has been moved. I am sorry I have given vent to a certain amount of feeling, but I could not help it.

I thought this debate could be conducted decently without any personal rancour or animosity, because the occasion demands it, because I feel that when the history of this episode comes to be written, the first question that may be asked may well be this: on what foundation does the reputation—an already established reputation—of our erstwhile Legal Secretary and present Chief Secretary rest? I know that that reputation has been built on very secure and stable foundations. We have known him as an advocate of various causes; we have known him as a public orator; but I think, if the palm has to be given for an individual performance, it will be given to him as a funeral orator, all the more so because the object of his premature funeral oration is still very much alive. It was so touching; it was so much in the tradition of the Public Service; he gave a nice testimonial, a certificate, almost an illuminated address. Nothing could have been better. The choice expressions that fell from the lips of the Chief Secretary deserve to be perpetuated in an illuminated scroll which the ambassador-to-be from Ceylon could very well remove to the capital of India and exhibit to those who are to parley with him.

Mr. Chairman, this kind of funeral oration is rather catching, because I find that the rather harsh and stentorian voice of the Minister of Agriculture seemed to be subdued, seemed to have become mellowed; his usual bellicose strain had become almost lachrymose.

Perhaps the most trenchant criticism of one aspect of this question came from one of the recent additions to this House, namely the hon. Member for Negombo (Mr. Siriwardana). Are we here taking the time of the House perpetrating another farce and another fraud? What had happened? Apparently the germ of this scheme was laid months ago. It was germinated; it was sprouted; everything is over, barring the shouting—if I may mix the metaphor. Negotiations have been carried on. The imprimatur of the Secretary of State has been obtained. The blessings of Viceregal Lodge have been given. What is more, we are told that the Indian Government contemplate, not to be beaten by our little venture, elevating the status of their representative and appointing a person here in keeping with the dignity of our ambassador. That is the state of affairs in which the representatives of the people are called upon to pass a Supplementary Estimate.

I have drawn, very respectfully, the attention of this House on more than one occasion to this habit of the Ministerial Board, of assuming the assent of the representatives of the people and carrying negotiations to such a length that they can well come before us and say, "Now do not stultify your Ministerial Board. Give us your sanction, even though we have done something wrong". Mr. Chairman, that attitude is growing; it is growing to such an alarming extent that I had, even at the beginning of this week, to draw the attention of the House to the fact that we were very nearly abdicating from the position that had been given to us—thank goodness, not by the Ministers—by the electorate of this country. That is the position.

If I have any qualms, any hesitation about taking the time of the House any longer than I have been used to, it is because I see the utter futility of this debate in this House when every major decision is conceived in private, hatched in secret and brought to the light of this House, in this case, for the first time to-day.

Indeed we are told by no less a person than the Chief Secretary himself that for months, apparently for a period approaching a year, they had realized that some such representation of this country

is necessary in India. Apparently this is not one of those matters that arose out of an emergency; it was not one of those matters in which the opinion of the elected representatives of the people could not have been obtained in time; it was not one of those matters on which a report could not have been presented; it was not one of those matters in which we could not have been called together unofficially, if necessary, and our views ascertained.

It required the persistent efforts of more than one Member of this House to extract the belated promise that this matter would come up for discussion. And in what form? As a Supplementary Estimate—when even the appointee to the office has been asked and has consented. Mr. Chairman, is this House honest? Would it be true to itself? Can the Members be expected to be taken seriously when they get out to their electorates, if in each of these matters they are to be passively acquiescent in the decisions already taken? I for one, however ineffective my protest may be, would like to register my most indignant protest at this culmination of a number of such cases when our opinions have been completely ignored and decisions taken and we have been invited to acquiesce in those decisions. That is one aspect of the matter; and I must congratulate the hon. Member for Negombo (Mr. Siriwardana)—I find that he has just come in—on touching upon it.

The other point, Mr. Chairman, is the purpose, the object of this appointment. How delightfully vague, how almost urbane and diplomatic the Chief Secretary was when describing the functions of this office. In fact, he said that the functions of this dignity have been framed in language as wide and as general as possible. That is true, Mr. Chairman; it is more than true. It is the most elusive set of functions that a person can possibly contemplate.

What is to be the position of the person who is the Leader of the House and the first citizen of the land? What is his position going to be? In what capacity is he going? Is he going under a Constitution where "External Relations" are within the purview of this House? I ask that question. With whom would

[Mr. Ponnambalam.]  
 "External Relations" remain for the duration of the war? Do I understand that from an overflowing anxiety and a passion for public service, the Hon. Leader of the House contemplates taking orders from one who is not a Minister of the House? That is the question. I stress it, Mr. Chairman; and that was one of the reasons why I asked you not to allow the motion for closure.

The Constitutional aspect of the question has not been touched upon. What precisely is to be the position of this person who is to itinerate, though not in the fashion of a travelling circus as the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Lands contemplated, but all by himself, as a ring-master? From whom does he take his instructions, I should like to know; and if those instructions are contrary to the wishes of this House, what is the position? Is this representative merely to be a facile mouthpiece of a section of the Government of this country which is not responsible to the elected legislature, or is he getting an *ad hoc* appointment with very definite ideas of what the functions involved are? In other words, is he to be an independent agent, or is he going to be dressed in the swaddling clothes provided by the Chief Secretary and the Governor? I would like to know that. Secondly, what are his powers in the matter of settling—very, very nice phrase—problems of mutual concern between India and Ceylon? How lovely! Who is he, and what right will he have to commit this country in the solution, speedy or otherwise, of problems of mutual concern? Mr. Chairman, are we seriously expected to swallow that pill?

There has been diatribe after diatribe hurled on the head of this old man, diatribes not really quite necessary upon an occasion like this; I do not say "undeserved", but hardly necessary. For the services he has rendered to Buddhist scholarship, to Buddhist learning and to the resurgence of Buddhist education, which are real services rendered by this gentleman, every section of the people of this country will always be grateful. If he was undertaking a goodwill mission, a semi-religious mission; if he was going as a modern Mahinda, on a return trip carrying back the gospel, well, I can

understand it. We shall all be at the Jetty to see him off; we will even throw flowers at him.

But, Mr. Chairman, we are considering here a person who is a diplomat, a person who will have to lie abroad for his country; and I must confess that Sir Baron Jayatilaka, apart from the episode investigated by the Bracegirdle Commission, has not given any such promise. The Chief Secretary told us that this person as the Leader of the House holding an unparalleled position of eminence in this country is to join the privileged and pampered class of Public Servant, the apex of the social pyramid in the Colonies of the Empire. But at the same time—that is the curious thing—he spoke of it as if it was an act of self-abnegation. I always thought that the last infirmity of a noble mind was "to scorn delights and live laborious days". But this gentleman wants to scorn his Ministerial days and emulate ambassadorial ways!

And such a person is to settle outstanding questions between India and Ceylon. I feel that there is a catch in that. Our memories are notoriously short. There has been one deputation to Imperial Delhi; significantly enough, that deputation was led by the Minister of Agriculture and Lands, and the permanent Financial Secretary brought up the rear. The Hon. Minister of Local Administration was the discarded middle. And, I believe, somewhere, pitchforked in between this trio, was the Minister of Labour, Industry and Commerce. But the Hon. Leader of the House, this paragon of all the virtues, this pre-eminently great man, found no place. He was not even invited to go. In fact, we are aware that he was rather gently elbowed out. But, of course, Mr. Chairman, some Ministers have a nice way of elbowing out a person.

In these matters, the compliment had to be returned, and India sent a deputation here led by a very distinguished Oxford man. We would have then thought perhaps that Sir Baron's brief sojourn at Oxford, imbibing Oxford culture, would have entitled him to a place in the coterie of those selected few who were to meet the distinguished representatives of Imperial Delhi on behalf of the Ceylon Government. But no, Mr. Chairman. Sir Baron Jayatilaka was kept as a



curio only to be looked at, to be admired, but not to be approached. Or are we to understand that for Sir Baron Jayatilaka to participate in deliberations of such a nature would to reduce himself to the level of mundane human beings, that he was really reserved for something much bigger, and that really then the Ministers had a glimmering of the possibility that, alone and by himself, he should be given the opportunity of solving this insoluble problem? Is it that, Mr. Chairman, or is it that Sir Baron Jayatilaka, after his brief sojourn in India, felt that that country, even in the present disturbed state, would afford him an asylum more congenial to his advancing age and over-maturing wisdom than the somewhat irreverent exhibitions which he witnesses within this House and outside it? Or is it due perhaps to his feeling that he has in point of fact lived too long and that he must really make way for others?

I say that for a very good reason. It is remarkable, it is even disconcerting how short our memories can be, how disconcertingly short they can be. Mr. Chairman, one of the gravest reflections upon this appointment is this. This debate started somewhere about 4.30 last afternoon, and I believe after nearly seven speeches for the opposition had been made, the first advocate, the first defender of the vanishing faith was found in the person of the present Minister of Health and erstwhile Member for Kandy.

**The Hon. Mr. G. E. de Silva:** I am still the Member for Kandy.

**Mr. Ponnambalam:** Still Member for Kandy, but not in the Opposition. There is a great difference, Mr. Chairman, because, if the speech of the Chief Secretary was a funeral oration, if the speech of the Minister of Agriculture and Lands was lachrymose in the extreme—the speech of the Minister of Health excelled them all—I do not mean merely in the matter of mixed metaphors, but excelled them all in delivering a panegyric.

But, as I said, we are a notorious people with short memories. You will remember, Mr. Chairman—or have you forgotten it?—some little time ago—not very long ago—in April, 1940, the Board

of Ministers staged a little drama. They went out more or less in a body. They felt that they should have a little change. They came and sat here, in the back-benches. Special seats were provided for them. Then one fine morning we saw them all back in the front benches. But there was this significant difference: there was no leader for this ramshackle crew; there was no leader. And what was more, they would not elect a leader. There was something brewing, something going to happen, something in the air.

Well, what was in the air materialized in the form of a vote of censure sponsored by the Member for Matale (Mr. Aluwihare) and directed against Sir Baron Jayatilaka. That was in April, 1940, Mr. Chairman. How fast we grow old in this country!

*From 3.25 p.m. MR. SPEAKER presided as Chairman.*

**The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike:** We were just growing old when you came in, Sir!

**Mr. Ponnabalam:** I was just referring to a small anecdote, Mr. Chairman, when you took the Chair. I was referring to a debate that took place in 1940, just over 2 years ago, in which, on the motion for censure brought by the hon. Member for Matale, against the Minister of Home Affairs, then not the elected Leader of the House, his present advocate in the Ministerial Board and unquestioning admirer—the present Minister of Health—spoke in these terms:

“ I feel it my duty to support this motion. I am convinced that the Leader of the House is no longer serviceable to the country as Minister of Home Affairs or as Leader of the House.”

He was referring to the one man above all men in every sphere of human activity put forward as the person who must be sent abroad.

“ I say this not for the first time, not for the second time, third time . . . that the Leader of the House has failed us.

That was in April, 1940, Mr. Chairman.

“ Are we going to allow him to carry on in this position so that the country may get into a more chaotic state than it is now?”

A Member who is no longer in this House asked:

“ Do you want to hang him ?”

[Mr. Ponnambalam.]

Another:

"I do not want to hang him; he has hanged himself."

So that, not only are we really participating in some contemplated obsequies, but this is also something in the nature of a resurrection! The present Minister of Health really could not contain himself: he became so indignant, that Sir D. B. Jayatilaka had to appeal to you to save him from his present friend. Sir D. B. Jayatilaka addressing you said on that occasion:

"I must sit down, or you must ask this gentleman to keep his mouth shut. He does not see how unfair he can be; he does not even realize it."

Sir D. B. Jayatilaka said that of the Member for Kandy when he was standing up in defence of himself, standing alone, Mr. Chairman—that is the poignant fact—standing alone in his old age. I have on most occasions found myself opposed to Sir D. B. Jayatilaka and his views, but I must say that on this occasion he made one of the finest speeches of his entire career. Of course, as is his wont, he completely ignored the indictment presented by the Member for Matale (Mr. Aluwihare).

I am referring to this because the question has been asked whether this is not a means of getting rid of Sir D. B. Jayatilaka. That question has been insistently asked, and we must face it. There is no better place in which to face it than this House itself.

"Is he being kicked upstairs?" we are asked. You can hardly say that a man who, being the Leader of this House, is made to take office as a public servant under the Chief Secretary is being kicked upstairs. Oh, no! He is being gently let downstairs, on cushioned steps lined with plush. He is being let downstairs, very gently—not kicked upstairs. Even the robust constitution of Sir D. B. Jayatilaka would not stand being kicked upstairs.

I say that there is something very relevant in that question, for this reason. As early as April, 1940, Sir D. B. Jayatilaka, with rather astonishing perspicacity, had come to the realization that all this to-do that was taking place at that time was really not for any par-

ticular fault that had suddenly been discovered in him, but because he had lived too long! He had occupied that chair for too long a period, and he was not giving way to his impatient friends. I will quote his exact words:

"To judge from what has been said, I have committed one crime, to which I am afraid I must plead guilty, and that is, I have lived too long. There are so many people who are so anxious about my health and welfare that they want to help me to withdraw from the position I hold."

And then, having referred to the story of the Buddha and his brother-in-law, Devadatta, with a significant glance to his right, he said, "The breed of Devadattas is not extinct in Ceylon."

After all, Mr. Chairman, a person can rightly be judged by his own words, by the normal interpretation that one places on the English language, which, fortunately or unfortunately, still remains our *lingua franca*. So judged by these words, as far back as two years ago Sir D. B. Jayatilaka felt that an attempt was being made—at that time abortive, because it was a flank movement—an attempt was being made gently to get him out of the way, in order to keep him in good health for some longer time than he would live if he was called upon to continue performing the onerous duties of Minister of Home Affairs and Leader of the House!

And, after a valiant defence put up by the old man—we hear so much about this "venerable" old man, what happened to those colleagues of his who have now become vociferous in their affection for him, an affection which has become an affectation? What happened at the close of that debate, what happened at the division, Mr. Chairman? Sir D. B. Jayatilaka, of course, as a matter of form had to decline to vote on the motion of no-confidence in him, but all his colleagues on the Ministerial Board declined to vote on that motion of censure!

Would it be irrelevant, or irreverent, to inquire from the Ministerial Benches, which still remain the same in composition except for one Member, since when has there been a subsequent accretion of confidence in the old gentleman, and how did that particular accretion of confidence come about? Can we really and honestly face the people and say that this is not a repetition of the same move?

We have a habit, as we grow older, of forgetting what happened six months or a year ago. Somebody put it that with advancing age, the right foot does not know what the left hand does. That is one of those *bon mots* that we get in this House. I do not know whether you have been assailed by that complaint, Mr. Chairman, but certainly Sir D. B. Jayatilaka seems to have forgotten this rather gentle, but abortive, effort made in 1940 to get rid of him.

This is an astonishing case. This gentleman, as most of us know quite well, was not at all anxious to go to India, in the first instance, but by devious methods, one fine morning Sir D. B. Jayatilaka found himself committed to go to India, without knowing it, and so he went. Then there were two sentiments operating, one of them prevalent here: "Now that the old fellow has gone, how can we keep him there? How long can we manage to keep him there?"

I should have thought that the reaction in the breast of the old gentleman would have been a desire to get back to Ceylon as quickly as possible, but he certainly worked himself into a position where he had practically to call upon the Board of Ministers and the Officers of State, and say "Look here, appoint me to go abroad".

That is another extraordinary aspect of the situation, that a Minister, in his old age—

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** Would the hon. Member allow me to correct him? It is unfair to Sir Baron to say that he came and offered himself. That is not so. As I have already stated, he was only too ready to be of service anywhere we considered him to be most useful, where his services were necessary. He was making a sacrifice.

**Mr. Ponnambalam:** I am perfectly willing to accept the explanation of the Minister of Agriculture and Lands, but here again we see a case of, "What the right end says, the left end does not know." We have the word of the Minister of Health. What did he say? That Sir D. B. Jayatilaka was most anxious to go to India.

**The Hon. Mr. G. E. de Silva:** The hon. Member is misrepresenting what I

said. I said that Sir D. B. Jayatilaka stated that if his services were wanted in India, he was willing to go.

**Mr. Ponnambalam:** Which, by interpretation, means this, "I have found for myself a very 'cushy' job, and at a time like this I am not averse to taking it up. I can address myself to Buddhist lore and Pali, I can be close to Buddha Gaya and to Saranath. I am prepared to go". That is how I interpret it. Of course, I have a peculiar mind in these matters. I am not inclined to be so generous to these people as some others are to-day with the people's money.

All this certainly leaves a very bad taste in the mouth. Sir D. B. Jayatilaka leaves for India a few months ago, and discovers, for the first time, that not only must we have a permanent representative with the Government of India, but that a whole complicated machinery of representation and a purchasing machinery with elaborate offices, with private secretaries and the like, should be established in India.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a situation like this is not peculiar to this country only. Situations like this have arisen in other countries. We have had Baldwin serving under MacDonald; we have had Chamberlain before he died serving under his *bete noir*—Churchill.

Now, if honestly the Leadership of this Council and of the country has become inept, nerveless, inefficient and incompetent, well then, why not change horses? We are not in midstream. [Interruption.] I thank the Legal Secretary for the remark—"They are changing now!" That is it! They are changing now; they are swopping places—but they are sending one horse across the seas! The truth must come out, and it has come out. You are swopping horses at a cost of Rs. 50,000 a year to this country. That, in the words of the Minister of Health, is a mere bagatelle! Rs. 50,000 to get rid of a man, nicely, gently, with perfect decorum and dignity. This is only a nice, decent way of getting rid of an old horse, an old horse, panting, trying to get uphill. Get rid of it and take in its stead a horse that will break through jungles, that can go right through scrub and jungle.

The other Members who has proved to be the most vocal advocate of this

[Mr. Ponnambalam.] appointment is the hon. Member for Gampola (Mr. R. S. S. Gunawardana). I must confess to a weakness: I rather like the hon. Member; I am rather fond of him. He usually, fortunately for him, is on the right side, but I was surprised when to-day he let himself go and began to shriek and howl. He was very annoyed that unbecoming sentiments should have been expressed on the Floor of this House with reference to this paragon of all the virtues.

Might I remind him, if it is not too unkind, that the hon. Member was associated with me in considering that neither Sir D. B. Jayatilaka, nor incidentally yourself, Mr. Chairman, nor the Hon. Minister of Labour, Industry and Commerce, should be entrusted with the right to make representations when you too went on a voyage, to the Coronation.

**Mr. R. S. S. Gunawardana:** I stand by that.

**Mr. Ponnambalam:** The hon. Member stands by that. Then, on matters of such great moment, on questions such as the reform of the Constitution—I take it he does not want me to weary the House by reading the passages—he did not feel that Sir D. B. Jayatilaka can be properly entrusted with the task of conveying to the advisers of His Majesty's Government the views of this Council and this country on questions of Constitutional reform.

**Mr. R. S. S. Gunawardana:** Sir,—

**Mr. Ponnambalam:** He who argues against himself is of the same opinion still.

Clearly, Mr. Chairman, if upon a question which had been thoroughly canvassed and fully discussed, we did not think that Sir D. B. Jayatilaka could express our views correctly to His Majesty's Government, are we going to allow him, on matters of moment, as they arise and when they arise, to represent accurately, at a distance of several thousands of miles away the views and opinions of the people of this country? I should have thought that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Lands really would not have drawn the

analogy between the position of Sir D. B. Jayatilaka, which, in the representative hierarchy, apparently has found no place or precedent in the past, because he is not a High Commissioner or Agent-General but only a representative of the Government for the duration of the war, and an Ambassador sent from England to America. One would imagine that we are a sovereign country with a sovereign legislature and a Cabinet dictatorship?

It is not as if in England they sent Sir Geoffrey Butler as Ambassador Extraordinary to Washington or Sir Stafford Cripps to the Kremlin during this war, or Sir Samuel Hoare, relinquishing his Ministerial portfolio but not his seat in the House of Commons, as Ambassador to Spain. Are we seriously asked to draw even the remotest analogy between such appointments in England with that contemplated here? Of course, the analogy will fail, in the sense that we are told that the Hon. Leader has undertaken to resign his seat in Council.

We have already had three missions to India. First, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Lands went. He obtained a promise from the Commerce Member of the Government of India. Subsequently, the Hon. Minister of Labour, Industry and Commerce went to India, and he got that promise partially implemented. In a way, we were given to understand that nearly 38,000 tons of rice a month would reach this country. In point of fact, 50 per cent. of it have never reached this country, in spite of the able intervention of two Ministerial heads and the subsequent benediction of the third.

In the meantime what has happened? The Government of India has made it abundantly clear that the supply of rice to Ceylon will be made through the normal trade channels. That was definitely a condition put upon their promise. Apparently, because of the non-observance of that condition, or because it was impossible to observe it, the fact remains that we did not get even 50 per cent. of what was promised.

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** That is not quite correct. In the first instance, it was to be sent through the normal trade

channels. If that failed, the Government of India had undertaken to give us all the assistance possible to find the rice, and even the transport if it was possible. They wanted us, in the first instance, to try to obtain the rice through the normal trade channels, and failing that, they were prepared to help us.

**Mr. Ponnambalam:** I accept that explanation. But the fact is that we have not got 50 per cent. of what was promised to us. This point is significant. Before Sir D. B. Jayatilaka went to India two or three months ago, the Madras Government had completely re-oriented their attitude in the matter of purchase of rice. In the first instance, they had decided to buy all available rice and food grains in the Madras Presidency. That was actually done before Sir D. B. Jayatilaka went to India.

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** No, Sir.

**Mr. Ponnambalam:** It is so. I challenge the Hon. Minister on that point. I want some documentary evidence. The Madras Government were definitely undertaking a change in their policy and were going to be solely responsible for the purchase of rice and food grains in the Madras Presidency.

I see, Mr. Chairman, that the Hon. Minister of Labour, Industry and Commerce is mute.

**The Hon. Mr. G. C. S. Corea (Minister of Labour, Industry & Commerce):** I shall speak when my turn comes.

**Mr. Ponnambalam:** Now, it may be that when we sent Sir D. B. Jayatilaka to India, we were not aware of that fact. I say that before Sir D. B. Jayatilaka left these shores, that decision had been taken by the Madras Government. On representations made by the Governor's Government of this country, the Central Government of India have asked the provinces to allot a certain quota to Ceylon—and this is the most important thing—the Madras Presidency has allotted us 15,000 tons. These 15,000 tons will therefore be bought through the

machinery of the Madras Government. And we are left with 5,000 tons of rice for which this great dignitary, the Leader of the House, and a tremendous organization involving several members of the Civil Service, on enhanced emoluments, have gone to India to establish themselves there.

Mr. Chairman, what are the requirements of the Travancore Government? Their requirements are actually more than the requirements of the Ceylon Government. They have not established Ministers Plenipotentiary, Envoys Extraordinary or Itinerating Ambassadors to get this rice from across various Presidencies into Travancore. That problem has existed in respect of certain other Native States also.

It is really very difficult to convince anybody that you want this elaborate organization with Sir D. B. Jayatilaka at the head to bring in 5,000 tons of rice. If you are incapable, if the ministerial Board from here is incapable of negotiating and getting those 5,000 tons of rice sent to us, the sooner they throw in the sponge the better.

Then, I must also, as representing a section of the House who hold that view, enter my emphatic protest against this appointment. Questions about spending are not merely the concern of the ministerial Board or the Indian Government. Hon. Members may or may not agree with me, but I think they will bear with me to this extent, that I have never hesitated to express in plain language my personal views on questions such as immigration and alienation of Crown land; on the question of the definition of the word "Ceylonese", and I have held the view that we really have for a very small benefit that might possibly accrue to us alienated the sympathies of a very powerful neighbour who would always extend a helping hand to Ceylon. I have held that view, and I am not too happy that that view has triumphed.

In point of fact, this Board of Ministers, under the leadership and almost the tutelage, if one is to give any weight to the panegyrics and encomiums that are paid to Sir D. B. Jayatilaka, have carried on a policy which has proved altogether unsatisfactory. The fact remains

[Mr. Ponnambalam.]  
that they have completely alienated the sympathies of a vast section of the Indian people.

Mr. Chairman, a person who says that Sir D. B. Jayatilaka, lounging in the city of Delhi, is likely to bring conviction to the hearts and minds of Indians, is asking us to swallow a big pill. Surely, representation in one country goes with the nationals of that country. You will remember that India has had a member of the Civil Service, not a very senior member but a fairly good member as the Agent of the Government of India in Ceylon, because there are Indian nationals in Ceylon. The main reason for having a representative in a country, is the presence of a large number of nationals of that country resident in the country in which you have a representative.

Mr. Chairman, surely it is the height of political impudence for Ministers to come here and cry and say that there is a great deal of misrepresentation being carried on, if they cannot, round a table or over a cup of tea, convince the Agent of the Government of India, who is not a nationalist or a politician, to the contrary. He is a Civil Servant come here to do his duty. All you have to do is to ask him to report the truth to his Government. The work has got to be done here. If there is a charge of discriminatory legislation in this country, and if that charge is to be met, it can be met by satisfying the Government of India through their representative in this country. You will have to satisfy that gentleman here that there is no active discrimination, that there is no campaign against the Indians.

So that, all these great questions that would arise—matters of mutual concern and moment—will reduce themselves to nothing except that Sir D. B. Jayatilaka, rather a conventional or social figure-head, will dine with Administrative Secretaries. Yes, dine but, being a teetotaler, he will not wine; but he can whine (with an "h" in it).

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** May I move that we continue the debate until it is concluded?

**The Chairman:** We might have a break of 15 minutes for tea.

**The Hon. Colonel Kotalawala:** Can anyone move now that the question be now put?

**The Chairman:** We have debated this subject sufficiently.

**Mr. Freeman:** Since you have ruled before that tea is to be at 4 o'clock, I suggest that we adjourn for tea now. It is very inconvenient if we do not, because we do not want to have cold tea, and it is not fair to the caterer.

**The Chairman:** We will suspend the sitting for 20 minutes for tea.

*Sitting accordingly suspended until 4.30 p.m., and then resumed.*

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** I move, Sir, that Emergency Standing Order 2 (4) be suspended to enable opposed business as well to be considered after 4.30 P.M.

Question put, and agreed to.

**Dr. Kaleel:** Sir, after listening to the revelations of the hon. Member for Point Pedro (Mr. Ponnambalam), concerning the storied past of the Members of this House, more particularly of the Members in the front benches, with regard to the opinions they have held from time to time of the Leader of the House, I feel that it is not fair for me now to speak on that subject. I have, Sir, deliberately forgotten some of the things that I wanted to say, because it would appear like the Sinhalese saying: "*Gahen wetuna minihata gona enna wage*".

I would, however, like to point out one matter over which there is a great deal of misunderstanding, not only among Members of this House, but also among the public both in Ceylon and in India. There are people who think that there definitely is anti-Indian feeling in Ceylon, and there are others who think that there is no such feeling in this country. I think that in a way both parties are right. None of those who support the view that there is anti-Indian feeling in

this country, and none of those who deny that there is such feeling, is absolutely convinced of what he is saying.

Listening to the speeches of those who felt that there was anti-Indian feeling, one could have discerned that there was also feeling at the back of their minds that things were not so bad as they want us to believe. On the other hand, those who said that there was no anti-Indian feeling in this country gave one the impression that they too had a feeling at the back of their minds that there was a good amount of anti-Indian feeling prevailing at present in the country.

As far as I can see, there is absolutely no real anti-Indian feeling at all in Ceylon. In point of fact, there is no anti-Indian feeling among the people of this country. There is, however, an artificial feeling created against the Indians by certain interested parties at certain times for particular purposes.

I should like to give hon. Members a short history of the anti-Indian feeling that has been created in this country. You will remember, Sir, that before the Donoughmore system of Government was adopted in this country, there was no kind of anti-Indian feeling here. At that time the people of Ceylon, both Indian and Ceylonese, got on well politically, socially and economically.

I must, at the outset, trace the history of this anti-Indian feeling.

**The Chairman:** Should we go into all that?

**Dr. Kaleel:** That is the most important point, Sir.

**The Chairman:** We have had enough of it.

**The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike:** Another controversy by itself!

**Dr. Kaleel:** I shall not take more than 10 minutes.

This feeling, as I said, was created for a certain particular purpose, particularly, I regret to say, by my predecessor. When the elections were to be held, my Friend looked for something by which he could create a strong feeling among the masses in order to support his election campaign. I must say that he was

a great student of mass psychology. He first started by burning the effigies of certain leading citizens of this country. But he found that it did not work. Then, he started this campaign of an anti-Indian feeling among the masses just for the purpose of his election campaign.

From then onwards some of our amateur leaders thought that this was really something to go on. They really did not understand why the Labour Leader created this feeling; they began to feel that there was really something in it and began to work on it for their own particular purposes. The people began to be moved more and more by the speeches made by these new leaders; they themselves mistook what was really a temporary madness as the feeling that was generally prevalent in this country.

The Indian Members then misunderstood the whole situation; they thought that the leaders were against them, that the people were against them. I think the Leader of the House was quite right when he said that there was no such feeling in this country at all.

Before one can have any cultural, economic or other form of understanding between India and Ceylon, it is necessary that this anti-Indian feeling should be removed from the minds of the Indian people. I think the suggestion made by the Muslim Nominated Member (Mr. Jayah) was really a very good one, because the only way of helping the Leader of the House, in the work that he will be called upon to do in India, is to prepare the way. That could be done by sending a representative body from Ceylon—representative of all communities and shades of opinion—particularly of those who are *persona grata* with the Indian leaders to first settle all differences that are prevalent, real or imaginary.

As I pointed out, this feeling was really a stunt started by certain political leaders. They themselves gave up that idea the moment they gained their object. For instance, my predecessor, gave up that idea the moment he became a Member of this House. Actually, when he wanted to become the Mayor of the Municipal Council, he gave it in writing that he would entertain no further anti-Indian feeling.

**The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike:** What is all this? Is not this irrelevant?

**Dr. Kaleel:** Therefore, I would strongly support the amendment of the Muslim Nominated Member (Mr. Jayah), that a deputation be sent from this country, anterior to the departure of the Leader of the House, in order to prepare the way and to bring about a perfect understanding between the two different countries. Then matters will be very easy for the Leader of the House when he goes to India. He will find that there is no propaganda of any sort to disturb his mind. He will be able to do his work very much better and in a way that will be acceptable both to the people of this Island and the people of India.

I therefore support the amendment moved, that the Board of Ministers should reconsider whether it is not feasible to send a deputation consisting of a few Members. They should not, of course, forget the spirit in which the Supplementary Estimate is referred back, and send the wrong type of Members or constitute themselves into another deputation and go on a holiday to India during the Christmas season. I hope they will consider this matter very seriously, and select carefully the people who should go and who could really bring about that understanding, and send such a deputation either before Sir Baron goes to India or along with him.

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** I move that the question be now put?

**The Chairman:** Does the House agree?

**Members:** Aye!

Question put, "That Supplementary Estimate be referred back to the Board of Ministers for further consideration".

The Committee divided: Ayes, 15; Noes, 29.

**AYES.**

Aluwihare, Mr. B. H.	Pereira, Diwan Bahadur
De Zoysa, Dr. A. P.	I. X.
Dharmaretnam, Mr. S.	Ponnambalam, Mr. G. G.
Ilangantilleke, Mr. J. H.	Razik, Mr. A. R. A.
Jayah, Mr. T. B.	Samarakkody, Mr. S.
Kaleel, Dr. M. C. M.	Siriwardana, Mr. H. de Z.
Natesan, Mr. S.	Sri Pathmanathan, Mr. R.
Newnam, Mr. H. E.	Wille, Mr. G. A. H.
C.M.G., Y.D.	

**NOES.**

Kannangara, The Hon.	Freeman, Mr. H. R.
Mr. C. W. W.	Griffith, Mr. F. H.
Senanayake, The Hon.	Gunasekera, Mr. D. D.
Mr. D. S.	Gunawardana, Mr. R. S. S.
Bandaranaike, The Hon.	Hewavitarne, Mr. Rajah
Mr. S. W. R. D.	Jayasuriya, Mr. A. P.
Corea, The Hon. Mr.	Jayasuriya, Mr. D. P.
G. C. S.	Kularatna, Mr. P. de S.
Kotalawala, The Hon.	Mahadeva, Mr. A.
Colonel, J. L.	Nugawela, Major E. A.
De Silva, The Hon. Mr.	Parfit, Mr. H. F.
G. E.	Rajapaksa, Mr. D. M.
Abeywickrama, Mr. Simon	Ratnayaka, Mr. A.
Amarasuriya, Mr. H. W.	Ratwatta, Mr. H. L.
Amarasuriya, Mr. Thomas	Senanayake, Mr. Dudley
Batuwantudawe, Mr. U.	Tambimuttu, Mr. E. R.
De Fonseka, Mr. Susanta	Wanigasekera, Mr. D.
De Silva, Mr. G. R.	

Question put, "That Supplementary Estimate (1) be passed".

The Committee divided: Ayes, 30; Noes, 14:

**AYES.**

Kannangara, The Hon.	Freeman, Mr. H. R.
Mr. C. W. W.	Griffith, Mr. F. H.
Senanayake, The Hon.	Gunasekera, Mr. D. D.
Mr. D. S.	Gunawardana, Mr. R. S. S.
Bandaranaike, The Hon.	Hewavitarne, Mr. Rajah
Mr. S. W. R. D.	Ilangantilleke, Mr. J. H.
Corea, The Hon. Mr.	Jayasuriya, Mr. A. P.
G. C. S.	Jayasuriya, Mr. D. P.
Kotalawala, The Hon.	Kularatna, Mr. P. de S.
Colonel, J. L.	Mahadeva, Mr. A.
De Silva, The Hon. Mr.	Nugawela, Major E. A.
G. E.	Parfit, Mr. H. F.
Abeywickrama, Mr. Simon	Rajapaksa, Mr. D. M.
Amarasuriya, Mr. H. W.	Ratnayaka, Mr. A.
Amarasuriya, Mr. Thomas	Ratwatta, Mr. H. L.
Batuwantudawe, Mr. U.	Senanayake, Mr. Dudley
De Fonseka, Mr. Susanta	Tambimuttu, Mr. E. R.
De Silva, Mr. G. R.	Wanigasekera, Mr. D.

**NOES.**

Aluwihare, Mr. B. H.	Pereira, Diwan Bahadur
De Zoysa, Dr. A. P.	I. X.
Dharmaretnam, Mr. S.	Ponnambalam, Mr. G. G.
Jayah, Mr. T. B.	Razik, Mr. A. R. A.
Kaleel, Dr. M. C. M.	Samarakkody, Mr. S.
Natesan, Mr. S.	Siriwardana, Mr. H. de Z.
Newnam, Mr. H. E.	Sri Pathmanathan, Mr. R.
C.M.G., Y.D.	Wille, Mr. G. A. H.

(2) Civil Service: Acting Salaries of Class II. Officers functioning in Class I. Posts.

**The Hon. Mr. R. H. Drayton (Chief Secretary):** I beg to move the following Supplementary Estimate standing in my name:

Head 6, Civil Service.

Sub-head 1, Personal Emoluments.

Amount: Rs. 10 (token vote).

Nature of Service: To obtain authority to meet from savings the acting salaries of officers in Class II. of the C. C. S. acting in posts classified as Class I. posts in the amended Civil Services Minute.



Mr. Chairman, my Observations are extremely lengthy. I do not think that I should add to them at this stage of the proceedings.

I beg to move that Supplementary Estimate (2) be passed.

Supplementary Estimate (2) was passed.

**(3) State Council: Allowance to Members for Colombo Travelling.**

**The Hon. Mr. C. E. Jones (Acting Financial Secretary):** I beg to move the following Supplementary Estimate standing in my name:

Head 3, State Council.

Sub-head 3, Travelling.

Amount: Rs. 36,000.

Nature of Service: Payment of allowances to State Councillors for Colombo travelling on account of the temporary withdrawal of trucking of motor cars.

The position is that owing to the Railway having refused trucking facilities—I think, from the 1st of October—some Members of Council, from outstations, have had to incur additional expenditure. It was first thought that so much a day should be allowed, but the matter was referred to the House Committee and they have put up this recommendation.

I beg to move that Supplementary Estimate (3) be passed.

Supplementary Estimate (3) was passed.

**(4) Debt Conciliation Board: Staff.**

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** I move, Sir, the following Supplementary Estimate standing in my name:

Head 63, Land Commissioner.

Sub-head 8, Expenses in connection with the working of the Debt Conciliation Ordinance.

Amount: Rs. 2,136.

Supplementary Estimate (4) was passed.

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** I move that Council do resume.

*The Council having resumed—*

MR. SPEAKER took the Chair.

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** On behalf of the Hon. Leader, I move, Sir, that

Supplementary Estimates (1) to (4), passed in Committee, be approved.

Question put accordingly, and agreed to.

Supplementary Estimates (1) to (4) were approved.

**†AMENDMENT OF STANDING ORDERS.**

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** On behalf of the Hon. Leader of the House, I move that the Report† of the Committee on Standing Orders on the amendment to Emergency Standing Order No. 1 referred to it on November 3, 1942, be taken into consideration, and that the Standing Orders of the State Council be amended as recommended by the Committee on Standing Orders.

Question, "That the amendment proposed by the Committee on Standing Orders be accepted", put, and agreed to.

Standing Orders ordered to be amended accordingly.

**‡RENT RESTRICTION BILL.**

The following item stood upon the Orders of the Day:

The Minister of Local Administration to move,—

That the Bill intituled "An Ordinance to restrict the increase of rent and to provide for matters incidental to such restriction" be now read a second time.

**The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike:** I wish to move the second reading of the Rent Restriction Bill.

**Mr. Jayah:** We are opposing it.

**The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike:** The Emergency Standing Order was suspended, and the House agreed to sit till 5 o'clock to transact business.

**Mr. Wille:** That was done to finish only the debate on the Supplementary Estimate that was in progress.

† Report presented, November 19, 1942.

‡ For the Observations of the Financial Secretary and the Report of the Board of Ministers, see HANSARD of November 17, 1942.

**Mr. Speaker:** We agreed to transact all business before us.

**Mr. Ponnambalam:** What is the use of starting this debate when we have only 10 minutes left?

**The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike:** The matter is urgent in the sense that the Bill has to be got through early.

I should like to know when we propose to meet next.

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** 1st December.

**The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike:** We can meet one day next week and then adjourn.

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** Actually a number of Members have told me that it is not convenient for them to meet next week.

**The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike:** The only point is that the Bill is fixed for second reading and reference to a Committee of the whole House; so that the matter can be gone through at one sitting rather than have the Bill referred to a Standing Committee. If that is acceptable, and if the Bill goes through in that way with any amendments that the House may make, it would be all right. But if the second reading alone is to be taken up at that sitting and the Bill is going to be referred to a Standing Committee, it would mean that we will not be able to have the Bill through till February next. It would work hardship if the Bill is put off till then.

**Mr. Speaker:** What is the Hon. Minister's proposal?

**The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike:** Take it up at the next meeting, and immediately after the second reading, go into Committee.

**Mr. Speaker:** Notice has been given for that purpose?

**The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike:** Yes, Sir; I merely wanted to explain the position to the House, so that the House may not later refuse to adopt that procedure, as then an impossible situation would arise.

**Mr. Speaker:** That can be decided at that stage.

**The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike:** If the House does not go into Committee immediately after the second reading, a difficult situation would arise, and I must point out that—

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** If the House is not in favour of the procedure suggested, then I would have to give notice now that I would move that Council do sit the week after also. I do not know what the wishes of the House are, but in case the proposal of the Minister of Local Administration is not acceptable to the House, I should like to ask Members not to fix up any business for the week after, because we would have to finish with this Bill.

Further consideration of item deferred.

### †WAR PRISONERS FOOD AND CLOTHING (EXEMPTION FROM CUSTOMS DUTY) BILL.

**The Hon. Mr. Jones:** I move,—

That the Bill intituled "An Ordinance to provide for the exemption from customs duty of articles of food and clothing imported for the use of prisoners of war and civilian internees, for rebate of customs duty paid on the importation of such articles where such articles are purchased in Ceylon for the purposes aforesaid, and for the validation of rebates heretofore allowed on such articles" be now read a second time.

Question put accordingly, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

**The Hon. Mr. Jones:** With the approval of the Board of Ministers, I move that the Bill be referred to a Committee of the whole Council.

Question put, and agreed to.

*In Committee—*

MR. SPEAKER presided as Chairman.

Clauses 1 to 7 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

† For the Observations of the Financial Secretary and the Report of the Board of Ministers, see HANSARD of November 5, 1942.

Enacting Clause and Title ordered to stand part of the Bill.

**The Hon. Mr. Jones:** I move that Council do now resume.

*The Council having resumed—*

MR. SPEAKER took the Chair.

**The Hon. Mr. Jones:** I move, Sir, that the Bill be now read the third time, and passed.

Question put accordingly, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

### LANDS RESUMPTION (AMENDMENT) BILL.

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** I move,—  
“ That the Bill intituled “ An Ordinance to amend the Land Resumption Ordinance ” be now read a second time.

Question put accordingly, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** With the approval of the Board of Ministers, I move that the Bill be referred to a Committee of the whole Council.

Question put, and agreed to.

*In Committee—*

MR. SPEAKER presided as Chairman.

Clauses 1 to 6 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Enacting Clause and Title ordered to stand part of the Bill.

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** I move that Council do resume.

*Council having resumed—*

MR. SPEAKER took the Chair.

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** I move that the Bill be now read the third time and passed.

Question put accordingly, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

### WAR DAMAGE (IMMOVABLE PROPERTY) BILL. THOROUGHFARES (AMENDMENT) BILL.

**The Hon. Colonel Kotalawala:** On behalf of the Deputy Chairman of Committees and Chairman of Standing Committee “ B ”, I present,—

(a) The Report of Standing Committee “ B ” on the Bill intituled “ An Ordinance to authorize payments in respect of war damage to immovable property and the collection of contributions towards the cost of such payments; and to make provision for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.”

(b) The Report of Standing Committee “ B ” on the Bill intituled “ An Ordinance to amend the Throughfares Ordinance.”

### THOROUGHFARES (AMENDMENT) BILL.

**The Hon. Colonel Kotalawala:** I move that the report of Standing Committee “ B ” on the Bill intituled “ An Ordinance to amend the Throughfares Ordinance ”, be accepted.

Question put, and agreed to.

**The Hon. Colonel Kotalawala:** I move that the Bill be now read the third time, and passed.

Question put accordingly, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

### INCREASE OF GRANT TO ASSISTED VERNACULAR SCHOOLS AND DEARNESS ALLOWANCE FOR ORPHANAGES.

**Mr. E. R. Tambimuttu (Trincomalee-Batticaloa):** With the permission of the House, I move,—

That this Council is of opinion that in view of the present increase in the cost of labour and materials—

(a) The maintenance grant given to Assisted Vernacular Schools should be increased from 50 cents to Re. 1 per child for the present financial year;

(b) The dearness allowance based on the living index should also be granted to orphanages in addition to the present normal capitation grant.

Motion ordered to be referred to the Executive Committee of Education, under Standing Order 57.

**CHIEF HEADMEN: RETIREMENT  
OF OFFICERS ENGAGED ON  
FOOD PRODUCTION.**

**Mr. S. Dharmaretnam (Batticaloa South):** I move,—

That in view of the urgent need to speed up paddy cultivation in Ceylon and in view of the fact that the Chief Headmen are in most cases experienced men capable of rousing interest in the people, this Council resolves that no Chief Headmen should be retired during the pendency of the war without prior reference to the Assistant Government Agents (Emergency) who have been charged with the duty of increasing cultivation of food crops in Ceylon.

Motion ordered to be referred to the Executive Committee of Home Affairs, under Standing Order 57.

**DIVISIONAL REVENUE OFFICERS:  
SELECTION INTERVIEWS AT  
JAFFNA AND BATTICALOA  
ALTERNATELY.**

**Mr. Dharmaretnam:** I move, Sir,—

That as Jaffna and Batticaloa are the two chief towns of the Tamil Provinces in Ceylon, this Council is of opinion that the second and the subsequent interviews for the selection of Divisional Revenue Officers be held alternately in Jaffna and Batticaloa and as the last interview was held in Jaffna, the next interview should be held in Batticaloa.

Motion ordered to be referred to the Executive Committee of Home Affairs, under Standing Order 57.

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE OFFICERS  
FOR BATTICALOA PADDY  
CULTIVATION.**

**Mr. Dharmaretnam:** I move, Sir,—

That as the Batticaloa Lagoon runs from North to South and divides the area into two unequal portions with the bulk of the paddy lands on the western shore, and as communication over the lagoon involves delay and hardship, and as want of suitable communication has greatly impeded the development of the areas on the western shore, this Council resolves that an additional Divisional Revenue Officer should be placed in charge of the western shore of the Eruvil Porativu and Mannunai South pattus during the pendency of the war primarily to stimulate paddy cultivation pending a redemarcation of the areas of the Divisional Revenue Officers of the Batticaloa District.

Motion ordered to be referred to the Executive Committee of Home Affairs, under Standing Order 57.

**ADJOURNMENT.**

**The Hon. Mr. Senanayake:** I move that the Council do now adjourn until Tuesday, December 1, 1942, at 2 P.M.

Question put, and agreed to.

Adjourned accordingly at 5 P.M. until 2 P.M. on Tuesday, December 1, 1942.