



PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

SENATE

OFFICIAL REPORT

Vol. 15 No. 20

Wednesday, 7th December, 1960

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

Sittings of the Senate
Street Collections Regulation
Local Government By-laws
Special Commissioners By-laws
Village Communities Order
Telecommunications Regulations
National Housing Regulation
Appropriation Bill, 1960-61 (Third Day)—
Debate adjourned

PRINTED AT THE GOVERNMENT PRESS, CEYLON

Subscriptions : 12 months commencing from month following date of payment Rs. 15.50 (uncorrected copies Rs. 18.50). Half rates for 6 months, each part 30 cents, by post 36 cents, payable in advance to the SUPERINTENDENT, GOVERNMENT, PUBLICATIONS BUREAU, POST OFFICE Box 500, Galle Face Secretariat, Colombo 1

1961

GOVERNMENT OF CEYLON

GOVERNOR-GENERAL

HIS EXCELLENCY SIR OLIVER ERNEST GOONETILLEKE, G.C.M.G., K.C.V.O., K.B.E.

THE CABINET

(Formed by The Hon. SIRIMAVO RATWATTE DIAS BANDARANAIKE, July, 1960)

Prime Minister and Minister of Defence and External Affairs—Senator
The Hon. SIRIMAVO RATWATTE DIAS BANDARANAIKE.

Minister of Agriculture, Land, Irrigation and Power—The Hon. CHARLES
PERCIVAL DE SILVA, M.P.

Minister of Finance—The Hon. FELIX REGINALD DIAS BANDARANAIKE, M.P.

Minister of Justice—Senator The Hon. SAMUEL PETER CHRISTOPHER
FERNANDO.

Minister of Commerce, Trade, Food and Shipping—The Hon. TIKIRI
BANDARA ILANGARATNE, M.P.

Minister of Health—Senator The Hon. ALEXANDER PERERA JAYASURIYA.

Minister of Transport and Works—The Hon. IDAMPITIYE RALLAGE
PUNCHIBANDA GUNATILAKA KALUGALLA, M.P.

Minister of Education and Broadcasting—The Hon. AL HAJ BADIUDDIN
MAHMUD, M.P.

Minister of Local Government and Housing—The Hon. MAHANAMA
SAMARAWEERA, M.P.

Minister of Industries, Home and Cultural Affairs—The Hon. MAITHRIPALA
SENANAYEKE, M.P.

Minister of Labour and Nationalised Services—Senator The Hon.
CHANDRADASA WIJESINGHE, O.B.E.

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries, Home and Cultural
Affairs—WELIGAMA POLWATTE GALAPPATHIGE ARIYADASA, Esq., M.P.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Defence and External Affairs—
The Hon. FELIX REGINALD DIAS BANDARANAIKE, M.P.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour and Nationalised
Services—MICHAEL PAUL DE ZOYSA SIRIWARDENA, Esq., M.P.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Commerce, Trade, Food and
Shipping—DON SAMUEL GOONASEKERA, Esq., M.P.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice—NUWARAPAKSA
HEWAYALAGE ASOKA MAHANAMA KARUNARATNE, Esq., M.P.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education and Broadcasting—
VELA THANTHIRI GURUNANSELAGE KARUNARATNE, Esq., M.P.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health—JAMES PETER
OBEYSEKERE, Esq., M.P.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Local Government and
Housing—DAYASENA TURNOLIUS PASQUAL, Esq., M.P.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance—GEORGE RAJAPAKSA,
Esq., M.P.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture, Land, Irrigation
and Power—MUDIYANSE TENNAKON, Esq., M.P.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport and Works—TIKIRI
BANDA TENNEKON, Esq., M.P.

SENATE

Wednesday, 7th December, 1960

The Senate met at 2.30 p.m., MR. PRESIDENT [SENATOR THE HON. SIR CYRIL DE ZOYSA, KT.] in the Chair.

SITTINGS OF THE SENATE

SENATOR THE HON. A. P. JAYASURIYA (MINISTER OF HEALTH AND LEADER OF THE SENATE) : I move,

(a) That the proceedings this day be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order 7 ;

(b) that at 8 p.m. the House shall be adjourned without question put ; and

(c) that at 7.30 p.m. paragraphs (3) and (4) of Standing Order 7 shall operate.

On Question, Motion agreed to.

SENATOR THE HON. JAYASURIYA : I move,

That at its rising this day the House do adjourn until 2.30 p.m. on Thursday, December 8, 1960.

On Question, Motion agreed to.

THE PRESIDENT : Hon. Senators, there are 28 motions to be moved by the Hon. Leader. With your permission and consent I propose to ask the Hon. Leader to move all the 28 motions together and thereafter I will put them to the House. Before I do so, I would like to ask hon. Senators whether they would wish to comment on any of these motions, in which case I will take the particular motion out of the group and put it to the House independently of the others.

Hon. Senators will remember that when notice of these motions was given I had copies of them distributed to each hon. Senator, so hon. Senators know what is being moved today. The motions are also on the Order Paper. If that suits the House, instead of taking these motions one by one, I would suggest that all the 28 motions be taken up together.

2—J. N. R. 14347—717 (12/60)

STREET COLLECTIONS REGULATIONS

Resolved :

That the Regulations made by the Minister of Local Government and Housing under Section 2 of the Street Collections Regulation Ordinance (Cap. 335) in respect of the area within the administrative limits of the Municipal Council of Kurunegala, which were presented on November 29, 1960, be confirmed.—[Senator the Hon. Jayasuriya.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BY-LAWS

Resolved :

That the by-laws relating to tax on vehicles and animals made by the Urban Council, Batticaloa, under Sections 166 and 170 of Urban Councils Ordinance, No. 61 of 1939, approved by the Minister of Local Government and Housing and published in the *Government Gazette* No. 11,841 of 28.8.1959, which were presented on November 29, 1960, be not disallowed.—[Senator the Hon. Jayasuriya.]

Resolved :

That the by-law relating to pensions and gratuities made by the Urban Council, Kegalla, under Sections 166 and 170 of Urban Councils Ordinance, No. 61 of 1939, approved by the Minister of Local Government and Housing and published in the *Government Gazette* No. 11,852 of 11.9.1959, which was presented on November 29, 1960, be not disallowed.—[Senator the Hon. Jayasuriya.]

SPECIAL COMMISSIONERS BY-LAW

Resolved :

That the by-law relating to sale of meat made by the Special Commissioner, Weligama, under Sections 166 and 170 of Urban Councils Ordinance, No. 61 of 1939, approved by the Minister of Local Government and Housing and published in the *Government Gazette* No. 11,914 of 23.10.59, which was presented on November 29, 1960, be not disallowed.—[Senator the Hon. Jayasuriya.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BY-LAWS

Resolved :

That the by-laws relating to markets made by the Urban Council, Hatton-Dickoya, under Sections 166 and 170 of Urban Councils Ordinance, No. 61 of 1939, approved by the Minister of Local Government and Housing and published in the *Government Gazette* No. 11,862 of 25.9.59 which were presented on November 29, 1960, be not disallowed.—[Senator the Hon. Jayasuriya.]

Resolved :

That the by-law relating to offensive and dangerous trades made by the Urban Council Ratnapura, under Sections 166 and 170 of Urban Councils Ordinance, No. 61 of 1939, approved by the Minister of Local Government and Housing and published in the *Government Gazette* No. 12,207 of 30.9.1960, which was presented on November 29, 1960, be not disallowed.—[*Senator the Hon. Jayasuriya.*]

Resolved :

That the by-law relating to markets made by the Urban Council, Balangoda, under Sections 166 and 170 of Urban Councils Ordinance, No. 61 of 1939, approved by the Minister of Local Government and Housing and published in the *Government Gazette* No. 12,205 of 23.9.60, which was presented on November 29, 1960, be not disallowed.—[*Senator the Hon. Jayasuriya.*]

Resolved :

That the by-law relating to offensive and dangerous trades made by the Urban Council, Kadugannawa, under Sections 166 and 170 of Urban Councils Ordinance, No. 61 of 1939, approved by the Minister of Local Government and Housing and published in the *Government Gazette* No. 12,215 of 21.10.60, which was presented on November 29, 1960, be not disallowed.—[*Senator the Hon. Jayasuriya.*]

Resolved :

That the by-laws relating to sale of meat made by the Urban Council, Horana, under Sections 166 and 170 of Urban Councils Ordinance, No. 61 of 1939, approved by the Minister of Local Government and Housing and published in the *Government Gazette* No. 11,836 of 21.8.59, which were presented on November 29, 1960, be not disallowed.—[*Senator the Hon. Jayasuriya.*]

Resolved :

That the by-law relating to water service made by the Urban Council, Bandarawela, under Sections 166 and 170 of Urban Councils Ordinance, No. 61 of 1939, approved by the Minister of Local Government and Housing and published in the *Government Gazette* No. 11,862 of 25.9.59, which was presented on November 29, 1960, be not disallowed.—[*Senator the Hon. Jayasuriya.*]

Resolved :

That the by-law relating to the Ratnapura Fair made by the Urban Council, Ratnapura, under Sections 166 and 170 of Urban Councils Ordinance, No. 61 of 1939, approved by the Minister of Local Government and Housing and published in the *Government Gazette* No. 11,832 of 14.8.59, which was presented on November 29, 1960, be not disallowed.—[*Senator the Hon. Jayasuriya.*]

Resolved :

That the by-law relating to libraries made by the Urban Council, Matale, under Sections 166 and 170 of Urban Councils Ordinance, No. 61 of 1939, approved by the Minister of Local Government and Housing and published in the *Government Gazette* No. 11,841 of 28.8.59, which was presented on November 29, 1960, be not disallowed.—[*Senator the Hon. Jayasuriya.*]

STREET COLLECTIONS
REGULATIONS

Resolved :

That the Regulations for the Matale Urban Council area, made by the Minister of Local Government and Cultural Affairs under Section 2 of the Street Collections Regulation Ordinance (Chapter 335), which were presented on November 29, 1960, be approved.—[*Senator the Hon. Jayasuriya.*]

Resolved :

That the Regulations for the Panadura Urban Council area, made by the Minister of Local Government and Housing under Section 2 of the Street Collections Regulation Ordinance (Chapter 335), which were presented on November 29, 1960, be approved.—[*Senator the Hon. Jayasuriya.*]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BY-LAWS

Resolved :

That the by-law relating to loitering in streets and pavements made by the Urban Council, Horana, under Sections 166 and 170 of Urban Councils Ordinance, No. 61 of 1939, approved by the Minister of Local Government and Housing and published in the *Government Gazette* No. 11,832 of 14.8.59, which was presented on November 29, 1960, be not disallowed.—[*Senator the Hon. Jayasuriya.*]

Resolved :

That the by-laws relating to the public library made by the Urban Council, Kegalla, under Sections 166 and 170 of Urban Councils Ordinance, No. 61 of 1939, approved by the Minister of Local Government and Housing and published in the *Government Gazette* No. 11,836 of 21.8.59, which were presented on November 29, 1960, be not disallowed.—[*Senator the Hon. Jayasuriya.*]

Resolved :

That the by-laws relating to temporary structures made by the Urban Council, Talawakelle-Lindula, under Sections 166 and 170 of Urban Councils Ordinance, No. 61 of 1939, approved by the Minister

of Local Government and Housing and published in the *Government Gazette* No. 11,841 of 28.8.59, which were presented on November 29, 1960, be not disallowed.—[*Senator the Hon. Jayasuriya.*]

SPECIAL COMMISSIONERS BY-LAWS

Resolved :

That the by-laws relating to the ayurvedic dispensary made by the Special Commissioner, Weligama, under Sections 166 and 170 (read with Section 196) of Urban Councils Ordinance, No. 61 of 1939, approved by the Minister of Local Government and Housing and published in the *Government Gazette* No. 11,862 of 25.9.59, which were presented on November 29, 1960, be not disallowed.—[*Senator the Hon. Jayasuriya.*]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BY-LAWS

Resolved :

That the by-law relating to meetings made by the Urban Council, Dehiwala-Mount Lavinia, under Sections 166 and 170 of Urban Councils Ordinance, No. 61 of 1939, approved by the Minister of Local Government and Housing and published in the *Government Gazette* No. 11,980 of 27.11.59, which was presented on November 29, 1960, be not disallowed.—[*Senator the Hon. Jayasuriya.*]

SPECIAL COMMISSIONERS BY-LAW

Resolved :

That the by-laws relating to public markets made by the Special Commissioner, Weligama, under Sections 166 and 170 of Urban Councils Ordinance, No. 61 of 1939, approved by the Minister of Local Government and Housing and published in the *Government Gazette* No. 11,994 of 4.12.59, which were presented on November 29, 1960, be not disallowed.—[*Senator the Hon. Jayasuriya.*]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BY-LAWS

Resolved :

That the by-law relating to water supply made by the Urban Council, Nawalapitiya, under Sections 166 and 170 of Urban Councils Ordinance, No. 61 of 1939, approved by the Minister of Local Government and Housing and published in the *Government Gazette* No. 12,119 of 29.4.1960, which was presented on November 29, 1960, be not disallowed.—[*Senator the Hon. Jayasuriya.*]

Resolved :

That the by-law relating to pensions and gratuities made by the Urban Council, Horana, under Sections 166 and 170 of Urban Councils Ordinance, No. 61 of 1939, approved by the Minister of Local Government and Housing and published in the *Government Gazette* No. 12,027 of 1.1.60, which was presented on November 29, 1960, be not disallowed.—[*Senator the Hon. Jayasuriya.*]

VILLAGE COMMUNITIES ORDER

Resolved :

That the Order made by the Minister of Local Government and Housing under Section 6 of the Village Communities Ordinance (Cap. 198), that the limits of the Kanuwana Village area in Ragam Pattu of Alut Kuru Korale South in the Colombo District of the Western Province, are altered and redefined by the exclusion from that village area of the area specified in the Schedule thereof, with effect from February 1, 1961, which was presented on November 29, 1960, be confirmed.—[*Senator the Hon. Jayasuriya.*]

TELECOMMUNICATIONS REGULATIONS

Resolved :

That the Regulation made by the Minister of Transport and Works under Section 12 of the Telecommunications Ordinance, No. 50 of 1944, as modified by the Proclamation published in *Gazette Extraordinary* No. 9,773 of September 24, 1947, and presented on November 29, 1960, be approved.—[*Senator the Hon. Jayasuriya.*]

Resolved :

That the Regulation made by the Minister of Transport and Works, under Section 12 of the Telecommunications Ordinance, No. 50 of 1944, as modified by the Proclamation published in *Gazette Extraordinary* No. 9,773 of September 24, 1947, and presented on November 29, 1960, be approved.—[*Senator the Hon. Jayasuriya.*]

NATIONAL HOUSING REGULATION

Resolved :

That the Regulation made by the Minister of Local Government and Housing under Sections 2 (f), 44 (1) and 69 of the National Housing Act, No. 37 of 1954, and presented on November 29, 1960, be approved.—[*Senator the Hon. Jayasuriya.*]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BY-LAWS

Resolved :

That the by-law relating to offensive and dangerous trades made by the Town Council, Samanthurai, under Sections 166 and 170 of Town Councils Ordinance, No. 3 of 1946, approved by the Minister of Local Government and Housing and published in the *Government Gazette* No. 11,828 of 7.8.59, which was presented on November 29, 1960, be not disallowed. [Senator The Hon. Jayasuriya.]

Resolved :

That the by-law relating to price of meat made by the Town Council, Vavuniya, under Sections 166 and 170 of Town Councils Ordinance, No. 3 of 1946, approved by the Minister of Local Government and Housing and published in the *Government Gazette* No. 11,862 of 25.9.59, which was presented on November 29, 1960, be not disallowed. [Senator The Hon. Jayasuriya.]

APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960-61

Order read for resuming adjourned debate on Question.—[29th November] :

“That the Bill be now read a Second time.”—[Senator The Hon. C. Wijesinghe.]

Question again proposed.

SENATOR A. D. JAYASEKERA :
ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, 1960-61 වර්ෂය පිළිබඳ අයවැය ලෙබනගය ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙන මේ අවසාවාවේදී මේ ගරු සභාව ඉදිරියේ වචන සවල්පයක් කථා කිරීමට මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙතවා. සාමාන්‍යයෙන් මගේ කථාව කරන්නට අදහස් කරන්නේ අය වැය ලෙබනගයෙහි ඇති ඉලක්කම් අනුව කරුණු ඉදිරිපත් කරමින් නොවන බව පළමුවෙන්ම සඳහන් කරන්නට කැමතියි. මේ රටේ දේශපාලන ඉතිහාසය දෙස බලා, මේ රටට, එසේ නැත්නම් අපේ ජාතියට, වැළඳී තිබෙන රෝග මොනවාද කියා සොයා බලා, ඒ රෝග හැදීමට හේතු කවරේදැයි පරීක්ෂා කර, ඒ පරීක්ෂණ අනුව ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂය වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් යෝජනා කොට, ඒ වැඩ පිළිවෙල අනුව දැන් ක්‍රියාරම්භ කර තිබෙනවා ඒ රෝගවලට නියම ප්‍රතිකාර කිරීම ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂ ආණ්ඩුවේ ප්‍රධාන පර

මාර්ගයයි. එවැනි ක්‍රියා මාර්ගයක් අනුගමනය කරන විට සමහර විට රජය ගන්නා සෑම පියවරකටම සියළු දෙනාම සම්පූර්ණයෙන් එකඟ නොවන්නට පුළුවන්. එසේ එකඟ නොවුවත්, කල් යාමේදී මේ ආණ්ඩුව ගෙන යන ක්‍රියා මාර්ගවලින් සියල්ලන්ගේම යහපත සැලසෙන හෙයින්, පසුව ඔවුන් ඒ වාට එකඟ වේවිය කියා මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙතවා. දූෂණය වූ යම් කිසි සමාජයක් ප්‍රතිසංස්කරණය කරන විට, යම් යම් බාධාවන්, යම් යම් විරුද්ධතාවන් ඇතිවීම සවහාවිකයි. එහෙත් ඒ විරුද්ධතාවන් දක්වන අය, රජය විසින් ක්‍රමානුකූලව සහ සාර්ථකව වැඩ පිළිවෙලවල් ක්‍රියාවේ යොදවා ඒවායින් සාර්ථක ප්‍රතිඵල ලැබෙන්නට සලස්වන විට, ඒ වැඩ පිළිවෙලවල් සාර්ථක වූ විට, සතුටට පත් වෙනවා ඇති.

අධිරාජ්‍ය වාදී පාලනයක් මේ රටේ අවුරුදු ගණනක් තිස්සේ පැවතුණා. ඒ අධිරාජ්‍ය වාදී පාලන කාලයේදී මේ රටේ තත්ත්වය සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම අමුතූම ක්‍රමයකට හැඩ ගැසුණා. ඒ අමුතූ ක්‍රමය නිසා රටේ හේද රාශියක් ඇතිවුණා. මේ හේද තබාගෙන, හේද ඇති කරමින් කටයුතු කිරීම නිසා අධිරාජ්‍ය වාදීන්ට පහසුවෙන් පාලනය ගෙන යන්නට හැකි වුණා. මේ පාලනයෙන් තැළී පොඩිපට්ටම්ව සිටින ජනයා සමගි සම්මුතියකට පැමිණවීම බොහොම අමාරු කාර්යයක්. සභාපතිතුමනි, මොළයක් ඇති කාට වුණත් මේ තත්ත්වය පිළිබඳ පැහැදිලි අවබෝධයක් තිබෙනවා. මා හිතනවා, මේ ගරු සභාවේ සහිත මහතුන්ට මා කියන කාරණය තේරුම් යන්නට ඇත කියා.

මේ දේශපාලන හේද වෙන්ව ගෙන සලකා බලන විට, ආගම් වශයෙන්, ජාති වශයෙන්, කුල වශයෙන්, භාෂා වශයෙන් සහ තවත් නොයෙකුත් මාදිලියේ කරුණු උපයෝගී කර ගනිමින් ඒවා ඇති කර ගෙන තිබෙන බව අපට පේනවා. අපේ රටේ සමගියට බඩා වක්ව පවතින්නේ ජාති වශයෙන්, කුල වශයෙන්, භාෂා වශයෙන් සහ ආගම් වශයෙන් රට වැසියා බෙදී සිටීමයි. මේ හේද නැතිකර ගැනීමෙන් මේ රටේ දේශපාලන තත්ත්වය හොඳ මඟකට හරවන්නට පුළුවන් බව අපට කියන්නට පුළුවන්. රටේ දැනට ඇති වි

නිබෙන මේ හේද නැති කරන්නට යම් කිසි වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් යෝජනා කළ විට ඒ වැඩ පිළිවෙල කඩා කප්පල් කර දැමීමට, හේද වපුරුවා එමගින් ප්‍රයෝජන අත්පත් කර ගැනීමට මාන බලන කොටස් අද සුදු නම්ව සිටිනවා. මේ ප්‍රයෝජන අත්පත් කර ගන්නට මාන බලමින් සිටින කොටස්, රටේ දියුණුවට අදාළ වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් යෝජනා කළ විට, ඊට විරුද්ධව උග්‍රව නැගී සිටිනවා. ඒ නැගී සිටීම වළක්වන්නට බොහොම අමාරුයි. මේ රටේ දියුණුවට අදාළ ප්‍රශ්න කීපයක්ම පැන නැගුණා. ඒ ප්‍රශ්න කීහිපයටම විරුද්ධව ඒ කොටස් කටයුතු කළා. ඒ වාගේම අදත් විරුද්ධ කම් පානවා. දීර්ඝ දර්ශනයක් ඇතිව, — එසේ නැත්නම් අනාගතය දෙස බලා— රජය යොදන වැඩ පිළිවෙලවල් වලට විරුද්ධකම් පෑම හරි නැහැ. දැනට ඒවායින් ප්‍රයෝජනයක් නැති වුවත්, කාලයක් ගත වූ විට ඒ වැඩ වලින් ප්‍රතිඵල ලැබෙන බව මේ ගරු සභාවට මතක් කර දෙන්නට මා කැමතියි. රජය විසින් ඇති කරන වැඩ පිළිවෙලට උගත්, යමක් තේරුම් ගත හැකි ජනයා විසින් සිය කල්පනා ශක්තිය යොමු කොට ඊට සහයෝගය දීමට කටයුතු කරන විට තමා, සාර්ථක ප්‍රතිඵල ලබාගැනීමට හැකි වන්නේ. එසේ නැතිව ඒ වේලාවේ ප්‍රයෝජනය පමණක් තකා කටයුතු කිරීමෙන් සාර්ථක ප්‍රතිඵල ලබා ගන්නට ලැබෙන්නේ නැහැ.

කාලයක් තිස්සේ වහල් අන්දමින් ජීවත් වූ අපි කෙසේ නමුත් දේශපාලන නිදහස ලබා ගත්තා. එසේ නිදහස ලැබීමෙන් පසුව, ඒ නිදහස අපි කොයි ආකාරයට පාවිච්චි කරනවාද, මොනවාද අපේ සමාජයට වැළඳී තිබෙන රෝග කියා මඳක් කල්පනා කර බලන්නට ඕනෑ. නමුත් සමහරෙක් කල්පනා කරනවා, මේ රටේ පිරිහීම් සියල්ලක්ම ඇතිවී තිබෙන්නේ ආර්ථික තත්ත්වය වෙනස් නොවීම නිසාය කියා. අපේ සම්පූර්ණ ආර්ථික තත්ත්වය විදේශිකයන් සතුව පැවතුණා. එසේ පැවතුණ නිසා ම මෙහි තුබූ සියලුම ධනය විදේශ වලට ඇදී ගියා. ඒ නිසා, මේ රටේ ධනය විදේශවලට ඇදී යාම මැඩපවත්වා ගැනීමෙන් මිස, අන් කිසිම ක්‍රමයකින් මේ රටේ ආර්ථික තත්ත්වය නගා සිටුවන්නට බැරිය යන අදහස රටේ එක්තරා පක්ෂයක් තුළ ඇති වුණා. ඒ අදහස වැරදිය කියා මම

කියන්නේ නැහැ. නමුත්, ආර්ථික පිරිහීමට වඩා භාෂා, සාහිත්‍ය, සංස්කෘතිය අතින් රට පිරිහී ඇති බව තව පිරිසකගේ කල්පනාවයි. ඒ නිසා සමහර පක්ෂ කල්පනා කළා, “අපට තුබූ ආගම්, භාෂා, කලා ශිල්ප ආදී සියල්ලක්ම නැතිව ගියා; ඒ නිසා භාෂාව නගා සිටුවන්නට ඕනෑ; අපේ ආගම දියුණු කරන්නට ඕනෑ; අපේ කලා ශිල්ප දියුණු කරන්නට ඕනෑ; අපේ සිරිත් විරිත් නගා සිටුවන්නට ඕනෑ.” ය කියා. ඒ අය එසේ කියා සිටිනවා. එක් පක්ෂයක් ආර්ථික අංශයෙන් රට නගා සිටුවන්නට පුළුවන්ය කියා අදහස් කළා. තවත් පක්ෂයක් භාෂාව, සංස්කෘතිය, කලා ශිල්ප ආදිය වැඩිමෙන් රට දියුණු කිරීමට පුළුවන්ය කියා අදහස් කළා. නිදහස ලැබුණට පසුව මේ දෙපක්ෂය අතරේ තරමක සටන්තයක් ඇති වුණා. එක කොටසක් කියනවා, “මය කිසිවක් කරන්නට බැහැ, අපේ ආර්ථික තත්ත්වය නගා සිටුවන්නේ නැතිව” කියා. එවිට තව පක්ෂයක් කියනවා, “භාෂා, සාහිත්‍ය, සංස්කෘතිය විනාශ වී ගොස් රටේ ශිලාවරකම නැතිව ගිය විට ආර්ථික තත්ත්වයෙන් වැඩක් නැහැ” කියා. මෙය ප්‍රශ්න දෙකක් වශයෙන් සලකා ක්‍රියා පිළිවෙලක් රටට දෙන ලද්දේ මේ ආණ්ඩුව මගිනුයි. බණ්ඩාරනායක මැති තුමාගේ දේශපාලන ක්‍රමයේ ප්‍රධාන වෙනස දකින්නට තිබෙන්නේ මේ ස්ථානයේයි. එතුමා කල්පනා කළා, අවුරුදු දහස් ගණනක් පැරණි සංස්කෘතියක් ඇති රටක, ඒ කාරණය සම්බන්ධව කල්පනා කරන්නේ නැතිව, ආර්ථික කරුණු ගැන පමණක් කපා කිරීමෙන් මහජනයාට ඒ සම්බන්ධව අවබෝධයක් ඇති කරදීමට කොහෙත්ම පුළුවන් කමක් නැතැයි කියා. ඒ නිසා එතුමා කල්පනා කළා, සංස්කෘතික තත්ත්වයත්, ආර්ථික තත්ත්වයත් යන මේ දෙකම එක සමානව දියුණු කරන්නට ඕනෑය කියා. සංස්කෘතියෙන් ආර්ථික තත්ත්වය දියුණුවෙනවාය, ආර්ථික තත්ත්වය දියුණුවීමෙන් සංස්කෘතිය උදාවෙනවාය, යන ප්‍රතිපත්තිය අනුව, ඒ දෙකේම දියුණුවට කටයුතු සැලැස්වීම එතුමාගේ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය වූ බව අපි දන්නවා. ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂය පිළිගෙන ක්‍රියා කරන්නේ ඒ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය අනුවයි.

ඒ අනුව, කරුණු කීපයක් සම්බන්ධයෙන් අපි ඉදිරිය බලමු. මෙම පක්ෂය විසින් ප්‍රධාන කරුණු කීපයක් ඉදිරිපත්

[Senator Jayasekera]

කර දැනටමත් ක්‍රියාවේ යොදා තිබෙනවා. එයින් එකක් නම්, රාජ්‍ය භාෂාව පිළිබඳ ප්‍රශ්නයයි. ඊට බොහෝම අමාරුකම් ඇති වුණා. තවමත් ඇති වෙනවා. ඒ වාගේම අධ්‍යාපන ප්‍රශ්නයටත් අපි අත ගැසුවා. ඒක බොහෝම භාර ධුර ප්‍රශ්නයක්. මේ ප්‍රශ්නය දෙස එක එල්ලේ බලන විට ඕනෑම කෙනෙකුට තර්ක කරන්න පුළුවනි, මෙයින් යම්කිසි හේදයක් ඇති කරන්නට යනවාය කියා. මේ හේදය රටේ දියුණුවට බාධාවක් යන හැඟීම සමහර අය තුළ ඇති විටටත් පුළුවනි. ඇත්ත වශයෙන් මෙය හේද ඇති කිරීමක් නොව, ඉදිරි කාලයේදී මේ රටේ යම් කිසි හේදයක් හටගන්නට ඉඩ තිබෙනවා නම්, එය වැළැක්වීමේ එකම උපක්‍රමය බව මා ප්‍රකාශ කරන්නට කැමතියි.

භාෂාව සම්බන්ධ ප්‍රශ්නය ගන්නා විට, අපේ ද්‍රවිඩ සහෝදරයන් කලබල වුණා. තමන්ගේ භාෂාව නැති වන්නට යනවාය කියා ඒ උදවිය කලබල වුණා. නමුත්, එයින් එවැන්නක් අදහස් කළේ නැහැ. ඇරත්, එය කරන්නට පුළුවනි දෙයකුත් නොවෙයි. නමුත්, අද දවසේ වුණත්, එක් තරා ද්‍රවිඩ පිරිසකුත්, එක් තරා සිංහල පිරිසකුත් කැ ගසනවා, තමන්ගේ භාෂාවන් කෙරෙහි යම් කිසි හැඟීමක් තිබෙනවා නම්, මේ තරම් උග්‍ර තත්ත්වයක් ඇති වන්නේ නැහැ කියා. ද්‍රවිඩ අය වෙනම පැන්නකට වි කැ ගසනවා. සිංහල අය වෙනම පැන්නකට වි කැ ගසනවා. මේ දෙපක්ෂය අතර මිත්‍රත්වයක් ඇති කිරීමටත්, මේ දෙපක්ෂය අතර අවබෝධයක් ඇති කිරීමටත් අද පිළිවෙලක් නැහැ. ඒ නිසා දෙපක්ෂය විරුද්ධ වාදීන් ලෙස පෙනී සිටින්නට වැයම් කරනවා. නමුත් ඉදිරි කාලයේදී මේ භාෂා පණත නියම පිළිවෙලට ක්‍රියාත්මක කරගෙන යන විට, ද්‍රවිඩ භාෂාවන් ආරක්ෂා කරගෙනම මෙම ජාතීන් දෙක අතර සමගිය කොයි තරම් දුරට ඇති වේවිද කියා අපට බලා ගන්නට හැකි වේවි. ඉදිරි අවුරුදු 10 තුළ මෙය හරියාකාර ක්‍රියාවේ යෙදෙන විට, එවැනි තත්ත්වයක් ඇති වී මේ ජාතීන් දෙක එකතු වන්නට පුළුවන් බව මට සරි වශයෙන්ම කියන්නට පුළුවනි. මේ ප්‍රශ්නය ගැන මුලදී නොයෙකුත් උදවිය නොයෙකුත් බාධක මවා පෙන්වා, මෙයින් දබර ඇති වන්නට පුළුවන්ය, කෝලාහල ඇති වන්නට

තර්ක ඉදිරිපත් කලා. ඔවුන් එසේ කළේ ඉදිරිය බලා නොවෙයි. ඒ වෙලාවට ලබා ගන්නට හැකි ප්‍රයෝජනය ලබා ගැනීමේ බලාපොරොත්තුවෙනුයි. එසේ බාධා ඇති කිරීම, ධනවාදීව ක්‍රියා කිරීමක් ය කියා අපට කියන්නට පුළුවනි. නමුත්, මෙය ක්‍රියාවේ යෙදීමේදී, ඒ විධියට පක්ෂ වලට බෙදා ගෙන තබා ගැනීම වැළැක්වීමට මෙය උදව්වක් වෙනවා ඇති.

දෙවැනි ප්‍රශ්නය නම්, පාසැල් ප්‍රශ්නයයි. මෙය ඉතා මෑතදී විශාල උද්ඝෝෂණයකට ලක් වූ ප්‍රශ්නයක්. මේ සම්බන්ධයෙන් දැනට යම් කිසි විරුද්ධත්වයක් පැන නැග තිබුණත්, මා කල්පනා කරනවා, මේ රටේ ආගම් වශයෙන් බෙදී සිටින ළමයින් අතර තව කවුරුදු 10ක් 15ක් පමණ ගත වන විට මිත්‍රත්වයන් ඇති වී, ඔවුන් තුළ දැනට තිබෙන වැරදි හැඟීම් සහ වැරදි අවබෝධ මඟ හැරී, එකම සහෝදර පිරිසක් වශයෙන් ජීවත් වීමට පුළුවන් වීමේ තත්ත්වයක් ඇති වේවිය කියා. මේ කරුණු දෙක ජාතිය සරි කිරීමට නොහොත් දැඩි කිරීමට ගත් ප්‍රධාන පියවර දෙකක් වශයෙන් සලකන්නට පුළුවනි. ඒ නිසා ඒ වෙලාවේ වාසිය සහ ප්‍රයෝජනය තකා කට යුතු කර ගැනීමට මේ ප්‍රශ්න ආධාර කර ගන්නේ නැතිව, මේවා අපේ රටේ ජනතාවට වඩා හොඳ අනාගතයක් ඇති කර දීමට ගත් පියවර දෙකක් හැටියට සැලකිය යුතු බව මතක් කරන්න කැමතියි.

යම් කිසි රටක, භාෂාව, අධ්‍යාපනය සහ නීතිය යන කරුණු තුන ඒ රට තුළ සමගිය ඇති කිරීමේ ප්‍රධාන මාර්ග තුන බව මා සඳහන් කරන්නට කැමතියි. මේ තුනෙන් වෙන් වී කොයි රටකවත් සමගියක් ඇති කරන්නට බැහැ. මේ සමගිය ඇති කිරීමට තමයි, අද ඇමෙරිකාව ලැහැස්ති වන්නේ. වර්ණ හේදය නිසා ඇමෙරිකාව ඉදිරි කාලයේදී විශාල අමාරුවකට පත් වන්නට ඉඩ තිබෙන බව ඔවුන්ට පෙනී ගිය නිසා, දැන් එහි එකම විධියේ අධ්‍යාපන වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් ක්‍රියාත්මක කරගෙන යනවා. මුලදී, නොයෙකුත් වර්ණවල මිනිසුන් ඇමෙරිකානුන්ගේ ප්‍රයෝජනය සඳහා ඇමෙරිකාවට ගෙන ගියා. ඇමෙරිකානු ජීවිතය අනාගතයේදී භයානක තත්ත්වයකට පැමිණෙන්නට ඉඩ තිබේය කියා කල්පනා කළ ඇමෙරිකානුන්, දැන් බලහත්කාරයෙන් වාගේ ඒ පාසැල්වල මේ දෙපක්ෂයම මිශ්‍ර කිරීමක අධ්‍යාපනය දෙනවා. ඒ වාගේම

එංගලන්තයේත් නොයෙකුත් වර්ග ඇති වුණා. ඒ අය අතරත් මේ විධියේ ස්ථාවර ඇති වුණ නිසා ඔවුන් කල්පනා කලා, අනාගතයේදී ඒ රටේ යම් කිසි එක්සත් කමක් ඇති කිරීමට නම් අධ්‍යාපනය මිශ්‍ර කළ යුතුය කියා. මේ රටේ එම ප්‍රශ්නය ඒ ආකාරයෙන්ම විසදන්නට සූදානම් වන විට, එය එක්තරා පක්ෂයක වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් හෝ බලපොරොත්තුවක් පමණක් යයි යම් කිසි කෙනෙක් කියනවා නම්, එය වැරදි අදහසක් බව මා කියන්නට කැමතියි.

ගරු සභාපති තුමනි, රටක ආර්ථික දියුණුවට ප්‍රධාන වශයෙන් වැදගත් වන කාරණය නිෂ්පාදනය වැඩි දියුණු කිරීමයි. නිෂ්පාදනය යම් තරමකට වැඩි කරනවා නම්, දියුණු කරනවා නම්, ඒ තරමටම ඒ රටේ ජීවන තත්ත්වය උසස් වෙනවා; ජීවන වියදම අඩු වෙනවා; රැකිරණ සුලභ වෙනවා. ඒ එසේ තිබියදී, අප තිතරම කියනවා, රැකිරණ නැතියවුන්ගේ ප්‍රශ්නය උග්‍ර වේගන එනවාය කියා. අපේ රටේ දැන් අභ්‍යන්තර ධනය පහල බිහිවවා. නිෂ්පාදනය වැඩි දියුණු කිරීමත්, රටේ අභ්‍යන්තර ධනය පහල බැසීමත් යන කරුණු දෙක ඉතා වැදගත්, එමෙන්ම සැලකිය යුතු කරුණු දෙකක්. ගරු සෙනෙට් මන්ත්‍රී දොස්තර පීරිස් මහත්මයා අපේ අභ්‍යන්තර ආර්ථික තත්ත්වය පිරිහී ගොස් ඇති බව සඳහන් කලා මට මතකයි. රටේ ආර්ථික තත්ත්වය පිරිහීම වැළැක්වීමට තිබෙන මාර්ගය පැහැර හැර මෙතෙක් කල් කටයුතු කොට තිබෙන විට, දැන් මේ රැකිරණ ප්‍රශ්නය ආදිය විසඳීම ඉක්මනින්ම කරන්නේ කෙසේද? විසඳන්නේ කෙසේද? අපට ලත වෙන් නට සිදුවී ඇත්තේ ආර්ථික තත්ත්වය දියුණු කිරීමට තිබුණ මාගීය පැහැර හැර තිබීම නිසා නොවේද? කෙසේ වෙතත් මේ සම්බන්ධයෙන් දැන් අපට ලතවෙන් නට සිදුවී තිබෙනවා. නිෂ්පාදනයට වුවමනා කරන වස්තුව හෙවත් ධන නිධානයන් නැත්නම් නිෂ්පාදනය දියුණු කරන්නට බැහැ. ඒ අතින් නම් අපට කිසිම අඩු පාඩු වක් නොමැති බව පැහැදිලිව පෙනෙනවා. මේ රටේ නිෂ්පාදනයට වුවමනා තරම් බිම් ප්‍රමාණයක් අපට තිබෙනවා. ඒවාගේම අපට අවශ්‍ය තරම් අමු ද්‍රව්‍ය මෙහි තිබෙනවා. එහෙත් ක්‍රමවත් අධ්‍යාපනයක්

නොමැති විම නිසා අපට ඒ ධන නිධානයන්ගෙන් ප්‍රයෝජනයක් ලබා ගන්නට හැකියාවක් ඇති පුද්ගලයන් බිහි කරගත හැකි වී නැහැ. නිෂ්පාදනයට අවශ්‍ය තරම් පිරිසක් අපට මේ රටේ නැහැ. ඒ අපට ලැබී ඇති අධ්‍යාපනයේ වරද තිසයි. අධිරාජ්‍ය වාදීන් විසින් දෙන ලද අධ්‍යාපනයෙන් අපේ රටේ බිහි කර තිබෙන්නේ පාරිභෝගිකයන් කොටසක් පමණයි. නිපදවන්නන් හෙවත් නිෂ්පාදකයන් මේ අධ්‍යාපනයෙන් හැදුවේ නැහැ. පාරිභෝගිකයන්ගෙන් පමණක් රටක් ගෙන යන්නට බැහැ. පාරිභෝගිකයන් හෙවත් භුක්ති විඳින්නන් පමණක් සිටින රටක, ඔවුන් රටේ ඇති දේ කකා බිබී සිටින විට, ටික කාලයක් යන විට රටේ ඇති ධනය ඉවර වෙනවා. රටේ නිෂ්පාදනය වැඩි දියුණු කරන්නට ක්‍රම සලස්වන්නට ඕනෑ. නිෂ්පාදනය සඳහා අවශ්‍ය දැනීම ඇති ශිල්පීන් හා කාර්මිකයන් අපට ඇතිකර ගැනීමට ඇති ඕනෑ කම නිසා ජාතික අධ්‍යාපනය කියන සෞභාව පැන නැගුණා.

ජාතික අධ්‍යාපනයක් ඕනෑය යන සෞභාව පැන නගින්නට මූලික හේතුව වූයේ ඒකයි. අපේ රටේ කිසිවක් උපදවන්නට දැනීමක් ඇති පිරිසක් නොමැති බව කාටත් පේනවා ඇති. එය එසේ වන්නට ඉඩ දීම කොහෙන්ම යුතුකමක් නොවෙයි. අපි බලයෙන්ම එවැනි අධ්‍යාපනයක් ලබාදෙන්නට කටයුතු පිළියෙල කරන්නට ඕනෑ. අද තිබෙන අධ්‍යාපනයෙන් නිෂ්පාදකයින් බිහි වන්නේ නැහැ. අපි ඒ තත්ත්වය වලක්වා, රටේ දියුණුව, එමෙන්ම නිෂ්පාදනයේ දියුණුව සඳහා ලංකාවේ ඇති ධන නිධානයන්ගෙන් ප්‍රයෝජන ගත හැකි කාර්මිකයින්, ශිල්පීන් බිහි කිරීමට කටයුතු කරන්නට ඕනෑ. මා මේවා කියන්නේ ගුරුවරයකු වශයෙන් මට ඇති අත්දැකීම් අනුවයි. අද රට දෙස බලමු. ගමක් දෙස බැලූ විට, වැඩක් කළ හැකි පුද්ගලයන් ඉන්නේ එක්කෙනෙයි, නැත්නම් දෙන්නෙයි. වැඩ කොටසක්, මේ විජාතික අධ්‍යාපනය නිසා, “ නිකමත් ” වී සිටිනවා. මා මේ ගම්වල සිටින දරුවන්ට විරුද්ධව කරන කපාවක් නොවෙයි. අධිරාජ්‍ය වාදීන් බලපොරොත්තු වූයේ නැහැ, ද්‍රව්‍ය සම්පාදකයින්, කාර්මිකයින් බිහි කරන්නට කටයුතු යෙදීමට. ඔවුන් ඒ විධියේ අධ්‍යාපනයක් අපේ දරුවන්ට,

[Senator Jayasekera]

දුන්නේ නැහැ. විජාතික අධ්‍යාපනයෙන් හැදෑරූ වැඩුණ පිරිසක් උගතුන් වශයෙන් ලංකාවේ වැජඹෙනවා. විජාතික අධ්‍යාපනය ලත් අය වැඩක් කරන්නට යන්නේ නැහැ. බොරු තත්ත්වයක් ගැනීමට ඔවුන්ට හිතෙනවා, මේ අධ්‍යාපනය නිසා. තත්ත්වයක් ඇති අයවලුන් ලෙස ජීවත් වීමට ඔවුන් ඉබේම වාගේ පෙළඹෙනවා. ඔවුන්ට රටේ දියුණුව ගැන කල්පනා කරන්නට ශක්තියක් නැහැ; ඒවාගේම ඉඩකුත් නැහැ. මා මෙය මෙසේ විස්තර කරන්නේ මෙතෙක් පැවති අධ්‍යාපනය අද දක්වාම තිබෙන්නේ ජීවිතයෙන් වෙන් වූවක් හැටියට බව පෙන්වා දීමටයි. මේ දෙන අධ්‍යාපන ජීවිතය හා සම්බන්ධ වන්නේ නැහැ.

ඉගැනීමත් දැනීමත් යන දෙක අතරේ විශාල වෙනසක් ඇති බව ලෝකයේ උසස් පෙළේ අධ්‍යාපනඥයන් පිළිගෙන ඇති සැට කාලයක් මුලුල්ලේ ඒ පිළිබඳව ප්‍රකාශ වී ඇති අදහස් වලින් අපට පෙනෙනවා. සමහර අධ්‍යාපනඥයන් කල්පනා කළා, කරුණු රාශියක් දැන සිටීමෙන්ම අධ්‍යාපනය සම්පූර්ණ වෙනවාය කියා. බොහෝ කරුණු දැන සිටීම, බොහෝ පොත පත කියවා තිබීම, හොඳට කථා කිරීමට පුළුවන් කම ආදිය තිබේ නම්, ඉගෙනීම සම්පූර්ණය යන අදහසක් අධ්‍යාපන ලෝකයේ තිබුණා. නමුත්, මේ අදහස වර්තමාන අධ්‍යාපනය අනුව සෑම රටකම වාගේ වෙනස් වේගෙන යනවා. භෞතික වාදය මත රුසියාවේ සමාජ තත්ත්වයෙහි වෙනස්කම් රාශියක් ඇති වී තිබෙනවා. ඇමරිකාවේද ඒ මතය වෙනස් වේගෙන යනවා. එයට “pragmatism” යයි ඉංග්‍රීසියෙන් කියනවා. එයට, කෘත්‍ය සාධකතා යයි සිංහලෙන් කියන්නට පුළුවන්. මෙයින් අදහස් කරන්නේ, යම්කිසිවක් පිළිබඳව උගත් කමක් ඇතැයි ගණන් ගන්නේ ඒ සම්බන්ධව ක්‍රියා කරන්නට පුළුවන් නම් පමණයි යන්නයි. තිදර්ශනයක් වශයෙන් මෙය දක්වන්නට පුළුවනි. දැන් අපට ගොවිතැන ගැන කථා කරන්නට පුළුවන්. නමුත් අපට ගොවිතැන් කරන්නට බැහැ. අපි ගොවිතැන් කරන්නේ නැහැ. එම නිසා අප ගොවිතැන දන්නවාය කියා අපට කියන්නට බැහැ. ගොවිතැන ගැන පොතපත කියවා අප ලබා ගෙන තිබෙන දැනීම, උගත්කමක් හැටියට අද අධ්‍යාපන ලෝකය පිළිගන්නේ නැහැ.

යම්කිසිවක් ගැන කියන්නට පුළුවන් කම තිබුණත් එය කරන්නට බැරි නම් එය උගත්කමක් හැටියට පිළිගන්නේ නැහැ. උගත්කම, ඉගෙනීම කියන්නේ දැනීම ක්‍රියාවට පරිවර්තනය කිරීමටයි. මේ අදහස අමෙරිකාවත්, ඒවාගේම රුසියාව ආදී සමාජවාදී රටවලත් අද පිළිගත් දෙයක්. එයින් අදහස් කරන්නේ මිනිස් ජීවිතයට අධ්‍යාපනය සම්බන්ධ කිරීමයි. අධ්‍යාපනය එක් කරුණකුත් ජීවත්වීම තවත් කරුණකුත් නොවෙයි. අධ්‍යාපනයත්, ජීවිතයත් එකයි. අධ්‍යාපනය ජීවිතයට එක් කිරීමට පුළුවන්. ඒ පරිදි අධ්‍යාපනය වෙනස් වන විට, යම් කිසි වෘත්තීය පුහුණුවක් හෙවත් රැකී රක්ෂා පුහුණුවක් ලබාදෙනවා නම්, ලබුණ පාසැලෙන් පිට වන විටම ඔවුන් යම් කිසි වෘත්තීයක යොදවන්නට පුළුවනි. එසේ නැතිව, ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ විභාගය හෝ වෙනත් විභාගයකින් සමත් වී සමාජයට ගිය විගස ඔවුන් සොයන්නේ, කොයි කන්නෝරුවේද මුරකරු වැඩක් තිබෙන්නේ, කොයි පාඨශාලාවේද ගුරුකමක් තිබෙන්නේ, කොයි වෙළඳ ආයතනයේද ලිපිකාර වැඩක් තිබෙන්නේ යනා දී වශයෙන් මිස කොයි ස්ථානයේද කුඹුරු තිබෙන්නේ, කොයි ස්ථානයේද ගොවි පළ වල් තිබෙන්නේ කියා නොවෙයි. එයයි, ලමයින්ට බසින්තට සිදුවී තිබෙන ජීවිතය. ඒ නිසා අපි ලමයින්ට පුරුදු කර වන්නට ඕනෑ, අධ්‍යාපනයෙන් පසුව අධ්‍යාපනයත් සමග ජීවිතයට බැස ක්‍රියාවේ යෙදවීමට පුළුවන් ක්‍රමයක්. මේ ජාතික අධ්‍යාපන ක්‍රමය මගින් අදහස් කරන්නේ ලමයින්ට පාඨශාලාවෙන් පිට වූ පසු යම් කිසි කාර්යයක යෙදෙන්නට පුළුවන් කමක් අනුක්‍රමයෙන් ඇති කිරීමයි. එසේ වූ විට, රැකී රක්ෂා ප්‍රශ්නය විසඳීම පහසු වෙනවා ඇති. රක්ෂා ප්‍රශ්නය දැන් තිබෙන අන්දමට නම් විසඳීම අපහසුයි. අධ්‍යාපනය සඳහා ආණ්ඩුව විශාල මුදල් ප්‍රමාණයක් වැය කරන නමුත් එයින් සැහෙන තරම් ප්‍රයෝජනයක් ලැබෙන්නේ නැහැ. “මේ වර්ෂයේ අපේ පාඨශාලාවලින් මෙතරම් ශිෂ්‍ය සංඛ්‍යාවක් පිට වෙනවා, ඒ අයට මේ අයුරින් රක්ෂා සපයන්නට පුළුවනි” යි කියා සැලැස්මක් ඇතිව ක්‍රියා කළ යුතුයි. සමහර විට, මගේ ඒ අදහස ක්‍රියාත්මක කිරීමට අපහසු නැහැ. නමුත් මගේ මේ ප්‍රකාශයෙහුත් සමහර දේශ පාලන පක්ෂයකට මොකක් හෝ කොතක් අල්ලා ගැනීමට පුළුවන් වේවි.

“ අපේ ලුමයින්ට වැඩ කරන්න කියනවා, උදලු ගන්න කියනවා, එහෙම නැත් නම් වෙනත් විධියේ කාර්මික වැඩ කරන්න කියනවා, මේකද අධ්‍යාපනය? ” කියා ලුමයින්ගේ දෙමව්පියන් අසන්නට පටන් ගනිවි. ඒ උදවිය අධ්‍යාපනය යනුවෙන් අදහස් කරන්නේ, ලොකු පොත් ගොඩක් කිහිලි ගන්නා ගෙන පාසැලට ගොස් ගෙදර එන එකටයි. කම්හල් වැඩ, වඩු වැඩ, අධ්‍යාපනය වශයෙන් ගණන් ගන්නේ නැහැ. සමහර විට මව්පියන්ගෙන් මේ විධියේ ලොකු කෝෂාවක් එන්නේ, ඒ නිසා වෙන්නට පුළුවනි. ඒ මොකද? ජාතික අධ්‍යාපන ක්‍රමයක් අනුව අධ්‍යාපනය සකස් වන විට, නිකම් ඉන්නට බැරි වෙනවා; වැඩ කරන්නට වෙනවා. ශ්‍රමය වැය කරන්නට වෙනවා. වෙනත් විධියකින් කියනවා නම්, වැඩ කරන්නට නොහොත් ශ්‍රමය වැය කරන්නට විවේකයත්, ශ්‍රමය වැය නොකරන්නට විවේකය වශයෙන් ශ්‍රමය වැය කිරීමට අවස්ථාවන් ලැබෙන පරිදි අධ්‍යාපනය සකස් වන්නට ඕනෑ. ශ්‍රමය වැය කරනවාය කියන්නේ, යම් කිසි කමාන්තයක, යම්කිසි වැඩක යෙදීමටයි. කමාන්තයේ යෙදෙන තැනැත්තාට ඔහුගේ විනෝදය සඳහා විවේකය වුවමනා කරනවා. ඒ වාගේම විවේකය ලබාගෙන සිටින තැනැත්තාට ශ්‍රමය වුවමනා කරනවා. මේ කරුණු දෙක එකතු කිරීමට හැකි වන්නේ අධ්‍යාපනය නියම ස්ථානයට ගමන් කරවීමෙනුයි. ඊට ඇති එකම මාර්ගය ජාතික අධ්‍යාපන ක්‍රමයක් ඇති කිරීමයි.

දැනීම සම්බන්ධව කපා කරන විට, අපි බොහෝ විට කියන්නේ, පුටුවක් උඩට විදිග වාක්‍යයක් ලිවීමට හැකි නම් ඔහු උගතෙක්ය කියයි. එහෙම නැත් නම්, ලොකු දේශනාවක් කලොත් ඔහු උගතකු බවයි අපේ කල්පනාව. එය මේ රටේ සාමාන්‍ය පිළිගැනීමයි. වැඩ කරන තැනැත්තාගේ වැඩ කිරීමට ඇති හැකියාව උගත්කම හැටියට ගණන් ගන්නේ නැහැ. ඒ තැනැත්තා වෘත්තීය අතින් කොයි තරම් දක්ෂයකු වුවත්, උගතකු වශයෙන් ගණන් ගැනෙන්නේ නැහැ. අපේ දොස්තර මහත්මයා හොදට වැඩ කරන කෙනෙක්. ඒ දොස්තර මහත්මයා, සමහර විට, ලොකු පණ්ඩිතයකු සේ පෙනෙන්නේ නැහැ. ලෙඩ රෝගවලට අපේ ඇති හය නිසා අපි එතු

මන්ලාට ගරු කරනවා. නමුත් ලොකු කපා පවත්වන්නේ නැති නිසා, ලොකු පොත් ලියන්නේ නැති නිසා, ඒ තැනැත්තා උගතෙක් නොවේය කියා සමහර අය කල්පනා කරනවා. මෙය හරි හැටි විස්තර වුණද කියා මට සැකයි. මා කියන්නේ, සහාපති තුමනි, යම් කිසි දැනීමක් යම් කිසි රටකට වුවමනා කරනවා නම්, ඒ දැනීම නිතරම ක්‍රියාවට පරිවර්තනය කිරීමට පුළුවන් වන සේ අපේ අධ්‍යාපනය සකස් විය යුතු බවයි.

සමාජ ක්‍රමයක් අනුව, සමාජවාදී පිළිවෙළ කට අනුව වෘත්තීය පුහුණුවක් ලබා දෙනවා නම්, මිනිසුන් අතර වගී වශයෙන් වේවා, පෞද්ගලික වශයෙන් හෝ වේවා ඇති වන ආත්මාර්ථකාමී අපේක්ෂාවන් වෙනස් වී, ඒ අයට සාමාන්‍ය වශයෙන් සමුපකාර ක්‍රමය පුරුදු වෙනවා. ඒ නිසා ආත්මාපිකාමීව තම තමන් ගැනම පමණක් බැලීමේ අදහස වෙනස් වී, සමූහ වශයෙන්, සාමූහිකව අනෙක් අය කෙරෙහිත් යම් කිසි හැඟීමක් ඇතිව ජීවත් වන්නට පුළුවන් කම ලැබෙනවා. හොදට හෝ නරකට, අපට නොයෙකුත් විධියේ දුෂ්කරතා ඇති වී තිබෙනවා. අපි ඒ දුෂ්කරතා එකින් එක මග හරවා ගන්නට ඕනෑ. අපේ ආගමේ හැටියට බලන විටත්, මේ සියලු දේම නිතරම වෙනස් වෙමින් පවතින බව අපට පෙනෙනවා. ඒ ධර්මය අනුව බලන විට අපට පේනවා, මිනිසුන් පවා වෙනස් වෙවී එන බව. අන්තිමට මනුෂ්‍යත්වයට එන්නට ඕනෑ. ලෝකයේ යුද්ධ නැති වෙන්නට ඕනෑ. ජනතාවගේ සමගිය ඇති වෙන්නට ඕනෑ. මේ තත්ත්වය ඇතිවුණම තමයි අපට සැබෑ මනුෂ්‍යත්වය ඇති වෙන්නේ; නියම මනුෂ්‍යත්වය ලබා ගන්නට පුළුවන් වන්නේ.

මේ ආකාරයට දෙන අධ්‍යාපනය ගැන ඇමෙරිකාවේ ප්‍රතිපත්ති මාලාවක් පිළියෙළ කර තිබෙනවා. එය පිළියෙළ කර ගෙන තිබෙන්නේ කාර්ට්ලේලි නමැති ප්‍රධාන පංක්තියේ අධ්‍යාපන විශාරදයකුගේ මාර්ගයෙනුයි. එය දන් මුද්‍රණය කර ප්‍රසිද්ධ කොට තිබෙනවා. ඒ අනුව මෙන් නම් ප්‍රතිපත්ති පහ ඇමෙරිකාවේ දෙන අධ්‍යාපනය කෙරෙහි බල පවත්වනවා. මා ඇමෙරිකාව උදාහරණයක් වශයෙන් ගෙනහැර දක්වූයේ වෙන රටවල් ගැන කපා කරන්නට ගියහොත් මාක්ස්වාදියකු හැටියට මා

[Senator Jayasekera]

හඳුන්වා දෙන්නට පුළුවන් තිසයි. සාමාන්‍ය යෙන් අද රටේ තත්ත්වයේ හැටියට වෙන රටවල් ගැන මතක් කළ පමණින් ඒ තැනැත්තා මාක්ස්වාදියකු හැටියට හංවඩු ගහනවා. ඇමෙරිකානු අධ්‍යාපනය ගොඩනගා තිබෙන ප්‍රතිපත්ති පහ මෙන් මේවායි :—

1. රජයේ යහපත තකා සියළු ලමයින්ට ඉගැන්විය යුතුයි.
2. මේ අධ්‍යාපන සේවයට මව්පියන් අවනත වීම ඔවුන්ගේ පරම යුතුකමකි.
3. එසේ අවනත වන ලෙස බල කිරීමට රජයට අයිතියක් තිබේ.
4. අධ්‍යාපන වර්ගය හා ඉගැන්වීමේ අඩුම ප්‍රමාණය සම්මත කිරීම රජයට අයිතිය.
5. රජයේ අදහස පරිදි මහජන මුදල් ඊට යෙදිය හැකිය.

මා ඇමෙරිකාවේ අධ්‍යාපනය ගොඩ නගා ඇති ප්‍රතිපත්ති පහ ගෙනහැර දක්වූයේ, ජාතික අධ්‍යාපනයක් දීම සඳහා ඇති කොට තිබෙන පාසැල් පණත මාක්ස්වාදී එකක් හැටියට වැරදි අදහසක්, බොරු අදහසක් රටේ සමහරුන් තුළ පහළ වී තිබෙන තිසයි.

ඊළඟට, අප අධ්‍යාපනයෙන් බලාපොරොත්තු වන දෙයක් තමයි, ජනතාවක් නියම වශයෙන් හැඩ ගැස්වීමට කටයුතු කිරීම. අධ්‍යාපනයෙන් ජනතාවක් නියම විධියට හැඩගැස්විය යුතුයි. අපි අධ්‍යාපනය ගැන සඳහන් කරන විට නිතරම කියන දෙයක් තමයි, “විද්‍යා දරුවා විනයය” යන කීම. “අධ්‍යාපනයෙන් විනය ලැබෙනවා” ය යන්න එහි අදහසයි. ඒ අදහස අපට අත්හැර දමන්නට බැහැ. මනුෂ්‍යයාට විනයක් තිබෙන්නට ඕනෑ. ලමයෙකුට පාඨශාලාවේ දී විනය ආරක්ෂා කර ගන්නට උගන්වන්නට ඕනෑ. පාසැලේදී ලමයෙකුගේ විනය පිරිහෙනවා නම්, ඒ ගැන සොයන්නට ඕනෑ. සමහරුන් විනය වැරදි විධියට තෝරුම් ගෙන පාඨශාලාවේදී කටයුතු කරන බව පේනවා. බලය පෙන්වීමෙන් විනය ආරක්ෂා කරගත හැකිය කියා බොහොම දෙනෙක් කල්පනා කරනවා. එය වැරදි ස්වයංකාරී විනය හෙවත් සෑම ලමයකු

විසින්ම තමා හික්මවා ගැනීම උගන්වන්නට ඕනෑ. ලමයින් විසින්ම තම තමන් හික්මවා ගැනීම නොකළහොත් සිදු වන දේවල් අපට පෙනෙන්නට තිබෙනවා. සමහර පාඨශාලාවල ප්‍රධාන ගුරුවරයා පත්තිවලට එන විට ලමයි ‘හුම්’ නැතිව ඉන්නවා. එහෙත් පත්තියෙන් ගුරුවරයා පිටවූ වහාම එක්කෝ ගල් කැටයකින්, තැන්තම් කොළ බෝලයකින් එකෙක් අතිකාට ගහනවා. මොකක් හරි දෙයක් කොට පත්තියේ විනය විනාශ කරනවා. ලමයින්ට ඔවුන් විසින්ම හික්මීම කර ගැනීමට ඉගැන්වූයේ තැන්තම් පත්තියේ විනය විනාශ වෙනවා. නැවතත් පත්තියට ප්‍රධාන ගුරුවරයා පැමිණෙන විට ලමයි ‘හුම්’ නැතිව නිශ්ශබ්දව සිටිනවා. ඒ විනය නිසා නොවෙයි, ප්‍රධාන ගුරුවරයාට ඇති හය නිසයි.

අපේ රටේ එක්තරා ආගමක පාසැල් ලමයින් තුළ විනයක් නැති බව පසුගිය දිනවල පළ වූ ප්‍රකාශ වලින් අපට දැනගන්නට ලැබුණා. ඒ ආගමේ අය ඔවුන්ගේ පාසැල්වල විනය නමැති ස්පිරිතුව තිබෙනවාය කියා උද්ඝෝෂණය කළා. නමුත්, ගරු සභානායකතුමනි, මේ කීම මහා බොරුවක් බව මා කියන්නට කැමතියි. අද මුහුදු බඩ පලාත්වල ඇති ඔවුන්ගේ පාසැල්වලට ගිය විට නමුත්තාත්සේලාට කළුලැලි වල ලියා ඇති කුණුහරුප පේලි ගණන් දකගන්නට ලැබේවි. ඒ වාගේම කළුලැලි වල ඇද ඇති විකාර රූප දකගන්නට හැකිවේවි. එමෙන්ම හොඳ විනයක් ඇතැයි කියන එම පාසැල්වල ගුරුවරුන්ට ලමයි පවා තළනවා. ගුරුවරුන්ට ලමයින් යොදවා තළවනවා. ගුරුවරුන්ට අපහාස කරන්නට ලමයින් යොදවා තිබෙනවා. එසේ කරන විට ඒ පාසැල්වල විනය හොඳවී තිබෙනවාය කියන්නේ කෙසේද? ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, මෙය මොන විධියේ විනයක්ද? ඒ ලමයින් එක්තරා විධියක පිරිහීමකට හෙළා නැද්ද? ඒ පාඨශාලාවල ඒ උසස්යයි කියන විනය, අවුරුදු සිය ගණනක් ම රැකගන්නාය කියන ඒ ඊනියා විනය, මේ මොහොතේදී විනාශ කළා නොවේද? කෙබඳු විනයක් වුවත් මේ පාඨශාලාවල ඇතිවේය කියා කියන්නට පුළුවන් කමක් නැහැ. දැන් ලමයින් ගුරුවරුන්ට ගහන්නට පටන් ගෙන තිබෙනවා. තව වික

කලක් යන විට එතැනින් නොනැවති අම්මට තාත්තට මෙන්ම පූජක පක්ෂයටත් ගහන්නට පටන් ගන්නට ඉඩ තිබෙනවා. මේ ඇති කර තිබෙනවාය කියන විනය, ගුරුවරුන්ට ගහන, දෙමව්පියන්ට ගහන, ඊළඟට පූජක පක්ෂයට ගහන විනයය කියා අපට ප්‍රකාශ කරන්නට පුළුවනි. විනයය කියන දෙය ආරක්ෂා කිරීමට දෙමව් පියන් බැඳී සිටිනවා පමණක් නොව, එය ළමයින්ගේ අභ්‍යන්තරයෙහි අවශ්‍යයෙන්ම ඇති කරන්නට වුවමනා ගුණ ධර්මයක් බව අවිවාදයෙන් පිළිගත යුත්තක් නමුත්, බලයෙන් විනය ඇති කරන්නට බැහැ. මේ අවස්ථාවේදී කියන්නට සිදුවී තිබෙන්නේ, සමහර තැන්වල නම් අපට දකින්නට ලැබී තිබෙන්නේ මේ ගරු සහාවේ කියන්නට බැරි තරම් අසභ්‍ය, කැත, නින්දිත දේවල් බවයි. අපි දන්නවා, ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදය අනුව යම් කිසිවකට විරුද්ධත්වය ප්‍රකාශ කිරීම බොහොම හොඳ දෙයක් බව. විරුද්ධත්වය ප්‍රකාශ කිරීමත්, එයට අසතුට දැක්වීමත්, හේතු යුක්ති කියා ඇති තතු ප්‍රදර්ශනය කිරීමත්, බොහොම හොඳ ප්‍රතිපත්තියක්. නමුත් හොඳ මාගීවලින් ඉවත්ව මේ විධියට අසභ්‍ය දේ බිඳී කිරීමෙන් ඒ අයට මහත් විපාක විදින්නට සිදුවන්නට ඉඩ තිබෙනවා.

ඊළඟට තවත් කරුණක් ඉදිරිපත් කිරීමට සතුටුයි. අපේ ගරු ජයසුන්දර සෙනෙට් මන්ත්‍රීතුමා දන් නැහැ, නමුත් එතුමා කියන්නට යෙදුණා, “රොන් අරගෙන සෙමින්” යන කවියේ හැටියට බමරුන් මල්වලින් රොන් ගන්නා අයුරු මේ ආණ්ඩුව අය බදු අයකරන බව කී නමුත්, දන් මේ රජය අය බදු අය කරන්නේ බමරුන් පැණි ගන්නා ආකාරයට නොව දෙබරුන් පැණි ගන්නා ආකාරයටය කියා. එක් අතකින් එතුමාගේ කථාව සාබැය කියන්නටත් පුළුවන්. මී මැස්සා ලොකු කුඩා කොයි මලිනුත් සමාන ලෙසිනුයි පැණි උරා ගන්නේ. නමුත් දෙබරුන් ලොකු මල්වලින් වැඩියෙනුත් කුඩා මල්වලින් අඩුවෙනුත් රොන් අරගන්නවා. ඒ ආකාරයට මේ ආණ්ඩුව වැඩිය තිබෙන අයගෙන් වැඩි ප්‍රමාණයකුත් ටිකක් තිබෙන අයගෙන් සුළු ප්‍රමාණයකුත් ගන්නවා. නමුත් දෙබරුන්ගේ කථාව

සභ්‍යය කියා මට කියන්නට බැහැ. මේ ගැන කල්පනා කරන විට, මේ විධියේ පැරණි කවියක් මතක් වෙනවා.

“තැන තැන නිදන් කොට නොතබම සැම දම කව බොව යදින්හට දන් දෙව වඩා පෙම මිහි බැඳී බිඟුන් හට වන දෙය දක දකම නව තව ලොබින් දන රැස් කර තබනු කිම”

මෙය ඉතා හොඳ පැරණි කියමනක්. මී මැස්සන් පරිස්සමින් මී පැණි එකතු කර තැබූ පසු කවරුවන් කඩා ගන්නවා. මෙය දක දකත් ධනය රැස්කර තබනවාට වඩා ඒ ධනයෙන් දන් දී, වෙනත් නැති බැරි අයට දී, තමනුත් ප්‍රයෝජන විඳි සමාජයට සේවයක් කිරීම හොඳය කියන එකයි, එහි සාමාන්‍ය අදහස. ඒ වාගේම පරම්පරා ගණනකට ධනය රැස්කර තැබීමේ සිටිනා අපේ සමාජයේ ඇති වී තිබෙනවා. අපේ සමහර උදවිය අදහස් කරනවා, සාමාන්‍යයෙන් සැහෙන වටිනාකමක් ඇතිව, පරම්පරා ගණනක් ධනය ඇතිව, ජීවත් වෙන්නට ඕනෑය කියා. තමන්ට වුවමනා තරම් එක්රැස් කර ගන්නාම ඇති නොවේ ද, එයින් සැතපීමට පත් වන්නට පුළුවන් නොවේ ද කියා කල්පනා කරන්නේ නැහැ. ඒ වෙනුවට “මගේ පුතාට ලොකු පදවියක් ඇති කර තබන්නට ඕනෑ” ය කියා කල්පනා කරනවා. එයින් නවතින්නේ නැහැ. පුතාගෙ පුතාට කොහොම වේවිද කියා තවත් දුරට කල්පනා කරනවා. ඔය විධියට හත් තුමු පරම්පරාවකටම ධනය එක්කාසු කරනවා. ඒ විධියට ධනය රැස් කරන්නේ මොන අදහසකින්ද?

SENATOR THE HON. C. WIJE-SINGHE (MINISTER OF LABOUR AND NATIONALIZED SERVICES) : කලින් කී විධියට මී මැස්සා එකතු කරන්නේ මොකටද?

SENATOR JAYASEKERA : මැස්සා එකතු කළාම තවත් කවුරුවන් කඩා ගෙන කනවා. මා කියන්නේ ඒ විධියට එකතු කරන්නට ඕනෑ නැති බවයි. කාටවත් කඩාගෙන කන්න එකතු කරන්නට ඕනෑ නැහැ. ඒවා තමාට භුක්ති විඳින්නට පුළුවනි. මේක පැරණි අදහසක්. බොහෝ කාලයක් සඳහා, පරම්පරා ගණනකට ධනය එකතු කරන්නට ඕනෑය කියන අදහස පැරණි අදහසක්. ඒක අද

[Senator Jayasekera]

තත්ත්වයට ඔබින් තොර නැහැ. විශේෂ යෙන්ම සමාජවාදී රටක එය කරන්නට පුළුවන් කමක් නැහැ. සමාජවාදී ආණ්ඩුවක් ඇති වුණොට පස්සේ, උපදින අයට රැකී රක්ෂා තිබෙනවා නම්, ආර්ථික සම්පත්තිය තිබෙනවා නම්, පරම්පරා ගණනකට බනායක් එකතු කර තබන්නට ඕනෑ නැහැ. හැබැයි, රට වැසියන්ට දක්ෂ කමක් ලබා දෙන්නට ඕනෑ. වැඩක යෙදීමේ පුළුවන්කම සියලුදෙනාටම තිබෙන්නට ඕනෑ. එවිට ඉදිරි පරම්පරා ගණනකට බනාය රැස් කර තබන්නට වුවමනා වන්නේ නැහැ. මේ විධියට මෙම අදහස තෝරුම් ගන්නවා නම්, මා හිතනවා, හුඟක් බනාය රැස් කර තැබීමට උත්සාහ ගන්නා අයට එය සැන සීමට කාරණයක් වෙනවා ඇති. ඒ නිසයි මා ඒ කරුණු ටික සදහන් කෙළේ. එය ඒ ආකාරයට තෝරුම් නො ගන්නොත්, තමාගේ දරුවාට මොකක් වේවිද, තමාගේ මුණුබුරාට මොකක් වේවිද, මුණුබුරාගේ මුණුබුරාට මොකක් වේවිද, මගේ නම තියෙන්නේ නැහැ නොවේද ආදිය ගැන සිතමින් ඒ එකතු කිරීමේ අදහස ඇති උදවිය නිතරම දුක් වෙනවා.

ඊ ලඟට, සභාපතිතුමනි, මේ රජයේ විශේෂ සැලකිල්ල යොමු කළ යුතු කරුණු කීපයක් සදහන් කරන්නට මම අදහස් කරනවා. අපේ අළුත් ආණ්ඩුව—ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයේ ආණ්ඩුව—පිහිටුවීමට පසු, 1956 දී, සංස්කෘතික දෙපාර්තමේන්තු වක් ඇති කලා. ඊට කලින්, 1952 දී, සෝල්බරි සාමගේ යෝජනාවක් අනුව “ලංකා කලා මණ්ඩලය” කියා එක්තරා සංස්ථාවක් ඇති කලා. ඊට පස්සේ රාජ්‍ය භාෂා දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවක් ආරම්භ කලා. තවත් ලලිත කලා මණ්ඩලය කියා එකක් ඇති වුණා. ඔය සියල්ලම යම් යම් අදහස් පිට—හොඳ අදහස් පිට—ආරම්භ කළ සංවිධාන බවට අනුමානයක් නැහැ. මේ ලංකා කලා මණ්ඩලය බොහොම පැරණි අදහස කින් ආරම්භ කළ එකක්. එය එක්තරා පිළිවෙළකට සිවිල් නිලධාරීන් වැනි අය සම්බන්ධ වී කරගෙන ආ වැඩපිළිවෙළක්. නමුත් ඒ කලා මණ්ඩලයේ වැඩි දෙනෙක් කලාව කියන්නේ කුමක්ද කියා නොදන්නවාය කීම අවනම්බුවක් නම්, දන්නවා මදි බවයි සදහන් කරන්නට වී තිබෙන්නේ. ඒ වුණත් මෙම මණ්ඩලයට

අවුරුදු පනා ලක්ෂයක් පමණ මුදල් වියදම් කරනවා. ඒ වාගේම සංස්කෘතික අමාත්‍යාංශයටත් විශාල මුදලක් වියදම් කරනවා. අධ්‍යාපන ඉන්ට් උපදේශක මණ්ඩලය කියන එකටත් විශාල මුදලක් වියදම් කරනවා. ඔය කී සෑම මණ්ඩලවලින්ම එක්තරා වැඩ පිළිවෙළක්—හොඳ වැඩ පිළිවෙළක්—කෙරෙනවා ඇති. නමුත් සංස්කෘතිය සම්බන්ධවත්, කලාව සම්බන්ධවත් පොදු වශයෙන් රටේ පැහැදීමක් ඇති වන විධියේ කිසිම දෙයක් මේ දක්වා කෙරුණු බවක් නම් අපට දන ගන්නට නැහැ. රටේ පැහැදිලි අවබෝධයක් ඇති වන අන්දමට මේ දක්වා කටයුතු කෙරුණු බවක් අපට දන ගන්නට නැහැ.

මේවා අධ්‍යාපන මණ්ඩලයෙන් කෙරෙන නට ඕනෑය කියා මා අදහස් කරනවා. එකක් කර්මාන්ත අමාත්‍යාංශය යටතේ තිබෙනවා. තව එකක් මුදල් අමාත්‍යාංශය යටතේ තිබෙනවා. තවත් එකක් අධ්‍යාපන අමාත්‍යාංශය යටතේ තිබෙනවා. මේ අමාත්‍යාංශ තුන යටතේ ඇති කරුණු අධ්‍යාපන අමාත්‍යාංශයට එක් කර කටයුතු කළහොත් සංස්කෘතිය සහ කලා දියුණු කරන්නට පුළුවන් වෙනවා. පාඨශාලා මාර්ගයෙන්, පාඨශාලා උපයෝගී කර ගෙන, මේ කටයුත්ත කරගෙන යන්නට පුළුවන්. අධ්‍යාපන අමාත්‍යාංශය යටතේ තිබෙන ගුවන් විදුලියේ ප්‍රවෘත්ති අංශය මේ සදහා යොදවන්නට පුළුවන් වේය කියා මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. ඉදිරි කාලයේදී අපේ ගරු අමාත්‍ය මණ්ඩලය මේ කාරණය ගැන සැලකිල්ල යොමු කරනවා ඇතැයි මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා.

ඊලඟට, සභාපතිතුමනි, මා තව කාරණයක් ගැන සදහන් කරන්නට කැමතියි. එනම්, අපේ ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂ ආණ්ඩුව මගින් ආරම්භ කරන ලද සමගි මණ්ඩල පණත ගැන යි. මේ පණත ගැන සමහර විට තමුත්තාන්සේලා බොහෝ දෙනෙකු නොදන්නවා විය හැකියි. මේ මණ්ඩල කවර ආකාරයේ කටයුතු කරනවාද කියාත් සමහර විට තමුත්තාන්සේලා නොදන්නවා විය හැකියි. දනට ලංකාවේ සමගි මණ්ඩල 11ක් පමණ පිහිටුවා තිබෙනවා. මේ මණ්ඩලවලට සමහර අය නොයෙක් විධියේ, නොයෙක්

මාදිලියේ විරුද්ධකම් දක්වනවා. මහ උසාවිවලින් අප යම්කිසි ප්‍රයෝජනයක් බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා නම්, මේ සමගි මණ්ඩල පණත හැඩ ගැස්වීමෙන් ඒ වාගේම ලොකු සෙනක් රටට කරන්නට පුළුවන්. මා එසේ කියන්නේ, ඒ ගැන මා අත්හදා බලා තිබෙන නිසයි. මා දැන් සමගි මණ්ඩලයක වැඩ කරනවා. මා කල්පනා කරන හැටියට අපේ ඇමතිතුමා මේ සම්බන්ධව තරමක් දුරට දන්නා බව තමුන් නාත්සේලාට මා කියන්නට සතුටුයි. මා වැඩ කරන සමගි මණ්ඩලයට වර්ෂයකට පැමිණිලි 1,200 ක් පමණ ලැබුණා. ඒවා සුළු පැමිණිලි බව ඒ සමගම සඳහන් කරන්නට කැමැතියි. බරපතල තුවාල සිදු කිරීම් ආදී දේ ගැන පවා විභාග කර බැලීමට මේ සමගි මණ්ඩල පණතින් ඉඩකඩ ලැබී තිබුණා, බලය ලැබී තිබුණා. එහෙත් පසුව, බරපතල තුවාල කිරීම් ආදී දේ ගැන පණතේ තිබූ කොටස අස්කර දැමීම, එවැනි බරපතල ඒවා හැර, සිවිල් පැමිණිලි 1,200 ක් පමණ අවුරුද් දක් ඇතුළත දී මා විභාග කර තිබෙනවා. මා විභාග කළ පැමිණිලි අතුරෙන් සියයට අසූවකටත් වඩා ගණනක් මට සමාදාන කරන්නට පුළුවන් වුණා; සමාදානයෙන් බේරුම් කර දෙන්නට පුළුවන් වුණා. ඔවුන් උසාවි ගියා නම්, රුපියල් හත් අට දහ පමණ වියදම් වන පැමිණිලි, වියදම් කළ යුතු ඒවා, මා සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම බේරුම් කර දුන්නා. මේ සමගි මණ්ඩල වලින් සාමාන්‍ය මහජනයාට ලොකු ප්‍රයෝජනයක් වෙනවා. පොඩි අවුලක් වූ විට උසාවියක ඒ සම්බන්ධව නඩුවක් දැමීමට යාමේදී කෙනෙකුට විදින්නට සිදුවන අමාරුකම් ගැන තමුන්නාත්සේලා දන්නවා. ගමේ මුලාදැතියා හමුවීමට ගොස්, පසුව පොලීසියට ගොස්, ඊට පසු උසාවි යන්නට ගිය විට ඒ දුප්පත් මනුෂ්‍යයා අමාරුවේ වැටෙනවා. අපේ ගමේ මනුෂ්‍යයෙකු ගැන මා හොඳට දන්නවා. අක්කර කාලක පමණ ඉඩමකට ඔහු නඩුවක් කියනවා. දනට ඔහු පදිංචිව සිටින ඉඩම බැඳලා සල්ලි අරන් නඩුව කියනවා. අත්තීමේදී වෙන්තේ මොකක්ද? නඩු කී ඉඩමක් නැති වෙනවා; තමන්ගේ පදිංචි ඉඩමක් නැති වෙනවා. සුළු සුළු ඉඩකඩම්, පාරවල්, ආදී කරුණු විශාල දේවල් ලෙස භාර ගෙන කට යුතු කරන විට දුප්පතා අමාරුවේ වැටේ

නවා. මේ වාගේ දේවල්, එනම් සුළු සුළු ඉඩකඩම් ආරාචුල්, පාරවල් සම්බන්ධ ආරාචුල් ආදිය බේරුම් කිරීමට මේ සමගි මණ්ඩල පණත වෙනස් කිරීමෙන් ප්‍රයෝජනයක් ලබා ගැනීමට හැකි වේ යයි මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා.

හැබැයි, මෙතැනදී උසාවිවල මෙන් විනිශ්චයකාරයන් වෙන්නට අපි ගියේ නැහැ; බලය යොදා විනිශ්චයකාරයන් වාගේ ක්‍රියා කරන්නට ගියේ නැහැ. බොහොම අවස්ථාවලදී ඒවාට සම්බන්ධ වී සිටි අයට හොඳින් කපා කර, සතුටුදායක අන්දමට ඒවා සමාදාන කරන්නට පුළුවන් වුණා. එමෙන්ම, මේවාට ආණ්ඩුවෙන් එතරම් වියදමක් යන්නේ නැහැ. වියදමක් යන්නේ යන්නේ, බොහොම සුළු මුදලක්, රුපියල් පනහක පමණ මුදලක් පමණයි. එයත්, ලිපිකාර මහතෙකුට දීම පිණිසයි. අපහසුකම තිබෙන්නේ මෙතැනයි. මන්ද? ලිපිකාර මහතෙකුගේ සේවය ලබා ගන්නට රුපියල් පනහක් වැනි සුළු මුදලකට පුළුවන් කමක් නැහැ. මේ ක්‍රමය නියම අන්දමට ක්‍රියාත්මක වෙනවා නම්, ගම් සභා උසාවිවලට ලාම්පුවක් නැතිවීමේ නඩුවක් වැනි දේ මිස සමහර විට අනෙක් නඩු යන්නේ නැහැ. මේ විධියට සුළු සුළු දේවල්වලට මහජනයා උසාවිවලට ගැම නැති කරන්නට පුළුවනි. සමහර විට සුළු නඩු සඳහා ගම්බද උසාවි නැතිවන්නට පුළුවනි. අතික් ලොකු නඩු පොලිස් උසාවි මගින් විසඳාගන්නට පුළුවන්. මම කියන්නේ නැහැ ලොකු උසාවිවලට මෙන් මේවාට වියදම් කරන්නටය කියා. නමුත්, දනට කරනවාට වඩා සුළු වියදමක් කිරීමෙන් සැහෙන ප්‍රතිඵල ලබන්නට පුළුවන් බව මගේ අත්දැකීමෙන් පෙනී ගොස් තිබෙන බව ප්‍රකාශ කිරීමට සතුටුයි.

ඊළඟට, අපේ ආණ්ඩුව මුල සිටම ආයුර් වේදය සම්බන්ධව විශේෂ උනන්දුවක් ඇතිව ක්‍රියා කළ බව ප්‍රකාශ කිරීමට සතුටුයි. අළුත් තත්ත්වයක්, අළුත් මාර්ගයක් ඇති කිරීමට එසේ ක්‍රියා කළේ. මේ ආයුර් වේදය කාලයක් තිස්සේ මේ රටේ ලොකු කැලඹීමකට හේතු වී තිබුණ එක් ප්‍රශ්නයක්. දැන් එය එක්තරා තත්ත්වයකට පැමිණ තිබෙනවාය කියා මා විශ්වාස කරනවා. මේ අර්බුදය මුලින්ම ඇතිවුණේ වෛද්‍ය ක්‍රම දෙකක් මිශ්‍ර කිරීමට යාම නිසයි. ආයුර්වේදයත් බටහිර වෛද්‍ය

[Senator Jayasekera]

ක්‍රමයන් යන දෙක එකට මිශ්‍ර කරන්නට යනවාය කියන හැඟීමක් ස්වදේශීය වෛද්‍යවරුන් අතර පැවතුණා. නමුත් මම සිතනවා, මේ දෙපත්‍ර මහත්වරුන් පිළිගන්නවා ඇති, මේ දෙපක්ෂය එකතු වී බොහොම හොඳ සංවිධානයක්, හොඳ වැසු පිළිවෙලක් මේ රටේ ගෙනයන්නට පුළුවන් බව. සාමාන්‍යයෙන් ඒ පැත්තක් නැතිව, මේ පැත්තක් නැතිව, දෙපැත්තම ඇතිව හොඳට සම්බන්ධ කර පර්යේෂණ පැවැත්වීමෙන් අපේ ආයුර්වේද ක්‍රමයේත් බටහිර වෛද්‍යක්‍රමයේත්—නම සමහර විට වෙනස් වන්නට පුළුවන්—සම්බන්ධකම් ඇති ඉතා හොඳ ක්‍රමයක් ඇති කරගන්නට පුළුවන්ය කියා මම කියනවා. සාමාන්‍යයෙන් ඔය තිබෙන නම් නොකිව්‍යට, ලෙඩ සුව වෙනවා නම්, රෝග සුව කරගන්නා ක්‍රමයය කියා නම් කරගත හැකියි.

අපේ උගත් වෛද්‍යවරුන් මුණගස්වා මේ විධියේ වැඩපිළිවෙලක් ඇති කිරීමට අපේ සෞඛ්‍ය ඇමති තුමා ක්‍රියා කරනවා නම්, බොහොම ප්‍රයෝජන ගන්නට පුළුවන්ය කියා මම අදහස් කරනවා. මා කියන්නේ නැහැ, ඒ බෙහෙත් වර්ග දෙක එකට කලවම් කරන්නටය කියා. මේ බෙහෙත් වර්ග දෙක එකට කලවම් කළොත් තමයි, ලොකු සවිටන ඇති වන්නේ. ඒ නිසා බෙහෙත් දෙවර්ගය එකට කලවම් නොකර, වෙද මහත්වරුන් දෙදෙනා එකට කලවම් කරන්නට පුළුවන්. චීනයේදී මම දැක්කා, මේ වෙද මහත්වරුන් දෙදෙනාම එකම ස්ථානයේ කලවම් වී සිටිනවා. ඒ ආරෝග්‍යශාලාවේ දෙපක්ෂයම සිටිනවා. දෙපක්ෂයම බෙහෙත් ලියනවා. තමන්ට කැමති එකක් තෝරා ගන්න පුළුවනි. ඒ වාගේම ඒ එකකටවත් විරුද්ධියක් ඒ දෙපක්ෂයෙන් එක පක්ෂයක්වත් කියන්නේ නැහැ. මේක හරකයි, අරක හොඳයි කියා කීමක් ඒ දෙපක්ෂය අතර නැහැ. ප්‍රතිකාර සඳහා පැමිණෙන අයට ඒ ඒ පරිදි දෙපක්ෂය විසින්ම උපදෙස් දෙනවා. එක පක්ෂයක් අනෙක් පක්ෂයටත්, අනෙක් පක්ෂය ඒ පක්ෂයටත් උදව් දෙමින් වෙද හෙදකම් පිළිබඳ කටයුතු කරගෙන යනවා. ඒ විධියට කරන විට, දෙපක්ෂයම සමගි වී, එක වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් යටතේ ඒ කටයුත්ත කරගෙන යාමට පුළුවන් කම ලැබෙනවා. අද ආයුර්වේදයේ වටිනාකම අනුව බලන විට, එය

ලෝකය පුරා ප්‍රසිද්ධ වන තත්ත්වයකට ගෙන එන්නට පුළුවන් කම තිබෙනවා. මා අදහස් කරන්නේ බටහිර වෛද්‍ය ක්‍රමය අයිත් කිරීමක් නොවෙයි. නමුත් අර මා කලින් කී විධියට, සමගි සම්පන්නව එකමුතු වී ඒ කටයුත්ත කරන විට, ආයුර්වේදයට මුළු ලෝකයේම තැනක් ඇතිවන්නට ඉඩ තිබෙන බවයි මා කියන්නේ. ආයුර්වේදයේ යම්කිසි හොඳ දෙයක් තිබෙනවා නම්, අද ඒ හොඳ දෙය වැසී තිබෙනවා. ඒ ගැන කිසිම පර්යේෂණ පැවැත්වීමක් දැන් ඇත්තේ නැහැ. පුරාණයේ සිටි භෞතවරුන් කළ පර්යේෂණ වලට පසු අපි කිසිම පර්යේෂණයක් කර නැහැ. එම නිසා නවීන විද්‍යාවන් උපයෝගී කරගෙන පයෝෂණ පවත්වා මෙය මොන ක්‍රමයකින්ද දියුණු කළ යුත්තේ, කියා සොයා බැලීමට උත්සාහ ගන්නට ඕනෑ.

ඊළඟට, රජයේ විශේෂ සැලකිල්ල යොමු විය යුතු තවත් කරුණක් සඳහන් කරන්නට කැමතියි. අපේ රටේ ආර්ථික ප්‍රයත්නය සම්බන්ධව ක්‍රියා කිරීමේදී, විශේෂයෙන් අපි ගොඩනැගීමේ ලබා ගන්නා වස්තුව වාගේම මුහුදෙන් ලබා ගන්නා වස්තුව ගැනත් හොඳ සැලකිල්ලෙන් ක්‍රියා කළ යුතු බව සඳහන් කරන්නට ඕනෑ. ධීවර කර්මාන්තය පුහුණු කරවන යම් කිසි ස්ථානයක්, පාසැලක් මේ රටේ තිබෙනවාද කියා මට නම් තවම දැනගන්නට ලැබී නැහැ. ධීවර කර්මාන්තය සම්බන්ධයෙන් යම් යම් කරුණු සඳහා යම් යම් නිලධාරීන් සිටින බව මා දන්නේ, ධීවර කර්මාන්තය ගැන ක්‍රමානුකූල පුහුණුවක් ලබා දෙන තැනක් ගැන නම් මා දන්නේ නැහැ. එවැනි සංස්ථාවක් දැන් අපේ රටට අවශ්‍ය වී තිබෙනවා. මසුන් ඇති කිරීම, බෝ කිරීම, මසුන් ඇල්ලීම ආදිය සම්බන්ධයෙන් ක්‍රමානුකූල, ශාස්ත්‍රානුකූල ක්‍රම වෙනත් නොයෙකුත් රටවල උගන්වනවා. එවැනි තත් කරනවා නම්, ස්ථිර ලෙස එක්තරා ධනයක් රටට ලැබීමේ මාර්ගය නිතරම විවෘතව තිබෙනවා.

මිගමු කලපුවේ මීට කලින් සිටි සමහර මසුන් දැන් වඳ වී ගොස් තිබෙනවා. අපි කිසිම කල්පනාවක් නැතිව සමහර වැව් වල, ගංගාවල, අලුත් වර්ගවල මසුන් බෝ කිරීම නිසා ඒවායේ කලින් සිටි මසුන් දැන් වඳ වී ගොස් තිබෙනවා. ආර්ථික

වශයෙන් සලකන විට මෙය කුඩා ප්‍රශ්න යක් නොවෙයි; මෙය විශාල ප්‍රශ්නයක්. එම නිසා අඩු වශයෙන් මිහමුටවෙන් ධීවර කමිත්තය නියම ශාස්ත්‍රානුකූල ලෙස පුහුණු කිරීමේ පාසැලක් පිහිටුවනවා නම් සුදුසු කියා මම මේ රජයට මතක් කරන්න කැමතියි. මගේ වෙලාවන් දැන් අවසාන—

THE PRESIDENT: නව වෙලා තිබේ නවා.

SENATOR JAYASEKERA: වන සත්ව දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව ගැනත් කරුණු කීපයක් සඳහන් කරන්නට තිබෙනවා. මේ රටේ සිටින උගත් පක්ෂයේ ජනයාවන් මේ වන සත්ව දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව කියන්නේ මොකක්ද යන්න ගැන සිතගොමු කර තිබෙනවාද කියා මට සැක සහිතයි. මම පසු දිනක විල්පත්තුවේ වන සත්ව උද්‍යානයට ගියා. ඒ ස්ථානයට පැමිණෙන අමුත්තන්ගේ නම් සටහන් කිරීම සඳහා තබා තිබෙන පොත පෙරලා බැලූ මට පෙනුණේ ලංකාවේ කිසිම කෙනෙක් ඒ ස්ථානයට ගිහින් නැති බවයි. ඒක පිටරට අයටම වැඩි වශයෙන් වෙන් කර තිබෙන බවයි, පෙනෙන්නේ. අපේ වන සතුන් ආරක්ෂා කරගත යුත්තේ අභය භූමිවලට ගොස් සතුන් බලා විනෝද වීමට පමණක් නොවෙයි. වෙනත් කරුණු නිසාත් වන සතුන් බොහෝම ප්‍රයෝජන වත් වෙනවා. ලංකාවේ ඇති වන සත්වෝද්‍යාන තරම් අලංකාර වන සත්වෝද්‍යාන ලෝකයේ කොයිම රටකටත් ඇතැයි කිසි මා විශ්වාස කරන්නේ නැහැ. ඒවායේ සතුන් වදවිඟෙන යනවා. විශේෂයෙන් අලින් වදවිඟෙන යන බව සඳහන් කළ යුතුයි.

AN HON. SENATOR: වල් අලිද?

SENATOR JAYASEKERA: එක් ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක් වල් අලි ද කියා අහනවා. වල් අලි පමණක් නොවෙයි, සෑම වර්ගයකම සතුන් වද වී ගෙන යනවා. ඒ නිසා වන සතුන් ආරක්ෂා කර ගැනීම පිණිස සුදුසු විධිවිධාන යෙදිය යුතුව තිබෙනවා. ඒ වාගේම, වන සත්වෝද්‍යාන පිළිබඳව මීට වඩා සැලකිල්ලක් දක්වා කටයුතු කිරීමෙන් ඉගෙන ගන්නා ලබන්නට ඒවාට හිය විට විශාල ප්‍රයෝජනයක් ලබා ගන්නට පුළුවන් වෙනවා. සාමාන්‍ය අයටත් විනෝදයක් ලබා ගන්නට පුළුවන්.

මේ ලඟදී දිනක් මා සත්වෝද්‍යානයට ගියා. මේ අවස්ථාවේදී සත්වෝද්‍යානය සම්බන්ධ කරුණු විකක් සඳහන් කරන්නට මා කැමතියි. සත්වෝද්‍යානය අද පාලනය කරන්නේ එක දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවකින්. එහෙත් සත්වෝද්‍යානයට යන පාර පාලනය කරන්නේ වෙනත් දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවකින්. සත්වෝද්‍යානයට යන පාරේ කාර් එකකින් යන්නට පවා අමාරුයි. පාර නැතිත් නැත කැඩී බිඳී ගොස් තිබෙනවා. ඒ පාරේ කාර් එකක් ගෙන ගියොත් වැඩි දුරක් යන්නට මත්තෙන් කාර් එක කැඩෙනවා. සත්වෝද්‍යානය හා එහි පාරවල් දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව දෙකකට අයත්ව තිබීම නිසා මහජනයාට නියම ප්‍රයෝජනයක් ලබන්නට බැරි වී තිබෙනවා. එහෙයින් වැඩ දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව මේ සත්වෝද්‍යානයට යන පාරවල් සම්බන්ධයෙන් වැඩි සැලකිල්ලක් දක්වා ඒවාට යාමට හොඳ පාරවල් ඇති කරනවා ඇතැයි මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. ඒවාගේම, ඒවායේ වැඩ කරන සේවකයින් ගත කරන්නේ අමුතූම ජීවිතයක්. කිසිම හොඳ සැප පහසු කමක් නැතිව, කරදර සහිත ජීවිතයක් ගත කරන සත්වෝද්‍යාන සේවකයින්ට භවන වැටුප ඔවුන්ට ජීවත්වීමට ප්‍රමාණවත් වන්නේ නැහැ. එම වැටුපෙන් ජීවත්වීම අමාරුයි. ඔවුන්ට අමතර කිසිම ආදායමක් ලැබෙන්නේ නැහැ. මේ සත්වෝද්‍යාන සේවකයින් කෙරෙහි වැඩි සැලකිල්ලක් දක්වා රජය කටයුතු කරනවා ඇතැයි මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා.

නව කාරණයක් ගැන මා සඳහන් කරන්නට කැමතියි. මේ ආණ්ඩුවේ හැලි අරක්කු—විෂ මත්පැන්—සම්බන්ධව විශේෂයෙන් සිත යොමු කළ යුතුයි. නොයෙක් මාදිලියේ විෂ මත්පැන් දැන් බෝවී ගෙන යනවා. විෂ මත්පැන් පානය අඩු කිරීමට ඊයේ පෙරේදා ලැයිසන් දීමේ ක්‍රමයක් ගැන යෝජනා කර තිබුණා. ලැයිසන් දීමේ ක්‍රමයකින් මත්පැන් පානය නතර කරන්නට පුළුවන් වේද කියා මට නම් විශ්වාස කරන්නට බැහැ.

[Senator Jayasekera]

කෙසේ නමුත්, මේ විෂ මත්පැන් පානයෙන් මහජනයා වැළැක්විය යුතු බව නම් පේනවා. මත්පැන් පානයට යම් කෙනෙකුගේ ආසාවක් තිබෙනවා නම්, එය මුදුන් පත්කර ගැනීමට—විෂ මත් පැන් පානයෙන් මුදවා—ඔවුන්ගේ සීතැති ඉටුකර ගැනීමට පහසු ක්‍රමයක් ඇති කළ යුතුයි. විශේෂයෙන් මා දන්නවා, මා ඉන්නාවූ ගම් ප්‍රදේශයේ, එනම් කොවිච්චි කඩේ පැත්තේ, ආණ්ඩුවේ අරක්කු තැබැරුම්වල සිල් කරන ලද බෝතල් තුළට පවා දැන් “කසිප්පු” ඊංගනව්‍ය කියා රුවයක් තිබෙන බව. මා දන්නේ නැහැ, මේ කසිප්පු කියන්නේ මොනවාද කියා. රජයෙන් විකිණීමට යවන අරක්කු බෝතල් තුළට කසිප්පු දැමීමෙන් විශාල ලාභයක් ඔවුන් ලබා ගන්නවාලු. ශත 60කින් පමණ කසිප්පු බෝතලයක් හරි ගස්සන්නට පුළුවන්ලු. සීනි වර්ගයක් අරගෙන හදන මේ කසිප්පු අරක්කු බෝතල්වල දමා විකිණීමෙන් විශාල ලාභයක් ඔවුන්ට ලබා ගන්නට පුළුවන්ලු.

බොන අයට, දැන් තැබැරුම්වලට යන්නට වුවමනාවක් නැහැ. විෂ මත්පැන් පෙරීම දැන් කර්මාන්තයක්, ගෘහ කර්මාන්තයක් බවට පත්වී තිබෙනවා. මෙය ඇතැම් අය අතර කොතරම් බහුල ලෙස තිබෙනවාද කියනවා නම්, ඉතෝ එල්ලාගෙන, නැතිනම් ඉතෝ ගසාගෙන තබාගෙන, වුවමනාකාරයකු ඉල්ලු විට ඕනෑම වේලාවක සාදා දෙන්නට පුළුවන් තත්ත්වයකට ගෙනවුත් තිබෙනවා. එක ප්‍රදේශයක නොවෙයි, දිවයින පුරාම මෙය පැතිරී තිබෙනවා. කොයි විධියෙන් හෝ ආණ්ඩුව මෙය මැඩ පැවැත්වීමට ඉදිරිපත් නුනොත්, ඒ අය, මේ කසිප්පු ජාවාරම්කාරයන් තමයි, සමහරවිට මේ ප්‍රදේශවල බල පුළුවන් කාරයන් බවට පත්වන්නේ. දැනටමත් එසේ වී තිබෙනවා. මේ ප්‍රදේශවල ඔවුන්ට විරුද්ධව ක්‍රියා කිරීමට රජයේ නිලධාරීන්ට පවා සමහර විට ඉඩක් නොලැබී යන්නට පුළුවනි. ඔවුන් දැන් කොතරම් ප්‍රබලද කියනවා නම්, ඔවුන්ගේ ආරක්‍ෂාවට ඔවුන් නොයෙකුත් නපුරු අවිආයුධ පවා පාවිච්චි කරනවා. ඒ අයට මොටෝ රථ තිබෙනවා. මෙය භයානක තත්ත්වයක් හැටියටයි හැඩ ගැසිගෙන එන්නේ. එම නිසා මත්පැන් සම්පූර්ණයෙන් නැති කරන්නට

ඕනෑ. එසේ නැතිනම් මත්පැන් බොන අයට මත්පැන් ගැනීමට හොඳ මාර්ග යක් සලස්වන්නට ඕනෑ. මේ දෙකින් කොයි එකක් හෝ ඉක්මනින් නොකළ හොත් රට කසිප්පුවලින් වැනසී යන්නට පුළුවනි.

සමහර උදවිය කියනවා, අරක්කු මිල අඩුකිරීමෙන් මෙය නැති කරන්නට පුළුවන්ය කියා. නමුත් කසිප්පු පාවිච්චි කරන අයගෙන් මම හොඳට සොදිසි කර බැලුවා; ඒ අය කියනවා, ආණ්ඩුවේ අරක්කු වතුර වගේය, කසිප්පු අඩියක් ගැහුවාම එක පාරටම “කරන්වි එක” ඇවිත්, නිකම් කැරකිලා හිටිනවාය කියා. ඒ වාට කියන්නේ, “ගහපත් මවත්” ලු.

SENATOR THE HON. C. WIJE-SINGHE : හිටපත් මවත්!

SENATOR JAYASEKERA : ඉතින් මේ අය ආණ්ඩුවේ අරක්කු වලට කැමති නැහැ. ආණ්ඩුවේ අරක්කුවලට වඩා කසිප්පු සැර නිසා ඒවා ඔවුන්ට නැතිවම බැරිලු. ඉස්සර කාලයේ වාගේ, බොන අයට ගහක් මැද ගෙන බොන්නට දෙනවා නම්, මේ තරම් අනතුරකට මිනිසුන් පත්වේය කියා මම හිතන්නේ නැහැ. මේ වස බීමෙන් ඇතැම් තරුණයෝ අද පිස්සු වැටිලා. ඉලන්දරින් මෙයට පුරුදු වී ටික කලක් යන විට, ඒවායේ විෂ හිසට නැගීමෙන් ඔවුන් පිස්සු වැටෙනවා. මම දන්නවා, ඔය සමහර පළාත්වල කසිප්පු තිප්පොලකට ලමයෙක්-පාසැල් යන ලමයි—ගිය විට, පලමු දවසේ සල්ලි ගන්නේ නැතිව, ඒ ලමයාට අර විෂ මත්පැන් ටිකක් පොල් කට්ටකට දෙනවා. දෙවෙනි දවසේත් ඔහු ආ විට මේ අන්දමට නොමිලයේම අර විෂ මත්පැන් ටිකක් දෙනවා. තුන් වෙනි දවසේ එන විට, ඔහු තරමක් එයට පුරුදුවී ඇති නිසා, මුදල් අය කරනවා. ඔය අන්දමට දැන් මෙය රට පුරාම පැතිරී තිබෙනවා.

SENATOR M. P. DE ZOYSA : උත්තර මන්ත්‍රීතුමා හොඳට දන්නවා මේ ගැන.

SENATOR JAYASEKERA : ඇයි මොකද දන්නේ නැත්තේ? මම ඉන්න ප්‍රදේශයේ මේවා ඕනෑ තරම් තිබෙනවා.

අපිට නිතර දකින්නට ලැබෙනවා ගත අයිතෝ ඕවා ඕනෑ තරම් තිබෙනවා. ආණ්ඩුවේ නිලධාරීන් හදිසියේ මේ තැන් වලට ගිය විට, ඒවා හැලි ගණන් ගතට බස්සවන හැටින්, ඔවුන් ආපසු ගිය පසු නැවත ගොඩ ගන්නා හැටින් ඕනෑ කෙනෙකුට දැන ගන්නට පුළුවන්.

මම මෙය විස්තර වශයෙන් සඳහන් කළේ මෙය සුළු කරුණක් නොවන නිසායි. අපට පැමිණිලි දහස් ගණනක් ඉදිරිපත් වුණා. ඒවායින් ඉතාමත් වැඩි කොටස මේ හැලි අරක්කු සම්බන්ධ නඩුයි. මේ ප්‍රශ්නය විසඳනවා නම් විසඳන්නට පුළුවන් වන්නේ පොලිසියත් ගම්මුලා දැනින් ආදී නිලධාරීන් එකතු වී වැඩ කිරීමෙන් පමණක් බව කියන්නට පුළුවනි. මේ අය එකතු නොවී මෙය කරන්නට පුළුවන් කමක් නැහැ. ඒ නිසා මේ සෑම දෙනාම එකතු වී මෙය මර්දනය කරන්නට යම් කිසි වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් යෙදිය යුතුය කියා මම සිතනවා. ඒ අන්දමට එකතු වී ක්‍රියා කළොත් මෙය හුඟක් දුරට මර්දනය කරන්න පුළුවන්. මෙය සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම නතර කර දමන්නට පුළුවන්ය කියා මා විශ්වාස කරන්නේ නැහැ. එසේ කරන්නට ගියොත් ලෙඩ රෝග සම්බන්ධ යෙහුන් තවත් නොයෙකුත් දුෂ්කර තාවලට මුහුණ පාන්නට සිදු වෙවි.

මීට වඩා මගේ කථාව දීර්ඝ කරන්නට මම බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ නැහැ. නමුත් නාන්දේට ස්තූති කරමින් මගේ කථාව අවසන් කරනවා.

THE PRESIDENT : The Sitting is suspended for two minutes. On resumption the Deputy-President will take the Chair.

Whereupon Mr. PRESIDENT left the Chair and MADAM DEPUTY-PRESIDENT [SENATOR LADY MOLAMURE] took the Chair.

SENATOR T. P. DE ZOYSA : Madam Deputy President, first of all I would like to say a few words on one of the points raised by Senator Dr. Peiris yesterday. He lamented that our external assets which stood at Rs. 1177 million at the beginning of 1956 had fallen to Rs. 674 million at the end of March 1960, when the U. N. P. Government took over.

I find that when they handed over the reins of office in July 1960 to this Government this figure had come down still further to Rs. 567 million, that is, a fall of Rs. 107 million within three months. I wonder what explanation my good Friend could give for this. I wonder whether he wants this House to believe that the Bandaranaike Government frittered away these external assets on useless expenditure. We all know that sterling balances increase and decrease, and this happens when the terms of trade change from time to time, according to the prices our commodities fetch in world markets.

When the U. N. P. was in power in 1951 the external assets were Rs. 1185 million and they came down to Rs. 607 million at the end of 1953. In the same way that he finds fault with the Bandaranaike Government, is it not right to also find fault with the then Dudley Senanayake Government? These are the vagaries of international trade. I do not think we should blame anybody. We should not blame the U. N. P. Government nor should the U. N. P. Government blame the S. L. F. P. for this.

In this budget we provide for a total expenditure of Rs. 1973 million, and within this sum a capital expenditure of Rs. 411 million is envisaged. The principal object of our economic policy is to achieve a socialist pattern of society. Accordingly, the basic criterion in determining social policies and the lines of economic advancement should not be private profit or the interests of a few but the good of the community as a whole.

In the absence of large industrial ventures, emphasis should be on increase in production of agricultural products and employment in that sphere. In particular, the benefits of economic development should be more for the worker and the peasant than for the privileged classes of society.

Development of agriculture calls for extension of irrigation on a large scale. It is gratifying to note that

[Senator T. P. de Zoysa]
the foundation has been laid for the development of the river basins in this Island to obtain the necessary water and hydro-power both for irrigation purposes and for the generation of hydro-electricity to supply cheap power for the establishment of industries. This is what His Excellency the Governor-General said when he addressed the Fourth Regional Technical Conference on Water Resources Development organised by the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East on 5th December, 1960. Speaking of self-sufficiency in regard to our own country His Excellency said :

“May I place before you in broad outline the Ceylon picture? The living standard of the people of Ceylon and the economic stability of our country depend to a large extent on self-sufficiency in our food supply. In this respect, we face a dual problem arising from meeting the present shortage on the one hand, and the demands of an increasing population, on the other.

As rice is the staple diet of this country, paddy cultivation occupies a vital position in its economy. The local production of rice meets only about 45 per cent. of our total requirements. In order to make this country self-supporting in rice we must expand our cultivated acreage and raise the yield per acre of existing acreages. Of the two methods, the latter is more advantageous. It is in Ceylon a less expensive and a quicker way of obtaining an added output than the opening up of new land.”

To meet these requirements the Minister of Agriculture, Land, Irrigation and Power is taking steps to have multi-purpose projects built in the river basins of this island. I quote again from the same speech of His Excellency :

“Samanalawewa—this reservoir is located in the upper reaches of the main river and is a combined irrigation and power project for irrigation of 40,000 acres of new land for rice cultivation and generation of about 40,000 kilowatts of firm power. The investigations so far made indicate that a reservoir with a storage capacity of 345,000 acre feet with an earth filled dam 335 feet high and 1,665 feet long is possible.”

That is not the only multi-purpose project that this Government contemplates in the near future. There

are also the Uda Walawe and Chandrikawewa projects. Once these schemes have been completed I have no doubt that this country will be self-sufficient in food and at the same time find the necessary hydro-electric power, cheap power, for our big industrial undertakings.

I now wish to show what had been done by the Bandaranaike Government from 1956 to the end of 1959 in the form of land development as compared with previous governments. For a period of 25 years up to the end of 1955, lands alienated by the previous Governments are: major colonization schemes in the dry zone, 19,279 allotments comprising 115,018 acres; village expansion schemes, 225,282 allotments comprising 320,451 acres; acquired estates, 12,988 allotments comprising 18,185 acres; highland colonization schemes, 100 allotments comprising 500 acres; middle class schemes, 4,799 allotments comprising 65,482 acres.

From 1956 to 1959, within the four years of the Bandaranaike Government, that Government has alienated under major colonization schemes in the dry zone, 14,920 allotments comprising 62,015 acres; under village expansion, 81,634 allotments comprising 116,379 acres; acquired estates, 12,619 allotments comprising 6,162 acres; highland colonization schemes, 4,225 allotments comprising 14,317 acres; middle class schemes, 3,774 allotments comprising 47,246 acres. These comparative statistics will, no doubt, give the lie direct to our critics.

Madam Deputy-President, I would now switch on to the fishing industry which my friend, Senator Jayasundera, referred to yesterday. Provision has been made in the budget for this year for a sum of Rs. 8½ million to provide 500 mechanized boats to fishermen and also for a sum sufficient to put up 200 fishermen's cottages. These 500 mechanized boats would give employment to about 2,000 persons a day. A boat would normally bring in a catch worth about Rs. 300 a day. Once this industry is developed in this manner,

we have no doubt that fish and fish products imported into this country would stop and we would thus retain in this country roughly about Rs. 60 million.

I know that there is a Fishermen Training Centre at Modera. I think it is taking in quite a number of men for training in mechanized fishing. I think it is the intention of the Government to improve this school to take in more pupils. I would here point out that although the U. N. P. Government was speaking so much about the fishing industry in Ceylon, not one fishing boat was provided to the fishermen during the U. N. P. regime.

There is also the question of providing houses for the homeless in this country. This Government has provided funds to establish three big saw mills at Medawachchiya, Pimbulkatuwa and Minneriya to make use of the timber that is being felled for clearing land for development purposes by converting them into housing material. I think one mill is now working and I have no doubt that before another six months elapse all three mills will be working at full speed. That will help the people in the house-building industry to get cheap timber for housing purposes.

There is one big obstacle in implementing a democratic socialist policy in the country. This obstacle is mostly due to the inefficiency of the administrative system. It is not possible to accelerate economic development with the existing kachcheri system of administration. This outdated system, established in this country by the colonial administrators, has to be pulled out root and branch before any progress in development could be made. I would compare this administrative machinery to a stream-lined bus fitted with a rickety old engine. If we are to do some useful work, this whole engine must be replaced by a new one. Unless this is done we will be left on the road without reaching our declared destination.

We all heard last evening from my hon. Friend, Senator Jayasundera, එක් බනපරියකුගේ විලාපයක් over

the new taxation proposals. At the same time I agree with my hon. Friend, Senator Barton, that Government should not kill the goose that lays the golden egg. It is the duty of the Government, I agree, to provide incentives to the private sector to work in unison with the public sector for the economic development of this country. Until major industries are established we must provide employment in agriculture.

On the subject of these taxes there is one matter which should be looked into by the Hon. Minister of Finance. You know, Madam Deputy President, that after attainment of independence in 1947, when the Government adopted the policy of Ceylonising trade, a large number of Ceylonese with limited capital resources formed themselves into limited liability companies with the object of establishing themselves particularly in the import and export trade, which was then practically the monopoly of foreigners. Most of these companies were registered with very large nominal share capital which bore no relation whatsoever to the issued or paid-up capital. This was done because the maximum fee payable on registration was Rs. 250, whatever the amount of the nominal capital. Registering with a larger nominal capital than was really required immediately obviated the necessity of having to alter the memorandum of association in the event of the company having subsequently to increase its issued capital.

The Hon. Minister of Finance stated in his budget speech as follows :

“An annual fee of Rs. 50 will be leviable on every Rs. 10,000 of nominal share capital of companies registered under the Companies Ordinance as at 15th September, 1960, and thereafter. This fee will not be payable by industrial or manufacturing corporations approved by Government. The estimated revenue from this measure is Rs. 10 million.”— [OFFICIAL REPORT, Representatives, 15th September, 1960 ; Vol. 39, c. 1660-1661.]

If this fee is levied as proposed, most of these companies would have to go into liquidation. By way of illustration, let us consider the case of a company floated with a nominal

[Senator T. P. de Zoysa]
 share capital of Rs. 1,000,000, issued capital of Rs. 100,000 and paid-up capital Rs. 50,000. This company made a profit of Rs. 5,000 in 1959, that is 10 per cent on the paid-up capital, which was the actual sum used in the business. The income tax of 45 per cent now levied on companies, together with the proposed surcharge of 15 per cent, would amount to Rs. 2,587.50, leaving only Rs. 2,412.50 available for distribution among the shareholders. The proposed annual fee on the nominal share capital would amount to Rs. 5,000, which would mean that although the company made a profit of as much as 10 per cent, it would still have to find a sum of Rs. 2,587.50—that is Rs. 5,000 fee less the Rs. 2,412.50 available from profits after payment of income tax—from its capital to meet the fee. The company will be forced into voluntary liquidation in order to prevent the investments of its subscribers from being swallowed up by this fee.

If the fee is levied only on paid-up capital, it would amount to Rs. 250, leaving a sum of Rs. 2,162.50 available for distribution among shareholders; that is to say, a company earning 10 per cent on its investments would be able to pay only a small fraction over 2 per cent as dividends, without putting anything into reserve.

This annual fee will deal a death blow on the policy of Ceylonising trade and will no doubt help limited liability companies registered abroad and doing business here and the Indian merchants whose businesses are largely run on a partnership basis, both of which are not subject to this fee.

Now, you will remember that when we wanted to Ceylonise the trade in 1947, some of our educated young men with limited resources joined hands and started small companies. Today they are on the streets. I think we should look into this question, because the same taxation will not affect the companies registered abroad and the partnership companies mostly run by the

foreigners in this country. Ultimately, what will happen is that Ceylonese business in this country will entirely collapse.—[Interruption.] I am glad that Senator Amarasuriya agrees with my analysis.

SENATOR E. J. COORAY: The Government does not.

SENATOR T. P. DE ZOYSA: I hope the Government will look into this matter, if it had not carefully looked into it at that time.

SENATOR NADESAN: Did you not take this point up at the Government party meeting?

SENATOR T. P. DE ZOYSA: I think I will draw the attention of the Hon. Minister of Finance to this matter, because he may not have gone into it very carefully at that time.

SENATOR S. NADESAN: It is a very important point.

SENATOR T. P. DE ZOYSA: I do not wish to take up any more of the time of the House as there are a number of hon. Senators who intend to speak. I thank you all for having given me a patient hearing.

SENATOR G. NALLIAH:

கௌரவ பிரதி அக்கிராசனர் அவர்களே, இந்த வரவு செலவுத்திட்டத்தைப் பற்றிப் பலர் இங்கு பேசினார்கள். இந்த வரவு செலவுத்திட்டம் சோஷலிஸ அடிப்படையிலே அமைந்த ஒரு வரவுசெலவுத்திட்டமாயிருக்குமென நான் எண்ணியிருந்தேன். ஆனால், நான் எதிர்பார்த்ததற்கு மாறாக இவ்வரவு செலவுத்திட்டம் சோஷலிஸ அடிப்படையிலே யில்லாததாய் அமைந்திருக்கின்ற தென்பது என்னுடைய கருத்து.

இந்நாட்டின் பொருளாதாரம் படிப்படியாகக் குறைந்துகொண்டு வருவதை நாமறிவோம். நிதியமைச்சர் அவர்களும் இதைப்பற்றி நன்றாகப் பிரஸ்தாபித்திருக்கிறார்கள். இவ்விதம் தேய்ந்துகொண்டு போகிற பொருளாதார நிலையை நாம்

எவ்வாறு சரிப்படுத்தலாம்? இப்பொருளாதார நிலையை நாங்கள் சரியான ஒரு நிலைக்குக் கொண்டுவர வேண்டுமானால், இந்நாட்டிலே வதியும் சகல மக்களும் அதற்காக ஒத்துழைக்க வேண்டும். அப்படியாக ஒத்துழைக்கக்கூடிய ஒரு நிலையை அரசாங்கம் ஏற்படுத்தவேண்டும். இன்னும், இந்நாட்டிலே வதியும் மக்கள் யாவரும் இந்நாட்டின் அபிவிருத்தியில், பொருளாதார வளர்ச்சியில், கண்ணுங்கருத்துமாயிருக்கக் கூடிய ஒரு சூழ்நிலையை அரசாங்கம் ஏற்படுத்தவேண்டும்.

இப்போது இந்த அரசாங்கம் பெரும்பான்மைப்பலத்துடன் இருக்கின்றது. எனவே நாட்டிலே ஒற்றுமையான சூழ்நிலையை ஏற்படுத்துவது அரசாங்கத்தின் முக்கிய கடமையாக இருக்கவேண்டும். ஆனால் இந்த அரசாங்கம் அந்த இலக்கை நோக்கிப் போவதாகத் தெரியவில்லை. இந்த அரசாங்கம் எடுக்கும் பலவிதமான நடவடிக்கைகளும் இந்நாட்டிலே வதியும் சிறுபான்மை மக்களுக்கு எதிராக இருக்கின்றனவென்று சொல்ல வேண்டியிருக்கின்றது. இனத்தாலும் மதத்தாலும் சிறுபான்மையாயுள்ளவர்களைத் தாக்கக் கூடிய விதத்திலே பலவிதமான நடவடிக்கைகள் எடுக்கப்பட்டு வருகின்றன. இவ்விதம் சிறுபான்மையோர் வெறுப்படைக்கூடிய நடவடிக்கைகளை அரசாங்கம் எடுத்துக்கொண்டுபோனால் எவ்விதம் எல்லா மக்களும் இந்நாட்டின் அபிவிருத்திக்காக, பொருளாதார வளர்ச்சிக்காக, உழைக்க முடியுமென நான் கேட்க விரும்புகிறேன். ஒரு நாட்டில் மக்கள் அனைவரும் நிம்மதியாகவும் சந்தோஷமாகவும் வாழக்கூடிய வசதியும் சூழ்நிலையும் இருந்தாற்றான் அவர்கள் அந்த நாட்டின் வளர்ச்சிக்காகவும் பொருளாதார விரித்திக்காகவும் உழைக்கக்கூடியவர்களாக இருப்பர்.

ஆனால் இன்று துரதிஷ்டவசமாக, இந்நாட்டிலே வதியும் மதத்தாலும் இனத்தாலும் சிறுபான்மையாயுள்ள மக்கள் பலவிதமான கஷ்டங்களுக்குள்ளாகி வருகின்றார்கள். இதை மறைக்க அரசாங்கம் எவ்வித பசப்பு வார்த்தைகளைக்

கூறினாலும் அவர்கள் அதனை ஏற்றுக் கொள்ளத் தயாராக இல்லை. இந்நாட்டின் பிரச்சினைகளைச் சரியான முறையில் தீர்க்காது அரசாங்கம் மக்களின் கவனத்தை வேறுபக்கம் திருப்ப முயல் சீன்றதென நினைக்க வேண்டியிருக்கிறது.

சமீபத்திலே அரசாங்கம் கொண்டு வந்த பாடசாலை மசோதா, இந்நாட்டில் வதியும் ஒரு பகுதி மக்களின் வெறுப்பை வெளிப்படுத்தியிருக்கிறது. இந்த அரசாங்கத்தைக் கைப்பற்றியிருக்கும் கட்சியினர் சிறுபான்மை மக்களின் விருப்பு வெறுப்பை, எண்ணத்தை எவ்விதமும் பொருட்படுத்தாது மிகமிக அவசரப்பட்டு அந்த மசோதாவை நிறைவேற்றிச் சட்டமாக்கினார்கள். ஆனால், சிறுபான்மை மக்களுக்கு எதிரான சட்டங்களை எவ்வளவு விரைவாக நிறைவேற்றுகின்றனரோ அவ்வளவு விரைவாக இந்நாட்டில் வதியும் சிறுபான்மை மக்களின் வாழ்க்கை வசதிக்கான சட்டங்களை நிறைவேற்றுகின்றார்களில்லை.

இந்த நாட்டினது அரசாங்கத்தை நடத்துகின்ற ஸ்ரீலங்கா சுதந்திரக்கட்சி பெரும்பான்மையான ஸ்தானங்களைப் பெறுவதற்கு எங்களுடைய கட்சியாகிய இலங்கைத் தமிழரசுக் கட்சியும் இலங்கை வாழ் தமிழ்ப் பேசும் மக்களும் பெரிதும் உதவினர் என்பதை எந்த விதத்திலும் இந்த அரசாங்கக் கட்சியினர் மறுக்கமுடியாது.

தமிழ் மக்களாகிய நாங்கள் பல அம்சங்களிலே எவ்வளவோ கவனிக்கப்படா திருப்பதை இந்த அரசாங்கம் கவனித்தாக வேண்டும் என்பதைச் சொல்லி வைக்க விரும்புகிறேன். செனட்டர் கூறே (Senator Cooray) அவர்கள் சிரிக்கிறார்கள். ஏனென்றால் அந்த நாட்களில் ஸ்ரீலங்கா சுதந்திரக் கட்சிக்கும் எங்களுக்குமிடையில் ஒரு நம்பிக்கை இருந்திருக்க வேண்டும் என்று ஐக்கியத் தேசியக் கட்சி நம்புகிறது. ஆனால் ஒரு போதும் அப்படியாக இருந்ததே இல்லை.

ஒருவிதமான ஒற்றுமை மனப்பான்மை மாத்திரமே ஏற்பட்டிருந்தது. ஐக்கிய தேசியக் கட்சியிலும் பார்க்க ஸ்ரீலங்கா சுதந்திரக் கட்சி இந்த நாட்டிலே பொருளாதார அபிவிருத்தி போன்றவற்றைச் செய்யக்கூடும்

[Senator Nalliah]

என்று நாங்கள் நம்பினோம். ஆகையால் அவர்களுடன் ஒத்துழைக்கக் கூடியதாக இருந்தது. ஆனால், இப்போது அவ்வாறு ஒத்துழைத்த தமிழ் மக்கள் அதைப் பற்றிக் கவலைப்பட வேண்டியவர்களாயிருக்கிறார்கள். ஆனால் இத்தகைய நிலைமை இன்னும் வளர்ந்துவர விடக்கூடாது. இந்த நாட்டில் தமிழ் பேசும் மக்கள் சந்தோஷமாக, சமாதானமாக இருப்பதற்கு சந்தர்ப்பம் அளிக்க வேண்டுமென்று நான் விரும்புகின்றேன்.

இந்த நாட்டிலே வாழ்க்கைச் செலவு மிகவும் அதிகரித்துக்கொண்டு வருகிறது. இதைத் தடைசெய்வதற்கு எங்கள் நாட்டின் வளத்தைப் பெருக்கவேண்டும். இந்த வளத்தைப் பெறுக்குவதற்கு புது விதமான உற்பத்தி முறைகள் வேண்டும். கௌரவ நிதி அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் இந்த நாட்டின் பொருளாதாரத்தில் வருமானம் இல்லாத சந்தர்ப்பத்தில், சில வரிகளை விதித்து இருக்கிறார். இந்த நாட்டிலே இருக்கும் பெரிய அப்புக்காத்து, “கியூ.சி” க்கள், வைத்திய நிபுணர்கள் ஆகியோர்க்கு தொழில் வரி என்றென்று விதிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கின்றது. இதை எல்லாரும் கொடுக்க முடியாது. இத்தகைய வரி முறைக்குப்பதிலாக வருமானத்துக்கேற்ப வரி விதித்திருந்தால் ஏற்றதாயிருக்கும்.

அடுத்ததாக, கார்களுக்கு வரி விதித்து இருக்கிறார்கள். பெரிய “கெடிலெக்” போன்ற கார்களுக்கும் சிறிய “பியட்” போன்ற கார்களுக்கும் ஒரே விதமான வரிவிதித்து இருக்கிறார்கள். இது சரியில்லை என்று நான் எண்ணுகிறேன். அடுத்ததாக “பெற்றோல்” விலை முன்னிலும் அதிகமானதால் பாதிக்கப்படுபவர்கள் ஏழை மக்களேதான்.

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The sitting is suspended for 30 minutes.

Sitting suspended at 4.30 p.m. and resumed at 5 p.m., Mr. President in the Chair.

கௌரவ அக்கிராசனர் அவர்களே, இடைவேளைக்குமுன், நான் வரிவிதிப்பு முறையைப்பற்றி பேசிக்கொண்டிருந்தேன்.

“கியூ.சி” க்களுக்கும் வைத்தியநிபுணர்களுக்கும் மற்றும் “பெற்றோல்”, “கார்” போன்றவைகளுக்கும் வரிகளை விதித்திருக்கின்றார்கள். இதனைப்பார்த்துப் பொது மக்கள் இந்த வரிகளெல்லாம் பெரும்பணம்படைத்தவர்களுக்குத்தான் என்று நினைக்கின்றார்கள். ஆனால், உண்மையில் இந்த வரிகளின் பளுவெல்லாம் சாதாரண மக்களையே சாரும் என்பதை நான் கூற விரும்புகின்றேன். அப்புக்காத்து சாதாரணமாக இதுவரை ஒரு வழக்குக்கு ஆயிரம் ரூபா வாங்கி வந்திருந்தால் இந்த வரி விதிக்கப்பட்ட பின் 1500 ரூபா, 2000 ரூபா என்று தமது கிரயத்தை கூட்ட வேண்டிய நிலையைத்தான் இந்த வரிகள் உண்டாக்கின்றன. இதனால் பொது மக்களைத்தான் இந்த வரிகள் பாதிக்கின்றன. அதுமாத்திரமல்ல. வைத்திய நிபுணர்கள் ஏழை நோயாளிகளிடம் இதுவரை வாங்கிவந்த பணத்தைக் கூட்டுவார்கள். அதுபோன்று, “பெற்றோல்” கட்டணமும் சாதாரண பொது மக்களின் மேற்றான் சுமத்தப்படும். ஆகையால் இந்த வரிகள் பொது மக்களைத்தான் பாதிப்பதாக இருக்கும் என்று நான் சொல்ல விரும்புகின்றேன்.

இந்த அரசாங்கம் தனது வருமானத்தைப் பெருக்க வேறு வழிகளைக் கையாண்டிருக்கலாம். நாட்டிலே உள்ள பெரும் பெரும் வங்கிகளை, அல்லாவிட்பால் “எஸ்டேட்” களை அரசாங்கம் தேசிய மயமாக்குவது மூலம் பெரும் பணத்தை அரசாங்கம் ஈட்டியிருக்கலாம். இம்முறைகளைக் கையாளுவதன்மூலம் சோஷலிஸ்த் திட்டத்தின் அடிப்படையில் செய்திருந்தால் இந்த அரசாங்கத்துக்குப் பிரயோசனம் கிடைத்திருக்கும். ஆனால், இப்பொழுது விதிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கும் வரிமுறை மூலம் பொதுமக்களின் மேல்தான் பளு சுமத்தப்பட்டிருக்கின்றது. இந்த வரிமுறைகளால் பொதுமக்களுக்குப் பிரயோசனம் எதுவுமில்லை. இந்த அரசாங்கத்திலிருப்பவர்களெல்லாரும் சோஷலிஸ்த் திட்டத்தில் நம்பிக்கை உள்ளவர்களாக இருக்கிறார்களா என்பதில் சந்தேகமாக இருக்கின்றது. ஏனென்றால், அவர்களின் நடை உடை பாவனை, பண்பாடு கலாச்சாரம் எல்லாம் இன்னும் மாற்றமடையவில்லை; இன்னும் உயர்ந்த ஸ்தானத்தில்தான் இருந்து கொண்டிருக்கின்றார்கள். இந்த நிலையி

லே எப்படி இந்த நாட்டிலே சமதருமத்தைச் சிருஷ்டிக்கப் போகிறார்கள்? பொது மக்களுக்கு சோஷலிஸ அடிப்படையிலே நாங்கள் நடந்துகாட்டப்போகின்றோம், அந்த வாழ்க்கை முறையை அவர்களுக்கு அளிக்கப் போகின்றோம் என்று கூறிக்கொண்டிருக்கின்றார்களே ஒழிய உண்மையிலே சோஷலிஸ முறையிலே இவர்கள் நடப்பதாகத் தெரியவில்லை. இந்த அரசாங்கமும் சோஷலிஸ முறையைச் சரியான முறையிலே பின்பற்றும் என்பதில் எனக்கு நம்பிக்கை இல்லாமலிருக்கின்றது.

அடுத்ததாக, கௌரவ அக்கிராசனர் அவர்களே, இந்நாட்டிலே ஊழல்கள் மிகவும் மலிந்திருக்கின்றன. எங்கு சென்றாலும் ஊழல் மயமாக இருக்கின்றது. கைலஞ்சம் மலிந்து கிடக்கின்றது. சாதாரண ஒரு கிராமத்தான், ஒரு கிராம “விதான” யிடம் ஏதாவதொரு தொழில் விஷயமாகப் போனால் அவன் எடுக்கும் சம்பளத்தில் அரைவாசிச் சம்பளம் “விதான” யின் கைக்குப் போகின்றது. பொலீஸுக்கு ஒரு விஷயமாகப் போனால், பொலீஸ் உத்தியோகத்தர்களுக்குப் பணம் கொடுக்க வேண்டியிருக்கிறது. கச்சேரிக்கு ஒரு விஷயமாகப் போனால் அங்கேயும் சிலர்க்குப் பணம் கொடுக்க வேண்டியிருக்கிறது. இவ்வாறு, எங்கு சென்றாலும் கைலஞ்ச ஊழல் மலிந்து கிடக்கின்றது.

இந்நாட்டிலே சாதாரண மக்கள் தங்கள் வாழ்க்கையைச் சரியானமுறையிலே நடத்த முடியாமல் தவிக்கிறார்கள். கௌரவ சுகாதார அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் அனேகமாக எல்லா ஆசுப்பத்திரிகளுக்கும் போய்ப் பார்த்தால், அங்கு சாதாரண பொது மக்கள் படும் கஷ்டத்தைக் கண்கூடாகக் காண்பார்கள். அம்மக்கள் பண வசதியுள்ளவர்கள் அடையக்கூடிய வசதிகளை அங்கு பெறுகிறார்களில்லை. இப்படியான நிலையை மாற்றுவதில் அரசாங்கம் கவனஞ் செலுத்த வேண்டும்.

எனவே இவ்வித கஷ்டங்களும் ஊழல்களும் நீங்குவதற்காக சம்பந்தப்பட்ட ஊழியர்களுக்குச் சில கட்டுப்பாடுகளை அரசாங்கம் விதிக்க வேண்டும். இவ்விதமான ஊழல்களெல்லாம் கூடிய கெதியில் அகற்றப்பட வேண்டுமென அரசாங்கத்தைக் கேட்டுக் கொள்கிறேன்.

பொலீஸ் இலாகாவைப் பற்றி இன்னொரு விஷயத்தைப் பிரஸ்தாபிக்க வேண்டியிருக்கிறது. பொலீஸ் நிலையங்களிலே ஏதாவதொன்றைப் பற்றி முறையிடப் போகும் இளம் பெண்கள் படும் கஷ்டங்கள் கொஞ்ச நஞ்சமல்ல. இவைகளை நான் நேரடியாகக் கண்டிருக்கின்றேன். இளம் பெண்களின் முறையீடுகளைக் கேட்க பெண் பொலீஸ் உத்தியோகத்தர்கள் இருப்பது மிகவும் பொருத்தமாக இருக்கும். முறையீடு செய்யச் செல்கின்ற இளம் பெண்கள் மானபங்கப் படுத்தப்படுகின்றார்கள் என்பதைச் சம்பந்தப்பட்ட அமைச்சர் அவர்களுக்குச் சொல்லி வைக்க விரும்புகின்றேன். இப்படியான முறைகேடுகளை நீக்க அரசாங்கம் தீவிர நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கவேண்டும்.

அந்நிய நாடுகளிலிருந்து எங்களுக்கு உதவிகள் கிடைக்கின்றன. அவ்வித உதவிகளெல்லாம் நன்முறையில் பயன்படுத்தப்படாமல் இருக்கின்றன. இந்நாட்டின் அமிலிருத்திக்கும் மக்களின் சுபீட்சத்துக்கும் அவைகள் நன் முறையில் பயன்படுத்தப்பட வேண்டும்.

எங்கள் நாடு உணவுக்காகவும் உடைக்காகவும் மற்றும் தேவைகளுக்காகவும் இன்று வரை பிற நாடுகளை எதிர் நோக்க வேண்டியிருக்கிறது. எங்கள் தேவைகளை எங்கள் நாட்டிலேயே உற்பத்தி செய்து கொள்ள நாம் முயல வேண்டும். ஆனால் இந்நாட்டில் வதியும் சகல இன, மத மக்களும் ஒற்றுமையாகவும் சந்தோஷமாகவும் வாழக்கூடிய ஒரு சூழ்நிலையை அரசாங்கம் ஏற்படுத்தினாற்றான் இந்நாட்டின் உற்பத்தி பெருக்கக் கூடிய வசதியிருக்கும்.

விவசாயிகளுக்குக் கடனுதவியளிக்கக் கூடிய வகையில் அரசாங்கம் “மக்கள் வங்கி” ஒன்றை அமைக்க இருப்பதாக அறிகிறேன். இது மிகவும் நன்மை தரக்கூடிய ஒரு விஷயம். பொதுமக்கள் முதலாளிமார்களிடம் போய்க் கடன் பட்டுக் கஷ்டப்படாமல் இருக்க இவ் வழி மிகவும் உபயோகமாக இருக்கும்.

எங்கள் நாட்டிலே ஏராளமான நிலம் பயிரிடப்படாமல் இருக்கின்றது. அவைகள் பயிரிடப்படல் வேண்டும். காணிக் கந்தோர்கள் இவ்விஷயத்தில் மிகவும் கூடுதலான முயற்சி எடுத்து ஆங்காங்கே

[Senator Nalliah]

வெறுமனே கிடக்கும் காணி-நிலங்களை, எல்லா மக்களுக்கும் கொடுத்து பயிர்செய்யக் கூடியதாக ஆக்கவேண்டும்.

அது மாத்திரமல்ல. மகாவலிகங்கை இருக்கின்றது. அதை அனூராதபுரி வரைக்கும் வட பகுதிக்குத் திருப்பிக் கொண்டு போய்விட வேண்டும். நாட்டிலே அபிவிருத்தி ஏற்பட வேண்டுமென்றால், எல்லாப் பகுதிகளிலும் ஒரே விதமாக, ஒரு வித்தியாசமும் இல்லாத முறையில் அதிகமான அளவில் என்னென்ன உற்பத்தி செய்ய முடியுமோ அவற்றையெல்லாம் பாரபட்சமின்றி செய்வதனால், நாட்டிலே ஒரு நல்ல சூழ்நிலை ஏற்படும் என்று நான் நினைக்கிறேன். இதனால், நாட்டிலே அதிகமான தொழிற்சாலைகள் ஏற்படக்கூடியதாகவும் இருக்கும். ஆகவே தொழிற்சாலைகளை எல்லாம் ஆங்காங்கே பொருத்தமான இடங்களில் அமைப்பது நல்லது. மட்டக்களப்பில் செங்கல், ஓடு உண்டாக்கக்கூடிய செம்மண் இருக்கிறது. அப்படியான இடத்திலே ஒரு ஓட்டுத் தொழிற்சாலை, சிமெந்துத் தொழிற்சாலை உண்டாக்குவதனால் மிகவும் பிரயோசனமாக இருக்கும் என நான் நினைக்கின்றேன். எனவே மற்ற இடங்களிலும் நல்ல பிரயோசனமான தொழிற்சாலைகளை ஏற்படுத்தினால் அதிகம் பிரயோசனமாக இருக்கும்.

இப்போது சிமெந்து ஒரு பை ரூபா 8½ விலையில் விற்கப்படுகிறது. இந்தச் சிமெந்து, 4, 5 ரூபாவுக்கு வாங்கக் கூடியதாகச் செய்ய வசதி இருக்கிறது. அதற்காக அரசாங்கம் மிகவும் கவனம் செலுத்த வேண்டும். நாட்டிலே சிமெந்து குறைந்த விலையில் மலிவான விலையில் கிடைக்கக் கூடியதாக வழி வகுக்க வேண்டும்.

எங்கள் நாட்டிலே வீடுகள் தட்டுப்பாடாக இருக்கின்றன. இந்த வீடுகளை அரசாங்கம் மேலும் கூட்ட முயற்சி செய்ய வேண்டும். வீடு கட்டுவதற்குத்

தேவையாகும் மரங்கள் கிடைக்கக்கூடியதாகச் செய்ய வேண்டும். அப்படிச் செய்தற்குப் போதிய வசதிகள் இருக்கின்றன.

எங்கள் காடுகளிலே மக்களுக்கு வேண்டிய மரங்கள் போதிய அளவில் இருக்கின்றன. இந்த மரங்களைப் பிரயோசனப்படுத்தி ஏழை மக்களுக்கு வீடுகள் கட்டக்கூடிய ஏற்பாடுகளைச் செய்ய வேண்டும்.

அடுத்ததாக, ஓடுகள் உற்பத்தியாக்கக் கூடிய தொழிற்சாலைகளை நாங்கள் உண்டாக்கினால் பொது மக்களுக்கு மலிவான விலையில் ஓடுகளை நாங்கள் விநியோகிக்க முடியும். இந்த முறையிலே, அரசாங்கம் பணத்தைக் கொடுத்துதவுவதில் மாத்திரமல்ல, மற்ற உபகரணங்களையும் கொடுத்து உதவுவது மூலம் பொது மக்களுடைய வீட்டுத் தட்டுப்பாட்டை ஒரு வகையிலே, ஓரளவு, குறைக்க முடியும். கௌரவ அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் இதைப்பற்றிக் கவனமெடுப்பார்களானால் வீட்டுத் தட்டுப்பாட்டுக் கஷ்டம் குறையக் கூடியதாயிருக்கும். அதுமாத்திரமல்ல, இப்பொழுது வீடுகள் எல்லாம் வாடகைக்குக் கொடுக்கப்படுகின்றன. இவ்வீடுகள் எல்லாம் அதிக வரியுடையனவாயிருக்கின்றன. இருந்தும் இவ்வீடுகளை மக்கள் பிரயோசனப்படுத்த வேண்டியவர்களாயிருக்கின்றார்கள். ஆகையால் இந்த வீடுகளுக்கான வரிகளை மாற்றியமைக்கக் கூடிய ஒரு திட்டத்தை ஆக்கினால் அதனால் பொது மக்களுக்கு இப்பொழுதிருக்கின்ற கஷ்டம் குறையக்கூடியதாயிருக்கும்.

வீட்டுத் திட்டத்தைப் பற்றி நான் பேசும் போது, யாழ்ப்பாணத்திலே மீன்பிடித் தொழில் நடத்தித் தம்காலத்தைக் கழிக்கும் வறிய மக்களுக்கு உதவும் பொருட்டு கடற்கரையில் ஒரு வீட்டுத்திட்டமிருக்கின்றது பற்றியும் குறிப்பிட விரும்புகின்றேன். இத்திட்டம் உருவாகி கிட்டத்தட்ட பத்து ஆண்டுகள் ஆகின்றன. ஆனால், இதைப்பார்த்தால் இந்த வீடுகள் எல்லாம் மிகவும் கேவலமான நிலையிலிருக்கின்றன. அங்கே வடிகால் களில்லை. போதிய “றெயினேஜ்”

இல்லாமல், அழுக்கு நீர் தேங்கி நின்று, இதனால் பூச்சி புழுக்கள் நிறைந்து காணப்படுகின்றன. இதனால் விஷ ஜந்துக்களும் பெருகி பொதுமக்களுக்கு — அவர்களுடைய சுகாதாரத்துக்கு—மிகவும் அபாயத்தை உண்டாக்கக் கூடிய நிலையிலிருக்கின்றது.

கௌரவ உள்நாட்டு அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் யாழ்ப்பாணம் வந்திருந்தபோது இதனை நான் அவர்களுக்குச் சொன்னேன். கவனிப்பதாகச் சொன்னார்கள். வீடுகளைக் கட்டுவது மாத்திரமல்ல, அவ்வீடுகளிலே மக்கள் சுகமாக, சுகாதார வசதிகளுடன் வாழச் செய்வதும் அவசியமாகும். இந்தக் கட்டுகரை வீட்டுத் திட்டத்தில் அமைக்கப்பட்டிருக்கின்ற “Water Sealed Latrine” கக்கசுகனில் மாரிகாலத்திலே நீர் நிரம்பியிருக்கின்ற தனால் இவற்றை மக்கள் உபயோகிக்க முடியாமலிருக்கின்றது. இதனால் இவர்கள் மிகவும் கஷ்டப்படுகின்றார்கள். இதனை இந்த அரசாங்கம் உடனடியாகக் கவனித்து நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கவேண்டும். அப்படிச் செய்யாமலிருந்தால், நிச்சயமாக அங்கே கொடிய நோய் பரவி விடக்கூடியதாயிருக்கும்.

இந்த அரசாங்கம் தன்னைச் சோஷலிஸ அரசாங்கம் என்று கூறிக்கொள்ளுகின்றது. இந்த நிலையில் மக்களுக்குள்ள கஷ்டங்களை அரசாங்கம் நீக்காமலிருக்குமானால் அது விசனிக்கத்தக்கதாகும். இப்படியான கஷ்டங்களை உடனடியாக நீக்குவதற்கு நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கவேண்டும்.

இனி ஆசுப்பத்திரிகளைப்பற்றிச் சிறிது கூற விரும்புகின்றேன். ஆசுப்பத்திரிகளிலே படுக்கை வசதி மிகவும் குறைவாகக் காணப்படுகின்றது. “டொக்டர்கள்” குறைவாக இருக்கின்றார்கள். தாதிமார் குறைவாக இருக்கின்றனர். இதனால் நோயாளிகள் படுகின்ற கஷ்டம் கொஞ்சமில்லை. இதனை உடனடியாக அகற்ற அரசாங்கம் முழுக்கவனமும் எடுக்க வேண்டும். இத்தகைய பொறுப்புக்களை அரசாங்கம் தட்டிக்கழிக்க முடியாது.

வைத்திய நிபுணர்களின் தட்டுப்பாட்டை நிவர்த்திக்கத் திட்டமிருக்கின்றது என்று கூறப்படுகின்றது. இரண்டாவது வைத்திய கல்லூரி அமைக்கப்படுமென்று கூறப்பட்டது. ஆனால், இன்னும் இது நிறைவேறுவதாக இல்லை. இரண்டாவது வைத்தியக் கல்லூரி மாத்திரமல்ல, மூன்றாவது வைத்தியக் கல்லூரியும் நிறுவப்பட்டு இந்நாட்டிலுள்ள வைத்தியர்கள் தட்டுப்பாட்டை நீக்கவேண்டும். அது மாத்திரமல்ல, தாதிமார் குறைவாக இருக்கின்றனர். நோயாளிகளை நன்கு பராமரிக்கக்கூடிய பயிற்சிபெற்ற தாதிமாரர்களையும் பெருக்க வேண்டியது இந்த அரசாங்கத்தின் கடமையாகும்.

அடுத்ததாகப் படுக்கைகள். ஆசுப்பத்திரிகளிலே படுக்கைகள் மிகவும் குறைவாகக் காணப்படுகின்றன. இதனால் நோயாளிகள், சிழங்குகளை அடுக்குகின்றது போல், நெருக்கமாகக் கீழே கிடத்தப்படுகின்றனர்; இந்தக் குறையை நீக்க அதிவிரைவில் நடவடிக்கைகள் எடுக்கப்படவேண்டும்.

நாங்கள் சோஷலிஸ அரசாங்கத்தை—சமதர்ம அரசாங்கத்தை—அமைத்திருக்கின்றோம் என்று வெறும் பிரச்சாரம் செய்துவிட்டால் மாத்திரம், வாயளவிற்கு கூறிவிட்டால் மாத்திரம், போதாது. போதிய கவனமெடுத்து சோஷலிஸமுறையில் மக்களின் குறைகளை நீக்குவது மிகவும் அவசியமாகும். இதனை இந்த அரசாங்கம் செய்யாது விட்டால், இந்த அரசாங்கத்தைச் சேர்ந்தவர்கள் தம்மைச் சமதர்மவாதிகள் என்று கூறிக்கொள்வதில் அர்த்தமில்லை! இக்கஷ்டங்களை யெல்லாம் உடனடியாக நிவர்த்திசெய்ய இந்த அரசாங்கத்துக்கு முடியாமற் போனால் படிப்படியாகவாகுதல் இவற்றை நிவர்த்திசெய்ய முயற்சிக்க வேண்டுமென்று நான் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன்.

எங்கள் நாட்டிலே பிரதான ஓர் உணவாக மீன் இருக்கின்றது. எங்கள் நாட்டைச் சுற்றி நாலாபக்கமும் மீன் நிறைந்த கடலிருந்தும் நாட்டிலே மீன் தட்டுப்பாடிருக்கின்றது. எனவே மீன் பிடித் தொழிலை விருத்தி செய்ய வேண்டும். எனக்கு முன் பேசிய

[Senator Nalliah]

ஒருவர், “நாங்கள் 500 ‘மெக்கனைஸ் போட்’ ரக்களைக் கொடுத்து மீன்பிடித் தொழிலுக்கு உதவப் போகிறோம்” எனக் கூறினார். இவ்விதம் வள்ளங்களைக் கொடுப்பதும் போதாது. மீன்பிடித் தொழில் புரியும் அவ்வேழை மக்களுக்கு வேறு உதவிகளும் செய்து கொடுக்கப்படல் வேண்டும். அவர்களின் வாழ்க்கைத் தரம் இன்று நன்னிலையில் இல்லை. அவர்கள் சௌகரியமாக வாழ வீட்டுவசதி செய்து கொடுக்கப்படல் வேண்டும். ஏழை மீன்பிடித் தொழிலாளர் படும் கஷ்டமோ அளவு கடந்ததாக இருக்கின்றது. எனவே, முதன்முதலாக அரசாங்கம் அவர்களுக்கு வீட்டு வசதி செய்து கொடுக்கவேண்டும். அடுத்ததாக அவர்களுக்குக் கடனுதவி கொடுக்க வேண்டும். இன்னும் நவீன மீன்பிடி வள்ளங்கள் அவர்களுக்குக் கொடுக்கப்படல் வேண்டும். 500 “மெக்கனைஸ் போட்” க்களையும் ஐநூறு பேருக்குத்தான் கொடுக்கலாம். இன்று மீன்பிடித் தொழிலிலே ஈடுபட்டோர் ஐநூறு பேர்தானே இருக்கின்றார்கள்? ஆயிரக் கணக்கானோர் இருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்கள் அனைவருக்கும் இவ்வித வசதிகள் செய்துகொடுக்க வேண்டும்.

இன்னும் நான் முன் குறிப்பிட்டது போல் அவர்களுக்கு அரசாங்கம் கடன் வசதி செய்து கொடுக்க வேண்டும். அவ்விதம் செய்யாவிட்டால் அவ்வேழை மீன்பிடித் தொழிலாளர்கள் முதலாளி மார்களிடம் போய்க் கடன்பட்டு வாழ்க்கையில் கஷ்டப்படவேண்டியிருக்கும். அது மாத்திரமன்று. சில காலங்களிலே கால வேறுபாட்டால் அவர்கள் தங்கள் தொழிலைச் செய்ய முடியாத நிலை ஏற்படுகின்றது. அப்படியான காலங்களிலே அரசாங்கம் அவர்களுக்குப் பண உதவி செய்ய வேண்டும். அவர்களில் அனேகம் பேர் வறியவர்களாக இருப்பதனாலே தொழில் செய்ய முடியாத காலங்களிலே மிகவும் கஷ்டப்படுகிறார்கள். அரசாங்கம் அப்படியான நாட்களில் அவர்களுக்குப் பண உதவி புரிவதால் அவர்கள் கஷ்டம் நீங்கும்.

இந்நாட்டிலே ஆண்டுக்கு ஏறக்குறைய பத்துக்கோடி ரூபாவுக்குக் கருவாடு இறக்குமதி செய்யப்படுகின்றது. இதை

நிறுத்த வேண்டும். ஆனால் அதே நேரத்தில் இத்தேவையைப் பூர்த்தி செய்வதற்காக அரசாங்கம் இந்த வரவு செலவுத் திட்டத்திலே மீன்பிடித் தொழில் அபிவிருத்திக்கு 9 இலட்சம் ரூபாதான் ஒதுக்கியுள்ளது. இத்தொகை போதுமானதன்று. இன்னும் கூடிய ஒரு தொகை இதற்காக ஒதுக்கப்படல் வேண்டும். இத்தொழிலை அபிவிருத்தி செய்வதால் இந்நாட்டுக்குத் தேவையான மீன், கருவாடு கிடைப்பது மாத்திரமல்ல, பிறநாடுகளுக்கும் அவற்றை ஏற்றுமதி செய்யக் கூடியதாக இருக்கும். எனவே இவ்வரசாங்கம் உணவு வகை அபிவிருத்திக்கு முக்கியத்துவம் கொடுக்க வேண்டும்.

அடுத்ததாக யாழ்ப்பாணத்திலே நமக்கிருக்கின்ற சில கஷ்டங்களைப் பற்றிக் குறிப்பிடல் வேண்டும். முதலாவதாக பலாலி ஆசிரியர் பயிற்சிக் கல்லூரியைப் பற்றிக் குறிப்பிட விரும்புகின்றேன். இக்கலாசாலை மிகவும் குறைந்த தரத்தில் இருக்கின்றது. கட்டடங்கள் இடிந்து விழக்கூடிய அபாய நிலையில் இருக்கின்றன. விஞ்ஞான ஆய்வுகூடம் ஆரம்ப நிலையிலேயே இருக்கின்றது. அந்தக் கல்லூரியை உயர்ந்த நிலைக்குக் கொண்டுவருவதாக முன்பிருந்த கல்வியமைச்சர் வாக்குறுதி யளித்தார். ஆனால் இன்று வரையும் எதுவித நடவடிக்கையும் எடுக்கப்படவில்லை. எனவே இந்த அரசாங்கம் இதில் உடனடியாகக் கவனஞ் செலுத்த வேண்டும். இக் குறைகளை நீக்க வேண்டும். எவ்விதம் சிங்கள மக்களின் ஆசிரியர் கலாசாலைகள் நன்னிலையில் இருக்கின்றனவோ, அவ்விதம் தமிழ் மக்களுக்கான இக் கலாசாலையையும் நன்னிலைக்குக் கொண்டுவருவது அரசாங்கத்தின் கடமையாகும். இதைத் தட்டிக் கழித்தால் எம்மிடையே மன வருத்தம் ஏற்படுவது மாத்திரமல்ல, நல்லுறவும் பாதிக்கப்படக்கூடும். எனவே அரசாங்கம் ஆலோசனையில் இருக்காது இதை உடனடியாகக் கவனிக்கவேண்டுமெனக் கூறுகிறேன்.

மற்றது, தொழில் நுட்பக் கல்லூரியை எடுத்துக்கொள்வோம். இது யாழ்ப்பாணத்தில் ஆரம்ப நிலையில்தான் இருக்கிறது.

முன் கொழும்பில் இருந்த கல்லூரியிலே ஆங்கில மொழி மூலம் பாட்போதனை போதிக்கப்பட்டது. ஆனால், அது இப்பொழுது சிங்கள மொழிக்கு மாற்றப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. சிங்கள மொழியில் எல்லா பாடங்களும் போதிக்கப்படுகின்றன. இங்கே தமிழ்ப்பிள்ளைகள் எப்படிப் படிக்க முடியும்? தமிழ்ப்பிள்ளைகள் வேறு பாடசாலைக்குப் போகவேண்டி இருக்கிறது. இந்த நிலையில் யாழ்ப்பாணத்திலே இருக்கின்ற பள்ளிக்கூடம் இன்னும் நல்ல நிலைக்கு வரவில்லை. இந்தப் பாடசாலையை நல்ல நிலைக்கு உயர்த்தத் தேவையானவற்றை இந்த அரசாங்கம் இன்னும் செய்யவில்லை. ஆகையால், அரசாங்கத்தினர் இந்த விஷயத்தில் உடனடியாகக் கவனம் செலுத்தவேண்டுமென நான் கேட்டுக்கொள்ள விரும்புகிறேன்.

School of Fine Arts கல்லூரியில் ஆங்கிலம் போதனை மொழியாக இருந்தது. இப்போது சிங்களத்தில் போதனை நடைபெறுகிறது. இதனால் தமிழ்ப்பிள்ளைகள் இங்கே பாட்போதனை பெற முடியாது இருக்கிறது. நாங்கள் சிங்களப் பிள்ளைகள் படிப்பதைக் குறைகூறவில்லை. தமிழ்ப்பிள்ளைகளும் சிங்களப் பிள்ளைகளைப் போன்றே படித்துவர அவசியமான வசதிகளைச் செய்து கொடுக்கவேண்டும். இப்படிச் செய்துகொடுக்க வேண்டிய நடவடிக்கைகளை அரசாங்கம் எடுக்குமென நான் எண்ணுகிறேன். சிங்களப் பிள்ளைகள் எந்த விதமான சலுகைகளைப் பெறுகிறார்களோ அப்படியான சலுகைகள் அத்தனையும் தமிழ்ப்பிள்ளைகளுக்கும் கிடைக்க வேண்டும் என்றே நாம் கேட்கிறோம். இப்படியான குறைகளை நிவர்த்தி செய்வது அரசாங்கத்தின் கடமை என எண்ணுகிறேன். அரசாங்கம் இதில் கூடிய கவனம் எடுக்கும் என நம்புகிறேன்.

நான் இன்னும் அதிகமாக எனது பேச்சை நீட்ட விரும்பவில்லை. கடைசியாக நான் சொல்லிவைக்க விரும்புவது என்னவென்றால், இந்த நாட்டிலே பொருளாதாரம் ஆயிவிருத்தி அடையவேண்டும் என்றால் நான் ஆரம்பத்தில் சொன்ன மாதிரி இந்த நாட்டில் உள்ள மக்கள்

அனைவரும் பீதியின்றி சந்தோஷமாக சமாதானமாக நிம்மதியாக வாழக்கூடிய ஒரு சூழ்நிலையை உருவாக்க வேண்டும். அந்தச் சூழ்நிலை இப்போது இல்லை என்று நான் எண்ணுகிறேன். ஆதலால் சகல சாதி, மத மக்களும் எதுவித பயமும் இல்லாமல் வாழக்கூடிய ஒரு சூழ்நிலையை உண்டாக்க வேண்டும். அப்படியான நிலையை உண்டாக்க அரசாங்கம் வழிவகுக்க வேண்டும். அப்படியில்லாமல் நாட்டு மக்களுக்கிடையே மனஸ்தாபத்தை வளர்த்துக் கொண்டு நாட்டை முன்னேற்றவேண்டுமென்று நினைத்தால் அது முடியாத காரியம். அரசங்கத்தினர், சிலவேளை இதனை உணராமலிருக்கின்றார்கள் என்று நான் நினைக்கின்றேன். இல்லாவிட்டால், இதனை உணர்ந்திருந்தால், அவ்வாறு செய்ய விரும்பவில்லாமலிருக்கின்றார்களோ எனக்குத் தெரியாது. அப்படியிருக்குமானால் அவர்கள் இவ்விடத்தில் தம் கவனத்தைச் செலுத்தவேண்டியது அவசியம்.

இந்த அரசாங்கத்தினர் கட்டாயமாக, வட, கிழக்கு மாகாணத்திலிருக்கின்ற சிறுபான்மைத் தமிழ் மக்களுக்கு உதவி செய்ய வேண்டியவர்களாயிருக்கின்றார்கள். அவர்கள் மிகவும் குறைகள் உள்ளவர்களாக இருக்கின்றனர் என்பதை இந்த அரசாங்கம் ஏற்றுக்கொண்டிருக்கின்றதென்று நான் நம்புகின்றேன். இதற்கிடையே, சென்ற ஆண்டில் ஆசிரிய கலாசாலைக்கு அனுமதி வழங்குவதில் அம்மக்களுக்குச் சலுகைகள் செய்திருக்கின்றார்கள் என்று நான் நினைக்கின்றேன். அரசாங்கம் சிறுபான்மைத் தமிழர்களுக்கு உதவி செய்வதாயிருந்தால், அந்த உதவி சுயமொழி ஆசிரிய கலாசாலைக்கு அனுமதி வழங்குவதில் மாத்திரமல்ல, மற்றும் துறைகளிலும் அவ்வுதவி யளிக்கப்படவேண்டும். எங்களுடைய தாய் நாடான இந்தியாவிலே, வைத்தியக் கல்லூரிகளிலே, சட்டக் கல்லூரிகளிலே, சர்வகலாசாலைகளிலே, இவற்றிலெல்லாம் ஒரு குறித்த காலத்துக்கு இத்தகைய மாணவர்களுக்குப் பயிற்சி வசதி அளித்து வருகின்றார்கள். அது மாத்திரமல்ல, நாட்டு நிர்வாகத்திலே, நாட்டு ஆட்சிமுறையிலே எல்லாம் அவர்

[Senator Nalliah]

களுக்கு ஒரு குறிப்பிட்ட காலத்துக்குப் பயிற்சி யளிக்கவும் வசதி யளித்திருக்கின்றார்கள்.

சோஷலிஸ அரசாங்கம் என்று கூறிக் கொள்ளும் இந்த அரசாங்கம், சிறுபான்மைத் தமிழ் மக்களுக்கு உதவி செய்ய விரும்பினால், அவர்களுக்கு—அவர்களில் ஒரு குறிப்பிட்ட சாராருக்கு—ஆசிரிய கலாசாலைக்கு அனுமதி கொடுத்து விட்டால் மாத்திரம் போதாது; ஒரு பொதுவான அடிப்படையிலே, எல்லோருடைய கஷ்டங்களும் நீக்கக்கூடிய முறையிலே உதவி செய்ய வேண்டும்.

திண்டாமை யை நீக்குவதற்கான சட்டமொன்று 1957 ஆம் ஆண்டிலே இங்கே நிறைவேற்றப்பட்டது. ஆனால், இதுவரையிலும் அந்தச் சட்டம் அமுலாக்கப்படவில்லை. அரசாட்சியார் அதிலே கவனமெடுத்து ஏற்ற ஒழுங்குகளைக் காலதாமதமில்லாமற் செய்ய வேண்டுமென்று நான் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன். அப்படி, அந்தச் சட்டத்தை நடைமுறைக்குக் கொண்டு வருவதிலே சிறுபான்மைத் தமிழர்களுடைய கஷ்டங்கள் நீங்கக் கூடியதாக இருக்கும். சிறுபான்மைத் தமிழ் மக்களுடைய நல்வாழ்வுக்கு வழிவகுப்பதாகவும் இருக்கும்.

அதுமாத் திரமல்ல, இந்நாட்டிலே அரசியல் சபை ஒன்றிலே அவர்களும் பங்குகொள்ளக்கூடிய முறையிலே, அரசாங்கத்தினர் நினைத்தால், செய்யலாமென்று நான் நினைக்கின்றேன். இந்நாட்டின் சனப்பிரதிநிதிகள் சபையிலே சிறுபான்மைத் தமிழர்களுக்கு ஒரிடம் கொடுக்கக்கூடியதாகச் செய்யலாம். பிரதிநிதிகள் சபையிலே நியமன அங்கத்தவர்களான ஆறு பேர்களிலே ஒருவரை சிறுபான்மைத் தமிழராக வைக்கலாம். அரசாங்கம் நினைத்தால் இது கஷ்டமான வேலையல்ல. ஏனென்றால், சிறுபான்மைத் தமிழர்களின் கஷ்டங்களை அரசாங்கம் உணர்ந்து அவற்றை ஒத்துக் கொண்டிருக்கின்றது. ஆகையால், இக் கஷ்டங்களை நீக்க பிரதிநிதிகள் சபையிலே அவர்களுக்கென ஒரு பிரதிநிதி யிருப்பது மிகவும் பொருத்தமாக இருக்கும். இதனை அரசாங்கத்தினர் கவனிப்பார்களென்று நம்புகின்றேன்.

SENATOR N. U. JAYAWARDENA : Mr. President, I had not decided to speak on the budget debate today, but in the absence of other speakers, I am afraid I have no alternative but to do so. I thought there were many other hon. Senators who were going to follow the last speaker and I am rather in a bit of a quandary because I am myself half prepared.

Permit me to offer my congratulations to the Hon. Finance Minister for the commendable way he has acquitted himself in dealing with the very complex task of preparing and presenting this first budget of the present Government. To one experienced in the financial operations of the Government, the preparation of the budget is difficult enough; to one not so experienced either in years or in knowledge as the present Finance Minister is, the task is much more difficult. Perhaps, his very youthfulness and lack of long experience—

SENATOR NADESAN : Lack of any experience !

SENATOR JAYAWARDENA : In spite of his inexperience he has presented a budget which in many ways is complex and contains novel features. He has not hesitated to make drastic changes in taxation measures and radical departures in the format.

I have done a little delving into financial history elsewhere. I find that he is only a little older than the Younger Pitt who became Chancellor of the Exchequer at the age of 22 years, at a time when England was facing one of the gravest political and financial crises in her history. The present Finance Minister is similarly placed. As of the Younger Pitt, I could well say that never in history has so much youth been vested with so much power and so much responsibility. I do hope and pray that he continues to show sobriety and understanding in the exercise of such power and responsibility.

The budget as presented by the Hon. Minister of Finance in the House of Representatives—I shall cease to call it the other place—on 15th September, 1960, provided, on the one hand, for an aggregate expenditure of Rs. 1,973.4 million composed of Rs. 1,562.1 million on recurrent expenditure and Rs. 411.3 million on capital expenditure, and on the other hand, for an estimated revenue of Rs. 1,603.7 million inclusive of an additional revenue of Rs. 130 million from the new taxes he announced on that day. The budget, thus framed, resulted in a deficit of Rs. 340 million, which he hoped to finance to the extent of Rs. 240 million from domestic borrowing, presumably through non-bank sources, to the extent of Rs. 150 million representing the foreign exchange component in the Estimates—I shall have occasion to refer to this component later—from overseas loans through the World Bank and lines of credit already negotiated or to be negotiated, and to the extent of Rs. 60 million from Foreign Aid already negotiated or to be negotiated. These sources of finance, as contemplated by the Hon. Minister, yield a total of Rs. 450 million, and if his expectations are realised—and herein lies the nub—the ensuing financial year should end up, according to his forecast, with a cash surplus, in the sense of cash receipts over cash outlay, amounting to Rs. 110 million. This admirable result would, indeed, then be an operation which not a single Government, since we became independent, has so far succeeded in achieving. I wish the Hon. Minister of Finance well and I wish him success. I do pray that his calculations are right, his anticipations are true and his forecasts are correct. A cash surplus of this magnitude should help him considerably to contain the inflationary tendencies inherent in the economy, as I shall presently demonstrate.

But what, Mr. President, is the budgetary situation in terms of the budget now presented to this House and in terms of events which have

succeeded since the budget was presented by the Hon. Minister nearly three months ago? The budgeted expenditure has risen to Rs. 1,996.2 million, an increase of Rs. 22.4 million which is, no doubt, due to the revisions made during the Committee stage of the budget, when it was considered by the House of Representatives. This is not the only change relevant to the budget. Government has found it necessary to reduce the export duty on rubber by 10 cents a pound owing to the sharp fall in the price of rubber. This will entail a revenue loss in the remaining months of the present financial year, which I estimate at Rs. 15 million. The result is that in the course of the passage of the budget from the House of Representatives to this honourable House, the budget deficit has worsened by Rs. 37.4 million. The Minister planned for a deficit of Rs. 340 million; it has since worsened to Rs. 377 million. I do not know what further revenue reductions the Government will suffer if prices of products continue to be as low as they are. A reduction in export duties and a fall in revenue will then become inevitable. I do not mention these matters to belittle the Hon. Minister's remarkable achievement. My anxiety is to draw attention to some of the elements that can upset even the most careful budgetary calculations.

This is not all. The budget deficit as anticipated by the Hon. Minister does not take into account several other elements. There is, in the first place, the sequence of customary supplementary estimates. One of the unsatisfactory features of our national finances in recent years has been the bad but growing habit of inflating the annual budget by supplementary estimates. I have some figures for recent years. I shall presently state the current expenditure in a sort of tabular form as provided for in the original estimates as passed by Parliament and on the basis of which the Hon. Minister of Finance has framed his revenue proposals, the supplementary estimates authorised by the House of Representatives in the relevant years, the

[Senator Jayawardena] total expenditure authorised, the actual expenditure, the actual expenditure expressed as a percentage of the authorised expenditure and the supplementary estimates expressed as a percentage of the provision in the budget estimates. I know that supplementary estimates do not come to this House. I raised the question some time ago to which the Hon. Leader of the House promised to give me a reply. I am still waiting for that reply. I do not want to go through the whole table. Had I not been called upon so suddenly to speak tonight I would have had the temerity to pass round to hon. Senators six statistical tables which would have enabled them to follow my arguments better. I will therefore give the expenditure figures beginning with 1952-53 and ending with 1958-59. This is necessary because I am rather anxious to demonstrate—not because I want to be clever but because I am prepared, and am foolish enough, to make a forecast and live up to it—what, in my view, is going to be the ultimate outcome of this budget.

In 1952-53 the budgeted expenditure was Rs. 948 million; supplementary estimates, Rs. 70 million; total provision Rs. 1018 million. The actual expenditure was Rs. 927 million. The percentage of actual expenditure to total provision was 91. The supplementary estimates amounted to 7 per cent. of the provision in the budget.

In 1953-54 the budget estimate was Rs. 951 million; supplementary estimates, Rs. 57 million, making a total provision of Rs. 1008 million. The actual expenditure was Rs. 795 million. Proportion actually spent in relation to total provision was 79 per cent. In other words, in that year, the actual expenditure was 79 per cent. of what was passed by Parliament both in the budget and by way of supplementary estimates. Supplementary estimates represented 6 per cent. of what was provided in the budget.

In 1954-55, the budget provision was Rs. 816 million; supplementary estimates, Rs. 110 million. The total provision was Rs. 926 million. The actual expenditure was Rs. 873 million which was 94 per cent. of the budget provision as well as supplementaries. Supplementary estimates represented 13 per cent. of the budget provision.

In 1955-56, budget Estimate was Rs. 950 million; supplementary estimates, Rs. 232 million making a total of Rs. 1,182 million. Actual expenditure was Rs. 1,103 million. This represented 93 per cent. of the budget provision as well as supplementary provision. Supplementary estimates were 24 per cent. of the budget estimates.

In 1956-57, which corresponds to the year that our late revered Prime Minister assumed office, the budget Estimate was Rs. 1,097 million; supplementary estimates Rs. 1 million, making a total provision of Rs. 1,098 million. The actual expenditure was Rs. 1,136 million. In fact, the actual expenditure was 103 per cent. of the total provision. Probably, the Finance Minister of that particular Government was a bit behind in estimating. Since the supplementaries amounted to only Rs. 1 million, one might as well say that there were no supplementaries that year.

In 1957-58, the budget estimate of expenditure was Rs. 1,163 million; supplementary estimates, Rs. 400 million; total provision, Rs. 1,563 million. The actual expenditure was Rs. 1,433 million. The proportion of actual expenditure to total provision was 92 per cent, and supplementaries represented 34 per cent. of the budget estimates.

In 1958-59, the budget estimate was Rs. 1,380 million; supplementary estimates, Rs. 363 million, making a total provision of Rs. 1,743 million. The actual expenditure was Rs. 1,662. Actual expenditure was 95 per cent. of the total provision. Supplementary estimates were equal to 26 per cent. of the budget provision.

I want to make it clear—I see the Minister in charge of finance in this House has arrived—that the supplementary estimates to which I referred really included now money provisions and not what I would call accounting jugglery, because under the loan fund procedure, which the Hon. Minister of Finance has decided to do away with, one has to provide supplementary estimates for large sums of money in any given year in order to give sanction to expenditure incurred in earlier years. If one includes that, this figure gets inflated. I have excluded that because it is purely an accounting fiction. There you merely give legislative authority for expenditure incurred in earlier years and do not make any new cash provision because the money has been spent earlier. I have referred only to provisions which represent new cash provisions by way of supplementary estimates.

In the financial year 1959-60, just concluded, the supplementary estimates for the eight months up to May 1960 totalled Rs. 50 million. I do not know what the actual provision now is. I am sure that the Hon. Minister of Labour and Nationalised Services will be able to enlighten us. Unless the Hon. Minister of Finance is going to exercise the strictest check on the now fashionable habit of bedevilling the budget estimates by a plethora of supplementary estimates, he may find it necessary to make provision for supplementary estimates reaching the magnitude of the actual budget deficit. It is, of course, open to him to say that he will not tolerate supplementary estimates in 1960-61, but then he would be a remarkable person.

If I assume, for the purpose of my argument, that supplementary provision will reach the modest level of 10 per cent. of the budget estimates, against a customary figure ranging from 24 per cent. to 34 per cent. in more recent years—I am rather conservative and I give the benefit to the Hon. Minister of Finance in the hope that he would have the courage to tell the other Ministers that they must not in fact make a mess of the

budget—and that actual expenditure will be short of authorized provision, including supplementaries, by only 5 per cent because you will see in all the figures I gave the actual expenditure represented 95 per cent. of the authorized provision, then a further expenditure of Rs. 70 million will be called for. I think my arithmetic is correct.

The Hon. Minister, however, indicated in his budget speech that Government was anxious—very rightly so—to ensure that expenditure plans were fulfilled to the limit, in which case he will end up with 100 per cent. actual expenditure. But I am definitely more conservative in assuming that the actual expenditure will be only 95 per cent. of the budgetary provision including supplementaries. On the calculation I have made so far I indicated, when the Minister responsible for the budget in this House was absent, that in the passage of the Appropriation Bill from the House of Representatives to this House the budget deficit has already increased by Rs. 37 million. The eventual budget deficit for 1960-61 will be more by Rs. 107 million.

However, that is not the end of this part of the story. The Hon. Minister of Finance has very wisely imposed a cut of 25 per cent. on the budget provision for capital expenditures in order to arrive at the probable actual expenditure which is the only total relevant to an assessment of the budget deficit. I must congratulate him on that because otherwise one would find that in 1960-61 the provision was for a potential expenditure on capital account completely unrelated to the realities of actual expenditure. So, if one compares these two years, 1960-61 with 1959-60, one comes to the horrifying conclusion that in 1960-61, when the Government proposes to spend so much more money on capital expenditure, the budgeted expenditure is less than in 1959-60. In order to get the right total one has got to subtract from the 1959-60 figure 25 per cent. That is a mental gymnastic one has to indulge in to understand this sort of operation.

[Senator Jayawardena]

The Hon. Minister of Finance has imposed a cut of 25 per cent. on 1960-61 capital provision on the valid ground that in the past loan fund expenditures have been consistently below budgeted provision by this figure. He gives these figures in his budget speech, but I do not propose to quote them. Although this device of a percentage cut is evidence of bad estimating in relation to performance by all Government departments for which the Hon. Minister cannot at all be blamed, it is better than an inflated and unreal estimate. I do sincerely hope that the Hon. Minister will ensure in the years to come that this practice is abandoned and budget details conform to anticipated performance.

Be that as it may, capital expenditure appearing in the Estimates as presented to this House have been revised to Rs. 429.1 million—as against a total of Rs. 411.3 million at the time when the Hon. Minister presented the budget in the House of Representatives—but the potential expenditure on this account is more by Rs. 143 million as the Hon. Minister verily remarks in his Budget speech :

“A percentage cut on the total of a Vote does not prevent departments from sanctioning expenditure up to the provision allowed against each sub-head.”

Again, in the same column of HANSARD lower down, he remarks :

“There should be no curtailing of capital expenditure, since the provision made even after the percentage cuts is considerably more than the average Loan Fund Expenditure in the last six years.”
—[OFFICIAL REPORT, REPRESENTATIVES, 15th September, 1960 ; Vol. 39, c. 1657.]

The Hon. Minister recognizes that the Estimates do not make provision for four new measures disclosed as part of Government's policy in the Throne Speech. Of these, I agree that the capital for the proposed life insurance corporation and the take-over of the two groups of newspapers will not involve a cash outlay, but to the extent, and only to the extent—that is my important qualification—that in respect of the life insurance corporation the capital takes the

form of an exchange of cash for Government securities held as an investment backing the capital of the corporation, and in respect of the press take-over to the extent that payment of compensation for the take-over is in the form of Government securities and is held in that form by the recipients of compensation. Then there will be no cash outlay ; otherwise, there will be, even despite what the Hon. Minister of Finance says. How much of the capital outlay will be held in this manner it is difficult to estimate and I do not propose to do so. But they belong to the second order of magnitude when we are dealing with totals. I am only making a point of some significance because it is basically wrong to say that it is not necessary to provide cash for the press take-over or for the capital for the life insurance corporation. Nothing has to be provided for if the operation takes place immediately as an exchange of Government securities for the cash. If otherwise, then it is necessary to provide cash to the extent that the exchange does not take place.

However, the inauguration of the National Youth Service will certainly involve a substantial capital and current outlay before it gets under way and before those engaged in this Service can begin to earn receipts towards meeting that outlay. We have already seen in the press some estimate of what this outlay would be in the sense of the numbers involved. No provision has to be made for this outlay. My own view is that it will take anything up to two years before the National Youth Service scheme ceases to be a liability and begins to make a positive contribution towards the resources of the Government. I do not think that the scheme is going to be self-financing in the first two years. In the first year, in any event, there will be a substantial outlay of funds.

I ignore the cost of the schools take-over because there are so many conflicting views expressed on it ranging from a substantial saving to

Government, by reason of certain educational establishments becoming private institutions, to a considerable financial liability on Government.

SENATOR NADESAN : Now they are going to give that by way of railway warrants and rent allowances to teachers.

SENATOR JAYAWARDENA : All in all, in my view, having regard to the tempo of Government development programmes as announced and canvassed by Government, and the urge and genuine enthusiasm displayed by Ministers of Government towards development projects, I estimate that the actual capital expenditure by Government will be around $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent more than the budgeted provision after allowing for the 25 per cent cut. In other words, I think the effectual cut will be $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent—

SENATOR B. H. DUNUWILLE : Will it be like that for 1956-57? The hon. Senator said there was 103 per cent expenditure. Will it be that for 1956-57?

SENATOR JAYAWARDENA : If one allows for actual expenditure on capital account, it will be $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent more than the budgeted provision which takes into account a cut of 25 per cent. Then you would require a further expenditure of Rs. 30 million. On this assessment, the likely outcome of the financial operations of Government will be a budget deficit of Rs. 470 million, instead of Rs. 340 million envisaged by the Hon. Minister—a worsening of the deficit by Rs. 130 million, but I shall give the Hon. Minister the benefit that capital expenditure will not exceed his estimate. This will reduce my estimate of the deficit to the figure of Rs. 100 million more than that reckoned by the Hon. Minister.

This estimate, however, does not take into account the likely increase in emoluments arising from the report on salaries and cadre which is expected shortly. Judging from

comments by Ministers, as reported in the press—I do not think the press reports are correct; but they may be—the Government is committed to implementing the recommendations in regard to salaries even before the report is published and considered by Government. These, if correct, will correspondingly worsen the budget deficit.

This is not all. What is relevant to a consideration of the impact of the financial operations of the Government is what is technically called the net cash operating deficit or surplus, a concept for the definition of which I must bear a measure of responsibility.

The budget proper, you will appreciate, deals with only a segment, no doubt a very important segment, of the financial operations for which Government is responsible in the course of a single accounting year. But there are other operations outside of the budget proper for which Government assumes financial responsibility. These constitute the operations financed out of advanced accounts, also the operations of all Government commercial activities undertaken by statutory corporations, for the finance of which Government is the ultimate provider of funds. If it were true that Government commercial enterprises were run at a profit, the strain on Government finances from these commercial activities would certainly be much less. But the facts are otherwise. It is one of the tragedies of our political life that every Government seems to make a success of running almost every Government commercial enterprise at a loss and these continuing losses add to the financial burden of the Government. When account is taken of these factors, I estimate that the out-turn of the financial operations of the Government for the year 1960—61 will entail an overall deficit of Rs. 470 million. But to arrive at the net cash operating deficit, one must exclude from this figure the repayments of borrowings amounting to Rs. 30 million *via* rupee sinking funds which are a meaningless exercise as I shall presently demonstrate.

[Senator Jayawardena]

The net cash operating deficit for the financial year 1960-61 I estimate at Rs. 440 million provided, of course, Government succeeds in getting the additional revenue budgeted for.

How does this compare with Government's performance in the previous years. The following table sets out the position for the last six years :

	Net cash operating deficit Rs. million	Percentage of Revenue
1955-56	.. 1.2	.1
1956-57	.. 196.4	15.6
1957-58	.. 222.3	17.4
1958-59	.. 413.4	31.1
1959-60 (Estimated)	.. 450.0	32.6
1960-61 (Estimated)	.. 440.0	27.8

These deficits are eloquent enough ; they are continuing to grow persistently and steadily. It is true that, thanks to the heavy dose of taxation which the Hon. Minister of Finance has had the courage to impose recently, and on which I shall offer some comments later, the deficit in the current financial year of Rs. 440 million—which is my own estimate—represents a reduced fraction of 27.8 per cent of the revenue as against an estimated deficit of Rs. 450 million, equivalent to 32.6 per cent revenue in the last financial year.

How have these large and mounting deficits been brought about? To budget for a deficit equivalent to 30 per cent of the revenue is ruinous for any national economy and can be justified only in circumstances of extremity and national disaster. If we are faced with a war or a revolution, if we are faced with the threat of sacrifice of freedom and liberty, then it is justified. In order to explain how these deficits have been brought about, one must clearly turn to an analysis of the expenditure. The Central Bank undertakes an admirable classification of Government receipts and payments which is very meaningful. Here again I must take some little credit for it because I was responsible for that classification. I have got a long table with me, copies

of which I could have given hon. Senators if I was not taken unawares today. Expenditure can be divided into three categories : (1) Purchases of Goods and Services ; (2) Transfer Payments ; (3) Capital Expenditure.

“Purchases of goods and services” very roughly corresponds to what is called recurrent expenditure. That again can be divided into three categories : (1) Administration ; (2) Social Services, and (3) Economic Service. The “Transfer Payments” are a bit of a hotchpotch. In fact, they are payments of a character where the beneficiaries are always at the receiving end in the sense that no services are performed by them. They are a transfer from one section of this community to another. Pensions are a transfer payment. They also include food subsidies on which I shall presently have to say quite a lot. “Capital Expenditure” includes capital maintenance. That, too, can be divided into Administration, Social Services and Economic Services.

I have got a Table running from 1955-56 to 1960-61. I do not propose to read the whole thing. I will concentrate on the years 1955-56, 1959-60 and 1960-61.

In 1955-56, Government spent Rs. 630 million on “Purchases of goods and services,” made up of Rs. 149 million on Administration, Rs. 257 million on Social Services and Rs. 133 million on Economic Services.

SENATOR LAYARD JAYASUNDERA : What about 1956-57 ?

SENATOR JAYAWARDENA : If you are interested in the other years I might give the figures straightway. The expenditure on “Purchases of Goods and Services” in 1956-57 was Rs. 689 million ; in 1957-58, Rs. 772 million ; in 1958-59, Rs. 886 million.

In 1959-60, expenditure on “Purchases of Goods and Services” was Rs. 935 million composed of Administration Rs. 229 million ; Social Services Rs. 392 million and Economic Services Rs. 190 million.

In 1960-61, "purchases of goods and services," Rs. 995 million composed of Administration Rs. 243 million; Social Services Rs. 422 million; Economic Services Rs. 206 million.

Now I come to Transfer Payments. In 1955-56, the expenditure was Rs. 233 million; in 1959-60, Rs. 336 million; in 1960-61, Rs. 464 million. Of this amount, the food subsidies are as follows—I will give the figures for all the years from 1955-56 to 1960-61 because I am going to concentrate for the next 40 minutes on this matter.

The expenditure on food subsidies in 1955-56 was Rs. 80 million; in 1956-57, Rs. 106 million; in 1957-58, Rs. 112 million; in 1958-59, Rs. 147 million; in 1959-60, Rs. 108 million. I have queried this figure and I will deal with it presently. In 1960-61 the expenditure is Rs. 200 million.

With regard to Capital Expenditure, the figures are: 1955-56, Rs. 431 million; 1959-60, Rs. 546 million; 1960-61, Rs. 505 million. You will see the significance of my earlier remarks. The budget provision for 1960-61 are given on a net basis after deflating them by a 25 per cent. cut, while the provision of Rs. 546 million in 1959-60 was on a gross basis, without a 25 per cent. cut. Hon. Senators must bear in mind the need to indulge in a bit of mental gymnastics in order to get at the true figures.

Capital expenditure includes, as I mentioned earlier, expenditure on capital maintenance. I will give the set of figures regarding expenditure on capital maintenance for the whole period because they are significant. They are significant because we ourselves as members of the public are being affected. In 1955-56, it was Rs. 49 million; 1956-57, Rs. 51 million; 1957-58, Rs. 76 million; 1958-59, Rs. 73 million; 1959-60, Rs. 70 million; in 1960-61, Rs. 66 million.

Capital expenditure again can be divided into Administration, Social Services and Economic Services. In 1955-56, the expenditure of Rs. 431 million was composed of: Capital

maintenance, Rs. 49 million; Administration Rs. 24 million; Social Services Rs. 100 million; Economic Services Rs. 256 million.

In 1959-60, Administration was Rs. 49 million; Social Services Rs. 121 million; Economic Services Rs. 376 million.

In 1960-61, Administration Rs. 39 million; Social Services, Rs. 99 million; Economic Services, Rs. 347 million.

I should explain, though I repeat myself, that the figures for 1959-60 and 1960-61 are based on the original estimates, while the figures for the earlier period from 1955-56 to 1958-59 are actual expenditures. Capital expenditure figures for 1959-60 are given on a gross basis, that is without the 25 per cent. cut, while those for 1960-61 are on a net basis after deflating them by a 25 per cent. cut. One should not run away with the thought that the capital expenditure for 1960-61 at Rs. 594 million is actually lower than in the previous year in respect of which the capital expenditure allocable is Rs. 546 million. If a cut of 25 per cent. is applied to this figure to allow for estimated savings, following the current year's example, it will be easily seen that the provision for capital expenditure in 1960-61 is about Rs. 95 million more or nearly 25 per cent. more than last year. This is all very commendable, but the remarkable and alarming feature of our public finances is that expenditure on Social Services should be so disproportionate to expenditure on Economic Services. We propose to devote in the current year only Rs. 347 million as capital expenditure towards expanding our economic services, while we are happily content to spend Rs. 422 million on maintaining our existing social services and in addition incur a further sum of Rs. 200 million on a net basis on food subsidies. I shall refer to this shortly.

It is important to observe that we propose to spend less on capital maintenance than before: Rs. 66 million in 1960-61, Rs. 70 million in 1959-60.

[Senator Jayawardena]
and Rs. 76 million in 1957-58. It is no wonder—as I am sure the Hon. Minister of Social Services will agree—our roads and public buildings are in such a bad state of repair.

SENATOR A. T. A. DE SOUZA : Who is the Minister of Social Services ?

SENATOR JAYAWARDENA : I mean the Hon. Minister whom you and I mentally know.

Stinting on maintenance is false economy. Bad roads take a terrific toll of vehicular traffic which, in turn, calls for greater expenditure on maintenance of transport and involves needless expenditure on maintenance of road vehicles of all kinds, raises the cost of transport and inhibits development all round.

If one were to assign reasons in a practical and realistic way to the mounting budget deficits we have experienced in recent years, one can positively say it is due to the misallocation of Government outlay. We have been curbing our expenditure on maintaining and expanding our economic services which alone can sustain, in the short and the medium, term, a growing budget deficit without simultaneously inviting financial bankruptcy, while we have shown no little alacrity in increasing our current expenditure on social services and on food subsidies. Our expenditure in respect of economic services has risen from Rs. 389 million in 1956-57 to an estimated Rs. 554 million in 1960-61—an increase of only Rs. 165 million. On the other hand, our outlay on social services and food subsidies has risen from Rs. 438 million to Rs. 721 million—an increase of Rs. 283 million.

To sum up, our growing budget deficits must be attributed to two factors : not only are the levels of expenditure on social services and food subsidies disproportionately high in comparison with levels of expenditure on economic services, but also the former have been increasing since 1955-56 at a disproportionately faster rate than the latter.

I should like to draw the attention of this House to the impact of food subsidies on Government expenditure. Since 1955-56, the net food subsidy has risen from Rs. 79.5 million to an estimated total of Rs. 200 million in 1960-61. Over the period, the total outlay on food subsidies amounted to around Rs. 776 million, after allowing for an increase of Rs. 25 million on the estimate of Rs. 108 million for 1959-60, because of the reduction in the price of rationed rice to 25 cents per measure,—for which my good Friends on this side, as Members of the last Government, I think were responsible. The above figure of Rs. 776 million, I may mention, is a net total, net after deducting the profit on sugar.

For the year 1960-61, the profit on sugar and the profit that you make on wheat—which is a small item—is taken at Rs. 110 million. From a strictly financial and economic point of view, it is basically wrong to show these profits as an offset against expenditure. This is a bad financial practice inherited from the past. These profits are a tax on the community in every sense of the term ; they are not normal ordinary trading profits. Government, as sole importer of sugar, earns a monopoly profit which is truly in the nature of a tax. It is arguable with no little force that if this profit was not earned, Government could well earn an equivalent amount of revenue by taxing mass consumption in other ways.

The Hon. Minister of Finance, who has shown that he is not averse to departing from financial orthodoxy and established procedure, will win praise from every one who can claim to have some little knowledge and understanding of Government finance if he would ensure that the profit on sugar is credited to revenue and the gross amount of the subsidies is shown under estimated expenditure. Then we can get the whole thing in a true sense of proportion.

I reckon that the sugar profit accruing over the six-year period averaged Rs. 75 million, or totalled Rs. 450 million. I am trying to compare the cost of the food subsidy from

1955-56 up to 1960-61. So, the gross cost of the food subsidies in this period can be taken at, say, Rs. 1,225 million, while capital expenditure on economic services—taking 1959-60 on the net basis by deflating the figure by 25 per cent—in the same period totals Rs. 1,766 million. In other words, we have spent on financing food subsidies an amount equal to two-thirds of the capital expenditure on economic investments made by the Government.

SENATOR THE HON. WIJESINGHE :
To prevent them from starvation.

SENATOR JAYAWARDENA : No. I will come to that in due time.

To make the point differently, with immediate reference to the budget for 1960-61, one could legitimately say that with the gross food subsidy at Rs. 310 million and the estimated capital expenditure on economic services at Rs. 347 million, the governments of this country and their supporters, whether of the hue green, blue or red, have reduced the finances of the country to such farcical situation that the Government is now obliged to spend on food subsidies an amount equal to 90 per cent of what it spends on economic development proper.

If that is going to be justified by, shall I say, the specious plea that but for the food subsidies the people of this country would starve it is one of the most irresponsible statements I have heard.

I can well understand the attractions of the food subsidy from a political point of view but I submit that it is a very short-sighted point of view indeed.

SENATOR THE HON. WIJESINGHE :
That was proved at the last general election.

SENATOR DUNUWILLE : Do I understand the hon. Senator to say that the expenditure on the food subsidies is almost equal to the amount set apart for economic development ?

SENATOR JAYAWARDENA : Almost equivalent—that is a short but effective way of putting the point.

If one were to lean back and reflect one can truly say that the mounting food subsidy bill is the political price which this country has been forced to pay and the economic cost we have been obliged to bear for the failure on the part of those responsible for our governance, since we became independent, to carry out appropriate policies in order to expand the base of our economy in such a way that the country can support the burden of a growing population. We have failed to do so and we, therefore, proceed to increase in some small measure the real incomes of the people by subsidising their food, but foolishly in a manner, and at a cost which prevents Government from taking enduring measures that will increase their real incomes permanently through rapid economic development.

I must confess the present situation offers admirable opportunities to certain political groups to exploit the situation to their great advantage. These political groups know too well that the mounting food subsidy bill is a canker eating into the vitals of the economic and financial body of the country. They also know too well that so long as these subsidies continue to grow, as they undoubtedly will, Government will be forced to slow down the rate of economic development and to impose tax measures of a kind that will denude the private sector of savings and retard expansion of the private sector itself. I shall return to this aspect presently. They are only too fully conscious that if food subsidies are eliminated, the present Government will be offered a golden opportunity to accelerate development both in the public and in the private sector and it will, thus, be in a position to establish on an enduring basis a truly social democratic society. But they are equally conscious that should Government succeed in this aim and in this task,

[Senator Jayawardena] their objective of establishing revolutionary socialism in this country will be lost for ever. Of course, they know too well that if and when they come to power, one of the first acts they do will be to eliminate the food subsidy, but they will argue on their terms. Their *quid pro quo* for eliminating food subsidies is nationalization of the means of production. Truly, Mr. President, I have rarely come across a neater and more convincing political argument than this. I must warn the Government in all humility and with all the emphasis at my command that until and unless the Government grasps this very awkward nettle of the food subsidy bill and destroys it, it must become an unwitting victim to revolutionary socialism, which is as different from the democratic socialism of the late Prime Minister, if I understand it aright as chalk is from cheese.

SENATOR DE SOUZA: Is there any other solution?

SENATOR JAYAWARDENA: If the hon. Senator will wait a little longer, he will get the solution.

SENATOR DE SOUZA: Wait for a *dirachcha lanuwa!*

SENATOR JAYAWARDENA: I would, therefore, invite the Government to strive to take this incubus of a food subsidy out of the forum of politics and solve it in the only terms it can be satisfactorily solved. Why not call a round-table conference of the political parties that matter and evolve an agreed programme for eliminating the food subsidy over time—a programme which envisages an increase in economic investment more than corresponding to the saving on food subsidy; a programme which, offers a subsidy on paddy production, if a subsidy is at all necessary, which is geared to productivity, a programme which imposes a reduction in the consumer subsidy corresponding to an increase

in real employment and income. There are many ways of solving the burden of the producer of paddy. One way would be to make the subsidy payment geared to productivity, not in cash but in savings certificates encashable ten years hence. This will entail a measure of forced saving. Whatever be the chosen programme, it must be carried out in stages, leading eventually to the elimination of all food subsidies, consumer and producer. It must, however, be a programme carried out in concert with political matters so that they are not enabled to make political capital out of this issue.

I hope you will forgive me if I detain this honourable House a moment or two more on this very vital issue.

Thanks to the Hon. Minister of Finance, we know for the first time how the food subsidies are composed of, namely:

	Rs. million
Subsidy to consumer ..	179.9
Subsidy to producer ..	129.0
Subsidy on local red onions ..	1.2
	<hr/>
	310.1
Less profit on sugar, wheat &c. ..	110.1
	<hr/>
Net subsidy ..	200.0
	<hr/>

SENATOR THE HON. WIJESINGHE: What about dhal and maldiva fish?

SENATOR JAYAWARDENA: How much does that come to?

SENATOR THE HON. WIJESINGHE: Rs. 3.4 million.

SENATOR JAYAWARDENA: Then it will increase the deficit a little more.

SENATOR THE HON. WIJESINGHE: Because you do not see it.

SENATOR JAYAWARDENA: I see it quite well.

With the guaranteed price of paddy at Rs. 12 per bushel, the delivered cost of a measure of domestically grown rice works out to 93 cents per measure. The delivered cost of imported rice works out to 38 or 42 cents per measure. Government sells both at 25 cents.

SENATOR DE SOUZA: In one case it is foreign exchange, but it is not so in the case of the other. I think there is some jugglery with figures.

SENATOR JAYAWARDENA: I will meet that argument in a moment. I shall explain the position. It is the tragedy of our economic policy that we should have fastened on this country a subsidy scheme which brings about the most strange and weird results. It is recognized by all—and this recognition is confirmed by the provision in the Estimates—that agricultural development must assume a leading role in our economic expansion. By and large, all expenditure on agricultural development—including provision of irrigation and land utilization—had the end result of increasing the output of rice by intensive and extensive cultivation. How many of us have paused to consider that every time money is devoted to agricultural development, it imposes a financial liability through an increase in the food subsidy?

May I generalise, Mr. President, to add point to my argument? Ceylon is, indeed, unique in its contemporary economic policy. Since our development policy must necessarily continue to have for years to come an agricultural bias—I do not for a moment ignore industrial development as I shall presently show—and since agricultural development must continue to be oriented towards expanding rice production, Ceylon happens to be the one solitary country in this wide world where development policy, instead of easing materially the financial burden, aggravates it by imposing a financial liability which continues to mount as development itself proceeds, thanks to our scheme of food subsidies and thanks, indeed to our

far-sighted politicians who had been responsible for our governments in the past!

I can understand the need for food subsidies in certain societies of the contemporary world. An affluent society can enjoy the luxury of food subsidies; indeed, circumstances are conceivable where the continuance of food subsidies on a large scale is a pre-condition of the society remaining affluent. In a stagnant society, food subsidies have no rightful place. In a stagnant society striving to seek self-sustaining growth, as it must, in order to escape revolution, chaos and misery, food subsidies are, indeed, a snare and a delusion. It speaks volumes for the political statesmanship of our past and present Governments, of our past and present leaders; it is a sad reflection on the financial acumen—or may I say wizardry—of our Finance Ministers that we should have so contrived to fasten the burden of the mounting food subsidy bill on a stagnant economy like ours, which only an affluent society like the United States of America can truly afford to bear.

I shall now deal with the interruption of my hon. Friend Senator de Souza. The point was made—if I understood him aright—that if we import food there would be loss of foreign exchange, that if we subsidise and grow domestic food there would be no loss of foreign exchange.

SENATOR DE SOUZA: That is not the point. I was only asking whether it is not financial jugglery to compare the 42 cents you pay on the foreign exchange with the 95 cents you pay locally.

SENATOR JAYAWARDENA: There is no financial jugglery involved. I cannot understand how it can arise although I understand what my hon. Friend means.

SENATOR DE SOUZA: In a little time you will see the point.

SENATOR JAYAWARDENA: I see the point perfectly. Forty-two cents is spent on the foreign exchange and 95 cents locally. The difference is because we pay for high cost rice and we pay it for domestic production. If we want high cost rice we must pay in order to get it. We pay that price knowing that it is for high cost rice, but we do not tax ourselves. We have a series of budget deficits of the magnitude that I have been pointing out. I shall presently show that our external financial crisis is due to the mounting deficits. One reason for the mounting deficits is the food subsidies and the food subsidies are being administered in a way that does not in the least increase production. The farmer who is indifferent gets the same subsidy per measure as the farmer who is efficient. The good, bad and indifferent farmers are all treated alike. I can understand the use of a food subsidy in the relevant and sensible meaning of the term if it is geared to production. If we do want for certain reasons to have high cost food, we must address ourselves to the question, "Is that the most efficient way of utilizing our limited resources?" There are many ways of providing food.

SENATOR DE SOUZA: My hon. Friend has missed my point. He has not yet followed the point I made.

SENATOR JAYAWARDENA: If I have not followed it, I hope my hon. Friend will develop it.

It is far better for us to dig holes in the ground and fill them up and employ people in the task of filling them—economically it is the most wasteful way of spending money—rather than continue to have rice production at this high cost. I do not think we need pay this high price for our rice. There is no necessity. In fact, it could well be reduced to something within reasonable limits.

SENATOR JAYASUNDERA: We are saving on foreign exchange.

SENATOR JAYAWARDENA: The saving of foreign exchange has nothing to do with it.

SENATOR DE SOUZA: The 95 cents paid locally cannot be compared with the 45 cents paid on the foreign exchange.

SENATOR JAYAWARDENA: The 38 or 45 cents on foreign exchange can be directly compared with the 95 cents paid in Ceylon rupees for domestic rice. There is no difference between the two prices and there is, in fact, no economic point in the statement that we must prefer high cost rice, domestically grown, to cheap foreign rice, unless and until we are prepared to say that we are willing to pay that price, either by getting back the full cost of the rice from the consumer or by taxing ourselves in some way and seeing that the full cost is paid from revenue. I think it is one of the most foolish things to grow high cost rice unless we are told that there is no other way of using our resources, which I refuse to believe. In fact it is far better for us, in every economic sense I know of, to have in every village half an acre of land and to employ people in relays so that one set may dig holes in the ground and the other set may fill it up. You can continue to employ them in this useless task of digging holes and filling them knowing fully well that it is utter economic waste.

AN HON. SENATOR: What about the consumer subsidy?

SENATOR JAYAWARDENA: I do not see any reason why the consumer should be subsidised at all. Why subsidise him on rice alone? Why not on anything else!

SENATOR DUNUWILLE: People must live.

SENATOR JAYAWARDENA: They can well live if they can get employment. You cannot get employment without development, and you cannot have development without funds, and you cannot have funds so long as you have this subsidy. I know my hon. Friends have got the answer—"Nationalise", and *abdacadabra*, overnight you get funds in plenty.

SENATOR A. REGINALD PERERA : You give the same advice that "J. R." gave Dudley!

SENATOR JAYAWARDENA : True, this advice was given. All I say is that if, along with that advice, corresponding action was really taken, the consumer subsidies would not have been what they were.

However, there is one thing about which I am convinced. I say in all humility that there is no financial device I can think of—I wish others can think of one—in a social democratic society, not a society of revolutionary socialism, which can afford to finance the food subsidy on this mounting scale and yet carry out a development programme. You cannot have both. One or the other must be sacrificed, and what we have sacrificed now is the development programme. Today we have mounting unemployment, and that is because Government cannot carry on a development programme; because by an accident of events which has become an accident of policy we have fastened on us the responsibility of carrying on a food subsidy scheme which is politically most unsound, as I shall presently show. It pays today for certain members of a certain political group—if I belong to that political group I would do the same—to use every conceivable argument to ensure that the food subsidy stays, because the only hope they have of bringing about a revolution in this country within our generation in the next five years is by seeing to it that the food subsidy is not removed. That is the best way they have—nothing else—of bringing about a revolution.

I wish to bring to the notice of the House and this Government that the food subsidy has concealed within it dynamite, and that this dynamite will destroy the Government if it has not the courage to accept the challenge. I make bold to say that if there is one Government that can do so and accomplish this task—I am not saying this merely to flatter any Member of this Government—I can think of no Government up to now

other than the Sirimavo Bandaranaike Government which is politically in a position to carry home to the people the unpalatable message that the only salvation this country has to preserve democratic socialism is by removing the food subsidy.

I wish this Government well, but I for one will continue to despair of any rational and sound economic policy and self-sustaining economic development in the concept of a social democratic society—I do not mean in a society of revolutionary socialism—so long as the present incubus of food subsidies continues to be with us. I would indeed prefer to equate the Government's development programme inversely with the size of the food subsidy bill—and the size of the food subsidy bill on gross terms alone.

After all, what the people of this country are interested in is not artificially cheap food; they want income whereby they may be able to buy food at the right price, at the given price. But when the people do not have employment, they cannot have an adequate income. And they cannot have employment, because there is no development—which is obviously due to the failure on the part of those who were responsible for our Governments, previous and present, to provide a programme of economic development on a scale adequate to take care of our rising population. They have not been able to do it because the food subsidy is eating into the vitals of the finances of this country.

One of the fortunate things in the life of this country is that we have not fastened ourselves with a subsidy on clothing. You will remember that just after the last war we had food control and textile control. It is the greatest of good fortunes that the Government or the Minister responsible at the time did not take into its or his head to peg down the price of textiles also, as in the case of food, housing and so on. I do not want to go into the economics of it, but the same argument could have been used for a subsidy on textiles as on food in respect of which the Government

[Senator Jayawardena]
of the day very foolishly indeed decided to give a guarantee for five years pegging the price of a bushel of rice at Rs. 12 when that was the price then obtaining in the world market—and that guaranteed price has come to stay. If, for instance, we had at one time controlled the price of textiles, today we would have been having in our estimates a subsidy for textiles as well. At that rate, we can use the entire revenue of the country to subsidize everything from the cradle to the grave!

I have endeavoured to show how the burden of a mounting food subsidy bill is crippling Government's ability to finance much needed economic development. But there are other repercussions of an equally grave kind. I computed earlier, if you will recall, from the Hon. Finance Minister's estimate of a budget deficit of Rs. 340 million, that the actual cash operating deficit for the current financial year is more likely to be of the order of Rs. 440 million, without making any allowance for the increased outlay on personal emoluments in consequence of the inevitable implementation of the Salaries Commission's report which is expected soon. Even if we take the Hon. Finance Minister's figure of Rs. 340 million as the deficit, one need only consider what the state of our public finances would be if there was no food subsidy at all. Government would have saved Rs. 310 million at one remove, and the deficit would have been reduced to a mere Rs. 30 million assuming, of course, that there was no increase in expenditure on development. But that is an unreal assumption. The point at issue is that the nature of the deficit would have assumed a different complexion altogether. I am not concerned with the size of the deficit. I am concerned with the nature of the deficit that would have been incurred. The deficit would have been incurred to finance development instead of to finance consumption or even to finance

production in a manner completely unrelated to productivity. At present the good, bad and indifferent paddy farmer gets the same rate of subsidy, but bad farming is not penalized and good farming is not encouraged.

How have the budget deficits in the past, to which the food subsidy bill has made a substantial contribution, been financed and how does the Minister propose to finance it in the current year? He expects to raise Rs. 240 million from domestic borrowing and Rs. 150 million from external loans. I have the gravest doubts about our ability to raise Rs. 240 million in the domestic market from non-inflationary sources, that is, from sources other than the banking system. I am even prepared to take a sporting wager with the Hon. Minister that he will not succeed in getting anywhere near this figure. It is true that the Employees Provident Fund provides a ready source of finance for Government. Subscriptions to loans from this source are unlikely to exceed Rs. 60 million a year. There is a widespread belief that nationalisation of life insurance would result in a large amount of additional funds towards Government loans. Nothing could be further from truth. In the last three years, insurance companies have invested in Government securities an amount ranging from Rs. 7 million to Rs. 12 million. Since foreign life insurance companies invest almost the entirety of their surplus funds in Government securities and Ceylonese companies invest around one sixth of their accruals in such securities—the balance being invested in the private sector and as loans to policy-holders—it is unlikely that Government will obtain on nationalisation of life insurance anything more than Rs. 15 million by way of subscriptions to Government loan as against an average of Rs. 10 million in the past. From these two sources, Government is likely to receive Rs. 75 million in all.

Government has at its disposal another source of funds which can take up Government securities. This source consists of sinking fund contributions to rupee loans, which are now

around Rs. 30 million. I do wish the Hon. Minister of Finance does look very carefully into this matter. The present exercise of providing sinking funds for rupee loans is a heritage from colonial finance, when it was the practice to raise external loans for which a sinking fund is an indispensable requirement; otherwise, foreigners would not lend the money to any government, whether it be this Government or any other government, in Ceylon or elsewhere. But a sinking fund for rupee loans is financial stupidity *in excelsis*. I must confess that soon after the Central Bank was established, Mr. Exter, who was the then Governor, and I managed to convince the Treasury that there was no need to provide a sinking fund for rupee loans, and a series of loans were floated under the borrowing powers then in force without any sinking funds.

Subsequently, when fresh borrowing powers were required—I had by then left the Central Bank—the authorities then responsible for affairs thought it essential to write into the new Act conferring fresh borrowing powers, provision that there should be a sinking fund for each rupee loan.

What is the result now? Because Government is now enjoined to provide money for rupee sinking funds, it has to budget in the estimates the necessary provision which in the current year amounts to around Rs. 30 million. Because of this needless provision, the budget deficit is enlarged by precisely a corresponding sum. And the Hon. Minister of Finance goes to the market to raise loans to cover this enhanced budget deficit. It is no better than robbing Peter to pay Paul.

One does not require much financial perspicacity to realise that the only effective sinking fund for a domestic loan is a budget surplus and in the absence of such a surplus the only effective backing to domestic loans is the police powers vested in the State to tax the people! I would, therefore, appeal to the Hon. Minister

of Finance, who has shown his readiness to take a practical view of finance, to do away with the fiction of sinking funds for rupee loans.

I must now return to my main theme. Inclusive of contributions to rupee loan sinking funds, the amounts available for subscription to domestic loans add up so far to Rs. 105 million. The Hon. Minister confidently assumes that "in view of the measures taken to reduce expenditure on non-essential imports, it should be possible to borrow more locally than hitherto". This is, indeed, a very naive assumption. He has, unfortunately, overlooked the fact that his taxation proposals impose an additional burden of Rs. 130 million on that sector of the community which has any savings capacity. The institutional savers such as the savings banks and the provident funds and trusts—exclusive of the Employees Provident Fund already allowed for—may well take up, say, Rs. 35 million in Government securities. This makes up a total of Rs. 140 million on my reckoning, which is Rs. 100 million short of the Hon. Minister's own optimistic estimate.

If this estimate includes borrowing from bank sources, then I agree that not even the sky is the limit to Government borrowing, provided the authorities are willing to pay the grievous price of inflation. I am doubtful, however, that the Minister will collect Rs. 130 million from his additional taxes. I shall refer to this aspect later. But I shall assume for the present that his anticipations are correct. It is most unlikely that foreign loans and aid will add up to the contribution of Rs. 210 million which the Hon. Minister has estimated, but I take that figure, too, as being correct.

If past performance is any guide in this rather difficult field of estimating, the effective contributions from these sources which can be reckoned as available within the financial year are unlikely to exceed Rs. 150 million. It takes time to negotiate loans, to negotiate aid; it takes years to make the necessary arrangements. I am rather concerned with the position within the next nine months as three

[Senator Jayawardena] months have already passed. Accordingly, on my own calculation, one is left with a total of Rs. 290 million only as being available to finance a budget deficit of Rs. 340 million. There is a deficit of Rs. 50 million instead of a surplus of Rs. 110 million anticipated by the Hon. Minister. That is the conclusion.

However, if we take the net cash operating deficit as computed by me at Rs. 440 million for the year 1960-61, and the non-inflationary sources of finance at Rs. 290 million on the estimates which I have just shown, there is a gap of Rs. 150 million which can only be financed by credit creation.

To sum up, then, my thesis is that the budgetary operations in the current financial year will leave an inflationary gap of Rs. 150 million instead of a deflationary potential of Rs. 110 million as envisaged by the Hon. Minister because he quite rightly took his deficit at Rs. 340 million, and his estimated sources of finance added up to Rs. 450 million. So, if his expectations are fulfilled—I do hope and pray that they will be fulfilled; I am not making these statements out of sheer delight to disprove somebody else's calculation—nobody would be happier than myself because then we would not get into a mess, as I anticipate we would, and I shall proceed to explain why. But we would be fooling ourselves as responsible Members of this House if we did not say what in our view was the more reasonable outcome of the budget.

SENATOR DE SOUZA: What about under-expenditure?

SENATOR JAYAWARDENA: I took under-expenditure into account and said that there was a 5 per cent. under-expenditure on current account every year. I took into account the fact that in the past there has been an under-expenditure of 25 per cent. on capital expenditure. I took into account what the Hon. Minister of Finance did not take into account, namely,

that there would be supplementary provision on recurrent expenditure amounting to about 10 per cent. of the budget, whereas in the past this has ranged from 25 to 35 per cent. I took into account that because of the anxious urge—a very desirable urge—on the part of the Government to expand development programmes, actual expenditure on capital account would be $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. more than budgeted for. So that, the actual cut would be $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. and not 25 per cent.

After taking all that into account—I am repeating this for the benefit of Senator de Souza who asked the question—after allowing also for the cash that the Government would need to finance extra-budgetary operations, including advance accounts, financing losses in all the very unsuccessful undertakings operating in a commercial way which every Government in the past has had to do, I came to the conclusion that the cash operating deficit, which is the relevant figure, would be Rs. 440 million and not Rs. 350 million. And I demonstrated that the ultimate outcome on the basis of my calculations would be that there will be an inflationary gap of Rs. 150 million instead of a deflationary potential of Rs. 110 million.

I agree that figures can be made to prove anything. I have explained in some detail the basis of my calculation. I have made estimates from knowledge available outside, with the little understanding I have of these matters. No one would be happier than myself if I am proved to be wrong, and I do hope and pray that the Hon. Minister of Finance would be right. However, I shall be false to my own understanding of these matters if I do not emphasise that on a realistic view of the budgetary prospects for the current year the likely outcome is an inflationary gap of Rs. 150 million on Government account alone.

Inflationary borrowing through the banking system and running down of cash balances must inevitably have its impact on Ceylon's external assets. I shall recount the

extent of the inflationary borrowing in recent years. In the year 1957-58 inflationary borrowing to the extent of Rs. 107.8 million was indulged in; in 1958-59, the figure was Rs. 241 million. These two figures are taken from the Report of the Central Bank. In 1959-60, I estimate that inflationary borrowing would be Rs. 275 million. For 1960-61 I estimate Rs. 150 million. I must say—and I say it in all sincerity—that the Finance Minister must be congratulated on containing the inflationary gap within the lower limit of what on my calculation, is around Rs. 150 million in the current year from the unmanageable totals of Rs. 241 million and Rs. 275 million respectively in the two preceding years, because if we had gone on in that fashion there would have been nothing left of this country. My hon. Friend says, "We can tax more." I agree with him that we can tax more—up to the point that we invite revolution of the kind that he wants!

SENATOR DE SOUZA: What is the hon. Senator congratulating the Hon. Minister on, except taxation?

SENATOR JAYAWARDENA: I am congratulating the Hon. Minister for containing not only on the taxation

SENATOR DE SOUZA: He is contradicting himself!

THE PRESIDENT: Hon. Senator, please carry on with the debate.

SENATOR JAYAWARDENA: The Hon. Minister of Finance must be congratulated on containing the inflationary gap within Rs. 150 million from unmanageable totals of Rs. 241 million and Rs. 275 million in the two preceding years.

A very useful exercise is to relate this inflationary gap to the fall in external assets in the years in

question. In the year 1957-1958, external assets fell by Rs. 113 million; in the year 1958-59 they fell by Rs. 128 million and in the year 1959-60, they fell by Rs. 235 million. For the year 1960-61 I have got a question mark.

SENATOR THE HON. WIJESINGHE: Nought!

SENATOR JAYAWARDENA: What is noteworthy in this list of losses of external assets is the cumulative impact of large budget deficits financed through bank credit on the rate of decline of our external assets.

In 1957-58, inflationary borrowing was Rs. 108 million and external assets fell by Rs. 113 million. In 1958-59, inflationary borrowing was Rs. 241 million and external assets fell by Rs. 128 million. In 1959-60, inflationary borrowing was Rs. 275 million and external assets fell by Rs. 234 million. The reason for this fall is this: there is what is called the cumulative impact of this credit creation on the assets, and when the cumulative impact takes effect, then the fall in assets takes place at a very much faster rate than the deficit. It requires a certain amount of intricate reasoning of a character which would not interest us. All I want to point out is that these large budget deficits financed through bank credit go on increasing to a point when you get a financial crisis almost overnight. These financial crises do not come announced. They come unannounced and take more stable governments than ours by surprise.

SENATOR DUNUWILLE: Like a thief in the night.

SENATOR JAYAWARDENA: Our external assets as at 30th September, 1960, stood at Rs. 530 million, as compared with Rs. 1,005 million three years ago. That is noteworthy. The figure of Rs. 530 million includes

[Senator Jayawardena]

Rs. 70 million held against sterling sinking funds which are not usable at all. Here again, I plead with the Hon. Minister of Finance that he might well get the Central Bank to publish the net external assets figure instead of the gross figure.

And it being 7.30 p.m., the debate stood adjourned; debate to be resumed tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT

Resolved, "That the Senate do now adjourn."—[Senator The Hon. A. P. Jayasuriya.]

Adjourned accordingly at 7.30 p.m. until 2.30 p.m. on Thursday, 8th December, 1960, pursuant to Resolution of the House this day.

SENATORS

Fifth Parliament—First Session

	Year of Retirement
*PRESIDENT—The Hon. Sir Cyril de Zoysa, Kt., J.P.	.. 1961
*DEPUTY PRESIDENT—Lady Molamure, C.B.E.	.. 1961
†K. Adamaly, Esq., O.B.E., J.P.	.. 1965
†T. Amarasuriya, Esq., O.B.E.	.. 1965
†A. M. A. Azeez, Esq., M.B.E.	.. 1965
†The Hon. Sirimavo Ratwatte Dias Bandaranaike	.. 1965
*Charles Barton, Esq., J.P., U.M.	.. 1963
†E. J. Cooray, Esq., C.M.G., O.B.E.	.. 1961
†R. A. de Mel, Esq.	.. 1961
*A. T. A. de Souza, Esq.	.. 1963
†Lady de Soysa, O.B.E.	.. 1963
*M. P. de Zoysa, Esq. (Snr.)	.. 1963
*T. P. de Zoysa, Esq.	.. 1965
†B. H. Dunuwille, Esq.	.. 1963
†The Hon. S. P. C. Fernando	.. 1963
*Chandra Gunasekera, Esq.	.. 1965
*A. W. A. D. S. Jayasekera, Esq.	.. 1963
*J. P. Jayasena, Esq.	.. 1965
†Layard Jayasundera, Esq.	.. 1963
*The Hon. A. P. Jayasuriya	.. 1961
†N. U. Jayawardena, Esq.	.. 1961
†J. H. V. S. Jayawickrama, Esq.	.. 1965
*L. B. S. Jinasena, Esq.	.. 1961
*S. Nadesan, Esq., Q.C.	.. 1965
*G. Nalliah, Esq.	.. 1963
†Dr. M. V. P. Peiris, O.B.E.	.. 1961
*A. R. Perera, Esq.	.. 1961
*Dr. A. M. Samarasinghe	.. 1961
†Dr. J. E. Senanayake	.. 1961
†The Hon. C. Wijesinghe, O.B.E.	.. 1963

* Elected.

† Appointed.

MEMORIALS

1870-1871

Year	Memorial
1870	...
1871	...
1872	...
1873	...
1874	...
1875	...
1876	...
1877	...
1878	...
1879	...
1880	...
1881	...
1882	...
1883	...
1884	...
1885	...
1886	...
1887	...
1888	...
1889	...
1890	...
1891	...
1892	...
1893	...
1894	...
1895	...
1896	...
1897	...
1898	...
1899	...
1900	...