



# පාර්ලිමේන්තු විවාද

(හැන්සාඩ්)

නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ

නිල වාර්තාව

(අශෝකිත පිටපත)

අත්තිකාරම් ප්‍රධාන කරුණු

1968 අගෝස්තු 18 වන ඉදිරිපත්

[වැඩ කටයුතු ඉදිරියට ගෙන යාම]

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, (1968-69) [හයවන වෙන් කළ දිනය]  
දෙවන වර කියවීම—විවාදය කල් නතර ලදී.

1968 අගෝස්තු 19 වන සඳුදා

ප්‍රශ්නවලට වාචික පිළිතුරු

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, (1968-69) [හත්වන වෙන් කළ දිනය]  
දෙවන වර කියවීම—විවාදය ඉදිරියට ගෙන යන ලදී.

## பாராளுமன்ற விவாதங்கள்

(ஹன்சார்ட்)

பிரதிநிதிகள் சபை

அதிகார அறிக்கை

(பிழை திருத்தப்படாதது)

பிரதான உள்ளடக்கம்

நாயிற்றுக்கிழமை, 18 ஆகஸ்ட் 1968

[நிகழ்ச்சித் தொடர்]

ஒதுக்கீட்டு மசோதா, 1968-69 [ஒதுக்கப்பட்ட ஆறாம் நாள்]

இரண்டாம் மதிப்பு—விவாதம் ஒத்திவைக்கப்பட்டது

திங்கட்கிழமை, 19 ஆகஸ்ட் 1968

வினாக்களுக்கு வாய்மூல விடைகள்

ஒதுக்கீட்டு மசோதா, 1968-69 [ஒதுக்கப்பட்ட ஏழாம் நாள்]

இரண்டாம் மதிப்பு—விவாதம் தொடர்நிறைவு

Volume 80  
No. 9

Monday  
19th August 1968

## PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OFFICIAL REPORT

(Uncorrected)

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

Sunday, 18th August 1968

[Continuation of Proceedings]

APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968-69 [Sixth Allotted Day]  
Second Reading—Debate adjourned

Monday, 19th August 1968

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968-69 [Seventh Allotted Day]  
Debate continued



## நியைன மன்றி மகவெலவ

பிரதிநிதிகள் சபை

House of Representatives

1968 ஏனென்றே 18 மெ ஓடி

ஞாயிற்றுக்கிழமை, 18 ஓகஸ்ட் 1968

Sunday, 18th August 1968

[1968 ஏனென்றே 18 மெ ஓடி கில வர்ணை  
1606 மெ கிரேவ் மெ ஓகிடு வடு கடுவது]

[1968 ஓகஸ்ட் 18 ஞாயிற்றுக்கிழமை அநிகார  
அநிகை. 1606 ஓம் பத்தியிலிருந்து நிகழ்ச்சித்  
தொடர்.].

[Continuation of Proceedings from Col.  
1606 of OFFICIAL REPORT for Sunday, 18th  
August 1968.]

## வெசர்ண பணல் வெடுவெண, 1968-69

ஓதுக்கிட்டு மசோதா, 1968-69

APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968-69

ஏ. ஓ. 3.47

வெடுவெணவார்வ ரீ. எம். வி. நானைநன்

(வல்ரூர்)

(தொக்டர் ஈ. எம். வி. நாகநாதன்—  
நல்லூர்)

(Dr. E. M. V. Naganathan—Nallur)

I have listened very carefully to many of the Opposition speakers. It was the same speech more or less from everyone of them. They all referred to the rice cut, the devaluation, the cost of living, unemployment, arrack and cigarettes. And now they propose a trade union for Members of Parliament—that is the only variation. It was becoming monotonous.

As for the rice cut, that is the best thing that ever happened to Ceylon, to the people of Ceylon and to the farmers of Ceylon. The rice cut has created a new psychology and outlook in our economic life. It is because of the rice cut that we had a real food drive and the people are now really interested in doing work; so that we could be self-sufficient as far as food is concerned.

The devaluation was thrust upon this Government. They did not choose it. In any country, the value of their rupee or their pound or their dollar depends on the amount of work that people put in. If, for instance, our labour or our clerical service or our other staff do not work and they do one day's work in ten days, they have devalued the rupee from Re. 1 to 10 cents. If, for instance, a building which should normally be completed in about a year takes five years, the rupee has been devalued by the people—the engineers or the others concerned in it. So, if the Government was forced to devalue, it was largely due to the Opposition and the Leftists who told the clerks and others not to work, to strike. Hence the rupee was devalued.

If in any country the money is not devalued but is appreciating, it is due to the work, the brain work, the brawn work and the concerted work of the people, their dedication to work.

The cost of living goes up due to two or three circumstances. For one thing, if there is devaluation, the cost of living will go up. Then if there is prosperity in the country, the cost of living will go up because there will be more money and, therefore, a certain amount of inflation will take place.

Today much of the money that went out for the import of food is going back into the pockets of the farmers. They have more money, they are more prosperous and their purchasing power is more. Unfortunately, there are not enough goods for them to buy because we have to restrict our imports. So the cost of living will go up.

Besides, in any agricultural country, it is the aim of the Government and the people to keep up the price of their produce. For instance, if the price of produce goes down, it will mean great suffering for the producers. In America where, owing to very good agricultural methods, they produce a lot of wheat, much more



[මෙදෙනමාරිය නොනොනන්]

than they require, what happens is that when there is a glut of wheat after a good harvest, the price of wheat comes tumbling down. The price goes down and the farmers are in distress. So the Government is forced to siphon off the excess wheat, buy it over at a fixed price, keep the price of wheat up and prevent the excess from coming into the market and pulling down the price. That excess was formerly burnt or dumped into the sea. Now it goes to various countries under P. L. 480.

It is the policy of any Government or any nation to keep the price of their local produce as high as possible and not allow it to go down. So the fact that prices of certain of our local produce are going up is not something that is bad. The money goes back to our people—provided, of course, the marketing is correct and the middleman does not swallow it up. That is what Governments have to see to. But the fact that the cost of living is going up is not a bad sign altogether provided the produce is local produce.

Sir, in regard to the duty on arrack, in Ceylon as in any other country, one source of revenue is alcohol. Another source of revenue is tobacco. One fact I notice about this is that today we are importing more yeast than is required for our needs. Hundred per cent of the yeast, or a good part of it, imported is used by the *kasippu* dealers. That is so in the case of dates, not the good quality dates but the inferior quality dates which we have to import from Iraq in exchange for our tea. All that goes into the hands of the *kasippu* dealers. I think all our requirements of yeast for bakers can be got from our local breweries. The by-product from these breweries can be taken over by the Government and issued under quota to the bakers. That is the only way you can control the menace of *kasippu*. If the increased duty on coconut arrack is going to make some people turn to

*kasippu* then that would be a dis-service to the people of this country. Many cases of disease in the liver are traceable to the consumption of *kasippu*. You can save on hospital bills and preserve the health of the people by preventing the manufacture of *kasippu* which can be done by stopping the import of such a large amount of yeast. You can even bring yeast under the FEECs scheme.

The price of tobacco has gone up by one cent as a result of the increased duty. In spite of the increase in price people will continue to smoke. You cannot help that.

Hon Members of the Opposition have complained against the Ceylon Broadcasting Corporation giving publicity to the food drive and the results of the food drive. It seems that they are rather worried that the Grow More Food campaign is a success. They do not want it to be publicized. They want it suppressed.

I want to say this about the mortgage of rice ration books. The previous Government gave Rs. 34 million to farmers for a whole year whereas the present Government has given for the *maha* crop only Rs. 66 million. As a result of good seed paddy and fertilizer, farmers are getting good crops. So why cannot they repay the loans? If there is some difficulty arising out of causes beyond their control the rice ration books are not mortgaged. They are allowed to carry on for another two or three harvests. Only in cases where there is no excuse for their not returning the loan in due course do they have to mortgage their ration books. There also, I understand, there has been a mistake. Certain officials have misunderstood the rule and made the people mortgage the whole ration book. They are supposed to take only the coupon, credit the man with one rupee, and thereby try and recover the money. Now, there is nothing wrong about the coupons being mortgaged because you find that the ration book has become a negotiable instrument. I find many people mortgaging their ration books



to the boutiques from which they buy their supplies and at the end of the month recover their ration books when they draw their salaries. So that, the ration book has become a negotiable instrument. The Government is not doing anything wrong, because it has helped the farmers as never before, and it has to see that the farmers do not swindle the Government, which is the State and, therefore, the people.

**கொழும்பு**

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please! The Deputy Chairman of Committees will not take the Chair.

අනුරූප කමිටියකුම මූලසනයෙන් ඉවත් වූයෙන්, කුරුම සහ නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමා මූලසනාරූඪ විය.

அதன் பிறகு, சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள் அக்கிராசனத்தி னின்றும் நீங்கவே, குழுக்களின் உப அ : சனர் அவர்கள் [ஜி. ஜே. பாரிஸ் பெரேரா] தலைமை தாங்கினார்கள்.

Whereupon MR. SPEAKER left the Chair, and MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES. [MR. G. J. PARIS PERERA] took the Chair.

**வேலூர் கிணைப்பை**

(டொக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

Another criticism levelled against this food drive is that the private sector has been encouraged to come in in a big way. The question is asked: "Why has it not been nationalized?" That is the criticism.

We know how colonization and the food drive, according to the normal nationalized methods, have served us. There has been a tremendous amount of input of money, time and labour, but the returns have been very slow and far between. We cannot say that the vast expenditure that was incurred in Gal Oya, in Kantalai, and in Ella have given us quick returns. Very slow returns have been coming in and that too over a long period.

We are now faced with a position where we want quick returns and where the Government has not sufficient money to invest. So it has got the private sector to invest capital and to bring in machinery. That was a very good move on the part of the Government. The private sector was encouraged to put in money in order to get a quick return and thereby accelerate the food drive.

It may be that some people have not been very keen in this respect. In such cases the Government can take the necessary steps to see that those who have enjoyed certain privileges channel their efforts towards the desired goal. The Government has the sanctions in its hands to see that the people discharge their obligations and not merely enjoy the five-year tax holiday and get all the benefits. The Government has got the sanctions in its hands to see that it is done and to punish the people who are not playing the game.

As I said, the criticism of all the Members who spoke from the other side was on the rice cut, devaluation, the cost of living, unemployment, arrack, cigarettes, FECCs and the C.B.C's propaganda about the food drive. The only one in the Opposition who gave some little thought to the Budget and spoke with some sense as usual was the conjoint Member for Colombo South, (Mr. Bernard Soysa). He himself found nothing wrong with the Budget; but with his clever manipulation of words, he tried to say something against the Budget. He said he objects to the view that the fundamental answer to the continuing balance of payments problem is self-sufficiency in food. I am surprised that he does not think it fundamental. He says the fundamental answer must be to go down to the roots of the problem, not merely on the question of import substitution but on the question of an investment programme.

When a ship is sinking owing to a big hole in the keel the fundamental problem is to plug the hole and save the ship from sinking. When a man



[Continued] is bleeding to death the fundamental problem, to save his life, is to stop the bleeding. Every year this country is sending out Rs. 1,000 million worth of foreign exchange and that is the fundamental problem that should be solved. Once we solve that problem and save our precious foreign exchange, we can think of other fundamental things. We will be able to pump back to the farmer, the poor people in the villages, at least 80 per cent of that sum. Then they will have more money in their hands and their buying power will be greatly increased.

That is the basis of industrial development in any country. Industrial development in any country will depend on the purchasing power of the people. So the saving of Rs. 1,000 million and the pumping back of that money to the people is fundamental to economic reconstruction in this country.

I am very sorry to note that the hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa) missed that point. He is the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, and I cannot understand why he missed it.

We have a problem here in Ceylon. How far can we be a welfare state and how far can we be a developed state? We do not have sufficient money yet to have a first-class welfare state as in advanced countries in the West and also to develop our economy which is backward. To develop our economy we want not only money but also our effort, our thinking and drive. So there must come a time when we must evaluate our position—as the Hon. Minister of Education said—to give free schools, free hostels, free maintenance, free books, subsidized bus travel, subsidized railway travel and so on. Can we afford this? Yet what about the future? Unless, as the hon. Member for Colombo South said, we think of our investment programme, a build-up for the future, where will we be?

Our population is increasing by 300,000 every year. When we subtract from this about 100,000 children who leave school every year, there is still another 200,000 for whom we have to find accommodation in our schools. New schools will have to be put up and teachers will have to be recruited. How about the medical treatment for these children?

So we are faced with a tremendous problem in the future. Sometime or other we got to tighten our belts. A programme of development seems to be much more necessary than a programme of expenditure. Our leftist friends can talk about better hospitals, better schools, playgrounds, and so on. While it may be popular for a time in the next generation we will become bankrupt and it will become absolutely impossible for us to go on.

This Budget is a budget which is concentrating on development. So much so, this is the biggest Budget ever produced in this country with an expenditure of over Rs. 3,000 million and a gap of Rs. 1,000 million to be bridged. The biggest expenditure to be incurred is mainly on development, on the agricultural front which is of fundamental importance at this moment, and also on the industrial front. As a result of the increased production in the agricultural front it has been possible to save a considerable amount of foreign exchange thus enabling the Government to concentrate still further on the industrial front. Even in this Budget a very large sum has been earmarked for industrial development, more than double the amount ever contemplated by the previous Government. Here in the Budget it is given in black and white and we can find it out easily by ourselves.

Now, Sir, on the question of the investment programme for the future, we have got to consider the very great problem of capital formation. There are three things they say you need to win a war—men, money and ammunition. So, for industrial development what is most important



are men; we want men who will work, men who will be dedicated to the country whether they are clerks, workers, or any others. The second important factor is money. As I told you, with our rapidly growing population—we have over 300,000 children born every year, in the next year it may be still more, and it will go on increasing—we have got to make investments. Capital must be invested for capital formation. And then we must have the necessary machinery for the industries and agricultural purposes. Otherwise we cannot face the future and provide for the generation to come.

Faced with this great problem the Prime Minister had to take certain very unpopular measures in the interest of the future of this country. Firstly the Prime Minister had to cut the rice ration and then follow it up with the devaluation of the rupee.

Now we have to conserve as much capital as possible and put it back into development. Towards this end, the previous Minister of Finance introduced what is called a tax holiday—I give him credit for that—with a view to inducing the private sector to invest. I am sorry that the Taxation Commission, purely viewing it from a taxation point of view, has recommended that it should not be continued. I feel that if we are to induce people to invest capital a tax holiday is a very good incentive. Capital formation is of paramount importance in this country if we are to keep abreast with the growing population.

With regard to the progress that this Government has made in the sphere of agricultural development everyone of the Opposition Members questioned the accuracy of the figures in relation to paddy production. Naturally, Sir, they are very worried that paddy is being produced in such large quantities, that the food drive has been a success, that it is gaining ground day by day, and the fact that the drain of foreign exchange by the importation of rice to a considerable extent has been halted.

In 1967, 55 million bushels of rice were produced. This year, already for the *maha* alone, 43 million bushels have been produced, and, if for the *yala* 21 million bushels are obtained as expected, we will have 63 to 64 million bushels, which will be almost 70 per cent of our needs. That achievement is a tremendous defeat for the Opposition which cannot face it. So, they are worried about the C. B. C. propaganda on this line. Why do they suspect that these figures are wrong? If they go round the country they will see the smiling fields richly laden with ears of corn. They will see the farmers building new houses, renovating their old ones and the wives and children of the farmers better dressed. This is not mere C. B. C. talk, but it can be visually seen that there is prosperity in this country. I believe that this attitude of theirs is due to a certain amount of consciousness of defeat, and they have a guilty conscience.

In 1964, according to their figures which they put out just before the general election, they said that they had obtained 50.5 million bushels and claimed that that was a great achievement. Yes, it is, if it was so. But in the same year the quantity of rice imported was 13 million cwts. In the year 1963, 49.2 million bushels of rice were produced in the country and the quantity imported was nearly 8 million cwts of rice. In 1964, though they advertised, when the elections were coming, that they had obtained 50.5 million bushels of rice they imported 13 million cwts. of rice. That is rather suspicious. And they also increased the flour imports from 2,460,000 cwts. to 6,163,000 cwts. Those figures contradict each other. If they had produced so much rice, why did they import so much extra rice, and so much extra flour? That is why they, having a guilty conscience themselves, think that we are repeating what they had done.—[Interruption].

I shall give the explanation. In December 1966 a cut on the rice ration was ordered and there was a



[වෛද්‍යවරයා නොහොත්]

great fear and uproar that if there is no rice people will want wheat flour. Whatever the ration be people must eat. We could not import rice. The rice-cut was forced on us because of the shortage of rice in the world markets and there was no rice available any where at that particular point of time. So, the Government had to import wheat flour to make up for the rice that was not available.

You do not import wheat flour on the spur of the moment; you have to import it well ahead. You must have at least 6 months to make the contract, and there must also be 3 months stocks in the country. So, in 1967 although we obtained 55.1 million bushels of rice, produced in this country, we increased our import of flour to 10 million cwts. because of the cut in the rice ration in 1966. We could not in December 1966 anticipate a big *maha* crop. The 1965 *maha* crop was a great success though the *yala* was spoilt by adverse weather. But, in anticipation, or just as an extra safeguard 10 million cwts of flour was imported in 1967. This year however, the imports of wheat flour have been greatly reduced. In fact the Hon. Prime Minister has told America that under P. L 480 we do not want so much flour and to cut it down considerably. So, that is proof that the figures given by this Government in regard to the success of the Food Drive, particularly where paddy production is concerned, are correct.

I do not wish to go into details with regard to these matters at this stage; we can do so in the Committee stage of the Budget. But I want to say once again that there must be a re-appraisal of our position: how much can we really afford in the way of a welfare state, and how much should we devote to development? Those are the two main questions that face us.

It is true that there is a budget deficit of Rs. 1,000 million. But it must be remembered that most of the money is to be spent on development in agriculture and industry, and

though there would be a large debt to pay it could be paid by future generations out of revenue from increased agricultural and industrial output. So, this Budget is not a consumption Budget, but an investment Budget.

Whenever there is an important debate in this House, like the Throne Speech Debate or the Budget Debate, some of the Members of the Opposition consider it a good thing to attack the Federal Party. Several canards have been raised and shameless lies and malicious falsehoods have been uttered, which should not be allowed to go unchallenged. Firstly, the L. S. S. P. Member for Agalawatta (Dr. Colvin R. de Silva) —I am sorry he is not here—has said that Mr. Chelvanayakam had sent a telegram to the Queen not to hand over the Trincomalee harbour. These are the type of lies uttered by these people without any kind of self-respect. This is a canard which I want to nail to the counter, and I challenge anybody to produce any kind of evidence in support of this allegation.

When the Trincomalee harbour was taken over we acclaimed it, but we told the then Prime Minister, the late Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike, that he should see to it that the employees of the bases were not forgotten but that they were absorbed into government departments, and so on.

Then there is another oft-repeated canard that we opposed the setting up of the Port (Cargo) Corporation. We welcomed it openly, both inside this House and outside it. Similarly, when the Galle harbour was nationalized we approved of it. In fact, when the Port (Cargo) Corporation was set up, some of our members were present and spoke at the opening ceremony. It is true that we did not recommend the take-over of the Trincomalee harbour because the experience in the Colombo harbour and the Galle harbour had been rather unfortunate for the country: operational costs had increased by nearly 100 per cent; there were delays as a result of which



the demurrage that had to be paid by us was one of the highest in the world; the value of cargo that had either been lost, stolen or destroyed, had also increased.

Then, the Galle harbour has been a running sore as far as the Government is concerned. Only about Rs. 50,000 worth of exports and imports are handled there, and there is a loss of Rs. 2 million every year. Therefore, we felt that nationalization of the Trincomalee harbour would mean the draining away of the country's money without putting it to proper use. We felt that the present contract system was not good. We did not want it. Instead of having the port nationalized we wanted the co-operative system tried out. We were prepared to give a foolproof system under which the workers would have a share of the profits and so would the administrators. If they do not have a vested interest they will not care to work.

Let us take, for instance, the case where a ship carrying some essential foodstuff is in harbour while at the same time there is a scarcity of that same foodstuff in the country. If the ship comes in on a pre-poya day, the men would not work on that day nor the next day, the poya day. As a result there would be delay. If the workers are shareholders they would take the trouble to work on the pre-poya day and the poya day and clear the goods, thereby helping themselves as well as the country.

In Russia and China there are no trade unions, and every man has to do a certain norm of work and every administrator has to keep to a certain target. There is complete discipline there. If they do not keep to that target or norm of work they may be sent to Siberia or punished in some other way.

We felt that in the interests of the country it would be better to try the co-operative plan in the Trincomalee harbour.

Then, there is the canard about the Paddy Lands Act. We supported that legislation, but we asked for two amendments. We wanted, first of all, the *ande* cultivators to be given the land. We said that he must own the land. After three years' trial as tenant, if he had cultivated the land successfully the Government, we said, should buy that land and give it to him, and the owner should be paid off. The *ande* cultivator would not get the land as a gift from the Government. He would have to pay its value to the Government in instalments. That is what we suggested, because the poor owner would have no rights over his land and he could not get rid of the tenant however useless or bad he may be. I do not think the Paddy Lands Act has worked very well yet.

Secondly, we opposed the Paddy Lands Act because there was discriminatory planning against a section of the Tamil people in it. Surely, as representatives of the Tamil people we cannot allow legislation which discriminates against a section of the Tamil people? On these two grounds we opposed that Act but we supported the principle for which it stood.

Then, there is the canard about the Petroleum Corporation.—[*Interruption*]. It is a damnable lie.

Then there is the canard about the D. C. Bill. On the D. C. Bill we have had a plethora of lies, malicious falsehoods, from politicians and, I am sorry to say, from the clergy. It was said that it was a step towards federalism. It was not a step towards federalism; in fact, it was a step away from federalism. In federalism you have autonomy; under the D. C. Bill there was no autonomy. The people of the area under a district council become the agents of the central government. Today the people have no share in the government. They are merely the ruled. The Ministers and the bureaucracy are the rulers. The people have no share in the government. Under the D. C. Bill the people would have had a



[වෛද්‍යවරයා කතාකරනවා]

share in the government. They could have initiated schemes for the betterment of their areas and they would have been directly connected with the central government. Now they are under the kachcheries.

So district councils would have been a good thing for the Tamils, the Sinhalese and everybody else. They would have changed the psychology of the people. The people would have been more responsible. What do they do now? Once in five years they vote a Government into power. After that they are at the mercy of the Government, the Government servants and Ministers like the Minister of Education. So that, as I said, the establishment of district councils would have been a step away from federalism.—  
[Interruption].

Hon. Members on the other side do not know what federalism is. They do not know what a federal state is. They do not even know what district councils are. Ignorant of these things they talk to the people about such matters.—[Interruption]. In any country where there are different races and languages the only way to achieve unity and solidarity is by adopting the federal system. It has worked well in other countries. Nowhere has the federal system failed. Take Switzerland, take Russia which has sixty-nine different states, take Pakistan, India, Czechoslovakia, and Canada; then again there is Yugoslavia which is a very fine example. All these countries have become united and strengthened by the federal system.

In Ceylon, history has been badly misrepresented. Because there have been invasions from South India, it is argued by some that no part of Ceylon should have a federal state. That, Sir, is a misrepresentation of history. The South Indian kings came to Tamilnad as conquerors, not as deliverers. I know it because my family has been associated with Jaffna for many years in a capacity where we had to resist the foreign

invaders. We were the first sufferers. We were the buffer state between the Indian invaders and the rest of the country. No doubt we did not suffer as much as the Sinhalese did because there was no language difficulty, no religious difficulty, no cultural difficulty, but politically and militarily they had to fight us.

I can give you a good example from present day history. Take the old Czechoslovakia, it was a united state. It had a very fine Government. President Benes was a very liberal and very good leader. The Czechs were the majority, the Slovaks and the Germans were in a minority. Therefore the minorities felt that they were not first-class citizens, that they were second-class citizens, dominated citizens. There was a certain measure of grievance.

Hitler's prestige at that time was very high. He wanted German domination, and he wanted the prestige of the Germans in Czechoslovakia to go up. Therefore he appealed to the minority Germans to follow him, and with their help he conquered Czechoslovakia.

But compare that with Switzerland. In Switzerland there was a federal state. The Germans were in a majority there and Hitler tried his utmost to induce the Germans in Switzerland to join him. The Germans in Switzerland refused to join Hitler. Why? Because the federal union had bound them together and had made them one consolidated unit. A federal union is the only way by which you can safeguard this country from invasion. The only reason why Switzerland was safeguarded from German invasion was because German people were part of the Federal Union of Switzerland. So, this fear is wrong—historically wrong, scientifically wrong, psychologically wrong—and unnecessary. Because we are ourselves ignorant we want to teach ignorance to others.







[ආදියදාස මයා.]

නම් එයට කිසි ලෙසකින්වත් විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වය බාධා නොකරන බව, මේ අවස්ථාවේදී ප්‍රකාශ කරන්න මා කැමතියි.

එපමණක් නොවෙයි, සහල් නිෂ්පාදනය සඳහා මේ රටේ ගොවි ජනතාවට කොපමණ ආධාර දී තිබෙනවාද කියා එතුමා විස්තරයක් කළා. මේ කාරණය මගේ ආසනයටද බලපාන නිසා ඒ පිළිබඳව යමක් සඳහන් කිරීමට මා අදහස් කරනවා. මගේ ආසනයට බලපා ඇත්තේ මෙන්ම මේ ආකාරයටයි. රජයේ ණය ලබා ගැනීමට නම් හාල් සලාක පොත් උකස් කළ යුතුයි. එසේ උකස් කිරීම නිසා සමහර අවස්ථාවලදී අප්‍රමාණ කරදරවලට ගොවි ජනතාවට මුහුණ පාන්න සිදු වෙනවා. අනුරාධපුරයේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (කේ. බී. රත්නායක මයා.) ප්‍රකාශ කළා, ඒ ප්‍රදේශයේ වැව් සිදි යාම නිසා, ප්‍රදේශයේ ජනතාවට ජලය බෙදා දෙන්නේ සලාක ක්‍රමයටය කියා. එවැනි අවස්ථාවක් ඇති වුණොත් ඒ ප්‍රදේශවල ජීවත්වන ගොවි ජනතාව වගා කරන්නේ කොහොමද? තමන්ගේ වගාවන්ට සිද්ධ වෙන්නේ කුමක්ද? එබඳු අවාසනාවන්ත තත්ත්වයකට මුහුණ දෙන්න සිදු වුණොත්, හාල් පොත් උකස් කර ණය මුදල් ලබාගත් ගොවීන් තම දරුවන්ට කන්න දෙන්න කොහොමද? මෙම ප්‍රශ්නය අපේ ප්‍රදේශයේ ඉතාමත් බරපතල ලෙසින් බලපානවා. මන්ද? මේ අවස්ථාවල අපේ ප්‍රදේශයේ විශාල නියඟයක් පවතිනවා. මේ නිසා ගොවිතැන් විශාල වශයෙන් පාළු වී යනවා. ඒ අන්දමට ගොවිතැන් පාළු වී ගිය අවස්ථාවලදී හෝ පාළු වන අවස්ථාවලදී පවුලේ සහල් පොත් උකස් කර ඇති නම් ඒ උදව්‍ය ජීවත්වන්නේ කොහොමද කියා කල්පනා කර බලන ලෙස මතක් කරනවා. තමන්ට ලැබිය යුතු අස්වැන්න නොලැබී යනවා නම්, වගාව විනාශ වී යනවා නම්, ඒ ගොවීන් තම දරු පවුලේ නඩත්තු කරන්නේ කොහොමද, ඔවුන්ට කන්න දෙන්නේ කොහොමද? එම නිසා, මා රජයෙන් ඉතා ඕනෑකමින් ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා, ණය මුදල් දීමේදී ගොවි ජනතාවගේ සහල් පොත් උකස් වශයෙන් තබා ගන්නා ඒ ණය කියා

වෙස්සන්තර ක්‍රමයට මහජනයාට හාල් සලාකය නොමිලයේ දෙනවා යයි තමුන් නාත්සේලා කියනවා. ඒ ක්‍රමය ගැන මා පසුව විස්තර කරන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. පුද්ගලයකුගේවත් ආණ්ඩුවේ වත් නොව, මහජනයාට හිමි දෙයක් වන හාල් සලාකය නියම විධියට ඔවුන්ට ලබා දීම, තමුන් නාත්සේලාගේ යුතුකමක්. එම නිසා, ඒ හාල් සලාකයට ඇඟිලි නොගසන ලෙස, හාල් සලාකයත් සමග සෙල්ලම් නොකරන ලෙස, ඉතා කරුණාවෙන් ආණ්ඩුවෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා.

අප ගත කළ හා දැනට ගත කරන යුග දෙක සම්බන්ධයෙන් මේ ගරු සභාවට කරුණු කීපයක් ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නට මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. අප ජීවත් වන මේ යුගයට වෙස්සන්තර යුගය යනුවෙන් සමහරුන් කියනවා. ඒ වාගේම, මීට කලින් අප ජීවත් වූ යුගය මැතිණියගේ යුගය ලෙස සමහරුන් හඳුන්වනවා. පළමු කොටම, මැතිණියගේ යුගය ගැන කල්පනා කර බලමු. මා මේ යුග දෙකේ තත්ත්වය විස්තර කර දීම සඳහා ගණන් වශයක් හදාගෙන තිබෙනවා. හැබැයි, එක් එක්කොනා එක එක විධියට ගණන් හදන්නට පුළුවනි. මැතිණියගේ යුගයේදී, සලාක පොතකට හාල් සේරු දෙක බැගින් දුන්නා. ඒ කාලයේ පිටරිටින් හාල් ලැබුණේ, සේරුවක් සත 80 ගණනේයි. ඒ අනුව, සලාක පොතක හාල් වෙනුවෙන් මැතිණියගේ ආණ්ඩුවට රුපියල් 1.60 ක් වියදම් වුණා. මැතිණියගේ යුගයේදී ඒ හාල් සේරු දෙක දුන්නේ, සේරුවක් සත 25 බැගින් සත 50 කටයි. ඒ හේතුවකට ගෙන, රුපියල් 1.10 ක් රජයට පාඩු වුණා. හාල් සලාක පොතක් වෙනුවෙන්, ඒ අනුව, සති 52ක—අවුරුද්දක—හාල් සලාකය වෙනුවෙන්, එක පොතකට රුපියල් 57.20ක් රජය පාඩු වින්දා. ලංකාවේ ජනගහනය 1,20,00,000ක් පමණ වෙනවා. 20,00,000 පැත්තකට දමා, 1,00,00,000 පමණක් ගනිමු. ඒ විධියට, අවුරුද්දකට 1,00,00,000 ජනතාවට හාල් සැපයීම සඳහා, මැතිණියගේ යුගයේදී රුපියල් 57,20,00,000ක් පාඩු වින්දා.

ඊළඟට අපි බලමු, තමුන් නාත්සේලාගේ වෙස්සන්තර යුගය ගැන. දැන් හාල් ගණන් කියා, හාල් සේරුවක් සඳහා



රුපියලක් රජයට වියදම් වෙනවා යයි අපි හිතමු. හාල් සේරුවක් රුපියල ගණනේ අරගෙන, මේ රජය එය නොමිලයේ මහ ජනයාට දෙනවා. ඒ අනුව, හාල් සලාක පොතක් වෙනුවෙන් රජයට සතියකට පාඩු වන්නේ, රුපියලක් පමණයි. මැතිණියගේ යුගයේදී හාල් සලාක පොතක් වෙනුවෙන් රුපියල් 1.10 ක පාඩුවක් රජය දැරුවා. එහෙම නම්, අද තමුන් තාන්සේලා පසුගිය රජයට වඩා ශත 10 ක් අඩුවෙනුයි, සතියක හාල් සලාකය වෙනුවෙන් පාඩු විදින්නේ. එහෙම නම් තමුන් තාන්සේලාට සති 52 කට—අවුරුද්දකට—හාල් සලාක පොත කින් රුපියල් 5.20 ක් ඉතිරියි, ලාභයි. එය කෝටියෙන් වැඩි කර බැලුවාම, මේ වෙස්සන්තර යුගයේදී තමුන් තාන්සේලා අවුරුද්දකට රුපියල් 5,20,00,000 ක ලාභයක් ලබන බව පැහැදිලි වෙනවා. ඔන්න, මැතිණියගේ යුගයේත්, මේ වෙස්සන්තර යුගයේත් වෙනස.

**එස්. බී. හේරත් මයා.** (හිරියාල)  
 (திரு. எஸ். பி. ஹேரத்—ஹிரியால்)  
 (Mr. S. B. Herat—Hiriyala)  
 මය ගණන් වැරදියි.

**ආරියදාස මයා.**  
 (திரு. ஆரியதாச)  
 (Mr. Ariyadasa)

වැරදි නම් හරිගස්සන්න. [බාබාකිරිමි]

සෞඛ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමාගේ කථාවෙන් පැන නැඟුණු ප්‍රශ්න රාශියක් ගැනත් මේ අවස්ථාවේදී කථා කරන්නට මා බලා පොරොත්තු වෙනවා. මා එසේ කථා කරන්නේ, ඒ ප්‍රශ්න අපේ ප්‍රදේශවලට බල පාන නිසයි. එතුමාගේ කථාව පටන් ගත්තේ හොඳ වාක්‍යයකින්. “ආරෝග්‍යා පරමා ලාභා” යනුවෙන් පවසමිනුයි, එතුමා තම කථාව ඇරඹුවේ. ඔව්, නිරෝගි භාවය ඉතා වැදගත්. ඒ විධියට සිය කථාව ආරම්භ කළ සෞඛ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා, මැලේරියා රෝගය ගැන විස්තරයක් කොට, දැන් මැලේරියා රෝගය එක්තරා පාලන තත්ත්වයකට ගෙනැවිත් තිබෙනවා යයි කීවා. එහෙත් මට නම් හිතන්න බෑ, මැලේරියා රෝගය එක්තරා පාලන තත්ත්වයකට ගෙනැවිත් තිබෙනවාය කියා. මුළු හපුතලේ ඡන්ද දායක කොට්ඨාශයම සනීපදායක ප්‍රදේශයක් හැටියටයි, කවුරුකුත් සලකන්නේ නැති. ඔබ්බට මැලේරියා රෝගය

ඒවාගේම බණ්ඩාරවෙලත් සනීපදායක ප්‍රදේශයක්. නමුත් අද හපුතලේ ආරෝග්‍ය ශාලාවෙන් මැලේරියා රෝගීන් සිටිනවා. හපුතලේ වැනි සනීපදායක ප්‍රදේශයකත් අද මැලේරියා රෝගය තිබෙනවා නම් බිංහුන්න ආදී ප්‍රදේශවල ඒ රෝගය පැතිරෙන්නේ නැද්ද? එමනිසා මැලේරියා රෝගය පාලන තත්ත්වයකට ගෙනාවාය කියා මේ අවස්ථාවේදී සතුටුවීම සුදුසු නැහැ. මැලේරියා රෝගය සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම රටින් තුරන් කිරීම සඳහා විශාල උත්සාහයක් දැරා විශාල වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් ගෙන යන්නට ඕනෑ. ජෙල් වැනි තෙල් සමාගම්වලට මුදල් නොගෙවූ නිසා ඒ සමාගම්වලින් මැයි මදුරු නාශක බෙහෙත් වගී අපට ලැබුණේ නැත, එමනිසා—මෙරටට අවශ්‍ය කරන ඒ බෙහෙත් ප්‍රමාණය ලබා ගන්නට නොහැකි වූ නිසා—මේ රටේ නැවත වරක් මැලේරියා රෝගය පැතිරෙන්නට පටන් ගත්තාය යන අදහස ගරු සෞඛ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා ප්‍රකාශ කළා. දැන් මේ ආණ්ඩුව තෙල් සමාගම් වලට ඒ මුදල් දී තිබෙනවා නොවැ. එහෙම නම් දැන් කරන්නට තිබෙන්නේ හැකි තරම් ඉක්මණින් ඒ වුවමනා මැයි මදුරු නාශක බෙහෙත් වගී ලබා ගෙන නැවත වරක් මේ රටින් මැලේරියා රෝගය තුරන් කිරීමට කටයුතු යෙදීමයි.

මේ රටට අවශ්‍ය බෙහෙත් ප්‍රමාණය සාධාරණ මිලට ලබා දීමට බැටිවී තිබෙන්නේ අකෘතඥවාදී වංචනික වෙළඳුන් නිසාය කියා ගරු ඇමතිතුමා කියන්නට යෙදුණා. එසේ නම් මේකට සුළු ප්‍රතිකාරයයි කළයුතුව තිබෙන්නේ. අවශ්‍ය බෙහෙත් ගෙන්වීමේදී වෙළඳුන් වංචනික විධියට ක්‍රියා කරනවා නම් බෙහෙත් ගෙන්වීම රජයට පවරා ගන්න. රජය මගින් මේ රටට වුවමනා බෙහෙත් ප්‍රමාණය ගෙන්වා ආරෝග්‍යශාලාවලට බෙදා දෙන්න. ඇත්ත වශයෙන් ගරු සෞඛ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා උත්සාහ වන්නට වැඩ කරන ඇමතිවරයකු බව මා මේ අවස්ථාවේදී කියන්නට සතුටුයි. අද අපේ ආරෝග්‍යශාලාවල තිබෙන බෙහෙත් ප්‍රමාණය දිනෙන් දිනම අඩු වෙනවා. රෝගීන්ට වුවමනා කරන බෙහෙත් නැත කියා හපුතලේ ආරෝග්‍යශාලාවෙන් මට නොයෙක් වර පැමිණිලි කරනවා. ඊට හේතුව වුවමනා ප්‍රමාණයට බෙහෙත් වගී නොලැබීමයි. හපුතලේ පමණක් නොව, බණ්ඩාරවෙල ආරෝග්‍යශාලාවට



[ආර්යදාස මය.]

ගියත් වැලිමඩ ආරෝග්‍යශාලාවට ගියත් බදුලු ආරෝග්‍යශාලාවට ගියත් තත්ත්වය ඒකයි. අවශ්‍ය බෙහෙත් නැහැ. එමනිසා රෝගීන්ට වෙදකම් කරන්නට පුළුවන් කමක් නැහැ. අකෘතඥවෘද්ධී අතරමැදියන් නොහොත් වෙළඳුන් රජයට කරදර කරනවා නම් කළයුතුව තිබෙන්නේ ඔවුන් පන්තා දමා, ඔවුන්ගේ බලපත්‍ර සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම අවලංගු කර දමා, බෙහෙත් ගෙන්වීම රජය මගින් කිපීමයි. එය අවශ්‍යයෙන්ම කළයුතු දෙයක් බව මා ගරු සෞඛ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමාට පෙන්වා දෙන්නට සතුටුයි.

ආරෝග්‍යශාලාවලට ආහාර සැපයීම පිළිබඳව කපා කරන අවස්ථාවේදී සෞඛ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා විරුද්ධ පක්ෂයේ නායිකාව කර තිබෙන ප්‍රකාශයක් ගැන සඳහන් කළා. සෞඛ්‍ය දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව අද හිඟමනේ යනවාය කියා විරුද්ධ පක්ෂයේ නායිකාව ප්‍රකාශයක් කර තිබෙන්නේ වී නමුත් යම් කෙනෙකුට දැන පරිත්‍යාග කරන්නට පුළුවන්කමක් තිබෙනවා නම් බුද්දගමේ හැටියට එය උසස් ගුණ බර්මයක්ය කියා එතුමා කියන්නට යෙදුණා. එසේ කියමින් එතුමා දැන පාරමිතාව ගැනත් සඳහන් කළා. අද සෞඛ්‍ය අමාත්‍යාංශය එක්තරා හිඟමනක යෙදී සිටිනවායයි මමත් කියනවා. ආරෝග්‍ය ශාලාවල ලෙඩුන්ට අහාර යක් සැපයීම සදහා හාල් මිටක් ඉල්ලමින් අපත් අද හිඟමනක යෙදී සිටිනවා. ඒ අනුව නොයෙක් නොයෙක් ආයතනවලින් හාල් එකතු කරගෙන යනවා. රජයට යම් අමා රුවක් තිබී යම් අවස්ථාවක ඒ රෝගීන්ට දුන් බත් වේල නැති කළාය කියමු. එය තාවකාලික පියවරක් නම් කමක් නැහැ. නමුත් දැන් මේ වැඩ පිළිවෙළ දිගටම අනුගමනය කරගෙන යන තත්ත්වයක් තිබෙනවා. එම නිසා “ආරෝග්‍ය පරමා ලාභා” කිව්වාට මදි. දැන පාරමිතාව ගැන කිව්වාට මදි. අකුරුණ පළමුවන ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (හේමචන්ද්‍ර සිරිසේන මය.) මතක් කළ පාඨය නම් කාලෝචිතයි. “සබ්බෙ සත්තා ආහාරවිචිකිතා”. සෑම මනුෂ්‍යයකුම ජීවත් වන්නේ ආහාරය නිසයි. ආහාරය නිසා මනුෂ්‍යයා ජීවත්වෙනවා නම් රෝගීන් ගැන කෙසේ කල්පනා කළ යුතුද? රෝගියකුට පෝෂ්‍යදායක ආහාර අත්‍යවශ්‍යයෙන්ම වුවමනා කරනවා. දැරූ ප්‍රසන්නියක්

බලාපොරොත්තුවෙන් පසුවන මවකගේ ශරීරයට ශක්තිය ලබා ගැනීම සදහා පෝෂ්‍යජනක ආහාර වුවමනා කරනවා. මැලේරියා රෝගියකු ගැන බැලුවත් වෙනත් රෝගියකු ගැන බැලුවත් තත්ත්වය ඒකයි. අවශ්‍ය ආහාර නොලැබුනොත් රෝගය ඉක්මණට සුව වන්නේ නැහැ. මේ ආදී වශයෙන් කල්පනා කර බලන විට අවශ්‍යයෙන්ම රෝගීන්ට පෝෂ්‍යජනක ආහාර සැපයිය යුතු බව අපට පෙනී යනවා. ආරෝග්‍යශාලාවල ලෙඩුන්ගේ බත් වේල නැති කිරීම කොයි තරම් දුරට බලපා තිබෙනවාද යන්න මා පෙන්වා දෙන්නට සතුටුයි.

නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමනි, පසුගිය දිනවල බදුල්ලේ ආරෝග්‍ය ශාලාවේ මාතෘ නිවාසයට ගියා නම් ඇද උඩ එක් ලෙඩෙකුත්, ඇද යට එක් ලෙඩෙකුත්, දෙපැත්තේ තවත් ලෙඩුන් දෙදෙනෙකුත් සිටින බව දකින්නට පුළුවන් වෙනවා. අද සමහර විට සෞඛ්‍ය අමාත්‍යාංශයෙන් කියනවා ඇති, එවැනි තදබදයක් බදුල්ල ආරෝග්‍ය ශාලාවේ නැත කියා. සමහර විට දැන් සිටින්නේ ඇදත් උඩ සිටින ලෙඩුන් පමණක් විය හැකියි. නමුත් එය මේ රජයේ සෞඛ්‍ය දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවේ හපන්කමක් හැටියට සලකනවා නම් සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම වැරදියි. ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමනි, බදුල්ලේ ආරෝග්‍ය ශාලාවේ මාතෘ නිවාසයේ වැඩි වශයෙන් ඉන්නේ මහියංගනය, මොණරාගල ආදී ඇත ප්‍රදේශවලින් පැමිණෙන අයයි. ඉතා ඈත ප්‍රදේශවලින් එන ගැමි ජනතාවයි මේ මාතෘ නිවාසයේ සිටින්නේ. ඒ දුප්පත් ගැමි ජනතාවට පුළුවන්කමක් නැහැ ආහාර වේල් තුනම හෝටල්වලින් මිලදී ගැනීමට. නමුත් තාත්සේන් දන්නවා ඇති අද ආහාර වේල් දෙක තුනක් හෝටලයකින් ගැනීම ඉතා මත් අමාරු කරුණක් බව. අන්න ඒ නිසා පිටිසර ගැමි ජනතාව ආරෝග්‍යශාලාවට එන්න කැමති වන්නේ නැහැ. ඒ අය ආරෝග්‍යශාලාවට පැමිණීම සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම නතර කර දමා තිබෙනවා. අන්න ඒ නිසයි ආරෝග්‍ය ශාලාවේ තදබදය නැති වී තිබෙන්නේ. ඔන්න ඕකයි අද තිබෙන තත්ත්වය.



ඊළඟට ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමනි, සෞඛ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා උත්පත්ති පාලනය ගැනත් කපා කළා. ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම උත්පත්ති පාලනය මේ රටට සුදුසු නැහැ. ඒ හේතුවෙන් මේ රටේ සිංහල ජනතාව ක්‍රමයෙන් අඩු වේගයෙන් යන්න පුළුවනි. මේ සම්බන්ධයෙන් සෞඛ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා හොඳ තර්කයක් ඉදිරිපත් කළා. එතුමා විසින් කියන්න යෙදුණා 10 දෙනෙකු වාඩි විය යුතු කැම මේසයක 100 කට වාඩි වෙන්න පුළුවන්ද කියා. එහෙම නම් සමහර විට මේ රටත් පිරිටට යවන ද්‍රව්‍යවල මිල තවත් කාලයක් යන විට තවත් අඩු වී ගියොත් මොකක්ද කරන්නේ? මේ රටේ උත්පත්ති පාලනයක් ඇති කිරීමෙන් එයට පිළියමක් යෙදිය හැකිද?

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමනි, අපේ සිංහල ජනතාව අතරේ එක්තරා දුර්වල කමක් තිබෙනවා. යම්කිසි කෙනෙක් යම්කිසි දෙයක් කී විට එය ඒ ආකාරයෙන්ම හාර ගන්නවා. ඒ ගැන විකක් හිතා බලන්නෙ නැහැ. උත්පත්ති පාලනයෙන් මොකක්ද සිදු වන්නෙ කියා විකක් සිතා බලන්නෙ නැහැ. නමුත් මට ආරංචි ලැබී තිබෙන හැටියට විශේෂයෙන්ම වතු වල වැඩ කරන අය—උතුරු ප්‍රදේශයේ අය—පෙබරල් පක්ෂයේ අය—මේ උත්පත්ති පාලනයට විරුද්ධව කතා කර තිබෙනවා. පත්‍ර මගින් අපට එවැනි ආරංචියක් දැන ගන්න ලැබුණා. එහෙම නම් උතුරු තැගෙනහිර ප්‍රදේශයේ ජනතාව මේ උත්පත්ති පාලනය හාර ගැනීමට කැමති නැහැ. නමුත් අපේ සිංහල ජනතාව පමණක් උත්පත්ති පාලනය හොඳය කියා පිළිගන්නවා. මෙයින් සිදු වන්නේ කලකදී සිංහල ජාතිය—මේ රටේ මහ ජාතිය—සුළු ජාතියක් බවට පත් වීමයි. සමහර විට රජය බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා ඇති උත්පත්ති පාලනයක් ඇති නොකොළොත් හුඟක් අමාරු තත්ත්වයකට මුහුණ පාන්න සිදු වේය කියා. නමුත් මේ රටේ මහ ජාතිය වන සිංහල ජාතියට එයින් වන්නේ ලොකු පහරක්. ඒ නිසා මා ගරු සෞඛ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමාගෙන් මේ අවස්ථාවේදී ඉල්ලා සිටින්නේ සිංහල ජනතාවට උත්පත්ති පාලනය පුහුණු නොකරන ලෙසයි. ඒ වෙනුවට ලෝකයේ වෙනත් රටවල් වලට

මෙන් දරුවන් හත් අට දෙනා සිටින පවුල් වලට රජය මගින් යම්කිසි අතිරේක දීමනා වක් ලබා දීමට කටයුතු යොදන්න. එවැනි දීමනාවක් ලබා දීමෙන් මේ රටේ ජාතිය බේරා ගන්නා ලෙස මා රජයෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා. එහෙම නැතිව මේ රටේ සිංහල ජනතාව නැතිවේගෙන යන හැටිය බලා සිටීමට අපට පුළුවන්කමක් නැහැ. වර්තමාන රජයට යම්කිසි අමාරු තත්ත්වයකට නැත්නම් මුදල් හිඟයකට මුහුණ පාන්න සිදු වී තිබෙනවා නම් ඒ තත්ත්වය මහ හැරවීමට උත්පත්ති පාලනයක් ඇති කරනවා නම් එය සම්පූර්ණ වැරදි දෙයක්. එවැනි දෙයක් කිරීමට පෙළඹෙන්නේ වැරදි හැඟීමක් ඇතිවයි. ඒ නිසා මා ඉතා ගෞරවයෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටින්නේ මේ රටේ මහ ජාතිය වන සිංහල ජනතාවට උත්පත්ති පාලනයක් පුරුදු කර සිංහල ජාතිය සුළු ජාතියක් බවට පත් නොකරන්න ය කියායි.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමනි, මට තවත් කරුණු රාශියක් ගැන කතා කරන්න තිබෙනවා. ඒ අතරේදීම අපේ පත් කළ මන්ත්‍රී නොන්ඩමත් මහතා විසින් ඉදිරිපත් කරන්න යෙදුණ කරුණු කිහිපයක් ගැනත් වචනයක් කීම වැදගත්ය කියා මා සිතනවා. ඒ මන්ත්‍රී තුමා විසින් කියන ලද යම් යම් කරුණු සම්බන්ධව විග්‍රහයක් මේ අවස්ථාවේදී කළොත් සුදුසුය කියා මා සිතනවා.

විරුද්ධ පක්ෂයේ මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් රටේ බඩු හිඟයක් තිබෙනවා යැයි බොරු ප්‍රචාර කරගෙන යනවාය කියා ඒ ගරු මන්ත්‍රී තුමා ප්‍රකාශ කළා. මා ඒ ගරු මන්ත්‍රී තුමාට කියන්න කැමතියි, අද මේ රටේ බඩු හිඟය නිසා ගම්වල ජීවත් වන සිංහල ජනතාවට වඩා ලොකු අමාරුවකට වතු වල ජීවත් වන දුටුබ ජනතාව වැළි සිටින බව. මගේ ඡන්ද කොට්ඨාශයේ නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමනි, වැඩි පුර තිබෙන්නේ වතුයි. සිංහල ජනතාව ඇත්තේ 18,000ක් පමණයි. එහෙත් දුටුබ ඉන්දියානු ජනතාව 42,000 ක් පමණ ඉන්නවා. ඒ නිසා ඒ ජනතාව ආහාර අතීන් විදින දුක ගැන මා දන්නවා. සමහර විට ගම්මානවල ජීවත් වන සිංහල පවුල්වලට එදිනෙදා තමන්ට වතු කරන ආහාර වේල ලබා ගැනීමට



[ආර්යදාස මහා.]

පුළුවන් කමක් නැති වූ අවස්ථාවක මඤ්ඤෝඤාත්ත පදුරක් උගුල්ලා තමාගේ වෙල වෙල පිරිමසා ගැනීමට පුළුවන් වන නමුත්, තමන්ට වුවමනා කරන ආහාර වෙල ලබා ගැනීමට බැරි වුණොත් ඒ වෙනුවට වෙනත් දෙයක් පිරිමසා ගැනීමට පුළුවන් කමක් ඒ වතු වල සිටින දුටු ජනතාවට නැති බව මා ඒ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාට මතක් කරන්න කැමතියි. එබඳු තත්ත්වයක් තිබියදී ඒ ගරු මන්ත්‍රී තුමා මේ ගරු සභාවට පැමිණ කියනවා, මේ රටේ ආහාර හිඟයක් තිබෙන බවට ප්‍රචාරයක් තිබෙනවා නම් එය විරුද්ධ පක්ෂයේ බොරු ප්‍රචාරයක් පමණයි කියා. එය ඒ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා මේ අවස්ථාවේදී කිය යුතු දෙයක් නොවෙයි.

ඒ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා තවදුරටත් කිව්වේ මොනවාද කියා අපි විකක් සිතා බලමු. මේ රට සංවර්ධනය කරන්නට අප බලා පොරොත්තු වනවාය, නමුත් එය දවස කින් දෙකකින් කරන්නට පුළුවන් කමක් නැත, මේ රටේ රුකි රක්ෂා ප්‍රශ්නය නිරාකරණය කරන්නට අපි බලා පොරොත්තු වෙනවාය, නමුත් දවසකින් දෙකකින් තුනකින් හෝ සතියකින් එය කරන්නට පුළුවන් කමක් නැත, ඒ වාගේම මේ රටේ බඩු මිල පහත හෙළීම සතියකින් දෙකකින් කරන්නට පුළුවන් කමක් නැත, ඒ නිසා අපට ඒ කටයුතු ඉෂ්ට කිරීම සඳහා සැලකිය යුතු කාල සීමාවක් අවශ්‍යය කියා ඒ ගරු මන්ත්‍රී තුමා ප්‍රකාශ කරන්න යෙදුණා.

නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමනි, අපේ ආණ්ඩුව පැවති කාලයේදී ඒ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් මේ පැත්තේ ඉදගෙන කිව්වේ මොනවද කියා තමුන් නාන්සේත් මේ ගරු සභාවේ සිටි නිසා තමුන් නාන්සේට මතක ඇති. මහ ජනයාට වුවමනා කරන, මහජනයා පරි හෝජනය කරන අවශ්‍ය දේවල් අද ඉතා වේගයෙන් ගණන් වැඩි වෙගන යනවාය, එය නැවැත්වීමට රජය කිසියම් ප්‍රතිකර්මයක් යොදන්නේ නැත, මේ රටේ මහ ජනතාව විශාල හිරිහැරයකට මුහුණ පා සිටිනවාය කියා ඒ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරු විරුද්ධ පැත්තේ ඉදගෙන එදා කිව්වා. එපමණක් නොවෙයි, මේ රුකි රක්ෂා ප්‍රශ්නය ඉතා මේගවත් අන්දමට නරක අතට හැරීගෙන

යනවාය, කමිකරු කායාර්‍යවල ලක්ෂ සංඛ්‍යාවක් ලියා පදිංචි වී සිටිනවාය ඒ උදවියට මොනවාද කරන්නේ යනාදි වශයෙන් තර්ක ඉදිරිපත් කළා. ඔය විධියේ තර්ක එදා ඉදිරිපත් කළ ගරු මන්ත්‍රී වරුන්ට අද හොඳින් පැහැදිලි වෙනවා ඇති එදා ජීවන අංකයේත් අද ජීවන අංකයේත් වෙනස් කොපමණද කියා. අද ජීවන අංකය මට මතක හැටියට 122ක් නැත්නම් 123ක් දක්වා නැග තිබෙනවා. ඒත් එක හාල් සේරුවක් ගණන් ගැනීමෙන් පමණයි. වැඩි හාල් සේරුව ගණන් බැලුවොත් මා හිතන හැටියට 135කට පමණ තිබේ.

ඔය විධියට බලන විට අද රට මේ තරම් අමාරු තත්ත්වයකට පත් වී තිබියදී අපට මේ පැත්තේ ඉදගෙන තිබියදි ව ඉන්න පුළුවන්ද? ඒ ප්‍රශ්න ගැන සාධාරණ වශයෙන් කල්පනා කර බලන විට—එදා මේ පැත්තේ ඉදගෙන ඒ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් ප්‍රකාශ කර ඇති අදහස් ගැන කල්පනා කර බලන විට—ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම අපි මේ කරුණු ප්‍රචාරය කරනවා මදි. මා එසේ කියන්නේ ඇයි? තමුන් නාන්සේලා එදා කිව්වා, ඉර හඳ පවතිනා තුරා හාල් පතට අත ගසන්නේ නැත කියා. එහෙත් තමුන් නාන්සේලා අත ගැහැව්වා. මේ කාරණය ගැන අපි කොතෙක් කියා තිබෙනවාද කියනොත් අපට දැන් එය කීම තිත්ත වෙලා. එදා තමුන් නාන්සේලා යම් දෙයක් කිව්වාද, අද ඊට හාත්පසින්ම පටහැනිවයි තමුන් නාන්සේලා කටයුතු කරන්නේ. ඒ නිසා ඒ බව අපි කොතෙකුත් කියා දැන් තිත්ත වී තිබෙනවා—කීමෙන් ප්‍රයෝජනයක් නැහැ.

පත් කළ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා තවදුරටත් කිව්වා, අමාත්‍යාංශවලට සහ දෙපාර්ත මේන්තුවලට මුස්ලිම් ජාතිකයකු හෝ දුටුබ ජාතිකයකු හෝ පැමිණි විට, නාම ප්‍රවරු ව දෙමළෙන් ලියා නැති නිසා ලොකු අමාරු වකට ඒ තැනැත්තාට මුහුණ පන්නට සිද්ධ වෙනවාය කියා. ඒ ගැන මේ අවස්ථාවේදී එක් කරුණක් පමණක් දැන් මම සඳහන් කරන්නම්; විස්තර වශයෙන් මා පසුව කථා කරනවා. එතුමා එවැනි ප්‍රකාශයක් කළත් නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමනි,



මඩකලපුව ප්‍රදේශයට ගොස් බැලුවොත් එතුමාට පෙනේවි, මඩකලපුවේ මහා නගර සභාවේ නාම පුවරුව ලියා තිබෙන්නේ දෙමළෙන් පමණක් බව. මඩකලපුවේ තානායමේ නාම පුවරුව යොදා තිබෙන්නේ දෙමළෙන් පමණයි. සිංහලෙන් වත් ඉංග්‍රීසියෙන්වත් එහි කිසිවක් සඳහන් කර නැහැ. ඒවාගේම, මඩකලපුවේ මන්ත්‍රීතුමාගේ (සී. රාජදුරේ මයා.) මෝටර් රථයේ අංක පුවරුවේ ඊ. වයි. නැත්නම් ඊ. එන්. අංක යොදා තිබෙන්නේ දෙමළෙන්. ඒ ප්‍රදේශයෙහි ජීවත් වන වෙනත් මෝටර් රථ හිමියන්ගේ ඔවුන්ගේ රථවල අංක පුවරු දෙමළෙන් පමණක් යොදා තිබෙනවා. ශ්‍රී අකුර සහිත රථවල ඒ අකුරත් අංකත් දෙමළෙන් යොදා තිබෙනවා. ඊවයි, ඊඑන්, සීවයි, සීඑන්, ආදී අංක පුවරුත් සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම දෙමළෙනුයි යොදා තිබෙන්නේ. මේ තත්ත්වය අනුව, මේ රජයේ පාලනයේ දුර්වලකමක් නැද්දැයි මේ අවස්ථාවේදී රජයෙන් අහන්නට අපට සිදුවී තිබෙනවා. නියම විධියේ පාලනයක් තිබෙනවා නම්, ඒ පාලනයේ බලය මඩකලපුව පැත්තට පැතිරෙන්නේ නැද්දැයි මා රජයෙන් අහනවා. පෙබරල් පක්ෂයේ උදව්‍ය තරඟ වේය යන බියෙන් ඒ අයට මෙවැනි දේවල් කරන්නට ඉඩ දී නිශ්ශබ්දව සිටින මේ රජය නියම විධියට රට පාලනය කරනවායි කියන්නේ කොහොමද?

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමනි, උඹව ප්‍රදේශය ගැන කල්පනා කර බලන්න. බදුලු නගරය පෙන්නුම් කරන දැන්වීම් පුවරුවේ උඩින්ම සිංහලෙනුත් ඊට යටින් දෙමළෙනුත් ඊට පහළින් ඉංග්‍රීසියෙනුත් “බදුලු නගරය” යන්න සටහන් වී තිබෙන බව තමුත්තාත්සේත් දකින්නට ඇති. ඒ ප්‍රදේශයේ සෑම දැන්වීම් පුවරුවක්ම ඒ විධියට භාෂා තුනෙන්ම යොදා තිබෙනවා. හපුතලේ ඡන්ද දායක කොට්ඨාශයට ගියත් බණ්ඩාරවෙලට හෝ වැලිමඩට ගියත් ඒ තත්ත්වය දකින්නට පුළුවනි. එහෙත්, මඩකලපුවේ පමණක් දැන්වීම් පුවරු හා නාම පුවරු සෑම එකක්ම තිබෙන්නේ දෙමළෙන් පමණයි. එවැනි තත්ත්වයක් ඇති කරගෙන සිටිය දී, තොණ්ඩමන් මන්ත්‍රීතුමා මෙම ගරු

සභාවට ඇවිත්, මේ ප්‍රදේශයේ කාර්යාල වල දැන්වීම් පුවරු දෙමළ භාෂාවෙන් යුතුයයි අපට කියනවා. “අපේ සිංහල සහෝදරවරුන් සිංහල ප්‍රදේශවල සෑම දැන්වීම් පුවරුවක්ම දෙමළෙනුත් යොදා තිබෙන නිසා අපිත් දෙමළ ප්‍රදේශවල නාම පුවරු සිංහලෙනුත් යොදමු” යි තොන්ඩ මන් මන්ත්‍රීතුමා දෙමළ ජනතාවට කියන්නේ නැහැ. මේ රජයේ පාලනයෙහි තද බල දුර්වලකමක් තිබෙන බව මේ අනුව අපට කියන්නට සිදු වී තිබෙනවා. ඒ දුර්වලකමින් තොරව රට පාලනය කිරීම සඳහා, මේ තත්ත්වය වෙනස් කිරීමට කිසියම් පියවරක් ගන්නා අවස්ථාවකදී අපගේ සහායයන් රජයට ඕනෑ නම් එය දීමට අප සෑම විටම සූදනම්ව සිටින බව මේ අවස්ථාවේදී විශේෂයෙන් ප්‍රකාශ කරන්නට කැමැතියි.

තොණ්ඩමන් මන්ත්‍රීතුමාගේ ප්‍රකාශ කීපයක්ම මේ අවස්ථාවේදී ඉදිරිපත් කර මින් කථා කරන්නට මා අදහස් කරන්නේ, අද තිබෙන තත්ත්වය අනුව එහි එක්තරා වැදගත්කමක් තිබෙන බව මා විශ්වාස කරන නිසායි. මේ රටේ කම්කරු සේවයෙහි නියුක්තව සිටින කම්කරු ජනතාවට ගෙවනු ලබන වේතන සාධාරණ නොවන බවත් එය ඉතා අඩු වේතනයක් බවත් තොණ්ඩමන් මන්ත්‍රීතුමා අද උදාසන මෙම ගරු සභාවෙහිදී ප්‍රකාශ කළා. මේ රටේ කම්කරුවන්ට ගෙවන වේතනය ප්‍රමාණවත් නොවන නිසා එය රුපියලකින් වැඩි කළ යුතුයයි, ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදී කම්කරු සමිතිය හෙවත් අසීස් මහත්මයාගේ කම්කරු සංවිධානය ඉල්ලීමක් කළ අවසථාවේ දී තොණ්ඩමන් මන්ත්‍රීතුමා ඉදිරිපත් වී එය රුපියලකින් නොව ශත 30 කින් වැඩි කිරීම සැඟහනවායයි කියා රුපියල ශත 30 ට බැස්සු හැටි ඔබතුමාටත් මතක ඇතැයි මා අදහස් කරනවා. එසේ කළ ඒ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා, අද මෙතැනට ඇවිත්, “කම්කරුවන්ගේ වේතනය මදි” යි කියනවා. කම්කරු ජනතාවට ගෙවනු ලබන වේතනය මදි බව ඇත්ත. ඒ නිසා තමයි, එක්තරා ආයතනයක් එය රුපියලකින් වැඩි කරන ලෙස ඉල්ලීමක් කෙළේ. ඒ අවස්ථාවේදී, එය රුපියලකින් වැඩි කරන්නට ඕනෑ නැත කියා ශත 30 දක්වා අඩු කරවා ගත්තේ තොණ්ඩමන් මන්ත්‍රී



[අර්ථදාය මය.]

තුමායි. ඒ බව අපට පත්තර මාර්ගයෙන් දැන ගන්නට ලැබුණා. ඉතින්, මේකට වරදකරුවන් අපද? මීට රජයවත් වරද කරුවකුයයි මා හිතන්නේ නැහැ. තොණ්ඩමන් මන්ත්‍රීතුමා ඉල්ලුවේ ගත 30 යි. රජය එය දන්නා. ඕකයි තත්ත්වය. කම්කරුවන්ගේ වේතනය ප්‍රමාණවත් නැතැයි දැන් එතුමා කියනවා. පුදුම කතා කියන්නේ මේවා තමයි.

ඒ මන්ත්‍රීතුමා තවත් ලස්සන කතාවක් කිව්වා. මේ රටේ කම්කරුවන් වෙනුවෙන් පෙනී සිටීම සඳහා මෙම ගරු සභාවට සෑම ප්‍රදේශයකින්ම නියෝජිතයන් පත් කළ යුතුයයි එතුමා ප්‍රකාශ කළා. එක්තරා අවස්ථාවකදී, මේ රටේ කම්කරු ජනතාව වෙනුවෙන් මෙම ගරු සභාවෙහි පෙනී සිටියේ එක් ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක් පමණයි. පසුව දෙදෙනෙක් වුණා. අද, කම්කරු වෘත්තියෙහි යෙදී සිටින ජනතාව වෙනුවෙන් කපා කිරීම සඳහා තොණ්ඩ මන් මන්ත්‍රීතුමාත් අන්තාමලේ මන්ත්‍රී තුමාත් මෙහි සිටිනවා. කම්කරුවන් සිටින සෑම ප්‍රදේශයකින්ම ඔවුන් වෙනුවෙන් නියෝජිතයන් මෙහි පෙනී සිටිය යුතුයයි තොණ්ඩමන් මන්ත්‍රීතුමා ප්‍රකාශ කළා. එක්තරා ආයතනයක් සේවකයන්ට රුපියලකින් පඩි වැඩි කරන ලෙස ඉල්ලු අවස්ථාවේදී තොන්ඩමන් මන්ත්‍රී තුමා එය ගත 30 කින් පමණක් වැඩි කළාම ඇතැයි කිව්වා. එහෙත් එතුමා අද කියනවා කම්කරුවන් ජීවත් වන සෑම ප්‍රදේශයකින්ම නියෝජිතයන් මෙම මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයට පත් කළ යුතුයි කියා. ලංකාවේ සෑම ප්‍රදේශයකින්ම නොව ලංකාවේ සෑම වත්තකින්ම එක් මන්ත්‍රී වරයා බැගින් තොන්ඩමන් මන්ත්‍රීවරයා වැන්නවුන් පත් කළත් මේ රටේ කම්කරුවන්ට නම් කවදාවත් සෙනක් සැලසෙන්නේ නැහැ. ඊට හේතුව විස්තර වශයෙන් සඳහන් කරන්නට වුවමනාවක් ඇත්තේ නැහැ. රුපියලක පඩි වැඩිවීමක් අවශ්‍යයි කියන අවස්ථාවේදී ගත 30 ක් ඇතැයි කිව්වා. ඊළඟට අනික් පැත්තෙන් ඇවිත් පඩි මදි කියනවා. එවැනි මන්ත්‍රී වරුන් ලංකාවේ සෑම වත්තකින්ම ආවත් අපේ කම්කරුවන්ට ඇති කරදර තව දුරටත් වැඩිවෙනවා මිස ඒවා කවදාවත් මගහැරෙන්නේ නැහැ.

පසුගිය රජය බනපති පැත්ත ගත්තා මිස කම්කරුවන්ට උදව් කළේ නැතෙයි කියනවා. ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම කියනවා නම්, මේ රටේ කම්කරුවන්ගේ අනාගතය සපුරාලීම සඳහා අර්ථ සාධක අරමුදලක් පිළිබඳ වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් ඇති වුණේ මේ රජය කාලයේ නොවෙයි. ඒ බව මා අවධාරණයෙන්ම කියා සිටින්නට කැමතියි. එදා ඉලංගරත්න මැතිතුමා කම්කරු අර්ථ සාධක අරමුදලක් ඇති කරන්නට යන අවස්ථාවේදී නොයෙකුත් වතු වල මහත් වරුන් අප සමග කිව්වේ මෙය නම් කවදා වත් කරන්නට බැරි දෙයක් බවයි. මේ හේතුකොටගෙන කම්කරුවන්ට යම් විධියක ප්‍රයෝජනයක් ඇති වන නමුත් මෙම වැඩ පිළිවෙල කවදාවත් ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්නට බැරියයි ඒ අය කිව්වා. ඔවුන් එවැනි තර්ක ඉදිරිපත් කළාට මොකද එය අද ක්‍රියාවේ යෙදෙනව. තමන් වයෝවෘද්ධ තත්ත්වයට පත්වූ විට තමන්ට පිහිටි විම පිණිස අර්ථසාධක අරමුදලක් කම්කරුවන් සඳහා ඇති කර දුන්නේ මේ රජයෙන් නොව පසුගිය රජයෙන් බව තොන්ඩමන් මන්ත්‍රීතුමාට මතක් කර දියයුතුය කියා මා සිතන්නේ නැහැ. එහෙත් එය නැවත වරක් මතක් කළේ එතුමාට එය යළිත් සිහිපත් කරවීම සඳහායි.

මෑතක සිට මගේ ඡන්දදායක කොට්ඨාශයේ වෙසෙන ගුරුවරුන් සහ වෙනත් රජයේ සේවකයන් විශාල කරදරයකට මුහුණ පා සිටින බවත් ඔවුන් අමුතු බියකින් පෙළෙන බවත් කිවයුතුව තිබෙනවා. ඒ උදවියට නොයෙකුත් අන්දමේ තර්ජන වලට මුහුණ දෙන්නට සිදුවී තිබීමයි එසේ වන්නට හේතුව. මෙවැනි තර්ජන වලින් එම රජයේ සේවකයන් මුදාහරින එක ඉතා හොඳ බව මෙම අවස්ථාවේදී මා අවවාදයක් වශයෙන් රජයට කියන්නට කැමතියි. ඕනෑම කෙනෙකුට ඕනෑම ආසනයක් තරඟ කරන්නට පුළුවනි. ඒකට අපේ විරුද්ධවාදිකමක් ඇත්තේ නැහැ. එහෙත් යම් යම් අවස්ථාවලදී ඒ ආකාරයට රජයේ සේවකයන්ගේ සහ පාසල් ගුරු වරුන්ගේ වැඩ කටයුතුවලට ඇහිලි ගසනවා නම් ඔවුන්ට තර්ජනය කරනවා නම් එය එතරම් සතුටුදායක දෙයක් නොවන බව කමිකර දෙන්නට ඕනෑ.



ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමනි, ඊ ළඟට මගේ ආසනයේ අඩුපාඩු කීපයක් ගැන සදහන් කරන්නට මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙතවා. මගේ ජන්දදායක කොට්ඨාශයේ පටන් ගත් වැඩ රාශියක් අවසන් නොවී තියෙනවා. මේ අවුරුද්දේ අධ්‍යාපන කටයුතු සදහා විශාල මුදලක් වෙන් කර තිබෙන බව ගරු අධ්‍යාපන ඇමතිතුමා විසින් කියන්නට යෙදුණි. ඒ ගැන අප සන්තෝශ වන අතර මගේ කොට්ඨාශයේ වැඩ අවසන් කර ගන්නට බැරි වී තිබෙන පාඨශාලා කීපයක් සම්බන්ධව කරුණු ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නට මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙතවා. පසුගිය අවුරුදු හතේ, අවේ කාල සීමාව තුළදී අපේ ප්‍රදේශයේ විද්‍යාල සෑදීම සම්බන්ධව අප වාද්‍යා පිහිටුවා තිබෙනවා. අපේ ප්‍රදේශවල පාඨශාලා තැනී නැත්වල පාඨශාලා හදාගෙන හදාගෙන හදාගෙන ගිහින් ගම් දෙකක පමණක් පාඨශාලා හදා ඉවර කරන්නට බැරි වුණා. පසුගිය අවුරුදු 3 ඇතුළතදී අවුරුද්දෙන් අවුරුද්දට අධ්‍යාපන අමාත්‍යාංශයට වෙන් කළ මුදල වැඩි කළාය කියා ගරු අධ්‍යාපන ඇමතිතුමා විසින් කියන්නට යෙදුණි. එහෙත් අපේ ප්‍රදේශයේ ඒ ඉතිරි වී තිබෙන පාඨශාලා ගොඩනැගිලි දෙක මේ වන තුරුත් මේ රජයට සාදා දෙන්නට බැරි වීම ගැන මා කණගාටු වෙතවා.

මගේ ජන්දදායක කොට්ඨාශයේ නවත් වැඩක් සම්බන්ධව කියන්නට මා බලා පොරොත්තු වෙතවා. මා සෞඛ්‍ය අමාත්‍යාංශයේ සිටි අවස්ථාවේදී එවකට සිටි ගරු සෞඛ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා සමග සාකච්ඡා කර දියතලාව නගරයට අත්‍යවශ්‍ය කාර්යයක්ව තිබූ මාතෘ නිවාසයක් සෑදීම සදහා රුපියල් දෙලක්ෂයකට කිට්ටු මුදලක් වෙන් කරවා ගන්නා. එවකට සිටි ගරු අගමැතිනිය මොස් ඒ මාතෘ නිවාසයට මුල් ගල පවා තැබුවා. ඉන් පසු එහි වැඩ පටන් ගන්නා. එහෙත් එහි වැඩ අවසන් කිරීම සදහා මේ දක්වා මේ රජයෙන් කිසිම වැඩ පිළි වෙළක් නොයෙදීම ගැන මා කණගාටු වෙතවා. දියතලාව නගරයට අත්‍යවශ්‍ය දෙයක්ව තිබෙන ඒ මාතෘ නිවාසය ඉක් මනින්ම නනා නිමකර දෙන ලෙස මා මේ අවස්ථාවේදී ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා.

ස්වදේශ කටයුතු භාර ගරු ඇමතිතුමා මේ අවස්ථාවේදී නොසිටීම ගැන මා කණගාටු වෙතවා. මා ස්වදේශ කටයුතු පිළිබඳ අමාත්‍යාංශයේ සිටි කාලයේදී එවකට සිටි ස්වදේශ කටයුතු භාර ගරු ඇමතිතුමාට කරුණු ඉදිරිපත් කර හල්දුම් මුල්ල නගරයේ විදුලි අලු මධ්‍යස්ථානයක් පිහිටුවීම සදහා මුදලුත් වෙන් කරවාගෙන ඒ පිළිබඳව වැඩ පටන් ගන්නටත් සැලැස්සුවා. රජයේ නිලධාරීන් යවා ඒ සදහා අවශ්‍ය ගොඩනැගිලි තැනීමට වැඩ පිළිවෙළ යොදා තිබුණු අවසානවේදී යම්කිසි බලපෑමක් නිසා මේ රජය ඒ කටයුත්ත සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම අත්හැර දමා තිබෙනවා.

ඊ ළඟට කහගොල්ලේ මුස්ලිම් විද්‍යාලය සම්බන්ධවත් වචනයක් කියන්නට ඕනෑ. කහගොල්ලේ මුස්ලිම් විද්‍යාලයක් සෑදීම සදහා ඉඩමක් වෙන් කරවාගෙන ඒ ඉඩම සදහා අද දක්වා මුදලුත් වෙන් කරවා ගෙන තිබෙනවා. එසේ මුදල් වෙන් කර තිබෙන අවස්ථාවේදී ඒ ඉඩම අසිත්කාරයා ඉඩම කැලිවලට කඩා ඒ ඉඩම වෙන්දේසි යේ විකුණාගෙන තිබෙනවා. මේ ඉඩම වෙන් කර තිබෙන්නේ මුස්ලිම් දරුවන්ට අධ්‍යාපනය දීමට විද්‍යාලයක් සෑදීමටය. මෙය විකුණන්නට ඉඩ දෙන්නට එපාය කියා අප දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවට කරුණු ඉදිරිපත් කළා. එහෙත් ඒ සම්බන්ධව කිසිවක් කළේ නැහැ. මේ සම්බන්ධව සොයා බලා, ඒ මුස්ලිම් සහෝදරවරුන්ගේ ළමයින්ට අධ්‍යාපනයක් ලබා දීම සදහා සකස් කර තිබූ වැඩ පිළිවෙළ නැවත ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන ලෙස මා ගරු අධ්‍යාපන ඇමතිතුමාගෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමනි, කහගොල්ලේ මහා විද්‍යාලය ඒ ප්‍රදේශයේ තිබෙන පැරණි මහා විද්‍යාලයක්. එම මහා විද්‍යාලයේ විද්‍යා අංශයට අවශ්‍ය උපකරණ නැති නිසා එහි විද්‍යාව ඉගැන්වීම සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම අත්හැර දැමීමට සිදු වී තිබෙනවා. ඒ නිසා මේ කහගොල්ල විද්‍යාලයට වුවමනා කරන විද්‍යා උපකරණ සපයා දෙන ලෙස මා ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා. ඒ ප්‍රදේශයේ නව ප්‍රතිසංශෝධන ක්‍රමය උඩ උසස් අධ්‍යාපනය පහසුකම් දීමට බලා පොරොත්තු වන මේ කහගොල්ල මහා විද්‍යාලයේ අඩු පාඩුවක් වශයෙන් තිබෙන මේ විද්‍යා උපකරණ ගිහය



[ආර්යභාෂා මග.]

ඉන්මණින්ම මහතරවා දෙන ලෙස මේ අවස්ථාවේදී ගරු අධ්‍යාපන ඇමතිතුමා හෝ මා නැවතත් ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා.

මට ලැබී තිබෙන කාලය දැන් නිම වී ඇති නිසා මීට වඩා යමක් කියන්නට මා බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ නැහැ. මෙතෙක් වෙලා මගේ කථාවට සවන් දීගෙන සිටීම ගැන මා ක්‍රමයෙන්ම ස්තූතිවන්න වෙනවා.

අ. හා. 5.20

ඩී. ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මහ. (කර්මාන්ත හා සිව්ව ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්)

(නිල. 12. සෙල්වරත් ඉගැන්වීම—කෙසේද  
තොග්විල, කැරුණුවිල අමාත්‍යාංශයේ පාසල  
පාසලක් කාර්යාලය)

(Mr. D. Shelton Jayasinghe—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries and Fisheries)

Mr. Deputy Chairman, in speaking on the Budget of 1968-69, I do not propose to trace back events of history, the happenings during the time of the previous Government, as I did during the discussion of previous Budgets. I do not think that in this year when we are discussing the fourth Budget of the Government we should attempt to make the record of the previous Government the basis of our criticisms.

In discussing the Budget for 1968-69, we must concede that we have had sufficient time to match words with performance. This year, in discussing the present Budget, we have got to tell this House and the people of this country what our performance has been.

It will not be appropriate at this stage to indulge in lengthy criticisms about the S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike Government or the Sirima Bandaranaike Government or the Coalition Government. Therefore it shall be my endeavour to place before the record of this Government for the last 3½ years and substantiate my statements with facts and figures.

A matter that is very important at the moment is the rising cost of living. I remember when we were

in the Opposition and the cost of living index was 112—it rose from 111 to 113—in 1964 we made very harsh criticisms of the performance of the then Government saying that the cost of living was very high and accused the Government of not doing anything about it.

At the time of the presentation of this Budget the cost of living index was 120. I do not want to make excuses but I do want to tell this House the reasons for the rise in the cost of living and why the Government has allowed the cost of living index to remain at that point. I would ask this House to judge us with fairness and without prejudice in the context of conditions as they are today.

I would say this at the outset: Government had to cope with a calculated rise in prices. Government had to impose restrictions on imports and bring about scarcities of essential commodities. This was not a situation that developed willy-nilly. This was a situation of which the Government was aware and over which it had a control. Therefore Government is responsible.

The cost of living index is influenced by two major causes: one is our export earnings and the amount of revenue that can be collected; the second is the price of imports.

When the Government took up office in 1965 it did not inherit affluent coffers. It assumed office at a time when the coffers were badly depleted. We were living a hand to mouth existence. Export prices were low. Local manufacture had not substituted imports. Accumulated wealth was not there to buffer the shock of rising prices and scarcities. That was the situation when this Government assumed office in 1965. I mentioned the case of export prices. The following year, in 1966, export prices did not improve. On the contrary prices dropped. Our export earnings dropped in 1962, contrasted with 1964-65, to the tune of Rs. 240 million.



I would now like to quote the relevant passage from page 1 of "Economic Development 1966-68", issued by the Ministry of Planning and Economic Affairs.

This is what it states.

"Ceylon's economic recovery was, however, set back by the exceptionally sharp drop in export earnings during 1966. The drop which amounted to Rs. 240 million, or 13 per cent, relative to 1965 was well beyond expectations although some decline in export prices was anticipated."

That was the drop in export earnings in 1966. In the year 1967 the position did not improve. On the contrary the position worsened. In 1967, the drop in export earnings as compared with 1965 was Rs. 268 million. This is what the Annual Report of the Central Bank of Ceylon for the year 1967 states at page 10 :

"...The export earnings in 1967 were the lowest recorded since 1953."

That was the position of export earnings in 1966 and 1967. The total loss from our anticipated export earnings in the years 1966 and 1967, as compared with 1965, was Rs. 508 million. I pointed out that the cost of living is affected by these earnings. To offset this decline in export earnings the Government had to adopt drastic measures not only against export earnings dropping alarmingly but also against the inability to bring in essential commodities which made them scarce and thus tended to increase prices.

Not only that, our agricultural sector was hard hit by the falling export earnings, by the low prices paid for them. Hon. Members would remember, particularly those Members from the Southern Province, how the hon. Member for Kamburupitiya (Mr. Percy Wickremasinghe) made an impassioned speech on this question on the floor of this House. He said that the tea smallholders were hard hit because of the low prices that obtained for their green leaf in 1966-67, and that relief should be forthcoming immediately. The

Government was aware of this situation and to afford some relief to the tea smallholders it had to bring a rebate scheme. It was introduced in September 1966 by this Government. If not for the rebate scheme many of the tea smallholders would have been out of business today. That is what the hon. Member for Kamburupitiya urged. That is correct. I am not saying this to praise this Government or some other Government, but that was the actual situation that obtained. A remedy had to be applied and it had to be applied in the context of declining export earnings. When the Government was hard put to find ways and means of keeping these smallholders going it had to come to their relief. I would kindly ask hon. Members to keep that in mind.

Another major step was taken to keep the export market going. On the 22nd of November 1967 the Government decided to devalue the rupee. There have been various opinions about this. There was criticism of the percentage of devaluation, opinions about whether it was the right time to devalue and whether something more should have gone with devaluation. That is another point.

කෙනෙමන් මය.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Whether you should have devalued at all.

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මය.

(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

I agree. I may myself hold some other view regarding how it should have been implemented. The fact is, if a devaluation was not done at that time our major agricultural sector would have gone out of business, and if it happened you would not have got back your export markets. Our traditional buyers would have sought alternative markets. Some might come back to us, but we cannot capture the markets that we lose. Therefore the Government devalued the



[පසුපසින් ඡායාරූපය මෙය.]

rupee on the 22nd of November 1967. by 20 per cent and this saved our export markets. The agricultural sector continued to function. The smallholders were able to keep themselves going. And we find today, in the year 1968, that conditions are improving both for the major plantations and smallholders of tea and rubber.

The year 1967 went by and in 1968 the Government was faced with a situation where not merely the promotion of any further development but even the industrial and agricultural development already achieved was threatened by a fall in export earnings and also a rise in imports values. The Government, therefore, had to introduce the FEEC Scheme in 1968. What did it mean? It meant a further devaluation. It meant a double rate in exchange and a further devaluation of Rs. 45 per Rs. 100. You will appreciate the steps the Government had to take to combat falling export prices and the rise in import values. The Government was aware of the situation. That is why the Government had to make calculated moves. We do not like to disown the responsibility for either rising prices or the scarcity of goods. No. It is improper and incorrect to do so. We accept that responsibility. We accept the difficulties in delivering essential commodities to the people. This is the background of events that led up to it. The cost of living index in 1964, when the Coalition Government was defeated, stood at 113.

When the Budget of 1968-69 was introduced by the Hon. Minister of Finance, the index stood at 120. The difference was seven points. I ask the House to judge fairly the issues of the moment. Devaluation alone meant a drop of 20 per cent in the value of the currency. If the Government was unable to hold the rise in prices, if it had no control of the situation, if it did not have the ability to handle the situation, prices would have spiralled and the index would have shot up from 113 to at least 133 points. It is to the credit of the Hon. Minister of

Finance that he was able to hold such a situation where everything pointed to a sharp and quick rise in the cost of living index. The operation of the FEECs scheme brought about a further devaluation of Rs. 45 per Rs. 100. If the Members of the Communist Party say that it amounts to a further devaluation, I too agree. However, if the situation was not under control the cost of living would have spiralled and gone out of all proportions and we would have actually had galloping inflation. It is again to the credit of the Hon. Minister of Finance, the Cabinet and this Government that they were able to hold and check the rise in prices, and as a result there is today a sense of safety and security. There is no feeling of panic in the country that inflation is likely to overtake us tomorrow or in the next month.

It is true that there has been a rise in prices. I shall demonstrate to you the reasons for it. I have shown you the background and the events led to it. I shall show the calculated reasons for the increase in prices and for the scarcity of essential commodities.

Faced with a situation of rising prices and scarcity of essential goods, the Government had to take a major decision. Control of export prices is something no Government in Ceylon can do. We have to trade in international markets and we have to accept what we get from those markets. There is a similar situation with regard to the rise in the prices of our imports of manufactured and other essential goods. If the prices of these imports rise in the international markets, then we have to pay the increased prices demanded for them.

The Government had to keep the agricultural sector going. If the tea smallholders were put out of business it would mean utter ruination for them. If the large estates went out of production our export trade would have been ruined for years. Consider the other side of the scale. The Government had to proceed with internal development. Large allocations had to be made for industries.



New sources of revenue had to be found. Ideas for earning foreign exchange from new sources — tourism and other sources — had to be studied and encouraged if they were feasible. The position in 1968 as it developed from 1967, was such that the Government could not put off a decision being made to the following year or the year after. As these vicissitudes came along, an alternative remedy had to be found.

Firstly, I refer to the smallholders in tea. In this parlous position what did the Government do? It made available, I remember, in September 1966 for the first time a rebate scheme. It was introduced with the sole object of raising the price level of green leaf supplied by the smallholders to the manufacturing factories. That was passed on to the smallholders, and the best test as to whether it reached the smallholder or not is that he is today vitally alive. I challenge any hon. Member to say that the smallholders have gone out of business. They have not, thanks to the rebate scheme. That is the acid test. This is the performance with which we have matched our words. We saved the situation for the smallholders. Under this rebate scheme, no less than Rs. 55 million was immediately set aside; and of that amount, I believe, as much as Rs. 38 million has already gone to the smallholder. It started by offering a rebate of 35 cents duty for those teas that were sold round about 70 cents. Gradually, as the market improved, from 70 cents the rebate was raised till it reached the level of one rupee. These rebates were passed on to the smallholder.

I am happy that the smallholders were saved from a dire calamity, irrespective of what any party or any government has done, because if they once went out of production, they would never have come back. That is the position. I shall be eternally grateful to the Hon. Minister of Finance for all that he did.

I want to say this: the argument that the rebate has not reached the small holder will not hold good for the reason that the records show that 13,000 more acres have come to the tea smallholder. It only shows that the smallholder had not only been saved from a dire situation but that under the rebate scheme he has flourished and today he is a vital part of the economy of Ceylon.—[*Interruption*]. I will come to the replanting scheme, hon. Member for Baddegama (Mr. Neal de Alwis). I will read out the figures to you. Why do you want to dispute my statement? I am seldom at fault when I read figures, because I read them out from the relevant passage. If you want to dispute my statement, you will have your turn when you speak.

I have not heard any hon. Member from your side up to now speaking on behalf of the smallholder—not one word. You want to make out that any action of this Government is wrong. I started by saying that I am not trying to blame any government for what has happened. I am not trying to criticize the governments that were there. Who cares about it?

Today we are the people who are on trial, not the Sirimavo Bandaranaike Government or the S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike Government. We held out certain promises to the people. We have been in office for three and a half years; we have spent a colossal amount of money and the people want to know what we have done with it. So I would kindly ask the hon. Members to kindly accept my speech in that spirit. Please do not make irrelevant remarks or interruptions. It only amounts to a temporary lack of sanity. I did not want to take up the hon. Member for Baddegama, but he asked for it.

Under the replanting scheme, payment was increased from Rs. 2,500 per acre to Rs. 3,750 per acre. There was an increase on 1st January 1963. The payment for replanting in that year was about Rs. 8 or 9 million. Last year this Government paid for the replanting of tea not much less



[தேர்தல் பணியை மீட்ட.]  
than the amount mentioned by the Member for Baddegama (Mr. Neal de Alwis)—Rs. 12,582,054.56.

சுரு தனித்தனிச்சொல்

(கொளரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

From where did the money come ?

தேர்தல் பணியை மீட்ட.

(திரு. ஷெல்டன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

I am coming to that. I am sorry many members have not stuck to the Budget but spoken on D. C. Bills etc. Who cares for all these Bills ?

The position of rubber: The replanting subsidy was Rs. 700 to 1,000 per acre. In January 1962 it was increased from Rs. 1,000 to Rs. 1,200 per acre. This Government, because we are treating this as a national base industry, want people to plant good rubber, manufacture good rubber and also turn to the manufacture of other types of rubber, not the usual type of sheet and crepe rubber. Therefore this Government, also conscious of the fact that on account of the drop in prices replanting projects could not be proceeded with, increased the replanting subsidy on 1st August 1966 from Rs. 1,400 to 1,500.

Sir, as I said before the theme of my speech is performance, not mere words. It is important, whatever the Government, that our agricultural sector should be kept in prime condition. If the Opposition comes into office tomorrow, I wish to say, it is my ardent desire to see that the agricultural sector comes to them well preserved and as a fully-fledged economic unit. That is essential. It does not matter who is in office. This Government proceeded further to see that not only a carefully maintained unit but a fully functioning economic unit was kept going. On the rehabilitation scheme for old rubber it spent nearly Rs. 690,179.45.

Many hon. Members spoke clean outside the Budget except the hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa) who spoke on taxation. If you were talking about the cost of living then you should have pointed an accusing finger at the Hon. Minister of Finance and said that his Budget is an inflationary budget. Not one word has been uttered by the hon. Members of the Opposition on that. Why did they not say that this is the first Budget where the Minister of Finance has not used Treasury Bills to finance his projects? Sir, I told you that the Government has full and firm control of the situation. It is borne out by this deficit financing. If Government found that it could not control the rise in prices that it could not control the prices or the scarcity of essential commodities, then surely it could have used other instruments like Treasury Bills. It proposes to finance the deficit by a very realistic, and may I say anti-inflationary, measures, namely, borrowing from domestic non-bank sources, Rs. 375 million; external finance by way of loans or grants for projects, Rs. 213 million; use of Commodity Aid Counterpart Funds, 263 million; total, 851 million. So, you see that the Minister of Finance does not intend to raise Treasury Bills in order to bridge any part of the Budget deficit. I remember the hon. Member for Yatiyantota—I am sorry he is not here—when he made his Budget Speech in 1964, said that he would not make use of Treasury Bills for the purpose of bridging the Budget deficit. He said: "Treasury Bills lead to inflation. A Finance Minister who makes use of the instrument of Treasury Bills has no control of the situation; he has got to live in doubt." He congratulated himself on that. So, why does the Opposition not extend the same compliment to the present Minister of Finance ?

But what did the hon. Member for Yatiyantota do thereafter? At the very first meeting of the Cabinet after the Budget Debate he asked for approval of the Cabinet to raise the



limit of Treasury Bills to Rs. 1,500 million. I can assure you that this Finance Minister will not ask for approval to raise Treasury Bills to bridge the Budget deficit.—[*Inter-ruption*]. That Cabinet paper was read here. The Hon. Minister of Finance has shown a calculated sense of judgment in the financing of the deficit.

The hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa) spoke about taxation and tax relief, and said that while a relief of Rs. 600 was being granted to the small man, a relief of as much as Rs. 45,000 was given to a person who earned a lakh or more. This is a gross misrepresentation of facts. The hon. Member read out one portion of the Budget Speech. I too would like to read that out:

“(i) The maximum marginal rate of tax to be 65 per cent. The rate schedule, which I propose, consists of eleven slabs going up from 7½ per cent. to 60 per cent.

I hope the Hon. Minister will in his reply amplify this: In his Speech he made only a very minute reference that the wealth tax would still prevail.

And this is what the Hon. Minister Further says in his Budget Speech, at column 99, Volume 80:

“...At the higher ranges of income, when the benefits currently available under the approved savings relief scheme and wealth tax are taken into account, the tax burden will continue to remain about the same.”

“The tax burden will continue to remain about the same”, that is, at the same percentage of 80. The hon. Member for Colombo South made a thundering statement that people in the higher income groups would be let off with a tax relief of Rs. 45,000 and more. That is incorrect. The correct position is that when the benefits currently available under the approved savings relief scheme and wealth tax are taken into account, the tax recoverable will be almost the same as now.

I must also congratulate the Hon. Minister of Finance for the “Pay As You Earn” scheme. There is no point in appointing commissions unless one

is prepared to implement their recommendations or at least take some useful advice out of them. We have had commissions after commissions in this country. They come and go with every Government but little or nothing is done.

The Hon. Minister of Finance, after studying the Report of the Taxation Commission, has made very radical changes in the collection of taxes. I congratulate him for that. If he attempted to introduce these changes in the year 1968-69 he would have created an utter mess because the changeover would have to be overnight. He would then not be able to get the revenue he is getting now. The date has been fixed as from the year 1970. Up to the year 1970 the departments concerned will adjust themselves and the taxpayer too would adjust himself to the forthcoming taxes which he knows he would pay in 1970. Therefore, I say, this is a commonsense approach to the problem, in the implementation of the recommendations of the Taxation Commission.

The other matter is the removal of the tax relief. The hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa) said he disapproved of this. When this tax relief scheme was put into operation it was mentioned in this House that this relief scheme would obtain only until such time as the industries were able to set themselves as going concern. The Hon. Minister of Industries is of opinion today that we have sufficient knowledge now to start off without this extra benefit of an additional tax holiday. The development rebate is available, the savings relief is available and an investment rebate is available, and it is not necessary at this stage to carry on any further with the tax holiday for industries.

At the initial stages when there are difficulties to be surmounted the Government gave this assistance as an impetus to people to invest in industries, and when industries are firmly established the normal pattern of taxation must follow. Otherwise it would be an undue privilege



[පෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මය.]

to those who come into these industries. I am sorry that this objection should have come from the hon. Member for Colombo South.

Now I come to the programme and performance of this Government. We have participated in several debates during the last two years particularly on development. In speaking on development one must relate once argument or speech to some target. I would like hon. Members for a moment to look at the Ten-year Plan of the S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike Government. This is a plan of the S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike Government which we, while in the Opposition, said was a good plan. It was not a target implementation plan because there were many deficiencies prevalent in the country. The infrastructure was not available, technology was not available, the finances were not available. Taken all in all, this was a ten-year plan that was well worth studying and attempting to implement.

If hon. Members would look at the figures given in this ten-year Plan at page 80, Table X at that page speaks of "Selected Targets of Physical Quantities (1957 and 1968)." These were the targets drawn out by the people responsible then, targets which would meet the requirements of the country, targets which would make the economy of the country safe. Take agriculture, for instance.

According to the Plan the production envisaged for tea by 1968 was 503 million pounds. What is the performance of this Government? In 1967, 490 million pounds of tea were manufactured. Can it be said that we have fallen short of the target?

Take rubber, The plan envisaged 299 million pounds by 1968. In 1967 production was 316 million pounds. That is 17 million pounds more in 1967 alone.

නීල් ද දල්විස් මය.

(திரு. நீல் டி அல்விஸ்)

(Mr. Neal de Alwis)

Thanks to the workers

පෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මය.

(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

I second that. Nothing could have been done if the workers did not support this.

With regard to coconuts, the production envisaged according to the Plan was 2,963 million nuts. In 1967, with all the disadvantages of the cyclone and the drought, we produced 2,421 million nuts. Is this a shortfall?

With regard to paddy, the Plan envisaged production of 77 million bushels in 1968. In 1957, when the Plan was drawn up, it was 31.5 million bushels. The Plan envisaged an increased of 144 per cent by 1968.

Sir, paddy production has been the subject of very violent and close debate. I want to read out some figures that were given to me by the Agriculture Department. They are to be found in the different administration reports which are available to hon. Members. In 1962-63 the production for both the Maha and Yala crops was 49,200,000 bushels. In 1963-64 it was 50,505,000 bushels. That is under the hon. Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike) as Minister of Agriculture. He did a good job. He started various committees. He promoted the idea of using fertilizer. He promoted the idea of mechanization. One mistake he made: all his work he limited to conferences with the government agents. He could not get down to the bedrock of agriculture—the farmers themselves.

The success of the food drive today is due to the fact that it is the farmers themselves who decide how much they will produce. Upon their support will depend the future of the Government. I have no words to thank them for their magnificent efforts. Whatever we do will not be sufficient recompense for them.

I have given you the figures for 1963-64. Then, in the year 1964-65, production dropped to 36,252,000 bushels. That was the year of the cyclone and there were various other



difficulties over which we had no control. In 1965-66 we caught up; we reached the figure of 45,787,000 bushels. And in 1966-67 we have had 54,961,715 bushels. That, Sir, is the best performance to date. But that performance for 1966-67 has been surpassed by an even better performance. I refer to the Maha crop in 1968.

What was the target set by your Government? I told you the targets in the Ten-Year Plan. There were targets for tea, rubber, coconut, and paddy. We have in many instances kept to those targets, and in some instance we have even exceeded the target.

I want to read just two lines from the administration report of the Commissioner of Agrarian Services:

"The most important of these objectives is that of import substitution. With this in view, the programme of paddy production envisages an increase in gross output of paddy from the present fields to about 70 million bushels by the end of 1970."

The Hon. Prime Minister has said that, if 70 million bushels of paddy are harvested, we shall be almost 75 per cent self-sufficient. That will mean about 900,000 tons of rice.

Now I want to read out to you a figure which surpasses even the previous year's performance. The agricultural programme took time to gather momentum. In our first year in office, 1965, we had to gather the wherewithal to implement the various programmes. The Hon. Prime Minister himself was unfortunately not in the best of health. There were various matters to tide over. I think he had more trouble than most people. The law of averages at least, if nothing else, must give him his break.

We have had devaluation. We have had a drop in export prices. The Hon. Prime Minister has had personnel difficulties. He has been ill. He has had multiple difficulties. One of the most disheartening of these difficulties was the sudden rise in the price of rice in the international market.

that had not happened, if we could have purchased our rice last year and this year at the price you paid in 1964, this Government would have been through. There would have been no problem. We would have been able to give every type of commodity, from essentials to non-essentials, that every person in this country wanted.

I shall read out the cost in rupees and cents.

சீல் டி. டி. டி. டி. டி.

(சிறு நீல் டி. அல்விஸ்)

(Mr. Neal de Alwis)

Do not talk of 'ifs'.

செல்டன் ஜேசிங்ஹே

(சிறு. செல்டன் ஜேசிங்ஹே)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

I wish to remind the hon. Member for Baddegama, this doubting Thomas, of what they are. I only hope that he does not provoke me any further.

I come to the year 1968. The Maha crop in 1968 is 43,497,594 bushels. This surpasses your record figure for Maha 1963-64, when you got 32,148,000 bushels. that was the year in which you had a very good achievement. I congratulate the hon. Member for Dompe on the superb performance and the achievement in that year of a total production of 50,505,000 bushels. In this Maha we have got 43,497,594 bushels.

I know the hon. Members of the Lanka Sama Samaja Party. I have told the hon. Member for Baddegama of what I know. He has interrupted me more than once. These Members are anti-national. They have been against every patriotic scheme put forward in this country. They have lived on dissension and on corruption. They have been stooges both to the Fourth International and to the



[செல்டன் சமீபம் மொ.]

feudalist from Horagolla. These are the people who have stood in the way of democratic progress. They are enemies of the country. They are traitors of the farmers. These are people who come here and pay lip-service to the farmers but go down the country and say, "These figures are all wrong, do not lend your support to this. You are going to keep an aristocratic Government, a capitalist Government, in office. It is by your support that they are carrying on. You pay for the farmers in China, you pay for the farmers in India, you pay for the farmers in Burma, do not pay for yourselves. No, you carry on. We will support you. We will be the leaders of the workers and the farmers."

We know these leaders of the workers and the farmers. We know how they have misled the masses. The masses today not only distrust you but detest you. Time and again you have told them and time and again you have let them down. You are self-seekers. That is why I say you are stooges to somebody else. You are anti-national; you are anti-patriotic.

May I now come back? As I said, the difficulties of this Government were multiplied by the rise in prices abroad.

Take the year 1963. I quoted to you the harvest of 1963. It is only but right that I should quote to you the tonnage and value of imports of rice from 1963 because otherwise it is not easy for us to appreciate the debacle fully, and for you to make your own judgment.

சீல்டன் சமீபம் மொ. (கோட்டி)

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன—கோட்டி)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne—Kotte)

What about the flour imports? It has reached the peak.

செல்டன் சமீபம் மொ.

(திரு. ஷெல்டன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

I shall come to that.

In the year 1963 Ceylon imported 550,702 tons of rice and the value paid for it was Rs. 244,143,690. In the year 1964, Ceylon imported 546,805 tons and the value paid for it was Rs. 282,625,304. In 1965 Ceylon imported 641,816 tons. The amount paid was Rs. 341,786,360. In 1966 Ceylon imported 484,576 tons of rice paying Rs. 261,261,588. In 1967, that is last year, the tonnage had fallen. You will find a decrease in tonnage due to the halving of the ration as well as to the rise in production. Ceylon imported 374,708 tons in the year 1967, paying Rs. 239,939,439. In terms of the bookings for the year 1968—I would ask hon. Members to kindly listen to this particular figure because it gives the answer to a lot of questions—Ceylon imports would be 290,000 tons of rice. The value she is paying is Rs. 290,000. I want to show you this. I read out to you the figures for the year 1964 when you had your excellent harvest. When you had your excellent harvest in 1964, you imported 546,805 tons of rice. You paid for it Rs. 282,625,304. Now we are importing half the quantity, 290,000 tons, but we are paying more than you paid for your full quantity in 1964. View this in fairness.

சீல்டன் சமீபம் மொ.

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

Your bad luck.

செல்டன் சமீபம் மொ.

(திரு. ஷெல்டன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

Bad luck? I say so. We are not trying to put the blame on international prices.

ஷெல்டன் சமீபம் மொ.

(திரு. ஷெல்டன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)

(The Hon. Dudley Senayake)



සෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.

(*திரு. ஷெல்ட்ரன் ஜயசிங்ஹ*)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

The Hon. Prime Minister says it has reached the peak in prices. I hope, for him and for all of us, that the law of averages will come.

In this context where we had decreasing earnings, where the prices we paid for our imports were twice what we paid in 1964, what has been the performance of this Government? How has it kept its agricultural sector, our prime sector, which is tea, rubber, coconut and paddy in earning? See the amount we paid for fertilizer. In 1964, your best year, you paid Rs. 79,148,975. In 1965 we paid Rs. 90,707,142, in 1966 Rs. 94,950,645, and in 1967 Rs. 116,733,146.—[*Interruption.*] That is so. This is the luck of the country. I do not think, God willing, much will be denied to our people. If good work, honest work and dedication to service, dedication to your country and your people deserve anything from the good Lord, then surely that prayer will be answered, not for us but for the people and for this country.

You spoke time and again about the Special Leases Board and about the equipment that is supplied today? We have done that. I do not deny it. As I said we accept the responsibility for the rise in prices. We accept the responsibility for shortages. We accept the responsibility for every cent that has been spent. Money has been spent for the service of the people. If shortages were imposed, if prices went up, it was in the nature of a call to the nation. For what? It was for performance that will free for all time our people from dependence on the foreigner so that we can walk as free men and women. Some hon. Members likened this performance to the *Parakrama Ugaya*. If we have achieved that I say we have done sufficient. As for me I shall go back home and be satisfied.

May I say this? In the year 1964 the hon. Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike), spent money on equipment; he spent a sum of

Rs. 15,503,961. He had to do that. In 1967 we almost doubled that figure. Our figure for 1967 stood at Rs. 23.3 million. I do not think it is necessary to give the break down of this figure. What I want to show is how close we have been to the targets set out in the ten-year plan. This ten-year plan was approved and accepted by all party members. I have not heard hon. Members of the Communist Party disowning this plan; nor the hon. Members belonging to the S. L. F. P., L. S. S. P., the United National Party, or the M. E. P. We may have our own ideas in regard to implementation. You criticized it, but you never opposed it. We have debated this plan. Every page of this plan has been debated on the Floor of this House.—[*Interruption.*] What is the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central (Mr. Keuneman) trying to talk? Is he still living in a world of deception? Whom are you trying to fool? Not anybody seated inside this House. I do not think he can fool even those outside this House. You are only three. You were there in 1960 and you are still there today.—[*Interruption.*]

I want to take the production of potatoes, chillies, and onions. In all these items we are close to this plan. The plan itself says that these figures that are given have been rounded off. You cannot stick to a millionth of a bushel and say you must reach this millionth of a bushel, or, if it is 1968, you must get in there by the 1st January 1968. These are targets that have been set. The process of implementation was very difficult for any Government. They had no infrastructure; neither did they have the technique or the technology. We did not have the finances. As a matter of fact, much of this was missing or nearly all of it. But I do not know how this miracle has been achieved. I myself doubt it. I cannot believe my own eyes when I see that this country in this year has progressed.

I want to tell you this. In the year 1967-68 the *maha* crop so far has brought 43,497,594 bushels. The *yala* has to come in. If the performance







The Hon. Prime Minister has been kind enough to give me a few minutes of his time. I did not want to impose on his kindness, but he has done so. I thank him.—[*Interruption*]. That may be so, but we have made that adjustment. Sir, our Whip gave you the time schedule—that is true—but it is open to us to make the necessary adjustments. The hon. Member, who has been a Speaker himself, should know that. I do not canvass the support of the hon. Member for Akuressa (Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe) or of the hon. Member for Katugampola (Mr. Subasinghe). I know my rights.

As I was saying, Sir, we supported the private sector and promoted it. Every little assistance that could have been given by my Minister was extended to the private sector; in the way of advice, techniques, allocations, whatever could be done was done.

During the period of office of my Minister we were responsible for 116 new units in the private sector. I would like to read out the allocations made to the private sector for various years. For 1965—that was the year we took over; you had made a half year allocation and I am not contesting that—the allocation was Rs. 215 million. For 1966 the allocation was Rs. 265 million. For 1967 it was Rs. 290 million. For the first half of 1968 it was Rs. 150 million and for the second half it was Rs. 200 million, that is, in regard to items coming directly under licence—licensable articles. In regard to those that are matched by our Ministry against O. G. L. imports, the figure is Rs. 125 million. All this totals up to Rs. 475 million. That is the extent of assistance that my Minister has given to the private sector.

And we are continuing to extend that assistance. If possible we shall increase the assistance because, whether it is the public sector or the private sector, all are citizens of this country, and any increase in their production we consider to be an increase in the gross national product. We are not concerned with persons.

We look at this problem from the point of view of the national development plan.

Hon. Members of the Communist Party, like the hon. Member for Akuressa (Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe), and hon. Members of the Lanka Sama Samaja Party, like the hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa), have time and again said that my Minister has now given up his ideas of the public sector; that he is now no more a public sector man; that he has been swallowed up by the private sector; that he is a private sector sympathizer, that he is a promotor of the private sector; that he wants to demolish the public sector; that he wants to take away from the public sector and give to the private sector.

When I started my speech I said that I would substantiate every word I say with facts and figures. The Government is on trial before the country, and they have to match their words with deeds and performance. This is no time to criticize anybody but to say what we have done and whether we have done it well. That is what counts.

Let us consider the figures in regard to capital contributions by Government since the Government-Sponsored Corporations Act came into force. Take the figure for 1957-58. The hon. Third Member for Colombo Central will do well to listen to this.

கேனமன் மொ.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I am listening.

செல்டன் ஜயசிங்ஹை மொ.

(திரு. செல்டன் ஜயசிங்ஹை)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

For 1957-58 Rs. 10,050,139 was the contribution by the Government to the public sector; for 1958-59 it was Rs. 15,800,000; for 1959-60 it was Rs. 18,990,080; for 1960-61 it was Rs. 30,902,600; for 1961-62 it was Rs. 37,297,271; and for 1963-64, which was your final contribution to the public sector, it was Rs. 88,548,342.



[செல்டன் சமயிண மொ.]

For eight years that was your contribution to the public sector—a very worthy and laudable effort! And I extend to you my humble thanks for the effort you made. Your contribution was no less than Rs. 236,106,214 in eight years to the public sector.

Hard things were said against my Minister. He has not been in the best of health; yet at all times he has given of his best to the country and this Government, and we owe him a debt of gratitude. When I read out the figures you will be surprised, and then you will realize that it is wrong to impute ill-advised or ill-thought out motives to him either on the Floor of this House or anywhere else.

The hon. Member for Akuressa has said that my Minister has given up the public sector. How can you say that? Here are the figures. His contribution to the public sector in 1965-66 was Rs. 98,648,946.

செவெடிமாவிசை சி. எ. சி. வினாமசிங்ஹ

(அனுராதபுரம்)  
(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்கிரமசிங்ஹ—அக்குறஸ்ஸ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe—Akuressa)  
After devaluation!

[செல்டன் சமயிண மொ.]

(சிரு. செல்வந்நன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)  
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

To hell with your devaluation! In 1966-67 it was Rs. 150,175,994. In 1967-68, that is up to 31st March 1968, it was Rs. 14,487,429. That is to say, for 3½ years his total contribution to the public sector was Rs. 263,312,369 which is more than what you had contributed in your entire eight years.

I want to put the House in the right perspective regarding this question. I gave the figures up to 31st March 1968.

செவெடிமாவிசை சி. எ. சி. வினாமசிங்ஹ

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்கிரமசிங்ஹ)  
(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

What was the contribution of the previous U. N. P. Government?

[செல்டன் சமயிண மொ.]

(சிரு. செல்வந்நன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)  
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

I told you that I do not blame your Government for one moment. I do not blame even the Bandaranaike Government. What are you now talking about the previous U. N. P. Government? You are not a person who is fit to be a Member of any Government. You are just a stooge, a pick-up, who has to be tolerated.

Up to 31st March 1968, our contribution to the public sector was Rs. 263,312,369. I wish to tell this House that up to date we have contributed more than Rs. 300 million to the public sector. That is the contribution of the Hon. Philip Gunawardena as Minister of Industries. When the estimate of the Ministry of Industries are taken up I shall be only too ready to meet any arguments raised by hon. Members. At this stage if I proceed to read out the figures relating to individual corporations I do not think I will be doing the correct thing as, in fact, I am taking up the time allocated to the Hon. Prime Minister.

Before I finish I want to speak a few words on aid. This is another controversial matter. Hon. Members, particularly from the Marxist parties and the S. L. F. P., have said time and again, "You have gone with the begging bowl. You are a stooge of the consortium, you are a stooge of America. The Budget of the Hon. Minister of Finance is written in New York and not here." Now, Sir, begging is a thing that no Government since 1948 brought on its head by its own faults. It is a legacy that has been left to us by our imperialist masters. I do not blame the S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike Government or the Sirimavo Bandaranaike Government. No, Sir. That was a condition that was brought about as a result of direct action not being taken by them. It human beings. Some people do it may be that their implementation schemes were wrong. We are all right, some people do it wrong, but it is not to be questioned.



I remember, when we were in the Opposition, the question, "What is your remedy?", being asked of the then Leader of the Opposition, the present Prime Minister. He said, "You have to get massive doses of foreign aid." The hon. Third Member for Colombo Central remembers it. It is in HANSARD. He said that unless you got massive doses of foreign aid you could not put to right the economy of this country. That was our way of thinking. We may be wrong. The hon. Third Member for Colombo Central may have a better way of doing it. When you form a Government please go ahead and implement your idea. But we have done what we were convinced was the best. We have not done something because we had to do it. That is my point. We did not do it because we had to do it. Even when we were in the Opposition our considered view was that the economy of this country could not be put to right unless we got massive doses of foreign aid. Therefore, when we came into office we set about getting massive doses of foreign aid to the best of our ability. We anticipated Rs. 250 million. It may be that we got Rs. 100 million. We may have got more or less. I shall read out the figures.

I have broken it down into three groups: (1) loans from the Aid Ceylon Group, which you call the consortium and the club; (2) other loans and grants that came from various countries—Western countries, Eastern countries, Socialist group, Capitalist group; (3) I. M. F. loans. The hon. Third Member for Colombo Central knows in what context I am referring to the I. M. F. loans. You have said that they are World Bank opinions; you have said that they are World Bank directions. That is why I have broken it down to three groups. So, you cannot go back on what you have said. Please remember that.

In 1965 Aid Ceylon Group assistance amounted to Rs. 6.9 million; in 1966 it was Rs. 120.5 million; in 1967

it was Rs. 211.7 million; and in 1968, the first half of 1968, it was Rs. 149.8 million.

Other loans and grants came from various other sources. We are friendly with all countries; we are not too big to turn our nose at anybody. We will get aid from wherever we can get it for the good of the country. In 1965 it was Rs. 134.7 million; in 1966 it was Rs. 104.1 million; in 1967 it was Rs. 35.9 million. The figures for 1968 are not available so far.

Now I want to refer to the I. M. F. drawings. This is very important, because it is of World Bank origin. In 1965 it was Rs. 109.5 million; in 1966 it was Rs. 144 million; in 1967 it was Rs. 122.5 million; and in 1968 it was Rs. 177.3 million. We have been accused of getting aid from various sources in the Capitalist world. We were called stooges of the World Bank, dictated to by Yankee opinion. This, Sir, is the world consortium. I am taking both figures together, Aid Ceylon Club and I. M. F., because of your accusation. In 1965 under the Aid Ceylon Club and the I. M. F. we got Rs. 116.4 million; in 1966 Rs. 264.5 million; in 1967 Rs. 334.2 million; and in 1968 Rs. 327.1 million. Sir, I would call it an earning. And why so? It has become an additional source of income to help us tide over our difficulties. It has actually become a budgetary item for the Hon. Minister of Finance. What does this assistance from these friends mean? We are very thankful to them for coming to our aid at the time of our need. When this country was impoverished, when it could not pay for its food, when its economy was damaged almost beyond repair, when the future held no prospects for us, this assistance was invaluable. I shall demonstrate the value of this assistance and what it meant.

In 1966 the acreage planted in rubber in Ceylon was 672,592 acres. We produced 172,899 tons on which we earned Rs. 311,081,941. In 1966 we had 596,445 acres of tea, and we



[සෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මය.]

manufactured 441,415,844 lbs. of tea. The value of earnings in 1966 was Rs. 1,026 million.

If you take the aid received in the year 1968 of Rs. 327.1 million, what does it show? It shows that for the year 1968 we have received as aid more than all the money we earned from the sale of rubber. That is the aid this country has had. It has been one of the prime earners. True, we have to return it, but if you calculate the capitalization required to produce such an amount of money—plantation, maintenance, capital expenditure involved, and profit and loss—you do not know what it will work out to. The interest is small; in some instances no interest. Payment is spread over 10 to 15 years.

Is it not a laudable effort? Why are you blaming us? Why are you criticizing us? Is it wrong for this country to have got this money for its development? I have shown what development has taken place. This money has not been wasted. We have reached the targets of the Ten-Year Plan of Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike. I have shown what we have done in the fields of agricultural production, industry, private enterprise and public enterprise. Sir, this is something that deserves every commendation. We must thank those friends who have helped this country.

Before I wind up, it is only right that I must place on record the fact that the Ministry of Industries, under the Hon. Mr. Philip Gunawardena, has contributed in no small measure to the efforts of this Government. We would never have been able to achieve our targets if not for the work, the dedication to service and the assistance of the Hon. Minister and of the officers of the Ministry of Industries. Sir, I must make special mention of those in our Ministry who came from different walks of life and who did not know very much about industry, like the Minister and myself. I have to thank them all. They are the unsung heroes. They

are people who should be given credit. I should like to mention the names of Mr. J. V. Fonseka, Mr. Mylvaganam, Mr. Vincent Pandita, Mr. Milton Aponso, Mr. Bhuvanendram, and Mr. Tennekoon, in particular. I take special pride in mentioning those names. I would, if I had your indulgence, read the names of every worker and employee in the Ministry of Industries. The targets we have reached and the support we have given the Government would never have been possible unless we had the unstinted support of them all. These are patriots unsung, and this Government thanks them. Before I wind up, I would like to say one thing.

සිරිමාවෝ ආර්. ඩී. බන්දරනායක මය.

(අත්තනලේල)

(திருமதி சிறீமாவோ ஆர். டி. பண்டார நாயக்க—அந்தனகல்ல)

(Mrs. Sirimavo R. D. Bandaranaike—Attanagalla)

Wind up, wind up.

செல்டன் ஜயசிங்ஹ் மய.

(திரு. ஷெல்டர், ஹன் ஜயசிங்ஹ்)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

The hon. Leader of the Opposition appears to have jittery feet this evening. She wants me to wind up. I do not know whether she wants to follow me or she is going to speak some time later.—[*Interruption*]. I am sorry. I did not mean it.

This Government, in this financial year of 1968-69, is in no position to criticize the Government of the Hon. Sirimavo Bandaranaike or the Government of the late Mr. Bandaranaike. The people are not interested in that now. Our criticisms of them are now confined to political platforms; that too is viewed very sceptically by the public now. All this talk of language and religion, the District Councils Bill, and so on, is just nonsense now. What the people ask now is: "What have you done? Have you carried our trust faithfully and well? Is your performance matched by your words?" That is what the people want to know.



I hope I have been able to explain in fair detail the performance of the National Government. We say that we accept every responsibility for the increase in prices, for the scarcities in consumer goods. It was a calculated and deliberate move—something that we asked for from the people in the name of development, in the name of the future of our country, in the name of generations yet unborn. And the response has been magnificent.—*[Interruption]*. You, from Horagolla, you who have never known the people, can laugh. It does not mean a thing to me; even the addition from Kotte does not mean anything to me. These people who are flotsam and jetsam, today blue, tomorrow red, do not mean a thing to the public. The public will treat them not as representatives of the people but as an anti-national and unpatriotic set of people, whether they come from Baddegama, Kotte or Attanagalla.

**மீதிமாவே அன் டிரைவராக இல்லை.**

(திருமதி சிறிமாவோ பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)

What about Carr's biscuits? Do not talk too much. We will produce your letters.

**செல்டன் ஜெயசிங்க இல்லை.**

(திரு. செல்டன் ஜெயசிங்க)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

I am sorry I have taken so much of your time, Mr. Deputy-Chairman. I thank you.

ஏ. ஓ. 6.48

**ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன இல்லை.**

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

Mr. Deputy-Chairman, I have seen the hon. Parliamentary Secretary in good form. He looks like the last man to leave the tavern. He has his last drink, he abuses the man who gives him the drink, he abuses everyone, gets angry with himself, and finally goes home and even assaults the domestic — *[Interruption]*. The domestic sector also gets a thorough assaulting from him after he takes a

drink—*[Interruption]*. It is very interesting to see him losing his self-respect and dignity and addressing senior Members of the House in a manner that he should not, but heaping praise on his Minister because he thinks the halo of his Minister will one day fall on his head. And what a nice head on which it can fall! Sir, I like his leader, the Hon. Minister of Industries, an old teacher of mine. *Theguru*—he was like the *poosa*: you see, the *poosa* taught the tiger how to climb the tree, but he never taught him how to get down. If my hon. Friend who comes from Wattala takes this lesson—*[Interruption]*.

The Hon. Minister of Industries might recall that when I was just a young university student—he was at Gothatuwa then—I used to go with him in his car. Those were lovely days—those days of political grandeur and romance, which we no longer see in him now. He now even goes to his Seat and tries to take the Prime Minister in his chariot in his days of senile decay. He offers a chariot to the Prime Minister who, under his own standards of political modesty, says: “No, no, I can yet walk”, and does not get into the chariot. If the hon. Parliamentary Secretary would follow in his footsteps he will also be like the *kotiya* that climbs but cannot come down.

In point of fact, I expected it. Of course, it was a very good speech in defence of government policy. I must congratulate him on that speech. But he got a little angry with the hon. Leader of the Opposition and—*[Interruption]*.

**செல்டன் ஜெயசிங்க இல்லை.**

(திரு. செல்டன் ஜெயசிங்க)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

I am sorry.

**ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன இல்லை.**

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

How nice it is when one gets a little sober! How nice to see him get up and apologize! Anyhow, it was very interesting to listen to him.



[ඒ. ඩබ්ලිව් නිලකරන්ත මෑ.]

The Hon. Finance Minister, in the year 1965, stood up on the Floor of this House and blamed the previous Government, the Government of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and said that we left the Treasury high and dry, left empty coffers, and there was nothing for them to do. He said that, in point of fact, they were trying to build the country with whatever resources they had. But in 1966 the Hon. Minister of Finance was like a cock-bird on a tree putting its feathers up and crowing loud to the entire world, "I am now venturing to do something for you." If you read his Budget Speech of 1966, it expresses the confidence of a cock-bird fluttering its feathers and telling, "I, U. B. Wanninayake, am prepared to do my best for the well-being of this country." Today the Hon. Minister of Finance is seated there not like the fluttering cock-bird but looking like a "themichcha kukula".

Mr. Chairman, if you will be pleased to read his Budget Speech for 1966-67, you will see that he referred very confidently to the question of the balance of payments. May I be permitted to read a part of it :

"The balance of payments current account had shown a persistent deficit since 1957. The total external assets had dwindled from Rs. 1,182 million in April, 1955 to Rs. 341 million in March, 1965, while the local foreign exchange reserves were hardly adequate to finance the imports of four or five days."

He continues further—

"In the twelve months that have passed, I am happy to state that Ceylon's economy has shown signs of improvement in several directions.

The most notable progress has been made in the sphere of the balance of payments. The total external assets of Ceylon which stood at Rs. 341 million when the National Government assumed office in March 1965 increased to Rs. 440 million at the end 1965. This improvement in the external assets position has taken place even after a sizeable reduction in short-term foreign liabilities. Towards the improvement of the external assets position, the assistance received from the International Monetary Fund and the increased inflow of foreign assistance made a useful contribution. In

1965, the balance of payments showed a surplus of Rs. 47 million in the current account after a series of persistent deficits since 1957."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 29th July 1966, Vol. 68 CC. 19-220]

Excellent performance indeed!

What happened after that? Even before the ink could dry on that Budget Speech, the deficit in the balance of payments amounted to Rs. 338 million. And he made that speech as if statistics would bear him out in due course. I do not wish to burden this House with statistics at this stage. It will be seen that the deficit in 1966 has been the highest since 1960. It was in 1960, you will remember, Mr. Chairman, that the Government of Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike came to office. And the Hon. Minister of Finance knows that the deficit in 1966 has been the highest since 1960.

What does the Hon. Minister now say in his Budget Speech in 1968 :

"The external payments problems which beset the economy in 1966 continued in 1967, when there was a further deterioration in the external payments situation, brought about chiefly by a continued fall in export earnings. The deficit recorded on the merchandise account was Rs. 351 million; an increase of Rs. 7 million over that of 1966. Net earnings on invisibles were Rs. 21 million as against Rs. 53 million in the previous year. As a result, the net deficit on current account increased by Rs. 39 million to Rs. 329 million in 1967.

The adverse current account position in our balance of payments in 1967, as mentioned earlier, was principally on account of a deterioration in our export earnings, both merchandise and invisibles. In regard to merchandise exports, the value of these exports declined by Rs. 28 million to Rs. 1,646 million. The decline in export values was due largely to a decline of 5 per cent. in the average price of our major exports, as measured by the Central Bank index of export volumes. The fall in prices was aggravated by a fall in the export volumes of rubber and coconut products."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 2nd August 1968; Vol. 80, cc. 45-46]

In point of fact you will see that according to the Minister in 1965 all the previous deficits were attributed to the former Governments and he took the credit for the surplus in 1965. On this argument who is to be blamed for the phenomenal deficit in 1966



and 1967? It is only this Government which has to be blamed for that. This in spite of all the concessions given to the western capitalist countries and local capitalists in the form of tax concessions, permission to repatriate capital and compensation to oil companies.

**ඉරු මන්තීයක**

(කෙළරඹ වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Fall in tea prices.

**ස්ටැන්ලි තිලකරත්න මය.**

(තිரு. ස්ටැන්ලි තිලකරත්න)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

When you made your Budget Speech in 1966 you started on the note that you were cock-sure of the real financial position and you blamed our Government because you said the foreign exchange reserves were hardly adequate to finance the imports of four or five days.

As in the case of the Balance of Payments the Minister's optimism and his dreams were short-lived. This is the external assets position since 1956, that is, when the late Prime Minister, took office. In 1956 the figure was Rs. 1,194.4 million.

**ඉරු මන්තීයක**

(කෙළරඹ වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

We left that for you.

**ස්ටැන්ලි තිලකරත්න මය.**

(තිரு. ස්ටැන්ලි තිලකරත්න)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

It was blood money of the Korean war that you left behind.

**ඉරු මන්තීයක**

(කෙළරඹ වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Continue your story from there.

**ස්ටැන්ලි තිලකරත්න මය.**

(තිரு. ස්ටැන්ලි තිලකරත්න)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

I shall get down to the year 1965. When the Government of the Leader of the Opposition went out of office

what was the external assets position? Rs. 407.6 million. And in 1966 it came down to Rs. 281.9 million.

**ඉරු මන්තීයක**

(කෙළරඹ වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

What is the position today?

**ස්ටැන්ලි තිලකරත්න මය.**

(තිரு. ස්ටැන්ලි තිලකරත්න)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

Today it is Rs. 407.0 million. You are where you were when you took over in 1965.

**ඉරු මන්තීයක**

(කෙළරඹ වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

In spite of a higher volume of imports.

**ස්ටැන්ලි තිලකරත්න මය.**

(තිரு. ස්ටැන්ලි තිලකරත්න)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

Anyhow it will be seen that the external assets dwindled to rock-bottom in 1966—Rs. 281.9 million—during the U. N. P. regime, and in 1965 when the Government of Mrs. Bandaranaike was defeated we left the country in a better position than what it came to in 1966.

This is what the Report of the Central Bank for the year 1967 states :

“External assets figures showed an increase by Rs. 125 million despite the deterioration in the balance of payments. This fortuitous increase was entirely the result of the various borrowing arrangements resorted to in 1967.”

So that the increase in the external assets figure in 1967 was the result of borrowings.

**ඉරු මන්තීයක**

(කෙළරඹ වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

The other figures also include borrowings.



ස්ටැන්ලි තිලකරත්න මය.

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

But you borrowed the most.

"In addition to the substantial net drawings from the International Monetary Fund, there were temporary borrowings from foreign banking sources amounting to Rs. 57 million and an increase in liabilities under payments agreements by Rs. 80 million. For the same fortuitous reasons, the International Reserve of the Central Bank increased by Rs. 117 million between the end of the previous year and the end of December, 1967."

That is how the country was managed during this period.

රු වන්තිනයක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

The previous figures also include borrowings.

ස්ටැන්ලි තිලකරත්න මය.

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

This is how the Government managed to improve its position in 1965. Hence we see that both in 1965 and 1967 this Government increased its foreign assets not through economic development but by borrowing from various foreign sources and thereby committing future generations to the curse of indebtedness.

What is the position of the Public Debt? Since the Hon. Minister of Finance is accustomed to take 1956 and 1960 for purposes of comparison always—those are his dividing lines—I am not going into the other years but I am confining myself to those years.

In the year 1956 the gross foreign debt was Rs. 211.4 million.

රු වන්තිනයක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

You must add to that the savings that were left behind.

ස්ටැන්ලි තිලකරත්න මය.

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

The gross domestic debt was Rs. 1,161.3 million. In 1960, the foreign debt was Rs. 293.7 million and the domestic debt was Rs. 2,230.4 million.

රු වන්තිනයක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

By that time you had finished about three-fourths of what we left behind.

ස්ටැන්ලි තිලකරත්න මය.

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

We will come down to your figures now. In 1965—that is the critical year—the foreign debt was Rs. 489.3 million and the domestic debt was Rs. 4,184.8 million. In 1966 the foreign debt increased to Rs. 543.8 million and the domestic debt increased to Rs. 4,743.3 million.

And what is the position today? The figures for 1967 are available. The position in 1967 is that your foreign debt has gone up—it has spiralled—from Rs. 211.4 million in 1956 and Rs. 293.7 million in 1960, during the tenure of office of the present Leader of the Opposition, to Rs. 739.3 million.

රු වන්තිනයක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

The difference is that your foreign debt was used to meet recurrent expenditure whereas our foreign debt is used to provide development.

කෙනමෝ මය.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Nonsense!

රු වන්තිනයක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I will give you the figures.



**சீட்டென் லீ திலகரத்ன மஹ.**

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

That is a very weak argument, Sir that all this is for economic development. I will show you how it was utilized.

Let us now look at the domestic debt.—[Interruption]. The Hon. Minister is very unhappy with the presentation of the arguments.

Mr. Chairman, you will see that at the time the late Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike took over the domestic debt was Rs. 1,161.3 million, and when the present Leader of the Opposition became the Prime Minister, the domestic debt was Rs. 2,230.4 million. In 1965 it was only Rs. 4,184.8 million. And what is it today?

**ஆர். வந்தினாயக்க**

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

They had exhausted the reserves.

**சீட்டென் லீ திலகரத்ன மஹ.**

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

In what way?

**ஆர். வந்தினாயக்க**

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

The foreign assets that were left behind.

**சீட்டென் லீ திலகரத்ன மஹ.**

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

Those figures sometimes hurt him. I will show you from your own figures how in 1966 the domestic debt went up to Rs. 4,743.3 million, and in 1967 it went up to Rs. 5,321.5 million, which is the figures as it stands today. There has been a steep rise in both the foreign debt and the domestic debt.

**ஆர். வந்தினாயக்க**

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

How it was used is what counts.

**சீட்டென் லீ திலகரத்ன மஹ.**

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

I will come to that presently. The foreign debt which stood at Rs. 412.1 million in 1964 has gone up to Rs. 739.3 million in 1967. The domestic debt which stood at Rs. 3,787.4 in 1964 has risen to Rs. 5,321 in 1967. The steadily rising trend in the public debt could be easily discerned.

It is also significant that while the total withdrawals from foreign sources in 1966-67 amounted to Rs. 236.2 millions, repayments during the same year amounted to Rs. 45.7 million, or nearly 20 per cent of the withdrawals. At this rate a point will be reached very soon when the repayments would exceed the withdrawals.

The extent of indebtedness and its significance in relation to the economy could be gauged by the fact that out of a total capital expenditure of Rs. 1,024 million provided for in this Budget, Rs. 161 million or 16 per cent is in respect of contributions to public debt, sinking funds, and amortisation payments.

**ஆர். வந்தினாயக்க**

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

The loans you took are coming in for repayment now. Our debts are not coming in for repayment.

**சீட்டென் லீ திலகரத்ன மஹ.**

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

Yes, but this ratio is considered to be too high by any known standard at this time.



**சு. வந்தியாயகம்**

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)  
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

You do not know. You were not with them at that time.

**சு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன**

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)  
(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

By any known standard at this time it has reached the highest figure.

The total arrivals from 1965 to 30th June this year have been Rs. 484.56 million.

**சு. வந்தியாயகம்**

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)  
(The Hon. Wanninayake)  
They have not come.

**சு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன**

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)  
(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

Yes. What you are expecting to arrive.

It is significant that out of this amount Rs. 161.9 million or one-third has been from U. S. sources under commodity loans and aid under P. L. 480.—[Interruption]. Yes, under P. L. 480. He is forgetting his own figures. Actually one-third has been from U. S. sources under commodity loans and aid under P. L. 480.

It is relevant to examine the motives for the granting of aid by the U. S. I do not know whether the Hon. Minister of Finance has seen this. He probably would have read this. This is not an ordinary magazine. This is actually the "Harvard Business Review".

**சு. வந்தியாயகம்**

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)  
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

An American production ?

**சு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன**

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)  
(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

The Americans are talking as to why they are giving you aid, Mr. Minister of Finance. It is not to help you but to keep the American domestic economy going.

**சு. வந்தியாயகம்**

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)  
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I thought you do not take serious notice of these things.

**சு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன**

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)  
(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

I am quoting from the very books of your own masters. Your own masters are telling us and telling the world why they are giving you aid. I refer to page 63 of this magazine : "Impact of foreign aid on U. S. exports". This is the result of research conducted by the Harvard University and it is very important to see why the Americans are so very interested in giving us aid. I am not going to read this at length, but the relevant sections for the Minister's own persuasion will be interesting.

**சு. வந்தியாயகம்**

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)  
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

You must read the whole article.

**சு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன**

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)  
(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

Yes, I can make this book available to him.

"During fiscal 1966 the Agency for International Development (AID) spent"

for which the hon. Parliamentary Secretary shouted "Aid".

—"1.1 billion in the United States procuring commodities for shipment to developing countries as a part of the U.S. foreign assistance program. As a result, U. S. businessmen are keenly concerned with the question :—"



They are not concerned about this country; they are concerned about their own development there—

— “How much impact does direct government procurement of U.S. goods for export to developing countries have on U.S. trade and, in particular, on commercial exports by private businessmen?”

They are themselves raising this question. The Americans are aiding us. Commodity aid is coming to us. I do not want to mention their names but these two research scholars are both attached to the International Development Department of the Department of State, and they are asking this question :

“How much impact does direct government procurement of U.S. goods for export to developing countries have on U.S. trade and, in particular, on commercial exports by private businessmen?”

The question has aroused considerable debate. Among businessmen whose overseas markets have expanded because of foreign assistance, the aid program has received very strong support.”

May I show you the statistics? It is very interesting to see how much of aid those people get as a result of this.

“... it is largely due to the operation of our foreign aid program that the steel industry has managed to escape the full effects of the forces at work in the world market place.”—

The American steel industry is surviving, according to them, because of the fact that commodity aid is being sent to these developing countries. The U. S. has been able to save their steel industry because of the aid coming over to us. Actually the American Government procures from them and then sends it to us. When it comes here, it is handed over to the Minister of Finance, and when he takes it, he makes the country indebted. Of course, the writing is on the wall for them. They will go away, but they will keep generations of people in this country indebted to the United States Government.

அ. வன்னினாயக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

We shall settle all the debts before we go.

ஸ்டீலி திரைகரத்ன மஹ.

(திரு. ஸ்டீலர்ஸ் லி திரைகரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

It goes on to say :

“We estimate that AID procurement in the United States of steel mill products currently accounts for some 30 per cent. of the value of our steel exports, and for an even higher per cent. of the tonnage shipped—perhaps as much as 40 per cent. Without this AID support it is highly probable that the deficit in steel trade might have been 1 million tons larger.”

So you will see that in order to save the American steel industry, to save the American private industry, an aid programme is carried on and programme is carried on and our friends take over the aid given by them and commit this country for years to come. It goes on :

“By fiscal 1966 the full impact of these AID-trying policies to safeguard the U.S. balance of payments position became apparent. In that year \$ 9 out of every \$ 10 of foreign commodity expenditures financed by AID went to U.S. suppliers.”

This is very interesting to note. Out of expenditures financed by AID, if you take into consideration \$ 10, \$ 9 dollars went to those manufacturers. It continues to say :

“In general, the overwhelming proportion of commodity and other expenditures now financed by AID is tied to procurement in the United States.”

If not for the commodity aid that they are giving us the American economy would have been in a worse crisis than it is now and they would have faced the problem of balance-of-payments in a bigger and larger way. You talk a lot about aid. Here is something very interesting. This Magazine further states :

“It should be noted that throughout this article foreign assistance or aid (in contrast to AID) includes that provided under the Agency for International Development, Public Law 480, and the Export import bank.”



[பேரவைத் தலைவர் அவர்கள்]

It goes on to say at the next page :

"As can clearly be seen in exhibit", the U.S. market share declined rather steadily between 1948 and 1955 from 30 per cent to 25 per cent largely as a result of the post-war recovery of competitive suppliers in Europe and Japan) between the low point in 1955 and 1965. The U. S. share showed a net rise of about three percentage points. Also obvious in both exhibits is the marks increase between 1955 and 1965 in the proportion of exports to developing countries paid for by foreign assistance—from 8 per cent. in 1955 to 18 per cent. in 1960, when formal AID—tying policies first began to her effective, to 28 per cent. in 1965."

சுரு. வணிகத்துறை

(கேள்வியளிப்பவர்)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

That is before we came in.

பேரவைத் தலைவர் அவர்கள்.

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

Yes, but you are following all what came after that. This is very interesting to note [Interruption.] In fact, this Magazine belongs to a famous institute. I can hand it over to the Hon. Minister of Finance if he wants to read it.

Let us now come to the purpose for which this aid is given. The Hon. Minister's argument is that aid is given only for development works. Let us take the case of India. The United States of America wants India to behave as a very good girl. During our time, of course, we did not want to behave as a very good girl. That was the trouble with us.

சுரு. வணிகத்துறை

(கேள்வியளிப்பவர்)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

You are talking of your time. What are those years that you speak of?

பேரவைத் தலைவர் அவர்கள்.

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

In fact our time is the time since 1956 and more particularly since 1960, when the present Leader of the Opposition was the Prime Minister

of this country. That is our time, the time we came into this House. Let us take the case of India. The Aid India Consortium hoped to pledge \$ 900 million between between then and now on non-project aid for this year. [Interruption.] I shall come to Ceylon. You all have been taken for a ride. I shall give you the figures.

சுரு. வணிகத்துறை

(கேள்வியளிப்பவர்)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

From what document?

பேரவைத் தலைவர் அவர்கள்.

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

I am going to give the figures from the notes I have made for my speech. Just imagine the Hon. Minister of Finance! A gentleman whose Budget Speech is written by his officials, a gentleman who reads his Budget Speech the day he delivers it, is asking me from where I get these figures.

சுரு. வணிகத்துறை

(கேள்வியளிப்பவர்)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I am not saying that what the hon. Member is reading is wrong, but somebody else may have given wrong figures.

பேரவைத் தலைவர் அவர்கள்.

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

Now, 900 million dollars between then and now. The Project Aid for this year is 400 million dollars or even more to cover specific projects such as fertilizer, plants etc. Last year India was pledged 550 million dollars and the year before that it got 900 million dollars in non-project aid only because two-thirds of it came from the United States and the World Bank's soft loan affiliate, the International Development Association. So the prospect is not so cheerful. The I. D. A. and the United States do not look the most bountiful aid giver just now. What is happening is this.



**சு. உத்தியோக**

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

From where did you get these figures? Tell us at least the source.

**பேர்தலைவர் கிண்கரன் மை.**

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

I have collected these figures. I need not tell the Hon. Minister of Finance from where I got them. Even in the case of aid to India the bulk of the aid has been given by the United States. That is what is known as non-project aid for development. May I tell you some of those things for which aid has been given. They are, agriculture, fertilizers and birth control. On birth control the aid amounts to 1.8 million dollars.

**சு. உத்தியோக**

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

That is nothing much.

**பேர்தலைவர் கிண்கரன் மை.**

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

Of course, in the case of the Hon. Minister of Finance birth has been controlled by now.

In point of fact, most of this aid is actually for non-project industries. For fertilizers, birth control and so on rather than for steel mills.

Similarly, liberalization of imports has been welcomed by Washington. This has been made possible by a violent switch from project-oriented aid to non-project aid.

In the case of Ceylon also we find a similar situation. As far as Ceylon is concerned the same policy continues. Not only is the same policy continued but you will also see from it the type of aid that has been given: for fertilizers we have got 11.28 million dollars; for commercial vehicles we have got 34.49 dollars.

**சு. உத்தியோக**

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Fertilizer is for development.

**பேர்தலைவர் கிண்கரன் மை.**

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

I was telling this House by way of interruption that this was actually used for productive ventures.

**சு. உத்தியோக**

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Do you not need fertilizers?

**பேர்தலைவர் கிண்கரன் மை.**

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

For motor spares we have got 39.49 million dollars. Yes, I know, the Hon. Minister needs fertilizer now. Building materials 14.10 million dollars; industrial raw material and machinery, 72.77 million dollars; textiles, 27.25 million dollars; tyres and tubes, 19.72 million dollars; dry fish, 4.43 million dollars; dried chillies; 1.90 million dollars; and so it goes on, all the extent of 484.56 million dollars with the intermediate goods and equipment.

**சு. உத்தியோக**

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Intermediate goods and equipment are for development.

**பேர்தலைவர் கிண்கரன் மை.**

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

It does not say so. It talks of raw materials and many other things. All that put together come to 484.56 million dollars. Of the foreign aid relied on by the Hon. Minister of Finance to help bridge the deficit in 1968-69, Rs. 263 million is composed of commodity aid while only Rs. 213 million is composed of project aid.



[ස්ථානීය නිලධාරීන්ගේ මධ්‍ය.]

That is how the assistance has been given to the Hon. Minister of Finance.

I should like to draw your attention to another aspect of this problem. This Government will never solve the problems connected with unemployment, balance of payment, foreign assets, cost of living, etc. In point of fact the Hon. Minister or the Parliamentary Secretary to the Hon. Minister of Industries and Fisheries spoke about the industrial policy they have ventured upon. What have they ventured upon? Recently, with trumpet blast they inaugurated the Tulkiriya Textile Mills. That was an aid-project which was negotiated by the Government of the Hon. Mrs. Sirima Bandaranaike. That was done by her Government when we were in power. Today the bulk of the industrial projects are projects which were started during the time of the late Mr. Bandaranaike as well as of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition when she was Prime Minister. But what have this Government done? They have only increased unemployment.

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය

(කෙනෙරා වැන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

We have rationalized.

ස්ථානීය නිලධාරීන්ගේ මධ්‍ය.

(ශ්‍රී. ස්ටැන්ලි තිලකරත්න)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

Not rationalized. They have only increased unemployment. In 1956 only 85,952 persons were unemployed. In 1960, the year the Hon. Leader of the Opposition led the Government the unemployment figure was 151,092 in 1965 it was 199,655, and in 1963, today, the figure is 266,371. And the Central Bank is of opinion that there are at least seven lakhs of people who do not wish to go to your employment exchanges in order to register themselves for employment. That is the position in which you find yourselves today.

That is what has made the loud-mouthed Minister of Education go about the country—I am sorry to use the word, but I must—blackguarding the graduates who are asking for employment, and everyone, including the press. In fact, a certain newspaper said that he did not blackguard only one person, and that is himself. He did not do that.

When the Government of the present Leader of the Opposition went out of office in 1965 there was no graduate unemployment in this country. Today there are nine thousand graduates unemployed. If this Government continues for another two years we will have 14,000 to 15,000 graduates unemployed in this country, and that will be the heritage they will leave to us when we take over the Government thereafter.

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය

(කෙනෙරා වැන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

It is only now that our universities are producing the graduates.

ස්ථානීය නිලධාරීන්ගේ මධ්‍ය.

(ශ්‍රී. ස්ටැන්ලි තිලකරත්න)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

In the sphere of employment and in the industrial sector it is our Government that set up the various industries. On the foreign policy pursued by the Government of which Sir John Kotelawela was Prime Minister we had no contact with the socialist countries. It is the late Prime Minister, Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike, who actually established diplomatic relations with all those countries and got aid from the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and all the socialist countries in order to develop the economy of this country.

Then what happened? We laid the foundations, we installed the machinery and erected the roof, and then we were defeated in 1965. Then this Government went and opened the schemes we had started.



Look at the industries we have. Look at the steel industry, look at the cement factory down South and look at the textile mill at Tulhiriya. It was only recently that that was inaugurated. Even the Terminal Building at the Katunayake Air Port was the result of a promise made by the Canadian Government to Mrs. Bandaranaike's Government.

In fact, if there is anything that could be called industry in this country today, it is there as a result of the efforts of the Government from 1956 to 1959 and that from 1960 to 1965.

சு. வந்தியானை

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

There is an excellent assessment of those industries. I shall read it out presently.

ஸ்டீன்லி திலக்கரத்னே.

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

Please do. What has this Government done? What are the industries started by them? There is an industry which I can recommend to them but I cannot do it in this House.

But whatever is said and done, how have this Government increased the employment capacity in this country? The Hon. Minister of Nationalized Services is the person who led the Colombo Municipal Trolley Service to bankruptcy. When this Government came into office they actually started employing people in the C.T.B. and telling the country, "Oh! We are solving the country's unemployment problem."

What has happened today? Today the C.T.B. is top heavy. It has been reported that each vehicle has 14 people to work it. Even other corporations are over-staffed. There has not been any economic development in this country since the present Government came into power which would have contributed towards absorbing the young men coming out of schools and universities.

In fact, the number of science students seeking admission to universities in 1968 came down to 2,745, the number of arts students seeking admission came down to 7,930. The number of arts students sitting for the G.C.E. 'O' level was 150,000 and the number of science students sitting for the same examination was 35,000. The number of arts students sitting for the G.C.E. (Advanced Level) Examination in 1968 is 25,000. The number of science students sitting for the G.C.E. (Advanced Level) Examination is 6,000. About 3,000 arts graduates and 1,000 science graduates are likely to pass out of the universities during the current year. And what employment facilities has your Government provided for them?

With regard to the cost of living, everything has gone up in price. I remember the time when we were in the Opposition with the Hon. Minister of Finance. Of course, then I was not a member of the S.L.F.P. When you moved a Vote of No Confidence against Mrs. Bandaranaike's Government we supported you, we fought with you. You criticized her Government against the rise in the cost of living. I heard the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries today developing a very apologetic speech on this subject. I can remember what the Hon. Minister of Finance said in his Budget speech in 1966 about the cost of living index.

சு. வந்தியானை

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Read also about the increase in real wages.

ஸ்டீன்லி திலக்கரத்னே.

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

This is what he said in his Budget speech of 1966:

"The cost of living index has remained stable over the entire period this Government has been in office as a result of the direct measures taken to keep prices down



[சீமென்ட் கிலைகர்த்த மலை.]

and the stable monetary and fiscal policies followed by the Government.”— [OFFICIAL REPORT, 29th July 1966; Vol. 68, c. 21.]

May I repeat that for your edification :

“The cost of living index has remained stable over the entire period this Government has been in office as a result of the direct measures taken to keep prices down and the stable monetary and fiscal policies followed by the Government.

Then he goes on to say at column 34 of the same Budget speech :

“The Colombo Consumers’ Price Index which had been rising sharply during the last few years slowed down considerably in 1965. The rise in the overall index in 1965 was only 0.3 points as compared with an increase of 2.5 and 3.4 points during the years 1963 and 1964 respectively.”

Then again at column 35 he says :

“During the decade prior to 1965 steadily rising prices of textiles had been a major factor in raising the index of the cost of living. In 1965, however, the prices of textiles declined slightly below the prices prevailing over the previous year. This lowering of prices took place in spite of a lower volume of textile imports in 1965 than in 1964 and higher import price of textiles. This lowering of prices in the face of these two circumstances is attributable partly to an increase in the ration of textiles issued on coupons and partly to measures adopted by Government to bring out hoarded goods.”

What brave words! What an achievement! The impression he created in the mind of everyone was that he had been able to tackle the problem of the rise in the cost of living. In this context let us analyse the cost of living figures since 1956. They are very revealing.

In 1956, when the late Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike was Prime Minister, the cost of living index was 100.2. In 1959, at the time the Government was dissolved for the general election, the index was 105.2. In 1960, when the present hon. Leader of the Opposition formed the Government, it was 103.5. In 1965 it was 112.5.

சென்ட்ரி கிலைகர்த்த மலை

(கெளரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

It went up from 100.2 in 1956 to 112.5 in 1965.

சீமென்ட் கிலைகர்த்த மலை.

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்தன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillickeratne)

Here are the figures for 1967 :

January	..	113.4
November	..	116.3
December	..	119.3

The figures for 1968 are :

January	..	119.2
June	..	120.3
July	..	121.5

That is where the cost of living index stands today.

சென்ட்ரி கிலைகர்த்த மலை

(கெளரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Read out the other figures relating to the increase in the real wages also.

சீமென்ட் கிலைகர்த்த மலை.

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்தன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

The Government has established another record. The cost of living index has sky-rocketed to the unprecedented figure of 121.5 in July this year. The sharp rise in the index from 113.4 to 119.3 between January and December 1967 is mainly attributable to the devaluation of the rupee in November 1967. As a result of the devaluation of the rupee there was a sharp increase in the cost of living index and that was seen in November 1967.

சென்ட்ரி கிலைகர்த்த மலை

(கெளரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

To off-set that an allowance was paid.



**ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன** **மொ.**

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

Allowances were paid!

**செ. வந்தியாயக**

(கௌரவ வந்தியாயக)

The Hon. Wanninayake)

See table 44.

**ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன** **மொ.**

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

In point of fact, as far as the Minister was concerned, he announced to this country in his Budget Speech that there was going to be a 25 per cent reduction in the import prices of textiles.

**செ. வந்தியாயக**

(கௌரவ வந்தியாயக)

The Hon. Wanninayake)

I did not say that.

**ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன** **மொ.**

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

You did not say that? Will you please tell us what you said?

**செ. வந்தியாயக**

(கௌரவ வந்தியாயக)

The Hon. Wanninayake)

I said that I was removing import duty in respect of four varieties.

**ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன** **மொ.**

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

Yes, you were removing!

**செ. வந்தியாயக**

(கௌரவ வந்தியாயக)

The Hon. Wanninayake)

Wait and see. Read the Budget Speech. You do not know where it is?

**சிரிமாவோ பந்தாரநாயக** **மொ.**

(திருமதி சிரிமாவோ பந்தாரநாயக)

(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)

Wait till 1970?

**ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன** **மொ.**

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

What has happened? Sir, the Salu Sala increased its prices of all items of textiles ranging from 18 cts. to 93 cts. a yard which amount to an increase ranging from 10 per cent to 25 per cent over the prevailing prices. In fact, the full impact of the FEECs Scheme introduced in May this year is still to be felt, and you have not felt it yet. What has happened under the FEECs Scheme? A nadar has ordered three lakhs worth of padlocks and he has got the consignment of padlocks. He would in all probability grease them and keep them until he is able to sell them out. That is what is happening under your FEECs Scheme. The full impact of it has not still been felt by the people—first you had the devaluation of the rupee—and what steps have the Government taken to counteract it? In point of fact, the Central Bank opinion was divided on the question of devaluation.

**செ. வந்தியாயக**

(கௌரவ வந்தியாயக)

The Hon. Wanninayake)

How do you know?

**ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன** **மொ.**

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

Oh, yes! It was divided on the question of the devaluation. You think that we do not know these things? We got confidential papers also in this House one day. We have got our spies in every one of these places and we get all this information. There were one or two strong-headed people and they wanted to go through this devaluation.



[ස්වෛරී නිලධාරීන්ගේ මය.]

Before the economy felt the full impact of devaluation the Government introduced the FEECs Scheme. What has happened? The cost of living index has risen to astronomical figures and the people of this country will have to bear unprecedented hardships due to the mismanagement and inefficiency of this Government.

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීතුමා

(කෙළවර වැඩිපුරා)

The Hon. Wanninayake

What are you reading from?

ස්වෛරී නිලධාරීන්ගේ මය.

(ති. ඩබ්ලිව්. ජයවර්ධන)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

What is it that you want? The Hon. Minister reads other peoples speeches always as his Budget Speech—the man who reads other peoples speeches, the man who gets statistics from the Central Bank officials, the man who really wants to answer the Opposition criticism by running always to the Official Box, Sir, is the man who is asking me from where I have got my figures. Look at this spectre of a Finance Minister haunting you!

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීතුමා

(කෙළවර වැඩිපුරා)

The Hon. Wanninayake

You get information from the Central Bank also?

ස්වෛරී නිලධාරීන්ගේ මය.

(ති. ඩබ්ලිව්. ජයවර්ධන)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

Yes, some of them from the Central Bank also.

The only reference to the cost of living in the Hon. Minister's Speech is this:

"In 1967, the average of the Colombo Consumers Price Index increased by 2 per cent. over the average for 1966. The increase was mainly on account of food items and to a lesser extent in the commodities that constitute the fuel and light

group. The price index for textiles which had fallen in 1966 declined further in 1967."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 2nd August 1968; Vol. 80, c. 44.]

Where are the Hon. Minister's brave utterances of 1966? What has happened to the measures that he adopted to bring down the cost of living? In fact, the newspapers are daily crying out that the cost of living index is going up. I remember the "Daily Mirror" carrying a news item recently stating that the Government Parliamentary Group was summoned in order to discuss matters pertaining to the bringing down of the cost of living index and that only a handful turned up as they were not worried about the cost of living index at all.

That was the newspaper report. This is the interest that this Government is taking in order to bring down the cost of living. You will be pleased to see that important changes have come about from time to time. I will give the figures during our time and your time pertaining to a variety of articles. Of course, I will show you how Salu Sala has prospered. In point of fact I am glad that the "Daily Mirror" has given front page publicity to this. White poplin has gone up from Rs. 2.10 to Rs. 2.30 a yard. Your dyed poplin has gone up from Rs. 2.12 to Rs. 2.50. Your satin from Rs. 2.79 to Rs. 3.59. Your taffeta from Rs. 2.79 to Rs. 3.35. The tussore which you are wearing I know you are all essentially "tussore" gentlemen has gone up from Rs. 3.68 to Rs. 4.40. Your drills, khaki blue and white, from Rs. 2.43 to Rs. 3.43; satin drill from Rs. 2.43 to Rs. 4.61. This is how the newspaper publishes it. This is the issue of the "Daily Mirror" of August 5th, 1968. The prices of a large number of textiles have shot up despite the Finance Minister's budgetary proposal to waive the import duty of 25 cents a yard. The Salu Sala immediately started increasing—that is the first increase after the Finance Minister announced that he was going to waive the import duty of 25 cents per yard.



Now coming down to comparative prices of foodstuffs and dried fish obtainable in 1965 and 1968, when we went out and when you came in—

**சு. உத்தியாசக**

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

You must give the 1956, 1965 and 1968 figures. Then it is correct.

**பீல்டி திலகரத்ன**

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

I will quote these prices. The Hon. Minister of Finance can get the figures from the Central Bank if he wishes, and give them in his reply. You know the price of *ulu hal*? In 1965 when we were in power it was 45 cents a pound, now it is Re. 1 a pound. Tamarind has gone up because it is a very good laxative for the Government also! It was 48 cents per pound during our time, it has now gone up to 70 cents. The prices I am quoting are from the Marketing Department retail shop as they stood on 31.7.68.

I challenge the Hon. Minister of Finance to produce the relevant files.

**சு. உத்தியாசக**

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I will produce the 1956 figures. When you took over what were the prices?

**பீல்டி திலகரத்ன**

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

*Mung-eta* has gone up from 44 cents to 56 cents a pound, but now it is not available. Coffee has gone up from Rs. 2.60 to Rs. 2.75 a lb. The increase has only been 15 cents. I think quite a lot of coffee would have been consumed by the Minister of Finance in putting these figures together in order to present his Budget Speech. கடுகு from 40 cents to 57 cents. கீழை from Re. 1.40 to Re. 1.50. கிழங்க from 28 cents to 60 cents.

கடுகி from 67 cents to 72 cents, கிழங்க from 23 cents to 33 cents, கீழை from 80 cents to Re. 1.15— just before the harvest it went up to Re. 1.40— கீழை from 70 cents to Re. 1.15. barley from 36 cents to 56 cents, கீழை from 48 cents to 84, and not available!

**சு. உத்தியாசக**

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Then it does not matter what the price is.

**பீல்டி திலகரத்ன**

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

So, you do not want கீழை?

**சு. உத்தியாசக**

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

If it is not available how can you quote the price?

**பீல்டி திலகரத்ன**

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

How cynical you are—[*Interruption*] I am surprised that he is the Finance Minister. Anyhow, the Prime Minister has a Finance Minister whom he can finish up with the end of this Government. His political future is tied up with this Finance Ministry, and I am very unhappy because he is one of the best Ministers we have on the other side—a gentleman to whom we can go at any time. He is a very charming gentleman with no pride. With all this you are going to finish up your political career. I am sorry for you.

**சு. உத்தியாசக**

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

You are quoting prices of articles which are not available.



சீமென்ட் திருவாரூர் மன்றி.

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கராத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

He would have done well as any other Minister. To continue the price list: விவசாயம் from Re. 1.34 to Rs. 3.00. Wanniya people do not eat மீன்? In the blackmarket the price has gone up to Rs. 7.50. These figures are from the Marketing Department sales depots. அரிசனம் 23 cents, but the Marketing Department price list, giving the prices as they stood on 31.7.68, says: "காய". அரிசனம்! காயம்? No potatoes. I am also convinced that there is no அரிசனம் at all. காயம் 92 cents in 1965, today "காயம்". Now we come to dried fish. We were called the காயம் Government, but we had enough dried fish. We were the people who broke the racket in காயம். We were the people who finished the importers who were draining our external assets by fraudulent devices, by over-loaded invoices. We were the people who broke the காயம் racket, and made it quite easy for them to govern this country in the sphere of importing காயம். Talking of காயம், ours was காயம் காயம்; theirs is mixed with Eau-de-Cologne! காயம்—retail price at the Marketing Department and the C. W. E. as it stood on 15.10.64—Re. 1.55, and on 29.7.68—Rs. 2 ரூபாய். No doubt, there are enough on the other side, but of different type—90 cents, now gone up to Rs. 2. காயம்—

சீமென்ட் திருவாரூர் மன்றி.

(திருமதி சிறிமாவோ பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)

Which Thondaya?

சீமென்ட் திருவாரூர் மன்றி.

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கராத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

This is no disrespect to anyone in the House. காயம் also has gone up in price. That must be due to the change in the political climate, because Thondayas are very high in price on the other side.

from Re. 1.06 to Re. 1.40. காயம் from 93 cents to Re. 1.40, காயம் from Re. 1.30 to Re. 1.60, காயம் from Re. 1.30 to Re. 1.60, காயம் from Re. 1.25 to Re. 1.60, காயம் from Re. 1.10 to Re. 1.40, காயம் from 95 cents to Re. 1.20. The price increases range from 25 per cent to 100 per cent, 110 per cent in the case of a number of articles. Bread—from 25 cents to 35 cents a pound. Beef without bones—காயம் காயம்; all the others are காயம் காயம், but we want காயம் காயம்,—from 97 cents per pound up to Re. 1.50 and Re. 1.60 per pound. That is the position as far as the cost of living index is concerned.

Speaking on the agricultural front, the hon. Parliamentary Secretary was very eloquent that the quantities of commodities imported to this country had been reduced and as a result of that they have been able to save quite a lot of money. Of course, you will see that the position is very much different today. What has really happened? While the import of rice to Ceylon has decreased, the import of flour has increased. I would place the figures before the House. In point of fact, the Hon. Prime Minister himself promised that he would place these figures before this House. I have myself computed some figures on the basis of the Central Bank Report and other reports published by the Department from time to time.

I do not wish to place facts and figures in regard to tea, rubber and coconut because they have already been placed before this House. The Hon. Minister of Finance has actually been very silent on that aspect of the import of flour to Ceylon. And, here is the hon. Parliamentary Secretary telling us that they have saved millions of rupees as a result of the reduction of the import of rice to Ceylon. The Hon. Minister in his Budget speech said:

"...production data reveal that the efforts of Government at import substitution in the field of agriculture, which is the fundamental answer to the continuing balance of payments problem, have begun to bear fruit."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 2nd August, 1968; Vol. 80, c. 38.]



"Payments on food and drink imports in 1967 declined in value by almost Rs. 15 million. Payments on rice imports alone declined by Rs. 43 million."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 2nd August, 1968; Vol. 80, c. 46.]

It is very interesting to see these figures. The Hon. Minister has not placed before this House figures regarding quantity of flour that has been imported into this country.

The actual position regarding flour is that the quantity imported in 1967 had risen by 253,000 tons or 96 per cent over the 1966 imports. The value of this additional quantity imported has cost us nearly Rs. 113 million.

You cut down the ration by one measure and imported less rice. But the people have to eat; so there is food substitution and flour is imported in larger quantities.

You will see that while there has been a reduction in the volume of rice imports from 494,000 tons in 1966 to 318,000 tons in 1967 amounting to a decrease of 113,000 tons valued at Rs. 22 million, the imports of flour have increased from 264,000 tons in 1966 to 517,000 tons in 1967, amounting to an increase of 253,000 tons valued at Rs. 113 million. When people do not eat *bath* they eat *thambapu piti*.

What is happening is that the Government is now producing figures to show that we are importing less rice and therefore spending less. When the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries and Fisheries (Mr. D. Shelton Jayasinghe) was speaking, you will remember, Sir, I interrupted him, and the Prime Minister then said that he has got the figures and he would give them.

I will give the figures. The imports of flour have increased from 264,000 tons in 1966 to 517,000 tons in 1967 as a result of which we have had to incur an additional expenditure of Rs. 113 million. In other words, while there has been a reduction of

22.9 per cent in the volume of rice imported in 1967, there has been an increase of 95.8 per cent in the volume of flour imported in 1967. That is the position.

Various reasons have been attributed for the increase in the imports of flour, but the fact remains that there has been a phenomenal increase in the quantity imported in 1967 in spite of the Government's self-proclaimed success in the food drive. If the food drive has been successful as the Government make it out to be, if they are able to provide us with the rice we need, what is the need to go and increase the imports of flour from 264,000 tons in 1966 to 517,000 tons in 1967? That is a standard by which one can gauge whether the food drive has been a success or not.

Sir, I want to mention an incident in regard to the food drive in my area. In 1967, on May Day, the Prime Minister had a big *shramadana* at Kotte called දියවන්නා මග සංවර්ධන වැඩ පිළිවෙළ. The Prime Minister was taken for a ride. My opponent who contested my seat took the Prime Minister for a ride—on mud. What happened? It must be reported. The U. N. P. May Day demonstration started from Kotte and proceeded to Diyawanna Oya. The land adjoining that had not been cleared for cultivation. There was a big demonstration about the food drive. A quarter of an acre of this land was cleared, and it was muddy.

I was not invited and I could not go and engage myself in this type of foolery because my voters would have found fault with me if I participated in that type of thing.

What happened? A boat was lowered on to the mud. There was no water in the Diyawanna Oya. The Prime Minister sat in the boat with his camera. By his side was my opponent, Mr. Niyathapala, the Senator. Personally, I do not blame him. But there were ten to twelve youth lea-



[ஃவென்லி கிலெர்னன் மல.]

guers who kept the boat on mud and pushed it to a distance of nearly a quarter of a mile. The Ceylon Film Unit filmed the entire thing; and after that the Hon. Prime Minister came out very happy thinking that the Diyawanna Oya project was started. In the end, after the *dana* was over, the organizers quarrelled over the remaining rice and on how to distribute the remaining dried fish. Not only that, Sir; today that very half acre of land is again jungle.

Children were escorted to the paddy fields in their thousands and lakhs in order to boost the food drive. Children were made to assemble for the Hon. Prime Minister to take the salute. None of us are opposed to the food drive, Sir, but we are opposed to foolery.

When the Government party were in the Opposition, they were blaming us for using the Government Film Unit for our political ends. The Government Film Unit today is being abused, the Ceylon Broadcasting Corporation is being abused, and even the Director of Broadcasting is now trying to play the role of a political stooge to this Government.

That is how the food drive is being organized in certain areas. In point of fact, none of us are opposed to the food drive. We want the country to be self-sufficient. But we must see whether steps are being taken towards achieving self-sufficiency, whether self-sufficiency would come our way by the year 1970.

The Hon. Finance Minister in his Budget speech, and the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries and Fisheries today, sand an optimistic note. But people are not going to judge us by our words. People are going to judge us by our deeds. We have had thirteen by-elections in this country; we have had by-elections in Catholic areas closer to your electorate where,

in one case, 85 per cent of the people are Catholics. I am referring to the Negombo Electorate.

You will recall that the late Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of this House, Mr. T. Quentin Fernando whom we respected as a Member of this House, won the Negombo seat by a majority of 17,700 votes. But what happened at the by-election? We reduced the majority from 17,700 to a figure of 7,400.

What happened at Nattandiya? I am sorry the Hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce is not here. For conducting a villifying campaign against the present Opposition after a sordid history, he was given an ambassadorial post in Pakistan. He was brought down in time for the by-election at Nattandiya, which is a 65 per cent Catholic constituency. What happened there? At Nattandiya we reduced their majority from 5,400 to 244 votes. In point of fact, at Welimada, they never had a UNPer to contest the seat. And in the other ten seats, the L. S. S. P. won one seat, and the S. L. F. P. all the other nine seats.

What happened in the V. C. elections? We swept the board in most of the elections. In Maho, we were voted to power; but what happened?

செ. வன்னினாயக்க

(கெளரவ வன்னினாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

In Maho?

ஃவென்லி கிலெர்னன் மல.

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

In Maho V. C., our Chairman was stabbed to death.

செ. வன்னினாயக்க

(கெளரவ வன்னினாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

There were no party politics in it.



ஃஸ்டீலி திலகரத்ன மஹ.

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

The S. L. F. P. Chairman who was put into office in Maho V. C., in the constituency of the Hon. Minister of Finance, was brutally done to death when he came and sat in the Chairman's seat.—[*Interruption.*] You say you have done so much to the country. If you have done so much, how is it that you have lost in the local government elections? You have lost the Parliamentary by-elections. You are, by some deliberate device, delaying the election petition appeals. You do not want to face the by-elections. You do not want to face a general election today.

You started this Session of Parliament on *Julie hatha*. July 7th is a bad day for you. You are going to have some trouble on September 8th, I gather.

ஷெர்வீலி மஹ.

(கெளரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

You are sorry about it.

ஃஸ்டீலி திலகரத்ன மஹ.

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

We are sorry to lose a great Friend. He is a very good Friend of ours, and I must pay a passing compliment to him. He is a Finance Minister who goes into his Ministry in the Secretariat unnoticed by anyone. He does not want the fanfare and pomp which other Finance Ministers have had. For that I give him credit. He is a very good gentleman, Sir. But he is ruining the country. That is the whole trouble. In point of fact I have found it difficult to get appointments from other Finance Ministers. I have seen him in his Ministry only once. I only gave him a call and he said, "Come. Come." I went to the Ministry. The job could not be done because it was an impossible demand, but anyhow, he gave me a hearing. In that way, he is a great man, but he is burdened

with a job, that will kill his entire political future. In point of fact, he has served this country. I knew him when I was at the University. When I was a college student I used to come here in the old State Council days. It was not the same Wanninayake. A very well built, very healthy, dark-looking gentleman walked in, and everyone said it was U. B. Wanninayake from the Wanniya. This son of the Wanniya is getting back to his soil less his political stripes. That is the greatest regret we have.

The Government's history of the last 3½ years has shown that in the sphere of education it has bungled and in the sphere of the daily life of the people it has bungled. A Police Commission has been appointed with no powers to increase the salaries of the police constables. There is the ever insistent demand of the working class for increased wages in order to meet the rising cost of living. A small concession of Rs. 15 and Rs. 10 was given. But afterwards what happened? Is there not a direct reflection of the increase of prices as a result of the FECCs scheme on the consumer? Every day what we hear is *wagawa*. We are for *wagawa*. We are for bigger yams than *ala*, *bathala*. We will have better yields.

It must be kept in mind that the children of this country should not be used and abused by you for political purposes. You were blaming others for militarizing, for regimenting, children. I do not mind them being regimented if they have got to salute a man of some standing. Your Minister of Education, is he a man worth saluting? He hates the younger generations. He hates the growing up students. He has banned Henry Jayasena's play—

சிரிமாவோ பண்டாரநாயக்க மஹ.

(திருமதி சிறிமாவோ பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)

He has allowed it now.



பென்லி திலகரத்ன மய.

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

He has allowed it ?

—just because a child or an undergraduate through desperation wants to commit suicide. In point of fact, he is being hooted wherever he goes and that shows the popularity of your Minister of Education. He has messed up and completely disorganized the system of education in this country.

அடி மன்றியாக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

You should have listened to him yesterday.

பென்லி திலகரத்ன மய.

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

You talk so much of your Minister of Industries—a traitor to the cause of socialism, a man who betrayed trust. There are many matters concerning him which I do not want to place before this House.

In point of fact, I am waiting for the sordid events relating to the dismissal of Mr. Serasinghe from the Ministry of Industries and Fisheries to be revealed in this House. Mr. Serasinghe was the Director of the Colombo Industrial Exhibition, who worked there. Mr. Serasinghe saw me and told me that he had already written to the Hon. Prime Minister as well as to the Hon. Minister of State about how he came to give evidence in the Kolonnawa election petition case which was dismissed. It is not *sub judice* now. He even told me that due to the persistent persuasion of the wife of the Minister of Industries, he lied in court, and that he had never seen Mr. Samarasinghe, and Mr. Samarasinghe had never stepped into his office to ask for jobs. He lied because the Minister's wife wanted him, in point of fact, to do so

In fact Serasinghe told me that he went up to the Prime Minister and said this. He came to my residence and told me, "Mr. Tillekeratne, I am leaving this place to go and see Mr. Justice T. S. Fernando. Mr. Samarasinghe has been found guilty in an election petition where I have given evidence, and he trusted me. I lied, and the Gods have punished me. When Mr. Maithripala Senanayake left the Ministry there was a file of papers relating to overtime payment due to me in a sum of Rs. 23,000. In point of fact, the file was there. It was taken away home by the wife of the Minister, advising me, 'Give this evidence; when you do, the file will be returned and you will get your sum.' The election petition case went on. My evidence got Mr. Samarasinghe unseated from this House."

I asked him this question: "Have you seen Mr. Samarasinghe earlier?" His answer was: "Mr. Tillekeratne, I swear by God Kataragama, I have never seen Mr. Samarasinghe ever in my life. I was told at a consultation, 'If you give this evidence we could prove the case against Samarasinghe'. I gave that evidence. I do not respect this man but I must say I gave this evidence, but I did not know who Samarasinghe was." Then I asked him: "How did you know him?" His answer was: "On the day the petition was being heard before Justice T. S. Fernando, I was taken to that courthouse by one of the supporters of Mr. Philip Gunawardena and shown: 'This is Samarasinghe, you have to say that this is the man who came and asked you for jobs.'"

I am placing this on record because Mr. Serasinghe wrote a letter to the Hon. Prime Minister. Mr. Serasinghe also wrote a letter to the Hon. Minister of State. Mr. Serasinghe wanted the C. I. D. to inquire into this matter. The C. I. D. inquired and Mr. Serasinghe now is out of the Ministry, kicked out lock, stock and barrel. after he had perjured himself in the Supreme Court against a



Member of this House with the connivance of a responsible Member of this Government. I am one of the lawyers who appeared for Mr. Samarasinghe and that is why he came to my place. He showed me the copies of the letters he sent to the Hon. Prime Minister and the Hon. Minister of State. He even told me that his wife is a relation of the Hon. Minister of State, and matters have been represented to him. Finally when he was to be sacked from the Ministry he went up to a certain lawyer.

I am making this disclosure. Public decency demands that men like this should not talk of *hunu* in other people's *bulath paiyas* and of corruption. I am very sorry that he is not in the Chamber. This is the man. Mr. Serasinghe went up to the lawyer and told him, "For all I have done this is what I have got." The lawyer tuned his voice. He has three voices. One voice is for ordinary talk, one voice for political talk and the other for his clients. He changed his tone and said, "Mr. Serasinghe, are you a Buddhist?" Mr. Serasinghe said, "Yes, Sir, I am a Buddhist?" Then the lawyer said, "What can we do? You must believe in the *Karmic* theory and *Karma* has overtaken you." Poor consolation for Serasinghe!

We have got the order in the Kolonnawa election petition case. In point of fact I must pay a tribute to Justice T. S. Fernando. He has retired. That is why I thought it fit and proper to make this statement on the Floor of this House. I was waiting to see him privately after his retirement. He could not but believe the evidence of Mr. Serasinghe, the Director of the Colombo Exhibition, when he said: "He wrote me these letters and then followed up the letters by seeing me on two or three occasions, asking for jobs." Serasinghe told me that he had made representations to the Hon. Prime Minister and the Hon. Minister of State, and that Mr. Samarasinghe never came to his office. Then on

that evidence alone Mr. Samarasinghe lost his seat as Member for Kolonnawa.

This is the man who went to Avisawella and said, "I have not earned money. My treasure is my children." As to how the Kolonnawa election campaign was financed is a matter that should be further investigated. We must also find out how the "Burutha Walauwe" is now well kept, efficiently handled and run. She is a real lady for good business organization!

I am sorry the Minister of Industries and Fisheries is not here. I thought I should move, with the concurrence of the Opposition, a Vote of Censure on the Hon. Minister of Industries and Fisheries on this matter. I say this because he started his speech with an attack on us. The worst type of corruption is there in his Ministry.

Mr. Serasinghe is no longer in Government Service. Mr. Serasinghe has joined a mercantile firm, and you would have read a newspaper report one day that a man had walked from Colombo to Katharagama in order to fall at the feet of God Katharagama and ask for pardon. That man is Serasinghe. He met me a week before he marched directly from Colombo to Katharagama to ask for pardon from the God. I do not know whether the God pardoned him.

I am telling this on the Floor of this House, and I accept full responsibility for this. I am a man with a very short career in the legal profession. I have never in my life prosecuted in a false case. My conscience is pure. When I find that the case is false, I tell the magistrate that I do not wish to proceed.

We may pull out people but we cannot get people into this. Mr. Samarasinghe, Member of Parliament for Kolonnawa, lost his seat because of Serasinghe's evidence. In point of fact, Serasinghe lied.



[சீவனிலி கிலகரன் மல.]

According to Serasinghe, "I lied because the Minister and his wife wanted me to lie." Also, there was resistance from the senior counsel who appeared for the petitioner.

மல மன்றிவரலேன்

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

Who is that ?

சீவனிலி கிலகரன் மல.

(கிரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

I do not want to take much of the time of this House. I must say that the level of honesty of the Hon. Minister of Finance is on a much higher level. There are honest men on both sides of the House. There are good men on both sides of the House. Today, if we have criticized the Budget Speech of the Hon. Minister of Finance—please do not take it amiss—we have done so because we like you. Unfortunately, you never invited us to your tea party. However, today I am extending you an invitation to my party after my budget speech, at "Sravasti".

The Hon. Minister has presented this Budget in the midst of all these difficulties. The burden on his shoulders is a very heavy one. He is now advancing in years. Though advanced in age I am sure his shoulders will bear the strain. Anyhow, I wish him luck not as the Minister of Finance but as U. B. Wanninayake, but I do not wish him and his Government any luck politically in the future.

மன்றி வரல மல. க. 8.12 மலேன் கலெது  
மன்றிவரல மலேன் கலே கலெ கலே.

மன்றிவரல மலேன் கலே 19 வன கலே,  
மன்றிவரல கலே.

அப்பலாது பி. ப. 8.12 மலையாசிலிடலே சபையின்  
நடவடிக்கைகள் இடை நிறுத்தப்பட்டு, விவாதம் ஒத்தி  
வைக்கப்பெற்றது. 1968 ஓகஸ்ட் 19, திங்கட்கிழமை  
விவாதம் மீள ஆரம்பமாகும்.

*It being 8.12 P.M., Business was inter-  
rupted, and the Debate stood adjourned.*

*Debate to be resumed on Monday, 19th  
August 1968.*

கலே கலே

ஒத்திவைப்பு

ADJOURNMENT

மல மன்றிவரல

(கௌரவ வன்னினாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I move,

"That the House do now adjourn."

மன்றிவரல மலேன் கலே கலே கலே.

வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு, ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

Question put, and agreed to.

மன்றி மன்றிவரல மலேன் கலே  
மல. க. 8.13 மலேன் கலே 13 வன  
மன்றிவரல மலேன் கலே, 1968 மன்றிவரல  
19 வன கலே, மல. 10 வன மன்றிவரல  
கலே.

அதன்படி பி. ப. 8.13 மலேன் கலே, சபை  
அதலாது 1968 ஓகஸ்ட் 13 ஆம் தேதிய  
நிர்மாணத்திற் கிணங்க, 1968 ஓகஸ்ட் 19,  
திங்கட்கிழமை மல. ப. 10 மலேன் கலே  
ஒத்திவைக்கப்பெற்றது.

*Adjourned accordingly at  
8.13 P.M., until 10 A.M. on Mon-  
day, 19th August 1968, pursuant  
to the Resolution of the House  
of 13th August 1968.*



නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය

பிரதிநிதிகள் சபை

House of Representatives

1968 අගෝස්තු 19 වන සද්ද

திங்கட்கிழமை, 19. ஓகஸ்ட் 1968

Monday, 19th August, 1968

ප්‍රශ්නවලට වාචික පිළිතුරු

வினாக்களுக்கு வாய்ப்புல விடைகள்

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

ගොවි හමුදාවේ සිටි බිලිලීම්. එන්. රත්න තිලක මහතා

திரு. டபிள்யூ. என். ரத்னதிலக, விவசாயப்படை முன்னணி உறுப்பினர்

MR. W. N. RATHNATILLEKE, EX-MEMBER, LAND ARMY

ප්‍ර. හා. 10 ට මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය රැස් විය. කළු නායකතුමා [රතු එස්. සී. ෂීලී කෝරියා] මූලාසනා රැස් විය.

சபை, மு.ப. 10 மணிக்குக் கூடியது. சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள் [கௌரவ எஸ். சி. ஷேலி கொரியா] தலைமை தாங்கினார்கள்.

The House met at 10 A.M. MR. SPEAKER [THE HON. S. C. SHIRLEY COREA] in the Chair.

සෙනෙට් මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයෙන් ලත් සන්දේශය

மூத்தவையிலிருந்து வந்த செய்தி

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

කළුනායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

I have received a Message from the Senate. The Clerk will read it now.

පහත දැක්වෙන සන්දේශය මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ ලේකම් විසින් කියවන ලදී:

சபைச் செயல்திகாரி பின்வரும் செய்தியை வாசித்தார் :

The Clerk of the House read the following Message :

“මතු පළවන කෙටුම්පත් පනත්වලට සෙනෙට් මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය සංශෝධන නොමැතිව එකඟවී ඇත:

Food and Drugs (Amendment)  
Finance (Amendment).”

1. පී. බී. ඉලංගරත්න මයා.—(කොලොන් නාව—ලක්ෂ්මන් ජයකොඩි මයා.—දිවුල පිටිය—වෙනුවට)

(திரு. பி. பி. இலங்கரத்தன—கொல்லாண்மை—திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி—திவுலுபிட்டிய—சார்பாக)

(Mr. T. B. Ilangaratne—Kolonnawa—on behalf of Mr. Lakshman Jayakody—Divulapitiya)

ඉඩම්, වාරිමාර්ග හා විදුලිබල ඇමති ගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය : (අ) ගොවි හමුදාවේ හටයෙනු වශයෙන් රාජංගන යනිට් II බිලිලීම්. ඇන්. රත්නතිලක මහතාගේ සේවා කාලය සටහන් කරනවාද? (ආ) ඔහුට හිමි හාල් සලක පොත තවම ඔහුට ගොවිහමුදාවෙන් නොලැබී ඇති බැව් දන්නවාද? (ඇ) අස්වූ දා සිට අද දක්වා ඔහුට ලැබිය යුතු හාල් දීමට කටයුතු කරනවාද? (ඊ) නොඑසේ නම් ඒ මන්ද?

காணி, நீர்ப்பாசன, மின்விசை அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா : (அ) ராஜாங்ககளை இரண்டாம் பிரிவைச் சேர்ந்த விவசாயப் படைவீரர் திரு. டபிள்யூ. என். ரத்னதிலகவின் சேவைக் காலத்தைக் குறிப்பிடுவாரா? (ஆ) அவரின் பங்கிட்டரிசிப் புத்தகம் இதுவரையும் விவசாயப்படைபிலிருந்து அன்றாளுக்கு கிடைக்கவில்லை யென்பதை அறிவாரா? (இ) விவகிய நாளிலிருந்து இன்றுவரை அவருக்கு கிடைக்க வேண்டிய அரிசியைக் கொடுக்க நடவடிக்கை எடுப்பாரா? (ஈ) அன்றேல், ஏன்?

asked the Minister of Land, Irrigation and Power : (a) Will he state the period of service of Mr. W. N. Rathnatilleke as a member of the Land Army, Unit II, Rajangana ? (b) Is he aware that his rice ration book has not been returned to him so far







candidates sitting in the English medium? (c) If Sinhala candidates have failed to gain admission to the Medical College through the Sinhala medium, is it due to the shortcomings of the candidates or is it due to the deficiencies of their teachers? (d) Is he aware that it was compulsory for the children of Sinhala parents to sit the 1965 G. C. E. (Ordinary Level) and 1967 G. C. E. (Advanced Level) Examinations in the Sinhala medium? (e) If so, how was a Sinhala candidate permitted to sit this examination in the English medium? (f) Since an injustice has been done, will he take steps to extend this concession to the children of other Sinhala parents also?

**லாமனி சீயசூரிய மொ. (அமைச்சர் ஸா ஸ்சீக்காநிக கடுவது பிடுவடி பர்லிமென்து லேகி)**

(திரு. காமனி ஜயசூரிய—கல்வி, கலாசாஸ விவகார அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரிய தரிசி)

(Mr. Gamani Jayasuriya—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education and Culture Affairs)

(a) Admission to the medical faculties is not made according to and proportions from Sinhala, Tamil and English media students. Admission is according to merit as determined by the marks obtained at the G.C.E. (Advanced Level) Science Examination held in December 1967. (b) Does not arise. (c) Does not arise in view of (a) above. (d) Yes, in connection with school candidates. (e) No such permission was allowed by the Commissioner of Examinations. (f) Does not arise in view of (e) above.

**ஓல்கரநீந மொ.**

(திரு. இலங்கரநீந)

(Mr. Ilangaratne)

மே விஸாஸ ஸாஸ மொயி துனைமீ பவநீவநலாடி டுநனைவ கடுவது.

**சீயசூரிய மொ.**

(திரு. ஜயசூரிய)

(Mr. Jayasuriya)

ஓவி.

**ஸேவி கடுவது : வடுப ஸா ஸீ. ஏ. ஓர்மடுலடு லேவி**

காணிப்பட்டாஸ : வேதஸம் ஊ. சே. நி. கட்டுப் பணமும்.

LAND ARMY : WAGES AND E.P.F. CONTRIBUTIONS

**6. ஓல்கரநீந மொ. (சீயகெஓி மொ. வெதுடு)**

(திரு. இலங்கரநீந—திரு. ஜயக்கொடி—சார்பாக)

(Mr. Ilangaratne—on behalf of Mr. Jayakody)

ஓவி, வர்லிமென் ஸா விடுலில ஓமநினைர் ஓஓ பூநீய : (அ) ஓநீநநலலே ஓவரநீ லல ஸா ஓநீகடு ஸேவி கடுவது கடுவது ஓலெந ஓேநீக விடுப டுபீயலே 6 வுவி ஓவிநீனே ஓநடு ஓீநகடு ஓலெநுஸே டுபீயலே 2 ஓர் 2.50க விடுபக ஓலீநீ ஓநுடு மடுல விடமீ கரநீநே கடுவது ஓகாரடகிநீடு ஓ ஓலெ ஓடகநீ கரநீ வடு? (ஆ) ஓலீவ ஓலீ ஓலெ ஓர்மடுலே பநந ஓடுவே லேவி ஓஓக ஓர்நீநே ஓமீபூர்ஓ விடுபே பூமஓஸ ஓநுடு ஓலீநீ, ஓ ஓநுடு ஓர்மடுலே லேவி ஓஓக ஓர்நீநே ஓலீநீ? (ஓ) ஓவிநீடு ஓலீவ விடுப ஓவிநீனே ஓநடு ஓலீவ கடுவது கரநீவடு? ஓலீலே ஓலீ, ஓ ஓலீ?

காணி, நீர்ப்பாசன, மின்சக்தி அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா : (அ) அத்தனகல்லை, சவரங்கல ஆகிய இடங்களிலும் ஏனைய இடங்களிலும் உள்ள காணிப்பட்டாஸ உறுப்பினருக்கு தின சரி வேதஸம் ரூபா 6 எனினும் நாளாந்தம் அவர்கள் தங்கள் வேதஸத்தில் 2 அல்லது 2.50 ரூபாவையே பெறுவதனால் எஞ்சிய தொகை எவ்வகையில் செலவு செய்யப்படுகிறது என்பதைக் கூறுவாரா? (ஆ) ஊ. சே. நிதிக்கான மாதாந்தக் கட்டுப்பணம் மொத்தச் சம்பள அடிப்படையில் கணிக்கப்படுவது வழக்க மாயிருக்கக் காணிப்பட்டாஸ உறுப்பினர் பேரில் செய்யப்படும் ஊ. சே. நிதிக் கட்டுப் பணங்கள் ஏன் அந்த அடிப்படையில் கணிக்



[ஓலெரன் த மெ.]

கப்படுவதில்லை? (இ) அவர்களுக்கு வேதன மாகச் சேரவேண்டிய முழுத் தொகையையும் அவர்கள் பெற்றுக் கொள்ளத்தக்கதாக அவர் உரிய நடவடிக்கை எடுப்பாரா? இன்றேல், ஏன்?

asked the Minister of Land, Irrigation and Power : (a) As the members of the Land Army at Attanagalla, Savaranga and elsewhere, in fact, receive only Rs. 2 or Rs. 2.50 as daily pay, although their daily pay is Rs. 6, will he state in what manner the balance money is spent? (b) As E.P.F. contributions are based on the gross salary, why are E.P.F. contributions relative to members of the Land Army not computed accordingly? (c) Will he take steps to see that the total sum that is due to them as wages, is in fact, paid to them? If not, why?

செனேவிரன் மெ.

(திரு. செனேவிரன்)

(Mr. Seneviratne)

(அ) காலநிலை சப கமிட்டி வார்த்தை அது மற கர் காலி பரிசீலி சேவகமெய்குளே டீம நாடு பகலித் துனிமீ:

பலமுதல கம மெசம துடி டினகடு ரு. 2.கி.

காலநிலை மெசமே சிடு டினகடு ரு. 2.50.கி. மெசம அமறலி டினகடு மற 50 கி அதுரு டீமநாவிக் டேது லுனெ. லிக் அமெய்கு டின கடு ரு. 1.80 கடு தோடுகி மூடலக் ஈகார ஈடலா லும கர்ன அறர், தில கலுமீ ஈக நாடுகிமே பகலுகமிட ஈடலா கால. மெவது லுன பகிய ரு. 6.00கி தோடுகி லுலித் மெம பூசுநம புக தோடுகி. (அ) காலி தலி அதுகாரக ஈகா வார்த்தாவென் அதுமற கர் காலி பரிசீலி மெலி கமிடலி ஈமலீக டித் மலுந்மே மலிக பகியென் 10%. ஓடுகி கிடுமே மூடலகடு மெவது லுனெ. மெலிது சேவக அடு பகடுக அர் மூடலடு டுமகி மூடல மெவது தோடுகி. (ஆ) மெலுந்மடு கிமீ கியலம மூடல டுமடு மெவது லுனெ.

ஈ. பி. ரன்லிங்ம மெதா, மூன்வந்த, டுமெலெயடு

திரு. ஆர். எம். ராங்கண்டா, முங்கவத்தை, உடமெல ஹெத்த

MR. R. M. RANBANDA, MUNWATTA, UDA HEWAHETA

7. ஓலெரன் த மெ. (பி. லி. பி. மீ. மெர்ன் மெ.—மலெமே—மெலுமடு)

(திரு. இலங்கரத்தா—திரு. ரி. பி. எம். ஹெரத்—வலப்பின—சார்பாக)

(Mr. Hangeratne—on behalf of Mr. T. B. M. Herath—Walapane)

காலிகடு ம காஈர் காலிமென் கலு பூசுநம : (அ) டுமெலெயடு மூன்வந்த துனிமலெடீடே டேடர் ஈ. பி. ரன் லிங்ம மெதா மிலித் ஓடுகிபன் கர்ன லு டு மெலி பாலிகீல (அம பிடுலீ/டுகி/3/ ஈ ஈக து/படு/654) 1966.6.19 டின மிலக கர்ன லு லி பதும டுந்மலாடி? (ஆ) பகி புகிபடு கடுமேடி? (ஆ) புகிபடு மெமெக் பாலிகீலகடு தோடுகி கால்தே மன்டி? (டு) டுடகடு ஓமல மகாம லுமீடுமல பதும கிய கர்னலாடி? தோ லிசே தமீ, லீ மன்டி?

விவசாய, உணவு அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா :

(அ) உட ஹெவாஹெத்த என்ற பகுதியிலே முங்கவத்தை கிராமத்திலே தென்னலியந்த கெதா என்ற இடத்திலே வசிக்குந் திரு. ஆர். எம். ராங்கண்டா என்பவர் குத்தகைக் கமக்காரர் என்ற முறையில் செய்ததும் PL/EV/3/ஈ /து/படு/654 ஆகிய இலக்கங்கையுமுடையது மான முறைப்பாடு சம்பந்தமாக 19.6.1966 இல் விசாரணை நடந்ததை அறிவாரா : (ஆ) விசாரணையின் விளைவு என்ன : (இ) முறைப்பாடு செய்தவருக்கு முடிவைத் தெரிவிக்காத தேன் : (ஈ) இந்த குத்தகைக் கமக்காரருக்கு காணியில் உள்ள குத்தகை உரிமையை அவர் மீண்டும் பெறுதற்கு நடவடிக்கை எடுப்பாரா?

asked the Minister of Agriculture and Food : (a) Is he aware that the inquiry into complaint, No. PL/ EV/3/ஈ and து/படு/654, made by Mr. R. M. Ranbanda of Tenneliyaddeggera, Munwatta, Uda Hewaheta, as a tenant cultivator was held on 19.6.1966? (b) What was the outcome of the inquiry? (c) Why have the







அரு. உன். உ.பி. டி. உ.பி. கருணாரத்ன  
(கௌரவ என். எச். ஏ. எம். கருணாரத்ன)  
(The Hon. N. H. A. M. Karunaratne)  
ஃ ஁ன கபய்யு கர்ணை யனப. ஃபீர  
வகயென் டினயக் கியன்தப பூஉவன்  
கமக் நபு.

ஔரரத்ன மய.

(திரு. இலங்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Ilangaratne)

ரூபியலே டயய சியயப 20 கின் டபு  
கர் நியை நிய டநாபாபரன் சியயப  
20 கின் வபி கர்நதப கபய்யு கர்ந  
பாட?

அரு. உன். உ.பி. டி. உ.பி. கருணாரத்ன

(கௌரவ என். எச். ஏ. எம். கருணாரத்ன)

(The Hon. N. H. A. M. Karunaratne)

ஃ ஁ன கபய்யு கர்நதப.

ஔரரத்ன மய.

(திரு. இலங்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Ilangaratne)

டிநய கியன்தப பூஉவன் ட?

அரு. உன். உ.பி. டி. உ.பி. கருணாரத்ன

(கௌரவ என். எச். ஏ. எம். கருணாரத்ன)

(The Hon. N. H. A. M. Karunaratne)

டிந கியன்தப பூஉவன் கமக் நபு.

பூபடின டேபாஃநமேந்நு: சிசிரி நியு  
சியுபி நபுந விபந கிரிமே டன்சபயக்  
சியடி

டொல்பொருள் திணைக்களம் : சிசிரியாச் சவரோவி  
யத் திறப்புழிழாச் செலவு

ARCHAEOLOGICAL DEPARTMENT: EXPEN-  
DITURE OR CEREMONIAL REOPENING  
OF SIGIRIYA FRESCOES

9. டி. சி. நெந்தனேன் மய.

(திரு. டி. பி. நெந்னகோன்)

(Mr. T. B. Tennekoon)

டபாபந ப ஃஃகியரின கபய்யு டுமநி  
஁ன் டுபு பூய்நய: (ட) 1968 மூடி 9  
பநடி சிசிரி நியுசியுபி நபுந விபந  
கர்சமே டன்சபய பிசியேட கிரிம சடின  
பூப விடின டேபாஃநமேந்நுபி கமிகர்  
வன் கி டேநெக் கபபமக் டினக் வபிசி

யேடிபநு டுபுபிடி? (ஃ) மே டன்சபய  
சடின பூபவிடின டேபாஃநமேந்நுபி கமிகர்  
வன் யேடிம ஃர் கடி டநிநுந சியடி  
மேநபாடி? (ஔ) பூபவிடின டேபாஃநமேந்  
நுபென் ஃடிந சிசிரியப பி கிரிபப ஁னந  
கபபமக்? (ஃ) ஃம டேபாஃநமேந்நுபி  
கிரிபிசின் பென் பென் வகயென் ஃம  
டன்சபய பெநுபென் டபாநை டுநி  
஁ன் ஁ஃநு, யபிம ஁ஃநு யநாடி  
ஃநும ஃடிந் கர்ந்நேடி?

கல்வி, கலாசார விவகார அமைச்சரைக்  
கேட்ட வினா: (அ) 1968 ஆம் ஆண்டு மே 11  
9 ஆந் திகதி சிசிரியாச் சவரோவியங்களை,  
மீண்டும் பொதுமக்களின் பார்வைக்குத்  
திறந்து வைத்த விழாவினை ஆயத்தப்படுத்து  
வதற்கு தால் பொருட் திணைக்களத்தைச்  
சேர்ந்த எத்தனை தொழிலாளர்கள், எத்தனை  
நாட்கள் வேலைக்கமர்த்தப்பட்டனர்? (ஆ)  
இவ்விழாவிற்கு தால்பொருட் திணைக்களத்  
தைச் சேர்ந்த தொழிலாளர்களை அமர்ந்தியது  
தவிர, ஏற்பட்ட மற்றும் செலவுகள் யாவை?  
(இ) தால்பொருட் திணைக்களத்திலிருந்து  
அத்தனைத்தன்று, சிசிரியாவுக்குச் சென்ற  
அரசகருமத்திற்குரித்தான வாகனங்கள் எத்  
தனை? (ஈ) இவ்விழாவின் சார்பாக இத்  
திணைக்களத்தைச் சேர்ந்த உத்தியோகத்தர்  
கள் பெற்றுக் கொண்ட பயணப்படி, உணவுப்  
படி முதலியவற்றை அவர் வெவ்வேறுகச்  
சமர்ப்பிப்பாரா?

asked the Minister of Education and  
Cultural Affairs: (a) Will he state  
the number of labourers of the  
Archaeological Department who were  
employed in making preparations for  
the ceremonial reopening of the  
Sigiriya frescoes on 9th May, 1968,  
and the number of days spent by  
them in this connection? (b) Besides  
providing labour, what other ex-  
penses were incurred by the  
Archaeological Department in respect  
of these celebrations? (c) How many  
official cars were sent to Sigiriya on  
this day by the Archaeological  
Department? (d) Will he state the  
amounts earned by each of the officers  
of this Department for travelling,  
subsistence, etc., in this connection?



ජයසූරිය මයා.

(තිල. ඉයාසූරිය)

(Mr. Jayasuriya)

I tabled the Answer.

සහ මේසය මත තබන ලද පිළිතුර මෙසේයි :

சபாபீடத்தில் வைக்கப்பட்ட விடை வருமாறு :

The Answer tabled is as follows :

(අ) 1968 මැයි 7, 8 සහ 9 වැනි දිනයන්හිදී කමිකරුවන් 55 දෙනෙකු යොදවන ලදී.

(අ) දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවේ වාහන දිවීමට—	රු. ශ.
පැවුණු වියදම ... ..	283 01
ආරාධනා පත්‍ර මුද්‍රණය කිරීම ... ..	625 0
අමතර වියදම් ... ..	50 50
	<hr/>
	958 51

(ඉ) පුරාවිද්‍යා දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවෙන් එදින සිහිරියට නිල රථ යවා නැත. දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවට අයත් ලොරියක්, ලැන්ඩ් රෝවරයක් සහ ජීප් රථයක් මෙම උත්සවය සඳහා සිහිරියේදී පාවිච්චි කරන ලදී.

	යැවීම්	ගමන්	අතිකාල දීමනා
	රු. ශ.	රු. ශ.	
(1) ඇස්. ඒ. සිරිසේන මයා., රියදුරු ... ..	6 0	4 0	
(2) ආර්. ඒ. විල්සන්—කමිකරු ... ..	9 0	4 0	
(3) ඩී. ඩී. දසනායක—රියදුරු ... ..	19 50	4 0	
(4) එච්. පී. සිව්සේන (කමිකරු) ... ..	10 0	4 0	
(5) පී. කේ. රොබෝසි-කෝට් (රියදුරු) ... ..	26 0	4 0	
(6) කේ. ආර්. සමරනායක (කමිකරු) ... ..	12 0	3 85	
(7) ඇම්. ඩබ්. ඊ. කරුණාරත්න (ජයාරූප ශිල්පී) ... ..	26 25	4 0	
(8) කේ. ඉණරත්න (පරීක්ෂක) ... ..	18 75	4 0	
(9) ආචාර්ය ආර්. එච්. ද සිල්වා (වැඩබලන පුරාවිද්‍යා කොමසාරිස්) ... ..	30 0		
(10) ඩබ්ලිව්. ඩී. ඇම්. ප්‍රනාන්දු (සහකාර කොමසාරිස්—ප්‍රකාශන හා ගවේෂණ) ... ..	55 0	2 0	
(11) ඒ. එස්. දේවපුර (කොතුකාශාර නිලධාරී) ... ..	17 0	7 70	
(12) ඇම්. එච්. සිරිසේන (ප්‍රකාශන සහකාර) ... ..	15 0	2 0	
(13) ඇස්. ඇම්. සෙනවිරත්න (සැලසුම්කරු) ... ..	52 0	4 20	
(14) ඩබ්ලිව්. ඇම්. ලොකුබණ්ඩා (කමිකරු) ... ..	6 0	7 80	
(15) ඊ. ඇම්. ඩී. ජේ. අප්පුහාමි (රියදුරු) ... ..	—	—	20 36
(16) යූ. ඩී. ජේ. අමරසේන (රියදුරු) ජාතික කොතුකාශාර දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව ... ..	—	—	11 44
(17) පී. කේ. විල්සන් (රියදුරු) මාතලේ කවචේරිය ... ..	—	—	6 87
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	302 50	55 55	94 88



(அ) 55 தொழிலாளர்கள் 1968 ம் ஆண்டு மே மாதம் 7 ம், 8 ம், 9 ம் திகதிகளாகிய 3 நாட்களில் வேலைக்கு அமர்த்தப்பட்டார்கள்.

	ரூ.	ச.
(ஆ) (i) இப்பகுதி வாகனங்களின் பெற்றோல் உண்டியல்கள் .. .. .	283	01
(ii) அழைப்பிதழ்கள் ஆதியன அச்சடித்தற் செலவு .. .. .	625	0
(iii) இடைநேர் செலவுகள் .. .. .	50	50
	<b>958</b>	<b>51</b>

(இ) அலுவலகத்துக்குரிய மோட்டார் கார் ஒன்றும் இத்தினத்தன்று தொல் பொருட்கலைப் பகுதியால் சிசிரியாவுக்கு அனுப்பப்படவில்லை. இப்பகுதி வாகனங்கள், ஒரு லொறி, ஒரு லான்ட் ரோவர், ஒரு ஸ்ரேசன் வாகன் ஆகியவை சிசிரியாவில் நடைபெற்ற கொண்டாட்டங்கள் தொடர்பில் உபயோகிக்கப்பட்டன.

(ஈ)	உணவுச்செலவு	பிரயாணம்		மேலதிகச் சம்பளம்	
		ரூ.	ச.		
		ரூ.	ச.	ரூ.	ச.
(1) திரு. எஸ். ஏ. சிறிசேன (சாரதி) .. .. .	6 0 ..	4 0 ..	—		
(2) திரு. ஆர். ஏ. வில்சன் (தொழிலாளர்) .. .. .	9 0 ..	4 0 ..	—		
(3) திரு. டி. டி. தசனாயக்க (சாரதி) .. .. .	19 50 ..	4 0 ..	18 25		
(4) திரு. எச். பி. சைமன் (தொழிலாளர்) .. .. .	10 0 ..	4 0 ..	11 34		
(5) திரு. பி. கே. ரெப்பொசிங்க (சாரதி) .. .. .	26 0 ..	4 0 ..	26 62		
(6) திரு. கே. ஆர். குமரனாயக்க (தொழிலாளர்) .. .. .	12 0 ..	3 85 ..	—		
(7) திரு. எம். டபிள்யூ. இ. கருணரட்ண (படப் பிடிப்பாளர்) .. .. .	26 25 ..	4 0 ..	—		
(8) திரு. கே. குமரரட்ண (பரிசோதகர்) .. .. .	18 75 ..	4 0 ..	—		
(9) டாக்டர் ஆர். எச். த சில்வா (தொல்பொருட்கலைப் பகுதி பதில் ஆணையாளர்) .. .. .	30 0 ..	— ..	—		
(10) திரு. டபிள்யூ. பி. எம். பர்னாந்து (உதவி ஆணையாளர்—வெளியீடுகளும் அகழ்வு) .. .. .	55 0 ..	2 0 ..	—		
(11) திரு. ஏ. எஸ். தேனையூர் (நூதனசாலை உதவிப் பாகுதலாளர்) .. .. .	17 0 ..	7 70 ..	—		
(12) திரு. எம். எச். சிறிசோமா (வெளியீடுகள் உதவியாளர்) .. .. .	15 0 ..	2 0 ..	—		
(13) திரு. எஸ். எம். செனிவிரட்ண (படம்வரை அறிஞர்) .. .. .	52 0 ..	4 20 ..	—		
(14) திரு. டபிள்யூ. எம். லொக்கு பண்டா (தொழிலாளர்) .. .. .	6 0 ..	7 80 ..	—		
(15) திரு. இ. எம். டி. ஜே. அப்புகாமி (சாரதி) .. .. .	— ..	— ..	20 36		
(16) திரு. யு. டி. ஜே. அமரசேன (சாரதி தேசிய நூதனசாலைப் பகுதி) .. .. .	— ..	— ..	11 44		
(17) திரு. பி. கே. வில்சன் (சாரதி, மாத்தலை கச்சேரி) .. .. .	— ..	— ..	6 87		
	<b>302 50</b>	<b>55 55</b>	<b>94 88</b>		



(a) 55 labourers were employed for 3 days, i.e. 7th, 8th and 9th May 1968.

	Rs.	c
1. Petrol bills of departmental vehicles .. ..	283	01
2. Printing of invitation cards, etc. .. ..	625	0
3. Incidental expenses .. ..	50	50
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	958	51

(c) No official cars were sent to Sigiriya by the Archaeological Department on this day. The departmental vehicles, a lorry and land Rover and a station waggon, were utilized in connection with the celebrations at Sigiriya.

	Subsistence		Travelling		Overtime	
	Rs.	c.	Rs.	c.	Rs.	c.
1. Mr. S.A. Sirisena (Driver) .. ..	6	0	4	0		
2. Mr. R.A. Wilson (Labourer) .. ..	9	0	4	0		
3. Mr. D.D. Dasasanayake .. ..	19	50	4	0	18	25
4. Mr. H.P. Simon (Labourer) .. ..	10	0	4	0	11	34
5. Mr. P.K. Robosingho (Driver) .. ..	26	0	4	0	26	62
6. Mr. K.R. Samaranyake (Labourer) .. ..	12	0	3	85		
7. Mr. M.W.E. Karunaratne (Photographer) .. ..	26	25	4	0		
8. K. Gunaratne (Inspector) .. ..	18	75	4	0		
9. Dr. R.H.De Silva (Ag. Archl. Commissioner) .. ..	30	0	—			
10. Mr. W.B.M. Fernando (Assistant Commissioner P-&E.) .. ..	55	0	2	0		
11. Mr. A.F. Dewapura (A.K.M.) .. ..	17	0	7	70		
12. Mr. M.H. Sirissoma (P.A.) .. ..	15	0	2	0		
13. Mr. S.M. Seneviratne (Draughtsman) .. ..	52	0	4	20		
14. Mr. W.M. Loku Banda (Labourer) .. ..	6	0	7	80		
15. Mr. E.M.D.J. Appuhamy (Driver) .. ..	—		—		20	36
16. Mr. U.D.J. Amarasena (Driver National Museums Dept.) .. ..	—		—		11	44
17. Mr. P.K.Wilson (Driver Matale Kachch-eri) .. ..	—		—		6	87
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	302	50	55	55	94	88

**බීඩි කර්මාන්තය**

පීඨික කෛත්‍යොත්‍ය

**BEEDI INDUSTRY**

10. පී. බී. තෙනෙකෝන් මයා.

(කි.පු. ඊ. පී. කෙන්නකෝන්)

(Mr. T. B. Tennekoon)

ස්වදේශ කටයුතු ඇමතිගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය : (අ) බීඩි නිෂ්පාදන රටේ දුප්පත් පන්තියේ අය පැවිලි කරන්නක් මෙන්ම දුප්පත් පන්තිකයින්ගේ කර්මාන්තයක් බවත් එතුමා දන්නේද? (ආ) (i) මේ කර්මාන්තය සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම වාගේ ඉන්දියානුවන් අත තිබුණ බවත්, (ii) එය ලාංකික කළ යුතුයයි එකල තිබුණ එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂ රජයට බලකල මුත් එයට කිසි පිළිසරණක් එම රජයෙන් නූත බවත් එතුමා දන්නේද? (ඉ) ඉන්දියාවෙන් බීඩි ගෙනීමට අවස්ථාවක් තිබේද? (ද) ඉන්දියාවෙන් බීඩි ගෙනීමට අවස්ථාවක් තිබේද?

මෙය ලාංකික කර්මාන්තයක් බවට පිළිගෙන, ඒ අනුව කටයුතු කෙලේ පසු ගිය ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂ රජයෙන් බව එතුමා දන්නේද? (ඊ) මේ රජය පත්වූ පසු එම සහන අඩුම් ඇති බව එතුමා දන්නේද?

உள்ளாட்டு விவகார அமைச்சரகக் கேட்ட வினா : (அ) ஏழை வகுப்பினர் பீடி புக்கப் பதையும் பீடி தயாரிப்பது ஏழை வகுப்பினரின் கைத்தொழில் என்பதையும் அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஆ) (i) ஒரு காலத்தில் இந்தக் கைத்தொழில் இந்தியருக்கே சொந்தமாயிருந்ததையும்; (ii) இந்தக் கைத்தொழில் இலங்கையருடையது ஆக்கும்படி பொது மக்கள் வேண்டியபோதிலும் அக்காலத்தைய ஐ. தே. க. அரசாங்கம் அந்த விடயத்தில் தலையிட மறுத்ததையும் அவர் அறிவாரா? (இ) பீடி தடைசெய்ததும் பீடி







**ක්‍රීඩා භාණ්ඩ ආනයන බලපත්‍ර**

විකීර්ණාංක පොලිසි සහ වෙනත් උපකරණ සඳහා  
ලිකිතව පැවරුණු බලපත්‍ර සඳහා

**SPORTS GOODS IMPORT LICENCES**

**11. ඩී. බී. තේනකෝන් මයා.**

(**ශ්‍රී. ඊ. ඩී. තේනකෝන්**)

(**Mr. T. B. Tennekoon**)

රාජ්‍ය කටයුතු ඇමතිගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය:

- (අ) 1967 වර්ෂයේ ක්‍රීඩා උපකරණ ගෙන් විමේ බලය ලත් වෙළඳුන් කී දෙනෙක් දිවයිනේ සිටියේද? (ආ) 1968 පළමුවැනි කොටසට කී දෙනෙකුට බලපත්‍ර දුන්නේද? (ඇ) එක්තරා පිරිසකගේ බලපත්‍ර කපා සුළු පිරිසකට පමණක් දීමට හේතු කවරේද? (ඈ) එම බලපත්‍ර ලබාගත් වෙළඳුන්ගේ නම් සඳහන් කරන්නේද?

இராஜாங்க அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா :

- (அ) இந்நாட்டு வியாபாரிகளுள் விகி யாட்டுப் பொருட்களை இறக்குமதி செய்வதற்கு 1967 இல் எத்தனை பேர் உத்தரவுச் சீட்டு வைத்திருந்தனர்? (ஆ) 1968 இன் முதற் பகுதிக்கு எத்தனை பேருக்கு இறக்கு மதி உத்தரவுச் சீட்டு கொடுக்கப்பட்டது? (இ) சில இறக்குமதியாளரின் உத்தரவுச் சீட்டுகளை இரத்து செய்து அதனால் சீட்டுகள் பெற்றவர் தொகையைக் குறைத்ததன் காரணமென்ன? (ஈ) இறக்குமதிச் சீட்டுகள் கொடுக்கப்பட்ட வியாபாரிகள் பெயர்களைத் தருவாரா?

asked the Minister of State: (a) In 1967 how many dealers in the Island held import licences for sports goods? (b) How many were issued import licences for the first part of 1968? (c) What was the reason for cancelling the import licences of some importers, and thereby restricting the issue of licences to a smaller number? (d) Will he state the names of the dealers who were issued import licences?

ගැ. ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන (රාජ්‍ය ඇමති සහ අභ්‍යන්තර කටයුතු ඇමතිගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය):

(කෙළවර වූ ඉ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන—இராஜாங்க அமைச்சரும் பிரதம அமைச்சராகும் பாதுகாப்பு வெளிவிவகார அமைச்சராகும் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசியும்)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene—Minister of State and Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and Minister of Defence & External Affairs)

- (අ) ආනයනකයෝ 38 දෙනෙකි. (ආ) ආනයනකයෝ 11 දෙනෙකි. (ඇ) ආනයන බලපත්‍ර නිකුත් කරන ලද්දේ ජනසතු සේවා හා ක්‍රීඩා අමාත්‍යාංශයේ නිර්දේශයන් අනුවය. (ඈ) සීමිත වාත්සිස් සමාගම, සීමිත කාර්ගිල්ස් සමාගම, සීමිත ස්පෝට්ස්මන් සමාගම, කේ. බී. ඩී. පෙරේරා, සීමිත ඩන්ලොප් (ලංකා) සමාගම, ඩී. බී. ග්‍රීන්වේ, නිමරොඩ්, රස්ටම්ප් සහ සමාගම, පීලා ඒප්බර්, සීමිත මිලර්ස් සමාගම.

**ජනලේඛන හා සංඛ්‍යා ලේඛන දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව: සංඛ්‍යා ලේඛනඥ පුරප්පාඩු**

தொகை மதிப்பு புள்ளிவிவரத் திணைக்களம் புள்ளி விவரவியலாளர் பதவி வெற்றிடங்கள்.

**DEPARTMENT OF CENSUS AND STATISTICS: VACANT POSTS OF STATISTICIAN**

**12. ඉලංගරත්න මයා.** (ඩී. බී. එම්. හේරත් මයා. වෙනුවට)

(ශ්‍රී. ඩී. ඉලංගරත්න—ශ්‍රී. ඊ. ඩී. ආර්. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන)

(**Mr. Ilangaratne—on behalf of Mr. T. B. M. Herath**)

- මුදල් ඇමතිගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය: (අ) ජනලේඛන සහ සංඛ්‍යා ලේඛන දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවේ සංඛ්‍යා ලේඛනඥ තනතුරු 3ක් සඳහා පුරප්පාඩු ඇති බව එතුමා දන්නේද? (ආ) මේ පුරප්පාඩු පිරවීම සඳහා දැනට සේවයේ යෙදී සිටින සංඛ්‍යා ලේඛන නිලධාරීන් පමණක් සලකා බලනවාද? එසේ නැත්නම් ඊට හේතු මොනවාද? (ඇ) සංඛ්‍යා ලේඛනඥ තනතුරු වෘත්තීය ගණයේ තනතුරක් නිසා මේ උසස් කිරීම් වල දී දැනට සේවයේ යෙදී සිටින උපාධිධර සංඛ්‍යා ලේඛන නිලධාරීන්ට විශේෂ සැලකිල්ලක් දක්වනවාද? නොඑසේ නම්, මන්ද? (ඈ) දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවේ











[රත්වත්තෙ මිය.]

වැය කපාවෙනුත් විශේෂ වරප්‍රසාද සහ පහසුකම් ලැබී තිබෙන්නේ ඇත්තෙන් ම මුදල් ඇති කොටසට පමණක් බවයි. ඒ කාරණය මේ ගැන සභාවේදී ප්‍රකාශ කරන්නට කැමතියි. ඒ සමගම ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් මගේ බලවත් විරෝධය මේ අවස්ථාවේ ප්‍රථමකොටම පළ කරන්නට කැමතියි. මට ප්‍රථමයෙන් කපා කළ විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයේ ගැන මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් අදහස් රාශියක් ඉදිරිපත් කළා. ඒ සෑම අදහසකටම මගේ අනුමැතිය ලැබෙන බවත් මේ හිදී සඳහන් කරන්නට කැමතියි. මේ විවාදයට සහභාගි වෙමින් කපා කරන්නට අද දින මට ලැබී තිබෙන කාල වේලාව විකක් නිසා මගේ කපාවෙන් බලංගොඩ මැති වරණ කොට්ඨාශයට පමණක් අදාළ කරුණු දෙක තුනක් අලලා කපා කරන්නටයි මා බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ.

මේ රජයේ වගා ව්‍යාපාරය ගැන අයවැය කපාවේ සඳහන් වෙනවා. වගා ව්‍යාපාරය සාර්ථක ප්‍රතිඵල සහිත වනු දකින්නට අපිත් බොහොම කැමතියි. ඒ නිසා වගා ව්‍යාපාරයට අපේ සම්පූර්ණ සහයෝගය දෙන්නට අපි ලැස්තියි. එහෙත් මේ පැත්තෙන් කපා කළ ගැන මන්ත්‍රීන්ගේ කපා වලින් ඉදිරිපත් කරන ලද කරුණුවලින් මේ වගා ව්‍යාපාරය ප්‍රෝඩාවක් බව පැහැදිලි වුණා. කියන තරමට වගා සංවර්ධනයක් මේ රටේ ඇති වෙලා නැති බව කරුණු සහිතව ඔප්පු වුණා. මාත් ඒ අදහස අනුමත කරන බව විශේෂයෙන් සඳහන් කරන්නට කැමතියි.

1967 ගොවිරජා තේරුණේ බලත්ගො ගොඩින් බව තමුන්නාන්සේ අසා ඇතැයි මා විශ්වාස කරනවා. ඒ වර්ෂයේ යල් කන්නයේදී අක්කරයකින් වී බ්‍රසල් 276 ක් නිෂ්පාදනය කරන්නට සමර්ථ වූ නිසා ඒ මහතාට ගොවිරජා වශයෙන් තේරෙන්නට අවස්ථාව සැලසුණාය කියනවා. ගොවිකම් සඟරාවෙන් ඒ බව පළ කර තිබුණා. ඒකත් තමුන්නාන්සේ දකින්නට ඇති. ගැන අගමැතිතුමා ඒ මහතාට රුපියල් 16,000 ක් වටිනා වර්ධක ටී රජයක් ප්‍රදානය කළ බවත් පළ කරන්නට යෙදුණා. එහෙත් එදා ඒ මහතා අරලියගහ මන්දිරයට කැඳවාගෙන ගොස් ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම ප්‍රදානය කර

ඇත්තේ රුපියල් දහසය දාහක් වටිනා වර්ධක ටී යන්ත්‍රයක් නොවන බව දැන ගන්නට තිබීම ගැන අපි කනගාටු වෙනවා. එදා ප්‍රදානය කෙළේ ඒ තරම් වටිනා වර්ධක ටී යන්ත්‍රයක් නොවෙයි. ඒ වෙනුවට රුපියල් දෙතුන් දහසක් වටිනා ලැන්ඩ්මාස්ටර් තමුති කුඩා අත් යන්ත්‍රයකුයි ප්‍රදානය කළේ. වෙන එකක් තබා එම යන්ත්‍රය ක්‍රියාත්මක කිරීමට ඇත්තේ යතුරක් නොවෙයි, කුඩා ලඟු කැබැල්ලක් පමණයි. ඔන්න ඔය අන්දමට මහජනතාව බොරුවෙන් මුළු කිරීමේ වැඩ පිළිවෙළකුයි මේ රජය ගෙන යන්නේ. එම නිසා මෙම අහිංසක ගොවියාට මේ ආකාරයෙන් සැලකුමේ බලංගොඩ ගොවි රජා නිසාදැයි දැනගන්න කැමතියි. ගැන කපානායකතුමනි, මෑතකදී පැවැති අතුරු මැතිවරණයේදී මේ පුද්ගලයා එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයට පක්ෂපාතීව කටයුතු කළ බව මා දන්නවා. එබඳු පුද්ගලයකුටත් මේ ආණ්ඩුව මෙබඳු ආකාරයෙන් ක්‍රියා කිරීම නිසා දැන් ආණ්ඩුව කෙරෙහි කළ කිරීමකට පත් ව තිබෙන බව කියන්නට කැමතියි. ඒ මහතා පමණක් නොවෙයි, එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයට ඉතා උනන්දුවෙන් වැඩ කළ අනිකුත් උදවිය පවා, තමන්ගේ ඇස් ඉදිරිපිට සිදු වන මෙබඳු දේවල් නිසා මහත් කලකිරීමකට පත්ව සිටින බව සඳහන් කරන්න කැමතියි.

වගා ව්‍යාපාරය යටතේ දනව බලංගොඩ ප්‍රදේශයේ රජයේ ඉඩම් බදු දිගෙන යනවා. අපත් කැමතියි. මේ රටේ වගා ව්‍යාපාරය සාර්ථක වෙනවා නම්, අස්වැන්න වැඩි වෙනවා නම්. එහෙත් රජයේ වගා ව්‍යාපාරය යටතේ බලංගොඩ ප්‍රදේශයේ ඉඩම් බෙදා දෙන්නේ එම ප්‍රදේශයේ උදවියට නොවෙයි, පිටස්තර උදවියටයි. අක්කර පහහ, සියය, පිටස්තර උදවියට බෙදා දෙන විට ඒ ප්‍රදේශයේම පදිංචි අහිංසක උදවියට හේනක් කොටා ගැනීමට අක්කරයක් දෙකක් ලබා ගැනීම ඉතාමත්ම දුෂ්කර වී තිබෙනවා. ගැන කපා නායකතුමනි, වගා ව්‍යාපාරය සාර්ථක කර ගැනීමට නම්, ඉඩම් නැති දුප්පත් ගොවියන්ට ඉඩම් කොටස් බෙදා දිය යුතු බව විශේෂයෙන් සඳහන් කරන්න කැමතියි. ඒ වාගේම අඩු පොලියක් ණය මුදල් සඳහා අය කළ යුතුයි. අපේ ආණ්ඩුව



නිවුණු කාලයේ පොලිය වශයෙන් අය කළේ සියයට හයක් නමුත් දැන් එය සියයට දොළහ දක්වා වැඩි කර තිබෙනවා. ඒ වාගේම ණයට ලබා ගන්න පෝර අඩු මිලට සැපයීමට කටයුතු යොදන්න ඕනෑ. ගොවියාට අවශ්‍ය ජලය කලට වේලාවට සපයන්න ඕනෑ.

රජයේ වගා ව්‍යාපාරය සාර්ථක කර ගන්න නම්, ගොවීන් විසින් නිෂ්පාදනය කරන ද්‍රව්‍ය අලෙවි කර ගැනීම පිණිස වෙළඳපොලට ගෙන ඒමට පාරවල් ඕනෑ කරනවා. විශේෂයෙන්ම අපේ ප්‍රදේශයේ පාරවල් අඩු නිසා ගොවියන්ට තම ද්‍රව්‍ය වෙළඳපොලට ගෙන ඒමට දුෂ්කර වී තිබෙනවා. එසේ වුණත් රූපියල් ලක්ෂ අටක පමණ වියදමින් සැතපුම් භාගයක පමණ මාර්ගයක් බලංගොඩ නගරය හරහා තනා ගෙන යනවා. මෙබඳු විශාල මුදලක් සැතපුම් භාගයක පමණ පාරක් තැනීමට වැඩ කරන්නේ නැතුව දැන්වත් එය නවතා දමා එම මුදලින් බලංගොඩට අවශ්‍ය අතිකුත් මාර්ගයන් තැනීමට ක්‍රියා කරන මෙන් රජයේ වැඩ, තැපැල් හා විදුලි සන්දේශ ඇමතිතුමාගෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටින්න කැමතියි. රූපියල් ලක්ෂ අටක මුදලින් පාරවල් ගණනාවක් තනන්න පුළුවනි. එසේ තැනුවොත් තමන්ගේ නිෂ්පාදන ද්‍රව්‍ය වෙළඳපලට අපහසුවක් නැතුව ගෙන ඒමට අවකාශ ලැබීමෙන් ගොවියන් තුළ වගාව සම්බන්ධයෙන් විශාල උනන්දුවක් ඇති වෙනවාට කිසිම සැකයක් නැහැ. එම නිසා යම් යම් අය ගේ පෞද්ගලික වුවමනාවන් පිරිමැසීමට රූපියල් ලක්ෂ අටක් වැය කොට සැතපුම් භාගයක පමණ මාර්ගයක් තැනීම නුසුදුසු බව නැවත වරක් පෙන්වා දෙන්න කැමතියි. යම් විධියකින් කොළඹ සිට බලංගොඩට ඇති මැගීය පළල් නම්, එම ස්ථානයෙන් පමණක් අවහිරයක් වී ඇති නම් එබඳු විශාල මුදලක් වැය කොට පළල් පාරක් තැනීම ගැන අපේ අකමැත්තක් නැහැ. එහෙත් සැතපුම් අඩුවක් පමණ ඇති කොළඹ-බලංගොඩ මාර්ගයේ පළල් අඩු තැන් හරියාකාර සකස් කරන්නේ නැතුව බලංගොඩ හරහා සැතපුම් භාගයක පමණ මාර්ගයක් මෙබඳු විශාල මුදලක් වැය කර තැනීම ගැන අපේ කනගවුව ප්‍රකාශ කළ යුතුව තිබෙනවා.

ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, දැනට බලංගොඩ නගරයේ පාලනය එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයට පැවරී ඇති අතර පාලනයෙහි ඇති අඩු පැඩුකැලි නිසා නගරයේ ජීවත් වන ජනතාව බෙහෙවින් කළකිරී සිටිනවා.

ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, බලංගොඩ ප්‍රදේශයේ වගා ව්‍යාපාරය සාර්ථක කර ගැනීමට නම් අලෙවි කිරීමේ දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවේ මධ්‍යස්ථානයක් පිහිටුවීම ඉතා අවශ්‍යව තිබෙන බව මතක් කරන්න කැමතියි. එක්සත් ජාතික පාක්ෂික අබ්සාලි මහත්මියගේ පවුලට අයිති වී මෝලක් තිබෙනවා. අලෙවි කිරීමේ දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවේ මධ්‍යස්ථානයක් ආරම්භයට ඔවුන්ගේ හල් පික වකුණ ගන්න අමාරු තත්ත්වයක් ඇති වෙන්න ඉඩ තිබෙනවා. ඒ නිසා අබ්සාලි මහත්මිය විසින් සෑම අතින්ම යටිතල ව්‍යාපාර යොදමින් අලෙවි කිරීමේ දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව මගින් එවැනි ස්ථානයක් ආරම්භ කිරීම අතපසු කරවනවා. කිරිමැටි තැන්පත් සමුපකාර සංවිධානය මගින් ඒ කොටන මෝලක් ආරම්භ කර තිබෙනවා. එය ආරම්භ කිරීමේදීත් නොයෙකුත් අන්දමේ අකුල් හෙළමින් එය කඩාකප්පල් කරන්න සූදනම් වුණා. ඒ නිසා අලෙවි කිරීමේ දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවේ මධ්‍යස්ථානයක් ආරම්භ කිරීමේ වැඩ කටයුතු පමා කිරීමට ආණ්ඩුවේ නිලධාරීන් පවා පොළඹවා ගෙන දිනෙන් දිනම එහි වැඩ කටයුතු පමා වන අන්දමට ක්‍රියා කරගෙන යනවා. මා ඒ බව නිර්භයව මේ ගරු සභාවට ප්‍රකාශ කරන්න කැමතියි. වගා ව්‍යාපාරය ගැන පමණක් නොව, වගා ව්‍යාපාරයට සෑම අතින්ම රුකුල් දෙන සෑම කටයුත්තක් ගැනම සලකා බලා වැඩි වැඩියෙන් උනන්දු වෙන්න කටයුතු කරගෙන යන මෙන් මා මේ ආණ්ඩුවෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා.

ඊළඟට ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, විශේෂ බදු ක්‍රමය යටතේ බලන්ගොඩ ප්‍රදේශයේ ඉඩම් දී තිබෙනවා. අක්කර 50, 60, 100 ආදී වශයෙන් යම් යම් අයට දී තිබෙනවා. මොරටුවේ ලී මෝල් හිමියෙකුටත් ඉඩම් අක්කර 50 ක් පමණ දී තිබෙනවා. ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, අද බලංගොඩ ප්‍රදේශයේ තිබෙන රජවක නමැති ගමේ උල්පත් ඉඩම්වල ආරක්ෂිත ඉඩම්වල තිබෙන ගස් ඉතාමත් වේගයෙන් කපා ගෙන යනවා.



[රත්වත්තෙ මිය.]

පසුගිය යල කන්නයේදී රජවක වී වන කළ ප්‍රදේශ අද වේළිලා ගෙස් තිබෙන බව ප්‍රකාශ කරන්න ඕන. අර ලී මෝල් හිමියා අද වන තෙක් ඒ අක්කර 50 ඇතුළත එක මිරිස් ගසක්වත් සිටුවා තැනි බව මේ අවසානවේදී ප්‍රකාශ කළ යුතුව තිබෙනවා. ඒ නිසා බය විධියට විශේෂ බදු ක්‍රමය යටතේ බලංගොඩ ඉඩම් බෙදා දීම වහාම නවත වන්නය කියා මා ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා.

ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, වගා ව්‍යාපාරයට අපිත් බොහොම කැමතියි. වගා ව්‍යාපාරයට අපිත් පුළුවන් තරම් සහයෝගය දෙනවා. නමුත් අද බලංගොඩ ආසනය තුළ පවතින තත්ත්වය ගැන විකක් කල්පනා කර බලන්න. 1965 මහ මැතිවරණයේදී නමුත් නාන්සේලා විසින් පොරොන්දු 21 ක් ඉදිරිපත් කරන්න යෙදුනා. විශේෂයෙන්ම ගොවි ජනතාව නමුත් නාන්සේලාගෙන් බලාපොරොත්තු වුණ දෙයක් තමයි, ඔවුන්ගේ ආගම ආරක්ෂා කර දේවිය යන්න. නමුත් මා කතාහවුවෙන් මතක් කළ යුතු කරුණක් තිබෙනවා. බලංගොඩ නගරයට හැතැප්ම 15 ක් පමණ දුරින් කුරගල නමැති බෞද්ධ සිද්ධස්ථානයක් තිබෙනවා. අද ඒ සිද්ධස්ථානයට සිදු වී තිබෙන දේ ගැන විකක් කල්පනා කර බලන්න. අද එය මුස්ලිම් භක්තිකයන්ට අයිති ස්ථානයක් බවට පත් කරගෙන තිබෙනවා. මා පුරාවිද්‍යා දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවෙහි මේ ගැන විමසා බැලුවා. පසුගිය දිනක ඉඩම් ඇමති තුමාගේ කායාර්ගයේ රැස්වීමක් පැවැත් වුණා. මා එහිදීත් කියා සිටියා, මේ සිද්ධස්ථාන භූමියේ ගොඩනැගිලි තැනීම වහාම නවත්වන්නය කියා. ඒ නෂ්ටාවශේෂයන් තැනි නාස්ති කිරීමට ඉඩ නොදෙන්නය කියා මා ඉල්ලා සිටියා. නමුත් ඒ ස්ථානයේ ගොඩනැගිලි තැනීම අද වන තෙක් නතර කර නැහැ. ඒ සිද්ධස්ථානයටම අයිති ගබඩාලේ පාවිච්චි කරමින් තවමත් ගොඩ නැගිලි තනා ගෙන යනවා. පුරාවිද්‍යා දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවෙන් ගොස් බැලුවොත් මේ තත්ත්වය හොඳට බලා ගන්න පුළුවන් වේවි. බලංගොඩ ජනතාව මේ ගැන ඉතාමත් කතාහවුවට පත්ව සිටිනවා. ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් ආණ්ඩුව මගින් කිසිම පියවරක් නොගෙන අඩුසැලි මහත්මයාට උච්ඡිඡනා අත්දැමට ක්‍රියා කරගෙන යාමට

අපගේ කතාහවුව ප්‍රකාශ කරනවා. මා ආණ්ඩු පක්ෂයේ සිටින ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් ගෙනුත් ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා, මේ තත්ත්වය ගැන විකක් සොයා බලන්නය කියා. මෙය ඉතාමත් පුරාණ සිද්ධස්ථානයක්. කීර් ඇල්ලේ ඥානවිමල ස්වාමීන් වහන්සේ විසින් මේ ගැන පොත් පවා ලියා තිබෙන බව තමුත් නාන්සේලා දන්නවා ඇති. පුරාණ රජ කාලයේ පටන් පැවත එන ශ්‍රී ලංකා පැරණි සිද්ධස්ථානයක්. නමුත් අද ඒ සිද්ධස්ථානයටම අයිති ගබඩාලේ පාවිච්චි කරමින් එහි ගොඩනැගිලි තනා ගෙන යනවා.

ඒ මදිවට අද විශේෂ බදු ක්‍රමය යටතේ ඒ අවට ඉඩම් පවා මුස්ලිම් ජනතාවට දී තිබෙනවා, මේ කොළඹ ප්‍රදේශයේ සිටින අයට අක්කර 50, 60, බැගින් දී තිබෙනවා. අද මුස්ලිම් භක්තිකයන් රාත්‍රියට පොල් පැළයයි කෙසෙල් පැළ දෙකයි අරගෙන ගොස් සිටුවමින් ඒ අවට ඉඩම් සියල්ලම අල්ලාගෙන තිබෙනවා. ඒ හේතුකොට ගෙන අද ඒ බෞද්ධ සිද්ධස්ථානයට යන්න පාරක් පවා නැති තත්ත්වයක් ඇති වී තිබෙනවා. එම නිසා බෞද්ධ ජනතාව වෙනුවෙන් එම සිද්ධස්ථානය පිළිබඳව යම් කිසි පියවරක් ගන්න ලෙස මේ ආණ්ඩුවෙන් අපි ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා.

තවත් දැවෙන ප්‍රශ්නයක් නම් රත්න පුරේ රෝහල් තත්ත්වය පිළිබඳ ප්‍රශ්නයයි. සබරගමුවේ පොදු ජනතාවගේ ප්‍රශ්න ජනයා තකා ආරෝග්‍ය ශාලාවක් රත්න පුරේ ඉදි කර තිබෙන නමුත්, අද එහි දුර්වලකම් රැශියක් තිබෙන බැවින් එම රෝහලෙන් ලැබිය යුතු නියම සේවය ඒ කොට්ඨාශයේ පොදු ජනතාවට ලැබෙන්නේ නැහැ. එහි පාලනය ඉතාමත් දුර්වලයි. ඒ හේතුකොටගෙන අද ලෙඩුන් රත්නපුරේ රෝහලට යාමට පවා අකැමති කරන බව මා තමුත් නාන්සේලා මතක් කරන්න කැමතියි. එම නිසා ඒ ආරෝග්‍ය ශාලාව පාලනය කරන්න ශක්තියක් ඇති වෛද්‍යාචාර්යවරයකු එතුනට පත් කරන ලෙස මා ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා.

ඒ වාගේම එම රෝහලේ ශල්‍යාගාරයක් තිබෙන නිසා රෝහලට වෙන් වූ වෙනම විචලි බල ජනන යන්ත්‍රයක් තිබිය යුතු බව තමුත් නාන්සේලා පිළිගන්නවා ඇති.



නොයෙක් අවස්ථාවලදී ලක්ෂ්‍යාන සිට ලැබෙන විදුලි එළිය ඇණ හිට ඇති නිසා අභිසංක දුප්පත් මිනිසුන් ජීවිතක්ෂයට පත් වී තිබෙන බව ඉතාමත් කනගාටු වෙන් සඳහන් කරන්න සිදු වී තිබෙනවා. එම නිසා දැවෙන ප්‍රශ්නයක් හැටියට තිබෙන මෙම ප්‍රශ්නය විසඳා ගැනීමටද හැකි පමණ ඉක්මනින් විදුලි බල ජනන යන්ත්‍රයක් එම රෝහලට සපයා දෙන ලෙස මා ආණ්ඩුවෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා.

කරුණු රාශියක් ඉදිරිපත් කිරීමට බලාපොරොත්තු වී සිටියේ නමුත්, කාල වේලා සීමා කර තිබෙන නිසා මගේ කථාව අවසන් කිරීමටයි මා බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ. වැඩ කරන ජනතාවට මෙම අය වැය කළාවෙන් යම් කිසි සහනයක් සැලසී තිබුණා නම් අපට ඒ ගැන සන්තෝෂ වෙන් නිබුණා. ජනතාවගේ එදිනෙදා ප්‍රශ්න විසඳන්නට මේ ආණ්ඩුව යම් කිසි ක්‍රියා මාර්ගයක් ගත්තා නම් අපට ඒ ගැන සන්තෝෂ වෙන් නිබුණා. ඒ නිසා කාන්තාවක් වශයෙන් මා කියන්න කැමතියි, පොදු ජනතාවගේ එදිනෙදා ප්‍රශ්න විසඳන්න බැරි මේ ආණ්ඩුව තව දුරටත් බලයේ සිටින්නට තැත් කරන්නේ නැතුව ඉල්ලා අස් වෙනවා නම් බලන්ගොඩ ජනතාව පමණක් නොවෙයි මුළු මහත් ලංකාවේ පොදු ජනතාව ඊටත් වඩා සන්තෝෂ වන බව. මුළු මහත් ලංකාවේ පොදු ජනතාවගේ ජීවන ප්‍රශ්න විසඳන්න පුළුවන් ශක්තියක් ඇති ආණ්ඩුවක් පත් කර ගැනීමට ජනතාවට හැකි වන පරිදි, ඒ ප්‍රශ්න විසඳන්න බැරි මේ ආණ්ඩුව කරුණා කර ඉල්ලා අස් වන ලෙස ඉල්ලා සිටිමින් මගේ කථාව අවසන් කරනවා.

දෙන්නට මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙන්නේ නැහැ. ඒ ප්‍රශ්නයට පිළිතුරු 1970දී දෙන්නම්. ඒ වන තුරු අපට ඇති වැඩ කටයුතු පිළිබඳ කරුණු රාශියක් ඉලක්කම් සහිතව ඉදිරිපත් කිරීමට මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා.

දැන් දින දෙක තුනකට ඉහත දී “මහසාර” නමැති නාට්‍යය බලන්නට ගැමට තමුන්නාන්සේ විසින් අප වෙත කරන ලද ආරාධනයක් පරිදි අප ඒ නාට්‍යය බලන්න ගියා. ඒ ගැන තමුන්නාන්සේට මා ස්තූති කරනවා. එහිදී තළ නිලියන්ගේ දක්ෂකම් දකින්නට ලැබීමෙන් මා බොහොම සන්තෝෂ වුණා. ඒ නාට්‍යයේ එක්තරා වාක්‍යයක් මට මතක් වෙනවා. රජ බිසවගේ මාලයක් හොරකම් කළාය කියා දුප්පත් ගැමියකුට බොරු චෝදනාවක් කර අධිකරණය ඉදිරියට ගෙනාවා. ඔහුට විරුද්ධව තිබූ නඩුව ඇසූ අවසානවේදී ඇත්ත කිව්වත් බොරුව කිව්වත් ලබෙන්නේ එකම දඩුවම බව ඒ දුප්පත් ගැමියාට කිව්වා. ඒවාගේ අප බොරුව කිව්වත් ඇත්ත කිව්වත් විරුද්ධ පක්ෂය එකම තීරණයකටයි බිහින්නේ. අප කුමක් කිව්වත් විරුද්ධ පක්ෂය මේ අයවැය ලේඛනයට විරුද්ධ වයි ඡන්දය දෙන්නේ. එහෙත් මා මේ අවස්ථාවේදී සම්පූර්ණ ඇත්ත ප්‍රකාශ කරන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. විවාද කිරීමේ අදහසින්ම නොවෙයි අප දන්නා හැටියට සම්පූර්ණ සත්‍ය කරුණු ඉදිරිපත් කර, අවශ්‍ය ද්‍රව්‍ය සම්බන්ධව විස්තර ඉදිරිපත් කර ඒවාගේ මිල ගණන් අඩු කරන්නේ කෙසේද කියා මා තමුන්නාන්සේලාගෙන් ප්‍රශ්න කරනවා. මගේ ප්‍රශ්නවලට උත්තර දෙන්නට පුළුවන් වුණොත් මා දැන් සඳහන් කරන ඇතැම් ද්‍රව්‍ය සම්බන්ධව මෙන්න මෙහෙම මිල අඩු කරන්නට පුළුවන්ය කියා පෙන්වා දුන්නොත් අප ඒ අනුව ක්‍රියා කරන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා.

ඇතැම් අවශ්‍ය ද්‍රව්‍ය ලංකාවේ නිෂ්පාදනය නොකරන නිසා අපට ඒ ද්‍රව්‍ය පිරිටට වලින් ගෙන්වන්නට සිද්ධ වී තිබෙනවා. පිරිටටවලින් බඩු ගෙන්වන්නේ මාර්ග තුනකින්. ආහර කොමසාරිස්තුමාගේ මාර්ගයෙන් පිරිටටින් බඩු ගෙන්වනවා. එමෙන්ම සමුපකාර තොග වෙළඳ ආය

පූ. හා. 10.28  
**ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන**  
 (கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)  
 (The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

කථානායකතුමනි, මගේ කථාවේදී ආහාර ගැනීම සහ බෙදා හැරීම ගැනත්, ජාතික සංවර්ධන වැඩ කීපයක් ගැනත් කරුණු ස්වල්පයක් ප්‍රකාශ කිරීමට මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. අපේ බලන්ගොඩ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරියගේ ඉල්ලීම ගැන—අපට ඉල්ලා අස් වන ලෙස කළ ඉල්ලීම ගැන—මගේ කථාවේදී සමුපකාර තොග වෙළඳ ආය



[ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන]

තනය—මා ලෙනෙසියට සතොසේ කියා කියන්නම්—මාර්ගයෙහි පෞද්ගලික වෙළඳුන් මේ රටට පිටරටින් බඩු ගෙන් වනවා. හාල්, උම්බලකඩ, පරිප්පු ආදී ආහාර වර්ග රාශියක් ආහාර කොමසාරිස් තුමා මාර්ගයෙන් ගෙන්වනවා. මිරිස්, කොත්තමල්ලි, සුදුරු, මාදුරු ආදී ආහාර වර්ග සතොසේ මාර්ගයෙන් ගෙන් වනවා. ඒ හැර සලු සැල මාර්ගයෙන් මේ රටට රෙදිපිළි ගෙන්වනවා. මේ ද්‍රව්‍ය සියල්ලම සලාක ක්‍රමය අනුවයි බෙදා හැරේ. හාල්, උම්බලකඩ, පරිප්පු ආදී ආහාර කොමසාරිස් තුමා මාර්ගයෙන් ගෙන්වන ආහාර ද්‍රව්‍යත් මිරිස්, කොත්තමල්ලි, සුදුරු, මාදුරු ආදී සතොසෙන් ගෙන්වන ආහාර ද්‍රව්‍යත් රෙදි පිළිත් රජයෙන් නියම කරන මිලක් සා ප්‍රමාණයක් අනුව සලාක ක්‍රමයට බෙදා දෙනවා. පිටි, සීනි, ලුනු වර්ග, පිටි කිරි යනාදිය සලාක ක්‍රමයෙන් තොරව බෙදා හරිනවා. ඒ ද්‍රව්‍ය ආහාර කොමසාරිස්තුමා මාර්ගයෙහි සතොසේ මාර්ගයෙහි ගෙන්වනවා. පිත් මලු වර්ග, සිමෙන්ති, සුදු ලුනු යන මේ ආදී ද්‍රව්‍ය සතොසේ මාර්ගයෙන් ගෙන්වා සලාක ක්‍රමයෙන් තොරව බෙදා හරිනවා. දැන් මේ සියලුම ද්‍රව්‍ය රජය මගින් හෝ සතොස මගින් හෝ ගෙන් වන නිසා මිල අඩුම ස්ථානවලින් ඒ ද්‍රව්‍ය ලබා ගන්නට අපට පුළුවනි. ඒවා යේම ලාභයක් තබා නොගෙන සලකා ක්‍රමයට, සෑම පාරිභෝගිකයකුටම සමාන ප්‍රමාණයක් ලැබෙන පරිදි ඒ ද්‍රව්‍ය බෙදා හරින්නට අපට පුළුවනි. මේ ද්‍රව්‍ය ගෙන් වන රටවල් නියම කර තිබෙන මිල ගණන්, ඒ මිල ගණන් වැඩිවී තිබෙන පිටිය, ඒ ද්‍රව්‍ය මේ රටේ බෙදා හරින ක්‍රමය සහ ඒ ද්‍රව්‍යවලට අපේ රජය නියම කර තිබෙන මිල ගණන් ආදී විස්තර මා පෙන්වා දෙන්නම්.

ධීට ප්‍රථමයෙන් ජීවන වියදම ගැන වචනයක් කිවයතු ව තිබෙනවා. මා සිත්ත ගැටියට ජීවන වියදම ගැන සෑම ආණ්ඩු වක්‍ර සොයා බලා තිබෙනවා. නිදහස ලැබූ දින පටන් මේ වන තෙක්ම සෑම ආණ්ඩු වක්‍රම ජීවන වියදම් ප්‍රශ්නය ගැන සොයා බලා තිබෙනවා. 1960 වර්ෂයේදී වර්තමාන කොලොන්නාවේ ගරු මහාතිලක (පී. බී. ඉලංගරත්න මයා.) එවකට වෙළඳ

ඇමතිවරයා ගැටියට ක්‍රියා කළ කාලයේදී මේ ජීවන වියදම් ප්‍රශ්නය ගැන සොයා බලන්නට මහාදේව මහත්මයාගේ ප්‍රධානත්වයෙන් යුත් කාරක සභාවක් පත් කළ බව අපට මතකයි. ඒ කාරක සභාවේ වාර්තාව 1961 වර්ෂයේදී මුද්‍රණය කර තිබෙනවා. එය ඉතාම වැදගත් වාර්තාවක්.

ඒ කාරක සභාවට දැනට ආහාර අමාත්‍යාංශයේ සිටි ලේකම් වශයෙන් සිටින මහාදේව මහතාත්, ශ්‍රී ලංකා මහා බැංකුවේ ප්‍රධාන නිලධාරියකු වන කැලේගම මහතාත්, සමුපකාර නොග වෙළඳ ආයතනයේ උප අධ්‍යක්ෂවරයකු වන එස්. බී. සේනානායක මහතාත්, ආහාර උප කොමසාරිස් වරයකු වන ජේ. එච්. ලැනරෝල් මහතාත්, වෙළඳ අමාත්‍යාංශයේ උප ලේකම්වරයකු වන ආර්. එම්. ඩී. සේනානායක මහතාත් ඇතුළත් වී සිටියා. ඒ කාරක සභාව විශේෂයෙන්ම පරිප්පු, අර්තාපල්, ලුනු, මිරිස්, කරවල, පොල් සහ පොල් තෙල් ආදිය ගැන විභාග කර බැලුවා. 1938 ත් 1960 ත් අතර කරවල මිල ලෝක වෙළඳ පොලොවේ සියයට 400 කින්, 500 කින් හා සමහර අවස්ථාවලදී සියයට 700 කින් පමණ වැඩි වී තිබෙනවාය කියා ඒ වාර්තාව මගින් ඉලංගරත්න ඇමතිතුමාට පෙන්වා දුන්නා. ඒ කාලය තුළ පරිප්පු මිල සියයට 900කින් වැඩි වී තිබෙනවා. සමහර වර්ගවල මිල සියයට 400 කින් වැඩි වී තිබෙනවා. මිරිස් මිල සියයට 600 කින් වැඩි වී තිබෙනවා. අර්තාපල් සියයට 500 කිනුත්, ලුනු වර්ග සියයට 400 කිනුත් වැඩි වී තිබෙනවා. මේ අන්දමට ලෝක වෙළඳ පොළේ මිල වැඩි වී තිබෙන ආකාරය මේ වාර්තාවෙන් පෙන්වා දී තිබෙනවා. ඒවා පෙන්වා දී ඒ මහත් වරු කියා තිබෙන්නේ මොනවාද? පරිප්පු ගෙන්වීම සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම රජයට ගෙන සමුපකාර නොගවෙළඳ ආයතනය හා සමුපකාර කඩ මාර්ගයෙන් බෙදා හැරියා තිබෙනවා. අර්තාපල් ගෙන්වීමත් සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම රජය අතට ගන්නා කියා තිබෙනවා. මිරිස් හා ලෑන ගෙන්වීමත් සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම රජය අතට ගන්නා කියා තිබෙනවා. කරවල ගෙන්වීමත් සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම රජය අතට ගන්නා මි. තො. ස. අතට ගන්නා කියා තිබෙනවා. ඒ හැර වෙනත් නොයෙකුත් අංශයන් දක්වා තිබෙනවා. මේ නිර්දේශ සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම දැන්



ක්‍රියාවේ යොදවා තිබෙනවා. තවත් කරන්නට දෙයක් නැහැ. මා හිතන විධියට දැන් පරිපූ පු ගෙන්වන්නේ ආහාර කොමසාරිස් තුමා විසිනුයි. එය රජය අතට අරගෙන ඉවරයි. අර්තාපල් කවුරුවත් ගෙන්වන්නේ නැහැ. දැන් ලංකාවේ අර්තාපල් නිපදවනවා. දුනු වර්ගත් අද සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම ගෙන්වන්නේ රජයේ. ආයතනයක් වන සතොසෙන්. මිලිස් වර්ගත් සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම ගෙන්වන්නේ සතොසෙන්. කිසිම පෞද්ගලික වෙළෙන්දෙක් ඒවා ගෙන්වන්නේ නැහැ. සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම කරවල ගෙන්වන්නේ සතොසෙන්. සතොස රජයේ ආයතනයක් නිසා රජයෙන් ගෙන්වනු වත් සතොසෙන් ගෙන්වනු වත් එකයි.

ඒවා බෙදාහරින්නේ මෙන්ම මේ විධියටයි. සමුපකාර තොග වෙළෙඳ ආයතනයෙන් සතොස සිල්ලර කඩවලටත්, සමුපකාර සමිති සංගම්වලටත් දෙනවා. බොහොම සුළු කොටසක් පෞද්ගලික වෙළෙඳුන්වත් දෙනවා. කවුරුත් දන්නා පරිදි භාල් ගෙන්වන්නේ රජයෙන්; බෙදෙන්නේ රජයෙන්. නොමිලයේම දෙන නිසා ඊට වඩා මිල අඩු කරන්න පුළුවන් කමක් නැහැ. අර්තාපල් ගෙන්වීම තහනම් කර තිබෙනවා. දැන් අර්තාපල් ලංකාවේම ව්‍යාගත්තට ඕනෑ. දුනු මිලිස් කරවල ගෙන්වන්නේ සතොස මඟිනුයි. මේ වාර්තාවේ හැටියට මේ අත්‍යවශ්‍ය ආහාර මේ රටේ පවුල් සියයට 90 ක්ම වැඩිපුර පාවිච්චි කරනවා. මේවායේ මිල බස්සන්නේ කොහොමද? පාරිභෝගිකයාට මේවා අඩුම මිලට දෙන්නේ කොහොමදැයි පෙන්වා දෙමින් වාර්තා කළ විට එවකට සිටි ඇමතිවරයා ඒ වාර්තා කරන ලද කාරණාවලින් එකක් දෙකක් ක්‍රියාත්මක කළා. කරවල සම්බන්ධයෙන් වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් ක්‍රියාත්මක කළා. අනෙක් ඒවා සම්බන්ධයෙන් වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් යෙදවේ නැහැ. බඩ ගෙන්වීම සම්බන්ධයෙන් මේ වාර්තාවේ සඳහන් කාරණා සියයට සියයක්ම අප ක්‍රියාත්මක කර අවසානයයි. එහෙත් බෙදීම සම්බන්ධයෙන් නම් අපත් ක්‍රියාත්මක නොකළ කාරණා තිබෙනවා.

සමුපකාර තොග වෙළෙඳ ආයතන නැති කර බෙදා හැරීම සතොසට දිය යතු බව වාර්තාවෙන් කියා ඇතත් අප ඒක කර නැහැ. එහෙත් බඩ තොග ඒ වෙළෙඳ ආයතනවලට බෙදීම සම්බන්ධයෙන්

කාරණා ගැන කල්පනා කර බලා එවා සියයට සියයක්ම ක්‍රියාත්මක කර අවසානයයි. ඊට වඩා යම් දෙයක් කරන්නට පුළුවන් නම් කරුණාකර ඒ ගැන කියන්න සියලුම බඩු වර්ග රජයෙන් ගෙනවිය යුතු යයි කල්පනා කරනවා ද? ඉහත කී අත්‍යවශ්‍ය බඩු රජයෙන් ගෙන්වනවා නම් මිල වැඩි වී තිබෙන්නේ කෙසේ දැයි ප්‍රශ්නයක් මතු වෙනවා. අපි එක එක වර්ගය ගැන කල්පනා කර බලමු. දැන් භාල් නොමිලයේ දෙන නිසා භාල් ගැන නම් ප්‍රශ්නයක් මතු වන්නේ නැහැ. හැබැයි, භාල් සේරුවක් ගන්නේ ශත 80 ට බව අග මැතිතුමාත් ආහාර ඇමති තුමාත් කීප විටක්ම කියා තිබෙනවා. [බාධා කිරීමක්] භාල් දෙන්නේ නොමිලයේ. ඒ නිසා භාල් මිල මෙතැනදී ප්‍රශ්නයක් වන්නේ නැහැ. භාල් සේරුවක් ශත 5 ට ගත්තත් අපට කමක් නැහැ. [බාධා කිරීමක්] භාල් සේරු දෙකක් දිය යතුද, එකක් දිය යුතුද යන ප්‍රශ්නය ගැනත් මට කරුණු කියන්නට පුළුවනි. මම ඒකටත් එන්නම්. භාල් මොන මිලකට ගත්තත් නොමිලයේ දෙන නිසා මිල පිළිබඳ ප්‍රශ්නය මෙතැනදී වැදගත් වන්නේ නැහැ.

කරවල මිල වැඩි වී තිබෙන ආකාරය මා පෙන්වා දුන්නා. සියයට 600 කින්, 700 කින් පමණ කරවල මිල වැඩි වී තිබෙනවා. කරවල ගෙන්වන මිල ගණන් අනුව ඒවා පාරිභෝගිකයාට විකිණීමේ මිල ගණන් නියම කර තිබෙනවා. පරිපූ, මිලිස්, කොත්තමල්ලි, සුදුරු, මාදුරු සහ භාල් කරවල යන මේ සියල්ලම රජය මගින් ගෙන්වා මිල නියම කොට සලාක ක්‍රමය අනුව පාරිභෝගිකයාට බෙදා දෙනවා. සලාක පොත් තිබෙන සියලු දෙනාටම මේ බඩු වලින් නියමිත ප්‍රමාණයක් ලබා ගන්නට පුළුවනි. මේ සලාකය ලබා ගැනීම සම්බන්ධයෙන් නම් මෙතෙක් කල් ලංකාවේ කොහේ සිටින කෙනකුගෙන්වත් චෝදනාවක් ලැබී නැහැ. මේ එක දවසක් හෝ නොලැබුණා යයි කාගෙන්වත් පැමිල්ලක් ලැබී නැහැ. කොතැනකින් හෝ එවැනි චෝදනාවක් ලැබෙනවා නම් වහාම එය හරිගස්සනට පුළුවනි. මේ දවස බෙදන්නේ සතොසෙන් සහ සමුපකාර කඩවලින් නිසා වහාම ඕනෑම වරදක් නිරූපි කරන්නට පුළුවනි. රජයෙන් නියම කර තිබෙන සලාකය හාම පාරිභෝගිකයාටම ලැබෙන



[ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන]  
 ප්‍රමාණය නම් මදි වන්නට පුළුවනි. එක වෙනම ප්‍රයත්නයකි. කෙසේ වුණත් රජයෙන් නියම කර තිබෙන ප්‍රමාණය නොලැබුණ යයි කිසිම කෙනෙකුගෙන් වෝදනා වක් එල්ල වී නැහැ.

මිල වැඩි වී තිබෙන්නේ ඇයි? මහා දේව වාර්තාවෙන් ජේන විධියට එක ලෝකයේ කොතැනක වුණත් ස්වභාවයෙන්ම සිදු විය හැකි දෙයකි. මුදල් සැපයීම වැඩි වී තිබීම වැනි නොයෙක් නොයෙක් කාරණා නිසා, අපේ රටේ මෙන් මේ බඩු සපයන රටවලත් ජීවන වියදම ක්‍රම ක්‍රමයෙන් වැඩි වී තිබීම නිසා, මේ බඩුවල මිලත් වැඩි වී තිබෙනවා. සී. අයි. එෆ්. මිල අවුරුදු පහා මාස්පහා ඉබේම වාගේ වැඩි වෙනවා. ඒ අනුව නියම කෙරෙන මිලකට අප බඩු ගත යුතුයි. දෙවැනි කරුණ මෙයයි: සුවස් අර්බුදය නිසා සුවස් ඇල වසනු ලැබීම හේතුකොට ගෙන, බටහිර යුරෝපය ආදී ප්‍රදේශවලින් විශේෂයෙන්ම ලංකාව වැනි රටවලට එන තැව් වලට වැඩිපුර හැතැපීම 10,000 ක් පමණ කරන්නට යිදු විමෙන් පසුගිය අවුරුදු දෙක තුළ ඇතුළත දී තැව් ගාස්තු වැඩි වීමත් බඩු මිල වැඩි වීමට හේතුවක් වුණා. ඒ හැර, වරායේ සේවකයන්ට ගෙවන පඩිත් ක්‍රමයෙන් වැඩි වී තිබෙනවා. ලොරි කුලී හා වෙනත් ගමන් ගාස්තුත් වැඩි වුණා. මේ සෑම දෙයක්ම බඩු මිලෙහි අඩංගු වුණු නිසා එය ඉහළ ගියා. විදේශ විනිමය අඩුපාඩුකම් නිසා ඇතැම් ද්‍රව්‍ය අඩු කරන්නටත් අපට සිදු වුණා. ඒවාගේම, 1964 ත් 1968 ත් අතර කාලය තුළදී ලංකාවේ මුදල් සැපයීමත් 20 කෝපියකින් පමණ වැඩි වී තිබෙනවා. ඒ මුදල් පාරිභෝගිකයන් අතේ තිබෙනවා. ඒ සමගම අප වි බුසලකට රුපියල් 14 බැගින් දැන් ගොවීන්ට ගෙවනවා. කම්කරුවන්ගේ පඩි වැඩි කර තිබෙනවා. පාරිභෝගිකයන් අතේ මේ මුදල් තිබියදීම පිරිවිත් ගෙන්වන බඩු හුඟක්දුරට තහනම් කර තිබෙන නිසා ලංකාවේ ද්‍රව්‍ය සඳහා එම මුදල් පාවිච්චි වීම හේතුකොට ගෙනත් මිල වැඩි වෙනවා.

මේ රජය ගත් ක්‍රියා මාර්ග දෙකක් නිසාත් බඩු මිල, ආහාර ද්‍රව්‍ය මිල ටිකක් වැඩි වී තිබෙනවා. රුපියලේ මිල අඩු කිරීමත් විදේශ විනිමය හිමිකම් සහතික පත් ගෙවත් "ෆීස්" ක්‍රමය ඇති කිරීමත් ඒ පියවර දෙකයි. මේ පිළිබඳ තරුණ ශාස්ත්‍රඥයන් ආහාර ඇමතිතුමාත් මුදල්

ඇමතිතුමාත් වෙනත් ඇමතිවරුන් විසින් මෙම ගරු සභාවට වටහා දී තිබෙන නිසා මේ අවස්ථාවේදී ඒ ගැන වාද විවාද කරන්නට වුවමනාවක් නැහැ. ඒ පියවර වල් දෙක ගන්නට අපට සිදු වුණු බව අප පෙනවා දී තිබෙනවා. මේ විධියේ නොයෙක් කරුණු නිසා, ද්‍රව්‍ය ලබා ගන්නා මිලුන් ඒවා බෙදා හැරීමේ මිලුන් වරායට ගෙන ඒමේ මිලුන් සේවකයන්ට ගෙවන මිලුන් වැඩි වී තිබියදී එය ඉතාම අඩු මිලකට පාරිභෝගිකයාට දෙන්නේ කොහොමද? දෙවැනියක් තිබෙනවා. එකක් නම්, අවශ්‍ය ද්‍රව්‍ය සියල්ලම ලංකාවේම නිපදවා ගැනීමයි. හාල්, මිරිස්, ආණ, අර්තාපල් හා අනෙක් අවශ්‍ය සෑම ආහාර ද්‍රව්‍යයක්ම මේ රටේ සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම නිපදවා ගන්නට පුළුවන් නම්, අප පිරවටවලට ගොස් ඒ රටවල් නියම කරන මිල ගණන් වලට ඒවා ලබා ගන්නට වුවමනාවක් නැහැ. සුවස් අර්බුදයෙන් අපට කරදරයක් වන්නේ නැහැ. අප අර්තාපල් ගෙන්වීම සම්පූර්ණයෙන් තහනම් කෙලෝ ඒ අදහස අනුවයි. හාල් සේරුව කැපීමෙන් ලංකාවේ වි ගොවිතැන දියුණු වුණා. මිරිස්, ආණ ආදී වූ අනෙක් ද්‍රව්‍යත් වැඩි කල් යන්නට පෙර මේ රටේම නිපදවා ගන්නට පුළුවන් වෙනවා ඇති. මහාදේව වාර්තාවෙහි ඒ ගැනත් සඳහන් කර තිබෙනවා. එහි කියා තිබෙන්නේ, මිරිස්, ආණ, අර්තාපල් ආදී ද්‍රව්‍ය පුළුවන් තරම් ඉක්මනින් ලංකාවේම වැවිය යුතු බවයි. ඒ අදහස, ඉලංගරත්ත ඇමතිතුමා සිටි රජයෙන් නොව අපගේ රජයෙන් දැන් ක්‍රියාවේ යොදවනවා. දැන් ඒ ක්‍රියා මාර්ගය සියයට සියයක්ම ආහාර ඇමතිතුමා විසින් ක්‍රියාවෙහි යොදවනවා. එම වාර්තාවෙහි ඉංග්‍රීසියෙන් මේ විධියට සඳහන් වී තිබෙනවා:

"Would it not therefore be desirable to set apart some of the irrigable land in our major irrigation schemes for the cultivation of crops like chillies."

ලොකු වාරිමාර්ග ක්‍රම යටතේ අපේ ලංකාවට වුවමනා කරන මිරිස් ලුණු යනාදිය—subsidiary foodstuffs—නිෂ්පාදනය කිරීම පිණිස හැකි පමණ ආධාර දිය යුතුයැයි මෙම වාර්තාවෙහි සඳහන් කර තිබෙනවා. එම ක්‍රියා මාර්ගය අනුව අද මෙම රජය වැඩ කරනවා. ඒ ආකාරයට මෙම රජය අද ක්‍රියා කර අවසානයයි. මෙම ද්‍රව්‍ය සියයට සියයක්ම ලංකාවේ නිපදවන්නට පුළුවන් වූවත් ඒවා පාරිභෝගිකයාට



දැන් ලැබෙන මිලට අඩුවෙන් ලැබේදැයි කියන්නට මා දන්නේ නැහැ. අද ලංකාවට වුවමනා කරන බිත්තර වර්ග ලංකාවේ ම ඇති වෙනවා. එහෙත් ඒවායේ මිල වැඩි වී තිබෙනවා. සමහර විට ඉන්දියාවෙන් ලබා ගන්නවා නම් ඒවා මිට වඩා ලාබයට දෙන්නට පුළුවන් විය හැකියි. ලංකාවේ නිපදවන සහල් සේරුවක් ශත 75ක් 80ක් පමණ වෙනවා. පිරටට සහල් එව්වර ගණන් නැහැ. එම නිසා සිත්තට එපා සියයට සියයක්ම ලංකාවේ නිපදවීමත් මෙම ද්‍රව්‍යවල මිල අඩු වේවිය කියා. බාග වෙලාවට මිල වැඩි වන්නට පුළුවනි. කුමන තුන් අපට සහනයක් සැලසෙන්නේ ආණ්ඩුවක් රට පාලනය කළත් එතැනි නැහැ. හැබැයි, විදේශ විනිමය අපට ඉතිරි කර ගන්නට පුළුවන් වේවි එසේ නම් අපට තව විධියකින් කල්පනා කරන්නට පුළුවනි අපි මේ බඩු මුට්ටු ගොවායින් පසු අලාබයක් දරා පැරිභෝගිකයාට දෙමුද කියා කල්පනා කරන්නට පුළුවනි. ඒ කියන්නේ subsidize කරමුද කියා කල්පනා කරන්නට පුළුවනි. අප එසේ කරනවා. සහල් ආදී බඩු වර්ග රජය මගින් බෙදාහරින්නේ විශාල අලාබයක් දරාගෙනයි. ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාගේ මෙම අයවැය ලේඛනය දෙස බැලුවත් රජයෙන් ආහාරවලට රු. 82,23,00,000 ක අලාබයක් දරනවා. Rs. 622.3 million පැරිභෝගිකයාට රු. 58,80,00,000ක්ද, වී ගොවියාට රු. 2,60,00,000 ක්ද, රතු ලුනුවලට රු. 75,00,000 ක්ද, පරිප්පුවලට රු. 60,00,000 ක්ද යනවා. ඒ අතර සිනි සහ පිටිවලින් ලාබයක් ලැබෙනවා. එම ලාබය නම් රු. 28,75,00,000 යි. එවිට ආහාර වර්ග සඳහා අයවැය ලේඛනයේ අඩුපාඩුව රු. 33,48,00,000 යි. එක විශාල ගණනක්. ඊට වඩා අලාබයක් දරන්නට අපට තබා කිසිම ආණ්ඩුවකට පුළුවන්දැයි මා අහනවා.

ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, සෞඛ්‍ය වැඩවලට, ඒ කියන්නේ නොමිලයේ බෙහෙත් දීම, නොමිලයේ සාන්තු සප්පායම් කිරීම යනාදියට, රු. 22,10,00,000 ක් යනවා. එමෙන්ම නොමිලයේ අධ්‍යාපනය දෙන නිසා ස්කෝල හදන්නට ගුරුවරුන්ට පඩි ගෙවන්නට සහ පොත්පත්වලට රු. 48,00,00,000 ක් වැය වෙනවා. අපේ රේජියෙන් රු. 6,00,00,000 ක මෙහෙයුමක් යක් තිබෙනවා. මේවා, ඔක්කෝම මුදල්.

මේ මුදල් අය වන එකෙන්ම හොයන්නට ඕනෑ; බදුවලින්ම හොයන්නට ඕනෑ. සෞඛ්‍ය වැඩවලට, අධ්‍යාපනයට, දුම්රිය සේවයට සහ ආහාරවලට මිට වඩා අලාබයක් දරන්නට පුළුවන්දැයි මා අහනවා. පරිප්පු ක්‍රමය තවත් ලිහිල් කරන්න අපට පුළුවන්ද? උම්බලකඩවලින් තවත් අලාබයක් දරන්නට අපට පුළුවන්ද? මේ කිසිම ද්‍රව්‍යයක් මිට වඩා අලාබයක් දරාගෙන බෙදා දෙන්නට මෙම අයවැය ලේඛනය අනුව මුදල් හොයා ගන්න පුළුවන්දැයි මා අහනවා. ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා කල්පනා කර බලන්නට ඕනෑ—මා දන්නේ නැහැ, එතුමාට පුළුවන් වේවිද කියන්න මෙවැනි අලාබ දරමින් කොහෙන් හරි මිට වඩා ශතයකවත් වැඩි ආදායමක් හොයන්නට පුළුවන්ද කියා. එහෙතම අපට කරන්නට තිබෙන්නේ එකම දෙයයි. ඒ නිසා මිළ අඩු වේද කියා මා දන්නේ නැහැ. ඒ කරන්නට තිබෙන දෙය නම් මේ රටේ වන්නට පුළුවන් හැම දෙයක්ම මේ රටේ වැවීමයි. මේ රටේ නිපදවන්නට පුළුවන් හැම දෙයක්ම මේ රටේ නිපදවීමයි. එසේ කිරීමෙන් මිළ අඩු තුනත් ඒ මුදල් ලංකාවේද රැඳෙනවා. ලංකාවේ රක්ෂා ඇති වෙනවා. ලංකාවේ ගොවීන් පොහොත් වෙනවා. ලංකාවේ කම්කරුවන් පොහොසත් වෙනවා. මේ රජය අනුගමනය කරන්නේ ඒ ක්‍රමයයි. හාල්, මීරිස්, මංගුට, පරිප්පු ආදී මේ ද්‍රව්‍ය ගැන මා මිට වඩා කථා කරන්නට අදහස් කරන්නේ නැහැ.

අය වැය ලේඛනයෙන් දවස් දෙක තුනකට පසු රෙදි මිල වැඩි කළ නිසා රෙදි ගැන වචනයක් කියන්නට සතුටුයි. ඒ විධියට රෙදි මිල වැඩි කළේ අය වැය ලේඛනය නිසා නොවෙයි. අය වැය ලේඛනයෙන් මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා රෙදි සඳහා තීරු බද්ද අඩු කළා. එහෙත් එදා උදේ වන තෙක් ඇමතිවරුන්වත් එය දැන ගෙන සිටියේ නැහැ. රෙදි වර්ග 4 ක් සඳහා මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා තීරු බද්ද සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම ඉවත් කළා. රුපියලේ මිල අඩු කරන්නට ප්‍රථම සඵ සල රෙදි ගෙනාවත් තිබුණා. රුපියලේ මිල අඩු කළ අවස්ථාවේදී සඵ සලට රෙදි මිල වැඩි කරන්නට සිදු වුණා. එසේ කළේ නැත්නම් සඵ සලට අලාභයක් විදින්නට සිදු වෙන්නවා. එහෙත් සිංහල අවරුද්ද වන මුදල් මුදා හැරීමේදී මෙහෙයුම පරණ රෙදි නොගය පරණ ගණනට ම බෙදන්නා කියා රජයෙන් නියම කළා.



[ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන]

එසේ නැත නම් දෙසැම්බර් මාසයෙහි, මිල වැඩි කරන්නට තිබුණේ. පෞද්ගලික වෙළෙන්දා සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම රෙදි ගෙන් නු වා නම් එහෙම කරනවා. ඒ නිසා පෞද්ගලික වෙළෙන්දාට විශාල ලාභයක් ලැබෙනවා. එහෙත් සඵසල රජයෙන් පාලනය වන නිසා, සඵසලෙන් සියයට 51 ක් සතොසට අයිති නිසා, එහෙම කරන්නට ඉඩ දුන්නේ නැහැ. සඵසල එහෙම කරන්නට අදහස් කළේ නැහැ. සිංහල අවුරුද්ද අවසාන වෙලත් ජූනි, ජූලි වන තෙක් පරණ රෙදි, අඩු ගණනට ගත්ත නිසා, අඩු ගණනටම විකේතා. අළුත් රෙදි තොගයක් ආවම, රෙදි නිෂ්පාදනය කරන රටවල මිල වැඩි කර තිබුණු නිසාත්, අපේ රටේ රුපියලේ මිල අඩු කර තිබුණු නිසාත්, සඵසලටත්, රජයටත් ඒ අලාභය විදින්නට බැරි නිසා ඒ රෙදිවල මිල වැඩි කරන්නට සිදු වුණා. හදිසියෙන්ම මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා මේ ගැන කල්පනා කර රෙදි මිල වැඩි වී තිබෙන ප්‍රමාණය වැඩි නිසා, චීන්, සුදු පොප්ලින්, පාට පොප්ලින්, ලෝග් ක්ලෝත් යන රෙදි වර්ග 4 සඳහා තිරු බද්ද සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම ඉවත් කලා. මහජනයා පාවිච්චි කරන රෙදිවලින් සියයට 93 ක්ම ඇතුළත් වන්නේ මේ රෙදි වර්ග 4 වයි. මේ රෙදි වර්ග 4 සඳහා තිරු බද්ද සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම ඉවත් කළ නිසා ඒවායේ මිල වැඩි කරන්නේ නැත කියා සඵසල සහ රජය සාකච්ඡා කර තීරණය කර තිබෙනවා. ඒ බව පත්‍රයේත් පළ වී තිබුණා. චීන් යාරයක් 2.12 යි. සුදු පොප්ලින් යාරයක් 2.12 යි. පාට පොප්ලින් යාරයක් 2.12 යි. ලෝග් ක්ලෝත් යාරයක් 1.90 යි. පරණ ගණන්වලටම මේ වර්ග 4 බෙදන්නට සඵසලත්, රජයත් එකතු වී කර තිබෙන තීරණය අද නැත්නම් හෙට ගැසට් නිවේදනයකින් පළ කරනවා.

අපට මෙහෙම කරන්නට පුළුවන් වෙලා තිබෙන්නේ කාරණා දෙක තුනක් කියයි. තොග වෙළෙන්දාට ලැබෙන වසිය අඩු කරන්නටත්, නැතහොත් තොග වෙළඳාම සඵවත් නම් සඵසල අතට ගන්නටත් සඵසල කල්පනා කරනවා. ඒ එක අදහසක්. අනික ලාබ රෙදි තොටු විකක් වටිනා රෙදි රෙදිපිළි ගෙන්වා නියම මිලක් නැතිව වැඩි මිල ගණන්වලට විකුණ

ගැනීම සඳහා වැඩිපුර විදේශ විනිමය ප්‍රමාණයක් සඵසලට ලබා දීමට රජය අදහස් කරනවා. සමහරවිට කෝචි කලිසම් මැනීම සඳහා පාවිච්චි කරන සුව රෙදි ආදි වටිනා රෙදි විකක් ගෙන්වා නියමිත මිලක් නැතිව විකිණීමෙන් ලැබෙන ලාභයෙන් මේ අලාභය මත හැර ගන්න සඵසලට පුළුවන් වේයයි අදහස් කරනවා. මේ රටට බඩු මුවු ගෙන්වීම රජයේ පාලනය යටතේ සිදු කිරීමෙන් රජය අදහස් කරන්නේ පාරිභෝගිකයාට ප්‍රයෝජනවත් ආකාරයට ඒ බඩු මුවු සපයා දීම බව එයින් පෙනී යනවා. පරිභෝගිකයාට හැම දෙයක්ම නිකම් දෙන්න බැහැ. අලාභයක් විදල දෙන්නත් බැහැ. කොයි රජයකට වුණත් තවත් වැඩ රාශියක් කරන්නට තිබෙනවා. යම් බඩුවක් පිටරටින් මේ රටට ගෙන්වා වරායේ ගොඩබන අවස්ථාවේ සිට පාරිභෝගිකයාට එනතුරු සිදුවන වියදම ගණන් බලා සුළුම ලාබයක් තබා ගෙන එම බඩුව පාරිභෝගිකයාට අඩු මිලකට ලබා දෙන්න පුළුවන්කම ලැබී තිබෙන්නේ බඩු ගෙන්වීම රජයේ පාලනය යටතේ තිබෙන නිසයි.

ඇතැම් ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් සඵසලට දොස් කිව්වා. රෙදි ගෙන්වීම සියයට සියයකින්ම රජයට ගෙන සඵසල මගින් බෙදාහැරීම පටන් ගත්තේ මේ ආණ්ඩුවයි. වෛද්‍යාවායාරී එම්. ඩී. පී. පීරිස් මහත්මයා වෙළඳ ඇමති වශයෙන් සිටි කාලයේ රෙදි ගෙන්වීම සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම රජය අතට ගත්තා. සඵසලෙන් සියයට 51ක් ස. තොසටත්, රජයටත් අයිති අතර සියයට 49ක් පෞද්ගලික වැසියන්ට අයිතියි. කොටස්කරුවන් 8,200ක් සිටිනවා. ඒ ඔක්කොම පුංචි මිනිසුන්. එක් අයෙකුට රු. 25,000කට වඩා තැන්පත් කරන්නට තහනම් කර තිබෙනවා. එහෙත් මේ මේ රෙදි අසුවල් අසුවල් මිලට විකිණිය යුතු යයි සඵසලට නියම කරන්නට රජයට පුළුවන්. අලාභයට විකුණන්නට යයි නියම කරන්නට අපට බැහැ. අලාභයට විකුණන්න රජයට වුණත් බැහැ. මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා අයවැය



ලේඛනයෙන් තීරු බදු ඉවත් කර දැමූ මහජනයා සියයට 93ක් පාවිච්චි කරන රෙදි වර්ග හතර හැකි තරම් අඩු මිලකට පාරිභෝගිකයාට සැපයිය යුතු යයි රජය තීරණය කළ නිසා සඵසලේ අධ්‍යක්ෂ මණ්ඩලය ඒ අනුව පියවර ගත් නිසා මිල වැඩි නොකර මේ රෙදි බෙදා හරින්න අපට පුළුවන් වී තිබෙනවා.

මම මෙතෙක් වෙලා කළ කටවෙහි අඩංගු කරුණු වලින් තමුන් නාත්සේලාට අවබෝධ වෙනවා ඇති, ලාබම රෙදි වෙළඳ පොළවලින් රෙදි ගෙන්වන්නට අපි කොයි තරම් උත්සාහ කරනවාද නියා. රෙදි ගෙන්වන්නට පුළුවන් ලාබම වෙළඳපොළ විතරයි. අපි රෙදිවලින් සියයට 75ක් පමණ ගෙන්වන්නේ විතරවෙන්. අපට සියයට සියයම විතරවෙන් ගෙන්වන්නට බැරි නේ විකුණා ගැනීමටත්, රෙදි ගෙත්වා ගැනීමටත් අපි ඇතැම් රටවල් සමඟ වෙළඳ ගිවිසුම් ඇති කරගෙන තිබෙන නිසයි. සියයට සියයම විනයෙන් ගෙන්වන්නට පුළුවන් නම් සමහරවිට අපට මිටත් වඩා අඩු මිලකට රෙදි බෙදා හරින්න පුළුවන් වෙයි. එහෙත්, එහෙම කරන්න බෑ. රජයේ පාලනයක් තිබෙන නිසා, මා කලින් මතක් කළ ද්‍රව්‍ය පුළුවන් තරම් අඩු මිලට මෙරටට ගෙන්වාගන්න අප උත්සාහ කරනවා.

දෙවනුව, අප පුළුවන් තරම් උත්සාහ කරනවා, ඒවා බෙදීමේදී යම්කිසි පාලනයක් කරන්න. ස. තො. ස. සිල්ලර කඩ මාර්ගයෙනුත්, මහජනයා විසින් පාලනය කෙරෙන සමුපකාර කඩ සමිති මාර්ගයෙනුත්, ඒවා බෙදා හරින්නට අප උත්සාහ කරනවා. බඩු හිඟයක් තිබෙනවා නම්, ඒ බඩු සලාක ක්‍රමයට බෙදන්නට කටයුතු කරනවා. යම් යම් අවස්ථාවල බඩු හිඟයක් ඇති වෙනවා, යුද්ධ නිසා. අරාබි-ඊශාලයේ යුද්ධය නිසා සුවස් ඇළ වැසීම හේතුකොට ගෙන, රුමේනියාවේ සිට ලංකාවට කොත්ත මල්ලි ගෙන එන නැව්වලට හැතැප්ම 10,000ක පමණ වටයක් ගසා එන්නට සිදු වී තිබෙනවා. එම නිසා, මිල වැඩි වෙනවා. මා පෙන්නා දුන් ක්‍රමය අනුව, අපේ පාරිභෝගිකයන්ට පුළුවන් තරම් අඩු මිලට ඒ ඒ ද්‍රව්‍ය ලබා දෙන්නට රජය කටයුතු කර තිබෙන බව පැහැදිලි වෙනවා.

ඒ හැරෙනවා, ලංකාවේ නිෂ්පාදනය කරන්නට පුළුවන් හැම ද්‍රව්‍යයක්ම ලංකාවේම නිෂ්පාදනය කිරීම අපේ රජයේ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය. ආහාර ඇමතිතුමාගේ උත්සාහයත්, කර්මාන්ත ඇමතිතුමාගේ උත්සාහයත්, අපේ මහජනතාවට වුවමනා කරන අහාර ද්‍රව්‍යත්, වෙනත් බඩු බාහිරාදියත්, ඒ වාගේම අමු ද්‍රව්‍යත් ලංකාවේම නිෂ්පාදනය කිරීම සඳහායි. මා කලින් සඳහන් කළ ද්‍රව්‍යවල මිල අඩු කරන්නට පුළුවන් කොයි විධියටදැයි පෙන්නා දෙන්න තමුන් නාත්සේලාට පුළුවන්දැයි මා දන්නේ නැහැ. ස. තො. ස. බඩු එහා-මෙහා ගෙන යාමේ ලොරි ගස්තු ගෙවන්න වෙනවා. ඒ වාගේම, එහි සේවය කරන නිලධාරීන්ට පඩිනඩි ගෙවන්නට තිබෙනවා. අප ඒ ඒ ද්‍රව්‍ය ගන්නා මුදලට අපේ වියදමිද එකතු කර, සුළු ලාභයකුත් තබා ගෙන, ඇතැම් ද්‍රව්‍ය බෙදා හරින, විකුණන පිලිවෙල මා පෙන්නා දුන්නා. රුපියලේ වටිනාකම අඩු කිරීමත්, විදේශ විනිමය ගිම්කම් සහතික ක්‍රමයත් ගැන මේ අවස්ථාවේදී විවාද කරන්න වුවමනා නැහැ. එම නිසා, ඒ ප්‍රතිපත්ති දෙක හැර, කොයි විධියට, මොන ප්‍රතිපත්තියක් අනුව ක්‍රියා කළොත්, ද්‍රව්‍ය මිල අඩු කරන්නට පුළුවන් දැයි විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වය පෙන්වා දෙනවාද? රජයේ පාලනයට ගන්න පුළුවන් මොන මොන බඩු වර්ගදැයි අප දැනගන්න කැමැතියි. ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්න පුළුවන් වැදගත් අදහස් විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයෙන් ඉදිරිපත් කෙරෙනවා නම්, ඒවා පිලිගෙන ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්නට අප බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. පසුගිය ආණ්ඩුවෙන් පත් කළ මහාදේව කොමිෂන් සභාවේ වාර්තාවේ නිර්දේශයන් සියයට සියයක්ම අප ඉෂ්ට කර තිබෙනවා වාගේ, ඊට පිටස්තර අළුත් අදහස් තිබෙනවා නම් ඒවාත් ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්නට අප බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා.

I would now like, Mr. Speaker, to speak a few words in English on the question of development as it affects my Ministry, particularly the question of tourism. I am speaking in English because I would like to explain the position not only to hon. Members of this House but also to people outside because tourism is of international importance. The question of tourism, I think, now engages world-wide attention. In the past ten years



[ශ්‍රී ලංකා ජනරජයේ]

every country without exception has been devoting much attention to encouraging tourists and visitors to come to their shores.

It is said, that in 1966 85 million people travelled and spent 13 billion dollars. In 1966, 200 million travelled by air; in 1975 it is expected that the number travelling by air would be 390 million; and in 1985 the number is expected to go up to 900 million.

They travel to countries all over the world. Are we in Ceylon to get a share of that? I think no country likes to stand out of the stream of world travel. Ceylon has attempted for several years to attract tourists to its shores—not only this Government but the previous Governments of Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike and of other Prime Ministers. We created tourist boards and tourist bureaus and carried out tourist propaganda. At that time, soon after the end of the last war, not only in Ceylon but throughout the world tourism was not such an international feature as it is today. Today it is the largest foreign exchange earner in the whole world because it is common to every country. It is not like the commercial products that are peculiar to some countries. It is not like tea which is peculiar to Ceylon and India, or machinery which is peculiar to Switzerland. Some make money out of flour, some out of jute. But tourism is common to every country. The smallest country—Singapore, Hong Kong—can make foreign exchange out of tourism just as much as big countries like France and America can. So every country is trying to enter this stream of tourism. India is spending almost 500 million rupees a year—300 million rupees in the private sector and 200 million rupees in the public sector—in developing tourism. So also are Hong Kong, Singapore, and, as I shall show you, a small country like Malta trying to attract tourists in various ways suited to their conditions and environments. Tourism has come to stay. So we have to take part in it because tourism means foreign exchange.

Apart from anything else it means we are adding to our depleted foreign exchange reserves with a minimum of expenditure.

This Government has taken some steps which no previous Government has taken. One is the appointment of a special committee—a consortium of world famous people—to prepare a feasibility report. I have sent copies of the abridged edition of that report to all hon. Members. The full copy is a very valuable document and it is rather expensive to distribute, but it is being translated into Sinhalese and Tamil and will be available for purchase. I am seeing to it that a copy is made available in the Library for hon. Members. It is a very valuable document and very useful. We are considering putting in pictures in addition to the figures, statistics and suggestions.

That is one step we took. We want to encourage tourism on a planned basis; not to leave it to the whims and fancies of individuals.

The second step we took was to appoint another group of people well-known throughout the world to study the handicrafts of Ceylon so that those handicrafts may be utilized in hotel construction, guest-house construction and in making goods for tourists to buy. That also is a very valuable document. This is also being translated into Sinhalese and Tamil. There are a number of pictures. A very good job has been done by our Government Printing Press and it is available to those who wish to have a look at it.

The Tourist Board has organized an exhibition on the 21st—I would invite hon. Members to go and see that exhibition—showing in pictorial form the suggestions of these two committees and how the tourist plan is to be projected in the next ten years. The exhibition will be open from the 21st of August.

The Hotels Exhibition was held two or three weeks or about a month ago. Hon. Members visited that and



all those who saw it was pleased that Ceylon is able to produce such a large variety of manufactured goods, goods we were particularly interested in for use in the construction of hotels and buildings, for furnishing them, cutlery and crockery and linen. So, instead of spending foreign exchange which is going to other countries, in our own country we can utilize our own labour and skill for producing what is necessary in this new projected plan.

The first thing then, if we want people to come here, is to see that they are accommodated properly. First things come first. And what accommodation do we have to offer them to live here? We have found that there are 1,100 guest rooms today in Ceylon, of which 650 need re-furnishing. They have been built at the beginning of the 20th century in the last days of Queen Victoria and they are not suited for modern living. I am not talking of any particular rooms or particular hotels, but they were planned for an earlier age.

Today those who come from other countries want air-conditioning. They want cleanliness. They want different types of rooms. And every hotel that I have been to in the last few months in the West and the East, I found has been built recently, since the War, and contains the most modern amenities for those who visit them.

So if we are to keep in that stream, if we are to entice people to come, we must have modern rooms. Of the 1,100 rooms that we have, 650 need re-furnishing and steps are being taken to re-furnish them. We need, according to this projection, another 1,850 rooms with modern amenities by 1976.

Now, that was the first consideration we gave our minds to because today unlike in the old days most tourists do not merely buy their tickets, plan out their tour and come to a particular country. Most of the tourists go to a travel agency and those travel agents have their set tours at set prices. They have their

charter planes or contract airlines and they tell you "with this round the world ticket you go to these countries." Those travel agents will have Ceylon in mind and find how many rooms can be booked for this group of tourists. In Ceylon till recently there were no rooms and many tourists could not come because travel agents could not find accommodation.

மெர்னாட் சோய்சா அவர்.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சோய்சா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

In regard to the number of rooms you propose to build, over how many years is that going to be spread out and what is the expectation of the inflow of tourists?

அன் சே. ஐ. பீ. ஜயவர்தன

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

In the course of my speech I shall deal with them. I do not want to be taken away from my line of thinking. We can in the Committee stage find that out. I shall come out with all the documents and figures in the Committee stage. But there is a certain general view that I want to put before the hon. Members. I am not concerned so much about the details of the figures, that you must have ten rooms less or ten rooms more. But we know that we need more rooms—maybe 1,000, maybe 1,850. I shall give you the exact figures I contemplate from these documents in the Committee stage. But what I can gather from this report is that by 1976 we require 1,850 rooms. We have only 1,100 rooms of which 650 can be re-furnished, and we need 1,200 more rooms. That is the first step we took.

You criticized us for giving four resthouses to the private sector. That was done deliberately. Tourists from the West come from October to April; that is the winter season in those countries. We had no modern rooms which we could give them. Bentara was a shambles. I am talking of the resthouses that were given to the



[ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන]  
Tourist Bureau for the purpose of tourism by our Government and the previous Governments. Bentara, Hikkaduwa, Anuradhapura and Horton Plains were the only resthouses given to the private sector. They were given because the Government wanted to get them ready for the next tourist season. And we got them ready because we gave them to the private sector.

**නීල් ද අල්විස් මය.** (බද්දේගම)  
(තිரு. நீல் டி. அல்விஸ்—பத்தேகம)  
(Mr. Neal de Alwis—Baddegama)  
Not Bentara!

**ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන**  
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)  
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

Some of them. We had to pull down Bentara completely. Hikkaduwa was got ready. There the private sector spent three or four million rupees. Otherwise the pressure on my Hon. Firend's Budget would have been more. Now without a cent being spent by the Government they were got ready. At Hikkaduwa they have put up a new wing of 50 rooms.

**බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මය.**  
(තිරු. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)  
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)  
You were talking of Bentara.

**ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන**  
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)  
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

I have not come to Bentara yet. At Hikkaduwa the private sector put up another wing. They spent a large sum of money and refurnished the whole place, which otherwise we would have had to do. That is ready and I understand it is booked from October to April. Tourists are now able to go there.

As for Bentara, we had to pull down the whole place. It is part of the development programme. Eighty

acres were acquired and a new big hotel is to be constructed. The contractors have come and they are hoping that it will be ready for the tourist season in October.

**නීල් ද අල්විස් මය.**  
(திரு. நீல் டி. அல்விஸ்)  
(Mr. Neal de Alwis)  
No ; next year!

**ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන**  
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)  
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

Unless you start a strike we can have it ready.

**නීල් ද අල්විස් මය.**  
(திரு. நீல் டி. அல்விஸ்)  
(Mr. Neal de Alwis)  
Definitely not this year!

**ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන**  
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)  
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

Let us hope it will be ready in October.

**වෙදනාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ**  
(අකුරැස්ස)  
(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ—அக்குறஸ்ஸ)  
(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe—Akuressa)  
It has already been abandoned.

**ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන**  
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)  
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

There were some negotiations going on about the lease. It has been signed and now work has started again. In addition to that hotel, two others of a smaller category, lower-priced to the public, are coming up, so that people from Ceylon also of certain income levels can use them and enjoy the amenities of sea-bathing and sun-basking in the Bentara Development Scheme. We are not meaning to do this only for foreign people but for our people also, for there are tourists in Ceylon.



Why some hotels are made more expensive and made in a particular luxurious way is because we do want foreign people to come and live in them for they pay in dollars and pounds. Why do we sell our tea to England and not consume the whole stuff here? Because English people pay in pounds, and that is foreign exchange we want. Why is India keen that as much as possible of her goods should be exported? Why is England keen that her goods should be exported and not consumed in England? Because they get foreign exchange.

We cannot make it too cheap for the foreigner. Why should he pay Rs. 2 for a plate of rice when he can afford to pay Rs. 10? Most certainly we also have to pay a little more if we go to that place, because we are living in the standard of a person who comes from abroad.

So, primarily the task of tourism is to attract people from outside our country to come to our country and spend their money in our country. If you do not want that we will give up tourism, but if you want that we must see to it that the tourist who comes is properly accommodated, has the comforts he enjoys at home and that he spends his money here. And there are people who benefit by the money he spends here.

Hikkaduwa, Bentara, Anuradhapura and Horton Plains—those are the only four resthouses that were given to the private sector. Undoubtedly, their rates are a bit high. I do not deny that. But it is done with a purpose and I think that purpose is being fulfilled. Those resthouses except Bentara which is not completed yet, are booked for a whole tourist season which is from October to April. That means we are earning foreign exchange which goes to add to our already depleted foreign reserves.

பி. சி. லி. கைனமன் மொ. (மேட் கைலி)  
துருவண மனோகு)

(நிரு. பி. ஜி. பி. கெனமன்—கொழும்பு  
மத்தி மூன்றாம் அங்கத்தவர்)

(Mr. P. G. B. Keuneman—Third  
Colombo Central)

They were always booked for the  
tourist season.

செ. சே. ஐ. பி. சீயவர்தன

(கெனமன் ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

Always booked.

Then this Tourist Plan contemplates four or five areas of development. It contemplates development in the South-West region of Ceylon. That does not mean that the whole of the South-West region is to be devoted to tourism, but certain amenities and facilities will be given by the State from Negombo up to Hikkaduwa. Such as the Bentara Development Scheme, there is provision here for a Colombo Development Scheme and for a development scheme adjoining the Katunayake Airport. That is one phase of development.

The other would be development in the Southern Province—from about Weligama, including Yala and other Southern Province areas. We may have to provide certain areas with lights, water and land for development purposes.

The third region would be the Central regions including Nuwara Eliya and the hills.

The fourth region is the historical regions from Kandy up to Sigiriya, Anuradhapura and Polonnaruwa.

The fifth region is the Eastern Province which is ideally suited when the South-West is beset by monsoon. In the season from May to August the Eastern Province region is the best region where one can enjoy. There is particularly a scheme here to take up a large area in Trincomalee which is now Crown land and help in tourist development as we are doing in Bentara.







அ. சே. ஐ. சீ. சீ. சீ.

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

The Kovach Report. I published it in 1965. I should like to read out those recommendations. I like them to go on record. The report states :

"1. That an experienced Director of Tourism be appointed immediately."—

I do not know whether you agree or not with what is being done.

"2. That the members of the Tourism Development Board be appointed and the Board begin to function as soon as possible."—

That board has disappeared and we have appointed a Tourist Board. I think they are functioning.

—“3. That the Secretariat of the Tourism Board be reorganized with special emphasis on Planning and Productivity.

4. That a Market Research be undertaken before any further large sum of appropriations are made for advertising and promotion.

5. That comprehensive tourist statistics be maintained in the future.”—

அ. சே. ஐ. சீ. சீ.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

That is not being done.

அ. சே. ஐ. சீ. சீ. சீ.

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

You cannot do all at once. It is being done.

அ. சே. ஐ. சீ. சீ. சீ.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

You had T. R. P. holders also as tourists.

அ. சே. ஐ. சீ. சீ. சீ.

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

You must be having some statistics.

—“6. That a Tourist Police created.

7. That existing duty on imported equipment and food products for hotels be drastically reduced.

8. That Tourism Areas be developed, by the improvement of hotels, resthouses and the creation of tourist entertainment.

9. That hotel rates be under the control of the Tourism Board.

10. That hotel rates be posted in rooms.

11. That all new resthouse construction should primarily consider the needs of the tourist and not the local requirements.

12. That all future construction plans of hotels, resthouses, motels and restaurants be submitted to the Architectural Department of the Secretariat of the Tourism Board for approval.

13. That a Hotel School be created with foreign, preferably Swiss, teaching staff.

14. That qualified young men be sent to the United States and Switzerland for hotel studies.

15. That a graduate architect be sent to the United States for specialization in hotel architecture.

16. That two or three members of the Tourism Board Secretariat be sent abroad for study and business contacts.

17. That resthouses be brought up to international standards.

18. That the country be subdivided into three regions for resthouse management purposes.

19. That three, preferably Swiss, Hotel men be engaged as district supervisors.

20. That the Public Works Department should not have a part in resthouse upkeep, and the entire maintenance system be reorganized.

21. That the government gradually retire from resthouse management by leasing resthouses to private industry.”—

You criticized me for that. I have given you four resthouses, and the volume of criticism for that? You say the Kovach Report is good in parts.

“22. That the rates in three star resthouses be increased.

23. That all hotels resthouses and guesthouses catering to tourists be registered with the Tourism Board.

24. That the U. S. Department of Health Service's Ordinance and Code Regulating Eating and Drinking Establishments be adopted, with modifications for use in Ceylon.



[ශ්‍රී ලංකා ජනරජයේ]

25. That greater exploitation of Ceylon's overseas air and sea transportation capacity be organized. This should include passenger travel by freighter services touching Colombo.
26. That frontier formalities be reduced and simplified to an absolute minimum.
27. That the necessary legislation be enacted for the preservation and improvement of scenic and touristic sites.
28. That steps be taken for the beautification of Colombo and other cities.
29. That a standard touristic site marker be designed and used throughout the country.
30. That no further licensing of the present type and grade of guides be carried out and the entire guide service be reorganized.
31. That legislation be enacted for the registration of shops.
32. That the gem industry be actively developed by the Tourist Board.
33. That a qualified gem cutter be brought to Ceylon to instruct the the gem industry.
34. That a Ceylonese gemmologist be sent to Germany to study cutting of stones in the manner customary in Europe and America.
35. That handicraft manufacture be improved in regard to design and utility of products.
36. That the Central Bank of Ceylon restudy the question of a tourist currency."—

කෙනෙක් මයා.

(ශ්‍රී ලංකා ජනරජයේ)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Open a school for gem smuggling!

ශ්‍රී ලංකා ජනරජයේ

(ශ්‍රී ලංකා ජනරජයේ)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

No, we have not done that.

- “37. That regulations be enacted for for licensing and control of travel agencies.
38. That 10 per cent. commission be paid to travel bureaus on rest-house bookings.
39. That Ceylon join the Pacific Area Travel Association.

40. That Tourist Festivals be organized.
41. That the volume and type of tourist propaganda be tailored to particular markets.
42. That postal rates for picture cards and airletters carrying photographs of Ceylon be reduced.”

So, we have implemented 90 per cent of these recommendations. We are considering the others; some we are not going to implement. So, we have made a start with the report that previous Government had in its hand.

The feasibility report I spoke of is in summary form. I think I have distributed it to Members. It gives the suggestions I made about the regions of Ceylon that we wish to develop, the air traffic that is expected, schemes of Trincomalee, Colombo, and so on. It is a very valuable document.

The planning of tourism today is a scientific matter, not like in the old days. There are priorities in tourism. According to one document the principal sectors of planning are :

- (a) basic infrastructure (water and power supply, approach roads)
- (b) accommodation capacity (hotel industry and supplementary means of accommodation)
- (c) transportation (internal and external networks)
- (d) creation of tourist resorts
- (e) protection of the natural and cultural heritage
- (f) development of demand
- (g) research and analysis of tourist traffic
- (h) vocational training
- (i) tourist organisation (national tourist organisations, peripheral structures, representation abroad)
- (j) facilitation
- (k) financing of different tourist activities
- (l) legislation and regulations for different tourist activities.



So, you see, tourism is not a subject that I can deal with incidentally in a Budget Debate. It is like foreign affairs today. I find that reading these various documents that come into my hand is taking more time than one would imagine. We can debate the report on tourism, if hon. Members like.

**பெர்னாட் சாய்சா உரை.**

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சாய்சா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

We will be prepared to serve on a Select Committee if you have one.

**டாக்டர். ஜி. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன**

(கொளரவ ஜி. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

Very good, because tourism is something which is not party politics. Whether it is an American or a Russian or a Chinese, if he comes here with some money in his pocket, what we want is the money in his pocket—not his race or his political affiliation. And if he does spend the money here, it means that some craftsman or some employee or some person in Ceylon is getting it. I welcome the suggestion that has been made.

I also want to throw out a suggestion that we take tourism apart from our party politics, because, even if another Government comes into being, we must have some continuity of policy, a programme. [Interruption]. You are against it? Then you will not be on the Committee. That is all. I do not think the hon. Member for Akuressa (Dr. S. A. Wickrema-

singhe) has been properly briefed by Russia: they are making tremendous efforts to encourage tourism.

**டாக்டர். சி. ஏ. விக்கிரமசிங்க**

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்கிரமசிங்க)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

After the country has been developed.

**டாக்டர். ஜி. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன**

(கொளரவ ஜி. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

We want to develop the country through tourism. You do not want to develop the country?

The hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa) made certain comments which I think I should refer to. He said that tourism has been omitted in the Budget. That is not correct: there is a reference to it in the Budget. The methodology adopted by the hon. Member in his analysis is a new technique in analysing tourist expenditure and earnings. The expenditure in a particular year cannot be used to assess the earnings of that year, particularly in the years when tourism was a subject of a Government department, with the dominant or sole tourist activity being limited to publicity. It takes a year or more for any publicity programme to have its impact. It is the cumulative effect of expenditure over a series of years which should be taken to analyse earnings. Using, however, the same criterion of the hon. Member, it is revealing to look at a few of the other years too.

These are the figures the hon. Member quoted:

1952	Rs. 2.27 lakhs	Rs. 11 million
1954	Rs. 4 lakhs	Rs. 10 million

Now, let us take a few other years:

Year	Expenditure	Earnings
1957-58	Rs. 895,000	Rs. 6.4 million (1958)
1958-59	Rs. 774,000	Rs. 6.9 million (1959)
1960-61	Rs. 1,092,000	Rs. 5.6 million (1961)



[මැ. ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන]

These figures are extracted from the Bureau Administration Report 1964-65—annexes C and D. I shall deal with this in the Committee stage.

The two reports that have been referred to have only served to place development plans on a sound footing from the investment as well as the promotion angle. It was at the instance of the Ceylon Tourist Board that the much quoted David Davis Report was published by the Ministry of Planning and Economic Affairs for the information of all foreign and local investors, public authorities and specialists in tourism.

The original expectation on tourist earnings by the board for 1973 was Rs. 136.3 million. The David Davis Report forecast for 1972 is Rs. 64 million and for 1977 is Rs. 146 million. The feasibility study team forecast for 1971 is Rs. 110 million and for 1976 is around Rs. 298 million.—[*Interruption*].

Then reference was made to a five-year course of the Ceylon Hotel School. The prospectus of the Hotel school lays down the training courses which are a 2 year craft catering course, a 3-year general catering course, a 1 year catering management course, in addition to short-term craft courses and refresher courses. There was never a proposal for a 5 year course. The administration report of 1964-65 of the former Tourist Bureau sets out the scheme in full. There is only a fourth year in management on completion of the 3 year general catering course for students obtaining a first class diploma. None of the batches of students now under training has completed the 3-year course. The first batch of students will complete the 3-year course in 1969. The question of the fourth year management course does not, therefore, arise at this stage. Mr. Chib had no hand in the Hotel School. The school was set up under UN personnel advice followed by a Colombo plan expert principal from Canada. The school is presently managed by an expert obtained under bilateral aid from West Germany

with a Colombo Plan lecturer from Canada and another lecturer from the U. K. with local understudies and visiting lecturers. We are not in a position to judge the standard of the products of the school since the first batch of trainees has not yet completed the 3-year course.

Maldivians in buggalows: Statistics are compiled according to certain set and accepted definitions. The U. N. Conference on Travel and Tourism in Rome in 1963 recommended a series of definitions to be adopted by member countries promoting tourism. The definition is as follows:

“For statistical purposes, the term ‘Visitor’ describes any person visiting a country other than that in which he has his usual place of residence for any reason other than following an occupation remunerated from within the country visited.

This definition covers:

Tourists—i.e. temporary visitors staying at least 24 hours in the country visited and the purpose of whose journey can be classified under one of the following headings:—

- (a) leisure (recreation, holiday, health study, religion and sport);
- (b) business, family, mission, meeting.

Excursionists—i.e. temporary visitors staying less than 24 hours in the country visited (including travellers on cruise.)”

Ceylon has adopted this definition for the census of visitor traffic. In terms of the definition, foreigners coming to Ceylon for non-immigrant, non-employment purposes have to be classified as tourists irrespective of the country from which they come and the means of transport they use. Even buggalows are acceptable and any inference that only foreigners who come by jet or luxury cruisers should be classified as tourist is not borne out by the definition.

It is interesting to analyse the purpose of the visit of the 555 Maldivians who came to Ceylon in 1967. Of the 555 who came here, 307 came as pleasure tourists. Visitors necessarily imply a certain quantum of expenditure in the country—perhaps what is not acceptable from the hon. Member's point of view is that the Maldivians do not spend as much money as the Americans. However,



there is no reason for any discrimination against our Maldivian neighbours on this ground so long as they fall within the purview of the United Nations recommendation adopted by Ceylon as a member country.

We should encourage the Maldivians to come to Ceylon. After all they are our friends. I remember, the Sultan was an old boy of Royal College.

வேலையாட்சி உள். ஸ். வி. வி. வி.

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

They were assaulted and robbed two months ago.

ஓர் ஸ். ஓர். ஓர். ஓர்.

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

They did not come here as tourists. They came here for other purposes. I went on board and found out.

Anyway, Maldivians can be tourists, whether they come in buggalows or airplanes. There is a regular travel service to the Maldives, and we encourage the Maldivians also to come to Ceylon.

Then there are various other reports. We are flooded with reports. There is the Kovach report, the Davies report, the Chib report, the Canadian expert's report, and all that. And, if you think it is advisable, I have no objection at all to having a Select Committee of the House which can go into the whole question of tourism and discussing how we can encourage tourism in this country. This is a subject which, as I said before, cannot be dealt with in a perfunctory budget speech. We have other problems to deal with.

I want to deal with one other aspect before I sit down, and that is the tax proposals of the Hon. Minister of Finance. The primary need for the country is development to increase our national income and to raise the standard of living of our people. In order to achieve these

objectives it is necessary to have sufficient resources, internal resources, as well as foreign exchange and technical know-how. The Hon. Minister has designed his tax structure in order to help these objectives. That is why he appointed a Taxation Commission and he is implementing the Taxation Commission's recommendations step by step. He does not intend to implement all of them at once, but portions of it he has implemented.

In the matter of earning foreign exchange, two earlier measures were taken, namely, devaluation and the FEEC scheme. Another is development of tourism. As the hon. Member for Colombo South pointed out, the Hon. Minister of Finance has given a tax holiday to tourist ventures.

In the field of obtaining the necessary technical know-how, the Budget proposals include a more liberal policy in the grant of tax exemption to foreign scientists, technicians and experts. The tax holiday will be continued for pioneer industries instead of for all undertakings which fulfil a very limited requirement. Thus, the repeal of the tax holiday as it existed previously does not bring any limitation in this field as may be popularly believed or by comparison with the tax holidays granted by other countries. It has already been explained in the Budget Speech that the incentives which are available in Ceylon make the impact of the tax holiday negligible or reduce it to nothing at all.

கௌரவ உள்.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Whom are you replying to? We are not against it.

ஓர் ஸ். ஓர். ஓர்.

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

We are replying to the country.



கேனைன் மக.

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

A very limited country you must be replying to!

சு. சீ. ஈர். சீவலட்சுமி

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

To the capitalists.

கேனைன் மக.

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Nobody in this House is opposed to it.

சு. சீ. ஈர். சீவலட்சுமி

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

The hon. Member for Kelaniya? I cannot say I totally disagree with him.

On the savings relief, Sir, I think the Hon. Minister changed it because he found that the savings were largely concentrated on Government securities and were not going into production ventures.

பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா மக.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

We foretold that when you brought the scheme.

சு. சீ. ஈர். சீவலட்சுமி

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

The Hon. Minister has taken away the tax holiday. The Hon. Minister of Industries and Fisheries is working out a scheme of approval on a wider basis to enable industrialists and entrepreneurs to venture into as many undertakings as are necessary for our economy.

So, his tax structure has a certain basis, a certain policy behind it, namely, to encourage development,

to encourage foreign technical know-how to come and help in the development of the country.

பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா மக.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Lots of second thoughts.

சு. சீ. ஈர். சீவலட்சுமி

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

We have therefore in this Budget followed our normal policy with which we went before the people. develop our resources as much as possible and develop them through three means. I shall cite our programme or policy :

"In the economic sphere, these objectives are best served by co-operative ownership and management where feasible;"—

All help has been given and will be given to the co-operative movement and that will include not only the consumer movement but also the producer movement as well as the industrial movement which co-operative institutions may wish to develop.—[Interruption].

—"public ownership and management where necessary in the public interest;"

For example, we have taken over the importation of certain foodstuffs, textiles, and so on. So, there will be public management and ownership, where necessary, in the public interest. As shown by the Hon. Minister of Industries and Fisheries and his Parliamentary Secretary, we are giving greater support and help to the private sector.

—"and private ownership and management sensitive to its responsibilities for the welfare of the community."—

பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா மக.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Joint stock companies.



ශ්‍රී ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන

(කෙළරාව ලී. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන)  
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

Yes, 'sensitive to its responsibilities'. We are maintaining control over those joint stock companies. The C. W. E. is holding about 51 per cent of the shares of the Salu Sala. So 51 per cent of the shares gives us power to see that private enterprise is run for the benefit of the people. We are utilizing the benefit of private ownership. We are not against private enterprise. We were returned on that ticket, the ticket that I mentioned to you—state ownership, co-operative ownership and private ownership. So those three must go hand in hand for the welfare of the community.

—"This is our path, as opposed to total state ownership and management on the one hand, and the ownership and management by a few capitalists on the other."

We do not intend to go or stray away from that path. Within the limits available to us, with all the difficulties that the Hon. Minister of Finance is faced with, in the foreign exchange situation that we were heirs to, we intend to keep within that path.

During the first few months of the existence of this Government the Hon. Prime Minister had to send the Governor of the Central Bank flying

\* \* \* \* \*

[දැනට මුද්‍රා කළ 1968 අගෝස්තු 20 වන අඟහරුවාදා නිල වාර්තාවේ I වන කොටසින් බලා  
ගත යුතුයි.]

[நிகழ்ச்சித் தொடர்ச்சியை 1968 ஓகஸ்ட் 20, செவ்வாய்க்கிழமை அதிகார அறிக்கை (பகுதி I) இல்  
பார்க்க].

[For continuation of Proceedings, see OFFICIAL REPORT for Thursday, 20th August 1968 (Part I) .]

to England to borrow money even to buy our essential goods. As pointed out by several hon. Members in the Budget Debate, massive foreign aid was necessary, as was also stated by the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) when he was Minister of Finance.

The hon. Member for Kotte (Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne) said that we should not take foreign aid, and showed us how American foreign aid helped American people. It may be so, but we need foreign exchange to keep ourselves going. In spite of the difficulties, a part of which was our inheritance, we have been able to keep our people in a satisfactory state of existence. I have shown you that there is very little we can do as long as cost of living depends on foreign imports for which we have to pay the prices asked for.

There is very little that we can do to reduce the cost to the consumer as far as imports are concerned. Where we have to subsidize we do so to the extent of almost Rs. 600 million. Where the privilege given to the private sector to import goods is abused we are always prepared to take them over to the State. But we intend as far as possible within our ability to see that the public sector, the co-operative sector and the private sector march hand in hand to keep our people happy and healthy.



to England to borrow money even to pay our essential costs. As pointed out by several hon. Members in the Budget Debate, massive foreign aid was necessary, as was also stated by the hon. Member for Yorkshire (Dr. N. M. Pears) when he was Minister of Finance.

The hon. Member for North (Mr. Stanley Tillastant) said that we should not take foreign aid and showed us how American foreign aid helped American people. It may be so, but we need foreign exchange to keep ourselves going. In spite of the difficulties a part of which was our insistence, we have been able to keep our people in a satisfactory state of existence. I have shown you that there is very little we can do as long as cost of living depends on foreign imports for which we have to pay the prices asked for.

There is very little that we can do to reduce the cost to the consumer as far as imports are concerned. Where we have to subsidize we do so to the extent of almost £200 million. Where the privilege is given to the private sector to import goods it should be as always prepared to take them over to the State. But we intend as far as possible within our ability to see that the public sector, the co-operative sector and the private sector march hand in hand to keep our people happy and healthy.

... We do not intend to go or stay away from the path. Within the limits available to us with all the difficulties that the hon. Minister of Finance is faced with in the foreign exchange situation that we were born to we intend to keep within that path.

During the last few months of the existence of the Government the hon. Prime Minister had to send the Governor of the Central Bank flying...

... This is our path as opposed to what state ownership and management on the one hand, and the ownership and management by a few capitalists on the other.

... We do not intend to go or stay away from the path. Within the limits available to us with all the difficulties that the hon. Minister of Finance is faced with in the foreign exchange situation that we were born to we intend to keep within that path.

During the last few months of the existence of the Government the hon. Prime Minister had to send the Governor of the Central Bank flying...

... The continuation of the exchange rate...  
 ... Part D ]