

80 වන කාණ්ඩය
9 වන කලාපය
(II වන කොටස)

11. සඳුද
1968 අගෝස්තු 19



පාර්ලිමේන්තු විවාද

(ගැන්සාඩ)

නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ

තිල වාතීව

(අගෝඛිත පිටපත)

අත්කරීත ප්‍රධාන කරුණු

පිසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, (1968-69) [හත්වන වෙන් කළ දිනය]
දෙවන වර කියවීම—විවාදය කල් නමන දේ.

ප්‍රශ්නවලට ලිඛිත පිළිතුරු

பாராளுமன்ற விவாதங்கள்

(ஹன்சாட்)

பிரதிநிதிகள் சபை

அதிகார அறிக்கை

(பிழை திருத்தப்படாதது)

பிரதான உள்ளடக்கம்

ஒதுக்கீட்டு மசோதா, 1968-69 [ஒதுக்கப்பட்ட ஏழாம் நாள்]

இரண்டாம் மதிப்பு—விவாதம் ஒத்திவைக்கப்பட்டது

வினாக்களுக்கு எழுத்துமூல விடைகள்

Volume 80
No. 9
(Part II)

Monday
19th August 1968

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OFFICIAL REPORT

(Uncorrected)

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

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

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

නියෝජන මன்றේ මණ්ඩලය

பிரதிநிதிகள் சபை

House of Representatives

1968 අගෝස්තු 19 වන සඳුදා

திங்கட்கிழமை 19, ஓகஸ்ட் 1968

Monday, 19th August 1968

[1968 අගෝස්තු 19 වන සඳුදා නිල වාර්තාවේ
I වන කොටසේ 1784 වන නිර්දේශ සිට ඉතිරි වැඩ
කටයුතු.]

[1968 ඉක්බිති 19 තිங்கදකිழමයමය අතිකාර අහිකක
(පලුති I) 1784 ආම පත්තියිලිලුත්තා තිකමුසිති
තොලරු.]

[Continuation of Proceedings from
Col. 1784 of OFFICIAL REPORT (Part I) for
Monday, 19th August 1968.]

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1968-69

ஒதுக்கீட்டு மசோதா, 1968-69

APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968-69

අ. සා. 11.55

කෙනමන් මය.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Mr. Speaker, the speech of the Hon. Minister of State has confirmed in me the belief I have held for a long time that he has chosen the wrong profession. I have stated earlier on the Floor of this House that he would have been an excellent lawyer. He will recall the public compliment I paid him on his speech in defence of the 1962 coup suspects. I told him publicly on that occasion that no lawyer in Ceylon could have done a better job for his clients. Listening to him today I have come to the conclusion 'hat he could be an excellent school master—of course, I must say, in the primary grades.

He gave us a lecture on how goods are brought to Ceylon, what goods are brought to Ceylon, how they are distributed, which goods are on the ration, which goods are not on 'he ration—all this was most interesting, and we thank the Hon. Minister for myself.

it. I am sure it will be a very valuable lesson for anybody who has not lived in Ceylon. But I must say, after listening to his speech, 'hat I do not think my Hon. Friend is a very good Minister. He is easily fooled.

යැ මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

He is a clever Minister.

කෙනමන් මය.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

He is a clever man but not a very clever Minister. When I deal with his speech on tourism, I shall show this House that it is a great pity that a man of such obvious intelligence should be so easily fooled by his advisers.

Anyway, we must thank the Hon. Minister of State for one central admission that he made. His entire speech was an admission that this Government does not know how to solve the problems of the people. That was the sum and substance of his speech. My Hon. Friend even appealed to the Opposition to show the Government how to govern.

He wanted us to tell him how to reduce the cost of living. He wanted us to tell him where economies can be made. He wanted us to tell him what expenditure could be curtailed. Why did not my Hon. Friend, when he was on this side of the House, assist the Government of the day in the same way?

යැ ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

They never asked.

කෙනමන් මය.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Nobody attacked the Government of that day with the vehemence of the Minister of State—except perhaps

the Minister of Industries and Fisheries is not here because I intend to pay him a very sincere compliment. I want to congratulate him on his speech. It was a very interesting, informative and, in considerable sections of it, frank speech.

My hon. Friend, from time to time, flew off the handle and abused some Members on this side of the House, calling them stooges and all sorts of uncomplimentary names. But basically, there were certain themes in his speech which could well be considered by the House as appropriate themes for the Debate on this Budget.

First of all, the hon. Parliamentary Secretary made a candid admission. He said that what has been done by this Government in the economic field was not accidental but was the result of calculated decisions. And he spread that assertion over the whole range of economic activity. He told us that the Government takes responsibility for all the features of the economic system. I thank him for that admission.

His second argument could be put simply as: "we could have done much worse".

ஒரு மிமிலி சேனானாயக (அலுவலகம், ஈர்வீசியல் ஸ்ரீலங்கா கட்டுவது சிவிலிசு சூழி, ஐய சிவிலிசு ஸ்ரீலங்கா கட்டுவது சிவிலிசு சூழி ஸ்ரீலங்கா கட்டுவது சிவிலிசு சூழி ஸ்ரீலங்கா கட்டுவது சிவிலிசு சூழி)

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனானாயக்க—பிரதம அமைச்சரும் பாதுகாப்பு, வெளி விவகார அமைச்சரும் திட்ட அமைப்பு, பொருளாதார விவகார அமைச்சரும், தகவல், ஒலிபரப்பு அமைச்சரும்)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake—Prime Minister, Minister of Defence and External Affairs, Minister of Planning and Economic Affairs and Minister of Information and Broadcasting)

Who are the "we"?

கௌனென் மை.

(சிரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

"We" means, your Government. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary said that your Government could

have done much worse than they have done. That is like saying, "We could have committed murder but we did not; we committed culpable homicide instead."

ஒரு மிமிலி சேனானாயக

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனானாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

He did not say that?

கௌனென் மை.

(சிரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

It is like saying that. Basically, he said that they had to take a whole lot of unpleasant decisions. They took them but they tried to minimise their diabolical effect. That was his second line of defence of the Government. I know it was a difficult task that he had to perform, namely, that of trying to defend the indefensible, but he did it as best as he could, and he did rather well.

His third theme was an equally interesting one. He was the first Member on the Government side in last 3½ years who said publicly: "It is no good discussing the faults of the past Government. We have now been here for 3½ years. It is time that we had a discussion on our own stewardship." I think that is a very wise observation and it is one on which I should like to take up the hon. Parliamentary Secretary.

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary complained that nobody on this side, with the solitary exception of the hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa), had discussed the Budget, and he asked us why we did not discuss the Budget. Of course, he did not discuss the Budget either, but he nevertheless asked us that question.

I thought the answer was given by the hon. Member for Colombo South himself. He said, quite clearly and categorically, that there is no point in discussing Budgets of this Government because all the important

[கேதமன் மொ.]

economic decisions are taken in between Budgets. That was so in regard to the cutting of the rice ration, the devaluation of the rupee, the FEECs scheme, and so on and so forth.

There is a second reason for this, and that is, that we have come to learn from experience that this Government takes major economic decisions not as a result of discussions in the House, or, apparently, even discussions in its own Parliamentary Group, but on the so-called "advice" of the World Bank.

The third reason was one I gave myself last year and which is equally true this year, namely, that the successive Budgets that this Government has presented have been more and more unreal. Last year I said the Budget they presented was an unreal Budget. It has been changed quite considerably. A number of their anticipations have been proved to be wrong.

For instance, they estimated that there would be only 10 per cent under-expenditure on capital account. Now the Minister of Finance tells us it was 21 per cent. This is only a small example. I can go on giving you many examples, but I am not discussing last year's Budget but the current Budget.

My hon. Friends adjust themselves ; all the time they are adjusting the Budget. They have made it somewhat ludicrous to discuss budgetary proposals at the start of a financial year. It would be far better, in my opinion, to discuss their Budgets at the end of each financial year because then we know what has happened and what the Government actually did. You will therefore excuse me if I accept the advice of the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries that this Budget Debate had better be confined to a critical assessment of the Government's performance in the management of the economy over the past 3½ years.

How successful has this Government been in the complicated and difficult task of the management of the economy? The management of the economy is not an easy task. More governments have fallen for mismanagement of the economy than for any other reason. One of the main reasons behind the fall of even the last Government was its weaknesses in the mismanagement of the economy.

ஒரு ஊழல்வகை விலிவி. துணியகை
(ஸ்வதேவ கமெது பிலிவி. துணியகை)

(கௌரவ கலாநிதி டபிள்யூ. தகநாயக்க—
உள்நாட்டு விவகார அமைச்சர்)

(The Hon. Dr. W. Dahanayake—Minister of Home Affairs)

Bungling!

ஒரு விலிவி மனீநாயகை

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

You supported their every Budget.

கேதமன் மொ.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

No. I supported them politically. I supported a large number of their actions. And against you I always supported them. But they showed certain weaknesses in management of the economy. Their policy in regard to the C. W. E. for instance was perfectly correct but there were weaknesses in its management.

ஒரு மனீநாயகை

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Bungling!

கேதமன் மொ.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

But your's is strangling! Everybody recalls the lurid tales told during the last elections by the hon. Gentlemen opposite: stories about unemployment, high prices and shortages of essential goods; stories

about a serious foreign exchange crisis, the rising public debt, inflationary spirals, runaway inflation, and similar matters. We were told that this Government was left with foreign exchange sufficient to import a few days' supply of food, and that there was no money in the kitty. They repeat these tales now. In fact, they were repeated by the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries. If all this was true, it is extraordinary how this Government began to act so recklessly in the economic field.

They said there was a serious crisis in foreign exchange, but that did not stop them from promising to lift the moratorium on the export of dividends, profits, and interest from this country. They said that there was no money in the kitty, but that did not prevent them from promising to pay the foreign oil companies Rs. 58.7 million as compensation for assets, which had been valued at Rs. 30 million by a tribunal.

சு. டிபி. சேனாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

How much did your hon Friend agree to pay?

கே. கே. மென்

(சு. கே. கே. மென்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

If my hon. Friend did it, he made a mistake.

பி. சோயசா

(சு. பெர்னாட் சோயசா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

He did not agree to anything.

கே. கே. மென்

(சு. கே. கே. மென்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

As far as I know, he never agreed to anything.

சு. டிபி. சேனாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Do not talk too much, we will produce the papers and documents.

கே. கே. மென்

(சு. கே. கே. மென்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

After 3½ years it is clear to everyone that all the economic ills, for which this Government blamed its predecessor, have grown immeasurably worse under their own dispensation. The Hon. Minister of State admitted that prices are going up.

சு. ஜி. ரி. ஜெயவர்தன

(கௌரவ ஜி. ஜி. ஜெயவர்தன)

(The Hon J. R. Jayewardene)

World prices.

கே. கே. மென்

(சு. கே. கே. மென்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

He discussed the whole question of the cost of living as though the only things that are consumed in Ceylon are the things that are imported. He asked us for suggestions as to how he should run this Government. He did not examine why the prices of local products are going up. He did not deal with that question. He did not deal with the question how shortfalls in imports and bad distribution contribute to the rise in price. He did not deal with the question how hoarding contributes to the rise in price. All these aspects of the matter he left untouched and he kept saying that *kottamalli* was four times the price that it used to be in the old days and asked us how to reduce it. My Hon. Friend is aware of the price situation. If he was not aware of it, the Member for Kotte yesterday quoted chapter and verse to show how the prices of all commodities in ordinary use have risen at least two to three times in the last 3½ years.

I do not want to deal with the question of unemployment because that has also been quite extensively dealt with. Towards the end of the term of the last Government, in 1963, there was an I. L. O. manpower survey. It showed that there were 497 730 persons at that time who could be described as unemployed or

[කෙනමත් මය.]

seriously under-employed. I understand the Central Bank now thinks that the figure is between 6 and 7 lakhs. There was a very interesting article published in the "Ceylon Daily News" showing the projection that by 1970, the year in which my Hon. Friend the Prime Minister hopes to go to the elections—

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උද්ගිරි ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ නායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

And come back.

කෙනමත් මය.

(ති.රු. කෙණෙමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

—the unemployment figure will reach one million.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උද්ගිරි ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ නායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I said, and come back.

කෙනමත් මය.

(ති.රු. කෙණෙමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

You may come back but I do not think you are coming back as Prime Minister.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උද්ගිරි ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ නායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

He does not like to hear that.

කෙනමත් මය.

(ති.රු. කෙණෙමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

The economic activities of the Government over the past 3½ years have been characterized by certain definite trends, I might say almost lines of policy. First, the determination to give relief to the rich and to add to the burdens of the poor. I do not want to re-examine all the past Budgets. But from the first Budget up to now substantial reliefs have

been given to the rich. Even in this Budget the super rich are given quite substantial reliefs, which was shown in great detail by the hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard de Soysa). I quite agree with the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries when he said that what this Government does is deliberate and calculated and not accidental. Otherwise, I cannot understand why the Minister of Finance should strike these gratuitous blows against the poor in this Budget. Was it not enough, Mr. Finance Minister, that you have helped your rich friends? Was it necessary once again to whack the poor man's cigarette, his tot of arrack and even his bottle of soda water? It is some kind of economic sadism. My Hon. Friend simply cannot produce a Budget in which he does not hit the poor in some way.

ගරු එම්. ඩී. එච් ජයවර්ධන (විද්‍යාන) මක පර්යේෂණ හා නිවස දැමිනි

(කෙළරාව ජේ. ඩී. ඒ. ජේ. ජයවර්ධන—විද්‍යාන) (ති.රු. කෙණෙමන්)

(The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena—Minister of Scientific Research and Housing)

Then you can do without soda.

කෙනමත් මය.

(ති.රු. කෙණෙමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

The Hon. Minister of Scientific Research and Housing has now decided that it is better to take arrack without soda. As long as it is not the molasses arrack that is being produced by the Minister of Lands, it may be so.

The second basic policy that has been followed over the last 3½ years is, where it is politically or technically feasible, to remove or reverse such prohibitions and restrictions as the previous Bandaranaike Government placed on the activities of foreign and local vested interests in this country. Sir, we see that in the removal of the moratorium, in the

decision to allow foreign banks once again to operate new accounts in the reduction of the companies tax, so on and so forth. I do not want to go into all those matters, but this has been their consistent line of economic policy. Thirdly, for class and political reasons, the Government was determined steadfastly to avoid any action that could affect adversely those who were mainly responsible for our economic misfortune. They want to avoid dealing with one of the fundamental reasons for the economic backwardness and exploitation of this country, namely, the stranglehold that the foreign monopolies exercise over our economy. And lastly, Sir, throughout the last three and a half years, because they want to avoid for class and political reasons, action against the foreign and local vested interests, they have treated us to a series of economic nostrums and panaceas, all of which have proved to be wrong.

Let us only take one example, without going over the whole field. Let us deal with the constant robbery of Ceylon through the imperialist trick of unequal exchange, which the Hon. Minister of Finance more politely described—I quote his own words—as “the continuing adverse trend in the balance of payments”. At Columns 42 and 43 of the HANSARD of 2nd August 1968, the Hon. Minister of Finance has this sad tale to tell us :

“The significance of the fall in the terms of trade is best appreciated when it is realised that the loss of foreign exchange in 1967, as measured from a base year, 1959, is Rs. 666 million. In other words, if in 1967 the same export and import prices had prevailed as in 1959, Ceylon would have been better off to the extent of Rs. 666 million, which means we could have imported 33 per cent or a third more goods than we actually did import in 1967.”

That is true. As a matter of fact the Hon. Minister might have quoted the estimate given to him by the World Bank itself last year that by 1970 the loss through unequal exchange would reach Rs. 1,000 million. Actually, Sir, in the period between 1965 and 1967, working on the same assumptions that animated

the Hon. Minister, we will find that Ceylon had lost on the exports of tea and rubber alone a sum of Rs. 860 million—Rs. 542 million on tea and Rs. 318 million on rubber. What is the fall due to ? What is this phenomenon due to ?

For years I have been hammering home in successive budget debates the reason for this. I have been trying to point out that the main reason for this shameful exploitation and robbery of Ceylon is the monopoly control of a few powerful foreign companies over our export trade. At least one thing has happened. After many years this position that I and a few others were continually hammering away at is being officially accepted. My Hon. Friend the Minister of Finance indicated this in his Speech. The Prime Minister has indicated in a round-about way that he now holds this view.

ශ්‍රී ලන්කීයයක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

In a straight way.

කෙනෙත් මො.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

In a straight way ? Well, I am glad to hear it. If he says so I am glad he admits it. Even the Central Bank admits it. The March 1968 Bulletin of the Central Bank publishes a most interesting and informative article on some aspects of the tea industry of Nalini Jeyapalan and A. S. Jayewardene.

I recommend hon. Members to read that article. Of course, I recommend the reading of my earlier speeches too, but if you do not wish to read my speeches, at least read that article. It is a detailed and comprehensive examination made by two economists—research workers in the Central Bank. After an exhaustive examination of the structure of the tea trade and the movement of tea prices they come to the conclusion that the main reason for the decline

[மன்றி மன்றி]

in tea export prices is the existence of a monopoly or what they call "the domination of the major tea markets by a few well known tea trading firms which gives them considerable power over the determination of prices". I do not wish to discuss the rest of the article. It shows how tea export prices were brought down; it shows the device of interlocking directorship and how it is done; it shows how the Colombo auctions are rigged; it shows how two out of the 119 registered buyers at the Colombo auctions account for more than a quarter of Ceylon's total tea exports, and how 12 out of the 119 buyers account for three quarters of the entire tea exports. All this is shown in very great detail. My hon. Friends opposite are aware of it. But what are they doing about it?

மன்றி மன்றி மன்றி

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

It is only we who are doing something about it.

மன்றி மன்றி

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

On the 1st of January 1968, with a fanfare of trumpets the Government proclaimed the formation of what was called Consolidated Export (Ceylon) Ltd—Consolexpo. It is a joint stock company in which the Government holds 51 per cent of the shares. Of course, this Company has not been working for a long time, but it has become evident that up to now this company has been really engaged in the same export activities that were already being undertaken by state and public trading agencies such as the Export Department of the C. W. E. that was started by the past Government.

மன்றி மன்றி மன்றி

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

This has to expand.

மன்றி மன்றி

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I shall deal with the question of expansion in a moment. Up to now what Consolexpo has done is to take up the export of the traditional commodities, tea and coconut, which was being done by the C. W. E. Export Department. As you know, this was mainly an export trade with the Soviet Union, some Eastern European countries and the U. A. R. Up to now what Consolexpo has done is to take over two agreements, one with the Soviet Union and the other with the U. A. R., in respect of tea.

Now I come to the question of expansion. I quote from the Economic Journal of 13.8.68 :

"Consolexpo expects to earn 8½ million rupees over the next 15 months from exporting both traditional and non-traditional export items to Europe."

That is the 15 months' programme of Consolexpo. It includes what has been taken over from the C. W. E. Export Department. It is quite clear that the British monopolies that dominate the tea trade do not have to worry very much about Consolexpo. For Consolexpo makes it very clear that only 10 per cent of this Rs. 8½ million worth of exports which they expect to ship to other countries over the next 15 months will be traditional exports like tea, rubber and coconut. Only 10 per cent, or less than Rs. 1 million worth, will be traditional exports! Thus far from being any challenge to the British monopoly of the export trade, all that Consolexpo will do is to provide another name for what was already there, and to give certain private companies and private investors a share in the profits which the C.W.E. had hitherto made on the export trade in traditional commodities with the U. S. S. R., the U. A. R. and certain East European countries.

Incidentally, I do not know whether the Minister of Commerce and Trade will speak in this Debate, but we would like to have some information about the organization called the Potash Fertilizer Company

which has apparently been made the agent for the sale of the products, which are handled by Consolexpo, in countries other than the socialist countries.

You will remember that when the article I referred to earlier was published in the Central Bank bulletin last March, there was a hullabaloo in the press saying that something should be done about it—about the way in which monopolies are pushing down export prices. But after that, nothing happened. So I ask the Minister of Finance: What is the point of crying about something if you are not going to do anything about it? Weeping is not a policy.

You are faced with a fact. You now know the reason for the fact. But, instead of dealing with it, you do something quite the opposite. In fact, again, by what we may call a calculated and deliberate policy, despite the fact that nearly Rs. 850 million of foreign exchange have been lost over the past 3½ years through the operations of these very British firms, this Government has gone and agreed during this period to lose another Rs. 77 million in foreign exchange by allowing these same firms to repatriate their profits, dividends and interest. In other words, you increase the loss of foreign exchange to Rs. 927 million.

First of all, you connive at robbery. Secondly, you go and add to the sum these firms acquired by direct robbery here. You let them make money in Ceylon. Why do you not insist that they spend that money in Ceylon, even if you do not want to nationalize their firms? Ministers often make speeches saying that our main task at the moment is to establish economic independence. This is a theme the Prime Minister regularly speaks on. He often says: "We have won political independence; we must now win economic independence". I agree. Theoretically, you are quite right. But what is the good of saying so if you are not going to do something about it?

The Minister of Scientific Research is highly disturbed. He holds up his hands in horror whenever we speak of nationalization of foreign capital. The gentlemen opposite are quite prepared to nationalize the rice ration books of the poor peasants, but they are not prepared to nationalize the British sterling companies who on their own admission, are exploiting the country and robbing it.

I mentioned this basic question in order to show how, even when the Government know and admit the realities of a situation, for political reasons they do not face up to and do something about it. If they said: "Well, you know, we would like to do it, but we do not feel strong enough", that is one thing. But they try to justify their inactivity theoretically and say, "it is a wrong thing to do."

In order to cover up their refusal to touch the foreign monopolies, members of the Government have from time to time trotted out various nostrums and panaceas for the economic ills of this country. Let me briefly run through them. I shall deal only with the ones which have been put forward in the last 3½ years, though some of them were put forward earlier, not only by the U. N. P. Government but even by the S. L. F. P. Government. But even though these theories have been proved to be wrong, both under the U. N. P. and the S. L. F. P. Governments, they are again being put forward under the U. N. P.-F. P. Government.

First, there is the old myth that foreign aid, especially from the imperialist powers, will help us to overcome the fall in foreign exchange earnings and revive the economy. A number of hon. Members opposite spoke about this matter. They spoke about the need for "massive foreign aid" and so on.

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries and Fisheries said that the expectation of foreign aid was the most important

[கேள்விகள் மொ.]

part of the Government's policy—that successive Budgets has been constructed on the basis of getting massive foreign aid.

You will recall that this is the reason that was given for over-compensating the foreign oil companies, for lifting the moratorium on the export of dividends, profits and interest, for allowing the foreign banks to open new accounts and for the various tax reliefs given to foreign firms.

If the Hon. Minister of State does not remember his speech I shall read it to him. It is reported in Volume 56 of HANSARD, column 1745. This is what he said when we discussed the proposal to over-compensate the foreign oil companies :

“If you settle the compensation problem with Shell Co. and Caltex, the whole deficit will be met by America and we will have no budgetary problem at all.” —[OFFICIAL REPORT, 6th August 1964 ; Vol. 56, c. 1745-6.]

செ. டி. டி. சேனாயக்க

(கேள்வியை நடத்தும் சேனாயக்க)

The Hon. Dudley Senanayake

He could not have said that.

கேள்விகள் மொ.

(திரு. கேள்விகள்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

He said it. Read Volume 56 of HANSARD, column 1745.

செ. டி. டி. சேனாயக்க

(கேள்வியை நடத்தும் சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

No, no.

கேள்விகள் மொ.

(திரு. கேள்விகள்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

What is the use of your saying “No, no.” It is there.

செ. டி. டி. சேனாயக்க

(கேள்வியை நடத்தும் சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

Produce HANSARD.

கேள்விகள் மொ.

(திரு. கேள்விகள்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I have given you the quotation and the reference. Read HANSARD.

செ. டி. டி. சேனாயக்க

(கேள்வியை நடத்தும் சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

Produce it and read it.

கேள்விகள் மொ.

(திரு. கேள்விகள்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I tell you it is there. It is not everybody who speaks with the frankness of the Minister of State. The other Ministers also had great expectations about foreign aid and it was made part of their Budgets. Under this Government there have been two ideas about foreign aid. First that foreign aid should be of a different nature to what it was in the past. Formerly foreign aid was basically project aid, and project aid is certainly not a bad thing. Such aid is tied to a definite project ; there is a definite commitment ; we know what is going to happen. But this time there has been a shift to what is called commodity aid.

செ. டி. டி. சேனாயக்க

(கேள்வியை நடத்தும் சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Only this time ?

கேள்விகள் மொ.

(திரு. கேள்விகள்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

No. It started earlier, but it has become the basic form of aid under your Government. There was commodity aid under P. L. 480 and all that sort of thing before. But the greater part of foreign aid today is commodity aid, and the greater part

of aid negotiated by your Government is either commodity aid from the Consortium or short-term borrowings from the I. M. F.

சு. வி. சீ. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Czechoslovakia is also going to borrow from the I. M. F.

கே. கெனமன்

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I read the report. I hope it is not correct. If Czechoslovakia does so, it will be doing something foolish.

சு. ஜே. ஐ. ரீ. ஜயவர்தன

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

Yugoslavia has borrowed from the I. M. F.

கே. கெனமன்

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I do not agree with that decision the Yugoslav Government.—[Interruption]. If the Russian Government decides to—[Interruption].

I am not against borrowing, but what is the type of borrowing that you are doing? And what are you using it for?

Between 1965 and 1967, they lost, on their own admission, Rs. 937 million in foreign exchange. What compensatory aid have you received during this period? You had great hopes that private foreign capitalists would come here and invest money. How much private foreign capital has come in during the last three and a half years? Rs. 5 million. Aid from the Consortium powers was Rs. 484 million. This makes a total of Rs. 489 million. Therefore during this period the loss of foreign exchange is almost double the inflow of foreign aid. This is the result of the policy followed by the present Government.

சு. வி. சீ. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

How did we manage?

கே. கெனமன்

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I will come to how you managed. You managed by mortgaging the future of this country. Consortium aid is Rs. 200 million less than what was promised.

சு. வ. சீ. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

It is coming in.

கே. கெனமன்

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Up to 30th June, 1968, on the figures given by the Hon. Minister of Finance, Rs. 688 million was promised but only Rs. 484.6 million was received. These are your imperialist friends!

There was an argument yesterday between the hon. Member for Kotte and the Hon. Minister of Finance. The Hon. Minister of Finance tried to make out that the greater part of Consortium aid was being used for development.

Some part of this aid was used for infrastructural activities. Some vehicles you received and the spare parts for them were used to aid the food drive and therefore are of an infrastructural character.

சு. வி. சீ. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Fertilizer?

கே. கெனமன்

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Fertilizer too. But why do you not also say that one-fourth of this

[කෙනමත් මය.]
commodity aid that you have received from the Consortium, namely Rs. 120.49 million, has been spent on flour.

ශ්‍රී වන් නිනායක

(කෙළරාව වන්නිනායක)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)
A small part.

කෙනමත් මය.

(ති.රු. කෙළරාමන්)
(Mr. Keuneman)

Out of every four rupees worth of aid received, one rupee is flour. Apart from developing paunches, I do not know what other development there is from this. This is aid for consumption.

ශ්‍රී වන් නිනායක

(කෙළරාව වන්නිනායක)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

The proportion was much higher earlier.

කෙනමත් මය.

(ති.රු. කෙළරාමන්)
(Mr. Keuneman)

Rs. 27.25 million of Consortium aid has been textiles. This is also consumption aid.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උඩ්ලි සේනානායක)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

How can they develop paunches if they are starving.

කෙනමත් මය.

(ති.රු. කෙළරාමන්)
(Mr. Keuneman)

If you want to develop paunches I have no objection. Therefore, your fond hope that foreign aid from your imperialist friends would come to your rescue has not materialized. They have not even given you the money that they promised. The net result has been that the outflow of foreign capital has been higher than

the inflow. That is the net result of your policy over three and a half years.

Their next panacea was tourism. Tourism has been an activity that has been with us for many years. But tourism as a major means of economic development is a policy of this Government. Both the Hon. Prime Minister and the Hon. Minister of State have spoken lyrically about the Government's expectations from tourism.

References have been made to the Hon. Prime Minister's speech at the opening of the Coral Gardens at Hikkaduwa. I do not want to deal with that. I will deal with more recent statements of his. In the Budget Speech of last year, he said what I will now quote from HANSARD of the 14th August 1967, Vol. 73, column 1878:

"If we are to survive as a nation, instead of developing new exports, we may as well concentrate on tourism."

ශ්‍රී ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන

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

May I interrupt my hon. Friend? I have the passage here. What I said was this:

If you settle the compensation problem with Shell Co. and Caltex, the whole deficit will be met by America and we will have no budgetary problem at all.—OFFICIAL REPORT, 6th August, 1964; Vol. 56, c. 1745.]

There I meant the deficit in foreign aid, not in the Budget.

කෙනමත් මය.

(ති.රු. කෙළරාමන්)
(Mr. Keuneman)

He is now trying to explain what he meant then, Sir.

ශ්‍රී ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන

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

You should have read the previous sentence.

කෙනමත් මය.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

When he said, "we will have no budgetary problem." I presume he was dealing with the budgetary problem,—foreign aid. I did not understand what you mean by a "deficit" in foreign aid.

ශ්‍රී ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

I said that if you were to pay up the Rs. 50 million, America can give you Rs. 500 million, and you will be able to meet the deficit in foreign aid, not in the Budget. It is quite clear. You read only a section.

කෙනමත් මය.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

No, Sir, I did not. You have only repeated what I read. I will establish that later. Shall we take that point up in the Committee's age? I will show you precisely what you said.

ශ්‍රී ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

All right.

කෙනමත් මය.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I do not want to be distracted from tourism. It is a rather sensitive subject for the Minister of State. Therefore he would like me to talk about something else.

I noticed only the other day that when opening the Katunayake Air Terminal the Hon. Prime Minister has said I am now going to quote from the "Ceylon Daily News" of the 6th August, 1968—that: "Ceylon however was faced with the task of diversifying her traditional export economy. Tourism was one on which the Government was banking heavily .." That is what the "Daily News" says.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

It is to get foreign exchange.

කෙනමත් මය.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

All right. I shall accept that.

The Hon. Minister of State was quite ecstatic about his plans for tourism. Last year, on 2nd August, 1967, he said—Column 218 of HANSARD—that he plans to attract 150,000 tourists over the next decade who will bring Rs. 200 million a year in foreign exchange to Ceylon. This year he did not give those figures but he lectured us on the A. B. C. of tourism. He told us that the number of tourists in the world was expanding tremendously and that we must make all the preparations to get hold of them. My hon. Friend is often misled in these matters. I presume he has seen the returns of the International Tourist Survey. I have got some facts from it here and you can take them as correct. It is certainly true that international tourism is expanding. But the survey shows that 94 per cent. of the world market and 90 per cent. of the admittedly large earnings from tourism are concentrated in Europe and America. South East Asia has only 0.3 per cent. of the world market of tourism and 0.7 per cent. of the world's tourist earnings.

My good Friend knows this. We have to compete with India, Thailand and other Asian countries for this 0.3 per cent. of world tourism. Therefore I think we should be a little more realistic and modest, considering that we are also off the main tourist map, in deciding how much to invest on tourism. I am not saying that you should not get whatever money you can from tourism. I am not saying that you should not give tourists value for their money. But the theory that the Hon. Minister of State was trying to propound, namely, that

[කෙතමන් මො.]

tourist revenue can be one of the main props of economic development, is one that is not easy to accept.

I have no time to deal with all the other aspects of this matter. I hope to deal with them during the Committee Stage of the Budget. But so far plans have been drawn up—I do not know to what extent the financing has been done to invest Rs. 186 million to build 1,400 new hotel rooms and to rennovate 600 existing rooms in order to accommodate some 55,000 tourists a year in the first period 1967-68. It was anticipated that this would earn us Rs. 64 million in foreign exchange a year.

I do not know how the Chariman of the Tourist Board, in an article in the "Times of Ceylon", anticipates that they are going to earn Rs. 150 million a year by 1973. But the results so far are completely different from what were anticipated. In 1966 and 1967 the Government invested Rs. 18 million each year on its new Tourist Board and Hotels Corporation. But the result was a deficit of Rs. 19 million:—[*Interruption.*] You items in the Balance of Payments which cover tourism. In each of the past two years you have been investing Rs. 18 million in tourism to lose Rs. 19 million:— Interruption. You have not recovered anything. What your tourist policy has amounted to is that you invest more to lose more, or, as the old saying goes, you throw good money after bad. This has been the basic result of your policy so far? You have a whole lot of good-natured amateurs dabbling in a world which they do not understand. I have a high respect for a lot of the gentlemen on your Tourist Board. But most of those persons do not have any knowledge of tourism. Tourism is a job for professionals. Why not let it be run by professionals and nor, by persons who can be easily bamboozled by interested parties?

The net result of your policy therefore has been that instead of tourist earnings helping to bridge the foreign

exchange gap the Government is now compelled to use foreign earnings from other sources in order to subsidize losses on tourism. And the reason for this—

ශ්‍රී ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන

(කෙරෙඳු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන)

(The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena)

In rupees or foreign exchange?

කෙතමන් මො.

(ශ්‍රී. ජේ. ජේ. ජේ.)

(Mr. Keuneman)

A drop in foreign exchange.

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක

(කෙරෙඳු වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Long term investment.

කෙතමන් මො.

(ශ්‍රී. ජේ. ජේ.)

(Mr. Keuneman)

If after two years this is the result your long term investment, then heaven help us all!

My Hon. Friend did not mention the World Bank Mission Report by Mr. Davis on tourist development. This Report says that the plan of the Tourist Board are far too costly. One example pointed out is the luxury hotels—[*Interruption.*] You have accepted that now.

The Tourist Board had a plan to spend Rs. 114,000 on a room in these Swank hotels. Even the World Bank thought it was too much for a luxury room. They said that Rs. 65,000 was enough. They also said that you should consider yourself lucky if as a result of your investment you get Rs. 39 million from tourist earnings in 1972.

My Hon. Friend the Minister of State also spoke about what a big success he has achieved in regard to leasing out former resthouses to private companies. He referred to Hikkaduwa. Let me remind him of what

he said about Hikkaduwa. I quote once again from his speech during last years Budget Debate :

“The Hikkaduwa and Bentota rest-houses have been given to a business firm largely composed of foreign capital. They are going to spent about Rs. 2 million. Had we not given the resthouses to that firm this Government would have had to spend the Rs. 2 million. Is this Government going to spend Rs. 2 million on one resthouse? Where will the Minister of Finance find the money to give me Rs. 2 million?”

What happened? The Ceylon Holidays Resorts Limited tried to raise money by public subscription. They were able to collect only Rs. 8 lakhs. The Government had to come to their rescue. The government-owned Bank of Ceylon loaned them Rs. 1 million.

ශ්‍රී ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන

(කෙළරාව ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

It is their business.

කෙනමත් මය.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

You could not get Rs. 2 million from the Minister of Finance, but they got Rs. 1 million from your own bank. The Government got the Bank of Ceylon to come to their rescue. Thus, this foreign firm got control of two of our best paying resthouses with an outlay of only Rs. 8 lakhs. The rest was lent by the Government's own Bank.

I understand—I speak subject to correction—that this foreign company pays only Rs. 36,000 a year as lease for Hikkaduwa—it is confirmed by the Hon. Minister. That is, Rs. 3,000 a month. That is less than what your old Tourist Bureau used to earn from that resthouse when that resthouse had only 12 rooms. What you have done is to allow a foreign firm to make money. You are making things more difficult for the country, and helping the foreign companies.

ශ්‍රී ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන

(කෙළරාව ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

Bentara was a loss.

කෙනමත් මය.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I am not talking of Bentara. I am talking of Hikkaduwa.

Now let us consider the next set of economic nostrums—devaluation and FEEC. There is no need to labour the point that devaluation has led to increased hardships and impoverishment of the people, reduced their real earnings, sent up the prices of goods they use in everyday life and plunged them into further debt and want. Hundreds of examples were quoted by hon. Members and also in the public press to establish this point. What I wish to examine today is how far these drastic economic measures that the Government introduced within the last two years have produced the so-called beneficial results on the economy as a whole that the government anticipated that they would.

Let us examine what has been the result of the devaluation of the rupee in November, 1967. You will recall, Sir, that one main argument to justify this measure was that devaluation would provide an incentive to greater export efforts by exporters of major products and thereby increase export earnings. The Hon. Prime Minister made this point when he spoke in favour of devaluation. It was repeated by the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries and Fisheries.

Has this, in fact, happened? Has devaluation, in fact, sent up our export earnings? The figures of the Central Bank show that for the period January to May, 1968 export earnings are considerably less than they were for the corresponding periods in both 1966 and 1967.

ශ්‍රී මන් නිකායක

(කෙළරාව வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Allow some time for it to take

effect.

கைமனை மை.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Six months is a long time to lose money. You are losing on both the swings and the roundabouts. The total value of exports, for the period from January to May, 1968, was Rs. 51.4 million less than the value of exports for the same period in 1967.

சுரு உன் நினைசக

(கெளரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

It would have been worse but for devaluation.

கைமனை மை.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

But it is bad enough. Take the relative figures in regard to our two major exports, tea and rubber. Take tea first. I am speaking of the January-May period. For that period in 1966 our export earning was Rs. 472.9 million; for the same period in 1967 it was Rs. 439.7 million; for the identical period in 1968 it was Rs. 362 million. In other words, there has been a drop of Rs. 122.3 million after the devaluation of the rupee, which was supposed to push up our export earnings.

I refer to the Central Bank Bulletin for April, 1968. It says at page 12:

"Exports of tea for the first four months of 1968 was 38.2 million pounds or 24.1 per cent. less than what was exported for the same period in 1967."

The bulletin shows that the position is the same in the case of rubber; that in the first four months of 1968, exports of rubber were 2.7 million pounds less than in the corresponding period in 1967, while export earnings from rubber were Rs. 19.17 million less.

So, what has happened is not that we have got a bigger market for our traditional exports or that our exports or that our export earnings from them increased, but that our export earnings continue to fall while

we pay higher prices for our imports. We are being robbed both on the swings and the roundabouts. This is what is happening to our economy as a result of your devaluation of the rupee. All your fancy theories that the devaluation of the rupee would stimulate exports of traditional goods and get better prices for our exports have proved to be moonshine. I think my hon. Friends will have to admit that they are getting nothing but the drawbacks from the devaluation of the rupee.

A similar experience has taken place in regard to the FECC's scheme. Of course, we have had only about three months of that scheme, but from what has happened in that period we can see that your policies are wrong. You are changing your own scheme because your expectations are not being realized.

One of the main reasons given by the Government for the introduction of the FECC's scheme was that it would knock a big hole in the exchange blackmarket. Have you done that? The price of the pound sterling and the dollar in the Ceylon currency blackmarket has not fallen at all. At the time of the Debate on the Foreign Exchange Entitlement Certificates Bill I said that it would not effect the currency blackmarket because this is not the reason why the currency blackmarket exists.

சுரு உன் நினைசக

(கெளரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Devaluation is not sufficient.

கைமனை மை.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

He says that devaluation is not sufficient. That is why I say that they do not want to commit murder; they want only to commit culpable homicide. But my Hon. Friend is ruthless and logical and he wants to commit murder.

செ. இனியாகை

(கேவரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

You are murdering truth.

கேனென் மை.

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I am murdering truth? You are murdering the country and the people.

My hon. Friends were expecting FEECs to stumulate an enormous flood of imports. What has actually happened? My Hon. Friend knows that today it is not difficult to buy FEECs if you have the money. If you have got the money, you can go to the bank and over the counter you can buy FEEC's. The big rush of speculators, the fast buck boys, to buy FEECs has died down because now you cannot sell FEECs. In the first rush, the FEECs, which netted in for the Minister the extra revenue which he is so proud of, were all bought up by speculators who started selling them to other speculators. At that time it was a *hatay* chance. whether you got FEECs or not. But now things have settled down. You were expecting the pound to settle at Rs. 23 under FEECs. It has only settled at Rs. 21.

செ. இனியாகை

(கேவரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

There is time yet.

கேனென் மை.

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

It might even go further down.

But is the FEECs scheme fulfilling its purpose? It helped certain speculators to make money. It may help to help certain luxury class people, with more money than they know what to do with, to get goods that they cannot easily acquire. It may help to give this Government a few more rupees for revenue

But beyond that, is the FEECs scheme helping to break the currency blackmarket? Not at all! All it is doing is what it was intended to do, and that is to be a second measure of devaluation, a devaluation over a range of one-third of Ceylon's imports.

You will remember that, three months ago, when the FEECs scheme was introduced, there was a big rumpus about the exclusion of the plumbago exporters from the list of traditional exporters. At that time everybody thought that there was something fishy about this but the Government said it was all a mistake and it was going to be corrected. Well, three months have passed; it has not been corrected. It is not going to be corrected. Perhaps there is something fishy about it after all.

I want to deal with one last aspect of this question of FEECs. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries stated that the Government was all out to help the private sector industrialists. The Minister of State said that the Government was walking on three legs. It had the State leg, it had the co-operative leg and it had the private sector leg, and on these three legs it walked the economic field.

What is your FEECs scheme doing to the private sector industrialists? One of the big reasons that was given by the Government for accepting the FEECs scheme was that the FEECs would be an inducement to the private sector Industrialists who will find it easier to import machinery and raw materials than in the past. In practice, the FEECs scheme may well prove to be a disincentive to any further development of private sector industry, especially when it applies to the import of capital goods. To increase the capital cost of starting industries is hardly the way to encourage the setting up of new industries, especially in the private sector where the profit motive is the

[කෙනෙත් මය.]

As the FEECs scheme is obviously temporary and no one knows how long it will last because it depends on the availability of foreign exchange—and that is a very scarce commodity indeed—few people will care to buy FEECs and import capital goods for new industries when they have to pay what is virtually a 40-45 per cent. Customs duty on machinery. They know that if the FEECs scheme ceases to operate, the value of their capital goods immediately goes down by 40-45 per cent.

Now this point is not one that I have invented. It is one that is openly made by the Ceylonese private manufacturers. So the theory that the FEECs scheme is going to help private manufacturers and private industrialists has not been proved to be correct. Those people, who are doing the job, do not agree with you. Therefore, even that nostrum has struck a bad patch.

Now we come to the last of their economic nostrums—the rice ration cut and the food drive. These are also two big “achievements” of the Government. The rice ration cut of December 1966 was one of the major economic measures taken by the Government and it was followed by a series of measures which are modestly described in this House as the “food drive” but which, over the radio, are being described as the return to the age of Parakrama Bahu the Great. The Hon. Minister of Finance in his Budget speech, at column 38, called it “import substitution in the field of agriculture, which is the fundamental answer to the continuing balance of payments problem”. To what extent have these objectives been achieved? Already it has been shown in the Central Bank Report itself that, despite the rice ration cut which was intended to reduce the foreign exchange expenditure on imports of food, in practice in 1967 the food bill in foreign exchange went up by Rs. 18 million over and above what it was in 1966.

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීවරයා

(කෙළරාව වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

What about the price of rice getting doubled?

කෙනෙත් මය.

(ශ්‍රී. කෙණෙමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

One of the factors was the increase in the price of rice. Anyway, your expectation of a saving on the rice bill was not realized.

Yesterday, the hon. Member for Kotte quoted certain figures of imports of flour. I shall not mention them again. But the fact is that the reduction in imports of rice of 113,000 tons in 1967 is practically the same amount as what was cut off from the rice ration. Naturally, when you import rice to give two measures per head to the people and you cut one measure from this ration, you do not import it; there is no need to import it because you are not giving it to anybody. So let me, first of all, say that it was due to the cut in the rice ration and to any success of the food drive that you imported 113,000 tons of rice less last year than in 1966. The decrease in the import bill for rice in 1967 was only Rs. 22 million. Though you cut the volume of rice imported by half it was only Rs. 22 million less in value that you had to pay.—[Interruption]. Undoubtedly, the price of rice rose. But none of my hon. Friends has yet explained why, in a year in which they claim there was phenomenal success in the food drive, there has also been such a phenomenal increase in imports of flour.

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීවරයා

(කෙළරාව වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

It is explained in the Central Bank

கேள்விகள் மூலம்.

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Even the Central Bank's explanation is not correct in the face of its own figures. In 1966 you imported 264,000 tons of flour. In 1967, when you had such success in the food drive that you now even dream of exporting rice, somehow or other, the imports of flour went up to 517,000 tons; in other words, flour imports nearly doubled. And you paid Rs. 234 million for our flour imports in 1967 as against Rs. 121 million in 1966. Not only did you import more flour in 1967 but you also paid more money for flour. In fact both the volume of flour that you imported and the value you paid for it doubled in 1967 as against 1966.

சுரு வந்தியாயகம்

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

It was done as a precautionary measure.

கேள்விகள் மூலம்.

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Not as a precautionary measure. That was only a small amount.

சுரு வந்தியாயகம்

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

See page 159 of the Central Bank Report.

கேள்விகள் மூலம்.

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

What was bought to be stocked was only a very small proportion of this increased volume of flour. I shall come to that. What the Central Bank says was a precautionary buffer stock was only a very small part of this volume. I shall give the exact figure. Out of 517,000 tons of flour imported in 1967, the Central Bank claims that only 76,300 tons were imported to be kept as buffer stocks.

All right, we will accept that 76,300 tons was for buffer stock, not for immediate consumption. Even if that is so, it still makes the flour imports for 1967, 440,700 tons or 63 per cent more than what they were in 1966. How do you explain that?

சுரு வந்தியாயகம்

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Surely, it takes some time.

கேள்விகள் மூலம்.

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Please explain. I have allowed for your buffer stocks. If you have scored such a big success in your food drive, why was it necessary for you to increase your imports of flour by 63 per cent in the same year?

சுரு வந்தியாயகம்

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

If you cut the rationed rise you have to import more flour. because there is a time lag for the production of rice.

கேள்விகள் மூலம்.

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

What your food drive really means is that you are trying to turn the Ceylonese from a rice eating people to a flour eating people. That is what it has turned out to be. Let us look at the consumption of rice and flour in the last two, years. The consumption of rice per capita has been practically stationary, 220 lbs. a year. The consumption of flour between 1966 and 1967 went up from 51.5 lbs. to 84 lbs. per annum. That is by nearly 63 per cent.

சுரு வந்தியாயகம்

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

That is the rice came.

கேள்விகள் கேள்வி.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary for the Minister of Industries spoke very lyrically about the reduction of rice imports. "Why should we subsidize the peasants of Burma, Thailand and China?", he asked. Yes, he does not mind subsidizing the wheat farmer of Australia, Canada and the U. S. A. He does not mind that.

ஆல் உணவியல்

(கேள்வியை வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Not for long.

கேள்விகள் கேள்வி.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

That is the real secret. This has nothing to do with the food drive. The real secret is that you are now trying to get the people to eat more flour instead of rice, as you get flour now on tick. You do not have to pay now but later for the flour that we consume today. Some other Government will have to pay for the consumption now. I showed you how one-fourth of the consortium aid that we get is flour. We get flour under U. S. Public Law 480. You have arrangements with America to eat now and pay later. Only, you will not make the payment, some other Government will have to make the payment and some other generation will have to go without food. This is your policy.

I asked them a question last time but they did not answer. If your food drive has succeeded so much why does not the price of rice come down? If there is so much extra rice coming on the market, why does not the price of rice keep coming down?

As so much publicity has been given to this so-called "miracle" of paddy production last year, please allow me to make one or two observations. I do not intend to dispute your figures. I do not trust a lot of

these figures. But they are made by the same set of officials for all Governments. So, there is not much point in trying to say that they were cooked under one Government and were uncooked under another. They are the only figures available. I shall show later why I distrust these figures. But for the moment I am prepared to accept them and argue on them.

All this fuss is being made because paddy production in 1957 was 55.1 million bushels. That is 5 million bushels more than it was in 1954. The peak year up till now was 1954, the last year of the former Government. If an increase in production has taken place, then I accept that. I am not trying to belittle that fact. The more rice that is produced in this country the better it is. The more foodstuffs that are grown in this country the better it is. What I dispute is not the actual production of paddy. What I dispute is your false propaganda and wrong conclusion from facts. My hon. Friends are basically talking about a return to the Parakrama Bahu Age, the export of rice and so on and so forth, all based on the fact that there was a 20 per cent increase in the production of rice between 1966 and 1967.

ஆல் உணவியல்

(கேள்வியை வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

It is not that we are returning to the Age of Parakrama Bahu, we are going to return.

கேள்விகள் கேள்வி.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I have not got enough time to go into all the figures, but I have the figures. If you look at the figures of production of paddy over the last 10 to 12 years, you will find that there have been two very bad years; one was 1956, when there was a 23.1 per cent drop in the production of paddy and the other was in 1965, when there was a 28.2 per cent drop in production. These were the two worst years in the last ten years, both due mainly to bad weather. We can say

that the weather is non political. It was bad in 1956, the first years of the Government of the late Mr. Bandaranaike, and it was also bad to Mr. Dudley Senanayake's Government in its first year. The weather was politically non-partisan in this matter. Now, Sir, I want to remind the House that after the 1956 drop of 23 per cent there was a sharp return to normality and in 1958 there was a 19.1 per cent increase in production over the previous year. You are now making such a fuss about the 20 per cent increase in production between 1966 and 1967, but in 1958 there was a 19 per cent increase in production without any special food drive, without Anandatissa de Alwis' hullabalo about miracles over the radio, without all this *waga bana* that you get the priests to chant over the radio, without all the minimokes, and *waga* loans. Without any of these things there was a 19 per cent. increase in paddy production between 1957 and 1958. Why are you shouting so much over this 20 per cent. increase in one year? One swallow does not make a summer, and one year's good production is not a reliable basis to start dreaming of a "Parakum Yugaya". You had a good year; be thankful. If you are going to spend money, spend the money. Nobody will oppose your spending the money to grow food, but let me tell you this. Do not deceive yourselves and the people that some "miracle" has taken place.

Why do you not hail the late Mr. Bandaranaike? A 19.1 per cent increase in production is only a little less than what you have produced last year with all your food drive activities. What else has happened? After that bad drop in production in 1956 there has been a continuous rise up to 1964 except in one year when there was a drop of one lakh of bushels. Since 1956 there has been a continuous and steady rise in paddy production. I just want to remind my hon. Friends about these matters lest they get swollen-headed and dazzle themselves. If you have increased the production of paddy be thankful that you have done so. If you like, shout

about it, but do not fool yourself with dreams that that you are going to export rice in the foreseeable future.

Sir, my hon. Friends know that if you want to find out whether there has been development in the economy you cannot look at only one branch of the economy, but you must look at the totality of the economy. What has your Government contributed to the growth of the economy as a whole? In 1965 and 1966, the first two years of this Government, their economic achievement was such that they had a minus gross national product per capita. It declined to a minus factor in both years.

Now, on your efforts, on your food drive and on your so-called industrial profits, what is the position? You have in the last year, 1967, registered an increase in the G. N. P. per capita of 2.7 per cent. In other words, you have brought it practically to what it was in 1964.—[*Interruption.*]

செ. வந்தினாயக்க

(கௌரவ வந்தினாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Despite a fall.

கேனமன் டீ.டி.

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Yes, it means, you fell down and after 2 years got up. It does not mean that you have gone higher; you have just got up. All your efforts over these years have brought you back to the position that you started from to the rate of economic growth that was there in 1964 when you took office. You have come back to the position where you were. Now, are you satisfied with it?

செ. வந்தினாயக்க

(கௌரவ வந்தினாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

No.

කෙනෙක් මො.

(ශ්‍රී. කෙනමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Of course, you cannot be satisfied with it. Your Prime Minister himself said so in 1965. He anticipated that the rate of per capita growth of the G. N. P. per annum should be 5 per cent; without a 5 per cent. growth rate, there would be no progress. I wish to quote what he said in 1965 :

“THE HON. DUDLEY SENANAYAKE :
But when you relate it to the increase of population, the real increase is 2.1 per cent.

MR. KEUNEMAN : You are talking of per capita output. I am talk of real output.

THE HON. DUDLEY SENANAYAKE :
The per capita and real product per capita is 2.1 per cent. In one year the per capita income declined; in another year you had a meagre increase; and it is estimated that we can never make any advance unless we at least have an increase of 5 per cent. annually.

DR. N. M. PERERA : In real output.

THE HON. DUDLEY SENANAYAKE :
Yes.

[OFFICIAL REPORT, 26th August 1965 ;
Vol. 61, cc. 1849-50.]

My hon. Friends should wait till they reach a 5 per cent per capita growth rate before they start to boast. Even your Prime Minister has said that you cannot make any real advance unless you have a annual growth rate of 5 per cent in the G. N. P. per capita. Do not try to pick out an isolated branch of the economy and say it is a good performance or a bad performance. You are not going to be judged on your performance on one particular project or in any one particular year or in any single economic branch but on the totality of your economic performance. As far as we can see you are back at the part where the last Government left off.

I have neither the time nor the inclination to deal with the inanities and senilities with which the Minister of Industries regaled us when he described his current philosophy and told us why he

opposes the Communist Party. I was here when he criticized us. I am sorry he is not here now. These lengthy irrelevancies were really an *apologia pro vita sua*, may be a dress rehearsal for the political autobiography which he is supposed to be writing. If so, it is certainly his final chapter. Never have I witnessed so peurile or so agonising an effort to scrape together a so-called “theoretical” justification for what everyone knows is a straightforward and base act of political opportunism and renegadism on his part. I do not know how he is going to justify the fact—the whole world knows it—of wriggling into the Senanayake Government that he had been denouncing in all the sane part of his life. But let that be. I have no interest in the apologies of an ancient renegade, but I am perforce compelled to examine the claims of an Hon. Minister in relation to the performance of the departments in his charge. Let me examine the claims of the Hon. Minister of Industries about industrial progress.

The Hon. Minister of Industries should have had the frankness to tell us just what the Rs. 103.9 million increase in industrial production about which the Government boasts is composed of. The Minister of Finance and the Minister of Industries told us that the latter has made a big contribution to economic development, because last year there was an increase of Rs. 103.9 million in the value of industrial production. Now the whole story about this is told in the Central Bank Report for 1967 at page 41. What have they said? The first thing that emerges from what is written is that two-thirds of this so-called increase, in other words a sum of Rs. 73 million, is the result not of increase in industrial production but of a wider survey of industrial activity. The Central Bank points out that two-thirds of this alleged increase is because they included in their survey of industrial production a number of units which they had not hitherto included. In 1966 they were able to survey only 1,394 units, but in 1967 they surveyed 1,830 units.

In fact one-third of this increased value, that is Rs. 39.7 million is mainly, to quote the Central Bank, "because a large number of smaller units engaged in beedi manufacture were brought in to the survey for the first time." What has happened is that the Central Bank surveyors have gone to the various places where girls wrap beedies and made a census of all these. This beedi industry was going on, godness knows for how many years, only they were not able to go around and collect figures. Almost three-fourths of your claim about increased industrial production consists of this, and yet you dare to say, "We are contributing our mighty mite to the production efforts of this country because in 1967 we have produced Rs. 103.7 million more in the value of industrial production." What is the rest of this claim made up of, Sir? The rest (Rs. 35.3 million) consists with one exception, of profits from the State industries which started under the S. L. F. P. Government with aid from socialist countries. One is the steel factory, the Tyre and tube factory is another.

This is the actual position. This is what your Own Central Bank says about it. Two-thirds of the increase value of industrial production is due to pure statistical changes! You should know that. And the other one-third is due to the fact that industries started by the S.L.F.P. With socialist aid are now coming into production and earning money.

You are getting the benefit from this. But please have the decency to thank the S. L. F. P. Government and the socialist countries for having given you Rs. 33 million more from industrial production. The Minister of Industries does nothing of the kind.

The Minister of Industries and his Parliamentary Secretary also say they have approved 116 new industries since they took office. But I ask them, how many of those industries have actually started; how many have got off the ground? Why do they not tell us that?

Let me say what the position is. There are 2 ways of approving new industries today. Those with a capital less than 25 thousand rupees are approved and financed by the Ministry of Industries if foreign exchange is available. Of these, 40 have been approved and some have been offered finance. I think about 5 or 6 of them have actually begun. In the case of industries where the capital value is more than Rs. 25,000, they have to go to the Development Finance and Credit Corporation. This Development Finance and Credit Corporation is today being run by a World Bank adviser called Dyer, and it has taken over both the functions of the Ministry of Industries in approving the new industries and the functions of the Central Bank in providing foreign exchange for them, and even the functions of the Central Bank in providing foreign exchange for them, and even the functions of the Ministry of Planning for. In short, the D. F. C. C. has become a government of its own as far as industries are concerned.

Everyone knows that the World Bank is opposed to any basic industrialization, and today through the Development Finance and Credit Corporation and Mr. Dyer the World Bank are exercising administrative control over industrialization. They are administratively able to enforce their view. Do you know that in the last 3 1/2 years only about 5 projects have been approved by the D.F.C.C.? 116 industries have been approved by the Minister, but only 5 of them have been approved by the Development Finance and Credit Corporation.—

ශ්‍රී ලන්කීයයක

(කෙළවර වැඩිකරගන්න)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

They are making available some

කේනමන් මය.

(ශ්‍රී. ජෙනමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Do without that capital and develop with your own funds. The Hon. Minister of Industries bellows and shouts at hon. Members, but he is like a mouse when it comes to talking back to the Development Finance and Credit Corporation. He is prepared to allow the Development Finance and Credit Corporation to run him and his Ministry. I do not know why we need a Minister of Industries or a Minister of Finance if the D. F. C. C. does their job. Today, the future of new industries are in the strangling hands of the Development Finance and Credit Corporation! Can a poor country like Ceylon afford these parallel institutions? Either we have to wind up our Ministry of Industries or wind up the Development Finance and Credit Corporation. As long as this corporation remains you are not going to have private sector development of industry in this country except on the lines that they approve. My hon. Friends know that.

One last question.

සභානායකතුමා

(ප්‍රධාන නායක අයුරු)

(Mr. Speaker)

I hope you are winding up!

කේනමන් මය.

(ශ්‍රී. ජෙනමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I am. I will not take more than five minutes. The Prime Minister asked: "How have we been managing all this time?" He challenged me on that. You have been managing by mortgaging the future of this country—that is my answer. And I will prove it to you. This Government cannot deal with the real, basic causes of the stagnation of our economy. Because they do not want to deal with them for class and political reasons, they try a lot of alternative nostrums. I told you how all those fancy tricks went wrong. So,

they do the only other thing that is possible, and that is, to put the country in pawn and plunge the country deeper and deeper in debt, and to leave it to a government that follows to settle the bill.

Look, for instance, at the way in which the external liabilities of the Government have increased since it took office. This is given in Central Bank Report, Table II (F) 4, at page 135. I have gone through this table every year. What do we see there? First, while the external liabilities of the previous Government increased by Rs. 1,715 million in the three-year period 1962-64, the external liabilities of the present Government have increased by double that figure in other words, by Rs. 3,064 million in the three-year period 1965-67.

Second, under this Government the proportions of external liabilities to export earnings has more than doubled. These are things that my hon. Friends must know. They must always see our external liabilities in relation to our export earnings. Look at the picture. In 1965 our export earnings amounted to Rs. 1,909 million, and our external liabilities to Rs. 717 million. That is external liabilities were 37 per cent. of our export earnings. In 1966 our export earnings amounted to Rs. 1,674 million and our external liabilities to Rs. 972 million, or 55 per cent. of our export earnings. In 1967 our export earnings amounted to Rs. 1,646 million and our external liabilities to Rs. 1,375 million. In other words, in 1967 our external liabilities were 84 per cent. of our external earnings!

My Hon. Friend, the Minister of Finance knows that in India, where the interest on external liabilities are 25 per cent. of the export earnings, people are holding up their hands in horror saying that it is an awful example of profligacy in finance. You are getting very close to that position.

The capital repayments and interest payments on our external liabilities already amount to 7 per cent. of

[கேனென்' மொ.]

our external earnings, and it is estimated that by 1970, purely as interest on our loans, we shall have to spend 15 to 20 per cent. of our export earnings.

In fact the I.B.R.D. "Note on Recent Developments and the Exchange & Growth Outlook 1967-71 of Ceylon" published on 24th March, 1967, tells us what will be the repayments position on short-term borrowings from the I.M.F. alone.

1967	..	Rs. 95 million
1968	..	Rs. 91 million
1969	..	Rs. 191 million
1970	..	Rs. 239 million
1971	..	Rs. 274 million

The public debt, both foreign and local, has already doubled since this Government took office. It has increased by Rs. 1,635 million. In fact the increase in the public debt in the last 3 years is equivalent to the entire export earnings in 1967.

On top of that the Government has decided to waive the moratorium on the export of dividends, profits, and interest. The Government is making matters worse by this.

The I. B. R. D. note 1 referred to earlier says at page 11 that by 1971 the export of dividends and profits will amount to Rs. 149 million a year. And you have agreed to that! That is what they say in that note.

செ. வெந்தியாயகை

(கேளரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

We are paying past debts.

கேனென்' மொ.

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Because they have no solution to the problems that the country is faced with and because all their nostrums have failed, the main economic policy of the Government is to plunge the country up to its neck in debt and to mortgage future generations to imperialist financial

agencies in order to ensure its temporary political survival. This Government is leaving it to its successors to pay the bills for its follies and crimes.

I have no more time to discuss all the other aspects of the Government's economic mismanagement. I have said enough to show that the longer this Government stays in office the greater the disaster to the economy will be, and, therefore, both patriotism and commonsense demand that this Government be removed from office as soon as possible.

டி. டி. 3.35

செ. எம். டி. எச். ஜயவர்தன

(கேளரவ எம். டி. எச். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena)

I should like at the outset, like other hon. Members, to congratulate my Friend and Colleague, the Minister of Finance, on the Budget he has produced.

I am sorry I was not in the Island when Budget Debate commenced and, therefore, I have not been able to follow all the speeches. I was, however, able last night to read some of the speeches as they appeared in the newspapers.

So far I have not read or heard any criticism of the Budget—on the main general features of the Budget. I do not think anybody could quarrel with the general features of the Budget.

I have always had very great respect for my Friend, the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central (Mr. Keuneman). As a matter of fact, in my university days I always enjoyed taking part in any debate in which he participated. But today, instead of criticizing the general features of the Budget, he rode his famous hobby-horse of exploitation by the foreign imperialist.

I have not the time within the one hour given to me to deal with all the points that the hon. member has raised but I shall deal with some of the points that he has raised, because I want to devote 20 or 25 minutes

[கரு. பதி. டி. பதி. சுவரீகன]
of the time allocated to me to depart-
ments under my charge as there seem
to be misconceptions in the minds of
certain people, who ought to know
better, as to what are the functions
of the Minister of Scientific Research
and Housing.

Firstly, I will deal with, in a
sentence or two, the points made by
the hon. Third Member for Colombo
Central about our repatriating divi-
dends. He is well aware of what
happened at the time when the
moratorium was placed upon the
payment of dividends.

You will remember, Sir, that at the
beginning of this Government we
were faced with a situation where
America had refused to give aid.
Other countries too were not
honouring their obligations.

ஊயாந்தொட்டி உள். பதி. பரேரா (யதியாந்தொட்டி)

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா—யட்டியாந்தொட்டி)

(Dr. N. M. Perera—Yatiantota)

There was no obligation.

கரு. பதி. டி. பதி. சுவரீகன

(கௌரவ எம். டி. எச். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena)

They had promised you aid.

ஊயாந்தொட்டி உள். பதி. பரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

That is not correct.

கரு. பதி. டி. பதி. சுவரீகன

(கௌரவ எம். டி. எச். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena)

I will show you.

ஊயாந்தொட்டி உள். பதி. பரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

The only country that refused to
have anything to do with us was the
United States of America, and that

had nothing to do with the morato-
rium. That had something to do with
the compensation to oil companies.

கரு. பதி. டி. பதி. சுவரீகன

(கௌரவ எம். டி. எச். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena)

Yes; and as regards the mora-
torium you well know what represen-
tations were made to the High
Commissioner at that time. Mr. R. S.
S. Gunawardena, in his memoirs that
he has written, has expressly referred
to this point.

ஊயாந்தொட்டி உள். பதி. பரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I do not know what Mr. R. S. S.
Gunawardena has referred to. No
representations were made to me.

கரு. பதி. டி. பதி. சுவரீகன

(கௌரவ எம். டி. எச். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena)

Is the hon. Member for Yatiyan-
tota saying that with the complete
moratorium that he placed, the rela-
tionship between Great Britain and
Ceylon would have been the same?

ஊயாந்தொட்டி உள். பதி. பரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I do not see any difference in the
relationship between Great Britain
and Ceylon. All that happened then
was that the Chancellor of the Ex-
chequer saw me and I explained the
position to him and I understood that
he was satisfied with the explanation
given by me.

கரு. பதி. டி. பதி. சுவரீகன

(கௌரவ எம். டி. எச். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena)

That is why they made representa-
tions over and over again. We have
not paid this money in one block
payment but in instalments over a
number of years. And last year alone
—the Hon. Minister of Finance has
given the figures—we have got in the
form of aid from Great Britain about
Rs. 50 million.

ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා
(අනුලව්‍යංචන)

(කලාநிති කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා—අගලව
වත්ත)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva—Agalawatta)

What about the interest ?

ආරු එම්. ඩී. එච්. ජයවර්ධන

(කොළඹ නගර සභා ම. ඩී. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන)

(The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena)

That is all right. And the aid that has been given by all the other countries amounts to over Rs. 250 million.

ටී. බී. සුබසිංහ මයා. (කටුගම්පොල)

(කී. ඊ. ඩී. ජයවර්ධන—කටුගම්පොල)

(Mr. T. B. Subasinghe—Katugampola)

How many millions have you given in the form of dividends ?

ආරු එම්. ඩී. එච්. ජයවර්ධන

(කොළඹ නගර සභා ම. ඩී. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන)

(The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena)

Today, in the world market countries are competing with each other to sell their goods. We are competing in the world market, for example, to sell our tea. Would it have been possible if we had offended the feelings of Great Britain in this matter, and not given the dividends to the tea companies ?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා.

(කලාநிති නගර සභා ම. ඩී. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

They did not refuse to buy our tea.

ආරු එම්. ඩී. එච්. ජයවර්ධන

(කොළඹ නගර සභා ම. ඩී. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන)

(The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena)

Then, on the matter of devaluation, I must tell my hon. Friend that we did not believe that devaluation was a permanent cure for the economic ills of a country. Devaluation, as I said in my speech, is a temporary measure to get over a temporary difficulty. As a matter of fact,

if we carried out the recommendations of the Central Bank instead of having feelings about the rising cost of living, then we would have got greater benefits economically from this measure. But certainly we had to temper that measure, and therefore wages were put up, and farmers were paid a higher price for their paddy. If we had used some of the benefits of devaluation, as the economists would have liked us to do, then the situation would have been very much better.

One knows the steps that were taken in Great Britain. There was a freezing of wages. In Ceylon, far from freezing wages, the Government legislated to give higher wages in the plantation industry. So that when you in one voice ask "what are the benefits of devaluation?", do not forget that the Government had to take certain measures to relieve the burdens on the poorer people of this country. So that I do not think any Member of the Government would say that devaluation is a cure for all economic ills for all time.

In most countries, devaluation has been introduced as a temporary measure till they adjusted the economy. Certainly, has not devaluation helped us in this matter ? What was the price of rubber when devaluation took place ? It was 64 cents at the time devaluation took place.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාநிති නගර සභා ම. ඩී. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Are you suggesting that the prices of rubber and tea are better as a result of devaluation ?

ආරු එම්. ඩී. එච්. ජයවර්ධන

(කොළඹ නගර සභා ම. ඩී. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන)

(The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena)

The rupee value is better.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාநிති නගර සභා ම. ඩී. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

What is the advantage of that ?

from Rs. 471 million to Rs. 863 million. That will show hon. Members that money which had been borrowed had been used productively. My good Friend opposite merely gave figures and percentages. The point is to see whether the money has been used productively or not. Moneys expended on capital expenditure are moneys used productively and not for day to day expenditure on salaries and other things.

கேள்விகள் 10.

(திரு. கெனமன்)
(Mr. Keuncman)

Do you think brick and mortar expenditure on buildings and real estate productive?

சு. பி. டி. பி. சுவாமிநாதன்

(கௌரவ எம். டி. எச். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena)

They are productive; it all depends on the circumstances.

I do not wish to weary the House much longer with figures. My Hon. Friend, the Minister of Finance, has set out in his Budget speech all that has been achieved and the moneys that have been spent.

He stated that 47,000 acres of new land had been brought under irrigation during 1965-67, and 25,000 more acres of land will be improved with irrigation and drainage facilities. In his Budget speech he also referred to several irrigation schemes that have been commenced and the extent of land that will be brought under cultivation. He also referred in his speech to colonization schemes. In 1966-67, 3,432 families have been settled in colonization schemes, and in 1967-68 5,800 families will be so settled.

On the controversial point of paddy, the increase in production is referred to in the Central Bank Report. My hon. Friend said it was fortuitous, it was a cycle. He said it was something like what happened in Mr. Bandaranaike's time when during one year they recorded a high yield. He said

that in the cycle we have come back to that point. He said the year was good, and that that was the reason for the increase, and that it was not due to any achievement on the part of this Government.

I do not wish to reply in my own words, and I shall quote from the Central Bank Report for 1967 at page 34:

"Paddy production increased in 1967 reaching a record level of 55.1 million bushels compared to 45.7 million bushels in 1966. This was an increase of 20.6 per cent. In 1966/67 Maha, the yield was 34.9 million bushels, an increase of 13.7 per cent over the previous Maha. The Yala crop was estimated at 20.2 million bushels which was an increase of 34.7 per cent over the same season in the previous year. It is noteworthy that the output in 1967 was 1.7 million bushels over the target set out in the agricultural development proposals of the Ministry of agriculture and Food. The average yield per acre in Maha 1966/1967 was 40.85 bushels compared to 35.91 bushels in Maha 1965/66. The figures for Yala were 42.33 bushels in 1967 and 35.04 bushels in 1966. These figures constitute an all-time record in paddy production in Ceylon."

Similarly, hon. Members would have seen the figures in the bulletin issued by the Information Department, which showed an increase in the production of chillies, onions and other subsidiary foodstuffs.

It is not only in agriculture but also in industry that there has been progress. My good Friend asked, what is the progress that has been achieved in industry? I do not want to weary this House with figures as they are given in the Central Bank Report for 1967 at page 42.

Let us look at industrial production. In 1964 it was Rs. 536 million, and in 1967 it was Rs. 954 million, an increase of almost Rs. 410 million.

In the sphere of employment, in 1964, 34,222 persons have been found employment whereas in 1967, 73,955 persons have been found employment, which means that 40,000 persons more have been found employment in the industrial sector.

In regard to firms, the number of firms registered in 1964 was 717, whereas in 1967, 1,830 firms have been

ශ්‍රී ලංකා එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

What have you started ?

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. එච්. ජයවර්ධන

(கௌரவ எம். டி. எச். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena)

One hundred and nineteen industries have been started ; they are not "seenibola" industries.

සාමාන්‍යයකුම

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please ! The Hon. Minister has only one hour for his speech. The hon. Member for Colombo South has finished his speech, and the other three hon. Members will have an opportunity to speak. So let the Hon. Minister continue.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. එච්. ජයවර්ධන

(கௌரவ எம். டி. எச். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena)

I have already stated that in this Budget a large amount of money is set apart for capital expenditure on the development of industries. Very often I am asked, "What is there in this Budget ? Therefore, it is necessary to explain a few things which are in the Budget and which, I think, the Hon. Minister of Finance has already referred to. I think, however, that repetition will do some good.

On account of land and agriculture the amount set apart in this Budget is Rs. 253 million ; on power it is Rs. 81 million ; on roads it is Rs. 38 million ; on ports and harbours it is Rs. 35 million ; on fisheries it is Rs. 20 million on industries it is Rs. 195 million.

The break-up of the Rs. 253 million set apart for agriculture is as follows : irrigation—Rs. 131 million ; colonization—Rs. 28 million ; youth schemes—Rs. 10 million Tea, Rubber and Coconut Replanting Rs. 35 million, Fertilizer Subsidies Rs. 30 million, Livestock Project Rs. 7 million, Agricultural Education Rs. 5 million and Reafforestation Rs. 4 million.

After all, is not everything being done to help the economy of this country ? And especially when people ask, "What are you doing to expand employment ?", The answer is that this vast sum of money which is being expended would help in some measure to relieve the growing problem of unemployment.

In the field of power, the next three years would see the rural electrification of 500 villages. Already work has started in some of the constituencies.

In regard to industry, I was not here when the Hon. Minister of Industries spoke. I read the speech of his Parliamentary Secretary. He had referred to the new textile mill, one of the biggest in Asia, that is being put up, the Puttalam Cement Factory, the Hardboard and Paper Factory, a second Plywood Factory, Omnibus cum truck project, Fertilizer Factory, the Provender Plant, the Fisheries Corporation and the development projects.

අ. ආ. 4

සාමාන්‍යයකුම

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please ! The Hon. Deputy Chairman of Committee will now take the Chair.

අනතුරුව ක්වන්තයකුම මුලසනයෙන් ඉවත් වුවෙන් කරක සහ නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමා [ඒ. ජේ. පාරිස් පෙරේරා මහ.] මුලසනාරුව විස.

அதன் பிறகு, சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள் அக்கிராசனத் துள்ளியு நீங்குவே, குழுக்களின் உப அக்கிராசனர் அவர்கள் [திரு ஜி. ஜே. பாரிஸ் பெரேரா] தலைமை தாங்கினார்.

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

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. එච්. ජයවර්ධන

(கௌரவ எம். டி. எச். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena)

As Isaid at the beginnig, one of the first features of the Budget is the growing expenditure. I think there is

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. එච්. ජයවර්ධන

(කෙළරාව எம். டி. எச். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena)

Then everybody would have been affected. Although the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central stated that small industrialists would be affected by this scheme, we have taken the precaution to set aside Rs. 100 million to be given to small industrialists on a system of quotas; so that the very small industrialists would not be affected. It is really those industrialists who had started certain industries under the protection of shortages during the war period that will be affected by this scheme.

Further, this scheme has also helped certain minor industries such as cinnamon, citronella oil and plumbago to boost their exports.

The hon. Third Member for Colombo Central, referring to the Hon. Minister of State, said that he had missed his vocation of becoming a teacher. I do not want him to say the same of me now; so I shall not give him a lecture on how this scheme has benefited the country, especially in respect of non-traditional exports.

Certainly we had misapprehensions at the beginning in regard to the operation of this scheme. It was thought the scheme would flop. But it has shown very encouraging results. I hope it will not be an all-time measure but I hope it will help us to put the economy right, enable efficient industries to forge ahead and also help people to start industries which will benefit the country, unlike those industries which the hon. Member for Yatiyantota described as "seenibola" industries.

The fourth feature of the Budget is the relief that has been given to certain middle-class people, namely, earned income relief, higher personal allowances, house-repair allowance to house-owners, and so on. A big noise has been made that the rich have been benefited by a reduction in the rate of tax to 65 per cent. You will remember, Sir, the economics of Kaldor. Some of his recommenda-

tions are now being followed in a certain way but not in the way that he had suggested at the beginning; now we have almost come back to his recommendations again. The marginal rate which he recommended as 45 per cent we have raised to 65 per cent. It is really no relief. The super rich people were given savings relief earlier; they were entitled to buy savings certificates, get off wealth tax and also not pay income tax on savings certificates.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

All by you.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. එච්. ජයවර්ධන

(කෙළරාව எம். டி. எச். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena)

All those concessions have been removed and we have come back to the Kaldor system. Above Kaldor's recommendation, we have brought it to the higher limit of 65 per cent.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Why do you do that?

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. එච්. ජයවර්ධන

(කෙළරාව எம். டி. எச். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena)

Because it gives a person the opportunity to have his own enterprise. Otherwise he invests in other people's industries. Every year we review taxation and whenever we see any faults we correct them. Otherwise they persist in their own folly. We have now removed certain things.

For instance, with this tax holiday there was one industry that made in one year a 600 per cent profit, and still they continued to enjoy a tax holiday. The hon. Member for Colombo Central (Mr. Keuneman) is nodding his head. I think he is in agreement with us when we say that the tax holiday should be removed. I personally feel that if a person is

[මු. එම්. ඩී. එම්. ජයවර්ධන]

making a 120 per cent profit over five years, then he should be given that concession instead of giving this grand tax holiday for five years to every one. The Minister of Finance has taken a progressive step in removing this tax holiday. There is also relief to the new industries. The Minister of Industries is entitled to give relief to industries if he think that those industries are good.

The main criticism of the Budget that nothing has been done to reduce the cost of living. I read a speech of the hon. Member for Kolonnawa (Mr. Ilangaratne) in which he had said that when they left the Government the cost of living stood at 110 and now we have brought it up to 123. He has forgotten to mention the one thing. When we left in 1956 the external assets were at 1250 million rupees, but when they left it was 370 odd million. Now, can he blame us when the cost of living went up. Yet the hon. Member for Kolonnawa blamed us and said nothing has been done to bring down the cost of living. I remember a friend of mine telling me that if we imported a lot of goods we could reduce prices. I think that is a simple device. By importing all that we need we can reduce prices, but we in the Cabinet realize that to import there must be external assets and unless we have external assets we cannot import. In fairness to us the hon. Member for Kolonnawa should have quoted the other figures also and said, "When they left the Government the external assets stood at Rs. 1250 million and when we left the Government it stood at Rs. 371 million." If we had those external assets this question would never have arisen.

Certainly, all over the world the cost of living has gone up. The cost of living could have been brought down if we had free imports. It is not so much the question of the cost of living going up, it is really the question of the increase in the incomes of the people. If there is an increase in incomes then it does not

matter what the cost of living is. In countries like Australia and America the cost of living is very higher, but then there is a corresponding increase in wages. In Ceylon what is the position regarding wages?

Taking the base year 1939 as 100, in 1965 in the case of agriculture the minimum rate was 116.3. I am reading from Table 43 of the Central Bank Report, Wages was 103.4. In December 1967, agricultural minimum wage was 138.8 in 1965-1967 it went up by 22.2 and the real wage rose by 12.9.

The industrial minimum wage in 1965 was 132.8, real wage 118; 1967 minimum wage 161.6, real wage 165. So in the industrial section the minimum wage had increased by 28.8 per cent, real wage by 17 per cent. Similarly in the government sector there were wage increases.

Therefore, although the cost of living has gone up, wages also have gone up. Not that I say that the wages all the people get are sufficient to live in comfort; it is true the cost of living has gone up, but it is this Government alone that forced employers by legislation to pay higher wages. I am not pointing to other countries and comparing with other countries. You must be thankful that you are in Ceylon. I was in India last week. There pound of bread is 60 cents. A kilo of sugar is Rs. 6. A kilo of rice—a kilo is equivalent to 2.2 lbs.—is Rs. 1.75 to Rs. 2.00 in Ceylon money. In Delhi it is about Rs. 2.50. Those are the prices prevailing in those countries. I am not saying this to comfort our people but prices all over the world are increasing. Most of the increases are inevitable. There are also some other increases. In the last Government the hon. Member for Kolonnawa was Minister. He now complains about the cost of living. What happened? They imposed restrictions on imports, they had few goods in the market, The large number of people trying to buy scarce goods sent up the prices. This is an inevitable thing that happens in a country. When a country develops, the cost of living increases. Could the

Members of the Opposition deny that the people today are having more money in their hands? This Sinhalese New Year they had much more money than they had before; they bought much more goods. Inevitably the cost of living must go up.

The two main reasons why the cost of living has gone up are: one, the devaluation which was referred to by the hon. Member for Colombo Central (Mr. Keuneman); we devalued 20 per cent, but the index rose by 8 points, not in proportion to the whole of this 20 per cent. Also there are certain unscrupulous traders who, because of the price of the FEECs, are putting up the prices of even those articles which are not covered by FEECs. As you know, when we introduced FEECs we made all food imports free; exchange was given for them at the old rates. Fertilizers were also allowed at the old rate. Of Rs. 300 million, Rs. 200 million was given at the old rate and only Rs. 100 million under FEECs. Therefore, Sir, you will see that this Government had taken certain measures to keep down the cost of living. The basic and essential requirements of the people were not affected by the FEECs scheme.

Sometimes the Government's policy has been a deliberate policy which has put up the cost of living. A deliberate decision was taken to ban the importation of chillies, and only the Government is now importing chillies. That is only for the purpose of giving the ration. Then, the importation of onions and potatoes too has been banned. This has inevitably made the prices of these articles to rise. That is only a temporary remedy to cure a certain disease, and soon, with increasing production, the prices are likely to come down, as we have seen in the case of chillies. With the increased production in chillies, the price of chillies, which was Rs. 8 or so per pound about four to five months back, has come down to Rs. 1.75 and Rs. 1.50 per pound. The Government had to take certain deliberate decisions in order to increase

production in this country, and certainly the fact that prices have gone up in the case of certain items is not a matter one should cavil at because, as has been seen, with increased production the prices are bound to come down.

Today some hon. Members were complaining that this Government without a heart has increased the price of arrack and the price of cigarettes by one cent. These two measures were not really taken in order to meet the loss in income tax, but we thought that we needed some remedy at these two points.—*[Interruption]*. If a person wants to drink he can drink the Gal Oya stuff at the old price. If a person wants coconut arrack he will have to pay two rupees more for a bottle. But we do not think that these are basic amenities. Certainly, for a country's development—I read out the figures relating to our development programme—some little sacrifice is necessary, a cigarette a day. I know that there are chain-smokers. I have one or two in my family who smoke one to two tins a day. They were able to give it up. I do not think it is such a great burden that is cast upon the people. But, let the people remember this. Last year we bought rice at £ 30 a ton; this year we are paying £ 60 a ton, but still, we have not charged them a cent extra. We are giving the rice free. Had we raised the price by five cents, rather, charged five cents a measure, we would have got a large revenue, but we did not touch the basic food of the people.

In the matter of clothing we had to remove the import duty on certain varieties in order to keep the prices down. The loss on this account is just equivalent to the amount realized by increasing the price of cigarette by one cent.

We have also stated that in future articles will be valued by the Customs on the c.i.f. value instead of the wholesale market value, and this is expected to bring relief to a large

[ශ්‍රී. එම්. ඩී. එච්. ජයවර්ධන]

section of the people. Therefore, you will see that the Government has taken certain definite measures to put down the cost of living as far as possible. An increase in the cost of living is inevitable in a developing country.

I shall now deal with one or two other features of the Budget. These are the main features of the Budget which I wish to comment on. In this Budget we have not had recourse to deficit financing or issue of treasury bills. The Budget has allocated a sum of nearly Rs. 869 million for capital expenditure. Certain income reliefs have been given to the middle-class. Although, in the case of those in the upper income limit, the marginal rate of tax has been reduced there is no real concession because the approved savings relief scheme under which they could have invested their money, has been removed. We propose to take steps in the future for capital formation in this country. Also, the Hon. Minister has announced in the Budget that he will see that shares of big concerns which employ more than 20 people, are open to the public, so that any person who has the money could buy shares in those companies which are today controlled by capitalists. The Hon. Minister has also simplified the payment of taxes by government servants and other salaried people by the "Pay As You Earn" system which will come into operation from next year. I congratulate the Hon. Minister on his very thoughtful Budget.

I should now like to deal with the departments under my Ministry. Some people are under the impression that the Ministry of Scientific Research is an old one. It was created only in February this year. People expect that the technological gap which exists today could be closed within a year or two. After the War science began to play an increasing role in the politics and governments of advanced countries as well as developing countries. All countries began to devote their energies to the application of technology to industries. In England there is not only a

Minister of Science, but also a Minister of Technology; showing the importance of technology. The gap that exists between the rich and the poor today can be closed and some of the things that the rich enjoy can be brought to the poor, only by the application of technology and science. I am glad the Hon. Prime Minister took this step to create a Ministry of Scientific Research, although it has very limited resources.

I must also explain for the benefit of some of the people who should know better, that when the Ministry of Scientific Research was created, for one month we were unable to procure a building. It took two months to get the money and buy the necessary furniture, and so on. And within three months the people expect us to bridge the technological gap that exists!

ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා

(කලාභිභි කොමන්ස් ජුරි. ඩී. සිල්වා)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

Who are these people? Who is the editor you are referring to?

ශ්‍රී. එම්. ඩී. එච්. ජයවර්ධන

(කෙළවරා ගම. ඩී. ඒ. ජයවර්ධන)

(The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena)

Some people have referred to the "wise words" that I spoke at the CASTASIA Conference. People must not think that those persons attending UNESCO Conference are fools and that they do not know the position of Ceylon. In fact the basic document on which the Conference discussions started had been prepared with a wealth of information and detail. There is a chapter devoted to Ceylon and I would like to read a paragraph:

"There is at present no institutional structure for formulating science policy or planning research activities; however, the possibility of creating a Ministry of Science or other central science policy body is receiving consideration. Co-ordination of scientific activity in certain sectors is effected by central research organizations coming under the Ministries of Agriculture, Health and Industries."

In 1966 the UNESCO Advisory Committee on the application of science and technology listed Ceylon among those countries in Asia where the government structures for the co-ordination and support of research were not sufficiently developed.

Therefore, when we went to the Conference we were aware of our drawbacks, but I am glad to state that at that Conference Ceylon was able to make many useful suggestions. Six or seven proposals made by Dr. Ponnampereuma, one of our delegates, were adopted by the Conference.

We in Ceylon do not have the necessary research institutions or the necessary funds for research, but we certainly have very good talent, and I am glad the opportunity was given to me to form the Science Council. We formed the Science Council as quickly as possible. Within three weeks of the passing of the Bill the Science Council was formed.

I am sorry to say that it has been utterly impossible to find accommodation to house the Science Council. For its meetings the Science Council uses a room in the C. I. S. I. R.

I am a layman. I am a lawyer by profession. But science policy has to be enunciated by the Science Council and given to me and it is only after that that I can put it to practical effect.

The Science Council consists of scientists and able administrators—a happy blend of persons who will be able to formulate a national science policy to harmonize with economic planning and with scientific manpower development, and hence with the educational system.

On the institutional side we have so far only the Ceylon Institute of Scientific and Industrial Research. That is the only scientific institution under my control. Some are under the impression that all research institutions are under my control. They are not. Only the C. I. S. I. R. is under my control.

In 1955 as Minister of Finance I piloted the Bill for the creation of this Institute, but, unfortunately, the Institute, its facilities and its scientific manpower have remained static for over ten years during which period the volume of industrialization has expanded more than tenfold. The institute asked for more land. Fortunately, because of the efforts of the Hon. Minister of Industries and Fisheries, we have been able to get four acres of land. We have asked for Rs. 20 million for the implementation of the expansion policy. The Treasury is refusing to give the money. The Treasury says, how can we give Rs. 20 million?

One of the resolutions adopted by the CASTASIA Conference is that a country should spend at least one per cent of its gross national product on the development of science. In advanced countries like the United States of America, in the countries of Europe, in Japan and in England, they are spending 3 per cent of their gross national product on science. In Ceylon, according to the UNESCO report, the total amount of money that has been spent on science is Rs. 27.5 million, of which half has been spent by the University both on teachers as well as scientists, and that works out to .009 per cent of our gross national product.

So when people talk of what this Ministry is doing, they do not take into consideration what is available in the form of money and other facilities. I shall say in a few minutes what I propose to do and what money I have got. Then you will realize that some definite steps are being taken to popularize science. Those who pass out of our schools do not know what a ray of light is. They do not know the fundamental principles of physics. When you ask them an elementary question, they are at sea.

This year, certain sums of money have been provided. We have asked for much more, but these are the moneys that have been given to us.

[මු. එම්. ඩී. එම්. ජයවර්ධන]

For the Science Council we have been promised Rs. 125,000. That is for the payment of salaries, subsistence, for prizes, land, and everything.

Then for a survey of scientific personnel we are to be provided with Rs. 10,000. We do not know how many scientists there are in Ceylon in the various branches of industry. We want to compile a survey of the scientists in the various fields so that industrialists will be able to know where these scientists are and whether they will be able to get their services.

We have asked for provision for special grants for fellowships, studentships, scholarships, prizes and medals. We have been allowed Rs. 25,000 and with that we propose to award research scholarships to the University, studentships for graduates as well as post-graduates.

Then we propose giving certain scholarships abroad to good scientists. As a matter of fact, when we made inquiries as to how much assistance would be wanted, we had a demand for nearly Rs. 5 million from our various scientists, recognized people, who asked whether they would be given money to complete their research in science. For that we have been given a token vote of Rs. 10.

Then for exchange of scientists we have been given a token vote of Rs. 10. For a science conference in Ceylon we have been given a vote of Rs. 10,000. We had a conference in India. We propose to have one, not on a large scale, in Ceylon too. It will be a conference of Indian scientists at the C. I. S. I. R. For printing and publications we have provision in a sum of Rs. 25,000.

Then there is an allocation for grants for purchase of books, journals and equipment. We had asked for Rs. 200,000. The Treasury has asked us to give details when the proposals come in.

Then there are grants to learned bodies. We have been given Rs. 100,000. There are twenty-two learned Societies. There are a chemical society and various other bodies. We have been given, as I said Rs. 100,000.

Towards contributions to international organizations, we have been allowed Rs. 5,960. This sum is the equivalent of a thousand dollars which we will be contributing to the Institute for Theoretical Physics at Trieste in Italy. They are doing problems in physics and mathematics.

We have also been given a certain amount for hospitality to distinguished visitors and scientists. We have been given a grant of Rs. 2,000, which is the amount that had been given in the previous year to the Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs.

Then we are asking for nearly Rs. 5 million. We have got some very good scientists at the C. I. S. I. R. I do not wish to mention their names. Most hon. Members are aware of them. They have asked for a national engineering laboratory for which a token provision of Rs. 10 has been made. I think the Treasury has given a token provision thinking that it cannot possibly be set up, but certainly we will do our best to see that plans are drawn up and everything is ready. I hope to have a start with this, and already a small committee has been appointed to work out the details. It is possible that in some of the factories they are not working full time. It is possible in these factories to produce other articles. The ECAFE report "On the Role and Application of Electric Power in the Industrialisation of Asia and the Far East 1965" recommends "that countries in the region give serious thought to the establishment and manufacture of units for heavy electrical equipment."

The Hon. Minister of Industries and Fisheries is hoping to turn out at the Hardware Corporation certain parts for lorry and bus chassis. In

The Steel Corporation and the Hardware Corporation it may be possible to produce certain multi-purpose machine tools, jigs and fixtures, and various other machine tools which will be necessary for industrial development of this country.

We have provision on a token vote for a National Instrumentation Centre. This Centre is to provide an effective maintenance, repair and calibration service for industrial, medical and scientific instruments. Having being a Minister of Finance and a Minister of Health I can say that there are 19 X-ray apparatus lying idle at the Electrical Engineer's Department because there are no people to repair them. This Instrumentation Centre is also listed to offer technical consultation service, to provide advance training in fields of instrumentation, to build, equip and develop research projects of other institutes, to produce instruments and apparatus which are not available locally and to assist and encourage local manufacture of instruments on well proven models.

We also expect to have a National Library and Documentation Centre. For this the Treasury has refused to sanction money, but we are pressing on with our demand for money.

We also have a Token Vote for an Employment Research Institute. This is rather an interesting one. The Ministry considers it desirable to set up a Research Institution which will investigate the possibilities of industrial development on a cottage basis, which will provide employment to large numbers.

We have also provision on a Token Vote for the establishment of a Physico-Mathematical Institute. Theoretical study of problems in physics, chemistry, engineering and statistics is required to complement the experimental work in these fields. I do not think I will be optimistic if I say that these works undertaken will be completed when even the machinery of Government is slow. There is difficulty in finding buildings and so on, but the Government

has taken the correct step. It will be my endeavour, with the help of the Science Council, to see that we take early steps to popularize science in Ceylon so that this technological gap could be bridged. Then we will be able to give the poorer people of this country some of those things which the rich enjoy today.

I shall now come to the Anuradhapura Preservation Board. That is also another department which has been brought under the control of the Ministry of Scientific Research and Housing. Steps have been taken to clear the sacred city. Now commercial buildings have been removed and only the government offices are still remaining there. I propose to get a grant of Rs. 5 lakhs from the National Housing Department to put up at least 250 houses in the new town area so that the sacred city area may be clear of commercial buildings. There is also the water supply scheme which is still in Stage I. The water supply scheme has to be expanded because Stage I caters only for 5,000 people. Now there are 15,000 people living in that area. Work in regard to Stage II and III is held up for want of water. The Hon. Prime Minister appointed a Committee in 1966 to attend to local administrative requirements.

The recommendations of that committee have been examined both by the Ministry of Local Government and my Ministry and soon a Bill will be introduced to set up a new local authority there. I hope it will be of the status of a municipal council. An amendment to the existing law is necessary. As you know, Sir, the Anuradhapura Preservation Board has been given authority over the area and therefore an amendment to the law is necessary. An Amending Bill will be introduced.

I would now refer to housing. I shall deal with this subject in a few sentences. As you know, the Housing Department has been without a permanent head for a long time. It has been unfortunate that in the Housing

[ශ්‍රී ලංකා ජනරජයේ නිවසේ සේවකයෙකු]

Department the people there have been changing very often and with the new administrative set-up also I see signs of people who do not stay there for long. With better prospects elsewhere they want to go away. It has also been a tragedy that even a Minister for Housing has not stayed there long. So we have had the situation where large sums have been owing to the Housing Department.

We have nearly Rs. 9.4 million owing to the Housing Department in respect of instalment payments on monies which have been advanced to build houses. We have Rs. 9.1 million owing to us as arrears of rent. It had been the practice up to now for those who had fallen into arrears to come forward with a request to compound their dues saying that they will pay later. Such requests had been readily granted. But I think I am going to be unpopular because I am not going to give this concession. I find one who borrowed in 1956 up to Rs. 9 lakhs and Rs. 10 lakhs, and who only recently paid Rs. 21,000. Now, without exception, all those people have to pay up. We have speedy methods to deal with these cases.

I find people are going to courts seeking injunctions against us to prevent us from taking possession of these properties. I can assure these people that they cannot play out government money and get away with it. The law is still powerful and the law can be amended to bring these people within the reach of the law. I can assure these people that though they can go to courts and get writs and injunctions against us to delay proceedings, though they remove bathroom fittings, and window fittings and door fittings, and damage their property, they cannot get away with it. Soon the law will catch up with them.

The Housing Department has, during the last three years, given as much in loans as during the last ten

years. It came to a stage during the last year when housing loans had to be stopped. During the last three years, 6,130 persons were given loans involving a commitment of Rs. 66.5 million. From 1955-65 the Housing Department has helped 7,700 persons with loans amounting to Rs. 100 million. So, you will see that within the three years we have done a little more than half as much as what they have done in the 10 years that preceded us.

We came to such a position that the granting of loans had to be suspended during the last year. Sometimes I see the Press asking me why I do not raise housing debentures when it is possible. All I can say is that these housing debentures have to be raised with the concurrence of my Friend, the Minister of Finance, who says, if I raise housing debentures there will be less money for him to raise. He is hoping to raise Rs. 375 million while I only want a small sum of Rs. 20 million or Rs. 30 million. To get permission from him is very difficult. But he has been sympathetic towards this housing problem and he has allowed us Rs. 10 million and a further Rs. 8 million, so that we will be able to take up the applications sent to us last year and all applications up to September, 1967 which have come to the final stages.

Owing to the prosecutions we have started—rather the recoveries we have started—we have found that there are a large number owing us over Rs. 59,000 in each case. So, in every single case, excepting the unfortunate cases where the bread-winner of the family has died or where someone has got into some trouble and so on, we give them a further chance. All the other people who borrowed at 3 1/2 per cent. and 4 per cent. and 5 per cent. who have put up large mansions. Some have tenements and are making money. I have directed that no mercy be shown to this type of person and that arrears must be recovered as soon as possible.

There are a large number of people waiting for houses. There is my good Friend from Colombo Central who is trying to build a new township and has allocated 17 acres of land for the purpose. This is a Trojan horse. They say, "Fear the Greeks when they bring gifts", but my Hon. Friend, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Local Government has not brought me a gift but 17 acres of land and wants me to develop the land. I have paid the money and bought the 17 acres. He has put up some 20 buildings while the land I have got is yet undeveloped.

However, I can give him the assurance that, as soon as I got this money, I hope to set aside Rs. 1 million for the Maligawatte Extension Scheme and help solve even in some measure the slum problem in Colombo.

In regard to the shanty problem in Colombo, I should like to tell this House that 4,000 shanties come up every year. Already we have 31,000 shanties in Colombo. These have got to be completely cleared, and for that purpose I have proposed that a Housing Corporation be set up.

Today there are a number of authorities for housing. The Minister of Local Government has a slum clearance programme. He is in charge of rent control, not I. The Minister of Housing is really helpless because rent control has a direct influence in house building activities. The Minister of Fisheries puts up houses for fishermen. The Land Development Department puts up houses in colonization schemes. There is the Irrigation Department which puts up houses for the people in that department.

So, you find that there are a large number of bodies spending large sums of money for housing but the activities of these bodies are not co-ordinated.

As I said before, I have proposed that a Housing Corporation be set up—this is mentioned in the Throne

Speech too—with wide powers to borrow money. I hope the Hon. Minister of Finance will give his approval to this scheme. This money is not given free. We are charging seven per cent. on the loans which originally they got for much less. Rates of interest have gone up. I am trying to get the Housing Department to charge economic rents on its houses because a large number of houses are in need of urgent repairs and are collapsing.

Houses which we rent to the public for Rs. 133, are rented out by them for Rs. 300 and they live in one room or the garage. They appropriate the profit which is made at the Government's expense. There are people who do not leave their houses. They rent it to others and make a profit on the deal. This should be stopped. So, I propose to charge an economic rent from people who rent out new houses.

I should like to inform this House that 1,800 flats will be ready by the end of this year and we will be able to solve even in some measure the housing problem in Colombo.

There are also certain other measures we propose to take. We have been in consultation with private industry in the matter of housing. Certain private firms with whom we are in consultation, have large sums of money in their provident funds. They need only land to build upon. I have promised to give them land on three conditions: firstly, they must charge a reasonable rent and hire purchase must be considered; the houses must be given to people who do not own houses; the houses must be approved by the Housing Department. If they are agreeable to keep to these conditions I am prepared to acquire suitable land round about Colombo and give it to these firms to build on so that the problem of housing will be eased.

[ගරු එම්. ඩී. එච්. ජයවර්ධන]

I am also happy that certain firms who have connections with international organizations having money in Ceylon, are also interested in this proposition. Unfortunately, they cannot come in until the Government comes to a decision that housing has to be given top priority and that housing is as urgent as providing food and clothing. If this decision is made I am certain that foreign capital will also come in. Many people have discussed this problem with me and I am glad to say that they are prepared to participate in this work if there is an assurance by the Government in this matter.

There are also various amendments to the law, which I do not have the time to deal with in detail. I have set up a Building Material Committee to find ways and means of providing the people with low-cost building materials. There is also research going on into low-cost housing which has up to now been under the Minister of Local Government and which he has kindly handed over to me. A committee has been set up with the Commissioner of Housing as Chairman to put up a scheme to provide builders with low-cost housing. So that you will see that we are doing everything possible within the limited finances available to us to give the people cheaper housing. Therefore, as Minister of Housing, I do realize that two very important functions have been assigned to me—Housing which is as important as food and clothing and Scientific Research by which we hope to bring science and technology within the reach of the people. As I said before, we hope to bring the amenities which the rich enjoy to the poor.

We here in the Front Benches are conscious that time is running short not only for speeches but also for the Government. We have only 1½ years more and within that time a large amount of work has to be done. We have been in office for 3½ years. Although the hon. Member of Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) thinks

that 3½ years is a very long period—perhaps it is a long period compared to his six months—it is not such a long time in the life of a nation or even in that of an individual. In the 3½ years we have been able to arrest the deterioration of the economy. The economy which was going down the slippery slope of bankruptcy, we have restored in the first two years. The last three years has seen us upsurging the economy, and now people are beginning to realize that some of the measures which were taken in between the budgets, which were unpopular, are now yielding fruit. The people will soon realize that this Government, when it gives a little dose of medicine, gives it for a good purpose to make the child healthy. Now we are happy that we took some of those measures, some bold measures which other Governments may have hesitated to take. Who would have taken the measures that we have taken? They would have looked to the polls and said, “these would make us unpopular and therefore in order to be in power we will carry on as we have done in the past.” They made allegations against us that we had taken these measures in spite of all the strikes, in spite of all the hartals. We are glad that because of a firm Prime Minister these decisions were taken and they are now bearing fruit.

We realize that in this short period much has to be done. We therefore ask for the co-operation of the Public Service. In the Public Service as you know—I need not say much—every year various strikes, various actions, direct actions and many other things, have been talked about which halt the march of progress. We appeal to them to join hands with us in this national endeavour. What are we trying to do? We are trying to bring the fruits of freedom to our people. It is a great task that is before us and in that great task we are happy that under the leadership of our Prime Minister we will not fail in our duty and that we will be able to say that within our period we have done some work for the future prosperity of this

ஏ. ஓ. 455

காலவியல் காலவியல் காலவியல்

(கலாநிதி கொல்வின ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

It is always a pleasure to follow upon the Hon. Minister who now has Housing and Scientific Research in his charge, because there is about him a bonhomie which tends to disarm criticism and also, incidentally, effectively to shield the fact that apologetics is substituted for achievement.

I am also following him and so many other speakers today in the language they have chosen to use because perhaps I myself may very well enjoy a little deviation into what seems to be the customary deviation in the last two days of the Budget Debate in so far as language is concerned.

Long years ago there was a University professor by the name of Rev. Spooner who attained great celebrity by his capacity to mix up syllables. There was one occasion on which he had said that he was tired of lecturing to weary benches. I noticed that tiredness had overtaken the Hon. Minister of Industries even at the very beginning of this Debate. Perhaps, we should ask ourselves why this weariness has descended upon the House in this Debate. It is, in the first place, not a situation that has arisen suddenly. I have noted that in the last year or certainly in the last six months this situation has been creeping upon us more and more until it became clear that, save for very exceptional occasions, everybody had to address not so much weary benches as empty benches. I think there is a reason for it and I should like, even on the occasion of a Budget Debate, to say that there are two reasons why it has happened broadly in this very Debate. On the one hand, there has grown up in this House, as I have noticed, an increasing sense of the normal and general irrelevancy of what is said and done here to what is actually being done. We are eternally discussing what prove to be irrelevancy. We are

discussing what has been done instead of what is to be done. This applies—and that is the second reason—also to this Budget. I listened to it. I always make it a point to be present so long as I occupy any of the Front Benches of the Opposition, whenever the Budget Speech is delivered because I think, apart from all else, it is a matter of elementary courtesy to any Finance Minister that we should be present to listen to a speech of which considerable part ordinarily comes out of the Central Bank Report of the previous year. Nobody is to be blamed for it. That is the primary source of our criticism.

But this year, I must confess, I had a besetting feeling of the irrelevancy of the Budget to the situation in hand. I think there that irrelevancy flows not from the habitual tendency of a very likeable Finance Minister to substitute humour for argument. He is one of the humorous men I have known in this House. The great misfortune is that Finance Ministers who are humorous tend to act also in terms of humour and it is the country which has to pay. But in this case, it is my firm belief, because it has been, I think, illustrated and exemplified over the years of this Government, that the real reason why the Finance Minister has adopted what I will call the protective cover of substituting humour for argument is that he is merely a channel for ideas and measures which are determined elsewhere, that he is only an instrument, and what is more, only a devil's advocate for what is really a devilish kind of economic policy.

It is impossible any longer for any Member of this House to believe—and I say so with all respect to every Member of the Cabinet—that the major economic decisions are in fact made in the Cabinet itself. One gets over and over again the strong impression that the Cabinet only considers how to carry out what has been proposed to it as something it should carry out by forces outside this country which, however respectable they may be, in the form of the

[ආවර්ග කොළින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා]

International Bank for Reconstruction and Development or the International Monetary Fund and the like, are nevertheless operating with outlooks and theories outmoded even in the countries which originally gave those outlooks and theories to us. It looks to me as if our country has been used as a kind of guinea pig in the last 3½ years. I understand why that situation has arisen.

Two aspects of that situation have come together to produce that result. On the one hand, as the Hon. Prime Minister once reminded me in the course of one of my speeches in this House, they believe firmly in the capitalist process. Of course, he called it private enterprise. But this is a well known substitute for a very old phase. Secondly, the Government of the day is beholden to the International Monetary Fund and other such bodies for essential finances. Now, he who extends credit has some degree of control over the debtor, as every firm in Ceylon which goes, for instance, to the Bank of Ceylon to borrow in a major way discovers. When it is unable to pay its interest or its capital instalments back, the Bank of Ceylon, exercising its right, places upon the board of the company a representative of itself. What is very important is that it imposes upon the particular firm a certain framework within which it must work. It literally insists that it drops certain lines and concentrates on others, and then, like the creditor seeking to protect his investment, uses the powers it has in that way to impose lines of policy upon the firm which has borrowed, independent of the debtor's wishes thereon. Here, of course, the debtor is only too willing because the debtor, as I pointed out through the mouth of the Hon. Prime Minister, accepts the basic outlook and theory of the policy that has been steadily imposed upon him.

Now, this is how I see it. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund and the rest of them are

manned by men who certainly are capable financiers but whose assumptions are the assumptions of theorists of a freely functioning, uninhibited capitalists economy. That is manifest from all their reports. I do not propose to quote and worry the House with quotations, or with statistics, in particular, because I think at this moment the House is suffering from what I will only call a "statistical indigestion". Everybody is flinging statistics at the other, and everybody is interrupting the other's statistics, and at the end of it I should imagine normal hon. Members of this House must be wondering whether out of figures there ever cometh any sense.

Be that as it may, Sir, I see it in this way. Now, for instance, I heard the Hon. Minister who preceded me, as I have heard other Hon. Ministers in this House, defend a position which increasingly becomes manifest in respect of their policy without public acknowledgment, that in truth and in fact this Government has given up what has been a standing objective of previous governments, namely, the imposition of a ceiling upon prices of a reasonable height or nature, in the interest of maintaining certain standards of living. For that they have substituted a policy which is infused or informed by the idea, which is purely a market idea, on which I really noted that in his final speech during the Throne Speech Debate the Hon. Prime Minister almost mesmerised himself—"What", he said, "everybody is turning to paddy because there is money in it." I am not on the question whether everybody is turning to paddy. Let the paddy experts discuss paddy. I have some views on the paddy question, but with the time at my command I do not propose to enter into that. The point he made was this: the market incentive is the instrument which the Government is using in the field on which it concentrates, and which I would call broadly, food production.

Now, you will see, Sir, that precisely in respect of that field, what is termed a "market incentive" is a technical term merely, for not

adequate prices but increasing profits in a so-called private enterprise—that is capitalism—economy. This incentive is ever enhancing profits. Now, Sir, if in the field of food that is made the incentive, whether you like it or not it will have strong, powerful, adverse, repercussions upon the cost of living. It is not necessary for me to discuss that here. It is so. You may adopt any line of theory, but that is so.

So, now we have got a new philosophy being thrust upon us, the philosophy of high prices for the producer regardless of the consequences to the consumer. This, Sir, is the fundamental basis on which the foreign banks are advising our Government, and our Government is pursuing that. Thus it is that despite a manipulated cost-of-living index—all the world knows that we have a grossly manipulated cost-of-living index—despite that manipulation we have had a steadily rising cost-of-living index until today we have the highest on record. Now, if the Government would publicly admit that it has thus given up substantially, not in every single detailed respect but substantially, the old-time objective—in my view the necessary objective in every case, of any Government, but nevertheless I call it the old-time objective—of keeping down the cost of living in the interest of what they believe to be a stimulation of production much of the debates that take place in this House and in this country would be conducted within a more relevant framework and to more pertinent ends. For this is a fundamental question. These airy remarks that we have heard in this Hon. House—some of them—are gems which are worthy of eternal preservation.

May I go out of this line of argument to say, it is a wonderful thing. I am sorry I was not here to hear it but I have read it. I think it is the 2nd Member for Akurana (Mr. Hameed) who gave a very simple solution to the problem that has been raised about the steady swelling of the public debt. He said,

“Why is everybody worried about this public debt? Surely everybody knows that no country pays its public debt but that some day it would stage a revolution and get away with it.” Perhaps it did not occur to him that you require a revolution for the liquidation. That is neither here nor there. I do not think it is the line of thought of this Government although it was a bright remark from Akurana. I hope, when some future Government in the interest of liquidating the public debt in that way decides to confiscate, through the cancellation by mere decree of the debts of the Government which are owing to some well to do people of this country, the hon. Member for Akurana will stand up to support it with a cheer.

We have some wonderful things like that mentioned, which I am not going into. If you look at it this way, in the manner in which I propose to place before this House, one can understand why there is a lack of immediate or heightened interest in this honourable House itself in the budget proposals as such. Sir, one would have thought there would be a great stir for instance when the Hon. Minister of Finance produced the largest budget gap in our history, but he did it with the air on the one hand of one of these habitual magicians who first produces his hat in order to later produce the rabbit out of it. He first said “I have got a deficit of Rs. 850 million, I will do this.” Really it started with Rs. 1,100 million. Then he did something with the figures and said it was Rs. 850 million. Then he did something else and said Rs. 300 million. He borrowed something from somewhere, he added something from somewhere, like a man cooking a broth. He brought a little pepper in, added a little salt; then he added a little oil and pummelled the fire a bit and said there was a surplus!

I think he is wiser in his generation than he pretends. I am quite sure he hadn't a gap of Rs. 850 million. He knows in his heart of hearts that whilst he is budgeting for this

[අමර්ස කොල්ලේන් ආදී ද සිල්වා]

monstrous expenditure, at the end of this year he would not have spent the money he asked for. He knows he has utmost safety in following that procedure because in this House we live in a strange world. Every year we discuss a budget in relation to a previous budget whose actual financial performance is not yet known because it has not been possible to close the accounts in advance. About a year or two afterwards, sometimes three or four years after, a body called the Public Accounts Committee, over which a colleague of mine today certainly presides with utmost grace and considerable efficiency, produces a report in which we are told various things, and nobody who is currently in Parliament even remembers what the wretched thing was. So, we all say, "A wonderful Public Accounts Committee, a glorious Auditor-General's Department. Look at the amount of muck-raking they have done." And if there is anything spicy somebody comes and reads it. But in the meantime the Government had rumbled on long ahead. It is a waste of time. I am sorry, but I admit I have often felt that the time and care that we spend on studying the Budget when it is presented is one of the greater wastes of time to which in fact the Front Bench of the opposition is committed by parliamentary tradition.

We know that this gap is not as big as that, but the Hon. Minister of Scientific Research and Housing just now let off a set of figures in answer to a question of the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central. He said there were only so many millions spent in 1962, so much spent on the capital budget in 1963, so much spent in 1964. And then he said, "In the 1965 Budget we voted so much, in the 1966 Budget we voted so much." And when the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central asked, "How much did you spend?", the Hon. Speaker who was in the Chair said, "You must not interrupt the Hon. Minister." So, we did not interrupt him. But I am sure he did not know

the figures anyhow. If he did, he was not going to read them to us, he was going to crack a joke.

If you took one year's figures in comparison with those of another immediately before that, it should be discovered that they had under-spent to the tune of 21 per cent on the capital budget. And if you took the 20 per cent in that capital budget and related it to the actual expenditure of a previous budget two years before, the figures would be approximately the same. My hon. Friend from Katugampola is reminding me of a matter, which I shall advert to, but before I do so I want to say that this is beautiful window-dressing. For the rest of the year every hon. Member of the Government can go round and say, "We have appropriated so much for this and so much for the other." For instance, the Hon. Minister of Public Works goes round the country eternally telling us how much money has been appropriated for his roads. But, for all I know, the wretched roads have more and more pot-holes every year. Maybe, because of the increase of traffic!

There is another thing: in these comparisons none of them brings in the fall in the value of the rupee. What is the good of telling us, "This year we are putting aside Rs. 867 million on the capital budget when it is in terms of rupees which have been twice devalued in the last year, 20 per cent lawfully and legally, and then by your entering into black-market operations through the FEEC? The generally accepted position is that the true devaluation approximates to the 40 per cent which Mr. N. U. Jayawardane, for instance, advised, echoing, I think, the I. M. F. So, what is the good of saying you gave Rs. 867 million as against Rs. 500 million? For, if you take 40 per cent of the Rs. 500 million, then you are entitled to add to that apparently, another Rs. 300 or 350 million. And, lo and behold! in the end you have your Rs. 850 million. So, you are really doing no very great thing. Leave the expenditure part aside because you will not spend the

money. That is certain. No Government will contract to spend the major portion of its capital budget, especially the new part, usefully, unless and until, in my view, it does a fundamental reconstruction of the entire administrative system. To me, I wish to say in this honourable House, that is fundamental, and I wish to admit in this honourable House that I have spent a considerable time studying it. It is not relevant to talk about it here.

It seems to be the custom and habit of any government in this country every time it thinks of a new idea or a new line of effort to immediately proliferate a new department. It will never look into the question whether by the more efficient functioning of what it already has it can get the job done. There are too many vested interests in the Public Service to look at it in that way, leave aside the laziness of the Government to think of matters anew.

So I honestly say to the Minister of Finance, I do not believe that you will spend on capital purposes the totality or the substantiality of your capital budget.

But there is another side to this. He says, I am finding this money locally also. He is going to do it by local borrowing apart from local money manufacture—some Rs. 325 million, if my memory serves me correct—having already found a new source of which he spoke a little proudly—Rs. 360 million from the FEECs scheme, that is, from blackmarketing in currency.

He says, I have got all this. But I believe that the Rs. 325 million, the borrowing prospects or expectation of that amount, has a relationship to his income tax re-modelling scheme.

From where are you going to borrow in this country? It is idle to say that the large body of the money that the Government borrows every year comes from the broad public. It does not. Everyone knows it. It comes from a rather narrow

body of people of whom incidentally the banks are the principals. Then there are those who have what may be termed large savings—savings which are so large that they cannot even spend them on conspicuous consumption.

Now what the Minister seems to me to have done is this. He says, I will re-model the income tax slabs, particularly in the upper-reaches thereof, in such a manner that I will increase the amount of money in the hands of the very rich.

It is quite true that he has stopped this tax-holiday up to a point. He says that only industries of a special character, pioneering industries, will enjoy that concession. I think “pioneering industries” will be found too often to be those who know how effectively to get into the inner reaches and secret recesses of the governmental structure. That is by the way. These things happen in every country. I am not bothered about that.

But my point is this. In the Kaldor scheme there was an inter-connexion between the reduction of the upper levels of the income tax and the expenditure tax. In fact there was a connexion between that and the wealth tax, the gift tax and so on. I am not on that. But this much may be said for Kaldor who in my opinion is not one of the prize economists in the world: he related his reduction of the upper income tax rates to the introduction of an expenditure tax by which he sought to compel the money released into the hands of the rich in the direction of investment instead of consumption. Here we have nothing like that. We have come back. Kaldor, I believe, recommended 45 per cent. The newspapers, I remember, before my Hon. Friend got up, were also talking of 45 per cent. those days, the 45 per cent, if I remember, was 65 per cent. Now also there seems to be some compromise with 65 per cent.

But the important thing is that the higher you go the greater is the amount of money released to a person

[ආධාරය කෙරෙහි ආදිය ද සිලවා]

who already, by definition, does not require that money himself. So that every person seeks for greater wealth. And that is where I say once again that the financial officers of this Government, be they abroad or at home—that makes no difference to me in this part of my discussion and argument—are going on the assumption, which is of the classical, out-moded economy of even the 19th century and before, that there is a person called a capitalist who is governed entirely in his motives, psychology, habits of living and so on, by the need to maximize his investments, and that therefore wherever he will find money coming into his hands he will invest it in further productive investment, that is further profitable investment. And therefore you have simply said, “Leave the money in his hands and somehow it will get invested.” I say, that assumption is unjustified in this country's conditions today. I am not talking of other countries. I am talking of Ceylon. I am not talking of the generality of under-developed countries. I am talking of Ceylon which I regard as an under-developed country; and I, for my part, am not shamed to call my country under-developed instead of using this utterly deceptive phrase about ‘developing countries’. It is an under-developed country.

The important point is, it is not a mere question of under-development that I am referring to. We are living under the extremest exchange and production difficulties. We have admittedly grave shortages, and it is pointed out, and was pointed out by my Hon. Friend the Minister of Housing and Scientific Research using his own theories as a former Minister of Finance, that the Government is trying to at least minimize the question of the cost of living in the field of essentials. The price rise and shortages are not in the field of absolute essentials, he said. He is very fair sometimes. He apparently, said, “Chillies are in short supply; we have made it deliberately short.

Onions are not available; We deliberately have made it unavailable because we think there are too many tears being shed in this country.” But in essence, he said, it is when you go upwards in the scale from absolute essentials to lesser essentials and so on up to ultimate luxuries that the great shortages and the high prices prevail. Be it so, and I will bring that to bear on my present argument. Precisely for that reason you will find that this measure will drive up prices and I will show you why.

First of all, the richer you are, the less you are concerned with the expenditure on absolute essentials which anyhow the Government claims it guarantees to everyone. Therefore, once that basic substratum, if you like, of essentials has been disposed of, the richer you are the more you chase after those other amenities of life which are now of common use in other countries but are rarities here. So what happens? The people with the money in their hands in the circumstances of considerable shortages in innumerable lines of goods chase after those lines of goods, according to their needs and their desires regardless almost of the price question.

I happen to know of a certain gentleman, a foreign gentleman, who has been here for some time, who had brought here a refrigerator which in terms of the currency which it cost him to bring it from England was Rs. 1,600, and he told me personally that a gentleman came along and offered him Rs. 10,000 for that refrigerator because he could not get one like that and money was meaningless. He was not interested in joining Sir Cyril de Zoysa in producing a refrigerator. He was more interested in getting one for his house. This happens in every line up and down the ladder; and we must never forget a simple market principle which we tend to forget in our discussions. It is not high economics. This is everyday economics. If one line of goods gets pulled up sharply

in price, it tends to pull up related lines of goods in price. We know that, and when a group of related lines of goods are pulled up in price, it has a general upward tug on the general price situation and thus we have rising prices. I related it to the factor—whether it be right or wrong—that we have innumerable shortages. So what the Hon. Minister of Finance is doing by placing more money in the hands of the rich will not I claim and contend, have the results which he believes it will have, that is, releasing to the capitalist in private enterprise—which is always enterprising in the wrong way; it is the source of the biggest public corruption in the country—more and more money hoping he will invest and cause a development in the economy. I say this is a wrong view that has been brought into operation.

Let us look at these matters and this Budget, and see what is happening in another way. My Hon. Friend, the Minister of Scientific Research and Housing, argued that we would have got more out of devaluation if they had not been kindhearted. He said, "We gave Rs. 10 here and Rs. 15 there, to this public servant and the other, and if we did not give that money we would have got more out of devaluation." What is the basic of this argument? For 20 years in this honourable House, I, who had not claimed to be an economist, literally howled against adopting, automatically, Keynesian assumptions in respect of public expenditure for the stimulation of Ceylon's economy. For instance, I was not concerned about the validity or otherwise of Keynesian economics in England, though I am ready to discuss it, if necessary. In Ceylon we have a simple fact. I pointed out time after time in Budget speeches this normal fact which everybody thought was rooted in this terrible Marxism in which I operate. It is simply this. We are an economy in which a major portion of our economic circuit is outside. That is the meaning of saying that we are an export-import economy. We produce

certain primary products, send them and sell them abroad and import manufactured and other products. So that every time you injected money into this economy in times of sagging of the economy, in order to stimulate the economy into greater production, in a country where you were dealing with primary products and not with manufactured products what you did was to stimulate imports; that is to say, to stimulate, to give aid to the manufacturer abroad who was exporting to us. If we had the manufacturing power and the circuit sufficiently and substantially in our country, then the Keynesian principle of injecting public expenditure into a sagging economy could have resulted to a degree in the stimulation of the domestic economy as a whole. Today nobody argues about that kind of thing very much. I notice that this hon. House has got away from old Keynes. I do not know who is the latest totem that is being worshipped in the economic section of our Government. I do not know.

May I be permitted a little witticism? I was purely injected into another argument. I saw in the newspapers last week that Dr. Gamini Corea—I hope it is not improper to refer to him—who is known to be the chief financial wizard, almost the financial panjandrum behind this Government, no doubt intended to make a kindly remark that would assist the Government in the present situation, I hope, or otherwise. Let us be nice to him. He had made the remark, "At last, we have now made the economy dynamic."

Sir, Dr. Corea, to my knowledge, is a very dynamic person but he must not mistake his own dynamism of effort for the dynamism of the economy. The economy is sagging while he is making every effort to put it up. I shall deal with this later if I have the time left. It is that the business of injecting expenditure in that way has gone. What do we have today? What has replaced that? I am interested in this matter. I am trying to be of some use in these discussions. Since the first Hon. Minister who

[අ.ම.ව. කොල්ලින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා] spoke in this Budget Debate tried to introduce a philosophy and even elementary economics into the discussions, I am willing to do a little elementary discussion myself on occasions.

Now, I was coming along then to the question of what is happening in terms of own position in regard to expenditure. I will go on from there to another aspect of the discussion I wish to enter into.

Apart from what I call, fundamental primitive capitalist assumptions of this Government, in respect of policy it dabbles occasionally in certain other assumptions, and therefore the Hon. Minister of Industries seems to be the sole propagator of it in the present Debate. I may appear to tilt at him, but I like to do my tilting to some purpose. I prefer to enter into political fights with those who are decisive in politics like, for instance, the Hon. Prime Minister and not with his satellites. There is no point. But, nevertheless, that was only an effort to introduce some theoretical concept allegedly other than the IBRD concept into this Debate. So, I want to say something.

The Hon. Minister of Industries deal with a thing called the mixed economy. In the course of dealing with the mixed economy he found it necessary to refer to trouser buttons with which he ought not to be familiar nowadays. He said, you do not want public production of trouser buttons. I do not know what he was adverting to. He must have been trying to think of something unusual. He wears a cloth and so I presume he uses no trouser buttons. So, what does he deal with. There is, in fact, no economy in this world today that does not have a mixed economy—not even in the Soviet Union. In it also are whole patches and sectors of what you would call private production. That is well known, and in fact one of the arguments of the anti-Soviet people in the world is that those little sectors, for instance, in the field of agriculture, where a little plot is still allowed to the

collective farm peasant, that they are more fruitful and productive than the general collective farms.

So, everything is mixed. But when we mix out economies we must not mix our ideas. That is a different field. We must not, under the idea of a mixed economy, confuse ourselves about economic ideas with which we are dealing.

The question is not whether there is some degree of a public section or some degree of a private sector in an economy. The question is, what is the fundamental governing set of principles on the basis of which that economic system functions? And when the Hon. Prime Minister, who I believe is loyal to his economic principles, says he stands for what he calls "private enterprise economy" I believe in his sincerity I do not argue with him about it. I think it is grossly and gravely wrong and it is doing a great damage to this country.

If I may say as an interlude, we have been dealing with this wretched mixed economy in Ceylon even since Independence. The late Mr. D. S. Senanayake never used this term "mixed economy". He was a sensible man. He spoke about normal things in a reasonable way and left the theories to the theoreticians. He dealt with facts and left the theory to look after itself. We are paying the consequences because even though you act without a conscious theory, there is a theoretical basis, unconsciously, in you, and even if the theory is wrong and the practice appears correct, at the end the country will pay.

What I want to say is this: we have been talking about this mixed economy ever since Independence, for 20 long years, and the situation we find ourselves in at the end is sufficient proof of the failure of this mixed economy theory. Here are we struggling against the rising cost of living, shortages in every known department, arguing whether we shall be self-sufficient in rice, arguing whether the increase, the

shooting up of our flour imports, has any relation to the Government's claim as to the increase in paddy production and so on. And we are just where we were.

I have been here off and on for twenty years and, as far as the essentials of economic discussions are concerned. I am sorry I do not think this House has been guilty of a discussion that was altogether fresh in this entire 20 years. So what is this ?

The Hon. Minister of Industries and Fisheries said, "O, we have a public sector; we have a private sector. We are encouraging both the sectors." I am not using his language but that is the essence of what he said. Now, that is an achievement which, I am sorry, not even a gentleman who has crossed from socialism to capitalism can achieve. You cannot do that. If you are stimulating the public sector you will find that you are invading the private sector; if you are stimulating the private sector, whether you like it or not you will be invading the public sector.

My hon. Friend, the Minister of State is a clearer thinker in mixed economies than his Colleague.

ஒரு சே. கா. பீ. பீ. பீ. பீ. பீ.

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

Not only I. Mrs. Bandaranaike also.

ஃல்டீய ஃல்டீயன் ஃல்டீ. ஃல்டீய

(கலாநிதி கொலின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

I am very glad to hear that. Both of you are clear thinkers. Of the two you may be the clearer thinker. She is clearly, however, the person who is going to control the thinking of the future.

ஒரு சே. கா. பீ. பீ. பீ. பீ.

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

If I may draw your attention—

ஃல்டீய ஃல்டீயன் ஃல்டீ. ஃல்டீய

(கலாநிதி கொலின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

After I have finished what I am saying you can interrupt me, gladly. I do not know what you are going to say; but you do not know what I am going to say.

ஒரு சே. கா. பீ. பீ. பீ. பீ.

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

You stimulated me.

ஃல்டீய ஃல்டீயன் ஃல்டீ. ஃல்டீய

(கலாநிதி கொலின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

I was just about to say this — and you will see that I am speaking correctly; you will not need to make your quotation if you wait a bit: the Hon. Minister of State publicly acknowledged that one of the lines of his policy is to hand back as far as possible to private capitalists what has been taken over by the State in various ways. He has followed that in the C. W. E., he has followed that in Laksala and Salu Sala and so on. It is well known. If he could, had he control over the other corporations which everybody is boasting about, he would follow that same policy. In tourism he is following it. He understands. He is a private enterpriser. He is a good capitalist, politician, and economist.

Very good. He says, "I am caught up in a framework which has been created, against which I struggled in my time helplessly and development had been anew since I was Finance Minister and now we have an ever growing public sector. What am I to do? Even as Minister of State I will begin to chip into it as much as I can. I will hand back." He is a very clear thinker in his economics. Do you wish to interrupt me with the quotation now? I am sure you do not.

ஒரு சே. கா. பீ. பீ. பீ. பீ.

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

I do

ஃபர்வீஸ் கொல்வின் ஃபர். டி. சில்வா

(கலாநிதி கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

I am always willing to give way to anyone.

ஃபர்வீஸ் கொல்வின் ஃபர். டி. சில்வா

(கொளவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

I want to draw the hon. Member's attention to the Ten-year Plan of the S. L. F. P. Government. I refer to HANSARD of 6th August 1964; Volume 56, column 1734:

"A mixed economy essentially means co-operation and partnership between the public and the private sectors."

ஃபர்வீஸ் கொல்வின் ஃபர். டி. சில்வா

(கலாநிதி கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

I said that every Government for 20 years has been following this wretched mixed economy policy. Whenever I happened to be in this House, which is with considerable interruption, I spent a lot of my time on these occasions showing why this is a meaningless thing.

The question is, what is the mixture? What are the proportions? The Minister of State is beginning to get rid, to change the proportions of the past to the extent within his power. And I am sorry the Minister of Industries also is reversing the proportions of the mixture in a reverse direction from what he thought was necessary when he was in Bandaranaike's M.E.P. Government. That is all right. Men change with times, their ideas change with times, their associates change with times and even their masters change with times. It does not matter. I feel no bitterness about these things. After all it is part of life that some people should degenerate and others should regenerate and so on. We must learn to take the rough with the smooth and keep to the main road.

At the same at time the Ministers one after the other—the last was the Minister of Housing—boasted about their achievements. When somebody interrupted and said, "Your profits are coming from the industries and corporations we launched", back came the retort from the Minister of Housing, "But we are making them profitable while the S. L. F. P. Government and so on did not." All honour to those who make them profitable. But I wish to say that we have always held, and I have constantly contended, that properly run every one of these public sector enterprises will be a success, will make a contribution to the Exchequer and will provide the basis of the economy of the future. I am glad that even in your hostile hands those enterprises are proving successful by the capitalist measurement of their profitability. You are proving what we claim. More and more of the economy of this country can be handled as public services and public enterprises and they will be a thousand times less corrupt than you think in the future.

Permit me this little divergence from the main line of argument. We are constantly hearing of big thefts in corporations and so on. I myself have a dossier with regard to co-operative societies, especially a major co-operative society in Agalawatta, which I wish to place before the Prime Minister during the Committee stage. I find that one of the gentlemen whom I would have had to expose, hearing that I was going to raise this matter, has decided that discretion is the better part of wisdom and he has not only handed over his resignation but got the Commissioner of Co-operative Development to send me an express letter to reach me last night so that I will not refer to that matter today. So I will not refer to it. This is an official of the Government and not of the Co-operative Department. And I hope in due course I will be able to make the Hon. Minister of Home Affairs understand that there is at least one official under his control

with whom he associated during my by-election and whom I hope he will discover as worthy of being shifted, and remove him.

What I was going to say is this. We are always exposing here the corruption in corporations and public enterprises, because that is one of our functions here. But I say that in any equivalent private firm or business of the size and equivalent nature of any of our corporations the annual losses by theft and corruption are very large and never let out to the public. There is no use anybody trying to hide that from me because, among other things, I happen to be a practising lawyer who is badly needed by the people who do those wrongs. If you will excuse me, Sir, I was told by one who should be an authority—I will not mention who he is—that according to the precepts and teachings of the Buddha, in regard to the matter of the arrangement of your private finances you must set aside 25 per cent. of your income for thieves and rogues. Well, I am sure the proportion is not less but more in private enterprises. I am not speaking of private enterprises itself being a thieving within the private sector.

So, we have to decide, which way are we going? Now, the Hon. Prime Minister, leading his Government, has told us clearly what is the way he wants to go. And nevertheless, time after time after time, we find that they have to divert themselves from that road in order to meet the immediate situation.

The Hon. Minister of State—I am sorry I had to rush away urgently on a certain matter, or else I always listen to him with great interest because he is the only man who can take an interruption with aplomb and say something cutting with aplomb and take a cutting retort also with aplomb. It is, if I may say biographically of him, a quality he showed even in his school days when we were at Royal College together. I still remember, we were discussing at a debate—we were little fellows of about fourteen years—that

better to have loved and lost than never to have loved at all, and all those of us who were discussing it were entirely innocent of any experience of the subject. And when my Hon. Friend was taking part in the debate, somebody interrupted and he quietly said, "I am always glad of an interruption because it gives me a chance to refresh my mind with the notes." He has the same quality up to date. I was listening to him and he was proudly saying how the Government buys all the unions, the Government buys all the potatoes, the Government imports all the rice, the Government is doing this and that. In short he was saying, although I am a private enterpriser, I still say that when the Government wants to do a service to the country, it tries to enter into public enterprise." I thank him for that testimony to public enterprise. That is what has happened to this Government, From abroad they are being whipped in one direction but here conditions twist them in the other. That is the dilemma in which they are caught. When they are not going in the way they have been asked to go they get the Hon. Minister of Industries to say, "Well, I am proud of our industrials!"

In the last few minutes I have left I want to deal with a matter which is much more real, which has been realized in this country but has not been referred to in this Debate at all. We say we are an export-import economy struggling to become a purely export economy. That is the only way I can try to describe this claim that we are aiming at self-sufficiency in food. I am not making that statement, that we expect to be self-sufficient in food in 1970. That is what the Hon. Prime Minister is saying. The point I am making is this. This is supposed to be an effort to break through the vicious circle in which we find ourselves. Today, whether we like it or not we are definitely an export-import economy in which exports are our life-line. If tomorrow—we must all be agreed on that—our tea, rubber and coconuts

[ආවේශය කොළඹින් ආර්. ද. සිල්වා]

should collapse, well, we collapse with them. That is how our economy is built. There are various ways of changing it. I am not discussing that matter today. If I do so, I will have to come out with the attitude of our own side. I am not going to do it. But there it is.

We like to sell on the World market. I am not talking of buying on the World market. I shall forget that for a moment. We have to sell on the World market. We have to buy on the world market and even if the nature of our purchases changes, that is, even if they shift gradually from consumer goods purchases to capital goods purchases, till we have to purchase on the world market for the foreseeable future during which period our industries even if they get highly stimulated are likely to be of a secondary and tertiary nature.

The state of the World market then, is a governing factor in our economic situation. The Government says that in certain ways. It says, "Look here, we have been overtaken by a depression." We have always been overtaken by depressions. The Hon. Prime Minister seems to be a very unlucky man. He is always overtaken by an international depression when he becomes Prime Minister. In 1952 he was overtaken by a depression, having said that I was wrong when I said that he was about to be overtaken by a depression. Now, in 1965 he was again overtaken when I said it was there, with all respect. Never mind, Cassandras are always doomed to that kind of situation. My point is this. They say, "Our export prices have fallen; our import prices have risen; we are caught in the scissors and we have to find a way out." Therefore, it is all right, we should have expected that from them

The Minister of Finance, while doing all this Chinese jugglery—if you will excuse that remark—with figures this is his anticipation as to the prospects of the World market and its economic situation. I am concerned for this reason. Much reference has been made to the British economy and the policy of the British Labour Government. Labels do not change the nature of the government and their policies. Is that what you are doing here, for that was claimed by some of Front-Bench speakers who engaged in fundamental economics? In England they decided, in order to make the capitalist economy profitable again as the necessary means of setting right the balance of payments, to give in the course of that stimulation to profitability a particular bias to export trade profitability; and for them to do that they needed not merely to damp down the home market, but see that domestic consumption was not allowed to increase. This Labour Government and its Chancellor Mr. Jenkins publicly stated in his Budget Speech: "I propose in the coming year not merely to stop the consumer spending at these levels but to force it down." In other words, he was going to drive down temporarily the standard of living of the people of England. Why did he do that? He says, "I will be able to divert all these lines of production and manufacturing industries which can concentrate more on the export market to those markets instead of their making easy profits in the domestic market." And the prime example of that is seen in the motor car industry which is howling night and day against this policy. So they put in devaluation accompanied by income and pricing policies of which policies—[Interruption]. I shall show that to you in a moment. And it has

driven down consumption by limiting incomes of the common mass of people. Now there is the theory underlying a capitalist state. If you cut down the amount of money that is available for domestic spending and divert assistance to the export sector then you will stimulate an export trade whose income will help to set right the balance of payments.

Now, Sir, is that what we are trying to do? I say that this line of assumption in the current Government policy is given to it by its advisers. That theory does not work with us for a very simple reason as everybody knows. We are producers of primary products through agricultural processes; we are not producers of manufactured products through industrial processes. Therefore, Sir, the stimulus of devaluation has not even the time to operate upon the production sector before the period of its possible effect runs out. The Hon. Minister for Housing rightly echoed one aspect of the economic theory in relation to devaluation. Devaluation is a temporary shot in the arm; it is not lasting in its effects. It is like giving a man some of those stimuli which are given to athletes in order to get them a better start. They end up with the dope having the opposite effect. If so, this devaluation is a form of dope. It makes you act in certain ways immediately, but if those activities cannot have quick results—the normal period given is something between one to two years—before other people and other countries can counter the process then, Sir, all you do is to get yourself into a worse position than when you started. Now the fact of the matter is there is no known means despite the use of fertilizer and everything to make a tea plant grow very much faster than it grows now, to make a coconut plant grow very much faster than it grows now and so on and so forth.

Therefore, Sir, devaluation as a stimulus to production in the export sector of Ceylon—I am not concerned

with it than anyone else—is a fake solution. And I say so despite all the big economists who may be in the I. B. R. D. and the I. M. F. and despite my not claiming to be an economist. It is just rank, elementary nonsense. The truth of the matter is that there is, assuming by that, something that they have constantly complained of about us. They say that we are a country in which we are doing all the things of which the Hon. Minister of Education boasted about the other day having brought a cohort from his own Ministry into that box in order to provide him the necessary mental pabulum for his exercise. He said, who else gives a free measure of rice, free education, free hospitals and so on? Wonderful talk! But, for these same reasons these very financial authorities who advised this Government have always said: They are spending too much on consumption; therefore we must find ways and means of cutting down that consumption. Cutting down whose consumption? The consumption of the people of whom 90 per cent are already on the barest level.

In my young days when I was a student in England, studying in the University of London, I used to be a habitual reader of a leftist inclined weekly magazine called the "New Leader" which was run by a dissident section of the Labour Party. I think I have spent my life associating with the dissidents. Now, in that magazine there was a beautiful cartoon produced by a man called Flambo about a proposal which was made by a person none other than Ramsay MacDonald as Minister of a National Government which was formed just as you formed yours, Mr. Prime Minister, drawing in a couple of renegades. That has to be done. You cannot form a National Government unless you have renegades.

Mr. MacDonald said: "We are in a grave financial situation so we propose to be fair to all; we shall introduce a cut in everybody's income, salaries, etc. of 10 per cent. And Flambo drew a cartoon in which there was a house against which flood

[අමර්සය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා]

waters were pressing, and there was a ladder, on each and every rung of which was standing a man. There was one in the bottom rung, his mouth and nose were just above the level of water. And from up there, Ramsay the man on the top rung says "now let us be fair to all, we will step down one rung". Now, Sir that is the economic theory which you have been asked to operate and are operating. This is not England. There is not that degree of consumer expenditure among the common mass of people to be, shall I say Sir, mopped up. But in this country if you want to mop up any heavy extra consumer expenditure, then you have to go for the incomes of the upper strata. That is where the heavy consumption is.

So I come back to where I began. This particular system of re-modelling which the Hon. Finance Minister and the Cabinet have introduced on this occasion will fail of its purpose, and the hopes of the Hon. Minister of Finance will come nowhere, but he will produce some other rabbit out of his customary hat and his Colleagues will get up and say : See, he is too modest to boast of his own achievement, and see how wonderful the Finance Minister has been ! After $4\frac{1}{2}$ years we are better than we were after $3\frac{1}{2}$ years, then we were better than after $2\frac{1}{2}$ years, and so at least up to March 1965.

This is all a bit of political nonsense ; and it is a pity that the Government of the day should be amused, when after all—it is my view and it is my humble view—the purpose of a Government is not to prolong its own life ; the aim of a Government should not be the renewal of itself at any cost. It is my honest and simple view that the aim of the Government should be to create a social, economic, political and general framework of living in which every individual will have the best chance of developing his own life. That cannot happen with this kind of trading

gerrymanders. It is idle to present this drive in the direction of food as being something so novel. I see Government speakers constantly getting up and asking us : "Are you for the Food Drive or not?" as if there is such a simple 'yes' or 'no' available to an utterly false question. If the Government is driving to give us food, let it drive by all means. But I answer : if you drive for your food at the cost of all other sectors of the economy, at the end you will not have the food also. That is the true answer to that silly question. "Are you opposed to growing more food in this country?" It is a ridiculous question to ask. If a man wishes to grow food in this country as it is, help him to grow it. But do not turn round and say that we have, after 20 years of that kind of mixed economic nonsense, got to the stage where our sole purpose has to be to see whether we can eat sufficiently even if we do not dress sufficiently, even if we do not house ourselves sufficiently, even if we do not intellectually develop ourselves sufficiently, even if we are depriving our people of science, and books and laboratories and schools.

The Hon. Minister of Education had entered into a disquisition of world youth. I wish to end with youth, seeing that I am myself approaching more and more the other end of my life. The Hon. Minister of Education wanders round this country making tirade upon tirade against students. It cannot be that the insecurity of youth in this country is due to unemployment. The youth in France are showing themselves disturbed, and they are not insecure. The youth of America are not insecure. I do not know in what kind of world the Hon. Minister is, because, what the previous section of my argument was going to be is this. There is every sign that America is entering upon a major recession. Its balance of payment problems are such that it has already had to enter upon measures which are intended to restrict its operations in the world.

Every country stimulating its exports and limiting its imports has forgotten in this capitalist world jungle that the exports of one country are the imports of another. So, when the American economy limits its investments artificially by raising its rates of interest and the like, it limits the growth of its economy by various disincentives to investment. Britain is doing the same thing. And now, Europe, especially Germany and France, are forced to do the same thing. France says she will not expand for five years. They are our markets, and should we not have expected from the Minister of Finance some little adverting to that situation and as to what will be his measures in relation to that, and what are the instruments he has? Or, is he going to say as the Hon. Minister of State used to say in his time as Minister of Finance: "We are a small country; we are a small economy. We cannot control the world movements; we cannot control the world economy. Therefore, we will be there like a cork tossed upon the waters." If so, let us not pretend that we are even driving, rather rowing a barge which has the same kind of rudder.

As to youth, the American youth especially, they are more insecure than any young man in this country. Any one who has gone there will tell you that their Education Ministers had been no better than our present Minister of Education. So they had to rebel before they could get something done in the universities. Our youth have rebelled and have had their heads broken and their futures blasted, without reform. That is the only difference.

I say that here in Ceylon it is idle for us not to face up to the fact that the growing mass of educated unemployed and the fact of major educated unemployment in our unemployment structure, create a basic sense of instability and insecurity in the students, and, as is always the way of youth, rightly, they hit

out in all directions in the hope that in the course of it they will knock out the proper man too.

Who are we to find fault with them? What they are fighting against we have participated in creating—you and I, both; for I have failed to persuade you who are in power, and you have misused your power. We have created this situation.

And I should like to find the Minister of Education changing his tune when he goes round the country. I should like to see him beating his breast and saying, *mea culpa, mea culpa*, if he likes the Latin. I do not know the Pali for it or I will tell him so. If he likes it in Sinhala, I should like to hear him say, "මගේ වරද", instead of "නොමේ වරද"; because that is the kind of language that he uses to the students.

This Government has claimed that it has solved or eased the racial problem. Permit me, Sir, this one remark in that regard. Wonderful easing, is it not, when for the first time in our history a major group of a minority publicly sets about forming a political party whose aim is a separate state. The hon. Member for Kayts (Mr. V. Navaratnam) mouths it here. His associates and dissidents from the Federal Party mouth it outside, let it be said, more honourably and directly than the Federal Party, with their double tongues and double naming of their own party. Excuse my sharp language, but I do not like a party which is "federal" in English and "separatist" in Tamil. It is a crime on this country.

The Member for Kayts and his group are the best proof that those who thought that by bringing communalists together they are removing communalism are wrong. That is the best proof that that is nonsense. They are asking now for a separate Tamil state. In India it is a crime, for which you can be jailed, to claim it. I do not ask that we have such a law here

[சுமரீய கைலீவின் ஈர். ௨ கிலீவ]

yet. I do not consider this threat seriously. But I say that that is the best proof that communal and racial relations in this country have deteriorated. That is precisely as a result of the political policy of this Government which has talked racial amity but has not produced it.

The leader of the Federal Party has told the truth. He has said that they are not clinging on to the Government for the sake of anything called racial amity. The hon. Member for Kankasanturai is a very truthful person. Let me pay that public tribute to him in this honourable House. I see him reported in the "Times of Ceylon." He said, "We are staying on in the National Government and we shall stay on in the National Government, because otherwise the Coalition will come into power, and that will endanger both the Tamil race and democracy", which are his substitutes for private enterprise and capitalism. He has shown the class nature of his party and the basis on which they have joined the Government.

They go about the country saying that somebody said that they sold to the Sinhalese and the Sinhalese sold to them. That is one of their little distortions, in which they are specialists.

What has been said in this House, and said clearly by me in this House, is that the Federal Party has sold the Tamil people to the capitalist rule of this country—and the U. N. P. have nothing to sell, for it has engaged in no other trading operation in its life.

Thank you, Sir, My apologies, my profound apologies. With great respect I wish to say that you have always shown yourself to be an indulgent occupant of that Chair, always, therefore, sure of every support and help from us. I thank you and I thank this honourable House.

I hope the Debate will get back to realities from the unrealities it had got plunged into.

ஈ. னா. 6.23

காரகணிய நியோஜீய கணியநிதும்

(குழுக்களின் உப அக்கிராசனர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Deputy Chairman of Committees)

Order, please! Mr. Deputy Speaker will now take the Chair.

ஈதனது உப காரக கணிய நியோஜீய கணியநிதும் இலகணியை ஈலன் இலகன், நியோஜீய கணியநிதும் [உ. ம. கிலீவகேரலி கை.] இலகணியை இலகன்.

அதன்பிறகு, குழுக்களின் உப அக்கிராசனர் அவர்கள் அக்கிராசனத்திலின்று நீங்கவே, உபசபாநாயக அவர்கள் [திரு. எம். கிலீவதம்பரம்] தலைமைதாங்கினார்.

Whereupon Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES left the Chair, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER [MR. M. SIVASITHAMPARAM] took the Chair.

ஈ. னா. 6.23

கே. சி. சி. ௨ கிலீவ (ஈலி, உலீகேரலி கணியநிதும் கிலீவ)

(கெளரவ சி. பி. ஈ. கிலீவா—காணி, நீர்ப்பாசன, மின்விசை அமைச்சரும் சபை முதுவரும்)

(The Hon. C. P. de Silva—Minister of Land, Irrigation and Power and Leader of the House)

I consider it a great privilege and honour to follow the learned and distinguished Member for Agalawatta.

As the Minister in charge of the subjects down at ground level, at foundation level, namely, land, irrigation and power, I want to speak on realities, as the hon. Member suggested. But before that, there are two matters he mentioned on which I wish to speak a few words.

One is the subject of a mixed economy. Sir, here is the Short-Term Implementation Programme of the S. L. F. P. Government. It has been drawn up in 1962 and is under the signature of Mrs. Sirimavo R. D. Bandaranaike. At pages 27 and 26 you find these statements. I shall first read from page 27 :

"In view of the tremendous tasks ahead, especially that of solving the unemployment and under-employment problem, it is essential that both public and private sectors make the maximum contribution towards economic development. Two major tasks confronting our country

in this respect are the expansion of production in new fields and the achievement of a better performance in traditional fields. Of these two, the expansion of production in new fields is by far the more difficult. That is because we have to adopt techniques with which we are not familiar. This is one of the difficulties that made it hard for private enterprise to make progress in new fields."

It talks of private enterprise and state enterprise. Then, at page 26 it says :

"Certain essential work, of course, can be undertaken only by the Government. But it can leave other work to private enterprise so long as it has at its disposal all the modern methods of controlling the economy."

That, Sir, has been the policy of Mrs. Bandaranaike, I think the most decisive factor in the Opposition. I do not know to what extent the good Lady has changed her policy. That I do not know. But this is the policy she enunciated in 1962.

வேலையாட்சிய உள். டீ. விக்கிரமசிங்க
(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்கம்)
(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

She was always for a socialist economy. So was the late Mr. Bandaranaike.

அரு. சி. பி. டி. டி. டி. டி.
(கௌரவ சி. பி. டி. டி. டி. டி.)
(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)
Yes, for a mixed economy.

வேலையாட்சிய உள். டீ. விக்கிரமசிங்க
(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்கம்)
(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

The Hon. Minister is for a capitalist economy.

அரு. சி. பி. டி. டி. டி. டி.
(கௌரவ சி. பி. டி. டி. டி. டி.)
(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

I am talking of a mixed economy.

வேலையாட்சிய உள். டீ. விக்கிரமசிங்க
(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்கம்)
(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

What is "mixed"? Is it an *achcharu*?

அரு. சி. பி. டி. டி. டி. டி.
(கௌரவ சி. பி. டி. டி. டி. டி.)
(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

If *achcharu* is mixed, Sir, the biggest mix is on that side, the S. L. F. P. and the Communist Party. I do not know in what form it is, but still it is an *achcharu*.

There were several things said about the American recession. We have heard, since 1947, from several Members who are on that side, about the coming of the American recession. This is 1968, and still it is coming.

அரு. சி. பி. டி. டி. டி. டி.
(கலாநிதி கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. டி. டி.)
(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

The Hon. Minister forgets what happened in 1952. Does he not know that America has had six recessions from 1947?

அரு. சி. பி. டி. டி. டி. டி.
(கௌரவ சி. பி. டி. டி. டி. டி.)
(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)
But they are going on.

அரு. சி. பி. டி. டி. டி. டி.
(கலாநிதி கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. டி. டி.)
(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)
So are we, for God's sake!

அரு. சி. பி. டி. டி. டி. டி.
(கௌரவ சி. பி. டி. டி. டி. டி.)
(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

The G. N. P. is going up. Production levels are going up and up. They have not yet fallen.

அரு. சி. பி. டி. டி. டி. டி.
(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)

We have also been going on for twelve years.

அரு. சி. பி. டி. டி. டி. டி.
(கலாநிதி கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. டி. டி.)
(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

There have been six recessions in America, and those recessions have had an effect on us.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(දොරාපාර් ග්‍රේ. ආ. වික්‍රමසිංහ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

They have resorted to cannibalism now to save themselves in Vietnam.

ආර්. සී. පී. ද සිල්වා

(කොරාච්චි ජී. පී. ඩී. සිල්වා)

(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

I am not interested so much in Vietnam or the United States of America or the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as in our own affairs. We have to get down to earth here.

ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා

(කොලම්බියා කොලීජියා ආර්. ඩී. සිල්වා)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

I think my Good Friend has forgotten. I was not discussing revolution or anything else. I said I wanted the Hon. Minister of Finance to tell us the prospects for the next year in terms of his measures when he knew there was a recession growing in the American economy which must, in the international market, have its repercussions on us. It is one of the major consumers of our rubber.

ආර්. සී. පී. ද සිල්වා

(කොරාච්චි ජී. පී. ඩී. සිල්වා)

(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

Well, Sir, we have been hearing about recessions which have been going on from 1947 until now, and I believe we shall go on hearing about them for many more years. But coming down to realities, Sir, this financial year is, as you know, the third year of this Government and the second year of the five-year development programme prepared by the National Government. During this year the food production drive has gone ahead and is well under way and paddy production, especially in the dry zone major colonization schemes, has gone up. The most important thing in regard to paddy production in the dry zone is the provision of irrigation water. It is

more important than fertilizer, agro-chemicals or even seed paddy. We had to face an innumerable number of irrigation difficulties in all the colonization schemes.

I shall show you how, during the last 2 years, we have solved major difficulties of the peasantry in the major colonization schemes in the dry zone with regard to irrigation. When the Hon. Prime Minister visited the Rajangana Reservoir in the Anuradhapura District he saw for himself that this reservoir was full of water, the major channels were overflowing but there was no water in the paddy fields. Naturally farmers will curse the Government. Owing to a policy decision taken in 1962 no field channels were cut. This is what the 1962 Short-term Implementation Programme says at page 330 :

“(4) Beneficiaries should be made to construct, or contribute to the cost of construction of field channels up to a reasonable length. The present practice of providing pipe-outlets to individual paddy lots should be stopped, and water should be provided to blocks of 100 acres or more.”

While we were following that policy no funds were provided for the Irrigation Department to cut field channels.—[Interruption]. We followed that policy and no field channels were provided. The Hon. Prime Minister saw for himself the horrible results of this policy. We hope to cut field channels for about 15,000 acres of field given without channels of which 7,000 acres are under the Rajangana Tank. There was no provision made available for providing field channels between 1962 and 1967. So we altered that policy and ordered that field channels should be cut in the future, and money should be authorized for that purpose. We gave authority to the Divisional Irrigation Engineers to approve expenditure up to an extent of Rs. 5,000 on any one project without reference to the head office. I am glad to say that the Irrigation Department has completed the construction of field

channels in those lands, and that has increased production in those areas and made the people happy.

There were genuine irrigation difficulties owing to various causes. It may be that channels have not been cleared or desilted. Those difficulties have since been put right. Now we have what you call a crash programme to solve these difficulties. That is very simple. Every cultivation committee was instructed to prepare a list of irrigation difficulties channel by channel, block by block, and send them to the irrigation engineers. They were ordered to meet the peasants and solve the problems for them one by one. I am glad to say that between the 1967 *yala* and *maha* and now the department has overcome three-fourths of the irrigation difficulties and the remaining problems will be solved very shortly. We have a register of irrigation difficulties in every colonization scheme.

There is another change in policy. In the past water issues in irrigation schemes were under the control of Government Agents. Now the Irrigation Department has been made solely responsible for the issue of water, control of water in major colonization schemes. For administrative control for cultivation purposes the government agents have been put under the Commissioner of Agrarian Services. There is a Bill before Parliament to amend the Irrigation Ordinance and this will embody all the changes in policy. The Irrigation Department will be solely responsible for the distribution of water and maintenance of irrigation channels, and the cultivation powers of the government agents will now be controlled by the Commissioner of Agrarian Services. These are the two main amendments proposed in the amending Bill that is now before Parliament.

In order to enable the Irrigation Department to exercise its powers of maintaining irrigation channels and

issuing water, a new grade of assistant irrigation engineer was created. Recruitment took place from the top of the technical assistants' grade. They will be in charge in major schemes of only the maintenance of irrigation systems and the issue of water, while the irrigation engineer and other staff can concentrate on the development and construction of further schemes. That, I think, is a major change of policy.

In the course of the various food production circuits of the Hon. Prime Minister, with which I was myself associated, many difficulties were discovered which prevented paddy fields under colonization schemes, which were developed at very high cost, from producing their best.

We found at Hambantota that farmers were cultivating Yala crops in the middle of July. That meant that they were sowing $4\frac{1}{2}$ month H4 paddy in Yala to be harvested in November, by which time the North-East monsoon would set in and there would be no chance for the Irrigation Department to desilt and clear the channels. That practice has been stopped. On inquiry we found that the reason for this practice was the shortage of tractors and the non-availability of better seed paddy than H4. We have taken action to develop a $3\frac{1}{2}$ month seed paddy which will respond to fertilizer, and to then enforce irrigation rules.

Another amendment will bring the Commissioner of Agrarian Services into the picture.

Every Yala the Irrigation Department advises farmers and government agents as to what extents can be cultivated in the major schemes according to the water available. Generally those instructions are ignored. They cultivate far more extents than should be cultivated, and that is the cause of most of our troubles. We find that in certain areas where 6,000 acres should be cultivated they cultivate 8,000 acres, and where 4,000 acres should be cultivated they cultivate 5,700 acres.

[මැරු සී. පී. ද සිල්වා]

Wherever they sow greater extents than the water available can irrigate there is trouble.

Another thing we found was that there are large number of encroachments. I had an encroachment survey done of all the colonization schemes and found that in every irrigation scheme the land encroached upon came to 30 per cent. of the Irrigation extent. In one particular place at Sorabora Wewa we found the encroachment was over 100 per cent. No doubt, these farmers are enterprising and clever, but what happens is that the channels get overloaded. There lies the trouble. I must say that our farmer is very clever and so are our irrigation staff who look after him.

You may be aware, Sir, that the Ministry of Agriculture is importing a large number of two-wheeled tractors known as "walking tractors." These will enable the farmer to get his field ploughed more expeditiously than now. The farmers' inability to get their fields ploughed fast was also a contributing factor towards late cultivation. I am mentioning this because these are vital matters and should be attended to without delay in order to raise production.

I am glad to say that the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Lands have been able to solve most of the problems that have prevented the farmer from doing his best.

The hon. Member for Agalawatte (Dr. Colvin R. de Silva) spoke about encroachments. In fact we have found that the total number of encroachments in these rural areas is about 160,000 acres. In Anuradhapura itself about 20,000 acres have been encroached.

As the problem of encroachment is very real, the Government has, as a matter of policy, decided that where the encroacher is a peasant who has no land or practically no land of his own, where the extent encroached is not needed by Government for any public

purpose and irrigation is available for that extent, then the land should be given to him. On that basis a large number of such encroachments in these areas have been regularised. I may say, although I do not have the exact figures with me now, that about 70 per cent of these encroachments all over Ceylon have been so regularised.

Most of the kachcheries, however, have one difficulty in this matter of regularisation, namely, the issuing of permits. All these encroachments have to be surveyed, plans have to be prepared, and permits issued. There is a little delay in that due to lack of surveyors at present. But with more surveyors being available to the Department I think even that difficulty will be overcome.

Of course, there are certain encroachments which cannot be regularized. For example, we found that lands which had been earmarked by the Government for a public purpose or some project, have been encroached upon. Now, that type of encroachment cannot be regularised. In some of those cases the Government Agents have had to file action for ejectment against the encroachers and throw them out. All in all, I think that in about 99 per cent of these cases, encroachments have been regularized. It is not in one district only that encroachments have occurred and we have had to take action as I have set out; in practically every district this has been the case.

In the Five-Year Programme of this Government, we set certain targets that we expected to achieve in all spheres of activity. I wish to say a few words on the manner in which the Irrigation Department has kept to its targets.

In regard to the providing of irrigation facilities to land through major irrigation schemes the target for the year 1965-66 was 13,990 acres. We actually provided those facilities—that is, achievement—to 13,439 acres; For medium size tanks, the target was 7,212 acres while the achievement was 7,606 acres; For

minor village tanks, the target was 5,476 acres and the achievement was 9,737 acres; For lift irrigation, the target was 2,200 acres, the achievement was 648 acres; for drainage schemes, the target was 3,000 acres while the achievement was 5,756 acres. Altogether, the target was 31,878 acres and the achievement was 37,186 acres of land provided with irrigation.

For the year 1966-67 the targets and achievements are as follows: for major schemes the target was 12,564 acres and the achievement was 6,894 acres; for medium sized schemes the target was 9,018 acres and the achievement was 8,907 acres; for minor schemes the target was 8,755 acres and the achievement was 8,479 acres; for lift irrigation, the target was 2,850 acres and the achievement was 1,170 acres; for drainage, the target was 5,200 acres and the achievement was 2,899 acres.

Over and above all this, the Irrigation Department repaired 66 tanks which were breached as the result of a cyclone in the North Central Province and these tanks irrigated an additional 8,000 acres.

So, for the year 1966-67 the total target of land to be brought under irrigation was 38,387 acres and the achievement was 36,279 acres. Taking both the years 1965-66 and 1966-67 as a whole, the target was 70,265 acres and the achievement, including the 8,000 acres brought under irrigation under the cyclone breached tanks, was 73,465 acres. I think that is a fairly reasonable achievement for two years.

During this period we placed an order for about Rs. 5 million worth of heavy machinery, which the department had not obtained for the last ten years. I am glad to say that some of the stuff has begun to arrive.

In the current year we have had certain setbacks. the department was engaged in the construction of field channels for about 4,000 acres of land which had been alienated earlier without field channels. A

certain amount of the energy of engineers and others was diverted to that work—the crash programme which I spoke of earlier, under which all the main channels and the field channels of all the schemes were repaired. The district cultivation committees also helped in that.

I wish to take this opportunity to place on record my appreciation of the great effort made by all the officers of the Irrigation Department, from the D. I. downwards, co-operating with the Government and the people of this country in producing food, which is most important. Whatever view one may take of food, as Lord Buddha said, "*sabbe satta aharatthitika*"— we have to eat. Whatever party we may belong to, whatever kind of life we may lead, we have to eat in order to live. Therefore, I wish to place on record my appreciation of the work and services of all the officers of the Irrigation Department in this great national effort.

The Irrigation Department has also been engaged in finding underground water in certain parts of Ceylon. In Vanathavillu we drilled certain wells and found water 300 odd feet below ground level. It was a good water supply. They have now obtained authority and funds to provide pipe-borne water supply to cultivators in that area. Each man gets one pipe connection with a meter, and he will be charged for the water at the rate of 50 cents per 1,000 gallons under an experimental scheme. That is not a fixed charge. We have to raise it or lower it according to costs.

We have searched for underground water in other parts of the country. We did so in the Jaffna Peninsula. About 550 feet or so below ground level we found base rock and no good water above that except surface water, which we are now tapping. But in the very bad area between Kataragama and Tissamaharama we hit water at Bogahapelessa, and I was told that from a test well they were obtaining fresh water at about 100 gallons per minute, or something like that. That will be explored.

[මරු සි. සී. ද සිල්වා]

As I said, there are approximately 261,000 acres of paddy field in major colonization schemes in the Island, and we have been solving irrigation difficulties. At the same time we got a team of experts, a FAO-IRBD Mission, to examine what could be done to get maximum production from these fields. The FAO-IRBD Mission visited the Island in 1966 and recommended an irrigation rehabilitation programme for increasing productivity and better water use in colonization schemes. Their report reads as follows :

“The Mission considers that irrigation on rehabilitation is of primary importance to all present and future irrigation development in Ceylon. The work to be done under this programme includes—

- (a) improvement of irrigation constructions and designs,
- (b) installation of water measurement structures,
- (c) installation of effective methods of control over timing and quantity of irrigation water distributed—the latter to be based on more exact knowledge of water requirements of the various crops to be irrigated and at the field level,
- (d) extension to bring about effective water use and management without undue wastage, on the basis of well devised farm plans, and
- (e) facilities to provide other inputs.”

To examine this, we have appointed a joint committee from the Ministries of Land and Agriculture under the chairmanship of the Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Land, Irrigation and Power and consisting of the Land Commissioner, the Director (Agricultural Development) of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, the Director of Agriculture, the Director of Irrigation, the Commissioner of Agrarian Services, the Commissioner for Co-operative Development and the Commissioner for Marketing. On their recommendation we started a pilot project to cultivate 5,000 acres at Elahera. This project is not tank-fed but channel-fed, and it therefore depends for water on the rainfall. A special D. A. E. O. was appointed as

project officer, and officers from the Irrigation Department, Agriculture Department, Agrarian Services Department and Co-operative department were also called upon to participate in this project. Thirty-five tractors, fertilizer, agro-chemicals and all other necessary facilities were supplied. The response of the farmers was magnificent. They produced an average yield of 86 bushels per acre on 5,000 acres. The previous average was 50 bushels per acre. This scheme would, therefore, be a success.

During the South-West Monsoon, we have cultivated, in addition to rice, certain other crops in the fields. I personally inspected the plots with the project officer and I found that subsidiary foodcrops such as ground-nuts, sorghum, soya-beans, cowpeas, greengram, onions were being grown with success on these paddy fields on which previously only paddy had been grown. The farmers were very enthusiastic. They have now seen that during the South-West Moonsoon they could grow these crops in their paddy fields, and these crops bring them additional money. The farmers are satisfied—that is the important thing.

As a result of this experiment the Government has decided to start eight similar projects of 5,000 acres each covering a total area of 40,000 acres. It is necessary to train the staff of the various departments concerned to carry out this intensive programme of work. This is a new policy which is being implemented in order to obtain the maximum yield from the colonization schemes.

On the instructions of the Hon. Prime Minister we have changed the unit of peasant-holding. In 1962, the last Government changed the unit of peasant-holding in the dry zone colonization schemes from three acres paddy plus two acres highland to two acres paddy plus one acre highland ; that is, from a five-acre unit to a three-acre unit. This was done in order to meet and satisfy, as far as

possible, the tremendous demand for land in colonization schemes. But we think now of increasing the size of the plots to six-acres in the major schemes because we have to get the biggest yields from the farmers.

In the case of Uda Walawe we are blocking out land according to the soil patterns for the cultivation of the various crops.

There is a Bill before the House to amend the Land Development Ordinance. The purpose of that amendment is to enable the allottee under the Land Development Ordinance to buy his allotment by paying the Government the cost of development.

வேலுவாலாவேயில் உயர். பி. வினாயசாமிநாயகர்

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்கிரமசிங்கு)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

And he can settle there afterwards?

ஆர். பி. டி. டி. சி. டி. டி.

(கௌரவ சி. பி. டி. சில்வா)

(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

He is protected. He is allowed to buy the land under certain conditions. I do not want to go into the details of that Bill; it is a lengthy Bill.

வேலுவாலாவேயில் உயர். பி. வினாயசாமிநாயகர்

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்கிரமசிங்கு)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

He becomes a private owner ?

ஆர். பி. டி. டி. சி. டி. டி.

(கௌரவ சி. பி. டி. சில்வா)

(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

He becomes a private owner but not a free owner.

வேலுவாலாவேயில் உயர். பி. வினாயசாமிநாயகர்

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்கிரமசிங்கு)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

Free enterprise !

ஆர். பி. டி. டி. சி. டி. டி.

(கௌரவ சி. பி. டி. சில்வா)

(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

Not exactly. It is a compromise. That is why that Bill took a long time to come. The Land Commissioner recommended an outright grant but the Cabinet changed it and gave a restricted grant. Still, it is not free.

I should like to state here that the River Valleys Development Board has completed the construction of the Uda Walawe reservoir one year ahead of schedule and now it is almost full. They are trying to keep the water level down. They are now constructing a siphon in the spill to enable the left bank channel to cross the spill channel. The work on the tank itself is complete. We have already installed the hydro-electric plant in to the two sluices. The immediate benefit of that reservoir will be to about 20,000 acres of field on the right and left banks of the Walawe in what is called the Liyan-gahatota anicut of the walawe-ganga. Upto now the farmers have depended on rainfall for cultivation. I have told them that we can guarantee the supply of water and we shall insist on their following cultivation rules. They must plough at the correct time, sow at the correct time, and not wait for the rain to come. That is what we are doing now. That is the immediate benefit derived from that tank.

In addition, we have almost completed constructing the main channel on the right bank from the sluice to Chandrika-wewa. There are a few more structures on which we are working now. I think in a month or so it will be completed, and we should be able, in this Maha season, to guarantee the issue of water to the farmers.

Under the Chandrika-wewa there are 7,000 acres right down on the sea coast and about 4,000 acres of field between the R. B. sluice and the Chandrika-wewa. They will get the immediate benefit next season of the Uda Walawe work.

I am glad to be able to say that we are now establishing a land development unit in Uda Walawe under the

[ශ්‍රී ඩී. ඩී. ද සිල්වා]

R. V. D. B., which should be capable of *asweddumizing* and providing irrigation facilities for an extent of about 25,000 to 30,000 acres. It will develop, *asweddumize*, provide water, and cut field channels for those 25,000 to 30,000 acres. We have been advised by the World Bank team that that should be our target and nothing less than that. That will be 25,000 to 30,000 acres a year.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(දොරාකුරු ගම. ඉ. වික්‍රමසිංහ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

What about our experts and engineers here? Why do you want to go to the World Bank for advice?

ශ්‍රී ඩී. ඩී. ද සිල්වා

(කෙනරා ජී. ජී. ඩී. සිල්වා)

(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

All right, I shall take the local expert's advice. We are building a unit which is capable of *asweddumizing* and providing facilities for 25,000 to 30,000 acres a year. With that we should be able to complete the Uda Walawe in two or three years, by which time I think the Mahaweli-ganga Stage I would be ready.

After the R. V. D. B. tank building unit completed the Uda Walawe reservoir bund, we moved it to the Muruthawela reservoir in the Mulkirigala Electorate.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(දොරාකුරු ගම. ඉ. වික්‍රමසිංහ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

What about the Mahaweli-ganga diversion?

ශ්‍රී ඩී. ඩී. ද සිල්වා

(කෙනරා ජී. ජී. ඩී. සිල්වා)

(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

Wait; I shall come to that. I am in no hurry.

We have also started work on a reservoir in the Nagadeepa Mahawewa in the Mahiyangana Electorate

Muruthawela-wewa on the Uru-bokke-oya reservoir is a new one. You get 13,000 acres of land in the Mulkirigala and Beliatta Electorates.

I saw the connected documents with regard to the Muruthawela reservoir in 1947. It was mooted by the late Rt. Hon. D. S. Senanayake when he was the Minister of Agriculture and Land. Recently the hon. Member for Beliatta (Mr. Atapattu) very strongly urged on the Government to have this included in the Budget. In fact, he personally appealed to the Prime Minister when it was not included in the Budget.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(දොරාකුරු ගම. ඉ. වික්‍රමසිංහ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

What about the hon. Member for Mulkirigala (Mr. George Rajapaksa)?

ශ්‍රී ඩී. ඩී. ද සිල්වා

(කෙනරා ජී. ජී. ඩී. සිල්වා)

(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

He pressed the last Government to commence work on it and for that purpose to have it included in the Budget, but he failed to get it done. Under this Government the hon. Member for Beliatta also wanted this project to be included in the Budget. I put it down to be included in the Budget but then it has not been included. Then the hon. Member for Beliatta made a special request to the Prime Minister and it was included in the Budget. Presently I am working on it.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(දොරාකුරු ගම. ඉ. වික්‍රමසිංහ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

Do not try to fool the people.

ශ්‍රී ඩී. ඩී. ද සිල්වා

(කෙනරා ජී. ජී. ඩී. සිල්වා)

(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

There is no fooling of the people. It has been partly done now; half of it has been done. There is one difficulty

வேலையாடிகள் சி. ஏ. விநாயகம்

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விநாயகம்)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

The hon. Member for Mulkirigala urged upon the previous Government and the Governments that were there earlier to have this scheme started. I think even before he entered Parliament he did so.

செ. பி. சி. டி. சி. சி.

(கௌரவ சி. பி. டி. சி. சி.)

(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

The then hon. Member for Beliatta (Mr. D. A. Rajapakse) asked for it during the time of the 1956 Government. But it was not included in the Budget. In 1960 the hon. Member for Mulkirigala also asked for it, but it was not included in the Budget. The hon. Member for Beliatta (Mr. Atapattu) urged for it under the present Government and he in fact begged of the Prime Minister to have it included in the Budget and the Prime Minister got it included in the Budget. They are constructing it now.

வேலையாடிகள் சி. ஏ. விநாயகம்

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விநாயகம்)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

Private transaction.

செ. பி. சி. டி. சி. சி.

(கௌரவ சி. பி. டி. சி. சி.)

(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

I do not know what transaction it is. It may be that the present hon. Member for Beliatta has more influence with the present Prime Minister than the then hon. Member for Beliatta and the hon. Member for Mulkirigala had with the Prime Minister of that time.—[Interruption].

I am telling you the facts. This Government has been able to finance the scheme while the former two Governments were not able to do so. It is being constructed now. We named it Muruthawela Reservoir. I am not in the habit of naming these tanks "—Samudra".

I constructed the Uda Walawe, the biggest reservoir ever built in Ruhunu Rata. I called it Uda Walawe—not somebody's Samudra. Then I built the Rajangana Wewa in Nuwara Kalaviya which is the biggest reservoir in that area. It is greater than Kala Wewa, and it is bigger than Nuwara Wewa and it is also bigger than Padaviya. I named it Rajangana Wewa. I never called it Samudraya or by anybody else's name.

A request was made to me to name Muruthawela Wewa oya as "Rajapaksa Samudrawaya". Unfortunately by that time I had already named it Muruthawela Wewa and they had unveiled the tablet. Therefore I could not comply with the request made. With regard to the matter a petition was also received by me but, of course, by that time we had named it Muruthawela Wewa. I must say that it is not possible to have schemes like this named after somebody. The only way you can achieve a name is by serving the people well and truly till you die. Then, Sir, after you are dead and gone a grateful nation will name a reservoir, a road, or a mountain after you. It was in that manner that the Gal Oya Reservoir was named Senanayake Samudraya by a grateful people for the services rendered to the people by a great man. I think that it is the only way you can achieve it and not by shouting, by force or by abusing people. Well, every time I construct a tank I shall name it as a Wewa, like the Uda Walawe Wewa and so on.

[ශ්‍රී ලංකා සභාව]

Now I am building a large reservoir on the Kelani-ganga at the foot of Adam's Peak. It is already half built and of course it will be very beneficial. It is at the foot of Adam's Peak and on the head-waters of Kelani-ganga. I called it Maithri Wewa. It is bigger and much deeper than the Parakrama Samudraya. I, with all humility, called it Maithri Wewa. I hope to build three more great reservoirs. But it will certainly not be any samudra. I want to give one bit of advice : Serve your people well, work hard and die peacefully ; and after your death a grateful nation will remember your work and name it something, maybe even a samudra.

When dealing with the wet zone I referred to the building of a reservoir on the Kelani-ganga. There are three rivers in the wet zone, namely the Kalu-ganga, Gin-ganga and Nilwala-ganga, and it is difficult to get them famed in a short time as there is plenty of water. This Government has called for tenders to prepare estimates for the project on these three rivers and in fact we have given the contract about a year or two ago to the E. C. I. or U. S. A. and I expect the plans shortly. I have given a couple of months' time, do not know what really are the plans for the controlling of the flood waters of these three rivers. I was told that the Consultant Engineers have prepared a fairly good plan for the control and use of the waters of those three rivers, which now, if I may say so, play the very devil out of the country, and I hope when those plans are received we will be able to call for tenders and get suitable people and suitable funds. I think our Planning Ministry is working on the correct lines, and the money invested on the project will be recovered in under 8 or 9 years.

Now I want to come to the Mahaweli-ganga Scheme. When the Throne Speech has discussed the hon. Member for Dambulla (Mr. T. B. Tennekoon) said that this scheme will never come. I want to say a few words about what happened in the immediate past. The U.S.O.M. team that was working on the diversion plan which they thought should be the first step in the scheme, it was attacked, the U. S. Government was attacked, and I was attacked because we tried to divert the river waters. Then the team found themselves in a difficulty and they went away. In 1962-63 I happened to represent Ceylon at the F. A. O. and, as vice-chairman, I was able to persuade the F. A. O. to take up the development of the Mahaweli-ganga project. The U. N. team worked on the project and prepared a scheme for the development of the Mahaweli-ganga project as a whole. The report is with us, but I am unable to print it because it has not been passed by the F. A. O. I shall, however, give a summary of the scheme.

The studies carried out by the Project Team have revealed that it is possible to provide about 6,000,000 acre-feet of water to irrigate 900,000 acres. Of this extent 273,000 acres are existing paddy fields and 627,000 acres will be new acreages which are at present uncultivated lands. Of the irrigable extent of 900,000 acres 312,000 acres lie in the Mahaweli Basin and 110,000 acres in the Maduru-oya Valley and 478,000 acres in the North-Central Province. In addition the combined use of the reservoirs and canal drops will provide for the development of 460 MW of installed generating capacity with an average annual power output of 2,377 million kwh.

To develop the natural yield of Mahaweli-ganga and its tributaries and to generate hydro-electric power, 16 multi-purpose units have been

planned at Polgolla, Moragahakande, Victoria Falls, Randenigala, Kotmale, Maduru-oya, Kalu-ganga and smaller reservoirs on tributaries of the Mahaweli. You will find that the figures in regard to the extends of irrigation

are more or less what I stated on the Floor of this House when the matter was discussed earlier.

The irrigable area of 900,000 acres is distributed as follows :

	District	Existing lands (1000 acres)	New lands (1000 acres)	Total
A. In the Mahaweli sea outlet area i.e., Kandekadu, Verugal Allai ..	Trincomalee ..	14.0 ..	73.2 ..	87.2
B. Maduru Oya, Vakaneri, Valachchenai ..	Batticaloa .. Polonnaruwa ..	6.8 ..	103.6 ..	109.9
C. Mahaweli Right Bank, Dambarawa, Soraborawewa, Ulhibiyawa areas ..	Badulla ..	3.3 ..	73.6 ..	76.9
D1 Giritale, Kawdulla, Kantalai Minneriya areas ..	Polonnaruwa ..	56.0 ..	35.4 ..	91.4
D2 Parakrama Samudra to Mahaweli river ..	Polonnaruwa ..	18.2 ..	9.1 ..	27.3
E. Minipe Left Bank to Ambanganga ..	Matale ..	10.4 ..	10.0 ..	20.0
F. Kaluganga ..	Matale ..	.5 ..	8.2 ..	8.7
G. Elahera ..	Polonnaruwa ..	4.8 ..	6.2 ..	11.0
H. Kandalama, Kalawewa, Rajangane Angamuwa ..	Anuradhapura .. Puttlam Kurunegala	40.7 ..	56.9 ..	97.6
I. Malwatu Oya, Nachchaduwa, Mahakanadarawa, Giant's Tank ..	Anuradhapura .. Mannar ..	52.2 ..	87.8 ..	140.0
J. Pali Aru, Parangi Aru ..	Vavuniya .. Mannar Jaffna	7.1 ..	49.2 ..	56.3
K. Kanagarayan Aru, Iranamadu, Muttuai yankaddukulam ..	Jaffna .. Vavuniya ..	32.6 ..	19.4 ..	52.0
L. Padawiya, Thanimurippu ..	Anuradhapura .. Vavuniya ..	19.9 ..	76.5 ..	96.4
M. Yan Oya basin, Huruluwewa and Wahal-kada ..	Anuradhapura .. Trincomalee	11.0 ..	24.9 ..	35.9
	Total	278.9	632.1	911.0

That is the existing scheme in regard to the Mahaweli-ganga. It has been reported that we should take in hand Phase I, Step I. Phase I, Step I consists of the following work for which tenders have been called. I shall read that too :

The general engineering features benefits of the Polgolla Diversion, as given in the final report, can be summarized as follows :

- (a) The Mahaweli waters are diverted by means of a Diversion Dam across Mahaweli-ganga at Polgolla. The diversion dam is a concrete one 530 feet long at crest level with a maximum head of 25 feet and is capable of coping with a river flow of 208,000 cubic feet per second without any

danger to upstream areas. A flood of this magnitude occurs only once in a thousand years.

- (b) The diversion tunnel is a pressure tunnel 5 miles long, 16 feet in diameter and of 2,000 cubic feet per second capacity and leads the water into Sudu-ganga.
- (c) The water is turbined through an underground power station having an installed capacity of 36 MW. The average annual firm power capacity in 21 MW. In the dry months from January to March the monthly firm power capacity is reduced to 10-14 MW. and in the wet months it reaches the maximum of 36 MW.
- (d) River training works on the Sudu-ganga to prevent erosion of Sudu-ganga river banks.

[මැ. සී. පී. ද සිල්වා]

- (e) The diverted water from Mahaweliganga and the natural flow of the Amban ganga are picked up by a diversion dam across Ambanganga at Bowetenne.
- (f) From this dam a 1,000 cubic feet per second free flow tunnel 4½ miles long and diameter 16 feet followed by an open canal take the water into Dambulu-oya, a canal 145 cubic feet per second capacity from the diversion canal augments Kandalama tank while the balance of 855 cubic feet per second will augment the Kala-oya system to benefit 46,200 acres of existing land and 40,000 of new lands.
- (g) The balance 1,000 cubic feet per second will pass over Bowetenne dam along the Ambanganga to benefit the Elahera, Giritale, Kantalai and Kaudulla systems benefiting 56,000 acres of existing lands and 44 acres of new lands.

The tentative estimate of the Polgolla Diversion project and development of areas benefited under it is as follows :

	million Rs.
Polgolla head works and Power Station	.. 86
Lenadora Power Plant	.. 12
Polgolla-Kala Oya drift basin canal	.. 83
Irrigation distributory system and land development	.. 142
Total:	323
Add settlement and infra structure	72
Total:	395

I wish to say this. Years ago, in 1957, I went with the hon. Member for Wategama (Mr. P. B. A. Weerakoon) from Kandy to the Central School in his electorate, and on that occasion I told him that we could divert the Mahaweli at a certain point which I pointed out. That is at Polgolla. Now, after nearly eleven years, the experts have said the same thing.

The additional value of the production from the new lands to be irrigated and existing lands provided with improved irrigation is estimated at Rs. 127.5 million per annum. The economic appraisal carried out by the project team indicates that the capital cost—net benefit ratio is 4.1 to 1 and the internal rate of return is 18 per cent. at market prices. Out

of a total of 200,000 acres, an extent of 101,500 acres is existing paddy land from which we shall now be assured of both the Yala and Maha crops. So, there will be 98,500 acres of new land.

We have gone much further than the hon. Member for Dambulla expected. You will find at page G-40 of the draft Estimates, Second Print, presented by my Hon. Friend, the Minister of Finance, under Head 60, Vote 7, Sub-head 41, "Construction of Mahaweli Ganga Diversion Scheme (Phase I, Step I)", that the total estimated cost of the scheme is Rs. 452,500,000, and the Estimates provide for 1968-69 a sum of Rs. 15 million. The Government expects to start work on this project in the coming financial year. So, it has gone much beyond the thinking of the hon. Member for Dambulla.

The best time for starting work on the river itself, as the report states, is January, February and March, when the river is low. That is the time, God willing, we expect to start work on this project.

වෛද්‍යවරය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(දොරාකුරු ගඟ. ආ. නිකුත්කරණ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

You do not want to depend on the River Valleys Development Board and on the present engineers. You want to call for American experts.

මැ. සී. පී. ද සිල්වා

(කොළඹ ජී. පී. ඩී. සිල්වා)

(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

We cannot do it.

වෛද්‍යවරය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(දොරාකුරු ගඟ. ආ. නිකුත්කරණ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

You cannot do it?

මැ. සී. පී. ද සිල්වා

(කොළඹ ජී. පී. ඩී. සිල්වා)

(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

Well, we can build it up, but—

வேலுவாடீய உஃ. ஸ். பி. வி. வி. வி.

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

Why do you want the I. B. I. ?

அ. சி. சி. டி. டி.

(கௌரவ சி. பி. டி. சில்வா)

(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

The E. C. I. are preparing detailed plans as advised by the U. N. D. P. team.

வேலுவாடீய உஃ. ஸ். பி. வி. வி. வி.

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

My information is that the River Valleys Development Board can draw up the plans and do it themselves. The Ceylon engineers with their experience in Uda Walawe can do it.

அ. சி. சி. டி. டி.

(கௌரவ சி. பி. டி. சில்வா)

(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

Sir, the F. A. O.-U. N. D. P. team, who prepared the project plan, the feasibility report, have advised us to get a foreign team to do this. And we cannot get the contractors to start by January or February. We have to start early, and we would not be able to start early. We have to utilize the services of our engineers. Otherwise we cannot do it.

வேலுவாடீய உஃ. ஸ். பி. வி. வி. வி.

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

There is the River Valleys Development Board with Mr. Kahawita as Chairman.

அ. சி. சி. டி. டி.

(கௌரவ சி. பி. டி. சில்வா)

(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

I do not say we are not doing it, but I shall not be rushed by anybody. I shall get our people to do a lot of the work but not all the work. I do not think our people can instal a power station of 45 megawatts.

வேலுவாடீய உஃ. ஸ். பி. வி. வி. வி.

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

They can do the first stage. The diversion can be done by them.

அ. சி. சி. டி. டி.

(கௌரவ சி. பி. டி. சில்வா)

(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

The hon. Member can do it his way. We shall do it our way.

Sir, he is interrupting me unnecessarily. He is diverting my speech, Sir.

அ. சி. சி. டி. டி.

(கலாநிதி கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

We are diverting all the way.

வேலுவாடீய உஃ. ஸ். பி. வி. வி. வி.

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

I am speaking for your engineers.

அ. சி. சி. டி. டி.

(கௌரவ சி. பி. டி. சில்வா)

(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

I once complimented my engineers, and I shall compliment them again. They are very hard-working, competent men. They are not second to anybody in the world. They are very good.

வேலுவாடீய உஃ. ஸ். பி. வி. வி. வி.

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

But you are insulting them.

அ. சி. சி. டி. டி.

(கௌரவ சி. பி. டி. சில்வா)

(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

I am not insulting them.

வேலுவாடீய உஃ. ஸ். பி. வி. வி. வி.

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

You are insulting them.

රු. සී. පී. ද සිල්වා

(කෙළරඹ ජී. පී. ඩී. සිල්වා)

(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

I am not insulting them. I repeat it again.

ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා

(කලාතිඨි කොල්වින් ආර්. ඩී. සිල්වා)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

The best way is to compliment in deeds, not words.

රු. සී. පී. ද සිල්වා

(කෙළරඹ ජී. පී. ඩී. සිල්වා)

(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

That is why I said we have got the plans and we hope to start work in several places. I have an image of what I propose to do. I am thinking aloud. I shall have to start work on the main diversion weir across the Mahaweli ganga at Polgolla. At the same time I would like to start work on the diversion weir across the Ambanganga at Bowatenna to send half the water, about a thousand cubic feet per second, into the Kalawewa Basin and the other thousand into the Minneriya Basin. That we shall start at once because once the water is diverted at Polgolla, it will go straight to the Minneriya Basin. That is natural. But we shall start diverting the Kalawewa too.

Then there is the question of power. As you know, we recently discussed the rural electrification scheme for 500 villages. The work is going on. We began by giving current to Hambantota, Tissamaharama, Kataragama, and now we re erecting a 132 KV grid line to Colombo to meet power shortages in Colombo and other areas for industry.

At the same time we are starting work on the Northern line from the Maskeliya Power Station, with a new 132 KV line at Polpitiya to go up to Kandy, Dambulla, Anuradhapura, Vavuniya, and Chunnakam.

I should like to say a few words on the Maskeliya Scheme itself. The power station is now nearly completed. I expect to inspect that place

and enjoy seeing it for myself. This is something all hon. Members must see. If they wish to visit this place I shall be glad to make arrangements.

We hope to take current up to Anuradhapura before 1970. I do not think we shall be able to go right up to Chunnakam. My ambition in life is to get water from the Mahaweli-ganga and electricity from the Kelani-ganga to Anuradhapura. We shall be able to give the Sacred Botree area, which does not get sufficient rainfall, the water and rainfall it needs at all times including the Yala season. I hope this Government will be able to achieve that. In the meanwhile we shall open up about 200,000 acres of new field.

The hon. Member for Mulkirigala (Mr. George Rajapaksa) said that the Minister of Land has given no water to anybody for 12 years. Well, within these 12 years I have been able to build the biggest reservoir in Ruhuna—the Uda Walawa—and the Muruthawela Reservoir. I shall be able to aswadumize the whole of Mulkirigala Electorate and give all the water necessary to the entire electorate including himself. I hope he will wash his whole body in the water if the Uda Walawe and the Muruthawala Reservoir and be a better man thereafter. Then the people will know who gave him water and who gave them poisonous words.

As I said, the preparation of plans for the diversion of the Mahaweli-ganga took 12 years, and was done by engineers of several nations. There were U.S. engineers, Russian engineers, Japanese engineers, English engineers and our own engineers. They took 12 years. This type of work takes a long time. It is not so easy as filling up the pages of HANSARD with speeches or piling up copies of HANSARD as high as the Walaweganga bund. That is very easy. If you pile up the issues of HANSARD in which the speeches of the hon. Member for Akuressa (Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe) appear, the pile will be higher than the Gal-oya bund or the

Walawe-ganga bund. To plan the diversion of the Mahaweli took time. I am not boasting ; I am telling you the facts. It took 12 years for the best engineers just to get the facts correct.

Finally, I wish to express my appreciation of the work done by all departments, especially the Irrigation Department and the Electrical Department, and all the engineers and the minor staff. They have done a good job of work all these years and made a very sound and solid contribution to the food drive.

I must also mention that during the last two years I have had the pleasure and the good fortune of receiving the advice and guidance and encouragement of the Hon. Prime Minister, something which I never got in the past as Minister of Land. You know, the present Prime Minister was a Minister of Agriculture and he has a thorough knowledge of and a good training in agriculture. In fact I find he has an "actually as a matter of fact" approach in meeting difficult situations. That is a very good solution. I must place on record my gratitude for the guidance, advice and directions I have received from the Hon. Prime Minister during the last 3½ years. That is one of the reasons why the Ministry of Land has been able to do a jolly good job of work and achieved the success it has.

අ. හා. 7.30

සෛවදානාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ
(*Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe*)

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය සභානායකතුමනි, ඉඩම් වාරිමාර්ග සහ විදුලි බල කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ගරු ඇමතිතුමාගේ කථාවට පසු මට කථා කරන්නට අවස්ථාව ලැබීම ගැන මා සතුටු වෙතවා. එතුමා විසින් ඉදිරි පත් කළ අදහස් අනුමත කිරීමට නුපුළුවන් වන්නේ වි නමුත්, එතුමා යම් යම් අවස්ථාවල සහායක හැටියට මේ ගරු සභාවේ කටයුතු හරියාකාර ගෙන යෑමට

ඉතාමත් ඉවසිල්ලෙන් හා මිත්‍ර භාවය කින් ක්‍රියා කරන බව නම් මා පිළිගත් නවා.

ගරු ඇමතිතුමා මතු කළ නිසා මා පළමුවෙන්ම එක් ප්‍රශ්නයක් ගැන වචන ස්වල්පයක් කථා කරන්නට බලා පොරොන්දු වෙතවා. ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම මේ අවස්ථාවේදී මා ඒ ප්‍රශ්නය ගැන කථා කරන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වුණේ නැහැ. එහෙත් වැරදි හැඟීමක් ඇති වීම වැළැක්වීමට මා මේ වචන ස්වල්පය කිව යුතුව තිබෙනවා. ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම මේ මගේ හපන්කමක් ගැන කථා කරනවා නොවෙයි. ඔය වාරිමාර්ග සම්බන්ධ ඉන්ජිනේරු ප්‍රශ්න ගැන මා විශේෂඥයකු නොවෙයි. මා දැන් පෙන්වන්නේ මහ වැලි ගහ හැරවීමේ ව්‍යාපාරය ගැන සකස් කර තිබෙන වාර්තාවක අඩංගු එක් කාරණයක් පමණයි.

මහවැලි ගහ හැරවීමේ ව්‍යාපාරය සම්බන්ධව පසුගිය ආණ්ඩුව පැවති අවදියේ, 1962 හෝ 1963 දී පමණ, මේ ගරු සභාවේ ලොකු විවාදයක් ඇති වුණා. ඇමරිකානු තානාපති කාර්යාලයේ ප්‍රධානත්වයෙන් යූ. එස්. ඩී. එම්. නම් සංවිධානය මහවැලි ගහ හැරවීමේ යෝජනා වාර්තාවක් ඉදිරිපත් කළා. ඒ අවස්ථාවේදී මා ඒ වාර්තාව ප්‍රතික්ෂේප කළ යුතුය කියා යෝජනාවක් මේ ගරු සභාවට ඉදිරිපත් කළා. මේ ගරු සභාව මගේ ඒ යෝජනාව ඒකච්ඡන්දයෙන් අනුමත කළා. මහවැලි ගහ හැරවීමේ ව්‍යාපාරය සම්බන්ධයෙන් ඇමරිකානු විශේෂඥයින් යොදවා පර්යේෂණ කර යූ. එස්. ඩී. එම්. නම් එම සංවිධානයෙන් ඉදිරිපත් කළ යෝජනා පිළිබඳව මේ ගරු සභාවේදී ප්‍රකාශ කරන්නට යෙදුණු කරුණු ගැන සොයා බැලිය යුතු බවත්, එක්සත් ජාතීන්ගේ මණ්ඩලයේ මේ කටයුතු භාරව ක්‍රියා කරන ආයතන විශේෂ ඉන්ජිනේරුවරුන්ගෙන් හා විශේෂඥයින්ගෙන් යුත් මණ්ඩලයකට මේ ව්‍යාපාරය පිළිබඳව සොයා බලා වාර්තාවක් ඉදිරිපත් කරන මෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටිය යුතු බවත්, ඒ අවස්ථාවේදී ගරු ඇමතිතුමා පිළිගන්නා ගරු ඇමතිතුමා පිළිගත් ඒ අදහස් ඒ විධියටම ක්‍රියාවට පරිවර්තනය කිරීම

[වෛද්‍යවාර්ග්‍ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ]
 ගැන මා ඒකමට කතාකළ වෙනවා. එහි ප්‍රතිඵලයක් වශයෙන් මහවැලි ගඟ හැර විමේ ව්‍යාපාරය සම්බන්ධව විස්තර සහිත ඉතා පැහැදිලි වාර්තාවක් අපට ලබා ගන්නට පුළුවන් වුණා. එක්සත් ජාතීන්ගේ මණ්ඩලයේ අන්තර්ජාතික ප්‍රසිද්ධියක් තිබෙන, ලෝකය පිළිගත් ඉතාම දක්ෂ විදේශඥයින්ගෙන් යුත් ඒ මණ්ඩලය විසින් මහවැලි ගඟ හැරවීමට කළ යෝජනාව පිළිගෙන ඉදිරිපත් කළ වාර්තාව අනුව එම යෝජනාව ක්‍රියාත්මක කිරීමට බලාපොරොත්තු වීම සම්බන්ධව ඉඩම් ඇමතිතුමාට මගේ කතාකළාව හිමි වෙනවා.

මහවැලි ගඟ හැරවීමේ යෝජනාව පිළිබඳව ඇමරිකන් තානාපති කාර්යාලයෙන් පාලනය කරන යූ. එස්. ඩී. එම්. නම් සංවිධානයන් කැනේඩියානු “හන්ටිං සර්වේ කෝපරේෂන්” නම් සංස්ථාවන් පිළියෙළ කරන ලද වාර්තාවේ සඳහන් වන්නේ මෙහෙමයි. Comment on the U. S. Operations Mission and Canadian Hunting Survey Corporation, 1958-62. “Trans-Basin Diversion Scheme”—ගඟ හරස් කර හැරවීමේ යෝජනාව සම්බන්ධව වාර්තා කර තිබෙන්නේ මෙහෙමයි :

The USOM scheme is to develop 325,000 acres—161,200 acres of new land and 163,800 acres of existing land where a full cultivation was not possible. Four hydro-plants with 260 m.w.—total cost Rs. 1,200 million.

එයින් කියවෙන්නේ මොකක්ද? සම්පූර්ණයෙන් සංවර්ධනය කරන්නට පුළුවන් බිම් ප්‍රමාණය අක්කර 3,25,000 ක් බවයි අමෙරිකන් තානාපති කාර්යාලයෙන් පාලනය කරන ඒ සංවිධානය සඳහන් කර තිබෙන්නේ. නිපදවන්නට පුළුවන් විදුලි බල ප්‍රමාණය මෙහෙවි 260 යි. වාර්තාවෙන් ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙන්නේ ඒ ආකාරයටයි. ඒ යෝජනා ක්‍රමයන් කැනඩාවේ යෝජනා ක්‍රමයන්ගේ දෙකම අපට සංසන්දනය කර බලන්නට පුළුවනි. ඒ දෙකෙන්ම බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ කුමක්ද? ඒ දෙකම මහවැලි ගඟේ වතුරෙන් දෙකෙන් පංශුවක් පමණක් ප්‍රයෝජනයට ගැනීමට වැඩ කරන්නට පුළුවන් ජල විදුලි බල

සීමා වූ යෝජනා. ඒ තිසා එයින් මහවැලි ගඟෙන් ගන්නට පුළුවන් සම්පූර්ණ ප්‍රයෝජනය ලබා ගන්නට බැරිය. මය කාරණය ගැන සලකා ඒ යෝජනා දෙකම ප්‍රතික්ෂේප කළ බව මේ වාර්තාවේ සඳහන් කර තිබෙනවා. මේ වාර්තාවේ තිබෙන්නේ මේ අන්දමටයි :

The U.S.O.M. proposals are correct in principle but cannot be considered the best and most economical solution of the problem.

මා සඳහන් කළ කාරණය වාර්තාවේ පැහැදිලි වශයෙන් සඳහන් වෙනවා. අපට දැන් කරන්නට තිබෙන්නේ අයවැය විවාදයට සම්බන්ධ කළාවක් පමණයි. එම තිසා මේ ගැන දැන් තවදුරටත් විස්තර කරන්නට මා බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ නැහැ. මේ ගරු සභාවට වැරදි හැඟීලෝ දීමට ඉඩ තැබීම වැරදි නිසයි මා කළා කෙළේ. එසේ නැතිව විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයේ මන්ත්‍රීවරයකු වශයෙන් විරුද්ධව කළා කරන්නට ආශාවෙන් නොවෙයි මා කළා කෙළේ. අමෙරිකන් තානාපති කාර්යාලයෙන් ඉදිරිපත් කළ යෝජනා ක්‍රමය අනුව මහවැලි ගඟෙන් හරි ප්‍රයෝජනයක් ගන්නට බැරි විනාශකාරී තත්ත්වයක් ඇති වන බවට අප කළ චෝදනාවට, මහවැලි ගඟෙන් සම්පූර්ණ ප්‍රයෝජනය ගැනීමට යෝජනා කළ ගරු ඇමතිවරයාගේත් අනුමැතිය ඇතිව, මේ පාර්ලිමේන්තුවේ එකඟත්වය ඒ කවිජන් දයෙන් ලැබීම නිසා ඒ යෝජනාව ප්‍රතික්ෂේප කරන්නට පුළුවන් වුණා. ඒ මගින් ඉතාමත් යුක්තිසහගත ජාතික සේවාවක් පසුගිය පාර්ලිමේන්තුවෙන් කරන්නට පුළුවන් වූ බව කියන්නට පුළුවනි. ඒ යෝජනාව ප්‍රතික්ෂේප කිරීමේ ප්‍රතිඵලයක් වශයෙන් උතුරු පළාත, උතුරු මැද පළාත සහ නැගෙනහිර පළාතෙන් භාගයක් යන විශාල බිම් ප්‍රමාණය සංවර්ධනය කිරීමට වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් සකස් කරන්නට අවස්ථාව සැලසුණා. ඒ වාගේම මෙහෙවි 960ක් පමණ වූ විදුලි බලයක් ලබා ගැනීමේ වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් සකස් කරන්නටත් අවස්ථාව සැලසුණා. එය අමෙරිකන් යෝජනාවලින් බලාපොරොත්තු වූ ප්‍රමාණය මෙන් දෙගුණයක් පමණ වෙනවා. ඒ තරම් වැඩ කරන්නට පුළුවන් ජල විදුලි බල

යක් යොදා ගැනීමේ යෝජනා ක්‍රමයක් ඇති කර ගන්නට පුළුවන් වූයේ මේ ගරු සභාව අමෙරිකන් යෝජනාව ප්‍රතික්ෂේප කළ නිසයි. ඒ බව මේ අවස්ථාවේ ප්‍රකාශ කරන්නට ඕනෑ. ඊට පසු අමෙරිකන් බැංකුවලින් නියෝජිතයන් යොදා මේ ව්‍යාපාරය කඩාකප්පල් කරන්නට උත්සාහ කළා. තමන් ලබා සිටින පළපුරුද්ද අනුව උඩ වලවේ ව්‍යාපාරය අපේ විශේෂඥයන්ට සම්පූර්ණ කරන්නට පුළුවන් වූණා. ගරු ඇමති වරයා කළ ප්‍රකාශය අනුව රාජාංගන ව්‍යාපාරයට සම්බන්ධ විශාල වැටත් බැඳ තිබෙනවා. සියේට සියයක්ම ලාංකික ඉන්ජිනේරුවන් විසින් පාලනය කරනු ලබන සංවිධානයක් මගින් රාජාංගනයේ වැව හදන්නට යෙදුණා. වාරිමාර්ග දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවෙන් නොවෙයි එය කරන ලද්දේ. Engineering Development Corporation නමින් හඳුන්වනු ලබන පෞද්ගලික කොමිෂනියක් මගින් එය කරවන ලද්දේ. ගහ හරස් කර උඩ වලවේ වේල්ල බැඳීම සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම වාරිමාර්ග දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවේ පුමු බත්වයෙන්, ප්‍රධානත්වයෙන් කර තිබෙනවා. රාජාංගන වැව හදා කොමිෂනියන් කොටසක් භාර ගෙන ඔය දෙකොටියාගේම එකතු වී මේ කාර්යය නිම කළා. එය ඉතාමත් දක්ෂ ලෙස මාස දෙකක් ඇතුළත, වර්ෂාව ඇවිත් වතුර ගලන්නට පෙර, ලංකාවේ පළමුවැනි වරට ඒ තරම් විශාල අන්දමට කළ වැඩක්. මේ වැනි වැඩක් මෙතෙක් ලංකාවේ කළායයි ඉතිහාසගත වී නැහැ. ඒ නිසා ඒ ගැන මේ අවස්ථාවේ මතක් කරන්නට ඕනෑ. ඒ ඉංජිනේරු මහත්වරුන්ට—ගංගා නිම්න සංවර්ධන මණ්ඩලයේ විශේෂඥයන්ට—මහවැලි ගහ හැරවීමේ පළමු වැනි කොටසේ වැඩ විකත්—සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම අත්හදා, උරගා බැලූ දැනුමක් ඇති අය නිසා—සියේට සියයක්ම සාර්ථක අන්දමට කරන්නට පුළුවන් බව පළමුවෙන්ම මතක් කරන්නට ඕනෑ. ආණ්ඩුවෙන් නිකුත් කරන වාර්තාවක් තිබෙනවා. මෙහි තිබෙනවා, ලෝක බැංකුවේ නිලධාරීන් මේ සම්බන්ධයෙන් වාර්තාවක් සැපයීමට බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවාය කියා. ආණ්ඩුවේ කටයුතු පිළි

බඳව විස්තර ඉදිරිපත් කරන මෙම වාර්තාවෙන් කොටසක් පමණක් කියවන්න කැමතියි :

“Preparatory Work on Mahaweli Ganga Project.

Preparatory to the commencement of construction work on Phase I Stage I of the Mahaweli Ganga Project by Government in 68/69, an FAO-IBRD Mission has commenced a detailed study of existing administrative and institutional machinery and settlement procedures involved in multi-purpose projects in Ceylon with a view to assisting the IBRD and other financial institutions in the appraisal of the project.

The report of the findings of this Mission will enable Government to submit loan applications to the IBRD and other foreign financial institutions on comprehensive recommendations than would otherwise be available.

The FAO-IBRD Mission composed of a team of consultants led by Messrs. R. A. Crofts—Marketing, P. Courbois—Rural Credit, B. G. Moussoures—Extension Services, R. Lunan—Rural Institutions, A. Storrer—Settlement and Dr. H. Weizmann, Land Settlement is at present engaged in their study. The findings of this Mission will be added as a supplement to the overall feasibility report on the Mahaweli Ganga Basin Development Project compiled by the UN Development Programme.

Offers were invited from Consultant firms of international standing for the preparation of detailed plans and estimates for the headworks of Phase I Stage I comprising (a) a diversion dam across the Mahaweli at Polgolla (b) a tunnel and (c) two power plants the total cost of which was estimated by the UNDP at Rs. 98 million. The designs, plans, estimates, etc., of the engineering works for the entire channel system under the diversion estimated to cost Rs. 78 million are being prepared by a Special Unit of the Irrigation Department.”

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කළානායකතුමනි, උඩ වලවේ ව්‍යාපාරය, රාජාංගන ව්‍යාපාරය සම්පූර්ණ කළාට පසුව මහවැලි ගහහැරවීමේ මෙම ව්‍යාපාරයේද වගකීම, ගංගා නිම්න සංවර්ධන මණ්ඩලය යටතේ දැනට වැඩ කටයුතු කර ගෙන යන විශේෂඥයින්ටම පැවරීම වෙනුවට ලෝක බැංකුවට සම්බන්ධකම් ඇති සංවිධානවලට පැවරීමෙන්, දැනට කර ඇති අත්හදා බැලීම් වලට බාධාවක් ඇති විය හැකි බව මතක් කරන්න කැමතියි. උඩවලවේ ව්‍යාපාරය, ඇමෙරිකන් විශේෂඥයින් වාර්තාවලින් පෙන්වා දුන්නාටන වඩා වැදගත, ඉතාමත්

[වෛද්‍යවෘත්ත ඵ්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ]

ම ප්‍රයෝජනවත්, ඵලදායී අනදමේ ව්‍යාපාරයක් බවට පමුණුව ගැනීමට හැකි වන අයුරින් උඩවලවේ වැඩ සම්පූර්ණ කර ගැනීමට අවකාශ සැලසී තිබෙනවා. වෙකොස් ලෝවැකියානු විශේෂඥයින්ගේ යෝජනාවන් අනුව ක්‍රියා කිරීමෙන්, ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් කලින් කර තිබුණු ඇමෙරිකන් උපදෙශකයින් යෝජනාවන්ට වඩා හාත්පසින්ම වෙනස් ඵලදායී, අඩු වියදමින් වැඩි ප්‍රයෝජනයක් ගත හැකි අන්දමට මෙම ව්‍යාපාරය සකස් කර ගත හැකිව තිබෙනවා. උඩවලවේ යෝජනා ක්‍රමය සම්බන්ධයෙන් එබඳු පියවරක් ගැනීමෙන්, ලෝක බැංකුවේ ඇමෙරිකානු විශේෂඥයින්ගේ උපදෙස් පිළිපැදීමෙන් වන්නට තිබුණු හානිය වළක්වා, මෙම සංවර්ධන ව්‍යාපාරයේ කටයුතු සාර්ථකව ගෙන යාමට හැකි වී තිබෙනවා. එම නිසා, එක්සත් ජාතීන්ගේ මණ්ඩලයේ, ලෝකය පිළිගත් විශේෂඥයන් විසින් පරීක්ෂා කර වාර්තාවන් ඉදිරිපත් කර ඇති, යෝජනා ඉදිරිපත් කර ඇති, ව්‍යාපාර වලට ඇගයීම් ගැසීමට ලෝක බැංකුවට ඉඩ දීමෙන් අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී බලය පාමින් අපේ සංවර්ධන කටයුතුවලට බාධා පැමිණවීමේ තත්ත්වයක් නැවත උද වන බව කනගාටු වෙන් නමුත් සඳහන් කළ යුතුව තිබෙනවා.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් මෙම කරුණු වික ඉදිරිපත් කළාට පසුව දැනට ඉදිරිපත් කර ඇති අය වැය ලේඛනය සම්බන්ධයෙන් වචන ස්වල්පයක් කථා කිරීමට මා අදහස් කරනවා.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මේ අයවැය විවාදයේදී මූලික ප්‍රශ්න ගැන මට පෙර කථා කළ විරුද්ධ පක්ෂයේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් දෙපොළක් විසින් පැහැදිලි විස්තරයක් කරන්න යෙදුනා. අගලවත්තේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාත් (කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා මයා.) මැද කොළඹ 3 වැනි මන්ත්‍රීතුමාත් (කෙනමන් මයා.) ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් හොඳ අවබෝධයක් ලබා දුන්නා. මේ ආණ්ඩුව විසින් මේ අයවැය ලේඛනයෙන් මේ ගරු සභාවට ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙන්නේ විශ්ව කම් වැඩපිළිවෙලක් හැටියට පිලිගත්වය කියා තිබෙනවා. අද රට ආර්ථික අතින් බොහොම අමාරු තත්වය

කට වැටී තිබෙනවා. අපනයන හා ආනයනය ගැන සලකා බලන විට, ඒ දෙක සසඳා බලන විට, තෝටි ගණනක පාඩුවක් ලංකාවට විදීමට සිදු වෙනවා. ඒ තත්ත්වය නැති කිරීමට නම් කළ යුතු ප්‍රධාන දෙය ආහාර වගාව වැඩි දියුණු කිරීමයි. අපට ප්‍රධාන වශයෙන් අවශ්‍ය වන ආහාර වර්ග වගාව වැඩි කර ඒ වෙනුවෙන් පිටරට ඇදියන මුදල් ඉතුරු කර ගන්න ඕනෑ. ඔන්න ඔය ප්‍රතිපත්තිය අනුව මේ ආණ්ඩුව අදහස් කරන්නේ වහාම මේ රට ආහාරවලින් ස්වයංපෝෂිත කිරීමටයි. මේ අන්දමට ඔවුන්ගේ වැඩ පිළිවෙල ක්‍රියාත්මක කර ගෙන ගොස් 1970 වන විට ඒ අයගේ අදහස ඉෂ්ට කර ගන්න පුළුවන්ය යන්නයි මේ ආණ්ඩුව විසින් ප්‍රකාශ කර තිබෙන්නේ. මේ ආණ්ඩුව විසින් හෝ වෙන ආණ්ඩුවක් විසින් හෝ මේ රටේ ආහාර වගාව වැඩි දියුණු කිරීමට යම් ප්‍රයත්නයක් දරනවා නම් එයට මොන පක්ෂයක්වත් විරුද්ධ වන්නේ නැහැ. ඒ වැනි ව්‍යාපාරයක් ගැන අපි විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයේ සිටියත් බොහොම සතුටු වෙනවා; ඒ වගේම ප්‍රශංසා කරනවා; ආධාර කරනවා නමුත් මේ ව්‍යාපාරයේ ගැබ් වී තිබෙන ප්‍රශ්න නියම අන්දමට විසඳන්නට වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් යොදන්නේ නැතිව, එහි ගැබ් වී තිබෙන අදහස් නියම අන්දමට ක්‍රියාත්මක කිරීමට වැඩපිළිවෙලක් යොදන්නේ නැතිව, එහි කටයුතු කිරීමට යාමෙන් මහජනතාව අද වැටී තිබෙන තත්ත්වයටත් වඩා නරක තත්ත්වයකට වැටීමට ඉඩ තිබෙනවා. අන්න එවැනි තත්ත්වයක් ඇති වීමට යනවා නම් අපේ හෘද සාක්ෂියට අනුව, ජාතික වගකීමක් ඇති පිරිසක් වශයෙන් විරුද්ධ පක්ෂයේ සිටින අපි විසින් ඒ ගැන කරුණු ඉදිරිපත් කළ යුතුව තිබෙනවා. එය මහජනතාව වෙනුවෙන් මේ ගරු සභාවේ නියෝජනය කරන අප විසින් පළමුවෙන්ම ඉටු කළ යුතු කරුණක් බව මතක් කරන්න ඕනෑ.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මා විසින් පළමුවෙන්ම මතක් කළ යුතු කරුණක් තිබෙනවා. මහවැලි ගඟ වාරිමාර්ග හා ජලවිදුලි බලය සම්බන්ධයෙන් වාර්තාවක් එක්සත් ජාතීන්ගේ මණ්ඩලයේ විශේෂඥයින් ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙනවා. එම වාර්තාවේ ලංකාවේ ආර්ථික තත්ත්වය ගැනත්, ජීවන තත්ත්වය සම්බන්ධයෙන් කරුණු

ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙනවා. මේ වාර්තාව බොහොම වැදගත් කරුණු ඇතුළත් වන සම්පූර්ණ වාර්තාවක් වශයෙන් හඳුන්වන්න ඕනෑ. එම වාර්තාවේ ඒ විශාල ව්‍යාපාරය ගැන පමණක් නොව, ලංකාවේ ආර්ථික ප්‍රශ්න ගැනත් ලුහුඬු පැහැදිලි විස්තරයක් අඩංගු වී තිබෙනවා. ලංකාවේ ජීවන තත්ත්වය සම්බන්ධව ඒ වාර්තාවේ මෙන්ම මේ විධියට සඳහන් වෙනවා.

Living conditions.

The cost of living index (that for 1952 being 100) for all items as compiled by the Central Bank was 112.3 in 1966, for food 109.1, clothing 117.0, fuel and light 95.9, rent 101.5 and miscellaneous 127.3."

1966 ලේඛන පමණයි මෙහි සඳහන් වී තිබෙන්නේ. අද ජීවන අංකය කොතරම් ඉහළ නැග තිබෙනවාද කියා මේ අනුව පෙනී යනවා ඇති. මෙන්ම මේ කොටස තමයි ඉතාම පැහැදිලිව අප විසින් කල්පනා කළ යුත්තේ :

"As in the majority of developing countries, the nutritional standard of the population of Ceylon is below adequate levels. According to statistics of 1963, average supplies per person per day are 1959 calories and 44 grams of protein, against the required 2,500 calories and 65 grams of protein. The availability of proteins in Ceylon is the lowest among 66 countries reported in FAO's production year book, 1965. In 1957, a joint FAO-WHO team reported that approximately 50 per cent of infants and pregnant women in low income groups were undernourished."

මේ වාර්තාවෙන් පැහැදිලි කර ඇති කරුණය ගැන අපේ විශේෂ අවධානය යොමු විය යුතුයි. එක්සත් ජාතීන්ගේ මණ්ඩලයේ ආහාර සහ කෘෂිකර්ම සංවිධානයේ විශේෂඥයන්ගේ කණ්ඩායමක් විසින් රට වල් 66ක් සම්බන්ධයෙන් කරනු පරීක්ෂා කර බැලීමේදී ලංකාවේ සාමාන්‍ය ජනතාවගේ ආහාරවල පෝෂ්‍යදායක ආහාර ශක්තිය භයානක අන්දමින් අඩු බව මෙම වාර්තාවෙන් ප්‍රකාශ කර තිබෙනවා. සාමාන්‍ය මනුෂ්‍යයකුට ආහාර ශක්තිය ඇති කර ගැනීමට කැලරිස් 2,500ක් චුවමනා වී තිබෙන්නේ වී නමුත්, ලංකාවේ අනුභව කරන ආහාරවල ඒ කැලරි ශක්තිය 1,559 ක් පමණක් බවයි මෙහි සඳහන් වන්නේ. මාංශභික්ෂ ආහාර කොටස් ශුචි 65ක් නිසිය යතු නමත් ලංකාවේ සාමාන්‍ය ජනතාව අනුභව කරන ආහාරයේ තිබෙන්නේ 44ක් පමණයි. ඒ විශේෂ කණ්ඩායම

විසින් පරීක්ෂා කර බැලූ රටවල් 66 න් පෝෂ්‍යදායක, සනීපදායක, ශක්ති ජනක ආහාර අඩුම ප්‍රමාණය අනුභව කරන්නේ ලංකාවේ පොදු මහජනතාව බව මෙම වාර්තාවේ සඳහන් වී තිබෙනවා.

මෙවැනි තත්ත්වයක් තිබෙන නිසා තමයි පසු ගිය ශ්‍රී ලංකා, බණ්ඩාරනායක, සහ සභාග ආණ්ඩු පැවති කාලයේදී ආර්ථික අතින් මොන තරම් අමැරුකම්වලට මුහුණ පාන්නට සිදු වී තිබුණත්, ආනයන අපනයන අතින් මුදල් සම්බන්ධයෙන් කොතෙක් අමැරුකම්වලට මුහුණ පාන්නට සිදු වී තිබුණත්, පිටරටින් හාල් ගෙන්වීම නිසා ලංකාවට කොයි තරම් අමැරු තත්ත්වයකට මුහුණ පාන්නට සිදු වී තිබුණත්, වැඩි මිලට අරගෙන යන 25ක් තරම් අඩු මුදලකට මහජනතාවට දෙමින් තිබූ සහල් සලාකය පිළිබඳව වෙනසක් නොකරමින් එසේ දිගෙන යාමට බලවත් සටනක් කෙළේ. මෙවැනි භයානක මත්දපෝෂණ තත්ත්වයක් ඇති වන්නට ඉඩ තිබෙන නිසයි එද ඒ සටන පවත්වාගෙන ගියේ. මහජනතාවට ලබා දිය යුතු ඒ සහනය දීම පිණිස, මත්දපෝෂණයෙන් පොදු මහජනතාව මද ගැනීම පිණිස, විශාල වශයෙන් ධනය රැස් කරන ලොකු ධනවතුන්ගේ බදු බර වැඩි කර පොදු මහජනතාවට හාමත් නොවී ජීවත් වීමට අවසාවාස සැලසීම සඳහායි ඒ සටන ඒ විධියට ගෙන ගියේ. එහෙත් හාල් සේරු දෙක එක කලාට පසුව සතියකට හාල් සේරු දෙකක් ලබාගැනීමට සාමාන්‍ය දුප්පත් මහජනතාවට පුළුවන් කමක් නැහැ. සලාකයට දෙන හාල් සේරුව නොමිලේ දෙන නමුත් එයට අමතරව තවත් හාල් සේරුවක් ගන්නට ගියොත් ඒ සඳහා 1.40ක් පමණ ගෙවන්නට වෙනවා. ඒ අනුව කලින් සහ 25 බැගින් හාල් සේරු දෙකක් ලබාගන්නට පුළුවන්කම තිබුණු නමුත් දන් හාල්සේරු දෙකක් ලබාගන්නවා නම් එකක් නොමිලයේ ලැබුණත් අනික 1.40ක් පමණ වන නිසා නොමිලයේ ලැබෙන සේරුවයි මිලයට ගන්නා සේරුවයි දෙකම ගැනීමේ දී එකක සාමාන්‍ය මිල සහ 70 ක් පමණ වෙනවා. ඒ නිසා සාමාන්‍ය දුප්පත් මිනිසාට සතියකට හාල් සේරු දෙකක් ලබාගන්නට පුළුවන්කමක් නැහැ. එය මත්දපෝෂණය භයානක අන්දමින් වැඩිවීමට හේතු වී

[වෛද්‍යවාර්තය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ]

අද මැලේරියා රෝගය හයානක අන්දමට පැතිරී ගොස් තිබෙන්නේ මැලේරියා මදුරුවා එදාට වඩා හයානක සහෙක් වි ඇති නිසා නොවෙයි. එයට හේතුව රටේ ජනතාව තුළ හයානක ලෙස මන්දපෝෂණය තිබෙන හෙයින් විෂබීජ සමග සටන් කරන්නට තරම් ශරීර ශක්තියක් මහජනතාව තුළ නොමැතිවීමයි. අනික් රෝගන් ඒ විධියටම වැඩි වී තිබෙනවා. දැන් නැවතත් ක්ෂය රෝගය පැතිරීගෙන යනවා. එයටත් හේතුව මන්ද පෝෂණය නිසා විෂබීජ සමග සටන් කිරීමට ශක්තියක් මිනිසුන්ගේ ශරීර තුළ නොමැති වීමයි. මේ ආණ්ඩුවේ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය නිසා හාල් මිල වැඩි වූ හෙයින් ජනතාව තුළ මන්ද පෝෂණය ඇති වී මිනිසුන්ගේ ශරීර ශක්තිය හීන වී ඇති බව ඒවායින් මැනවින් ඔප්පු වෙනවා. මනුෂ්‍ය ශරීරයට වුවමනා කරන මාංශ ජනක ධාතු—ප්‍රෝටීන්—ලබාගැනීමට වුව මනා කරන හාල් පමණක් නොවෙයි, මාළු, මස්, කරවල, ආදියත් දැන් නැහැ. තිබුණත් ලබාගන්නට විශාල වියදමක් දරන්නට ඕනෑ. මසකට සලාකයට දෙන්නේ පරිප්පු අවුත්ස 3 යි. ඊට වඩා ඕනෑ නම් රාත්තලක් රුපියල් 3 බැගින් ගන්නට සිදු වෙනවා. ඒ නිසා ආහාර අතින් හයානක තත්ත්වයක් දැන් රටේ පවතිනවා. මේ ආණ්ඩුව අද ගෙනයන ප්‍රතිපත්තිය නිසා ජීවන වියදම ඉහල යන හෙයින් මේ ප්‍රතිපත්තියට විරුද්ධව අපි විශාල සටනක් ගෙනයන්නේ අන්න ඒ හේතූන් නිසයි.

ගර නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මේ ආහාර වගා ව්‍යාපාරය සම්බන්ධව මීට කලින් මතු නොකළ කරුණු කීපයක් මතක් කරන්නට කැමතියි. ඉදිරිපත් කර ඇති සංඛ්‍යා ලේඛන අනුව බලන විට කලින් තිබුණට වඩා 1967 දී අස්වැන්න වැඩි වී තිබෙනවාය කියන එක අපි පිළිගන්නට ඕනෑ. ඒ ගැන අභියෝග කරන්න හෝ තර්ක කරන්න වුවමනාවක් නැහැ. 1967 වර්ෂයේ වී අස්වැන්න බ්‍රසල් 5,50,00,000ක් දක්වා වැඩිවුණා කියන එක ගැන තර්ක කරන්නට වුවමනාවක් නැහැ. එය ඇත්තක්ය කියා පිළිගන්නට වටහනවා. එහෙත් ආහාර වගාව දියුණු කිරීමට නැත්නම් අස්වැන්න වැඩි කිරීමට ගෙනයන වැඩ පිළිවෙළ ගැන යමක් කිරීමට ඕනෑ

දැනට ගෙනයනු ලබන පිළිවෙළ අනුව මේ ව්‍යාපාරය කොපමණ කලක් මේ විධියට ගෙනයන්නට පුළුවන්ද කියා බලමු. මේ රටේ තිබෙන පසෙහි සරුසාර බව නැත්නම් රසායනික තත්ත්වය දියුණුවන අකුමට මෙය කෙරෙනවාද කියා බැලීමට අපට යුතු කමක් තිබෙනවා. පිලිපයින්ගි-මැනිලා නගරයේ ඇති ගොවිතැන සම්බන්ධව අන්තර් ජාතික පර්යේෂණ මධ්‍යස්ථාන මගින් නිකුත් කර ඇති වාර්තාවකින් කරුණු කීපයක් ඉදිරිපත් කිරීමට මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. අද ලංකාවේ කුඹුරු වල නැත්නම් ගොවිපොළවල පසෙහි ඇති රස ගුණ තත්ත්වය ආරක්ෂ වන අන්දමට කටයුතු නොකර දැනට කරන අන්දමට රසායනික පොහොර යෙදීමෙන් පමණක් වැඩිපුර අස්වැන්නක් ලබා ගැනීමෙන් සිදුවන්නේ කුමක්ද? එසේ කිරීමෙන් ඉදිරියටත් නැත්නම් මතුවටත් ඒ අන්දමේ අස්වැන්නක් ලබාගන්නට පුළුවන් වේද කියන එක සැක සහිත කරුණක් නිසා ඒ ගැන කරුණක් දෙකක් කියන්නට මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා.

මේ වාර්තාවේ මෙසේ සදහන් වී තිබෙනවා.

“High yields in Australia, Spain, Italy and the United Arab Republic can be explained in part by the fact that rice in these countries is grown largely in well irrigated, highly productive soil, following good cultural practices.”

ඔස්ට්‍රේලියාව, ස්පාඤ්ඤය, ඉතාලිය මිසරය වැනි රටවල අත්කරයකින් බ්‍රසල් 100 කට වඩා ගන්නට පුළුවන් වී තිබෙන්නේ, ස්වාභාවික ලෙස පොළොව සරුසාර ඒ රටවල සුදුසු අන්දමට ශාස්ත්‍රානුකූලව ගොවිතැන් කිරීම නිසා බව කියා තිබෙනවා.

මේ වාර්තාවේ විශාල තර්කයක් සටහන් වී තිබෙනවා. ගොම, කොළ ආදී වශයෙන් ඇති ස්වාභාවික පෝර, වෙනත් විධියකට කියතොත් ඉක්මනින් දිරණ පෝර, යෙදවීම අවශ්‍ය බව එක තර්කයක්. රසායනික පෝර පමණක් යොදවා ගොවිතැන් කිරීම ශාස්ත්‍රානුකූල නැතිලි. මේ විශේෂඥයන්ගේ අදහසක්. මේ සම්බන්ධයෙන් ආණ්ඩුවේ ගොවිකම් සඟරාවේ සදහන් වී තිබෙන කොටසක් මා කියවන්නට කැම

ගොවිකම් දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවේ ව්‍යාප්ති අංශයෙනුයි. කුණ්ඩසාලේ කෘෂිකර්ම විද්‍යාලයේ කම්කාර්‍යවාර්‍ය ඇල්බට් මහතා ඒ සහ රාව මාර්ගයෙන් මෙසේ කියා තිබෙනවා.

“බෝග නිෂ්පාදනයේදී පොහොර භාවිතය ගොවිතැන තරම්ම පැරණි පිළිවෙතක් වුවත් එය පුළුල් ලෙස ව්‍යාප්ත වූයේ පැලෑටි පෝෂණය විද්‍යාත්මකව තේරුම් ගැනීමෙන් පසුවය. පොහොර ද්‍රව්‍ය කාබනික හා අකාබනික හෙවත් රසායනික පොහොර වශයෙන් ඒවායේ ස්වභාවය අනුව වර්ග දෙකකට වෙන් කරනු ලැබේ. සත්ව හා ශාකීය ද්‍රව්‍ය මුල් කොටගෙන ලබා ගන්නා පොහොර ගොවිපල් පොහොර, මිශ්‍ර පොහොර, ඇට කුඩු, ලේ පොහොර, හා නොයෙක් පුත්තක්කු වම් කාබනික හෙවත් ඉන්ද්‍රියවත් පොහොර වශයෙන් ගැනේ. පැලෑටි පෝෂණයට සම්බන්ධ මූල ද්‍රව්‍ය කෙළින්ම මුල් කොටගෙන නිපදවා ගන්නා ඇමෝනියම් සල්ෆේට්, සුපර් පොස්ෆේට්, මියුරියොට් ඔෆ් පොෂ්, වැනි රසායනික සායන අකාබනික පොහොර වශයෙන් ගැනේ.”

එතකොට කාබනික සහ අකාබනික වශයෙන් පෝර කොටස් දෙකක් තිබෙන බව පිළිගන්නවා.

“තමන් නවීන ගොවිතැන් ක්‍රම යටතේ වැඩි නිෂ්පාදනය සඳහා, ඉඩම් ඉතා සිසුම් ලෙස පරිහරණය කරන නිසාත්, උසස් අස්වනු සඳහා අනිපන්නය කරන ලද බෝග පාවිච්චි කරන නිසාත් කාබනික හා රසායනික පොහොර එක ලෙස භාවිතා කිරීම වඩා ඵලදායකය. මෙසේ කිරීමෙන් කාබනික පෝර පසේ ජීව භෞතික සාරය රැක ගැනීමට හේතු වන අතර රසායනික පෝර පසේ රසායනික සාරය රැක ගැනීමට හේතු වෙයි.”

මෙම විශේෂඥයා ඔහුගේ වාර්තාවෙන් ඉදිරිපත් කරන අදහස අනුව රසායනික පෝරත් කාබනික පෝරත් යන දෙවර්ගයම යෙදිය යුතුයි. ආහාර වගාවේ ව්‍යාප්තිය සඳහා අද මේ ආණ්ඩුව ගෙන යන ප්‍රවාරය නම්, අකාබනික පෝර පමණක් යෙදිය යුතුය යන්නයි. මේ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය රජය විසින් කොයිතරම් දුරට ප්‍රවාරය කරනවාද කියතොත් පසුගිය රාජ්‍ය කටයුතු විවෘතයකදී මා, කොළ පෝරු, ගොම පෝර ආදී කාබනික පෝර වර්ග පාවිච්චි කළ යුතුයයි කියන විට රජයේ උප ඇමති වැරදිකර මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් මගේ ඒ කීම සම්ච්චලයට විනිවිදව ලක් කළා. ඒ උදවියගේ අදහස අනුව ගවයන් බෝ කිරීම, ගව එඩේරකම ගොවිතැනට අවශ්‍ය නැහැ. අමෙරිකාවෙන් මෙහි පැමිණ සිටින විශේෂඥයකු ලංකාවේ ගොවිතැනත්, යොදනු ලබන පෝරත් සම්බන්ධව ඔහු

ගේ වාර්තාවක දක්වා තිබෙන කරුණු වලින් එකක් දෙකක් මා මේ අවස්ථාවේදී ඉදිරිපත් කළ යුතුයි. ආහාරය පේමිස් සී. මුමෝ නමැති මේ විශේෂඥයා මෙසේ ප්‍රකාශ කරනවා :

“I was asked to come to Ceylon on a two-year assignment sponsored by the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations to assist in the development of rice research facilities, equipment and techniques in Ceylon.”

ලංකාවේ ගොවිතැන් කටයුතු පිළිබඳ පර්යේෂණවලට ආධාර කිරීමට “පෝර්ඩ් ඇන්ඩ් රොක්ෆෙල්ෆර් ෆවුන්ඩේෂන්” නම් ආයතනය මගින් මෙහි පැමිණි කෙනෙකු බව මේ විශේෂඥයාම කියනවා. ඊළඟට ඔහු මේ විධියේ අදහසක් ප්‍රකාශ කරනවා:

“Ceylon has lots of soil. We cannot say that Ceylon is deficient in soil quantity because new areas are available for cultivation, but we will have to admit that they are not the best quality. As a matter of fact, Ceylon has some very serious problems with regard to soil fertility. The nutrient supplies are generally low and the texture is coarse (sandy). There is little heavy clay like the most productive rice soils of the world as in the Central Plains of Thailand, in the Mekong Valley, in the Irrawaddy, in the Indus, in the Ganges and other places where rice grows in surplus. The best place to grow rice is on level, clay soils with high natural fertility.”

ගොවිතැන් සඳහා අවශ්‍ය ඉතාමත්ම සරු සාර පස ලංකාවේ නැති බව මේ විශේෂඥයාත් පිළිගන්නවා. ගොවිතැන් කටයුතු සඳහා යන්ත්‍ර සූත්‍ර පාවිච්චි කරන ගමන්ම ගවයන් ඒ සඳහා යොදා ගැනීමත් අවශ්‍ය බව අප කවුරුන්හුත් පිළිගත යුතුයි. එහෙත් මෙම විශේෂඥයාගේ අදහස මෙසේයි :

“And the mamoty is not technical enough. It must be replaced. One of the most promising replacements is a chemical called ‘paraquats’ that does most of the work of the plough. I think it will be a great day for Ceylon, too, when all the water buffaloes are in the zoo.”

මොහු කියන හැටියට, පරණ ආයුධයක් වන උදාලු දැන් අත්හැර දැමිය යුතුයි.

ගරු වන් නිත්‍යයක
(*ගෙනරාග වන්නිනායක*)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)
කවුද ඔය කියන්නේ ?

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(*டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்கம்*)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

“The Technology of Rice Abundance” by Dr. James C. Moomaw, Agronomist, IRRI-Ford Foundation Rice Project Central Agricultural Research Institute, Gannoruwa.

තමුත් නාන්සේ නිදාගෙන සිටි නිසයි, ඇහුණේ නැත්තේ. මා එය නැවත කිය වන්නම්. ඒ මෙසේයි :

“I was asked to come to Ceylon on a two-year assignment sponsored by the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations to assist in the development of rice research facilities, equipment and techniques in Ceylon.”

තණකොළ, පිදුරු, යනාදිය දිරීම සඳහා උදාලේලෝන් පූරණ කොටනවා වෙනුවට රසායනික පොහොර පාවිච්චි කරන්නායි කියන්නේ මෙම විශේෂඥයායි. උදාලේලෝ පාවිච්චියට ගෙන පොළොව සකස් කරන වාට වඩා ඒ ක්‍රමය හොඳ බවයි ඔහු කියන්නේ. මි හරක් සත්වොද්‍යානයට ඇතුළු කරන්නායි කියනවා. මි හරකුන්ගෙන් වැඩක් නැතෙයි කියනවා. මි හරකුන් කොටි වලසුන් වාගේ ගම්වලින් ඉවත් කරන්නායි කියනවා. “Pest control in rice input in this country” - පැළෑටි නාශක, කෘමි නාශක රසායනික ද්‍රව්‍ය පොළොව සකස් කිරීම සඳහා වැඩි වැඩියෙන් යොදන්නය කියනවා. මෙවැනි දේ ප්‍රචාරය කරන හෙයින් අප විශේෂයෙන් දැනගන්නට කැමතියි, රජයේ ඇමතිවරුන්ගේ අදහස් මොනවාද කියා. උදව් තල පිටරටින් ගෙන්වන්නේ නැතුව මේ රටේ සෑදීම සඳහා අපි විශාල ලෝහ කර්මාන්ත ශාලාවක් ඇති කර තිබෙනවා. මැනිලාවේ ඉදලා අමෙරිකන් ඒකාධිකාරී කොමිෂන් දෙකක - එනම් පෝෆිඩ් සහ රොක්ෆෙල්ජර් දෙකින් - විශේෂඥයන් අපට ගුරුකම් දෙන්නට ආවා. එම පුද්ගලයෙක් කියනවා, පැරණි දෙයක් හැටියට සලකා උදාලේලෝ සම්පූර්ණයෙන් අත්හරින ලෙස. උදාලේලෝ වැනි ආශ්‍රිත පාවිච්චි කරන්නට වුවමනා නොවන රට වල් ලෝකයේ තිබෙනවා. අමෙරිකාව, ඕස්ට්‍රේලියාව, වැනි මධ්‍යගොහොරු නැති සමහරා විශ්ලි පොළොව පිහිටි රටවල යන්ත්‍රානුසාරයෙන් පමණක් ගොවිතැන් කඩා යනවා.

යුතු කරන්නට පුළුවනි. ලංකාවේ කඳුකරයේ පිහිටි ගොවිපොළවල තත්ත්වය ඊට වෙනස්. ලංකාවේ තෙත් කලාපයේ මෙන්ම විශ්ලි කලාපයේත් ගොවිපොළ වලින් විශාල ප්‍රමාණයක් සඳහා වැඩක් වර්ෂ පාවිච්චි කරන්නට හැකි වුවත්, උදාලේලෝ නොමැතිව වැඩ කටයුතු සර්වකලය කරන්නට තුළුවන්නේ බව අපි පිළිගන්නට ඕනෑ. එහෙත් සාමාන්‍ය යන්ත්‍ර වල සහ රසායනික ද්‍රව්‍යවල උපකරයෙන් මෙම කටයුත්ත කරන්නට පුළුවනායි මේ වාර්තාවෙහි ප්‍රකාශ කර තිබෙන බව පෙනෙනවා.

නැති විශේෂඥයකුගේ එවැනි අදහසකට වඩා වැදගත් සේ සැලකිය හැකි වෙන්නේ අයගේ අදහස් තිබෙනවා. එම අදහස් කාගෙද? මැනිලාවේ පිලිප්පයින් දුපතේ විශ්ව විද්‍යාලයෙහි විශේෂඥයන්ගේ සහ ජාත්‍යන්තර ගොවිතැන් පර්යේෂණ සංවිධානයෙහි විශේෂඥයන්ගේ සම්මුතියෙන් ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙනවා. “Rice Production Manual” නමින් යුත් පොත් පිංචක්. පි වගාව සම්බන්ධ අත් පොතක් * හැටියට සැලකිය හැකි මෙම පොතෙන් ප්‍රකාශ කර තිබෙන්නේ මොනවාද? ගිනිකඳු ආශ්‍රයේ තිබෙන ඉතාම සරුසාර පොළොවේ - very high productive volcanic Soil - රසායනික පොහොර - Mineral Fertilizer - පමණක් යොදා ගොවිතැන් කරන්නට පුළුවනි. එහෙත් ස්වාභාවික වශයෙන් සරුසාර බවක් නොලැබූ බිම්වල පස සාරවත් කර ගන්නට නම් දිරපු කොළ පොහොර, ගොම පොහොර - ස්වාභාවික පොහොර යෙදීම අවශ්‍යයි. එසේ කිරීමෙන් පොළොවේ සරුසාර භාවය රැක ගැනීමට අවශ්‍ය වන බව ඒ අයගේ මතයයි. අපේ ගොවින් පසෙහි ඇත්ත වූ ස්වාභාවික සරුසාර ගතිය පරෙස්සම් කර ගන්නේ නැතිව අලාභ්‍යත්‍රිය ලෙස ගොවිතැන් කරන බව තමුත් නාන්සේට මෙයින් පැහැදිලි වෙනවා ඇති. ගුවන් විදුලි වැඩ සටහනක් සඳහා මා සමග කළ සාකච්ඡාවකදී මා වැරදි අදහස් ප්‍රකාශ කළාය යන මතයක් කෘෂි කර්ම ඇමතිතුමාත්, ගුවන් විදුලියේ විශේෂඥයකුත් ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙනවා. කෘෂි කර්ම දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව යෝජනා කර තිබෙන අන්දමට කටයුතු කිරීම නිසා රසායනික පොර යෙදීම සඳහාත්, කෘමිනාශක

බෙහෙත් සහ වල් පැළෑටි නාශක බෙහෙත් සඳහාත් විශාල මුදලක් වියදම් වන බවටත්, අළුත් වී වර්ග පාවිච්චි කිරීම නිසා හයානක රෝග බෝ වීමට ඉඩ තිබෙන බවටත් මා කළ ප්‍රකාශය ඔප්පු කිරීමට ආණ්ඩුවෙන්ම ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙන වාර්තාවලින් කරුණු දක්වන්නට මා අදහස් කරනවා. මෙය මගේ අදහසක් නොව ආණ්ඩුවේ වාර්තාවලම සඳහන් වී තිබෙන දෙයක් බව එයින් පැහැදිලි වෙයි.

“බැක්ටීරියා කොල අංගමාරය. මෙම හයානක ගොයම් රෝගය පිළිබඳව විමසිල්ලෙන් සිටින්න.”

“Bacteria Leaf Blight of Rice. Look out for this serious disease.”

ඊ ළඟට තවත් රෝග කීපයක් පිළිබඳව සඳහන් වෙනවා.

“ගොයම් කීඹාවන් හා මර්දන ක්‍රම ”

“Paddy Plant hoppers and their control.”

ඒවාට වුවමනා බෙහෙත් සම්බන්ධව විස්තර ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙනවා. ඊ ළඟට ගොයම්වලට හානි කරන කෘමීන් සම්බන්ධව තවත් විස්තර ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙනවා.

“Rice Stembosa (Stemborer).”

ඊ ළඟට යෙදිය යුතු රසායනික පෝර ප්‍රමාණය සම්බන්ධව වාර්තා ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙනවා.

“Fertilizer Recommendations for Rice Production.”

සාමාන්‍ය ගොවි පොලකට හොණ්ඩර 3 1/2ක් අවශ්‍ය බව සඳහන් කර තිබෙනවා. අයි.ආර්. 8 වී වහා කරනවා නම් අක්කරයකට හොණ්ඩර 10ක් වුවමනා බව සඳහන් කර තිබෙනවා.

මා මේ ඉදිරිපත් කළේ මගේ අදහස් නොව කණිකර්ම දොර්තමේන්තුවෙන්ම බෙදා හරින ලද පොත්පත්වල සඳහන් වී තිබෙන දේයි. ඒ බව මේ ගැන සභාවේ වාර්තාගත වීම අවශ්‍ය නිසා මා මේ ප්‍රකාශය කරන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වුණෙහි.

ගැන නියෝජ්‍ය කලානායකතුමනි, තවත් කාරණයක් මතක් කරන්නට කැමතියි. රෝග බෝවීම ආදී කරුණු නිසා අද අපේ ආහාර නිෂ්පාදනය ප්‍රමාණවත් අත්දැමින් ගෙන යන්නට අමාරු වුණත්, කලින් තිබුණාට වඩා කිහිප ගුණයකින් ලෝක වෙළඳ පොළේ හාල් මිල වැඩි වී තිබුණත්, ඇමෙරිකාව විසින් මේ පිළිබඳව සහනදායක ආරංචි ප්‍රසිද්ධි කර තිබෙනවා. අද අමෙරිකාවේ විශාල සමාගම් කිහිපයක් මේ විධියේ දැන් වීම් ප්‍රසිද්ධි කර තිබෙනවා :

“Fortified rice that still tastes like rice

Scientists at Louisiana State University can put two dishes of rice before you that look and taste essentially the same, but one contains rice’s usual 6 to 7 per cent protein while the other is 20 per cent protein.

They did it by mixing in a special granule formulated from soya protein.”
 “65 per cent isolated soya protein and 34 per cent modified maize starch.”

සෝයා බෝංචිත් ඉරිඟුත් සංයෝග කර අද කෘත්‍රීම හාලක් නිෂ්පාදනය කර තිබෙනවා. ඒවා ප්‍රමාණයෙන් හාල් ඇට තරමයි. අපේ රට වැනි රටවල් ශිලගාමී වැඩ පිළිවෙලවල් වශයෙන් ගොවිතැන් කරගෙන යෑමේ විපාකයක් වශයෙන් අනාගතයේදී පොළොවේ රස ආරක්ෂා කර ගැනීමට බැරි තත්ත්වයක් උදා වී හයානක ලෙස වී ගොවිතැන විනාශවන තත්ත්වයක් උද්ගත වුණත් හාල් වෙනුවට අපට ඇමෙරිකාවෙන් මේ කෘත්‍රීම හාල් ලබා ගැනීමට පුළුවන්කම තිබෙන බව ඒ දැන්වීම්වල පැහැදිලි වශයෙන් සඳහන් වෙනවා. “අපට ආහාර අතින් ස්වයංපෝෂිත වෙන්ට පුළුවන් ; අක්කරයකින් බ්‍රසල් 100 ක්, 125 ක් දක්වා අපේ අස්වැන්න වැඩි කර ගන්නට පුළුවන් ; අද අනුගමනය කරන වැඩ පිළිවෙල අනුව මේ කටයුත්ත පහසුවෙන් ඉෂ්ට කර ගන්න පුළුවන් ” ආදී වශයෙන් විශාල ප්‍රචාරයක් රටේ තිබෙනවා. ඒක වැරදි හැඟීමක්. කෘෂිකර්ම දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවත්, ඇමති මණ්ඩලයේ වගකියයුතු උදව්‍යයන් මේ විධියේ ප්‍රකාශ කරනවා. මම රජයට මතක් කරන්නේ මැතිලාවේ පිහිටා තිබෙන ජාත්‍යන්තර කෘෂිකර්ම පදයෙහිම විශේෂඥයන්ගේ අදහස් අනුව

[වෛද්‍යවාර්‍ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ]

කටයුතු කරනට කියායි. ඒ උදවියගේ පිළිගත් අදහසක් තමයි, අපේ රටේ ගොවිතැන් සඳහා අකාබනික සහ කාබනික යන දෙවර්ගයේම පෝර යෙදවීම අවශ්‍ය බව. ලංකාවේ තිබෙන්නේ ස්වාභාවික වශයෙන් සරු සාර පොළොවක් නොවන බව ඒ උදවිය කියනවා. ගිණිකළු ආශ්‍රිත ස්වාභාවික වශයෙන් සරු සාර භූමිවල ගොවිතැන් කිරීමේදී අකාබනික පෝර පමණක් යෙදීමෙන් සාර්ථක ප්‍රතිඵල ලබා ගත හැකි බවත් එහෙත් නිසරු පොළොවක් තිබෙන ලංකාව වැනි රටවල ගොවිතැන්වලට කාබනික සහ අකාබනික යන පෝර දෙවර්ගයම යෙදිය යුතු බවත් ඒ විශේෂඥයන්ගේ මතයයි. චතුරේන් නිතරම පොළොවේ සාරය සෝදා ගෙන යන, මඩ වගුරු වශයෙන් පවතින භූමිවල ගොවිතැන් කිරීම සඳහා කාබනික සහ අකාබනික යන පෝර දෙවර්ගයම වුව මනා කරනවා. මැනිලාවේ තිබෙන පර්යේෂණ මධ්‍යස්ථානය ලෝක ප්‍රසිද්ධයි. ඒ මධ්‍යස්ථානයේ ඉන්න ප්‍රධානියෙක් තමයි, කාලයක් ලංකාවේ කෘෂිකර්ම දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවේ සේවය කළ ආචාර්ය පොත්තම්පෙරුම. ඔහු ගොවිතැන් කටයුතු පිළිබඳ විශේෂඥයෙක්. ලංකාවේ සේවය කරන කාලයේ ගොවිතැන් කටයුතු පිළිබඳව නොයෙකුත් පර්යේෂණ කළ ඔහු, ලංකාවේ බෙහෝ ප්‍රදේශවල පොළොව ස්වාභාවික නිධානයන් අතින් ඉතාමත් දුර්වල තත්ත්වයක පවතින බව සොයාගෙන, සරුසාර අන්දමට ගොවිතැන් කිරීමට නම් අක්කරයට ඇඹරූ හුණු ගල් වොන් 6 ක් බැගින් දැමිය යුතු යයි යෝජනා කළා. අපේ පොළොවේ “සිලිකා” නමැති ද්‍රව්‍ය හිඟ නිසා, ඒ අඩුපාඩුව දහසිය පිවිචු අළු යෙදීමෙන් මහහරවා ගත හැකි බවත් ඔහු කියා සිටියා. ඒ විධියට කටයුතු කළොත් තමයි, මා කලින් කියවූ සරඟාවේ සඳහන් ජෛව භෞතික සාරය රැක ගන්නට පුළුවන්කම ලැබෙන්නේ. අපේ පොළොව සාරවත් බවට හරවාගෙන, අපේ ගොවිතැන සශ්‍රීක කර ගන්නට නම් ඒ විධියේ ප්‍රතිකර්ම යෙදිය යුතු බව, ආචාර්ය පොත්තම්පෙරුම ලංකාවේ කෘෂිකර්ම දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවේ සේවය කරන කාලයේ නිකුත් කළ වාර්තා

වක සඳහන් වෙනවා. ගොවිතැන දියුණු කිරීමට නම්, විශේෂයෙන් හාපිටිගම් කෝරළයේ මේ විධියේ ප්‍රතිකර්ම යෙදිය යුතු බව උත්තරාගේ “බුලටින්” අංක හතරේ සඳහන් කර තිබෙනවා. ගොවිතැන සශ්‍රීක කිරීමට නම්, පොළොව සාරවත් කිරීමට නම්, දීර්ඛ පහසුබිම සදහා ගොමත් සමඟ මිශ්‍ර කරන ලද පිදුරුත් සමඟ අක්කරයකට ඇඹරූ හුණු ගල් වොන් 3 ක් යෙදවිය යුතු යයි ඒ මහතා සිය දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව මාර්ගයෙන් නිවේදනයක් නිකුත් කර තිබෙන නමුත්, එය ක්‍රියාත්මක කළේ නැහැ. අපේ ගොවිතැන සශ්‍රීක කිරීම සම්බන්ධයෙන් දැනට ගෙන යන වැඩ පිළිවෙළ සත්‍යවූදායක නැහැ. ශාස්ත්‍රීය විධියට ගොවිතැන් කර සරුසාර අස්වැන්නක් ලබා ගැනීමට නම්, එක්තරා කාලයක අපේ නේ, පොල්, රබර් හෝදාපුළු වී නැති තාස්තී වී ගියා වාගේ ගොවිතැනත් නාස්තියට පත් වන්නට ඉඩ නොදී එය වළක්වා ගැනීමට කටයුතු කිරීම අවශ්‍ය බව මතක් කිරීම මගේ යුතුකමකැයි මා හිතනවා.

ගොවිතැන් කටයුතු සම්බන්ධයෙන් රජකොයි තරම් ප්‍රචාරක කටයුතු කළත්, ගොවිතැන දියුණු කිරීමට විශාල ප්‍රයත්නයක් දරනවාය කිවත්, ගොවිත්ට රජයේ සම්පූර්ණ ආධාරය ලැබෙනවාය කිවත්—ආධාර ලැබෙන බව ඇත්ත—අද ඇති වී තිබෙන තත්ත්වය ගැන කියන්න ඕනා. කුඹුරු පනත ක්‍රියාත්මක වුණු හැටි, 1966-67 වර්ෂය පිළිබඳව ගොවි ජන සේවා කොමසාරිස්වරයා නිකුත් කර ඇති පාලන වාර්තාවෙන් පැහැදිලි වෙනවා.

එකල්හි වේලාව අ. ගා. 8.30 වූයෙන් කටයුතු අත්සිටුවා විඩාදය කල් තබන ලදී.

එතැන් සිට විඩාදය 1968 අගෝස්තු 20 වන අඟහරුවාදා පවත්වනු ලැබේ.

අට්ටොපානු ඩී. පී. 8.30 මණ්ඩලාධිකාරීව සභාවගේ ආධාරයෙන් ඉදිරිපත් වූ ඉතිරි ආකල්පවලට. 1968 ඉක්බිති 20, බණ්ඩාරාය මහලයේ විවෘතව පවතින බැවින්.

It being 8.30 P.M., Business was interrupted, and the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed on Tuesday, 20th August, 1968.

காலை நேரம்

ஒத்திவைப்பு

ADJOURNMENT

உத்தரவிடப்பட்டது 8.30 மணிக்குப் பிற்பாடு
உடனடியாக உபசபாநாயகர் அவர்கள் வினாவின்றிச்
சபையை ஒத்திவைத்தார்கள்.

இதன்படி பி. பி. 8.31 க்கு சபை
அதனது 1968 ஓகஸ்ட் 13 ஆம் தேதிய
தீர்மானத்திற் கிணங்க 1968 ஓகஸ்ட்
20, செவ்வாய்க்கிழமை மு. பி. 10 மணி
வரை ஒத்திவைக்கப்பட்டது.

*It being past 8.30 P.M., MR. DEPUTY
SPEAKER adjourned the House without
Question put.*

*Adjourned accordingly at
8.31 P.M. until 10 A.M. on Tues-
day, 20th August 1968, pursuant
to the Resolution of the House
of 13th August, 1968.*

உத்தரவிடப்பட்டது 8.31 மணிக்குப் பிற்பாடு
உடனடியாக உபசபாநாயகர் அவர்கள் வினாவின்றிச்
சபையை ஒத்திவைத்தார்கள்.

[௨௨ சி. லீ. லீ.]

கனவே போதுமான விரிவுரை மண்டபங்கள், விளையாட்டிடங்கள், விளையாட்டுப் பொருட்கள், போதுமான தளபாடம், நீரடைப்பு மல சலகூடங்கள், மருத்துவ வசதிகள் மற்றும் தொலைபேசி வசதிகளும் போக்குவரத்து வசதிகளும் ஏற்படுத்தப்பட்டுள்ளது. இவ்வசதிகள் இல்லாத பாடசாலைகளுக்கு இவ்வசதிகளை ஏற்படுத்த நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கப்படவிருக்கின்றது.

(a) The students in all practical farm schools have been paid an allowance of Rs. 1.50 each per day to

cover the cost of food. Lodging is free. In addition, they have been getting the following concessions : 4 eggs per student per week at 15 cents per egg. $\frac{1}{2}$ pint of milk per day per student. (b) This allowance and concessions have been found to be sufficient despite devaluation. (c) The schools have already been provided with adequate lecture halls, playgrounds, sports materials, sufficient furniture, water seal lavatories, medical facilities, telephone facilities and transport facilities. Action is being taken to provide these facilities which are not available in some of the schools.

