



පාර්ලිමේන්තු විවාද

(හැන්සාඩ්)

නිල වාර්තාව

(අශෝධිත පිටපත)

අන්තර්ගත ප්‍රධාන කරුණු

නිවේදනය :

" බ " ස්ථාවර කාරක සභාවට නම කිරීම

ප්‍රශ්නවලට වාචික පිළිතුරු

විලික්ඛ ආර්. ඩී. බණ්ඩාරනායක මහතා, සිරිමා ආර්. ඩී. බණ්ඩාරනායක මහත්මිය සහ නිහාල් ජයවික්‍රම මහතා විෂයෙහි නියම කර ඇති ප්‍රජා අගක්‍රම පිළිබඳ යෝජනා සම්මතයන් අවලංගු කිරීම

කල් හැබීමේ යෝජනාව

ප්‍රශ්නවලට ලිඛිත පිළිතුරු



தமிழ் இலக்கியம்

(மேலாண்டு)

மேலாண்டு

(மேலாண்டு)

தமிழ் இலக்கியம்

Digitized by Noolaham Foundation.
noolaham.org | aavanaham.org

பாராளுமன்ற விவாதங்கள்

(ஹன்சாட்)

அதிகார அறிக்கை

(பிழை திருத்தப்படாதது)

பிரதான உள்ளடக்கம்

அறிவிப்பு :

நிலைக்குழு " பி " க்கு நேமகம்

வினாக்களுக்கு வாய்மூல விடைகள்

திரு. பீலிக்ஸ் ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க, திருமதி சிறிமா ஆர். டி. பண்டாரநாயக்க, திரு. நிகால் ஜயலிங்கிரம ஆடுயோர் மீது விதிக்கப்பட்ட டுள்ள குடியியல் தகுதியினத்தை இல்லாதொழித்தல் சம்பந்தமான தீர்மானங்களை இரத்துச் செய்தல்.

ஒத்திவைப்புப் பிரேரணை

வினாக்களுக்கு எழுத்துமூல விடைகள்

Volume 35
No. 10

Friday
7th June 1985

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

OFFICIAL REPORT

(Uncorrected)

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

ANNOUNCEMENT :

Nominations to Standing Committee "B"

RESCINDING OF RESOLUTIONS FOR IMPOSITION OF CIVIC DISABILITY ON MR. FELIX R. DIAS BANDARANAIKE, MRS. SIRIMA R. D. BANDARANAIKE AND MR. NIHAL JAYAWICKRAMA

ADJOURNMENT MOTION

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

2 - A 084092 - 2,750 (85/06)

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(continued)

Official Report

(Unrecorded)

Principal Contents

ANNOUNCEMENT:
RESOLUTIONS ON THE
CIVIC DISABILITY OF MR FELIX N. DIAS
AND MR Nihal Jayaraman
AND MR Nihal Jayaraman
AND MR Nihal Jayaraman

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
GOVERNMENT NOTICE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

HANSARD

OFFICIAL REPORT

(Unrecorded)

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

ANNOUNCEMENT:
RESOLUTIONS ON THE
CIVIC DISABILITY OF MR FELIX N. DIAS
AND MR Nihal Jayaraman
AND MR Nihal Jayaraman

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
GOVERNMENT NOTICE

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
GOVERNMENT NOTICE

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
GOVERNMENT NOTICE

පාර්ලිමේන්තුව
பாராளுமன்றம்
PARLIAMENT

1985 ජූනි 7 වන සිකුරාදා
வெள்ளிக்கிழமை, 7 ஜூன் 1985
Friday, 7th June 1985.

ප්‍ර. සා. 9.30 ට පාර්ලිමේන්තුව රැස් විය. කථනායකතුමා [ජ. එල්. සේනානායක මහතා] මූලාසනාදායී විය.

பாராளுமன்றம் மு. ப. 9.30 மணிக்குக் கூடியது. சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள் [திரு. எ. எல். சேனநாயக்க] தலைமை வகித்தார்கள்.

The Parliament met at 9.30 a.m. MR. SPEAKER (MR. E. L. SENANAYAKE) in the Chair.

නිවේදනය
அறிவிப்பு
ANNOUNCEMENT

“බී” සථාවර කාරක සභාවට නම් කිරීම
நிலைக்குழு “பி” க்கு நேமகங்கள்

NOMINATIONS TO STANDING COMMITTEE “B”

කථනායකතුමා
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

In terms of Standing Order No. 139, I have appointed Mr. Norman Waidyaratne, Deputy Speaker, Chairman of Standing Committee “B” for the consideration of-

- (1) the Pokunugala PУrana Vihara Sanwardhana Samitiya (Incorporation) Bill ;
- (2) the Aganuwara Taruna Kavi Samajaya (Incorporation) Bill ; and
- (3) the Sri Lanka Samodaya Foundation (Incorporation) Bill.

I have also nominated the following additional Members to serve on Standing Committee “B” for the consideration of the Bills :

- Mr. W. J. M. Lokubandara
- Mr. R. M. Abeykoon
- Mr. P. Dayaratne
- Mr. Percy Samaraweera
- Mr. W. M. Karunaratne
- Mr. Chandrakumara Wijeya Gunawardane
- Mr. Ananda Dassanayake
- Mr. E. P. Paul Perera
- Mr. Anura Bandaranaike
- Mr. Anil Moonesinghe
- Mr. Sarath Muttetuwegama
- Mr. Gamini Lokuge
- Mrs. Daya Sepali Senadheera
- Mr. Asoka W. Somaratne
- Dr. S. Y. S. B. Herat.

පෙත්සම්
மனுக்கள்
PETITIONS

සූරිල් රංජන් ජයකොඩි මහතා (පොල්ගහවෙල)
(திரு. சுனில் ரஞ்சன் ஜயக்கொடி — பொல்கஹவெல)
(Mr. Sunil Ranjan Jayakody-Polgahawela)
පොල්ගහවෙල, මාවත්තේ ජ. එම්. නිලකරන්ත මහතා විසින් එවා ඇති
1985 පෙබරවාරි 8 දින දරන පෙත්සම මම ඉදිරිපත් කරනවා.

ඉදිරිපත් කරන ලද පෙත්සම මහජන පෙත්සම් කාරක සභාවට පැවරිය යුතු යයි
නියෝග කරන ලදී.

சமர்ப்பிக்கப்பட்ட மனுக்களைப் பொதுமனுக் குழுவிற்குச் சாட்டக் கட்டளையிடப் பட்டது.

Petition ordered to be referred to the Public Petitions Committee.

ප්‍රශ්නවලට වාචික පිළිතුරු
வினாக்களுக்கு வாய்மூல விடைகள்
ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

එම්. ජී. පුංචිහාමි මහත්මිය : අර්ථසාධක මුදල්
திருமதி எச். ஜி. புஞ்சிஹாமி : சேலாநி

MRS. H. G. PUNCHIAPPUHAMY : EPF DUES

62/85

1. ආවාසී ධබ්ලිවි. දහනායක මහතා (ගාල්ල)
(கலாநிதி டபிள்யூ. தஹநாயக்க — காலி)
(Dr. W. Dahanayake-Galle)

මම කැර ඇමතිතුමාගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය :

(අ) ආකෝක්කාවෙල මිල්ලෙගහදෙතියේ හිසරේ ගමේ පුංචිහාමි
මහත්මියට ගෙවිය යුතු අර්ථසාධක අරමුදල් (අංකය 4812/ජී/159)
ගෙවන ලෙසට එතුමා තියෝග කරන්නේද ?

(ආ) තියෝග නොකරන්නේ නම්, ඒ මන්ද ?

தொழில் அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா :

(அ) அன்கொஹாவல, மில்லகஹதெனியவில் வசிக்கும் திருமதி
ஹரியாதே கமகே புஞ்சிஹாமி என்பவருக்குரிய சேமலாப நிதி
பாக்கிசளை (இல. 4812/ஜி/159) வழங்கும்படி அவர் உத்தரவிடு
வாரா ?

(ஆ) இல்லையேயில், ஏன் ?

asked the Minister of Labour :

(a) Will he order the payment of Provident Fund dues to Mrs. Hiyare Gamage Punchihamy of Millegahadeniya, Ankokkawala, No. 4812/G/159 ?

(b) If not, why ?

එම්. වින්සන්ට් පෙරේරා මහතා (පාර්ලිමේන්තු කටයුතු හා ක්‍රීඩා
ඇමතිතුමා සහ ආණ්ඩු පාර්ශ්වයේ ප්‍රධාන සභිකයකුතුමා)

(திரு. எம். வின்சன்ட் பெரேரா — பாராளுமன்ற அலுவல்கள்,
விளையாட்டுத்துறை அமைச்சரும் பிரதம அரசாங்கக் கொறடாவும்)

(Mr. M. Vincent Perera—Minister of Parliamentary Affairs & Sports and Chief Government Whip)

I answer on behalf of the Minister of Labour.

(a) After the discrepancy in the membership number allotted to member H. G. Punchihamy was rectified it was ascertained that the correct membership number was 4812/G/79. The Commissioner of Labour had directed the Superintendent, E.P.F., on 30.04.85 to pay the benefits lying under this number to the member.

(b) Does not arise in view of answer to (a) above.

(b) Will he order that this citizenship should be allowed at once ?

(c) If not why ?

ලලිත් ඇතුලත් මුදලි මහතා (ජාතික ආරක්ෂාව පිළිබඳ ඇමතිතුමා සහ නියෝජ්‍ය රාජ්‍ය ආරක්ෂක ඇමතිතුමා)

(திரு. லலித் அத்துலத் முதலி—தேசிய பாதுகாப்பு அமைச்சரும் பாதுகாப்புப் பிரதி அமைச்சரும்)

(Mr. Lalith Athulath Mudali - Minister of National Security and Deputy Minister of Defence)

(අ) අතවශ්‍ය ප්‍රමාදයක් සිදු වී නැත.

දෙවැනිද මහතාගේ අයදුම්පත ලැබුණේ 1985. 01. 18-වන දිනය.

(ආ) ශ්‍රී ලංකා පුරවැසි නවය ඉල්ලුම් ඉදිරිපත් කරන ලද ඔහුගේ අයදුම්පත 1985. 05. 21 දින අනුමත කර ඇති අතර සහතිකය නිකුත් කිරීම සඳහා අවශ්‍ය මුද්දර, ජායාරූප යනාදිය එවන ලෙස ඔහුට දන්වා ඇත.

(ඇ) පැන නොනගී.

කමිකරු විනිශ්චය සභාව : නඩු අංක 1/14832/77

தொழில்நீதிமன்ற வழக்கு இல 1/14832/77

LABOUR TRIBUNAL CASE NO. : 1/14832/77

138/85

4. ලක්ෂ්මන් ජයකොඩි මහතා (අත්තනගල්ල)

(திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி — அத்தனாகல்)

(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody-Attanagalla)

අධිකරණ ඇමතිතුමාගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය :

(අ) කමිකරු විනිශ්චය සභා නඩු අංක 1/14832/77 දරන නඩුව සම්බන්ධව අභියාචනාධිකරණය විසින් ස්වකීය නින්දව 1980. 06. 20 ප්‍රකාශයට පත් කර, අදාළ සියලුම ලියකියවිලි කමිකරු විනිශ්චය සභාව වෙත එවා ඇති බව එතුමා දන්වාද ?

(ආ) අභියාචනාධිකරණයේ නින්දව එතුමා සහාය කරනවාද ?

(ඇ) මෙම නින්දව සම්බන්ධව කමිකරු විනිශ්චය සභාව ගෙන ඇති පියවර කුමක්දී එතුමා සඳහන් කරනවාද ?

நீதி அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா:

(அ) தொழில் நீதிமன்றத்தின் 1/14832/77 ஆம் இலக்க வழக்குத் தொடர்பான மேன்முறையீட்டு நீதிமன்றம் 20.6.1980 ஆம் தேதி தீர்ப்பை வெளியிட்டு இதனுடன் தொடர்பான எல்லாப் பத்திரங்களையும் தொழில் நீதிமன்றத்துக்கு மேன்முறையீட்டு நீதிமன்றம் அனுப்பியுள்ளதை அவர் அறிவாரா?

(ஆ) மேன்முறையீட்டு நீதிமன்றத்தின் தீர்ப்பை அவர் சமர்ப்பிப்பாரா?

(இ) இத்தீர்ப்பின் தொடர்பாக தொழில் நீதிமன்றம் என்ன நடவடிக்கை எடுத்துள்ளதென்பதை அவர் கூறுவாரா?

asked the Minister of Justice :

(a) Is he aware that the Court of Appeal has on 20.06.1980 declared its decision pertaining to Labour Tribunal Case No. 1/14832/77 and sent all the relevant documents to the Labour Tribunal ?

(b) Will he table the decision of the Court of Appeal ?

(c) Will he state what steps have been taken by the Labour Tribunal regarding this Case ?

செல்டன் ரனாராஜ் மஹா (අධිකරණ නියෝජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා)

(திரு. ஷெல்டன் ரணராஜா — நீதி பிரதி அமைச்சர்)

(Mr. Shelton Ranaraja-Deputy Minister of Justice)

(a) Yes.

(b) I table the decision of the Court of Appeal. *

(c) The Labour Tribunal has on 12.05.1981 conveyed to the parties concerned the decision of the Court of Appeal. In accordance with the decision of the Court of Appeal, the employer-appellant has to deposit with the Commissioner of Labour (Colombo) the compensation due. But as the employer-appellant has not acted in terms of the decision of the Court of Appeal, the Commissioner of Labour has filed Case No. 11541/4 in the Magistrate's Court of Colombo.

ලක්ෂ්මන් ජයකොඩි මහතා

(திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி)

(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

Will the Hon. Minister, along with the Ministry of Labour, work out some scheme in regard to these cases because we find that there are LT cases in the Magistrate's Courts and Magistrate's Court cases in LTs. Then there are Appeal Courts involved on both sides. Therefore the labour laws of this country have become very cumbersome to operate. Will the Hon. Minister consider discussing this matter with the Hon. Minister of Labour and work out an easier method to finalize these cases ?

செல்டன் ரனாராஜ் மஹா

(திரு. ஷெல்டன் ரணராஜா)

(Mr. Shelton Ranaraja)

There is a procedure to recover this money, and in accordance with that procedure a case has been filed in the Magistrate's Court to recover this money. A fine has been imposed on the defendant in this matter. The defendant appealed against that to the Court of Appeal. The case is to be taken up in the Court of Appeal this month on 19th June 1985.

* සහමේසය මත තබන ලද ලියවිල්ල :

சமர்ப்பித்து வைக்கப்பட்ட ஆவணம்:

Document tabled:

C.A. (S.C.) 361/78

L.T. No. 1/14832/77

National Textile Corporation - Employer-Appellant.

vs.

Sri Lanka Nidahas Welanda ha Karmika Ayathana Sevaka Sangamaya - on behalf of employee U. E. Perera

- Respondent

BEFORE : WIMALARATNE, J. (President, Court of Appeal), & K. C. E. DE ALWIS, J.

COUNSEL : A. Mahendrarajah for the Liquidator. G. G. Mendis for the Respondent.

ARGUED ON : 23.5.80

DECIDED ON : 20.6.80

WIMALARATNE, J. (President, Court of Appeal) :-

U. E. Perera, the workman on whose behalf the Union respondent appears, was appointed Welfare Officer of the Thulhiriya Mills of the National Textile Corporation on 5.6.73. He complained to the

Labour Tribunal that his services were unlawfully terminated on 23.8.77, and claimed reinstatement, back wages and other reliefs. The Corporation took up the position that it did not terminate the services of the workmen unlawfully, but that as the workman did not report for work after 22.7.77, it lawfully terminated his services as from 22.8.77.

The Tribunal, by order dated 22.11.78, held that the workmen's services were unlawfully terminated by the Corporation, and instead of ordering reinstatement, granted the workmen a sum of Rs. 40,000/- as compensation. The Corporation filed a petition of appeal on 8.12.78. The appeal briefs were dispatched to the parties on 4.7.79. When the appeal came up for hearing on 25.9.79 a postponement was granted on personal grounds on behalf of Counsel appearing for the appellants corporation.

On the next date, 12.11.79, Counsel for the appellants stated that the Corporation had been vested in the government under the provisions of the Business Undertakings (Acquisition) Act, No. 35 of 1971, and that *he had been instructed to appear on behalf of the competent authority*. He moves for an adjournment to file necessary papers.

On 4.12.79 Counsel who appeared for the appellants stated that *he was not appearing for the competent authority*. Counsel for the respondent produced the relevant gazette notification in proof of the vesting of the Corporation under the Business Undertakings (Acquisition) Act. This Court ordered notice to issue on the Attorney General and on the competent authority, which notices have been duly served.

On 4.3.80 Senior State Counsel who appeared for the Attorney General wanted time to look into the matter. On 9.5.80 this Court directed notice to issue on the Liquidator of the National Textile Corporation, Y.R. de Silva (It does not appear from the record that any papers were filed relating to the appointment of the Liquidator).

When this matter came up before us on 23.5.80 Mr. Mahendrarajah who appeared for the Liquidator referred us to Sections 19 to 22 of the Finance Act. No. 38 of 1971, and stated that he had no status to appear in this appeal. Senior State Counsel also said that he was not arguing the appeal on behalf of the appellants. Mr. N. S. A. Goonetilleke who had appeared earlier for the Corporation also stated that he had instructions not to appear for the Corporation. In this situation Counsel for the respondent invited us to dismiss this appeal for non-prosecution.

A notification in Gazette No. 58/6 dated 18.10.79 states that the National Textile Corporation had from that date been vested in the government. This vesting has been made by the acting Minister of Finance by virtue of the powers vested in him by Section 2 (1) (b) read with Section 17 of the Business Undertakings (Acquisition) Act. The property vestee had been specified in Schedule II as follows :-

All immovable property including land and buildings, all equipment and fixtures and all movable property, which on the day immediately proceeding the date of vesting in the Government, of the business undertaking specified in Schedule I, were used for the purposes of such undertaking.

When a business undertaking is so vested, Section 4 (1) provides that all the rights and liabilities under any contract or agreement which relates to the purposes of the undertaking and which subsists on the date of transfer shall vest in the government. The rights and liabilities of the corporation have therefore from 18.10.79 been vested in a competent authority, who has not considered it necessary to support this appeal.

Section 19 of the Finance Act provides that where the appropriate Minister considers that the activities of a public corporation should be terminated, he may, under the authority of a resolution passed by

Parliament (a) dissolve the corporation ; & (b) appoint one or more person to be the liquidator or liquidators of the corporation. With his written submissions dated 11.6.80, Mr. Mahendrarajah has produced a letter signed by the Minister of Textile Industries dated 21.3.80, dissolving the National Textile Industries, and appointing Y. R. de Silva as the Liquidator. He suggested at the conclusion of his written submission that the appropriate order would be an order for the abatement of this appeal.

In terms of Section 31 (I) (5) of the Industrial Disputes Act (Cap. 131) appeals from the Labour Tribunals are governed by the provisions of Chapter XXX of the Criminal Procedure Code. The equivalent relevant provisions of the Criminal Procedure Code Act, No. 15 of 1979, are section 349 and 358. Section 358 states that every appeal to the Court of Appeal shall abate on the death of the accused. In my view a situation similar to "the death of an accused appellant" in a criminal case has not arisen in this appeal. The true position appears to be that the liquidator is not supporting the appeal. Section 349 (3) provides that if the appellants does not appear to support the appeal, the court shall consider the appeal and make such order therein as it may deem fit. I am of the view that that is the course which this Court should adopt in this appeal.

The decision of the Tribunal that the termination of the workmen's services was unlawful is a decision on a pure question of fact from which there is no right of appeal. The Tribunal's decision that the termination of the workmen's services is unlawful will stand. The decision awarding the workman a sum of Rs. 40,000/- as compensation, is however, a decision which could be reviewed. The Tribunal has not set down the basis on which this amount has been calculated. When the workman's services were terminated on 22.8.77 he was short of his 55th year by 26 months. There was a contest at the trial as to whether the employees of the National Textile Corporation had a right to be in employment till they reached age 60. A circular No. 263 dated 15.12.75 (A6) was relied upon by the workman to establish his case that he had a right to remain employed until he was 60 years of age. The Corporation, in its written submissions, produced Public Administration Circular No. 95 issued on 4.4.75, in terms of which state employees and public sector employees may be required to retire on completing the age of 55 years. Circular A6 was an exception to Circular No. 95, and was applicable only to employees under the Ministry of Industries and Scientific Affairs. But when his services were terminated the workman was no longer an employee of a corporation coming under the Ministry of Industries. He was an employee in a corporation under the Ministry of Textile Industries. He thereupon ceased to be governed by Circular A6, and became subject to Circular No. 95.

The workman ought therefore, to have been given compensation for loss of career for a period of 26 months. His total emoluments at the date of termination amounted to Rs. 1020/- per month. The compensation due would then be Rs. 26,520/-. Allowing for subsequent increments and other benefits I would say that the payment to the workman of a sum of Rs. 27,500/- as compensation would be equitable. I would, therefore, whilst dismissing this appeal, substitute a sum of Rs. 27,500/- for the sum of Rs.40,000/- as compensation payable by the appellants to the respondent. The Respondent will also be entitled to the costs of this appeal, which I fix at Rs. 500/-

Sgd—:

PRESIDENT OF THE COURT OF APPEAL

K.C.E. DE ALWIS, J.

I agree—

JUDGE OF THE COURT OF APPEAL.

එම්. පී. ගිල්බට් මහතා : උසස්වීම
 திரு. எம். பி. கில்பட் : பதவியுயர்வு
 MR. M. P. GILBERT : PROMOTION

213/85

5. ලක්ෂ්මන් ජයකොඩි මහතා
 (திரு. லக்ஷமன் ஜயக்கொடி)
 (Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

යොවන කටයුතු හා රැකියා සහ අධ්‍යාපන
 ඇමතිතුමාගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය :

- (අ) කහඳුව, ගා/පිනිකහන කණිෂ්ඨ විද්‍යාලයේ විදුහල්පති එම්. පී. ගිල්බට් මහතා III ශ්‍රේණියේ විදුහල්පතිවරයෙකු වශයෙන් 1982 ජූලි 30 වන දින පත්වීමක් ලද බව එතුමා දන්වයිද ?
- (ආ) එසේ නම්, එම පත්වීමේ ලිපිය සහායක කරනවාද ?
- (ඇ) එම පත්වීම 31.12.1982 දින අවලංගු කළ බව එතුමා දන්වයිද ?
- (ඈ) එසේ නම් එම අවලංගු කිරීමේ ලිපිය සහායක කරනවාද ?
- (ඉ) එසේ අවලංගු කිරීමට හේතු කුමක්ද ?
- (ඊ) මේ සම්බන්ධ පරීක්ෂණයක් පවත්වා ඔහුට හිමි උසස්වීම ලබා දීමට කටයුතු කරනවාද ?
- (උ) එසේ නොවේ නම්, ඒ මන්ද ?

இளைஞர் அலுவலர்கள் தொழில் வாய்ப்பு அமைச்சரும் கல்வி அமைச்சரும் மாணவரைக் கேட்ட வினா:

- (அ) கஹதாவ, ගා/පිනිකහන කණිෂ්ඨ විද්‍යාලයේ විදුහල්පතින් අධ්‍යාපන ති. ආ. පී. ගිල්බට් III ආයුධ අධ්‍යාපන 1982 සැප්තැම්බර් 30 ආයුධ ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ නියමයට පත්වීමට අවස්ථාවක් ඇතිවාද ?
- (ஆ) அவ்வாறெனில் இந்தியமனக் கடிதத்தைச் சமர்ப்பிப்பாரா?
- (இ) இந் நியமனம் 31.12.1982 ஆம் தேதி இரத்துச் செய்யப்பட்டதை அவர் அறிவாரா?
- (ஈ) அவ்வாறெனில் இரத்துச் செய்த கடிதத்தைச் சமர்ப்பிப்பாரா?
- (உ) இவ்வாறு இரத்துச் செய்யக் காரணம் என்ன?
- (ஊ) இது தொடர்பாக விசாரணை நடத்தி இவருக்குரிய பதவி உயர்வைப் பெற்றுக் கொடுக்க நடவடிக்கை எடுப்பாரா?
- (ஏ) இன்றேல், ஏன்?

asked the Minister of Youth Affairs and Employment,
 and Minister of Education :

- (a) Is he aware that Mr. M. P. Gilbert, the Principal of G/Pinikahana Junior School, Kahaduwa, got an appointment as a Grade III Prinicpal on the 30th of September 1982 ?
- (b) If so, will he table that letter of appointment ?
- (c) Is he aware that this appointment was cancelled on 31.12.1982 ?
- (d) If so, will he table that letter of cancellation ?
- (e) What was the reason for such cancellation ?
- (f) Will he inquire into this matter and take action to grant him the promotion due to him ?
- (g) If not, why ?

වීරවන්ති සමරවීර මහතා (නියෝජ්‍ය අධ්‍යාපන ඇමතිතුමා)
 (திரு. வீரவள்ளி சமரவீர — கல்விப் பிரதி அமைச்சர்)
 (Mr. Weerawanni Samaraweera—Deputy Minister of Education)

- (අ) ඔව්.
- (ආ) ඔව්. * සහායක කරමි.
- (ඇ) නැත. එහෙත් අධ්‍යාපන සේවා කමිටුවේ ලේකම් විසින් එම පත්වීම අත්හිටුවා ඇති බව දැනිමි.

- (අ) පත්වීම අත්හිටුවීමේ ලිපියේ පිටපතක් * සහායක කරමි.
- (ඉ) රජයේ තීරණය අනුව එම පත්වීම ලැබීමට එම්. පී. ගිල්බට් මහතාට සුදුසුකම් තැනී බව අනාවරණය වීම නිසා එම පත්වීම අත්හිටුවා ඇත.
- (ඊ) නැත.
- (උ) කරන ලද පරීක්ෂණ අනුව ඔහුට සුදුසුකම් තැනී බව අනාවරණය වී ඇති නිසා.

ලක්ෂ්මන් ජයකොඩි මහතා
 (திரு. லக்ஷமன் ஜயக்கொடி)
 (Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)
 මොකක්ද, තැනී සුදුසුකම ?

වීරවන්ති සමරවීර මහතා
 (திரு. வீரவள்ளி சமரவீர)
 (Mr. Weerawanni Samaraweera)
 ඒ සම්පූර්ණ විස්තරය සහායක කරනවා.

ලක්ෂ්මන් ජයකොඩි මහතා
 (திரு. லக்ஷமன் ஜயக்கொடி)
 (Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)
 එහි තැනී සුදුසුකමක් සඳහන් කර තිබෙනවාද ? ඒ සහායක කරන ලිපියේ ඒ ප්‍රශ්නයට පිළිතුර තිබෙනවා නේද ?

වීරවන්ති සමරවීර මහතා
 (திரு. வீரவள்ளி சமரவீர)
 (Mr. Weerawanni Samaraweera)
 තිබෙනවා.

* සහායක මත. තබන ලද ලිපි :
 * සභාපිටිකම් කොටසක් සහිතව ඇතුළත් කළ
 Letters tabled :

මගේ අංකය : අසේන/අසේන/300
 1982 ජූලි 30 වන දින
 රාජ්‍ය සේවා කොමිෂන් සභාවේ
 අධ්‍යාපන සේවා කමිටුව,
 අධ්‍යාපන අමාත්‍යාංශ ගොඩනැගිල්ල,
 කොළඹ 2.

මලවිපතිරණයේ ගිල්බට් මහතා
 ගා/විල්ලඔගල ක.වි.,
 ඇල්පිටිය.

මහත්මයාණනි/මහත්මියනි.

III වැනි ශ්‍රේණියේ විදුහල්පති තනතුරට පත්කිරීම

1982 අප්‍රේල් මස 21 දින අමාත්‍ය මණ්ඩලය විසින් ගන්නා ලද තීරණය පරිදි, ඔබ 1982.04.21 දින සිට ක්‍රියාත්මක වන සේ අධ්‍යාපන අමාත්‍යාංශයේ III වැනි ශ්‍රේණියේ විදුහල්පති තනතුරකට ස්ථිරව පත්කර ඇති බව මෙයින් දන්වමි.

- 2. මෙම තනතුර ස්ථිරය. විශ්‍රාම වැටුප් සහිතය.
- 3. ආයතන සංග්‍රහයේ ව්‍යවස්ථාවලට ද, මුදල් රෙගුලාසිවලට ද, දෙපාර්තමේන්තු කියෝගවලට ද රජය විසින් වරින් වර නිකුත් කරනු ලබන වෙනත් යම් රෙගුලාසි හෝ කියෝග වෙනත්ම ඒවාට ද ඔබ යටත්වනු ඇත.
- 4. සේවය කරන ලෙස ඔබට නියම කෙරෙන දිවයිනේ කවර ප්‍රදේශයක වුව ද ඔබ සේවය කළ යුතුය. දිවයිනේ කවර ප්‍රදේශයක වුව ද අධ්‍යාපන අමාත්‍යාංශය යටතේ මේ හා සමාන තනතුරකට ස්ථිර මාරු කිරීමට ද ඔබ යටත්වනු ඇත.
- 5. ඔබගේ දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවේ ප්‍රධානියා විසින් නියම කරනු ලැබුවහොත් රජයේ නිලධාරීන්ගේ (ඇප) ආඥාපනත අනුව ඇප ඉදිරිපත් කිරීමට ඔබ බැඳී සිටිය යුතුය.
- 6. ඔබ මෙයට කලින් "පොදු 160" දරණ ආකෘති පත්‍රය සම්පූර්ණ කොට ගිවිසුමකට ඇතුළත් වී කොමිෂනරී තම වගාම එසේ කිරීමට ඔබට නියම කෙරෙනු ඇත.
- 7. ඔබ පත් වූ දින සිට, 1975.07.09 දිනැති අංක 96 දරණ රාජ්‍ය පරිපාලන චක්‍රලේඛයේ 4 වැනි ඡේදයේ නියම කර ඇති ආකාරයට ඔබගේ වැටුපෙන් සියයට ප්‍රමාණයක් වැන්දඹු හා අනන්දරු අරමුදලට දායක මුදල් ගෙවීමට ඔබ යටත්වනු ඇත.

[එස්. එස්. අබේසේනරත්න මහතා]

As the information supplied was inadequate, Mr. Perera was written to by the department on 4.4.83 to supply more details, which he has failed to do up to date. Instead, he has asked for an independent inquiry into this matter. Thereupon the D.A. had referred the papers to the Ministry on 2.6.83 for investigations to be made by the Special Investigations Unit of the Ministry. The S.I.U. had recorded the statement of Mr. Perera in respect of the theft at Karadiyan Aru. On 7.8.84 Mr. Perera has submitted the following 2 applications which have also been referred to the Ministry for action :

- 1. Losses due to corruption at the Gannoruwa Workshop.
- 2. Losses at the Govt. Farms during the period 1970 to 1976.

In the absence of full particulars the Ministry was unable to inquire into these cases.

ලංකා ඛනිජ තෙල් නීතිගත සංස්ථාව : වක්‍රලේඛ එස්.ජී.සී/99 (IV)
 இலங்கைப் பெற்றோலியக் கூட்டுத்தாபனம் : சுற்றறிக்கை
 எஸ் இ சி/99/(iv)

CEYLON PETROLEUM CORPORATION: CIRCULAR SEC/99(iv)

207/85

10. ලක්ෂ්මන් ජයකෝඩ් මහතා

(திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி)
(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

විදුලිබල හා බලශක්ති පිළිබඳ තියෝජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමාගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය :-

- (අ) ලංකා ඛනිජ තෙල් නීතිගත සංස්ථාවේ සභාපති විසින් අධ්‍යක්ෂ මණ්ඩලය පිළිබඳව කාර්ය ප්‍රධානීන් මාර්ගයෙන් සියලුම සේවකයන් වෙත යවන ලද 1985 පෙබරවාරි 1 වැනි දින අංක එස්.ජී.සී/99 (IV) දරන වක්‍රලේඛය එතුමා සභාගත කරන්නේද ?
- (ආ) සභාපති, උප සභාපති, ක්‍රියාකාරක අධ්‍යක්ෂවරුන් හා අධ්‍යක්ෂවරුන් සඳහන් කරමින් ලංකා ඛනිජ තෙල් නීතිගත සංස්ථාවේ වර්තමාන අධ්‍යක්ෂ මණ්ඩලය එතුමා නම් කරන්නේද ?

மின்சக்தி, எரிபொருள் பிரதி அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா :

- (அ) பணிப்பாளர் சபையினருடைய கடமைகள் பற்றி, பிரிவுத் தலைவர்கள் மூலம் சகல ஊழியர்களுக்கும் இலங்கை பெற்றோலியக் கூட்டுத்தாபனத் தலைவர் அனுப்பிய எஸ் இ சி/99 (iv) ஆம் இலக்கமிட்ட 1 பெப்ரவரி 1985 ஆம் தேதியச் சுற்றறிக்கையை அவர் சபையில் சமர்ப்பிப்பாரா ?
- (ஆ) தலைவர், உபதலைவர், தொழிற்படு பணிப்பாளர், பணிப்பாளர் பற்றிய விபரமடங்கிய இலங்கை பெற்றோலியக் கூட்டுத் தாபனத்தின் பணிப்பாளர் சபையினரின் பெயர்களைக் கூறுவாரா ?

asked the Deputy Minister of Power and Energy ;

- (a) Will he table Circular SEC/99 (iv) of 1st February, 1985 sent by Chairman, Ceylon Petroleum Corporation, to all Employees through the Heads of Sections pertaining to the Board of Directors ?
- (b) Will he name the present directorate of the Ceylon Petroleum Corporation specifying the Chirman, Vice-Chairman, Working Directors and Directors ?

සී. දයාරත්න මහතා
(திரு. பீ. தயாரத்ன)
(Mr. P. Dayaratne)

- (අ) මේ පිටපත සභාගත කරනු ලැබේ.
- (ආ) මේ අධ්‍යක්ෂ මණ්ඩලය පහත සඳහන් අයගෙන් සමන්විතය.
 - 1. දහම් විමලසේන මහතා - සභාපති
 - 2. කේ. ඡන්මුලලංගම් මහතා - අධ්‍යක්ෂ
 - 3. ජෝර්ජ් කන්දරපා මහතා - අධ්‍යක්ෂ
 - 4. එච්. ඩී. රත්නාසක මහතා - ක්‍රියාකාරී අධ්‍යක්ෂ
 - 5. ආර්. ආර්. නල්ලසියා මහත්මිය - ක්‍රියාකාරී අධ්‍යක්ෂ
 - 6. ආචාර්ය සී. එල්. කේ. තෙන්නකෝන් මහතා - අධ්‍යක්ෂ - 1985.03.21 දින සිටය.

දීනේෂ් ගුණවර්ධන මහතා
(திரு. தினேஷ் குணவர்தன)
(Mr. Dinesh Gunawardene)

ඒ අධ්‍යක්ෂවරුන්ගෙන් කාට හරි හමුදාවගේ විශේෂ ආරක්ෂාවක් දී තිබෙනවාද ?

සී. දයාරත්න මහතා
(திரு. பீ. தயாரத்ன)
(Mr. P. Dayaratne)

මම දන්නේ නැහැ. යොයා බලා කියන්න පුළුවන්.

ලක්ෂ්මන් ජයකෝඩ් මහතා
(திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி)
(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

තව ප්‍රශ්නයක් තිබෙනවා. මේ අධ්‍යක්ෂවරුන්ගෙන් එක් අධ්‍යක්ෂකවාව රජයට පවරාගත් වෙනත් ආයතනයක ප්‍රධාන මෑතේජර් මහත්මිය වශයෙන් කටයුතු කරන අතරම එම ආයතනය අද වන තෙක් නීතිගත සංස්ථාවට සම්බන්ධීකරණය කර නැති නිසා මේ දෙකේ සම්බන්ධතාවය කුමක්දැයි කියා සඳහන් කරනවාද ?

සී. දයාරත්න මහතා
(திரு. பீ. தயாரத்ன)
(Mr. P. Dayaratne)

මමතුමා විසින් අසන ලද ප්‍රශ්නයේ පලමුවැනි කොටසින් යම්කිසි වක්‍රලේඛයක පිටපතක් ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නට කියා ඉල්ලා තිබෙනවා. මා එය සභාගත කරන බව කීවා. ඒකෙ තිබෙනවා, සම්බන්ධය.

ලක්ෂ්මන් ජයකෝඩ් මහතා
(திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி)
(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

එහි තිබෙන්නෙ කොහොමද ?

සී. දයාරත්න මහතා
(திரு. பீ. தயாரத்ன)
(Mr. P. Dayaratne)

මම දන් එය කියවන්නම් :

පහත නම් සඳහන් අය, ලංකා ඛනිජ තෙල් නීතිගත සංස්ථාවේ අධ්‍යක්ෂ මණ්ඩලයේ මාමාර්ථකයින් වශයෙන් පත් කරනු ලැබ සිටී.

- දහම් විමලසේන මහතා - සභාපති
- කේ. ඡන්මුලලංගම් මහතා - අධ්‍යක්ෂ
- ජෝර්ජ් කන්දරපා මහතා - අධ්‍යක්ෂ
- එච්. ඩී. රත්නාසක මහතා - ක්‍රියාකාරී අධ්‍යක්ෂ
- ආර්. ආර්. නල්ලසියා මහත්මිය - ක්‍රියාකාරී අධ්‍යක්ෂ

ලංකා ඛනිජ තෙල් නීතිගත සංස්ථාවේ සභාපති, සීමාසහිත කොළඹ ගෑස් හා ජල සමාගමේ නීති බලධාරී වශයෙන්ද පත් කරනු ලැබ සිටී.

ක්‍රියාකාරී අධ්‍යක්ෂ එච්. ඩී. රත්නාසක මහතාගේ කාර්යාලය කොලොන්නාව නිමාවේ පවත්වා ගෙන යනු ලබන අතර, ඔහු ප්‍රධාන වශයෙන් ඛනිජ තෙල් නිෂ්පාදන ද්‍රව්‍ය අලෙවිය හා බෙදාහැරීමේ කටයුතු සහ කෘෂි-රසායනික ද්‍රව්‍ය හා සම්බන්ධ කටයුතුවල නියැලෙනු ඇත. ක්‍රියාකාරී අධ්‍යක්ෂ ආර්. ආර්. නල්ලසියා මහත්මිය, ඇගේ කාර්යාලය සීමාසහිත කොළඹ ගෑස් සහ ජල සමාගමේ කාර්යාලයේ පවත්වා ගෙන යනු ලබන අතර, එම සමාගමේ පරිපාලනය හාරව ක්‍රියා කරනු ඇත.

Mr. M. Haleem Ishak
Mr. Amarasiri Dodangoda
Mr. Richard Pathirana

to move—

“That this Parliament resolves – that the following Resolution on the imposition of Civic Disability on, Felix R. Dias Bandaranaike passed by Parliament in accordance with the provisions of Article 81 of the Constitution on 16th October, 1980 :—

‘THAT WHEREAS a Special Presidential Commission of Inquiry established under the Special Presidential Commissions of Inquiry Law, No. 7 of 1978, as amended by the Special Presidential Commissions of Inquiry (Special Provisions) Act, No. 4 of 1978, and consisting of the Hon. J. G. T. Weeraratne, Chairman, (Judge of the Supreme Court), the Hon. S. Sharvananda (Judge of the Supreme Court) and the Hon. K. C. E. de Alwis (Judge of the Court of Appeal) has in its report dated 29th August, 1980, recommended in terms of section 9 of the said Special Presidential Commissions of Inquiry Law, No. 7 of 1978, that Felix R. Dias Bandaranaike be made subject to civic disability by reason of acts done by him which constitute corruption and abuse of power, as set out in the finding contained in the said report ; and

WHEREAS the Cabinet of Ministers has in terms of Article 81(2) of the Constitution of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka approved the introduction of a resolution to impose civic disability on the said Felix R. Dias Bandaranaike for a period of seven years ;

This Parliament resolves, in terms of the provisions of Article 81 (1) (a) of the Constitution of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka read with Article 170 of the said Constitution and section 9 (3) of the Special Presidential Commissions of Inquiry Law, No. 7 of 1978, as amended by Act, No. 4 of 1978, that civic disability be imposed on the said Felix R. Dias Banaranaike for a period of seven years.’; and

The following Resolution on the imposition of Civic Disability on, and expulsion from Parliament of, Sirima R. D. Bandaranaike passed by Parliament in accordance with the provisions of Article 81 of the Constitution on 16th October, 1980 :—

‘THAT WHEREAS a Special Presidential Commission of Inquiry established under the Special Presidential Commissions of Inquiry Law, No. 7 of 1978, as amended by the Special Presidential Commissions of Inquiry (Special Provisions) Act, No. 4 of 1978, and consisting of the Hon. J. G. T. Weeraratne, Chairman, (Judge of the Supreme Court), the Hon. S. Sharvananda (Judge of the Supreme Court) and the Hon. K. C. E. de Alwis (Judge of the Court of Appeal) has in its report dated 29th August, 1980, recommended in terms of section 9 of the said Special Presidential Commissions of Inquiry Law, No. 7 of 1978, that Sirima R. D. Bandaranaike be made subject to civic disability by reason of acts done by the said Sirima R. D. Bandaranaike which constitute misuse or abuse of power, as set out in the finding of the said report ; and

WHEREAS the Cabinet of Ministers has in terms of Article 81(2) of the Constitution of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka approved the introduction of a resolution to impose civic disability on the said Sirima R. D. Bandaranaike for a period of seven years and expel the said Sirima R. D. Bandaranaike from Parliament ;

This Parliament resolves, in terms of the provision of Article 81 (1) of the Constitution of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka read with Article 170 of the said Constitution and Section 9 (3) of the Special Presidential Commissions of Inquiry Law, No. 7 of 1978, as amended by Act, No. 4 of 1978 –

(a) that civic disability be imposed on the said Sirima R. D. Bandaranaike for a period of seven years. ; and

(b) that the said Sirima R. D. Bandaranaike be expelled from Parliament.’; and

The following Resolution on the imposition of Civic Disability on, Nihal Mahes Sudiruikku Jayawickrema passed by Parliament in accordance with the provisions of Article 81 of the Constitution on 11th January, 1980 :—

‘THAT WHEREAS a Special Presidential Commission of Inquiry established under the Special Presidential Commissions of Inquiry Law, No. 7 of 1978, as amended by the Special Presidential Commissions of Inquiry (Special Provisions) Act, No. 4 of 1978, and consisting of the Hon. J. G. T. Weeraratne, Chairman, and Hon. S. Sharvananda (Judges of the Supreme Court) and Hon. K. C. E. de Alwis (Judge of the Court of Appeal) has, in its Report dated 10th December, 1979, recommended in terms of Section 9 of the said Special Presidential Commissions of Inquiry Law, that Nihal Mahes Sudiruikku Jayawickrema be made subject to civic disability by reason of acts done by the said Nihal Mahes Sudiruikku Jayawickrema which constitute abuse or misuse of power, as set out in the findings contained in the said Report ; and

WHEREAS the Cabinet of Ministers has in terms of Article 81(2) of the Constitution of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka approved the introduction of a resolution to impose civic disability on the said Nihal Mahes Sudiruikku Jayawickrema for a period of seven years ;

This Parliament resolves, in terms of the provision of Article 81 (1) (a) of the Constitution of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka read with Article 170 of the said Constitution and section 9 (3) of the Special Presidential Commissions of Inquiry Law, No. 7 of 1978, as amended by Act, No. 4 of 1978, that civic disability be imposed on the said Nihal Mahes Sudiruikku Jayawickrema for a period of seven years.’;

be made inoperative, be rescinded and be annulled.”

කථනායකතුමා
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

I wish to inform the hon. Members that this subject came up as a result of the Hon. Prime Minister raising objections to this Motion being on the Order Paper. You can discuss reasons for or against the point of Order raised by the Hon. Prime Minister. But I will not allow any substance to be discussed in this House. I want to make that quite clear to hon. Members of both the Government and the Opposition.

ලක්ෂ්මන් ජයකොඩි මහතා (අත්තනගල්ල)
(திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி — அத்தனகல்லை)
(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody-Attanagalla)

I move Item No. 1.

அனில் மூனேசிங்கே மஹா (மதுகாம)
(திரு. அனில் முனசிங்கே — மதுகாம)
(Mr. Anil Moonesinghe-Matugama)

I wish to second Item No. 1.

Sir, you will notice that this is not an Adjourned Debate. The Order Paper does not say that it is an Adjourned Debate. Therefore, it is a new Motion standing in our name and it has been now moved as a substantive Motion, Sir. I wish to read out that Motion.

காணொலி
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

Are you discussing the point of Order raised by the Hon. Prime Minister ?

ஊழல் இடைநிறுத்தல்
(திரு. அனில் முனிசிங்கம்)
(Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)

No, Sir, because this is not an Adjourned Debate, Sir.

உறுப்பினர்
(அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)
(A Member)

Then what is it ?

ஊழல் இடைநிறுத்தல்
(திரு. அனில் முனிசிங்கம்)
(Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)

This is not an Adjourned Debate, Sir.

காணொலி
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

A point of Order has been raised in this matter.

ஊழல் இடைநிறுத்தல்
(திரு. அனில் முனிசிங்கம்)
(Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)

Yes, Sir.

காணொலி
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

We adjourned when this point of Order was being discussed. Therefore, today's discussion is a continuation of that.

ஊழல் இடைநிறுத்தல்
(திரு. அனில் முனிசிங்கம்)
(Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)

No, with the greatest respect.

காணொலி
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

No. I am sorry.

ஊழல் இடைநிறுத்தல்
(திரு. ரணில் விக்ரமசிங்கம்)
(Mr. Ranil Wickremasinghe)

Sir, there is a point of Order.

ஊழல் இடைநிறுத்தல்
(திரு. அனில் முனிசிங்கம்)
(Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)

You, Sir, are governed by the Order Paper of the day.

ஊழல் இடைநிறுத்தல்
(திரு. ரணில் விக்ரமசிங்கம்)
(Mr. Ranil Wickremasinghe)

Yes. We are raising a point of Order.

ஊழல் இடைநிறுத்தல்
(திரு. அனில் முனிசிங்கம்)
(Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)

The Order Paper does not say that it is an Adjourned Debate, Sir. The Order Paper clearly says -

ஊழல் இடைநிறுத்தல்
(திரு. ரணில் விக்ரமசிங்கம்)
(Mr. Ranil Wickremasinghe)

I am raising a point of Order, Sir. I want to raise a point of Order on this.

ஊழல் இடைநிறுத்தல்
(திரு. அனில் முனிசிங்கம்)
(Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)

I am on my feet now. I want to say that it is a substantive Motion now which has not been accepted and I proceed to debate the Motion.

ஊழல் இடைநிறுத்தல்
(திரு. ரணில் விக்ரமசிங்கம்)
(Mr. Ranil Wickremasinghe)

I am raising a point of Order.

காணொலி
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

Let the Hon. Minister raise his point of Order.

ஊழல் இடைநிறுத்தல்
(திரு. அனில் முனிசிங்கம்)
(Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)

I am on my feet now.

காணொலி
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

You cannot decide that. I decide that. Sit down !

ஊழல் இடைநிறுத்தல்
(திரு. ரணில் விக்ரமசிங்கம்)
(Mr. Ranil Wickremasinghe)

Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of Order. Firstly, this Resolution is against the Constitution and the Standing Orders of the House. Secondly, a point of Order had already been raised and that point of Order is being discussed and until you, Mr. Speaker, give a ruling on it we cannot proceed to discuss the Resolution that is on the Order Paper today.

காணொலி
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please ! The hon. Member for Matugama will have to accept my ruling. This is a continuation of the Debate on the point of Order raised by the Hon. Prime Minister. Does the hon. Member accept that ?

ஊர்ஜித் இரூபித் தைதா
(திரூ. அனில் முனசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)

No, Sir, I am on the point of Order raised by the Hon. Minister of Education. There is a new point of Order raised by the Hon. Minister of Education.

ஊர்ஜித் இரூபித் தைதா
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

No. We proceed with this as adjourned on last day. (*Interruption*). You have to accept my ruling on it.

ஊர்ஜித் இரூபித் தைதா
(திரூ. அனில் முனசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)

Sir, I will accept your ruling. But most respectfully I must say that you have to listen to the arguments on the point of Order raised by the Hon. Minister of Education. You have heard only his point of view. But you have not heard my point of view on the point of Order raised by the Hon. Minister of Education.

ஊர்ஜித் இரூபித் தைதா
(அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)
(A Member)

You have no point.

ஊர்ஜித் இரூபித் தைதா
(திரூ. அனில் முனசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)

Sir, with the greatest respect, you can see—

ஊர்ஜித் இரூபித் தைதா
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please! The point of Order raised by the Hon. Minister of Education was a sequel to your attitude. You got up and said that this is a new Motion and that it had to be discussed.

ஊர்ஜித் இரூபித் தைதா
(திரூ. அனில் முனசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)

I was not on a point of Order. I was going on on what the Secretary-General of Parliament has given us. You will see that if there is an Adjourned Debate, it says that it is an Adjourned Debate. You can see the earlier Order Papers of this House. Where there were Adjourned Debates it says that they were Adjourned Debates.

ஊர்ஜித் இரூபித் தைதா
(திரூ. ரணில் விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Ranil Wickremasinghe)

Mr. Speaker, there are two documents in this House which we must look at. One is the Order Paper and the other is the document showing the attendance of the

Members and the matters taken up. If you take that up as was discussed on the last occasion and if you look at the records of the House you will find that this point of Order has been put off till the next day's meeting. In fact, I have this here because I think on that occasion the hon. Member for Kaduwela gave notice of a matter of public importance to be raised during Adjournment and as a result of that this matter was put off.

ஊர்ஜித் இரூபித் தைதா
(திரூ. அனில் முனசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)

Sir, I do not know under what the Hon. Minister is speaking. Is he speaking on his own point of Order?

ஊர்ஜித் இரூபித் தைதா
(திரூ. ரணில் விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Ranil Wickremasinghe)

Sir, I have raised a point of Order. I do not know under what the hon. Member is speaking.

ஊர்ஜித் இரூபித் தைதா
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please! Please take your seat. On the 10th of May the Chair had said:

"This debate is now suspended. The discussion can continue to the next Private Members' Day".

So please continue now. That is my final ruling. This is a continuation of that discussion.

ஊர்ஜித் இரூபித் தைதா
(திரூ. அனில் முனசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)

With the greatest respect I want to bring to your notice something which you have not taken cognizance of.—

ஊர்ஜித் இரூபித் தைதா
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

That is stated in HANSARD of 10th May.

ஊர்ஜித் இரூபித் தைதா
(திரூ. அனில் முனசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)

Mr. Speaker, when the Motion was moved by the hon. Leader of the Opposition—please give me a hearing—it was not seconded. The Secretary-General of Parliament can tell you that. Therefore, if it was not seconded there is no Motion that could appear on the Order Paper of today as a continuation debate. That is the legal point I am raising.

ஊர்ஜித் இரூபித் தைதா
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

It is clearly stated that the discussion was suspended.

சுதிரல் துகூடீத மததா
(திரூ. அனீல் முனசிங்ஹ)
 (Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)

Sir, the discussion was suspended on that day. But today is a new day. The Secretary-General of Parliament is responsible for arranging this Order Paper. The Order Paper does not say it is an Adjourned Debate.

கடாநாயகர்
(சுபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
 (Mr. Speaker)

At Column 373 of the HANSARD of 10th May 1985 it is very clearly stated, "This debate is now suspended."

சுதிரல் துகூடீத மததா
(திரூ. அனீல் முனசிங்ஹ)
 (Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)
 That is right.

கடாநாயகர்
(சுபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
 (Mr. Speaker)

"This discussion can continue on the next Private Members' Day."

சுதிரல் துகூடீத மததா
(திரூ. அனீல் முனசிங்ஹ)
 (Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)

You, Mr. Speaker, were not seized at that time of the point that -

கடாநாயகர்
(சுபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
 (Mr. Speaker)

It is clear, as daylight.

சுதிரல் துகூடீத மததா
(திரூ. அனீல் முனசிங்ஹ)
 (Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)

The point I am making is that the Motion was not seconded.

சுதிரல் துகூடீத மததா
(திரூ. லக்ஷமன் ஜயக்கொடி)
 (Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

Today it is proposed.

சுதிரல் துகூடீத மததா
(திரூ. அனீல் முனசிங்ஹ)
 (Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)

The Motion was not seconded on that day. That is why the Secretary-General has to explain why it is not an adjourned Debate. The Secretary-General has to explain to you all why it is not an adjourned Debate today. Every day this Order Paper on Private Members' Day when our Motions are debated, it is called an adjourned Debate. Why not today?

சுதிரல் துகூடீத மததா
(திரூ. லக்ஷமன் ஜயக்கொடி)
 (Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

Senior Ministers are here, Sir. The Ministers here in front of us are very Senior Ministers. They will be able to help us on this. The Hon. Minister of Cultural Affairs and the Hon. Minister of Social Services are there. I think they must help us.

கடாநாயகர்
(சுபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
 (Mr. Speaker)

You are trying to forget what happened on 10th when this Motion was proposed. - [Interruption] -

மெம்பர்
(அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)
 (A Member)

The Hon. Speaker will help you.

கடாநாயகர்
(சுபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
 (Mr. Speaker)

When this Motion was proposed and before it was seconded the Hon. Prime Minister raised objections. His point of Order was being discussed when the discussion was suspended for today. So, from that point you can take it up. If you are going into any other point I will have to ask you to sit down. That is my Ruling.

சுதிரல் துகூடீத மததா
(திரூ. அனீல் முனசிங்ஹ)
 (Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)

With respect I accept your Ruling, but what I want to say is that there is something wrong somewhere in this -

கடாநாயகர்
(சுபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
 (Mr. Speaker)

I will certainly look into that.

சுதிரல் துகூடீத மததா
(திரூ. அனீல் முனசிங்ஹ)
 (Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)

With the greatest respect, Sir, I wish to continue my argument. The only thing is I feel that this House chops and changes its views, its Rulings so often that we are at sea all the time. We do not know what is happening. Either you stick to the Rulings - that is what I am asking you to do - because it is very important that we have a body of Rulings -

சுதிரல் துகூடீத மததா
(திரூ. ரணில் விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)
 (Mr. Ranil Wickremasinghe)

That is a very unfair remark on the Chair to say that you are chopping and changing your Rulings.

தமிழ் இனமீத மதமா
(திரு. அனில் முனிசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)

on which we can definitely depend on.

கட்சிமாற்றம்
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

Can you give me some instances of chopping and changing of Rulings ?

தமிழ் இனமீத மதமா
(திரு. ரணில் விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Ranil Wickremasinghe)

Speaker's Rulings cannot be challenged, Sir. He cannot say that you are chopping and changing.

கட்சிமாற்றம்
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

You can continue with your argument.

தமிழ் இனமீத மதமா
(திரு. அனில் முனிசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)

I am, Sir, I accepted your Ruling and I am continuing. What I want to say in the course of continuing is that even this matter that you are going to rule on—that is the point raised by the Hon. Prime Minister—has had a previous history. When you were not here, Sir, the Deputy Speaker, at that time, has given a Ruling. It says :-

"This Standing Order refers to Standing Order 23 (3). All the requirements of that Standing Order have been complied with. Notice of this Motion has been given and this Motion has been stated to be in Order by the Hon. Speaker, and therefore it is in the Order Book. There is also no Standing Order which says anywhere that a Motion to appoint a Select Committee cannot be brought before this House. I therefore rule that this Motion is in Order."

Sir, that is at Column 776 of the HANSARD of 3rd April 1984. Now, during the course of that Debate too the Hon. Prime Minister also said—

கட்சிமாற்றம்
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

Are you now debating the April one or the 10th May one ?

தமிழ் இனமீத மதமா
(திரு. அனில் முனிசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)

I am debating the Point of Order raised by the Hon. Prime Minister.

கட்சிமாற்றம்
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

Raised on the 10th of May ?

தமிழ் இனமீத மதமா
(திரு. அனில் முனிசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)

Yes.

3 - A 084092 (85/06)

உண்மையான சமூகம் மதமா
(திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி)
(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

It is in a real jumble, Sir !

தமிழ் இனமீத மதமா
(திரு. அனில் முனிசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)

I am quoting from Column 775 of OFFICIAL REPORT of 3rd April 1984. The Hon. Prime Minister says :-

"The Government has submitted a Motion to the Secretary-General and the Speaker has accepted it.

It appears on the Order Paper. There is nothing out of order. Please do not go beyond the Standing Order."

Then after that unless some very cogent evidence is brought before you to say that it cannot be accepted today, it is ordained on you to accept it. So what are the cogent points ? This is the argument that I am trying to bring before you. What are the cogent points ? It must be against the Constitution. This Motion is not against the Constitution.

கட்சிமாற்றம்
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

That is in your opinion.

தமிழ் இனமீத மதமா
(திரு. அனில் முனிசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)

Yes.

கட்சிமாற்றம்
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

But in the opinion of the Hon. Prime Minister it is so.

தமிழ் இனமீத மதமா
(திரு. அனில் முனிசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)

Yes, then the Hon. Prime Minister must quote and say where it is against the Constitution. Where does it go against the Constitution ? Where does it hit against the Constitution, go contrary to the Constitution ? He must show all this. But merely saying that it is going against the Constitution is not sufficient. Now, I will quote to you what the Hon. Prime Minister has said. I will quote from Column 348 of the OFFICIAL REPORT of 10th May 1985, when he was arguing before you. He says :

"Sir, here too we are of opinion that Parliament has imposed civic disabilities under Article 81 of the Constitution and these Resolutions duly specify the period of the civic disability. In terms of Article 89 (b), once a Resolution for the imposition of civic disability has been passed in terms of Article 81 and the period of such civic disability is specified in such Resolution such person is disqualified from being an elector at an election of the President or Members of Parliament or to vote in a Referendum. The Constitution does not provide for the removal of such civic disability imposed by Parliament."

Now, that is not true.

கலாநாயகர் அவர்கள்

(சா.நாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Why do you not read the rest of the paragraph ?

ஈதிர் இளங்கோ மூலசாமி

(திரு. அனில் முனசிங்கம்)

(Mr. Anil Moonesinghe)

I will read the rest of the paragraph. I am going to argue that out—

“The only remedy is a Presidential pardon in terms of Article 34 (2).”

Now, the Constitution is silent. The Constitution does not say that you cannot do it. In fact, I can quote to you chapter and verse over and over again where the constitution is silent, where the constitutions of countries following the Westminster style of democracy, Parliamentary democracy have been silent, and where you can say this House is supreme, this House is sovereign, it can do anything. But, Sir, before I quote to you from Sir Ivor Jennings. I will quote again from the Hon. Prime Minister who says in Column 349—

“How are you going to make this inoperative ? How are you going to rescind this ? How are you going to implement this decision ? Even if we resolve under the provisions of the Constitution, I cannot see any way in which we can implement it. Therefore you will have to bring an amendment to the Constitution. You will have to change the Constitution for this purpose and that is a long process. Even then how are you going to make it inoperative ? It has already operated. I do not know who drafted this Motion !”

Now, let us answer his questions one by one. How are you going to rescind this ? This is very simple, Sir. We have brought this resolution to rescind. I ask you, Sir, most respectfully, can you say that this House cannot bring a resolution to rescind a previous resolution of this House ? Where does it say so ? It is a standard practice, Sir, of the House of Commons many of the privileges, powers, customs, practices and other ideas that we have taken over from the House of Commons continue to reside with us. Sir, you have been a Member of this House for a long long time. Over and over again in this House when our Standing Orders are silent or our Constitution is silent we tend to go back to the British Parliament, its procedures and practices. Over and over again, Sir, we have quoted them in this House. Suddenly, is it only now that these are inoperative ?

Therefore, Sir, I ask you the question, is Parliament supreme or not ? The Hon. Prime Minister has said that we have all the powers under the moon and the sun. I am not prepared to go so far. I say that we are bound by our Constitution, its powers are supreme, our Constitution binds us, but where our Constitution is silent, Sir, you are empowered to allow this House to act as a supreme and sovereign legislature. That is the gravamen of my argument. Our House, this Parliament

is so supreme that it can make a man into a woman, Sir. It can make a man into a woman. We have brought in laws, Sir. There are laws in our statute books where a woman is deemed to be a man in terms of a particular statute. We have done that, Sir. Although some people are under misimpression that we cannot make a man into a woman, this Parliament has a sovereign right to make a man into a woman. Now that does not mean to say that all the biological processes are carried out, Sir. Very often we pass laws which are, in fact not in terms of reality, perhaps, but we do it all the time. So we have that supreme power to do what we want provided we do not offend against the Constitution. Now, Sir, where do we in this offend against the Constitution ? The Constitution is silent. If the Constitution said you cannot do this or that, then I can understand that you cannot bring a resolution to rescind this particular type of resolution. It does not say that ; it is silent. The people who drafted this law drafted it quite knowing the practices and privileges of this House, that we have been rescinding resolutions in the past.

Sir, we have the right even to annul what has been done in this House. We have the right to do that. Very often, Sir, you used your right to expunge words spoken in this House. Does that mean that those words were not spoken ? We only expunge them because we do not want them to appear in our HANSARD because of certain offensive remarks or any acts against the traditions of this House.

Therefore, the argument of the Hon. Prime Minister as far as the first question is concerned is, how are you going to rescind this ? This has been done over and over again, Sir, not only in this Parliament but in the British House of Commons and in the Indian Parliament. You can rescind any resolution provided that you do not offend against the Constitution. As I said, Sir, the Constitution is silent on this matter. If the Constitution wanted us not to rescind this, then they would have had a proviso either in the Constitution or in the statute preventing us from doing so. How are you going to implement this decision ?

Sir, like in all decisions we take in this House, if we pass a resolution which has a binding effect under this law then the Government has to move in and see that it is implemented. Some Governments do not like that. Some Governments try to prevent these things happening, but I am quite sure that the hon. Members opposite, particularly those who are seated on the Front Benches who know the traditions of this House, who know the traditions of justice and fair play will not, Sir, in any way try to obstruct this.

“Even if we resolve under the provisions of the constitution, I cannot see any way in which we can implement it. Therefore, you will have to bring an amendment to the Constitution.”

Why should we bring an amendment to the Constitution when the Constitution is silent ?

Therefore, Sir, I wish to urge in this matter that you recognize that as far as this House is concerned your Ruling will be looked upon by posterity. In this particular case, are you, as the guardian and the custodian of our rights, going to trammel them in any way, make them restricted ? Or are you going to uphold the inalienable right of the representatives of the people to pass legislation, pass resolutions, in the way they want ? The Government, if they so wish – they have a majority – can defeat this Motion. Why are they preventing it from coming up for a debate or discussion ? That is a matter that you have to consider.

I quote again from the Prime Minister's speech at column 353 :

"That is what I am saying. Under the Constitution you cannot do it. If you consult your lawyers they will tell you that it is not possible according to the Constitution. We will all look fools if we pass this Motion."

In actual fact, you may remember that this House passed an amendment which prevented the courts from interfering in a decision made under this statute, and that was passed very, very quickly while there was a Writ of Certiorari before the Court of Appeal. A writ came up before the Court of Appeal whereby those people who were aggrieved under the Special Presidential Commissions of Inquiry went before the court, and the court was in the process of going into the validity or invalidity of the recommendations of the Special Presidential Commission. I am not going to advert to what those were ; I am only trying to impress on you, Sir, that when the courts were in the process of going into it, under what they said was the right of judicial authority always to interpret the statute, this House brought a new law which prevented the courts from interfering, intervening and acting as far as this statute was concerned. No court could question the acts of this House as far as this Act was concerned.

You will therefore see that all redress was shut out as far as these people were concerned, and this law was brought in a hurry in order to prevent that happening. We are now living under that law. I am not trying to canvass that. I am only trying to tell you, Sir, that once this House has passed a certain law it has the right also to see that the law is rescinded. I can quote to you from so many authorities. Once a law has been brought in, in the next session that law can be rescinded. How often has it been done ! It has been done in two ways, either by specifically bringing in a Motion to the effect that that law is rescinded or by bringing in a new law which permits us to vary or amend that law.

I Quote from page 90 of "The Law and the Constitution" Fourth Edition, by Sir Ivor Jennings :

"Again there is the practice, which is not even formally embodied in Standing Orders, by which committees of the House represent the Party strengths in the House. There is nothing except convention which restrains the Government from appointing a committee consisting only Members of the Government Party. Similarly, it is convention only which determines that a speech from the Government side shall be followed by a speech from the Opposition. Indeed, the whole idea of 'His Majesty's Opposition' is a product of convention. Government would be possible without the co-operation of the Opposition. The Government majority would march through the lobbies, voting for the Government, with monotonous regularity. The Government would get its legislation and its financial resources : the Parliamentary sessions would be shorter and ministers would be in the unusual position of having plenty of time for controlling their departments. It would, no doubt, be the end of parliament as a living institution just as the absence of debate has made the Privy Council into a formal instrument of no importance. Nevertheless it would be possible, and only the conventions provide for the continuance of the present system."

Therefore what I am trying to argue is that it is a convention.

I remember, Sir, that you once gave a Ruling when a certain matter was being debated. If I remember right, the hon. Member for Eheliyagoda wanted to speak immediately after the proposition. You ruled him out, although he had a very important meeting in his constituency, and you allowed me to speak because you were adhering to a convention of this House that normally a Government speaker must be followed by an Opposition speaker. So it is these conventions that have built up the traditions of parliamentary democracy in this country.

I want to quote again from "The Law and the Constitution" by Sir Ivor Jennings, at page 153 :

"Limitations upon parliamentary Authority"
Meaning of Parliamentary Supremacy

Parliamentary supremacy means essentially two things. It means, first, that Parliament can legally enact legislation dealing with any subject matter whatever. There are no limitations except political expediency and constitutional conventions. De Lolme's remark that Parliament can do anything except make a man into a woman and a woman into a man is often quoted. But, like many of the remarks which De Lolme made, it is wrong. For if Parliament enacted that all men should be women, they would be women so far as the law is concerned. In speaking of the power of Parliament, we are dealing with legal principles, not with facts. Though it is true that Parliament cannot in fact change the course of nature, it is equally true that it cannot in fact do all sorts of things. The supremacy of Parliament is a legal fiction, and legal fiction can assume anything."

Therefore, Sir, you will see that there is no limit to the supremacy of Parliament except for convention. As far as our Constitution is concerned, if it says that we cannot do certain things, then we have to adhere by that.

Sir, on this argument of the Hon. Prime Minister, there are certain things that we have to carry through either under our standing Orders or under the

[අතිරික්ත මූලධර්මය]

Constitution. What are they? They are definitely precise, so that we know what we cannot do. And certainly this is not one of them. These are the limitations.

Article 38(2)(b) provides that a Resolution to remove a President from office must be signed by not less than two-thirds of the Members of Parliament, or one-half of the Members of Parliament if the Speaker also agrees. Otherwise the Constitution provides that a Motion to remove the President will not be entertained. So there is one clear case where we cannot act unless we act in the way that the Constitution provides.

Article 81(2), which is the Article which we are now dealing with, says that if any person is to be disfranchised or to be expelled from Parliament after a recommendation by a Special Presidential Commission of Inquiry, such a Resolution must be moved by the Prime Minister with the approval of the Cabinet. Now, Sir, why was that brought? Because expelling a Member is a most important and vital thing. Therefore the Government, which controls the affairs of this House generally, did not want any ordinary Member to bring such a Motion. It had to be brought by the Prime Minister himself, in order to deprive the Member of the right to sit here in this House and to be burdened with not being able to vote, her civic rights being taken away.

But, Sir, look at the converse of that. The Constitution does not say that you cannot bring in another Resolution rescinding the earlier Resolution. Sir, therefore my argument is that once the Constitution is silent, then the conventions, the practices and procedures of this House take over.

Again Article 107(2) provides that a Motion for the removal of a Judge of the Supreme Court or the Court of Appeal from office on the ground of misbehaviour must not only contain the particulars of his offence but also be supported by one-third of the Members of Parliament. There are certain procedures now laid down by standing Orders. That Motion does not have to be brought by the Prime Minister. It can be brought by any person as long as the particulars of the offence are stated and one-third of the Members of Parliament support that Motion. Now you can see the difference there.

Then again, Article 152 provides that a Motion to withdraw money from the Consolidated Fund or to impose taxes shall not be moved except by a Minister. But, Sir, you have always allowed us to move cuts on the Ministers' pay - [Interruption] - during a Budget Debate because that is a convention of this House. Although Article 152 clearly provides that a Motion to withdraw money from the Consolidated Fund or to

impose taxes shall not be moved except by a Minister, you have allowed a rescinding Resolution, not authorizing but preventing the withdrawal of funds from the Consolidated Fund. The House has always allowed it. The Constitution does not say anything about this - that a rescinding Resolution cannot be brought by a Member. But we have in actual practice allowed that to happen.

Therefore, Sir, it is my most humble submission to you that this is a matter that you should consider not in terms of the Government, the Prime Minister or any particular person. This is a Motion that you have to consider on the merits of it and allow this Motion to be debated in this House. I will tell you a very important reason.

We have taken away the right of the people who are burdened by this law to go to the courts. If there is in any way some wrong done on that person, then what redress has that person? We know that a person who is convicted in a court of law, let us say of murder, has no other recourse but to go to the Hon. Minister of Justice and say that this has happened, these are the circumstances and very often that has been changed.

Now, Sir, what is the recourse here? The Hon. Prime Minister says that we must ask for a pardon, that we must move this House for a pardon. We are not here to ask for pardon for people. We are here to debate the question whether that Resolution which this House had passed can be rescinded or not? The argument that 'pardon' can only be extended by His Excellency the President and, therefore, does not fall within the prerogative of this House is not all relevant to this. We are not concerned with 'pardon'. We are only concerned with rescinding a Resolution which this House has passed. If you, Sir, say that we cannot rescind the Resolution, then, of course, we are establishing new precedents in this House. If you say that we are not allowed to rescind this Resolution because the Constitution is offended, then you must adduce arguments to the effect that the Constitution forbids it and that it is against the Constitution. Those are the main points that you have to consider in deciding this matter.

In this respect, Sir, I would like to bring to your notice, what the Constitution has to say about the legislative power of Parliament. Now, this is very important. Article 75 of the Constitution says:

"Parliament shall have power to make laws, including laws having retrospective effect and repealing or amending any provision of the Constitution, or adding any provision to the Constitution:

Provided that Parliament shall not make any law -

- (a) suspending the operation of the Constitution or any part thereof, or
- (b) repealing the Constitution as a whole unless such law also enacts a new Constitution to replace it."

Now, Sir, you are well aware that the Constitution is the highest authority in regulating the affairs of this country, as far as the laws are concerned. Now this Parliament can even repeal those laws. Parliament can bring in laws which have retrospective effect. Therefore, Sir, this Constitution, which the Hon. Prime Minister says is offended by our Motion, is the very Constitution which says that these are the determinants. These are the only things that you cannot do; "suspending the operation of the Constitution or any part thereof, or repealing the Constitution as a whole unless such law also enacts a new Constitution to replace it". Apart from that 'Parliament shall have power to make laws, including laws having retrospective effect.' Now, Sir, I commend Article 75 to you. What does it say? Does it not say that we can even alter the Constitution and we can bring retrospective laws? Where does it say that we cannot rescind a Resolution? If it is silent on a certain matter where does it say that we cannot change our minds? Where does it say that? This Parliament is supreme! It can change its mind on many things. It has changed it in the previous era. Therefore, Sir, I ask you, in the name of justice, in the name of all that is sacred in Parliamentary democracy, to consider our ideas, our contention and our arguments in the context of Article 75 of the Constitution. Can the Hon. Prime Minister show me where Article 75 in any way diminishes our right to legislate, to change our minds, to do whatever we want, to make even a man into a woman? If we can have all those rights, why cannot we bring in a Resolution rescinding our previous position?

I think even a small child will understand, Sir, that this is a very simple matter, because you have to decide this on the basis of the law, on the Constitution, as the Prime Minister says it, our privileges and practices. Sir, I do not want to go beyond this point because I think I have emphasised over and over again what I have meant, Sir. But, before I conclude I want to quote to you, Sir, what Erskine May has said at page 235 of the 20th Edition:

"The Speaker's rulings, whether given in public or in private, constitute precedents by which subsequent Speakers, Members, and officers are guided. Such precedents are collected and in course of time may be formulated as principles, or rules of practice. It is largely by this method that the modern practice of the House of Commons has been developed."

So, Sir, it is with this wish I wish to commend my submissions to you. You are a Speaker in line from earlier number of Speakers, many of them very distinguished men who gave rulings which we have abided by. Sometimes which we have not abided by then and sometimes we have walked out of this Chamber. Sometimes we have been carried out of this Chamber because we did not seek to abide by those rulings which we thought were not just. It is a part of parliamentary democracy that we should create a confidence, a mutual

confidence. Once a ruling is given that ruling must be as good as gold, a ruling which you can give without fear or favour, a ruling which you can be proud of, Sir. When you are not in that seat you can look back and say, "I as Speaker of this House gave a ruling of which I am very proud".

Thank you.

ජ. පී. පෝල් පෙරේරා මහතා (කඩුවෙලා)
(திரு. எ. பி. போல் பெரேரா — கடுவலை)
(Mr. E. P. Paul Perera-Kaduvela)

Mr. Speaker, Sir I am privileged to follow the hon. Member for Matugama (Mr. Anil Moonesinghe) because he has given an excellent exposition of the law as he understands. With regard to the point of Order raised by the Hon. Minister he said "We support the submission made by the Hon. Prime Minister that the proposed Motion is not consistent with the Constitution."

Sir, I would straightaway draw the attention of the House to Article 75 and 78 (2) of the Constitution. Article 75 to which the hon. Member was referring to, has a proviso. It deals with the legislative power of Parliament.

"75. Parliament shall have power to make laws, including laws having retrospective effect and repealing or amending any provision of the Constitution, or adding any provision to the Constitution:

Provided that Parliament shall not make any law -

- (a) suspending the operation of the Constitution or any part thereof, or
- (b) repealing the Constitution as a whole unless such law also enacts a new Constitution to replace it."

Article 78 (2) states:

"(2) The passing of a Bill or a resolution by Parliament shall be in accordance with the Constitution and the Standing Orders of Parliament"

So that, the two things become mandatory. No proposed Motion or Resolution shall have the effect of suspending the Constitution or any part thereof. Secondly, no Resolution shall conflict with the Constitution and the Standing Orders. However Article 78 (2) of the Constitution goes on to explain that -

" Standing Orders may be suspended by Parliament in the circumstances and in the manner prescribed by the Standing Orders."

You suspend Standing Orders. But you cannot suspend the Constitution. So, no Resolution becomes a valid resolution if it has the effect of suspending even a part of the Constitution or if it is in conflict or inconsistent with the Constitution. That is the very Article that the hon. Member referred to. So the Resolution *per se* moved by the Opposition with regard to the rescinding of the civic rights resolution comes within the ambit of the objection of the Hon. Prime Minister.

[*டீ. சி. ஸ்டீவ் ஸ்பீக்கர் மஹா*]

There were several arguments. I will summarize the arguments of the hon. Leader of the Opposition. He had principally two arguments as to why this point of Order should not be upheld. I will not go into details. He said, Parliament is a sovereign body and that it acted in the exercise of its judicial power by imposing civic disability. He also said that Parliament can reverse it also in the same way. Now, as opposed to that, the hon. Member for Matugama states that powers of Parliament are restricted by the Constitution. But the second aspect warrants your special attention and the attention of the House. The hon. Leader of the Opposition states that the purpose of this Resolution is to show that this House has committed a grievous mistake and an unjust order has been made. He says it is an act of injustice. He also made the allegation that the Resolution of 1980 and the other Resolutions were passed in a hurry, while the hon. Member for Matugama said, "No. Everything is valid up till now. You cannot go back. You can make it prospective. In other words, the action taken cannot be undone. But from now on we will set this aside without affecting its validity for the period in the past." I do not know which argument we have to meet. But let me assist you and the House by referring to the most salient aspect in our Constitution. The question is often posed: Is Parliament sovereign? For that purpose I refer this House to Article 3 of the Constitution. I will compare it with the 1972 Constitution. I think all these arguments stem because there is no proper understanding of the present Constitution, If I may say so with the greatest respect.

Article 3 of the present Constitution states:

"3. In the Republic of Sri Lanka sovereignty is in the people and is inalienable."

Then Article 4 says:—

"The Sovereignty of the People shall be exercised and enjoyed in the following manner:

(a) the legislative power of the People shall be exercised by Parliament, consisting of elected representatives of the People and by the People at a Referendum ;"

Everyone knows this legislative power. It is referred to in Article 75 which I read out to you, Sir, then (b) says:

"the executive power of the People, including the defence of Sri Lanka, shall be exercised by the President of the Republic elected by the People ;"

That too is very clear. Now, I come to 4 (c) :

"the judicial power of the People shall be exercised by Parliament through courts, tribunals and institutions created and established, or recognized, by the Constitution, or created and established by law, except in regard to matters relating to the privileges, immunities and powers of Parliament and of its Members, wherein the judicial power of the People may be exercised directly by Parliament according to law ;"

In other words, 4 (c) very clearly says that with regard to affairs of Parliament, Parliament has reserved unto itself the judicial power of the people. Now, Sir, as opposed to that I would draw your attention respectfully to Article 3 of the first Republican Constitution of 1972.

கலாநாயகர்
(*சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்*)
(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please ! The Deputy Speaker will now take the Chair

தலைவர் கலாநாயகர் இலாபகரமாக உட்கார்ந்தார். தலைவர் கலாநாயகர் இலாபகரமாக உட்கார்ந்தார்.

அதன் பிறகு, சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள் அக்கிராசனத்தினின்று நீங்கவே, பிரதிச் சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள் [திரு. நோமன் வைத்யரத்ன] தலைமை வகித்தார்கள்.

Whereupon MR. SPEAKER left the Chair, and MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER [MR. NORMAN WAIDYARATNA] took the Chair.

டீ. சி. ஸ்டீவ் ஸ்பீக்கர் மஹா
(*திரு. ஈ. பி. போல் பெரேரா*)
(Mr. E. P. Paul Perera)

Sir, I was referring to Article 3 of the first Republican Constitution of 1972, which reads as follows:

"In the Republic of Sri Lanka, Sovereignty is in the People and is inalienable."

Then, Article 4 says:

"The Sovereignty of the People is exercised through a National State Assembly of elected representatives of the People."

Article 5 says:

"The National State Assembly is the supreme instrument of State power of the Republic. The National State Assembly exercises—

- (a) the legislative power of the People,
- (b) the executive power of the People. . . .
- (c) the judicial power of the People through courts and other institutions created by law. . . ."

It is the same as Article 4 (c) of the present Constitution.

In other words, it is very clear in the first Republican Constitution that the National State Assembly was more powerful than the present Assembly. In fact, one may even argue, though not correctly, one may appear to argue, that there was no separation of powers in that everything went to the National State Assembly. However, in the present Constitution there is separation of powers. Nobody, that is, neither the judiciary nor the legislature nor the executive, can be considered by themselves as a sovereign body. It is a separation of powers.

One may argue, like in America, Sir, that sovereignty rests in the Constitution, that the Constitution is sovereign, though the Constitution

draws its strength from the ultimate sovereign, the people. In such a situation the question often is asked, "What are the rights of the legislature in dealing with its Members?"

You will recall, Sir, that in the period prior to 1972, there was a case, *Kariappan Vs. Wijesingha*, I believe, which is reported in the LXX New Law Reports, Privy Council Judgments. It is reported at page 49.

I will recall to the House the facts in that case. Mr. Kariappan was found guilty with five others of the charge of bribery and thereafter in 1965 the government enacted a special law, Imposition of Civic Disabilities Special Provisions Act, No. 14 of 1965, where under Mr. Kariappan lost his civic rights and his lat. This matter was challenged in various courts, ending in the Privy Council, and the main argument Mr. Gratiaen took up was this. Citing an American case he said.

"In this case the legislative body in addition to its legitimate functions exercises the powers and office of a judge. It assumes in the language of text books 'judicial magistracy'. It pronounces upon the guilt of the party without any forms of safeguards of trial. It determines the sufficiency of the proofs produced whether conformable to the rules of evidence or otherwise and it fixes the degree of punishments in accordance with its own notions of the enormity of the offence."

He was quoting a judgment in an American case reported in 328 US 303. In fact, the Privy Council judges go on to say—

"Mr. Gratiaen, seizing upon the description of the enactment of the Bill of Attainder as an assumption of judicial magistracy, went so far as to submit that Article 1 Section 9, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States of America, was plainly superfluous, because the separation of powers so clearly embodied in the Constitution carried with it as a necessary consequence the limitation that Congress could not pass a law truly described as an exercise of judicial magistracy."

So he argued that the Parliament at the time, that is the Parliament in Sri Lanka in 1965 that was governed by the Constitution Order in Council, had no power to exercise judicial functions in any matter and the judicial power was solely vested without any division or fusion in the judiciary, therefore this Act was usurpation of judicial magistracy or judicial power and said that this law should be struck down, but their Lordship of the Privy Council said this :

"It is the commission's findings that attracts the operation of the Act, not any conduct of a person against whom the finding was made."

In other words, there had been a commission which investigated the matter. It is the finding of the Commission that attracted the Act.

"Parliament did not make any finding of its own against the appellant or any other of the seven persons named in the schedule. The question of the guilt or innocence of the persons made in the schedule does not arise for the purpose of the Act and the Act has no

bearing upon the determination of such a question should it ever arise in any circumstances. Secondly, the disabilities imposed by the Act are not in all the circumstances punishment. It is of course important that the disabilities are not linked with the conduct for which they might be regarded a punishment, but more importantly the principal purposes which they served are clearly enough not to punish but to keep public life clean for the public good".

In other words, when they dismissed the appeal of Mr. Kariappan, the Privy Council said that this was essentially an attempt to keep public life clean and good, not punitive in content and dismissed the appeal. I believe, the drafters of the First Republican Constitution studied very closely this judgment reported in 70 New Law Reports, page 49, the judgment of the Privy Council, and brought in Article 5 in the first Republican Constitution, entrusting to the National State Assembly judicial power for the first time in this country with regard to privileges, powers and immunities of its Members.

Now, Sir, I believe this present situation arises from the exercise of the judicial power of Parliament with regard to its Members. This resolution, that is proposed and against which this point of Order has been made, seeks to invalidate a resolution of this Parliament in the exercise of its judicial power.

Now I am grateful to the hon. Leader of the Opposition — he concedes that Parliament acted in the exercise of its judicial power by imposing this civil disability, but he goes on to say —

The exercise of judicial power can be reviewed by Parliament".

He concedes that Parliament has exercised judicial power, then he says : "We must review this". Now the question really is : the Courts have held except the Supreme Courts, that there is no right of review in the case of the exercise of judicial power.

For a certain reason in this matter, again the hon. Member for Matugama cited in the course of his submissions the case of *Bandaranaike vs. Weeraratne* on the last date, where an attempt was made to canvass the findings and the recommendation of the Special Presidential Commission. The argument that was levelled was that you can review this matter, that you can review the earlier resolution of this House imposing civic disabilities against the persons named, on the basis of the proposition that the finding of the Special Presidential Commission and its recommendations have been undermined. But they have been silent on the most salient as part of it all, and that is dealt with in the case of *Bandaranaike v. Weeraratne* and others, (1981) (1) Sri Lanka Law Reports, page 10. This is very useful. In this case there was an application for a Writ of Certiorari under Article 140 of the Constitution. They first accepted the fact that Parliament had passed the resolution imposing the civic disabilities on the parties concerned and then they held that while conceding the

[ඒ. ඩී. චන්ද්‍ර පෙරේරා මහතා]

inviolability of the resolution if one of the conditions on which the resolution was founded could be set aside or could be destroyed, then the resolution also can be set aside. In other words, they were trying to attack the jurisdictional facts on which the resolution of this House was based.

This is what their Lordships said :

"It is to be noted that the imposition of civic disabilities and/or the expulsion of such person from Parliament, if he is a Member of Parliament, is to be effected by resolution passed by Parliament. The conditions for passing such resolution are :

- (1) The Special Presidential Commission of inquiry recommends that the person should be made subject to civic disability by reason of acts done or committed to be done before or after the commencement of the Constitution.
- (2) The resolution is passed by not less than 2/3 of the whole number of Members of Parliament (including those not present) voting in its favour.
- (3) Such resolution has been introduced by the Prime Minister with the approval of the Cabinet of Ministers."

"Mr. H. L. de Silva submitted on behalf of the petitioners, emphasising the word "passed"? that the certificate merely testifies to the fact that it has been passed by not less than 2/3 of the whole number of members and perhaps also that it has been introduced by the Prime Minister with the approval of the Cabinet of Ministers. We are unable to accept this submission and are of the view that the Speaker's certificate is border in scope and relates to all the conditions of the passing of the resolution in terms of article 81 referred to above by us. For example, we note that the certificate of the Speaker marked R 18 in application No. 4 of 1980 does refer to the findings and recommendation of the Special Presidential Commission. It also states that the resolution which was in fact moved by the Prime Minister had received the approval of the Board of Ministers and had been duly passed in Parliament in accordance with the provisions of Article 81. The latter part of sub-paragraph (3) of Article 81 states that such certificate of the Speaker shall be conclusive for all purposes and shall not be questioned in any court,"

In other words, to make it brief, the court said that once the Speaker's Certificate is there, no other person or body can question it.

කල්තැබීම

ඉක්මනාවහ්න

ADJOURNMENT .

එම්. චන්ද්‍රපෙරේරා මහතා
(ශ්‍රී ලං. එම්. චන්ද්‍රපෙරේරා මහතා)
(Mr. M. Vincent Perera)

I move,

"That the Parliament do now adjourn."

• ප්‍රශ්නය සහතික කිරීමේදී
විභාගය ඉදිරිපත් කිරීම
Question proposed.

අනුර බණ්ඩාරනායක මහතා (විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයේ නායකතුමා)
(ශ්‍රී ලං. අනුර බණ්ඩාරනායක — எதிர்க்கட்சி முதுவர்)
(Mr. Anura Bandaranaike (Leader of the Opposition))

Sir, I have given a very short notice to the Hon. Acting Minister of Finance and he has kindly consented to give me a hearing, but not to answer it. This is a very

serious question about the closure of the Overseas Trust Bank branch in Colombo. This morning the newspaper had a very brief notice of it. It says :-

"The Central Bank of Ceylon yesterday ordered that the Overseas Trust Bank branch in Colombo be closed for business until further notice.

This followed a report that the Overseas Trust Bank Hongkong had been closed for business due to financial difficulties. In a press statement the Central Bank said "it was fully aware of the situation and was in full control. Every effort was made to protect the interests of the depositors and creditors. They advised the general public to remain calm until the bank was open for business".

A notification issued last evening states the OTB Branch in Colombo City will remain closed for business today.

Sir, this is a very serious development amongst financial circles. I think most of the people who have deposited with this bank have naturally got very alarmed and perturbed and the appeal for calm will not work because nobody is calm in Sri Lanka these days. Therefore, in a situation like this I would like the Hon. Acting Minister of Finance to explain to us why this very powerful branch of this bank had to be closed down, and whether he is aware of the circumstances related to that.

එම්. එච්. එම්. නයිනා මරිකාර් මහතා (වැඩබලන මුදල් හා ක්‍රම සම්පාදන ඇමතිතුමා)

(இலங்கை எம். எச். எம். நயினா மரிக்கார் — நிதி, அமைப்புத் திட்டப் — பதில் அமைச்சர்)

(Mr. M. H. M. Naina Marikar - Acting Minister of Finance & Planning)

I am very ignorant of this, Sir.

දිනේෂ් ගුණවර්ධන මහතා

(ශ්‍රී ලං. தினேஷ் குணவர்தன)

(Mr. Dinesh Gunawardene)

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මම ප්‍රශ්නයක් කළ දී තිබෙනවා. මම ඒ ප්‍රශ්නය අතරින් ආරක්ෂක ඇමතිතුමාගෙන්. අවිස්සාවේලි මැතිවරණ කොටසකට අයත්, කොස්ගම පොලීස් විසම තුළ සාලාව, කොස්ගම, අර්ධදම්බලම ඒවනවෙත, පියතිලක තමැති ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයේ ප්‍රාදේශීය බල මණ්ඩලයේ උප ලේකම්වරයාගේ කිවසට 1985 ජූනි මස 1 වැනිදා බලහත්කාරයෙන් කඩාවැදුණු පිරිසක් ඔහුටත් ඔහුගේ පවුලේ උදවියටත් පහර දී, බලහත්කාරයෙන් ඔහු විරජයේ වාහනයක දමාගෙන, රජයේ දේශපාලන බලවතෙකුගේ නිවසකට ගෙන ගොස්, ඉන් අතතුරුව පොලීසියට හාර දී තිබෙනවා. පොලීසිය මගින් මේ පහර කෑ පුද්ගලයාට රීමාන්ඩ් භාරයට අරගෙන තිබෙනවා. මේක නීතීමය ප්‍රශ්නයක්.

මේ පසුබිම මත මම ආරක්ෂක ඇමතිතුමාගෙන් අසන ප්‍රශ්නය මේකයි එම පහර කෑ පුද්ගලයාගේ පවුලේ උදවිය පොලීසියට පැමිණිල්ලක් කර තිබෙනවා. ඒ අයගේ ජීවිතයට තර්ජනයක් තවමත් පවතිනවා. ඒ ප්‍රදේශයේම හිතියෙන් ඇදලී තිබෙනවා. සාමාන්‍ය ජනතාවට, තැන්තම් දේශපාලන විරුද්ධවැදීත්, මේ ආකාරයෙන් බලහත්කාරකම් කිරීමට දේශපාලන බලවතෙකුට ඉඩ දීමක් තිබෙනවාද? ඇයි පොලීසිය මේ ගැන ක්‍රියා නොකරන්නේ? ඒ හිතියට පත්වෙලා සිටින ජනතාවට අවශ්‍ය ආරක්ෂාව සැපයීමටත්, ඒ වාගේම මේ බලහත්කාරකම් කිරීමට සම්බන්ධ පුද්ගලයන් අත්අඩංගුවට ගැනීමටත් පොලීසියට තියෝගයක් දෙන්නය කියා මම ගරු ඇමතිතුමාගෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා. කුමන දේශපාලන බලවතෙකු ඒකට සම්බන්ධ වූණත් ඒ බලවතා නීතියට යටත් කළ යුතු බවයි. මම ආරක්ෂක ඇමතිතුමාගේ ඉල්ලා සිටින්නේ.

ලක්ෂ්මන් ජයකොඩි මහතා
(ති. ල. ලක්ෂ්මන් ජයකොඩි)
(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was shocked to hear the reply given by the hon. Acting Minister Finance about the closing down of the OTB. He is ignorant. This is not the reply that we expected to get from him.

මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්
(අங்கත්තවරුන් ඉරුවරුන්)
(A Member)

You are a well informed man.

ලක්ෂ්මන් ජයකොඩි මහතා
(ති. ල. ලක්ෂ්මන් ජයකොඩි)
(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

He could have checked this up.

එම්. එච්. එම් නයිනා මාරිකාර් මහතා
(ඉනුප් ආම්. ආම්. ආම්. නයිනා මාරිකාර්)
(Mr. M. H. M. Naina Marikar)

I have not replied.

මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්
(අங்கත්තවරුන් ඉරුවරුන්)
(A Member)

He has still not been able to answer the question.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථනායකතුමා
(ගිරාතිස් ජනාධිපතිතුමා)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

The hon. Acting Minister has not yet answered. I am shocked at your intervening. The hon. Member can ask his question, please.

ලක්ෂ්මන් ජයකොඩි මහතා
(ති. ල. ලක්ෂ්මන් ජයකොඩි)
(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

I would like to raise this matter with him because we know that all the big organizations like Prima and all other foreign investors in this country that have come from foreign countries to this country, go through the OTB more than the Hongkong & Shanghai Bank, the Grindlays Bank and all the other banks that are here. I know the American Express is a strong bank. We hear that there is a problem in the Hongkong office and there had been some incidents that have taken place there pertaining to its strength. This is having repercussions here on which I think immediate steps should be taken.

At the same time, did you look into the local component of the OTB bank? I am made to understand that through the OTB bank a lot of problems have taken place in our country, not only from the angle of the Hongkong office but also in regard to the personnel who are working there, starting with a person by the name of Mr. Lim and another local person by the name of Mr. Sivam. They have got into a problem pertaining to the security of this country. I have checked on this

and I am making a statement because there has been a drain of money through this bank. They brought in only Rs. 10 million as you are aware. All foreign banks brought only Rs. 10 million into this country and they have been doing a lot of business.

එම්. එච්. එම් නයිනා මාරිකාර් මහතා
(ඉනුප් ආම්. ආම්. ආම්. නයිනා මාරිකාර්)
(Mr. M. H. M. Naina Marikar)

The present position is Rs. 50 million.

ලක්ෂ්මන් ජයකොඩි මහතා
(ති. ල. ලක්ෂ්මන් ජයකොඩි)
(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

That is wrong.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථනායකතුමා
(ගිරාතිස් ජනාධිපතිතුමා)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Please wait for his reply.

ලක්ෂ්මන් ජයකොඩි මහතා
(ති. ල. ලක්ෂ්මන් ජයකොඩි)
(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

Of course, they brought in only Rs. 10 million.

මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්
(අங்கත්තවරුන් ඉරුවරුන්)
(A Member)

That is now.

ලක්ෂ්මන් ජයකොඩි මහතා
(ති. ල. ලක්ෂ්මන් ජයකොඩි)
(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

Today it is Rs. 50 million. When they wanted to form a bank for the Sinhala people they made it Rs. 50 million but when these people came they said Rs. 10 million. All those banks including the American Express that came here started with only Rs. 10 million. I am worried about this. I am very angry about this situation. It is only when we wanted to start a bank for the Sinhala people of this country that they made it Rs. 50 million.

ජී. ඩී. පෝල් පෙරේරා මහතා
(ති. ල. ආ. ඒ. පෝල් පෙරේරා)
(Mr. E. P. Paul Perera)

But the foreign banks were subject to a lot of conditions.

ලක්ෂ්මන් ජයකොඩි මහතා
(ති. ල. ලක්ෂ්මන් ජයකොඩි)
(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

Therefore, Sir, we would like to know what really has happened. You should check on that. Will you cause an immediate inquiry and give that inquiry equal prominence? Then the customers of the bank would know what the foreign banks are doing in this country. This is going to be very vital. I think everyone is interested in all these banks.

මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්
(அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)
 (A Member)

Habib Bank, Zurich Bank !

ලක්ෂමන් ජයකොඩි මහතා
(திரு. லக்ஷமன் ஜயக்கொடி)
 (Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

Therefore, I would like the hon. Acting Minister to give us a better and a detailed reply. I thought that when he saw this in the papers he would immediately react to it. I reacted because I am interested in the commerce and trading aspect of things. Immediately I got in touch and found out. The hon. Acting Minister must be knowing very well that this will come up. I think he should give more importance to this subject. I hope he will give us a better reply.

ගරු ජාතික ආරක්ෂක ඇමතිතුමාගෙන් මා විසින් මේ ප්‍රශ්නය අහන්නට යෙදුණි. දැනට ශ්‍රී ලංකාවේ අතාප කඳවුරුවල සිටින සිංහල, ද්‍රවිඩ, මුස්ලිම් හා වෙනත් ජාතිකයන්ගේ සංඛ්‍යාව වෙත වෙනම සඳහන් කරනවාද? අතාප කඳවුරු පිහිටා ඇති ස්ථාන සඳහන් කරනවාද? මම ඊට එහා මොකවත් අසා නැහැ. මීට ඉස්සර දුන් ලේඛනවලින් මෙන්ම මේ ගණන් තමයි. අපට ලැබුණේ, සිංහල අතාපයන් 3,500 යි. මුස්ලිම් අතාපයන් 3,000 යි. ද්‍රවිඩ අතාපයන් 4,500 යි. සම්පූර්ණ ගණන 12,000 ක් පමණ ඇතැයි කීවා. නමුත් අපි දන්නවා, ඒ වටකොටුවේදී ත්‍රිකුණාමලයේ ප්‍රශ්නය කොහොමත් ඇති වෙලා හොඳින්ම බව.

අපි දැනගන්න කැමතියි ත්‍රිකුණාමලයේ තත්ත්වය උඩ අතාප කඳවුරුවලට එකතු වී සිටින ප්‍රමාණය කොපමණද කියා. මොකද, ත්‍රිකුණාමලය කියන ප්‍රදේශය සිංහල ද්‍රවිඩ මුස්ලිම් ජනතාව තුනෙන් එක තුනෙන් එක තුනෙන් එක වශයෙන් ජීවත්ව සිටි ප්‍රදේශයක් බව තමුන්නාන්සේ දන්නවා. ලැබී තිබෙන ආරංචිය අනුව සිංහලයන් සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම පත්තා දමන්නට කල්පනා කරනවා ත්‍රිකුණාමල ප්‍රදේශයෙන් දකුණට. ඒ එක්කම මේ ඇත්තෝ හයටත් යන ගතියක් තිබෙනවා. ද්‍රවිඩයන් සහ මුස්ලිම්වරුන් අතාප කඳවුරුවලට යනවා. බැර වෙලාවත් ගෙයක් එහෙම පිරිවී තිබෙනවා නම්, තැන්නම් අසාධාරණයක් වෙලා තිබෙනවා නම්, යන්න එන්න තැනක් තැනිව අතාප වී සිටිනවා නම් ඒ කඳවුරුවලට යන්න ඕනෑ. නමුත් සිංහලයෝ මොකද කරන්නේ? කෙළින්ම දකුණට ගලාගෙන එනවා. අපි දැනගන්න කැමතියි මේ කඳවුරුවල දත් කොපමණ රඳවා සිටිනවාද කියා.

මීගමුවේ කඳවුරුක් තිබෙනවා. මීගමුවට සේරම ආවේ තසාරු කෝකිලායි ප්‍රදේශවලින්. ඒ අය බිවර කාර්මිකයෝ. අපට පොරොන්දුවක් වුණ ඒ අය ආපසු යවනවයි කියල. ඒ අය ආපසු යවනවාය. ගිහිල්ලා පදිවී කරනවාය. සත්තද්ධ කරනවාය. ආරක්ෂාව සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම සලසනවාය කියල අපට පොරොන්දුවක් වුණි. නමුත් ඒ අය තවම මේ කඳවුරුවල සිටිනවා. එම නිසා කොපමණ දුරට යථා තත්ත්වයට ගේන්න ගරු ඇමතිතුමා ක්‍රියා කළාද කියා අපි දැනගන්න කැමතියි.

අනුරාධපුරයේ සිංහල කඳවුරක් තිබෙනවා. අනුරාධපුරයේ කඳවුරේ ඉන්නේ මැදවර්ථීය ප්‍රදේශයේ උතුරේ මුලතිව් වාගේ ප්‍රදේශවලින්. ඒවාගේම පුල්ලුඩේ කෝකිලායි ආදී ප්‍රදේශවලින් ආ උදවිය. මේ ප්‍රශ්නය නිසා මුළු ලංකාවේම හැම එක්කොනම වාගේ අද ජීවත් වෙන්නෙ හය බිරාන්ත වෙලා. තමුන්නාන්සේ පුදුම වෙයි. මගේ ගමේ-දිවුලපිටියේ තගරයේ හැන්දලේ පහෙන් පස්සේ කවුරුවත් හැහැ. සේරම දෙරවල් වහගෙන බුදි. ගෙවල්වලට වෙලා ඉන්නවා හය බිරාන්ත වෙලා. මොකද? තුස්තවාදීන් ඇවිත් ගහයි කියල. මම ඒ ප්‍රදේශයට ගියාම මට ඇවිත් කියනව හේතුව එහේ විතරක් නොවෙයි. කොළඹ තගරයේ ඒයේ-

ජේ. ඒ. ඒ. අමරතුංග මහතා (වත්තල)
(திரு. ஜே. ஏ. எ. அமரதுங்க — வத்தள)
 (Mr. J. A. E. Amaratunga-Wattala)

මම විරුද්ධ වෙනවා, දිවුලපිටියේ මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ආර්යරත්න ජයතිලක මහතා) තැනි වෙලාවේ මේ ප්‍රශ්නය ඉදිරිපත් කිරීම ගැන.

ලක්ෂමන් ජයකොඩි මහතා
(திரு. லக்ஷமன் ஜயக்கொடி)
 (Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

එතුමා ගිටියොත් එතුමාත් කියයි. ඒයේ පිටකොටුවේ ටයර එකක් පිපිරුවයි කියල මුළු පළාතේම උදවිය දුටුන නටත් ගන්නා.

ඒ. පී. පෝල් පෙරේරා මහතා
(திரு. எ. பி. போல் பெரேரா)
 (Mr. E. P. Paul Perera)

මෙතුමා ප්‍රශ්නයක් තුළින් ඊට කලබල කරන්නයි හදන්නේ. ඊට කලබල කරන්න එපා.

ලක්ෂමන් ජයකොඩි මහතා
(திரு. லக்ஷமன் ஜயக்கொடி)
 (Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

මම මේකයි කියන්නෙ. ප්‍රධාරයක් කරන්න සම්පූර්ණ ජන සන්තීවේදන මාධ්‍ය යොද ගන්න. රූපවාහිනියත් ඇතුළු පත්‍ර යොදගෙන මේ මහජනයාට ඇති වී තිබෙන බිය ගතිය තැනි කිරීමට මොකක් හරි උපක්‍රමයීලි කටයුත්තක් කරන්නෙ කියා මම බැගුපත්ව ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා. මොකද? මේ හය කියන දේ බොහෝම හයානකයි. මේ ප්‍රශ්නයටත් මම එතුමාගෙන් පිළිතුරක් බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා.

අබ්දුල් රසාක් මන්සූර් මහතා (මුලතිව් දිසා ඇමතිතුමා)
(ஜனாப் அப்துல் ரஸூலாக் மன்சூர் — முல்லைத்தீவு மாவட்ட அமைச்சர்)
 (Mr. Abdul Razaak Munsoor-District Minister, Mullaitivu)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to bring to the notice of the Hon. Acting Minister of Finance the plight of many people in the Eastern Province who have pawned their articles with the People's Bank. The people in those areas are really suffering. There is no economic activity. The People's Bank has closed most of its branches. The ordinary farmer or fishermen cannot go and get facilities from the People's Bank. I know personally, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about the People's Bank branch in Kalmunai, where I believe more than Rs. 22 million worth of jewellery had been pawned by ordinary people-fishermen and poor people. They have paid the money but the bank authorities are refusing to hand back the articles pawned with the bank. This has been brought to the notice of the higher-ups in the People's Bank but they are not taking any interest to help the poor people in those areas. I read some time ago in the newspaper that in the Trincomalee District some effort was made to return the pawned articles but that has also not been completed. I therefore appeal to the Hon. Acting Minister, on behalf of the many people who are suffering in the Eastern province, that he takes suitable action immediately to see that their pawned articles are returned.

එම්. එච්. එම්. නයිනා මරිකාර් මහතා (වැඩබලන මුදල් හා ක්‍රම සම්පාදන ඇමතිතුමා)
(ஜனாப் எம். எச். எம். நயினா மரிக்கார் — நிதி, அமைப்புத் திட்டப் —புதில் அமைச்சர்)
 (Mr. M. H. M. Naina Marikar- Acting Minister of Finance & Planning)

Sir, I think my preliminary statement has been misunderstood by a number of people. What I want to say is, I do not know the circumstances under which the Overseas Trust Bank was closed. We are as much

agitated as the Members of the Opposition—in fact, even more—to find out the reasons and the implications of this closure. This is a matter we are going into straightaway. There is no harm in saying that there is a meeting with His Excellency at 11.30 to discuss this problem. I have made a note of what the Hon. Member for Attanagalla has said about the various implications of this closure. We will issue a report or we will make an announcement either through the newspapers or some other media to inform the people as to what action we have taken in relation to the Overseas Trust Bank. That is all that I can say at the moment. In fact, I myself was surprised. I do not read the papers early in the morning like the others—(Interruption).

අනුර බණ්ඩාරනායක මහතා
(තිரு. අනුර පண்டාරනායක)
(Mr. Anura Bandaranaike)

You should read the papers before all of us !

මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්
(අங்கත්තවරු ඉලුවරු)
(A Member)

You eat and sleep !

අනුර බණ්ඩාරනායක මහතා
(තිரு. අනුර පண்டාරනායක)
(Mr. Anura Bandaranaike)

Contemplating the problems of the world !

එම්. එච්. එම් නයිනා මරිකාර් මහතා
(ඉනුප් එම්. එස්. එම්. නයිනා මරිකාර්)
(Mr. M. H. M. Naina Marikar)

In regard to the other matter about jewellery, I had received several letters complaining about the difficulties. In the case of Puttalam and Kalptiya, it has all been taken away by the terrorists. In Nikaweratiya I do not know what is going to happen. At any rate all the jewellery has been sent to Colombo. The Chairman has stated that he is prepared to give the articles back if people come and claim them.—(Interruption). I am saying what the present arrangement is. He is also collecting a number of names of people who are willing to do it. That is to say, they can come and redeem the jewellery by paying the money, and those people who redeem their jewellery will not be deprived of any interest or any other financial assistance they are entitled to. I think that answers the question to some degree.

එම්. ඒ. අබ්දුල් මට්ට් මහතා (නියෝජ්‍ය තැපෑල හා විදුලි සංදේශ ඇමතිතුමා)
(ඉනුප් එම්. ඒ. අබ්දුල් මජීද් — තපාල්, තත්තිප් පොරොත්තු වරුන්ගේ පිරිනි අනුමැතිය)
(Mr. M. A. Abdul Majeed— Deputy Minister of Posts and Telecommunications)

Mr. M. A. Abdul Majeed— Deputy Minister of Posts and Telecommunications)

You can bring it to the Amparai people's Bank. From there we can redeem it.—(Interruption). No, no, all cannot come to Colombo. They are poor farmers and fishermen. There is the Amparai People's Bank branch. The pawned articles can be brought there, and the

people can travel the ten or twelve miles and take their jewellery. They have paid the dues and the interest almost one year back. Today our paddy cultivation is strangled because the peasants cannot get any loans. They have paid the money ; they have paid the interest more than one year back. We have been persistently appealing. Amparai is our district headquarters. The kachcheri is there. There is absolutely no problem there. Let the People's Bank bring the jewellery to the Amparai bank. The army is there. The police is there. They can remove it from there.

එම්. එච්. එම් නයිනා මරිකාර් මහතා
(ඉනුප් එම්. එස්. එම්. නයිනා මරිකාර්)
(Mr. M. H. M. Naina Marikar)

I agree with that, Sir. We will consider it very seriously. the only difficulty is, there must be a guarantee that all that jewellery will not be sized by the terrorists. But I think we can make the arrangements.

ආටානි විමල් වික්‍රමසිංහ මහතා (ඇතුළුයොධ)
(සෞඛ්‍ය විමල් වික්‍රමසිංහ—ආලෝචනා)
(Dr. Wimal Wickremasinghe—Eheliyagoda)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, may I say a few words with respect to this matter ? Since this is an Adjournment Debate, I would wish to add something to the question that has been raised by the Leader of the Opposition. In fact, since there is unnecessary alarm, I would wish to say this.

Having closed the OTB yesterday, the Monetary Board of the Central Bank is meeting today at 11 o'clock to discuss this matter. There is no deposit insurance organization in Sri Lanka, as in the United States. But the Central Bank has taken all the measures as far as I know personally, with respect to the protection of the depositors as well as the creditors of this country, and it has even raised the requirement. The hon. Member for Attanagalla indicated that the bank has been able to bring in only Rs. 10 million. No, that is wrong. The amount has been increased to Rs. 50 million —[Interruption]— and the Central Bank has imposed rigid rules.

There was a bank that crashed somewhere in 1848 or 1850. That bank was called the "Bank of Colombo", I believe. Since then, in order to avoid a run on the banking system, this measure has been taken, and the Opposition need not worry about it too much and create panic in the minds of the people and upset the whole mechanism in this country.

අනුර බණ්ඩාරනායක මහතා
(තිரு. අනුර පண்டාරනායක)
(Mr. Anura Bandaranaike)

I resent that remark because the Opposition is not trying to create panic in anybody.—[Interruption]. Anybody who bothers to read the morning newspapers will realize the situation.

தீயேர்சு கப்தாஸகதூமூ
(பிரதீசு சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)
Order, please !

ஈபாஸி பீமலு பீஔமஈஔ மஔஔ
(கலாநிதி விமல் விஔரமசிங்ஔ)
(Dr. Wimal Wickremasinghe)
They have made another allegation. [Interruption] I am entitled to express my own opinion.

தீயேர்சு கப்தாஸகதூமூ
(பிரதீசு சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)
Order, please ! But no improper motive should be attributed to any hon. Member.

ஈபாஸி பீமலு பீஔமஈஔ மஔஔ
(கலாநிதி விமல் விஔரமசிங்ஔ)
(Dr. Wimal Wickremasinghe)
The hon. Member for Attangalla -

தீயேர்சு கப்தாஸகதூமூ
(பிரதீசு சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)
I am sure the hon. Leader of the Opposition did not intend to create any panic.

ஈபாஸி பீமலு பீஔமஈஔ மஔஔ
(கலாநிதி விமல் விஔரமசிங்ஔ)
(Dr. Wimal Wickremasinghe)
No, Sir. We need not become panicky, I said. The Central Bank has its own statutory responsibility.

தீயேர்சு கப்தாஸகதூமூ
(பிரதீசு சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)
But anyway, we will calm down. There are so many other banks that have not crashed as yet.

ஈபாஸி பீமலு பீஔமஈஔ மஔஔ
(கலாநிதி விமல் விஔரமசிங்ஔ)
(Dr. Wimal Wickremasinghe)
There is one othe thing I wish to say. The hon. Member for Attanagalla says that there is a drain of foreign exchange from this country. That is also wrong. Any money that has been taken out of this country in terms of profits or dividends has been in line with the laws of this country. They want to give the impression that the foreign banks are taking money out unnecessarily. That is not true.

தீயேர்சு கப்தாஸகதூமூ
(பிரதீசு சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)
I do not think those impressions were given.

ஈபாஸி பீமலு பீஔமஈஔ மஔஔ
(கலாநிதி விமல் விஔரமசிங்ஔ)
(Dr. Wimal Wickremasinghe)
That is why I would like to enlighten them on this point that there is no serious reason for alarm.

ஈஔர ஁ஔ஁பாஸக மஔஔ
(திஔ. அஔர பஔடாநாயக்ஔ)
(Mr. Anura Bandaranaike)
May I assure the hon. Member for Eheliyagoda, Sir, that we do not require his enlightenment. We are fully satisfied with the reply given by the Acting Minister of Finance. We do not require further enlightenment, Sir.

தீயேர்சு கப்தாஸகதூமூ
(பிரதீசு சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)
Being an Adjournment question -

ஈபாஸி பீமலு பீஔமஈஔ மஔஔ
(கலாநிதி விமல் விஔரமசிங்ஔ)
(Dr. Wimal Wickremasinghe)
I am not a spokesman for the Government. I am entitled to express my view on this. Otherwise there will be a misunderstanding on this matter.

தீயேர்சு கப்தாஸகதூமூ
(பிரதீசு சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)
Perfectly correct.

ஈபாஸி பீமலு பீஔமஈஔ மஔஔ
(கலாநிதி விமல் விஔரமசிங்ஔ)
(Dr. Wimal Wickremasinghe)
And they would like to go to town on these matters when there is no serious cause for alarm [Interruption] The OTB question was started for a chance to go to town. It is Rs. 50 million, and the Central Bank has taken all the -

தீயேர்சு கப்தாஸகதூமூ
(பிரதீசு சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)
These are matters that are known to everybody who knows his facts. It is not a special secret or anything like that.

The Deputy Minister of Defence.

஁ஔ. பீஔஔ஁஁ ஁஁஁஁஁ மஔஔ
(திஔ. எஔ. விஔசஔஔஔ ஁஁஁஁஁)
(Mr. M. Vincent Perera)

We did not expect that the House would adjourn so early.

தீயேர்சு கப்தாஸகதூமூ
(பிரதீசு சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)
Kindly bring this quesion to the notice of the Deputy Minister of Defence.

එම්. වින්සන්ට් පෙරේරා මහතා
(**திரு. எம். வினசன்ட் பெரேரா**)
(Mr. M. Vincent Perera)
I will do so.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථනායකතුමා
(**பிரதிச் சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்**)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

The Hon. Minister of National Security.

එම්. වින්සන්ට් පෙරේරා මහතා
(**திரு. எம். வினசன்ட் பெரேரா**)
(Mr. M. Vincent Perera)

Same, Sir. I will bring that question to the notice of the Hon. Minister of National Security.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථනායකතුමා
(**பிரதிச் சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்**)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

The hon. Member for Kalawana – he is not here.

ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදීත්, සභා සම්මත විය.
வினா விடுக்கப்பெற்ற ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.
Question put, and agreed to.

පාර්ලිමේන්තුව ඊට අනුකූලව පු. ත. 11. 26 ට අද දින සභා සම්මතය අනුව, 1985 ජූනි 21 වන සිකුණදා පු. ත. 9. 30 වන තෙක් කල් ගියේය.

அதன்படி, மு. ப. 11.26 மணிக்கு பாராளுமன்றம், அதனது இன்றைய தீர்மானத்துக்கிணங்க 1985 ஜூன் 21 வெள்ளிக்கிழமை மு. ப. 9.30 மணிவரை ஒத்திவைக்கப்பட்டது.

Adjourned accordingly at 11.26 a.m. until 9.30 a.m. on Friday, 21st June 1985, pursuant to the Resolution of the Parliament on this day.

ප්‍රශ්නවලට ලිඛිත පිළිතුරු

විභාගවලට ඇතුළත්වන විභාගකරුවන්

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

අයෝග්‍ය නානායකාර මෙහෙවිය : විදු. ගුරු පුහුණුව

සෙස්වි අශෝකා නානායකාර : විශ්‍රුණාන ඡුසිරියා පයිරිසි
MISS ASOKA NANAYAKKARA : TRAINING AS SCIENCE
TEACHER

218/85

ආචාර්ය ඩබ්ලිව්. දහනායක මහතා (ගාල්ල)
(කලාතිඨි ධර්මය, තණතොට — කාණි)
(Dr. W. Dahanayake-Galle)

යොටන කටයුතු හා රැකිරීමේ ඇමතිතුමා සහ අධ්‍යාපන ඇමතිතුමාගෙන්
ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය :

- (අ) අංක 2 දරන මණ්ඩලයේ ඇතුළුවීමේ අංක 9 හිමි ගාල්ලේ වැනුනගොඩ නො. 53 පදිංචි අයෝග්‍ය නානායකාර මෙහෙවියට උසස් පෙළ විභාගයේ සම්මාන 4 ක් තිබියදීත් විදු. ගුරුවරයන් වශයෙන් පුහුණු කරනු ලැබීමට ඇය තෝරාගෙන නොමැති බැවින් එතුමා දන්නේද ?
- (ආ) ඇයට විශිෂ්ට පුද්ගලික තිබියදීත් ඇය තෝරා නොගත්තේ මන්ද ?
- (ඇ) මේ කරුණ තවදුරටත් සලකා බලා ඇය තෝරාගන්නේද ?
- (ඈ) තෝරා නොගත්තේ නම්, ඒ මන්ද ?

இளைஞர் அலுவலர்கள், தொழில்வாய்ப்பு அமைச்சரும் கல்வி அமைச்சருமா
எவரைக் கேட்ட வினா :

- (அ) காலி, வகுனாகொட 53 ஆம் இலக்கத்தில் வசிக்கும் செல்வி அசோக நானாயக்கார என்பவர் க. பொ. த. உயர்தர பரீட்சையில் நான்கு திறமைச் சித்திகள் பெற்றிருந்தும் விசுருணா ஆசிரியர் பயிற்சிக்கு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்படவில்லை என்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா ? (இவரது சேர்வில்லக்கம் 9, சபை இலக்கம் 2)
- (ஆ) இவர் தனித்துவத் தகைமைகள் பெற்றிருந்தும் ஏன் பயிற்சிக்கு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்படவில்லை ?
- (இ) விஷயத்தை மறுபரிசீலனை செய்து இவரைத் தெரிவு செய்வாரா ?
- (ஈ) இல்லையெயில், ஏன் ?

asked the Minister of Youth Affairs and Employment and Minister of Education :

- (a) Is he aware that Miss Asoka Nanayakkara, 53, Wekunagoda, Galle, whose admission number is 9, board number 2, and who has 4 credits in the A.L. examination, have not been accepted for training as a Science Teacher ?
- (b) Why has she not been accepted in view of her exceptional qualifications ?
- (c) Will he reconsider the matter and select her ?
- (d) If not, why ?

රජීල් වික්‍රමසිංහ මහතා (යොටන කටයුතු හා රැකිරීමේ ඇමතිතුමා සහ
අධ්‍යාපන ඇමතිතුමා)

(திரு. ரணில் விக்ரமசிங்ஹ — இளைஞர் அலுவலர்கள், தொழில்
வாய்ப்பு அமைச்சரும் கல்வி அமைச்சரும்)
(Mr. Ranil Wickremasinghe - Minister of Youth Affairs &
Employment and Minister of Education)

- (අ) අධ්‍යාපන විද්‍යා පීඨයට සිසුන් ඇතුළත් කිරීමේ සම්මුඛ පරීක්ෂණ ප්‍රථම වරට නිකුත් කර තැන.
- (ආ) පැන නොනගී.

- (අ) පැන නොනගී.
- (ආ) පැන නොනගී.

- (அ) கல்விக் கலாசாலைகளுக்கு மாணவர்களைச் சேர்த்துக்கொள்வதற்கான தேர்வுகூப்பரீட்சையின் பெறுபெறுகள் இதுவரை வெளியிடப்படவில்லை.
- (ஆ) எழவில்லை.
- (இ) எழவில்லை.
- (ஈ) எழவில்லை.

- (a) Results of the interviews for admission of students to College of Education have not been replaced so far.
- (b) Does not arise.
- (c) Does not arise.
- (d) Does not arise.

மே. மே. பிடாச மஹா : பிழாமை வுடுபு
திரு. கே. கே. பியதாச : ஓய்வூதியம்
MR. K. K. PIYADASA : PENSION

257/85

ආචාර්ය ඩබ්ලිව්. දහනායක මහතා
(කලාතිඨි ධර්මය, තණතොට)
(Dr. W. Dahanayake)

අභ්‍යන්තර ඇමතිතුමා සහ පළාත් පාලන නිවාස හා ඉදිකිරීම් ඇමතිතුමා සහ
මහාමාර්ග ඇමතිතුමා සහ හදිසි අවස්ථා මහජන පරිපාලන ඇමතිතුමාගෙන්
ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය :

- (අ) මහාමාර්ග දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවේ විශ්‍රාම ලත් කම්කරුවෙකු වන අංක 7908 දරන පොද්දල, කිඹිඳුල, ආබේගම, අංක 34 හි පදිංචි මේ. මේ. පිට්ටි මහතාට ඔහුගේ විශ්‍රාම වැටුප සහ අනෙක් දීමාන වහාම ලබාදීමට එතුමා කටයුතු කරන්නේද ?
- (ආ) එසේ නොකරන්නේ නම්, ඒ මන්ද ?

பிரதம அமைச்சரும் உள்ளூராட்சி, வீடமைப்பு, நிர்மாண அமைச்சரும்
பெருவீதிகள் அமைச்சரும் அவசரகால சிவில் நிருவாக அமைச்சருமா
எவரைக் கேட்ட வினா :

- (அ) 34, அபயகமை, கீம்பியகலை, பொதலை என்ற முகவரியினரும் நெடுஞ்சாலைத் திணைக்களத்திலிருந்து ஓய்வுபெற்ற தொழிலாளியும் 7908 ஆம் இலக்கம் கொண்டவருமாகிய கே. கே. பியதாச என்பவருக்கு அவரது ஓய்வூதியமும் பிற கொடுப்பனவுகளும் உடனடியாகக் கிடைக்கச் செய்வீப்பாரா ?
- (ஆ) இல்லையெயில், ஏன் ?

asked the Prime Minister and Minister of Local Government, Housing and Construction and Minister of Highways and Minister of Emergency Civil Administration

- (a) Will he cause Mr. K. K. Piyadasa, of 34, Abeygama, Keembiela, Poddala, who is a retired labourer of the Highways Department, No. 7908, to be paid his pension and other dues at once ?
- (b) If not, why ?

දයක මුදල් : පාර්ලිමේන්තු විවිධ වාර්තාවල වාර්ෂික දයක මිල රු. 200/- කි. (අශෝචිත පිටපත් සඳහා නම් රු. 175/- කි). පිටපතක් ගෙන්වා ගැනීම අවශ්‍ය නම් ගාස්තුව රු. 2.50 කි. තැපාල් ගාස්තුව ගත 90 කි. කොළඹ 1, නා. පෙ. 500, උපයෝජන ප්‍රකාශන කාර්යාංශයේ අධිකාරී වෙත සෑම වර්ෂයකම නොවැම්බර් 30 දව ප්‍රථම දයක මුදල් ගෙවා ඉදිරි වර්ෂයේ දයකත්වය ලබාගෙන විවිධ වාර්තා ලබාගත හැකිය. නියමිත දිනෙන් පසුව එවනු ලබන දයක ඉල්ලුම්පත් භාරගනු නොලැබේ.

சந்தா : ஹன்சார்ட் அறிக்கையின் வருடாந்த சந்தா ரூபா 200/- (திருத்தப்படாத பிரதிகள் ரூபா 175/-) ஹன்சார்ட் தனிப்பிரதி ரூபா 2.50. தபாற் செலவு 90 சதம். வருடாந்த சந்தா முற்பணமாக அத்தியட்சர், அரசாங்க வெளியீட்டலுவலகம், த. பெ. இல. 500, கொழும்பு 1 என்ற விலாசத்திற்கு அனுப்பி பிரதிகளைப் பெற்றுக்கொள்ளலாம். ஒவ்வொரண்டும் நவம்பர் 30 ந் தேதிக்குமுன் சந்தாப் பணம் அனுப்பப்படவேண்டும். பிந்திக் கிடைக்கும் சந்தா விண்ணப்பங்கள் ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்படமாட்டா.

Subscriptions : The annual subscription for Official Report of Hansard is Rs. 200/- (For uncorrected copies Rs. 175/-). A single copy of Hansard is available for Rs. 2.50. (Postage 90 cts.) Copies can be obtained by remitting in advance an annual subscription fee to the SUPERINTENDENT, GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS BUREAU, P. O. Box, 500 Colombo 1. The fee should reach him on or before November 30 each year. Late applications for subscription will not be accepted.

Friday, 21st June 1982

From 9.30 am to 12.30 pm
2891.00.70 no

From 1.30 pm to 4.30 pm
2891.00.70 no

From 5.30 pm to 8.30 pm
2891.00.70 no