

22 වන කාණ්ඩය

12 වන කලාපය

*Budget  
Debate 11<sup>th</sup> Reading  
P. M. A. A. Speech*

සිකුරාද

1983 මාර්තු 18

*Hutch*



# පාර්ලිමේන්තු විවාද

(හැන්සාඩ්)

## නිල වාර්තාව

(අගෝස්තු පිටපත)

අන්තර්ගත ප්‍රධාන කරුණු

ප්‍රශ්නවලට වාර්ෂික පිළිතුරු

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1983 [හත්වන වෙන් කළ දිනය] :

දෙවන වර නියමිත—විවාදය අවසන් කරන ලදී

පනත් කෙටුම්පත පූර්ණ පාර්ලිමේන්තු කාරක සභාවකට පවරන ලදී

1985-86

18



# വേദം

(പേര്)

വേദം

(പേര്)

പേര്

1985-86

18



# பாராளுமன்ற விவாதங்கள்

(ஹன்சாட்)

அதிகார அறிக்கை

(பிழை திருத்தப்படாதது)

பிரதான உள்ளடக்கம்

வினாக்களுக்கு வாய்மூல விடைகள்

ஒதுக்கீட்டுச் சட்டமலம், 1983 [ஒதுக்கப்பட்ட ஏழாம் நாள்]:

இரண்டாம் மதிப்பு—விவாதம் முடிவுற்றது

சட்டமலம் முழுப்பாராளுமன்றக் குழுவுக்குச் சாட்டப்பட்டது

Volume 22  
No. 12

Friday  
18th March 1983

## PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

OFFICIAL REPORT

(Uncorrected)

## PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

APPROPRIATION BILL, 1983 [Seventh Allotted Day]:

Second Reading—Debate concluded

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole Parliament

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



பார்லாமென்ட் விவாதங்கள்

(பொது)

புதிதான சட்டம்

(பொது விவாதங்கள்)

புதிதான சட்டம்

புதிதான சட்டம்  
புதிதான சட்டம்  
புதிதான சட்டம்  
புதிதான சட்டம்

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(GENERAL)

OFFICIAL REPORT

(Unconnected)

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

APPROBATION BILL, 1982 [Second Allotted Day]  
Second Reading - Debate concluded  
Bill committed to a committee of the House of Commons







[சுட்டிசெனது வினாக்கள்]

கைத்தொழில், விந்நூல அலுவலர்கள் அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா: (அ) கிந்தோட்டை ஒட்டுப்பலகைத் தொழிற்சாலையில் 18 வருடங்கள் சேவையாற்றிய தொழிலாளியான திரு. பி. எச். எஸ். தர்மசேன (சேவை இலக்கம் 989) என்பவருக்கு 1980 ஜூலியில் இரு தினங்கள் வேலைக்குச் சமூக மளிக்காமையால் முறையற்ற விதத்தில் வேலை மறுக்கப்பட்டுள்ளதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஆ) திரு. தர்மசேன தமது கையினம் சூறித்து பத்தேசம் வைந்தியசாலையிலிருந்து வைத்தியச் சான்றிதழ் ஒன்றைச் சமர்ப்பித்துள்ளவரை அவர் அறிவாரா? (இ) திரு. தர்மசேன ஏன் நீக்கப்பட்டார்? (ஈ) திரு. தர்மசேனவைப் பாக்கிச் சம்பளத்துடன் மீள, வேலையிலமர்த்துமாறு அவர் தயவுசெய்து கட்டளையிடுவாரா? (உ) இன்னேன்?

asked the Minister of Industries and Scientific Affairs: (a) Is he aware that Mr. B. H. S. Dharmasena, Labourer, Plywood Factory, Gintota, Service Number 989, who has a service of 18 years, was wrongfully deprived of works when he had been absent for two days in July, 1980? (b) Is he aware that Mr. Dharmasena submitted a medical certificate from the Baddegama hospital for his illness? (c) Why was Mr. Dharmasena discontinued? (d) Will he order Mr. Dharmasena's reinstatement with arrears? (e) If not, why?

கலாநிதி

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)  
(Mr. Speaker)  
Question No. 6.

உ. வினாக்கள் பதிலளிப்பது  
(திரு. எம். வினசன்ற் பெரேரா)  
(Mr. M. Vincent Perera)

On behalf of the Minister of Industries and Scientific Affairs I would like to table the answer as it is a long one.

சுட்டிசெனது வினாக்கள் பதிலளிப்பது  
(கலாநிதி டபிள்யூ. தஹநாயக்க)  
(Dr. W. Dahanayake)

Tabling the long answer will not help the victim.

உ. வினாக்கள் பதிலளிப்பது  
(திரு. எம். வினசன்ற் பெரேரா)  
(Mr. M. Vincent Perera)  
That I do not know.

சுட்டிசெனது வினாக்கள் பதிலளிப்பது  
(கலாநிதி டபிள்யூ. தஹநாயக்க)  
(Dr. W. Dahanayake)

I have got to look into the answer. Can the Hon. Minister let me know whether Mr. Dharmasena will be reinstated? That is my question (d). If not, why?

உ. வினாக்கள் பதிலளிப்பது  
(திரு. எம். வினசன்ற் பெரேரா)  
(Mr. M. Vincent Perera)  
I will answer relevant questions.

(d) No. (e) There was a strike at the Gintota Plywood Factory on 25th July, 1980. Mr. Dharmasena and several others of the Gintota Plywood Factory did not report for duty on 25th July, 1980 and hence according to Public Administration Circular No. 167 of 17th July, 1980, Mr. Dharmasena and others were considered as having vacated their posts. Hence there is no possibility of Mr. Dharmasena being taken back to service.

சுட்டிசெனது வினாக்கள் பதிலளிப்பது  
(கலாநிதி டபிள்யூ. தஹநாயக்க)  
(Dr. W. Dahanayake)

Is the Hon. Minister aware that Mr. Dharmasena was not a striker according to the ordinary meaning of the word 'striker'?

உ. வினாக்கள் பதிலளிப்பது  
(திரு. எம். வினசன்ற் பெரேரா)  
(Mr. M. Vincent Perera)  
Sir, I will need time to answer that.

கலாநிதி  
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)  
(Mr. Speaker)

That is a matter of interpretation.

சுட்டிசெனது வினாக்கள் பதிலளிப்பது  
(கலாநிதி டபிள்யூ. தஹநாயக்க)  
(Dr. W. Dahanayake)

Yes, it is a matter of interpretation. Their interpretation is wrong and the interpretation I gave them is correct.

உ. வினாக்கள் பதிலளிப்பது  
(திரு. எம். வினசன்ற் பெரேரா)  
(Mr. M. Vincent Perera)

I cannot express an opinion on that.

கலாநிதி  
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)  
(Mr. Speaker)

You can get it verified from the Minister concerned.

\* பதிலளிப்பது பதிலளிப்பது  
சபாநாயகத்தில் வைக்கப்பட்ட மறுமொழி:  
Answer tabled:

(a) I am aware that Mr. B. H. S. Dharmasena, Labourer, Plywood Factory, Gintota, senior member 989, who has a service of 18 years, vacated his post by not reporting for work on 25th and 26th July, 1980. (b) Yes. (c) Please see answer to (a) above. (d) No. (e) There was a strike at the Gintota Plywood Factory on 25th July, 1980. Mr. Dharmasena and several others of the Gintota Plywood Factory did not report for duty on 25 July, 1980 and hence according to Public Administration Circular No. 167 of 17th July, 1980 Mr. Dharmasena and others were considered as having vacated their posts. Hence there is no possibility of Mr. Dharmasena being taken back to service.











asked the Prime Minister and Minister of Local Government, Housing and Construction and Minister of Highways: (a) Will he table the names of the directors of companies where the foreign shareholding is over 50 per cent in the 61 enterprises in the Katunayake Investment Promotion Zone who have obtained 148 acres 03 perches as lease as answered to question No. 235/82 (2) asked by the MP for Attanagalla? (b) If not, why? (c) Will he inform the House whether these companies using tea, rubber, coconut, gems and other exports and raw material pay the due export duties to the Government of Sri Lanka? (d) Will he state the quantum of textile quota out of Sri Lanka country quota given to these companies who have over 51 per cent foreign ownership? (e) If not why? (f) Will he give the names of the Directors of the companies where the foreign ownership is lower than 50 per cent out of the 51 enterprises as mentioned in (a) above? (g) If not, why?

**එම්. වින්සන්ට් පෙරේරා මහතා**

(திரு. எம். வின்சன்ட் பெரேரா)

(Mr. M. Vincent Perera)

On behalf of the Prime Minister and Minister of Local Government, Housing and Construction and Minister of Highways, I answer.

(a) No. (b) The Commission is obliged to maintain secrecy under the Agreements. (c) One enterprise exporting packeted and bagged tea pays export duty on tea. (d) No. (e) Country quota under negotiation. (f) No. (g) Commission is obliged to maintain secrecy under the Agreement.

**බී. ප්‍රේමලතා මහත්මිය : විශේෂ පාරිතෝෂිකයක්**

(திருமதி பீ. பிரேமலதா : விசேட பணிக்கொடை)

MRS. B. PREMALATHA : SPECIAL GRATUITY

82/83

**4. මොනිපාල සේනානායක මහතා (සරත් මුත්තෙට්ටුවෙලම මහතා—කලවාන—වෙනුවට)**

(திரு. மைத்திரிபால சேனநாயக்க—திரு. சரத் முத்தெட்டு வெகம—கலவான சார்பாக)

(Mr. Maithripala Senanayake—on behalf of Mr. Sarath Muttetuwegama—Kalawana)

ඉඩම් හා ඉඩම් සංවර්ධන ඇමතිතුමා සහ මහවැලි සංවර්ධනය පිලිබඳ ඇමතිතුමාගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය : (අ) (i) අනුරාධපුර ඉඩම් කොමසාරිස් දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවේ සතිපාර්ශ්වක කමිකරුවෙකු රාජකාරියෙහි නිරතව සිටියදී 82. 03. 30 දින මිය ගිය බවත් ; (ii) විශේෂ පාරිතෝෂිකයක් ගෙවීම සඳහා මරණ සහතිකය හා ග්‍රාමසේවක සහතිකය ඉදිරිපත් කරන ලෙස ඉඩම් කොමසාරිස් විසින් ඔහුගේ අංක අ/4/ස/ක/9 හා 1982. 05. 03 දින දරන ලිපියෙන් මියගිය අයගේ බිරිඳ වන කලවාන, දෙල්ගොඩ කොළඹියේ බී. ප්‍රේමලතා මහත්මිය වෙත දන්වා යවන ලද බවත් ; (iii) ප්‍රේමලතා මහත්මිය විසින් මෙම ලිය

කියවිලි 1982. 06. 07 දින අනුරාධපුර සහකාර ඉඩම් කොමසාරිස් වෙත භාර දෙන ලද බවත් ; (iv) ඇයට හිමි කවර හෝ ගෙවීමක් පිලිබඳව එතෙක් ඇයට කිසිදු දැනුම්දීමක් කර නැති බවත් ; එතුමා දන්නේද? (ආ) මේ මුදල වහාම ගෙවන ලෙස එතුමා කියෝග කරන්නේද? (ඇ) එසේ නම්, ඒ කවදාද? (ඈ) නො එසේ නම්, ඒ මන්ද?

காணி, காணி அபிவிருத்தி, அமைச்சரும் மகாவலி அபிவிருத்தி அமைச்சருமானவரைக் கேட்ட வினா : (அ) (i) அனுராதபுரம் காணி ஆணையாளர் திணைக்களத்தைச் சேர்ந்த சுத்திகரிப்புத் தொழிலாளி 30.3.82 ல் மரணமடைந்தார் என்பதையும் ; (ii) காணி ஆணையாளர் நனது අ/4/ස/ක/9 இலக்க 3.5.82 ஆந் திகதிக்கு கடிதப்படி இறந்தவரின் மனைவியான கலவான தெல்கொட குடியேற்றத் திட்டத்தில் வசிக்கும் திருமதி பீ. பிரேமலதா என்பவருக்கு மரணச் சான்றிதழையும், கிராமசேவகர் சான்றிதழையும் அனுப்பும்படி வேண்டினார் என்பதையும் ; (iii) 7.6.82 ல் திருமதி பிரேமலதா இவ்வாணங்களை அனுராதபுரம் உதவிக்க காணி ஆணையாளரிடம் கையளித்தார் என்பதையும் ; (iv) அன்றுதொடக்கம் இவருக்குரிய எந்தக் கொடுப்பனவும் சம்பந்தமாக எத்தகவலும் கிடைக்கவில்லை என்பதையும் ; அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஆ) இப்பணத்தை உடனடியாகக் கொடுக்க அவர் உத்தரவிடுவாரா? (இ) அப்படியாயின் எப்போது? (ஈ) இல்லையெல், ஏன்?

asked the Minister of Lands and Land Development and Minister of Mahaweli Development : (a) Is he aware (i) that a conservancy labourer in the Land Commissioner's Department, Anuradhapura, died 30.3.82 while at work ; (ii) that by letter dated 3.5.82, bearing number අ/4/ස/ක/9—the Land Commissioner wrote to the deceased's wife Mrs. B. Premalatha, of Delgoda Colony, Kalawana, requesting her to forward the Death Certificate and the Grama Sevaka Certificate—for payment of a special gratuity ; (iii) that Mrs. Premalatha, handed these documents to the Assistant Land Commissioner, Anuradhapura, on 7.6.82 ; (iv) that since then she has heard nothing of any payments due to her (b) Will he order the immediate payment of this money ? (c) If so, when ? (d) If not, why ?

**එම්. වින්සන්ට් පෙරේරා මහතා**

(திரு. எம். வின்சன்ட் பெரேரா)

(Mr. M. Vincent Perera)

On behalf of the Minister of Lands and Land Development and Minister of Mahaweli Development, I answer the question :

(a) (i) Yes. (ii) Yes. (iii) Yes. (iv) informed on 10.11.82 of the payment of Death Gratuity. (b) Bank of Ceylon, Bambalapitiya, Cheque No. dd/2 202298 had been sent to her. (c) and (d) Do not arise.



**1980 ஜூலை மாதத்தில் பதவியிலிருந்து விவாகம் செய்யப்பட்டவர்கள்**  
**EMPLOYEES WHO VACATED THEIR POSTS IN JULY, 1980**

53/83

8. வேலைக்குப் போகாதவர்கள் (புதிய பதவியைப் பெறாதவர்கள்)

(திரு. மைத்திரிபால சேனநாயக்க—திரு. சரத் முத்தேவா)

(Mr. Maithripala Senanayake—on behalf of Mr. Sarath Muttetuwegama)

விடுவதற்கு உடனடியாகவே பதவியை விட்டுக் கொடுத்தவர்கள் எவ்வளவு? (அ) 1980 ஜூலை மாதத்தில் தமது பதவியை விட்டுக் கொடுத்தவர்களில் எவ்வளவு பேர் தமது பதவியை மீண்டும் பெறும்படி கேட்டுக் கொண்டனர்? (ஆ) அவர்களில் எவ்வளவு பேர் தமது பதவியை மீண்டும் பெறும்படி கேட்டுக் கொள்ளப்பட்டவர்கள் எத்தனை பேர்? (இ) எஞ்சியுள்ளவர்களையும் மீண்டும் சேர்த்துக் கொள்வதற்கு அவர் உத்தேசிக்கிறாரா? (ஈ) ஆமெனில் எப்போது? (உ) இல்லையெனில் ஏன்? (ஊ) அவ்வாறு மீண்டும் வேலைக்குச் சேர்த்துக் கொள்ளப்பட்டவர்களில் எத்தனை பேருக்கு அவர்களது சம்பள நிலுவைகள் வழங்கப்பட்டன? (எ) அவர்களுக்கும் அவர்களது சம்பள நிலுவைகள் வழங்கப்படமா? (ஏ) ஆமெனில் எப்போது? (ஐ) இல்லையெனில் ஏன்?

asked the Deputy Minister of Power and Energy : (a) Will he state the number of employees of all categories in Departments and Corporations under his Ministry who were considered to have vacated their posts in July, 1980? (b) Of these employees how many have been taken back work? (c) Does he propose to take back the remaining employees? (d) If so, when? (e) If not, why? (f) How many such employees so taken back for work have been paid their arrears of salary? (g) Will the others be paid their arrears of salary? (h) If so, when? (i) If not, why?

9. துறைமுகத்துறை (புதிய துறைமுகத்துறை) கட்டுமானப் பணிகளில் பதவியை விட்டுக் கொடுத்தவர்கள்

(திரு. பி. தயாரத்ன—அம்பாறை மாவட்ட அமைச்சரும் மின்சக்தி, எரிபொருள் பிரதி அமைச்சரும்)

(Mr. P. Dayaratne—District Minister, Amparai, and Deputy Minister of Power and Energy)

(a) No employees in departments and Corporations under this ministry has vacated his post in July, 1980.  
 (b) to (i) Do not arise in view of (a) above.

10. விடுவதற்கு உடனடியாகவே பதவியை விட்டுக் கொடுத்தவர்கள்

திரு. எச். டபிள்யூ. நிலவீர : மீள் வேலைக்கமர்த்தல்

MR. H. W. NILAWEERA : REINSTATEMENT

56/83

11. வேலைக்குப் போகாதவர்கள் (புதிய பதவியைப் பெறாதவர்கள்)

(திரு. மைத்திரிபால சேனநாயக்க—திரு. சரத் முத்தேவா)

(Mr. Maithripala Senanayake—on behalf of Mr. Sarath Muttetuwegama)

விடுவதற்கு உடனடியாகவே பதவியை விட்டுக் கொடுத்தவர்கள் எவ்வளவு? (அ) தமது பதவியை விட்டுக் கொடுத்தவர்களில் எவ்வளவு பேர் தமது பதவியை மீண்டும் பெறும்படி கேட்டுக் கொண்டனர்? (ஆ) அவர்களில் எவ்வளவு பேர் தமது பதவியை மீண்டும் பெறும்படி கேட்டுக் கொள்ளப்பட்டவர்கள் எத்தனை பேர்? (இ) எஞ்சியுள்ளவர்களையும் மீண்டும் சேர்த்துக் கொள்வதற்கு அவர் உத்தேசிக்கிறாரா? (ஈ) ஆமெனில் எப்போது? (உ) இல்லையெனில் ஏன்? (ஊ) அவ்வாறு மீண்டும் வேலைக்குச் சேர்த்துக் கொள்ளப்பட்டவர்களில் எத்தனை பேருக்கு அவர்களது சம்பள நிலுவைகள் வழங்கப்பட்டன? (எ) அவர்களுக்கும் அவர்களது சம்பள நிலுவைகள் வழங்கப்படமா? (ஏ) ஆமெனில் எப்போது? (ஐ) இல்லையெனில் ஏன்?

இன்னும் விவகாரம், தொழில்வசதி அமைச்சரும், கல்வி அமைச்சருமானவரைக் கேட்ட வினா : (அ) போர்த்தலை தவறாகவே விதி, 81/1 ஆம் இலக்கத்திலுள்ள திரு. எச். டபிள்யூ. நிலவீர 1980/81 ஆம் கல்வி ஆண்டில் கல்வி டிப்ளோமா பின்பட்டப் பயிற்சியை மேற்கொள்வதற்கு தெரிவு செய்யப்பட்டு அப்பயிற்சி நெறியைப் பின்பற்றினால் பதவி வழங்கப்படும்படி அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஆ) சம்பந்தப்பட்ட பயிற்சியை மேற்கொண்டதன் பின்னர் இவர் முதலில் பணியாற்றிய பாடசாலையான கப்போர்த்தலை கனிஷ்ட வித்தியாலயத்திற்கு 1981.10.01 ஆந்திகதி முதல் நியமிக்கப்பட்டாரென்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (இ) மேற்படி (ஆ) வில், குறிப்பிட்ட பிரகாரம் நியமனம்











have here with me the report of the investigations by the "Weekend Insight". I do not want to read the whole thing and take your time.

This is what it says :

"The tourist industry in this country has brought back the colonial Raj in this country".

கலிநாயகனது

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

What is that paper ?

வி. டி. தர்மலிங்கம்

(திரு. வி. தர்மலிங்கம்)

(Mr. V. Dharmalingam)

The "Weekend Sun", Sir.

கலிநாயகனது

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

What is the date ?

வி. டி. தர்மலிங்கம்

(திரு. வி. தர்மலிங்கம்)

(Mr. V. Dharmalingam)

I am sorry, Sir, I did not make a note of the date here.

It says that the tourist industry has brought back the colonial Raj into this country, that the way in which the people of this country are being treated in the hotels, how they are given third class and fourth class treatment, shows that we have gone back to the days of the British Raj. That is what the the tourist industry has done.

We have been talking about foreign aid on a number of occasions. What disturbs the Opposition is, what price are we going to pay for this foreign aid ? We are in the midst of tension, particularly in the Indian Ocean. We all know the super power conflict in the Indian Ocean area. If we keep on knocking at the doors of the Western countries asking for aid and more aid, if we keep on knocking at the doors of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank asking for aid and more aid, can we go on remaining unaligned ? That is the question I am asking. During the Non-Aligned Summit Conference, in one of the resolutions the world "Diego Garcia" had to be omitted at the insistence of Sri Lanka. We know, Sir, why it was done. We will debate that when we take up the votes of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. We can see the trend in which Sri Lanka is going. That is what is disturbing the Opposition.

Recently—not long ago—Mrs. Kirkpatrick had recommended to the Foreign Affairs Senate Committee of the United States that foreign aid

should be given by the United States only to countries that openly support them—openly support them. Can we, Sir, be still non-aligned when we go on knocking at the doors of the International Monetary Fund, when we go on knocking at the doors of the Western powers, asking for more aid, when we know what the mind of the United States is ? That is what is disturbing the Opposition.

கலிநாயகனது

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

You have exhausted your time. Hurry up.

வி. டி. தர்மலிங்கம்

(திரு. வி. தர்மலிங்கம்)

(Mr. V. Dharmalingam)

Five minutes more, Sir.

The success of a government's economic policies depends not on grandiose development schemes it undertakes to fulfil. It depends on the fulfilment of the promises that the government had given to the people as to what they would do to better the lives of the people, the quality of life of the people. The hon. Deputy Minister told us yesterday that the quality of life of the people must have improved because cereals and foodstuffs were available in plenty. It may be, Sir. I am not disputing that. It may be that foodstuffs are available in plenty, but the food stamps that available are like the banquet that was given to the cane by the fox on a flat plate. That banquet was not available to the crane. Because of the high prices today, the foodstuffs that are available in this country are not available to the vast mass of the people. As I told you yesterday, the price hike in foodstuffs and other commodities is not dependent on the world market but due to the actions of this Government.

This Government allowed the value of the rupee to decline. These are the causes. In 1977 when this Government went to the election they spoke of the high cost of living during the Sirimavo Government period and they undertook as their first priority to bring down the cost of living. This is what the U.N.P. manifesto says :

"We have experienced an unprecedented escalation of prices in the past six years. The rupee has brought less and less of the same commodity during this period.

"The U.N.P. will give the utmost priority to reducing the Cost of Living which reached Himalayan heights under Sirima's rule and made daily life unendurable."

Has this Government during these five years brought down the cost of living ? Has this Government made life endurable ? We know what the price—*(Interruption)*. My good Friend from Negombo says



[වි. ධර්මලිංගම් මහතා]

“yes, yes”. I do not know what he is saying ‘yes’ for. The Hon. Prime Minister—then he was the Minister for Local Government—at the Budget debate in 1977 gave us a list of prices. The Hon. Prime Minister is a very studious man. Whenever he wants to speak he studies the subject very well and comes here. He made a full study of the prices prevailing during Mrs. Bandaranaike’s time. He told us that 10 measures of rice in January 1970 was Rs. 7.50. In 1976 when Sirima’s rule came to an end it was Rs. 20. Today ten measures of rice is Rs. 85. Was it to that the Hon. Member for Negombo was saying, yes, yes ?

**එන්. ඩෙන්සිල් ප්‍රනාන්දු මහතා (කර්මාන්ත සහ විද්‍යා කටයුතු නියෝජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා)**

(*திரு. என். டென்சிஸ் பெர்னாண்டோ—கைத்தொழில், விஞ்ஞான அலுவல்கள் பிரதி அமைச்சர்*)

(Mr. N. Denzil Fernando—Deputy Minister of Industries & Scientific Affairs)

What do you want me to say ?

**මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්**

(*அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்*)

(A Member)

He may be buying at a subsidised rate.

**වි. ධර්මලිංගම් මහතා**

(*திரு. வி. தர்மலிங்கம்*)

(Mr. V. Dharmalingam)

Ten pounds of bread, the Hon. Prime Minister said, was Rs. 3 in 1970 and in 1976 it was Rs. 20. Today it is Rs. 28. Four pounds of sugar, the Prime Minister said, was Rs. 2.88 in 1970 and in 1976 it was Rs. 24.

**කථනායකතුමා**

(*சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்*)

(Mr. Speaker)

Shall we stop with sugar ? It melts sweet in your mouth.

**වි. ධර්මලිංගම් මහතා**

(*திரு. வி. தர்மலிங்கம்*)

(Mr. V. Dharmalingam)

We will stop with sugar, Sir, but you will know the trend. What I am trying to say is, the Government has not been able to implement its promises, because of unnecessary grandiose schemes by which they have frittered away the revenue of this country as well as all that they borrowed from foreign countries.

ප්‍ර. හා. 10.33

**ටයරන් ප්‍රනාන්දු මහතා (වැඩබලන විදේශ කටයුතු ඇමතිතුමා)**

(*திரு. ரி. நேரன் பெர்னாண்டோ—பதில் வெளிநாட்டலுவல்கள் அமைச்சர்*)

(Mr. Tyrone Fernando—Acting Minister of Foreign Affairs)

Mr. Speaker, the shadow Foreign Minister of “Eelam” has played the usual record that we have

heard during this Budget debate that this Government is selling this country lock, stock and barrel to the big, bad foreigners. I can assure the hon. Member that like his arguments he will remain a shadow. Your “Eelam” will never become a reality, nor will you be the Foreign Minister of “Eelam,” and your record is also now outworn.

Sir, I can assure this House, as the Acting Foreign Minister, that we have no intention of selling this country to anybody. We are not the puppets of either America or the Soviet Union. If somebody heard the Hon. Member’s speech one would think that there are about 100,000 foreign troops in this country controlling all of us. I think the hon. Member is aware that there are 100,000 Soviet troops in Afghanistan, 200,000 Communist Vietnam troops in Kampuchea, but there is nothing like that here. There are no troops controlling this country. There is no hot line from the White House controlling on all our actions. We are truly non-aligned. We have gone through 450 years of foreign domination. We have no intention of returning to that. However, do not ask us to be isolationists, to cut ourselves from the rest of the world.

That is what happened during the dark days of the S.L.F.P. We were all living in a well, like frogs in a well ; we had nothing to do with the rest of the world. But today this Government has succeeded in bringing us alongside the main current of development in the world. We have come out of this well ; not only have we come out of the well and joined the rest of the world, Sir, but we have, since we debated the Budget last year acquired fifteen times the size of our land area by way of sea bed. Three hundred and fifty thousand square miles have accrued to us. We have gained sovereignty over 350,000 square miles round the Island after signing the Law of the Sea Convention in Jamaica last December. This is a tremendous challenge—fifteen times the land area with vast resources, not only by way of fisheries but by way of mineral deposits in the sea bed. And this really, Sir, is a new frontier.

India is spending something like 30 million US Dollars, or 600 million rupees for research and development of their sea bed. I would urge the Minister of Finance that next year—we have only given Rs. 5 million this year to NARA, our body that deals with the sea bed—we should go all out to exploit this vast resource that we have got and we should get all possible foreign assistance for this.

We are not afraid of dealing with foreigners. I think the hon. Member is afraid to deal with foreigners. Maybe it is a hang-over from colonial times, but we are not afraid to deal with foreigners to our advantage. Maybe he is not afraid to deal with some foreigners. We will deal with all foreigners so long as it is to our advantage.



I think the hon. Member is an admirer of Gandhi. This is what Gandhi also once said –

“ I want cultures of all lands to be blown about my house as freely as possible but refuse to be blown off my feet by any.”

We do not want to live in a house all closed up, doors and windows all closed up. We want all this—winds of culture and modern technology—to blow about our house, but we will be on our own feet. We will take what is best and reject what is bad.

The hon. Member for Kalawana was yesterday talking about foreign investment and all the evils of it. I would like to remind the hon. Members of the Opposition of this: Communist China, of which he hon. Member for Gampaha (Mr. S. D. Bandaranayake) is a great admirer, is going all out for foreign investment. I was there a little over a year ago. There are investors from Hong Kong, Australia and Japan. The Communist Chinese, the Marxists, are coming to terms with private capitalist investors because they want investment, they want foreign exchange and they want employment. In fact, I stayed in a hotel which is a joint venture with Australia. There are no people in the world who are more nationalist than the Chinese. You will be interested to know that every Chinese child over the age of nine years has to learn English. It is a compulsory language, English, for every Chinese child over the age of nine years. Three thousand miles from Peking, I was able to converse with little Chinese Children in English whereas in our own country, say, with our own youth leaguers, we are not able to talk in English. I felt sorry. How much they have lost, Sir, as a result of this very narrow minded, isolationist thinking of the Opposition? These are the new dimensions this Government has introduced.

We have opened out the country to foreign investment, re-introduced English, acquired, rights to the sea Bed, obtained foreign aid—we have got, Sir, Rs. 9,000 million worth of foreign aid. Now, out of this 9,000 million of foreign aid, 2,500 million are sheer grants. We do not have to pay back. Nobody talks about that. In 1975, during the regime of hon. Member for Medawachchiya, all we got was 1,000 million rupees; today 9,000 million rupees and 2,500 outright grants.

**உன்திரேசென்**

(அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(A Member)

Who gave those grants?

**டெர்ன் ப்ரொன்ட் டெர்ன்**

(திரு. ரிளேன் பெர்னாண்டோ)

(Mr. Tyrone Fernando)

Various Governments—the United Kingdom has given, I think 100 million pounds for the Victoria Dam. The United States—

**உன்திரேசென்**

(அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(A Member)

That is the danger.

**டெர்ன் ப்ரொன்ட் டெர்ன்**

(திரு. ரிளேன் பெர்னாண்டோ)

(Mr. Tyrone Fernando)

What is the danger. They have not given us any troops free! Sir, during colonial times the British made us grow tea, because that was in their interest. They did not make us grow paddy. But today we are making them to pay for something we want. They did not say “ You build Victoria ”. We said, “ we are building Victoria. You pay for it, please ”. That is the difference. Now, what is the danger? There is a danger if they tell us, “ You build a military base for us, or you grow something that we want ”. Here we are doing something that we want. You will admit that the Mahaweli Diversion is nothing new. We have accelerated it.

**உன்திரேசென்**

(அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(A Member)

They have asked for Concessions?

**டெர்ன் ப்ரொன்ட் டெர்ன்**

(திரு. ரிளேன் பெர்னாண்டோ)

(Mr. Tyrone Fernando)

Well, we will wait and see. They have asked for nothing so far. They have been here as a colonial power for 150 years. So, they have also got something out of this country which they are now returning.

Sir, with regard to this story that we are puppets of the Americans, this is the favourite story of the Opposition, all about warships coming here and the Prime Minister going on board the warships, do you know, Sir, that more Russian warships have called here than American ships? Now, why are you not shouting that the Russians are here? Between 1975 and now, 70 Soviet warships have called here, I suppose for 63 American ships. We have no intention of becoming lackeys of the Americans or the Soviets, nor I would venture to say, do the Americans want us to be their lackeys.

Sir, I had the opportunity last year of calling at the White House and having a discussion for 45 minutes with the Vice President of the United States, Mr. George Bush, to whom I explained why we were non-aligned, how we were developing our country, our commitments to peace, and so on, and I said, “ I hope you appreciate our policy of non-alignment.” And Mr. George Bush said, “ Not only do we appreciate it, we respect it ”. So, we have won the respect of all the countries. As you know, Sir, on Afghanistan, we



[විදේශ ප්‍රකාන්ද මහතා]

condemned the Soviet Union. We asked them to withdraw. On the other hand, when Americans said, "Do not go for the Olympics in Moscow," we did not carry out that-

**මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්**

(අඟුණකොටුවේ ඉරුම)

(A Member)

Diego Garcia ?

**විදේශ ප්‍රකාන්ද මහතා**

(කිරු. ෆීරොන් පෙරේරා)

(Mr. Tyronne Fernando)

Why only Diego Garcia ? Why not Socotra. If you are condemning everybody. Do you condemn Socotra, the Soviet Base ? Let us hear your view on Socotra. Sir, he is silent.

We are very even-handed. We are balanced in our non-alignment and that is why we have won respect. We did go to the Olympics. Way back in 1952 when the UNP Government started dealings with China over the Rubber-Rice Pact, the Americans said "Do not do that. If you do, we will invoke the Battle Act". They threatened us but we went ahead. Today the Americans and Chinese are friends. They are our friends too. We stuck to our point of view and went ahead and gained the respect of both sides. That has been the policy of UNP Governments. Even at that time, Sir John Kotelawa was dubbed a Yankee lover and an imperialist. We did not join SEATO. We went ahead with the Rubber-Rice Pact and we were one of the first countries to recognize Communist China.

As part of this process of the opening out of the world, I would like to draw the attention of this House to the vast migration of labour to the Middle East. I am sure hon. Members who spoke before me may have already referred to this, but I should, from a foreign affairs angle, mention that it was during the period of this Government that these opportunities were made available to our people. Foreign exchange remittances totalled 2,500 million rupees in 1980, in 1981 it rose to 4,000 million rupees in 1982 it was 6,000 million rupees and the estimates for 1983 show the figure as 10,000 million rupees—more than from our tea exports. All this began after 1977 but all these opportunities were available in the Middle East from about 1974.

Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike's Government did not allow anybody to leave. There were travel controls, exit permits and so on. Nobody was allowed to go. Members of Parliament were not allowed to leave. I was not allowed to leave. I was then a Crown Counsel in the Attorney-General's Department and because I gave a ruling which the then Minister of Justice, Mr. Felix R. Dias Bandaranaike, did not like, I was

stopped from going abroad on a scholarship. That is what happened. Ordinary people who wanted to go to the Middle East could not go.

**වී. ධර්මලිංගම් මහතා**

(කිරු. ඩී. ජයවර්ධන)

(Mr. V. Dharmalingam)

So, now you are asking foreign governments to solve our unemployment problems ?

**විදේශ ප්‍රකාන්ද මහතා**

(කිරු. ෆීරොන් පෙරේරා)

(Mr. Tyronne Fernando)

Sir, this is the type of thinking that has left us in the lurch. He says we are asking foreign governments to solve our unemployment problems ! Nobody has asked these people to go but they are going. There has been a revolution in the living standards of our people. Your party is supposed to be working for the ordinary man and here it is the ordinary man who has benefited by way of the goods that they have sent, the money they have brought back and invested. In my electorate, thousands have gone and come and are going again. They have completely revolutionized their way of living. The prime achievement of this government has been to bring about a total change in the atmosphere. If you do not lose sight of the woods for the trees you will see a total change of atmosphere.

Recently I met a Minister of a foreign country who came here after seven years. He told me that he noticed a change and said that the country was a hive of activity and that he could not believe the difference from what he saw in 1975 and what he saw today. The buses and vans are full of people. People are rushing to get their passports. Where are they going ? They are going for employment because those jobs are there, they want to go abroad and do some business. We can talk till doomsday about theories and the IMF and the cost of living. There was a time when a plate of rice cost 25 cents but was the cost of living low ? You would say 'Yes'. But the wage 75 was cents, one third of your daily wage went on a plate of rice.

'සා දකින්න පෙළෙනුයේ දැන් ඉතින් නැගියවි' කියා ඒ කාලයේ කිව්වා. ඒ 'රේකෝඩ්' එක හැමදාම ගන්නවා. ලීදේ ඉන්න ගෙම්බො වගේ හිටිය ජනතාව ඒ ලීදෙන් එලියට අරගෙන තිබෙනවා, අපේ එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂ රජය විසින්. එම නිසා ඒ අයට ආලෝකය දකින්න පුළුවන්කම ලැබුණා. නමුත් තවමත් සමහර කොටසක් ඉන්නේ ලීද ඇතුළේමයි. ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයේත්, ද්‍රවිඩ එක්සත් මිලිකිති පෙරමුණේත් උදවිය තවමත් ඒ ලී පතුළේ ඉඳගෙන 'බක-බක' ගා කෑ ගන්නවා. එම නිසා තමයි, ඒ අයට තමන් මුහුණ දුන් එකම ඡන්දයකින්වත් ජය ලබා ගන්න බැරිවුණේ.

Last year, after six years of government we were re-elected with a bigger percentage. We got 51 per cent in 1977, but this time we got 53 and 54 per cent,



which is astonishing. No government in the world has that record. Normally, any government—(Interruption).—There were no elections. Here, at an election—(Interruption). No, no, at the Presidential Elections we got a bigger percentage. We won Anamaduwa from the Opposition at a by-election. After four or five years of government we won a seat from the SLFP, which was held by them for 20 years. Today, the Opposition is unable to whip-up the masses. This is the long and short of it. Because of the arising of the living standards, because the people have something to do, you cannot get the people to strike, you cannot get the people to demonstrate. This is what has happened. You cannot get people to agitate. But we did so in 1973 and 1974. We had Sathyagraha led by our President and the Prime Minister three or four years after they came into power. We had various movements. We agitated because the time was ripe for that, the people were ready for that and they wanted the government out. You cannot do that today. There is no suppression. People do not respond to your call, because they are quite satisfied, they have things to do, they have jobs to do and they have no time for you. In 1973 and 1974 we started this agitation. Our Leader took over our party and gave it a new image and a new policy. What has the SLFP done? What are they offering? What new things are you offering to the people? They are just fighting among yourselves.

In 1973 and 1974 our Leader brought new people into the UNP, appointed committees,—voluntary committees—to go into new policies, programmes. I had the privilege to be the secretary of a group of young people who did a programme, and the Hon. Prime Minister knows about it? We were called the IRU. The Intelligence Research Unit. In fact, at that stage we were dubbed the IRCs! We were supposed to be young rebels. I would like to take this opportunity to read out a few words from that where we have said—

“The national government of 1965”—

That is the government of Mr. Dudley Senanayake—

“was unable to put the ideals of the dispersed of wealth and political power into practice in a meaningful way and was defeated in 1970 and failed to attract the youth vote”.

And then we have suggested various remedies. Among them are —

“a free society, political power accountable to the people, a free economy, shares to the workers, lands to the farmers, participation of youth”.

—and so on and so forth. Sir, I am very happy to read here another proposal we had made—

“The irrigation programme —”

this was in 1974—

“.....should be accelerated particularly that of the Mahaweli Project”—

So as to support increases in the acreage under agricultural crops”.

Among the people who were associated with us were Mr. Dayaratne, hon. Deputy Minister of Power and Energy Mr. Gamini Kannangara, Chairman of the State Timber Corporation, Mr. Harsha Abeywardena and people like that. Now, let us see. Is the SLFP doing something like that? Are they offering the people something new as an alternative to us. They are not doing it. They have no alternative proposals. They do not want to go back to their old policies of controls, restrictions and queues. That is the long and the short of it.

Sir, then to summarize; the greatest single achievement—I think the greatest single trust of our foreign policy has been to bring this country out of a well to bring it in line with the main currents of world development by way of foreign investment, foreign aid, migration of labour, tourism, English, the seabed and so many other things.

Finally, I would be amiss if I did not again mention the revolution that was brought about in our party by our leader Mr. J. R. Jayawardene. After the death of Mr. Dudley Senanayake, he came in and gave the party a new way of thinking, a new philosophy, brought in new people. I was one of them, I was in the Attorney-General's Department. I resigned from there to come into this. Like that, he attracted a number of people. I would like to read this. These words were written by Mr. Nehru about Gandhi which are very appropriate, I think, in the case of our leader also. He says of Gandhi: “After the dark days, and then Gandhi came”. “He says” He was like a powerful current of fresh air that made us stretch ourselves and take deep breath. He was like a beam of light that pierced the darkness and removed the scales from our eyes. He was like a whirlwind that upset many things, but most of all the working of people's minds”.

Sir, this has been the biggest achievement of the Government. It has changed the minds of our people.

හැම දේම, කරන්න බැහැ කියලයි ඒ කාලෙ කිව්වෙ. ඒ වැඩ කෙරෙන්නේ නැහැ; ඒක කෙරෙන වැඩක් නොවෙයි කියලයි, ඒ කාලෙ කිව්වෙ. සිංහලයා මොඩයා කැවුම් කන්න යෝධයා” කියලත් කිව්වා.

But today, what has happened? The Sinhalese have built—I do not know anything about the Tamils. Tamils are supposed to be industrious anyway; Sinhalese are supposed to be the lazy fellows, but they have built—more dams, more irrigation channels than all the Kings put together. They have migrated 13 thousand miles to the Middle East and lots of them are working there. They had become known in the world and in Sri Lanka under the guidance of our President, the Prime



[විදේශ ප්‍රකාශන මහතා]

Minister and our Finance Minister. He is forging a head. While the opposition may bark, the caravan will move on !

Thank you.

සී. හා. 10.58

මෙමත්‍රීපාල සේනානායක මහතා (මැදවව්විය)

(සීල, ආයුධපුරාල ජෙනරායක)

(Mr. Maithripala Senanayake—Medawachchiya)

කපානායකතුමනි, රජය වෙනුවෙන්, වැඩබලන විදේශ ඇමතිතුමා කළ කපාවෙන් පසුව මේ අයවැය විවාදයේ ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයේ අවසාන කපාව හැටියට මගේ කපාව කරන්නට අවස්ථාව ලැබීම ගැන මා සන්තෝෂ වෙතවා. වැඩබලන විදේශ ඇමතිතුමාගේ පියාණන් දැ ස්ථිර ලේකම්තුමෙක් වශයෙන් කටයුතු කළ කාලයේදී මට එතුමා සමඟ වැඩ කරන්නට අවස්ථාවක් ලැබුණා. ඒ කාලයේදී එතුමාගෙන් ලැබුණු මාර්ගෝපදේශකත්වය මා කටදාවත් අමතක කරන්නේ නැති බව මම මේ අවස්ථාවේදී ප්‍රකාශ කරන්න සතුටුයි.

අවුරුදු 37 ක පමණ කාලයක් තුළ මේ ගරු සභාවේ අයවැය විවාදවලට සහභාගි වුණු කෙනෙක්, විශේෂයෙන් රජරට ගොවි ජනතාවගේ සිතුවම්-පැතූම් පිළිබඳව හොඳ අවබෝධයක් තිබෙන කෙනෙක් හැටියට, අද මේ රජයේ 6 වැනි අයවැය විවාදයට සහභාගි වීමට හැකියාවක් ලැබීම ගැන මා සන්තෝෂ වෙතවා. ඒ අවුරුදු 37 ක පමණ කාලයෙන් අවුරුදු 16 ක පමණ කාලයක් වගකිවයුතු අමාත්‍ය ධුර කීපයක්ම දැරූ පුද්ගලයෙක් හැටියටත්, ඊටත් කලින් රජයේ සේවකයෙක් හැටියටත්, ගොවි මහජනතාවගේ මෙන්ම රජයේ සේවකයන්ගේත් සිතුවම්-පැතූම් ගැන මනා අවබෝධයක් තිබෙන කෙනෙක් හැටියටයි, මා මේ විවාදයට සහභාගි වන්නේ, මීට ප්‍රථම මේ විවාදයේදී ඉදිරිපත් වුණු කරුණු මගහැර අලුත් කරුණු ඉදිරිපත් කරමින් මගේ අදහස් ප්‍රකාශ කිරීමට මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙතවා.

වැඩබලන විදේශ ඇමතිතුමා කීවා, ශ්‍රීදේ ඉන්ද්‍ර ගමේබො වගේ හිටිය ජනතාව මේ රජය විසින් ඉන් ගොඩ ගත්තාය කියා. ඒක ඇත්ත. දැන් ඒ ගොඩ ගත් ජනතාව බලාගෙන ඉන්නවා, තමන්ට දුන් පොරොන්දු ඉෂ්ට වී තිබෙනවාද, ඒ පොරොන්දුවල ප්‍රතිඵල භුක්ති විඳිනවාද කියා, ඒ විධියට එය ඉදිරිපත් කළොත් වරදක් නැතැයි මා හිතනවා. [බාබා කීරීම] ඒ මන්ත්‍රීතුමා කියනවා, ගොඩ ගත් එකම ඇතිය කියා. ගොඩ ගත්තට පසුව සිදු වී ඇති දේ මා එතුමාට අමුතුවෙන් කියන්නට වුවමනා නැහැ. මේ අවස්ථාවේදී පෞද්ගලික විවේචන වලින්, දේවේශසහගත ඇණුම්-බැණුම්වලින් තොරව පොදු ජනතාව වෙනුවෙන් යමක් කියන්න මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙතවා.

මේ අයවැය කපාව ගැන කල්පනා කරන විට මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා දෙවිනුවරදී පිළිසිදුණු මේ අයවැය බිලිදා බලන් සිංහලට ඇවිත් පුසුන කර තිබෙනවායි කියන්න පුළුවනි. ඒ පුසුනිය කිරීමට මාර්තු 8 වැනි දා නියම කර ගෙන තිබුණත්, ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම පුසුනිය සිදු වී

තිබෙන්නේ එහෙම නැත්නම් භයානක අන්දමට පිලි රුදාව ඇති වී තිබෙන්නේ පෙබරවාරි 18 වැනි දා මධ්‍යම රාත්‍රියේ බව මේ අවස්ථාවේදී තොකියාම බැහැ. පෙබර වාරි 18 වැනි දා මධ්‍යම රාත්‍රියේ උපත ලැබූ මේ ලදරුවාට උප්පන්න දීම සිදු කර තිබෙන්නේ මාර්තු මාසේ 8 වැනි දායි. ඒ නිසා වෙන්ත ඇති, මේ අයවැය ලේඛනය කරන්න තමාට සිදු වී තිබෙන්නේ කනගාටුවෙන්ය කියා එය ඉදිරිපත් කළ අවස්ථාවේදී මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා කීවේ, මම හිතනවා, එතුමා ඒ විධියේ වචනයක් පාවිච්චි කළේ, විශේෂයෙන්ම අවුරුදු දෙකක කාලයක් තුළදී මොනම විධියක සංවර්ධන වැඩකටත් මුදල් වෙන් කිරීමට හැකියාවක් නැත කියන ප්‍රකාශයක් කරමින්. ඒ කියන්නේ අවුරුදු දෙකකට කිසිම සංවර්ධන කටයුත්තක් කරන්නේ නැති බවයි එතුමා කියා පෑවේ. එම නිසාම මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාගේ කනගාටුව අපට තේරුම් ගත හැකි වෙන්නේ ඒ විග්‍රහය අනුවය කියන එකක් අපට කියන්න සිද්ධ වී තිබෙනවා. ඒ වාගේම මා මුලදී ප්‍රකාශ කළ අන්දමට මේ අයවැයෙන් මේ රටේ දුක් විඳින ජනතාව තව තවත් දුකට, පීඩාවට පත් වෙනවාය කියන විග්‍රහයක් කිරීමටත් අපට සිදු වෙතවා.

ගරු කපානායකතුමනි, අවුරුදු දෙකක් යන තුරු සංවර්ධන වැඩවලට මුදල් ප්‍රතිපාදනයක් නොකිරීම තමන්ට කරන්න සිද්ධ වෙනවාය කියා එතුමා කියා පෑවා නම් එයින් අපට තේරුම් ගන්න තිබෙන්නේ මොකක්ද? කාලපිමාව තුළදී රක්ෂා හිඟය උග්‍ර වෙනවාය කියන එකත්, ඒ වාගේම ජීවන වියදම තවත් ඉහළ යනවාය කියන එකත් වෙනත් විධියකින් එතුමා ප්‍රකාශ කළාය කියන කාරණය මේ අවස්ථාවේදී මොක් කරන්න සිද්ධ වෙනවා.

ආර්. ජේ. ජී. ද මැල් මහතා (මුදල් ගා ක්‍රම සම්පාදන ඇමතිතුමා)

(සීල. මුර්. ජේ. ජී. ද මෙල්—ඒඩ්, අභ්‍යාප්‍යුක්ති. ආභ්‍යාප්ති)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel—Minister of Finance and Planning)

මම හිතන්නේ මැදවව්වියේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා අවබෝධ කරගෙන ඇති ආකාරය විකක් වැරදියි. මම කිව්වේ නව සංවර්ධන යෝජනා ක්‍රමවලට අවුරුදු දෙකකට මුදල් වෙන් කරන්න බැරිය කියලයි. නව නව සංවර්ධන යෝජනා ක්‍රම කියන්නේ, අලුතෙන්ම කරන සංවර්ධන වැඩවලට, අපි හිතමු මෙහෙම. වෙල්ලක් බදින්නට, අලුතෙන්ම කරන්නේ ගාලාවක් ආරම්භ කරන්න. අපට මුදල් වෙන් කරන්න බැහැ. එහෙත් මහවැලියෙම තියෙනවා තවත් විශාල වැඩ කොටසක් කරන්න. ඒ ගැන මටත් වඩා හොඳට මන්ත්‍රීතුමා දන්නවා ඇති. තවම වෙල්ල බැඳගෙන යනවා විතරයි. සියයට අනුවක් වැඩ කරන්න තියෙනවා, "ඩවුන්ස්ට්‍රිම්". ඒවාට මක්කොටම මුදල් වෙන් කරන්න තියෙනවා. ඒ කියන්නේ ඇළවල් කැපීමට, මහ ඇළවල්, අතුරු ඇළවල් කැපීමට, මිනිසුන් පදිංචි කර වීමට, අස්වැද්දීමට, නව නගර පිහිටුවීමට, පාරවල්, ආරෝග්‍යශාලා, ඉස්කෝල හදා පවුල් අලුතෙන් පදිංචි කරවීමට, ඔන්න ඔවැනි කටයුතු සඳහා නව වෙන් කරන්නට තිබෙනවා, රුපියල් දස ලක්ෂ දස දහසක්



පමණ. ඒවාට මම මුදල් වෙන් කරනවා. එමෙන්ම දැන් අපි කරගෙන යන ඉඩම් සංවර්ධන යෝජනා ක්‍රම කුරුණෑගල හම්බන්තොට මෑතර මාතලේ බදුල්ල පමණක් නොවෙයි, අලුතින් මන්නාරම වවුනියාව මොනරාගල මෙන්ම පුළුන් නම් රත්නපුරේ හා කැගල්ලෙන් ආරම්භ කරනවා. දැන් අපි වැඩ කොටසක් කරගෙන යනවා. සාමාන්‍යයෙන් තව අවුරුදු 6 කට ඒ වැඩ කොටස ඉවර කරන්න බැහැ. නමුත් නාන්සේ දක්නවා, ඒ වැඩ කොටස තමුත් නාන්සේලා කරන්න බලාපොරොත්තු වුණේ අවුරුදු 30 කින්. අපි එන අවුරුදු හයේ ඒ වැඩ කොටස ඉවර කරනවා. හුඟකට රක්ෂාවල් දෙන්නත් බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. අලුතින් ලක්ෂ සංඛ්‍යාව ගොවීන් පදිංචි කරනවා. වැඩ වැඩි නිසයි, අලුතින් නව වැඩ ආරම්භ කරන්න බැහැ කියා මම යෝජනා කරන්නේ ; මුදල් නැති නිසා මෙන්ම වැඩත් වැඩි නිසා. අපි නිදර්ශනයක් වශයෙන් හිතමු. අපට එන අවුරුදු දෙකේ සමනලවැව යෝජනා ක්‍රමය ආරම්භ කරන්න බැහැ. එය ආරම්භ කරන්න ඕනෑ. ආරම්භ කළ යුතුයි. මිට පෙරදිසි එය ආරම්භ කළ යුතුව තිබුණේ. මම තමුත් නාන්සේත් සමග ඒ ගැන එකඟ වෙනවා, හැම දාම. මොකද, එයින් මනවැලියෙන්ටත් වඩා විදුලි බලය සැපයෙනවා. මෝසම් දෙකෙන්ම ජලය ලැබෙනවා. නමුත් එන අවුරුදු දෙකේ එය කරන්න බැහැ. 1985 න් පසුව නම් එවැනි වැඩ පටන් ගන්න පුළුවන්. ඒක පමණයි මම තෝරාගත් කළේ. වරදවා තෝරාගත්ත එපා. මම කළේ පැහැදිලි කිරීමක්.

**මෛත්‍රීපාල සේනානායක මහතා**  
 (ශ්‍රී. ආ. ම. ප. ක. සේනානායක)  
 (Mr. Maithripala Senanayake)

ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, මම මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාගේ කථාව වරදවා තෝරාගත්තා නොවෙයි. හමඟර විට මා කී විධියෙන් එය පැහැදිලි නොවුණා වෙන් න පුළුවන්. මමත් කිව්වේ අලුත් ව්‍යාපාර ගැන. එතුමා කිව්වා වගේ සමනල වැව ව්‍යාපාරය—

**ආර්. ජේ. ජී. ද මැල් මහතා**  
 (ශ්‍රී. ආ. ම. ප. ක. ජී. ජී. ද මැල්)  
 (Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

අවුරුදු දෙකකට පටන් ගන්න බැහැ.

**මෛත්‍රීපාල සේනානායක මහතා**  
 (ශ්‍රී. ආ. ම. ප. ක. සේනානායක)  
 (Mr. Maithripala Senanayake)

එමෙන්ම මොරගහකන්ද ව්‍යාපාරය. ඒ කියන්නේ රජරට මැදින් උතුරට ජලය ගෙන යන්නට හැකියාවක් ඇති එකම යෝජනා ක්‍රමය. මේ රටේ පස දෙස බලන විට හොඳම පස තිබෙන රජරට ප්‍රදේශයට වතුර ලබාගැනීමේ හැකියාවක් නොලැබෙන වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් ඇති වෙනවා. ඔය අවුරුදු දෙක තුළ එවැනි යෝජනා ක්‍රම පටන් ගැනීමට හැකියාවක් නොලැබුණොත් කියන එකයි මගේ අදහස. වන්නේ. මම වරදවා තෝරාගත්තේ නැහැ. මගේ ප්‍රකාශ කිරීමේ ආකාරයෙන් මගේ අදහස වරදවා දන්නාද මම දන්නේ නැහැ.

ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, අධ්‍යාපන ක්‍ෂේත්‍රයේ අද තිබෙන අසහනය සහ ප්‍රශ්න දෙස බලන විට ඉතා කණගාටුදායක තත්ත්වයක් පවතින බව පෙනෙනවා.

විශ්ව විද්‍යාලවල අද ඇති වි තිබෙන ප්‍රශ්නත් ලබන චර්ඡ දෙක තුළ සංවර්ධන වැඩට මුදල් වෙන් නොකිරීමත් නිසා ඇති වන තත්ත්වයත් ඒ උඩ අහල යන ජීවන වියදමත් එයට බලපාන ප්‍රශ්නත් මහවැලිය වැනි යෝද සංවර්ධන වැඩ අඩපණ වීම ගැනත් අපට කණගාටු වෙන්න සිද්ධ වෙනවා. මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා කියනවා දැන් කරගෙන යන වැඩ අඩු වන්නේ නැහැ කියා. නමුත් මා අදහස් කරන්නේ ඒ කාලය තුළදී අවශ්‍ය හැටියට අපි සලකන සමනලවැව යෝජනා ක්‍රමයෙන් බලශක්තිය දියුණු කිරීමත් විශේෂයෙන් උතුරු මැද පළාත මැදින් ජලය ගෙන යාමට නියම කරගෙන තිබෙන මොරගහ කන්ද යෝජනා ක්‍රමයේ දියුණුවත් මේ කරුණු නිසා සිද්ධ නොවෙනවා කියන එකයි. එයයි මට මේ අවස්ථාවේදී කියන්න සිදු වී තිබෙන්නේ. මේ තත්ත්වය උඩ ලබන චර්ඡය මොන අන්දමේ එකක්ද යන්න පෙනෙනවා.

අධ්‍යාපන ක්‍ෂේත්‍රයේ නිදහස් අධ්‍යාපනය අද මරලයි තිබෙන්නේ. මුදල් ඇති ධනවත් අයට අද අධ්‍යාපනයේ දොර ආරලා. දුප්පතාට අද ඒ තත්ත්වය නැහැ. මේ ක්‍රමයෙන් සිදු වන්නේ කුමක්ද? අද විශ්ව විද්‍යාල ප්‍රවේශයෙන් සමත් වන දක්ෂයන්ට විශ්ව විද්‍යාලයට ඇතුළු වීමට වරම් ලැබෙන්නේ නැහැ. එහෙත් ඒ තරම් දක්ෂකම් නැති, ධනවත් අයට ලක්ෂ ගණනින් මුදල් දී විශ්ව විද්‍යාලවලට ඇතුළු වී උපාධි ලබා ගැනීමේ අවස්ථාව සලස්වා තිබෙනවා. විශ්ව විද්‍යාලවල දැන් පවතින නොසන්සුන් තත්ත්වයටත් මෙය ප්‍රධාන හේතුවක් වී තිබෙනවා කියන එක කියන්නට අපට සිද්ධ වී තිබෙනවා. මම විශේෂයෙන්ම සදහන් කරන්න කැමතියි, රජරට වැනි ගැමි දරුවන් ඕනින දුෂ්කර ප්‍රදේශවල අධ්‍යාපනය ලබා ගන්නා ශිෂ්‍යයින්ට අද සරසවිවලට ගොස් වියදම් කරන්නට ආර්ථික අතින් පහසුකම් නැති බව. මගේ විසි පස් වසරක සේවය සම්පූර්ණ කිරීම සම්බන්ධ උත්සවවලදී එකතු වුණු මුදලකින් ශිෂ්‍යත්ව අර මුදලක් ඇති කර අද ඒ මුදල විශ්ව විද්‍යාල ප්‍රතිපාදන කොමිසමට පවරා දීමට හැකියාවක් ලැබීම ගැන මම සන්තෝෂ වෙනවා. විශ්ව විද්‍යාලවලට ඇතුළත් වන විශාල සංඛ්‍යාවකට ඒ අතින්ද මුදලක් හියදම් කිරීමට හැකියාවක් ලැබුණාය කියා මම අද සන්තෝෂයෙන් මතක් කරනවා.

අද විශ්ව විද්‍යාල තුළ ඉතා නොසන්සුන් තත්ත්වයක් පවතිනවා. පොලීසිය මෙන්ම පිටතින් පැමිණි මර වරයන්ද ශිෂ්‍යයින්ට පහර දී ඇති බව දැනගන්නට ලැබී තිබෙනවා. සරසවි ශිෂ්‍යයන්ට නොයෙකුත් කරදර නිරිඳුර විදින්නට සිදු වී තිබෙනවා. ඔවුන්ගේ ශිෂ්‍යත්ව නතර කර තිබෙනවා. මහපොළ ශිෂ්‍යත්ව නතර කර තිබෙනවා. සිසන් විකට අවලංගු කර තිබෙනවා. තේවා සික පහසුකම් කපා දමා තිබෙනවා. බැංකු ණය නවත්වා තිබෙනවා. පාසල්වල ඉගැන්වීම් කරමින් සිටි උසස් අධ්‍යාපනය සඳහා විශ්ව විද්‍යාලයට ඇතුළු වූ ගුරු හව තුන් නැවතත් එම පාසල්වලට යවා තිබෙනවා. ඔන්න ඔය කාරණා තුළින් බලපෑමක් ඇති වී තිබෙනවාය කියන එක මේ අවස්ථාවේදී කියන්නට සිදු වී තිබෙනවා.

මේ අවස්ථාවේදී ක්‍රියා කර තිබෙන ආකාරය දරදඬු වැඩි බලයි මට කියන්නට තිබෙන්නේ. මේ ශිෂ්‍යයන් සම්බන්ධව මානුෂික විධියට සලකා කටයතු කරන පලස



[මෙහිපාල සේනානායක මහතා]

මා රජයෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා. ඔවුනට අසාධාරණ ලෙස පහර දෙන්නට එපා. ඔවුන් සමග සාකච්ඡා කොට මේ ප්‍රශ්නය මීට වඩා සාමකාමීව විසඳා ගැනීමට ක්‍රියා කරන්නා කියන ඉල්ලීම මම මේ අවස්ථාවේදී විශේෂයෙන්ම කරන්නට කැමතියි. කොටින්ම රටේ දුක් විඳින ජනතාවගෙන් කොටසක් වූ මේ ශිෂ්‍යයන් යම් යම් අසහන වලින් පෙළෙන බව අපි පිළිගෙන ඒ ශිෂ්‍ය ප්‍රශ්න ගැන සානුකම්පිතව කල්පනා කර කටයුතු කරන හැටියටයි අපි මේ රජයෙන් ඉතාමත්ම ගෞරවයෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටින්නේ.

ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, අද වැඩි වි තිබෙන ජීවන වියදම අනුව රජයේ සේවකයන්ට වැඩිපුර මුදලක් වෙනත යට එකතු කර දීමට ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා එතුමාගේ අයවැය ලේඛනයේදී යෝජනා කළා නමුත් රජයේ සේවකයන්ගෙන් සීමිත පිරිසකටයි මේ රුපියල් සියයේ මාසික දීමනාව ලැබෙන්නේ. ඒ වික දීම ගැන වුණත් අපි සතුටු වෙන්නවා. එහෙත් එම රුපියල් සියයේ වැඩි වීමෙන් ප්‍රයෝජන ලබන්නේ සියයට කී දෙනෙක්ද කියන එක අසන්නට සිද්ධි තෙවා. සියයට හැත්තෑ පහකට පමණ ඒ සහනය ලැබෙන්නේ නැති බවද අපට මේ අවස්ථාවේදී කියන්නට සිද්ධි වෙනවා. රුපියල් සියයේ අමතර දීමනාව හිමි කොට ඇත්තේ පණස් පන් ලක්ෂයක් වන වැඩ කරන ජනතාවගෙන් තුන් ලක්ෂ අසූ පන්දහසකට පමණයි කියන එකත් ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාට මම මතක් කර දෙන්නට කැමතියි.

ඒ වාගේම පෞද්ගලික අංශය ගැනත් මතක් කරන්නට බිනා. පෞද්ගලික අංශයන් ස්වකීය සේව්‍යයනට මේ ආධාරය දිය යුතුව කියා මතුවුමක් ලා සාධාරණව ඉල්ලා සිටියත් ඒ සම්බන්ධ සම්පූර්ණ වගකීමත් රජය භාර ගත යුතුව තිබෙන බවත් මම මේ අවස්ථාවේදී මතක් කරනවා පඩි පාලක සභා සහ සාමුහික ගිවිසුම් මගින් ආවරණය වී ඇති සේවකයන්ට පවා මේ පඩි වැඩිවීම ලැබිය හැක්කේ 1984 අයවැය ලේඛනය ඉදිරිපත් කළායින් පසුවයි කියන එකත් අමතක කරන්නට එපා. මේ වැඩිවීම් රජයේ සංස්ථා, ව්‍යවස්ථාපිත මණ්ඩල, රජයට පවරා ගත් ව්‍යාපාර, සමුපකාර, වතු සේවකයන්ටත් තවමත් අනිමි වී තිබෙනවා. ඒ සම්බන්ධව විශේෂ සොයා බැලීමකුත් විශේෂ පියවර ගැනීමකුත් අවශ්‍යයි කියන එක මම ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාටත් රජයටත් මේ අවස්ථාවේදී මතක් කර දීමට සතුටු වෙන්නවා.

ඒ වාගේම මේ වතාවේ රුපියල් 1,000 න් පහළ වැටුප් ලබන උදවියට රුපියල් 100 ක් වැඩිකර, මෙතෙක් ජීවන අංකය අනුව ගෙවාගෙන ආ දීමනාව මාස 6 කට අත් සිටුවීම මේ අවස්ථාවේදී අසාධාරණයක් හැටියට මතක් කරන්න සිද්ධි වෙනවා. කොටින් කියතොත් රුපියල් සියයක් දී ඊට වඩා මුදලක් රජයේ සේවකයන්ගෙන් ලබා ගැනීමයි, කර තිබෙන්නේ. ඇත්තවශයෙන්ම මම මූලදී සඳහන් කළා වාගේ එසේ කර තිබෙන්නේ ජනතාව රැවටීමටය කියන්න සිද්ධි වෙනවා. බදු වැඩි කිරීම, බඩු මිල වැඩි කිරීම, දුම්රිය හා බස් ගාස්තු වැඩි කිරීම ආදී පියවරවල් තුළින් අයවැය ඉදිරිපත් කරන අවස්ථාව වන විට පුද්ගලයෙකුගේ මාසික වියදම රුපියල් 300කින් පමණ ඉහළ ගොස් තිබුණා. එසේ තිබියදී, සීමිත කොට, රුපියල් 100 කින් පඩි වැඩි කිරීම මංකොල්ලයකින් පසු

රුපියල් සියයක් ආපසු දීමක් කියන්න අපට සිද්ධි වෙනවා. වැඩි කර තිබෙන පඩිය ගණන් බැලුවොත් දිනකට රුපියල් 3.30 ක් පමණ වේවි නමුත් දිනායක වියදම රු. 15 කින් පමණ වැඩිවී තිබෙනවාය කියන එක මේ අවස්ථාවේදී මතක් කරනවා.

අයවැයට පෙර පිරිවැටුම් බද්ද වැඩි කිරීමෙන් ඒ බරද අද වැඩ කරන ජනතාවා වෙත පැටවී තිබෙනවා. ඒ බද්ද ටෙලෙන්දා පිට පැටවී නැහැ. බිඩිය බොන දුප්පත් මිනිහත් අද පිරිවැටුම් බද්දක් ගෙවනවා. වෙන විධියකින් කියතොත් මේ පිරිවැටුම් බද්දේ විශේෂ ලක්ෂණය වන්නේ මේ රටේ සියලුම රටවැසියන් අය බදු ගෙවන්නන් ගේ තත්ත්වයට පත් වීමයි. බිඩිය බොන දුප්පතාත්, කහට තේ එක බොන දුප්පතාත් අද මේ බදු ක්‍රමයට අසුවී තිබෙන බව මම කියන්න කැමතියි.

ජීවන වියදමට සරිලන ආකාරයට වැටුප් වැඩි වී නැති බව නියෝජ්‍ය මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාත් එතුමාගේ කථාවේ සඳහන් කර තිබෙනවා. 1983 මාර්තු 17 වෙනිදා “දිවයින” පත්‍රයේ “ජීවන වියදමට සරිලන ලෙස වැටුප් වැඩිවීමක් සිදුවී නැහැ” කියා එතුමාගේ කථාව වාර්තා කර තිබෙනවා.

ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, මා නියෝජනය කරන ගොවි ජනතාවගේ තත්ත්වය දෙස මොහොතක් බැලුවොත් අද ගොවි ජනතාවට මුහුණ පාන්නට සිදු වී ඇති අහංග්‍ය සම්පන්න තත්ත්වය ගැන මා විස්තර කිරීමට කලින් රජයේම පත්‍රයක් වන මාර්තු 11 වෙනිදා ‘දිනමිණ’ පත්‍රයේ ප්‍රධාන පුවත්නි වගාවට සිදු වී ඇති තර්ජනය මෙසේ පැහැදිලි කර තිබෙනවා:

**“පිරිවැටුම් බදු නිසා වගාවට තර්ජන?”  
කෘෂි සංවර්ධන අංශ රජයට කරුණු කියයි**

කෘෂිකර්ම දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවටද බලපාන පරිදි ව්‍යාපාර පිරිවැටුම් බදු පැනවීම නිසා මේ රට සහල්වලින් සහ වෙනත් කෘෂි නිෂ්පාදන ද්‍රව්‍යවලින් ස්වයංපෝෂිත කිරීමේ පරිශ්‍රමයට ඉමහත් බාධාවක් පැමිණ වෙනු ඇතැයි කෘෂිකර්ම සංවර්ධන හා පර්යේෂණ අමාත්‍යාංශ රජයට කරුණු ඉදිරිපත් කර ඇත.

කෘෂිකර්ම දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව මගින් ගොවීන්ට සපයනු ලබන බිත්තර විවලට පිරිවැටුම් බදු පැනවුවහොත් මෙම බිත්තර වී පංචවච්චි කිරීම ගොවීන් විසින් අඩු කරනු ඇතැයිද, එහි ප්‍රතිඵලයක් වශයෙන් හොඳ වර්ගයේ වී නිපදවීම පහළ වැටෙනු ඇතැයිද කෘෂිකර්ම අමාත්‍යාංශයේ ප්‍රකාශකයෙක් ‘දිනමිණ’ ට ඊයේ පැවසීය.”

ශීය විධියටයි, වාර්තා කර තිබෙන්නේ. ඒ වාර්තාව මම සම්පූර්ණයෙන් කියවන්න බලාපොරොත්තු වෙන්නේ නැහැ. ඔය කියවපු ප්‍රමාණයෙන් කෘෂිකර්මයට එවැනි ප්‍රශ්න තිබෙනවාය කියන එක හොඳින් පැහැදිලි වෙනවා. ඒ වාගේම ශ්‍රී ලංකා මහ බැංකුවේ 1982 ඔක්තෝබර් විවර්ණිකාවේ පැහැදිලිවම පෙන්වා දී තිබෙනවා ‘ඉකුත් වර්ෂයේ අදාළ මාසය තුළ නිකුත් කළ පොහොර ප්‍රමාණය සමග සසඳා බලන කල පසුගිය මහ කන්නයේදී පොහොර පාවිච්චිය සියයට 22 කින් අඩු වී තිබෙනවා, කියා. විඛුසලකට අවම වශයෙන් රුපියල් 5 ක් වැඩිකොට තිබෙනවා. බිත්තර විවලට, පොහොරවලට, වරැක්ටර් ගාස්තු වලට, කටු කම්බි ආදියට පිරිවැටුම් බද්ද පැටවී ඇති ආකාරය ගැන බලන විට ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම රුපියල්







**වීරසිංහ මල් ලිමාරච්චි මහතා**

(*කි.පු. වීරසිංහ මල්ලිමාරච්චි*)  
(Mr. Weerasinghe Mallimarachchi)

ඒක ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයේ එකක්.

**මෛත්‍රීපාල සේනානායක මහතා**

(*කි.පු. මෛත්‍රීපාල සේනානායක*)  
(Mr. Maithripala Senanayake)

නමුත් අපේ පක්ෂයේ එකක් නොවෙයි.

ඒ වාණේම ගරු කථානායක තුමනි, 1956 සිට මේ රටේ කර්මාන්ත නගා සිටුවීමට යම් යම් පියවරවල් අරගත්තා. නමුත් අද මොකක්ද සිද්ධවෙලා තිබෙන්නේ? අද දේශීය කර්මාන්ත රාශියක් වසා දැමීමට කරුණු යෙදිලා තිබෙනවා, රජයේ විවෘත ආර්ථික ප්‍රතිපත්තිය උඩ. මේ රටේ කර්මාන්ත සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම මරා දමනු ලැබූ තත්ත්වයක් දැන් පහලවෙලා තිබෙනවා. සියලුම කර්මාන්ත දේශීය හා විදේශීය ධනපතින් අනෙයි තිබෙන්නේ. විශාල පේෂ කර්මාන්තශාලා වැසී යන තැනටයි, දැන් කරුණු යෙදී තිබෙන්නේ. පේෂ කර්මාන්තය අන්තයටම පිරිහිලා. ඒ කාලයේ ගම්බද සෑම ගෙදරකම රෙදි වියන යන්ත්‍රයක් දෙකක් තබාගෙන කාන්තාවන් රෙදි විවීම කළා. අද ඒ සියල්ලම නැත්තට නැතිවෙලා තිබෙනවා.

**වීරසිංහ මල් ලිමාරච්චි මහතා**

(*කි.පු. වීරසිංහ මල්ලිමාරච්චි*)  
(Mr. Weerasinghe Mallimarachchi)

ඒ විජය රජපුරාවන්ගේ කාලේ.

**මෛත්‍රීපාල සේනානායක මහතා**

(*කි.පු. මෛත්‍රීපාල සේනානායක*)  
(Mr. Maithripala Senanayake)

විජය රජපුරාවන්ගේ කාලේ තමයි පටන්ගත්තේ. බොහොම හරි.

ඒ වාණේම ශ්‍රී ලංකා මහ බැංකු වාර්තාවේ මේ විධියට තියෙනවා:

"On the other had certain industries suffered from the free flow of imports. The setback in production was evident in the textile industry. The output of yarn and cloth of government owned textile mills as well as private mills was curtailed substantially during the year on account of marketing problems. A wide range of fashionable fabrics was imported from countries internationally reputed for high quality."

මග විධියට කියාගෙන ගිහින් තවත් නැතක මෙහෙම කියා තිබෙනවා:

"In view of these factors the local producers of textiles were unable to compete successfully with imported textiles in terms of both quality and price with the result that as the year progressed many of the textile concerns faced liquidity problems of appreciable magnitude."

මන්න මග විධියටයි, රෙදි කර්මාන්තයට මුහුණ පාන්න වූ තත්ත්වය. ඒක මේ අවස්ථාවේ නොකියාම බැහැ. රෙදි කටහල් සියල්ලම විකුණා දමන්නට සිදුවෙන තත්ත්වයකට දැන් පත්කර තිබෙනවා.

බදු සහන සලසා දීමෙන් ලංකාවේ පිහිටුවා ඇති කර්මාන්ත ආරක්ෂා කරන ක්‍රමයක් එදා තිබුණා. අදත් එය කළ හැකියි. මේ අන්දමට කර්මාන්ත රැකීමට වහාම පිය

වර ගැනීම අවශ්‍යයි කියන එක මම කියන්න ඕනෑ. විශේෂයෙන්ම රෙදිපිළි ඇතුළු ගෘහ කර්මාන්ත සියල්ලම අද විනාශ වෙගන යන නිසා ඒවා ආරක්ෂා කිරීමේ වැඩ පිළි වෙලක් ඇති කිරීමට පියවර ගත යුතුයි කියන එක මම මේ අවස්ථාවේදී කියනවා. සුළු පරිමාණයේ කර්මාන්ත ශාලා කිහිපයක්ම වසා දමන්න සිදුවී තිබෙනවා, මේ සියලුම විස්තර 1980 වේ මහ බැංකු වාර්තාවේ තිබෙනවා. අලෙවි කිරීමේ අපහසුකම්, අමු ද්‍රව්‍ය හිඟය, නිෂ්පාදන මූල ධන වියදම් නැතිවීම, නිෂ්පාදන වියදම් යනාදිය නිසා මේ කර්මාන්තශාලා වසා දමා ඇතැයි මහ බැංකු වාර්තාවේ සඳහන් වෙනවා.

**ගාමිණී දිසානායක මහතා (ඉඩම් හා ඉඩම් සංවර්ධන ඇමතිතුමා සහ හොවැලි සංවර්ධනය පිළිබඳ ඇමතිතුමා)**

(*කි.පු. ගාමිණී දිසානායක—කාණි, කාණි අධිකාරී*)  
(*අමාත්‍ය ජනරාල් මහාචාර්ය අධිකාරී*)

(Mr. Gamini Dissanayake—Minister of Lands and Land Development and Minister of Mahaweli Development)

කර්මාන්තශාලා එකක් දෙකක් ඇරෙන්න අනෙක් හැම පේෂ කර්ම මධ්‍යස්ථානයක්ම, පුද්ගලික අංශයට භාර දුන්නා. ඒවා අද ලාභ ලබමින් වෙලද පොළේ තරඟ කාරි තත්ත්වයකට මුහුණ දෙමින් සාර්ථකව ක්‍රියාත්මක කරගෙන යනවා කියා මතක් කරන්න කැමතියි, රජය වෙනුවෙන්. එකක්වත් වහලා දමවා නැහැ.

**එම්. හලීම් ඉෂාක් මහතා (මැද කොළඹ තුන්වන)**

(*ඉහළු ආර්. ඉෂාක් මහතා—කොළඹ මැද කොළඹ ප්‍රධාන*)

(Mr. Haleem Ishak—Third Colombo Central)

Is that why they are unable to pay the lease money they owe the State ?

**ගාමිණී දිසානායක මහතා**

(*කි.පු. ගාමිණී දිසානායක*)  
(Mr. Gamini Dissanayake)

No ! No !

**එම්. හලීම් ඉෂාක් මහතා**

(*ඉහළු ආර්. ඉෂාක් මහතා*)  
(Mr. M. Haleem Ishak)

That is what I read in the newspapers.

**ගාමිණී දිසානායක මහතා**

(*කි.පු. ගාමිණී දිසානායක*)  
(Mr. Gamini Dissanayake)

I will tell him the reason why, Sir.

Hon. Members will see that an agreement had been entered into with some of the companies that they were going to be given a grant of lands. As Minister for Lands, I objected to that, and I said we cannot give a grant. His Excellency the President, Hon. the Prime Minister and the Cabinet agreed that they should be given a long lease. So, until such time as we draw fresh agreements covering a long lease and not a grant, we have asked them not to pay. But they are quite prepared to pay whatever sum we have asked from them in obtaining a long lease.



**එම්. හලීම් ඉෂාක් මහතා**  
 (ஜனாப் எம். ஹலீம் இஷாக்)  
 (Mr. M. Haleem Ishak)

But the news item says they have defaulted payment!

**ගමිණී දිසානායක මහතා**  
 (திரு. காமிணி திசனாயக்க)  
 (Mr. Gamini Dissanayake)

I am not responsible for the news item and the news item is wrong.

**මොනිපාල සේනානායක මහතා**  
 (திரு. மைத்திரிபால சேனநாயக்க)  
 (Mr. Maithripala Senanayeke)

ඒක අවස්ථාවේ හැටියට වාසිදායක නම් විශ්වාස කරන්නන්, අවාසිදායක නම් විශ්වාස නොකරන්නන් සිදු වෙනවා. මම විශේෂයෙන්ම කියා පෑවේ ගෘහ කර්මාන්ත වශයෙන් තිබුණු කර්මාන්ත වලට සිදු වී තිබෙන තත්ත්වය ගැන කරුණුයි.

ඒ එක්කම, ගමනාගමන අපහසුකම් සහ වැඩි වී තිබෙන ගමන් ගාස්තු ගැන කල්පනා කර බලන්න. රජයේ සේවකයාට අද රුපියල් සියයක් දී තිබුණත්, සමහර අයට වැඩි වී තිබෙන ගමන් ගාස්තු වශයෙන් ඒවාගේ දෙගුණයක් ගෙවන්න සිදු වී තිබෙනවා. වැඩි වී තිබෙන අලුත් බස් ගාස්තු සම්බන්ධ විස්තර, කොපමණ දුරට එය වැඩි වී තිබෙනවාද යන වග, මාර්තු මස 9 වැනිදා 'දිවයින' පත්තරේ වාර්තාවක පල වී තිබුණා.

ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාගේ අයවැය කතාවේ අවසාන කොටසේ එතුමා විශේෂ ප්‍රකාශයක් කර තිබෙනවා. 1983 මාර්තු 8 වැනි-දින ගැන්සාඩා වාර්තාවේ 488 වැනි තීරුවේ එය මෙසේ සඳහන් වෙනවා :

"අනවශ්‍ය වියදම් අඩු කොට, අත්‍යවශ්‍ය දේ ගැන පමණක් අප දැන් අවධානය යොමු කළ යුතු තේද? බාහිර ආවේපයන්ගෙන්, දුෂණයන්ගෙන් හා නැතිනාස්ති කිරීම් වලින් අප වැළකිය යුතු නැද්ද? "පක්ෂ දේශපාලනය" හා "පක්ෂ හේද" ලෙස හැඳින්වෙන බටහිර පුහුණුවට අදාළව දේවල් ශ්‍රී ලංකාවට දැරිය හැකිද? එකිනෙකා නසා ගන්නා ජාති හේද, කලකෝලහල හා ප්‍රචණ්ඩ ක්‍රියා ශ්‍රී ලංකාවට දැරිය හැකිද? මේ ප්‍රශ්න වලට අපේ විරුද්ධවැදීන්ගෙන් පිළිතුරු බලාපොරොත්තු වෙමි. අපේ රටේ දේශපාලන, සමාජ, ආර්ථික හා පරිපාලන කටයුතු කෙරෙහි බලපාන මේ ගැටළු වලින් බොහොමයක් ගැන බොහෝ ශාලිවරු නැවත සිතා බැලීමත්, අලුතින් සිතා බැලීමත් කළ යුතු නැද්ද?"

488 වැනි තීරුවේ ඒ විශේෂ ප්‍රකාශය සඳහන් වී තිබෙනවා.

"ආර්ථික නිදහස පහා ඉතා දුප්පත්—අන්ත අසරණ තත්ත්වයක තවමත් ජීවත් වන අපේ ජනතාවගෙන් විශාල කොටසකට අවම සමාදායි මට්ටමක්ව ගෙන ඒමට අප සියලු දෙනාම එකඟවුව පොදු උත්සාහයක් දැරිය යුතු නැද්ද? මිනිසා මිසින් මිනිසා සුරාකමෙන් තොර, මුළු මහත් ජනතාවටම පොදුවේ යහපතක් උදා වන ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රීය සමාජවාදී සමාජයක් ශ්‍රී ලංකාවේ බිහිකිරීමට අප උත්සාහ කළ යුතු නොවේද? සටන් කළ යුතු නොවේද? මේ උපක්‍රමයන් සමහරක් ගැන නැවත සිතා බැලීමත් 21 වැනි සියවසේ අභියෝගයන්ට බුහුණ දීමට අපේ රට සකස් කිරීමත් ඉතා ඉක්මණින් කළයුතුව ඇත."

ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා තම කතාව අවසාන කිරීමේදී මේ ප්‍රකාශය කළා. ඒ ප්‍රකාශය ඉතාමත් අගය කොට සලකන්නවාය කියා මේ අවස්ථාවේදී ප්‍රකාශ කළ යුතුයි.

නිදහස ලැබී අවුරුදු 35 කට පසුවත් මේ රට අද මේ තත්ත්වයට පත් වී තිබෙනවා නම් මා නියෝජනය කරන ඒ කණ්ඩායම වෙනුවෙන් නොවැම්බර් 4 වෙනිදා මේ ගරු සභාවේදී මා කළ කථාවේ සඳහන් කරුණු හතරක් මේ අවස්ථාවේදී ගරු කථානායකතුමා නැවත වරක් සිහිපත් කිරීමට සතුටුයි.

ජනමත විචාරණය සම්බන්ධව අපගේ සහයෝගය දෙන බව ප්‍රකාශ කරමින් එදා මා කියා සිටියේ ඒ සංයෝධනයට මාත් මගේ පක්ෂයත් සහයෝගය දෙන බවයි. එසේ ප්‍රකාශ කළ අතර පහත සඳහන් පියවර ගන්නා ලෙස මා රජයෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටින්නවාය කියා ඉල්ලීමක් ද කළා. ඒ ඉල්ලීමත් මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාගේ ප්‍රකාශයත් එකට ගතයුතුව තිබෙනවාය කියලයි, මා කියන්නට සතුටු වන්නේ. මේ රටේ යම් විධියක දේශපාලන ක්ෂේත්‍රයකට අප අද පුරුදු වී තිබෙනවා නම්, ඒ ක්ෂේත්‍රය තුළින් ජාතියේ බෙදීමක් ඇති වී තිබෙනවා නම්—21 වෙනි ශත වර්ෂය වැඩි ඈත නොවෙයි—එය මගහැරීමට හැකියාවක් ඇති කර ගන්නට බැරිද කියන ප්‍රශ්නයයි එතුමා ඉදිරිපත් කළේ. එය අවශ්‍යයෙන්ම කළයුතු දෙයක් යයි මා කියනවා. අවුරුද්දෙන් අවුරුද්ද නෑත්තම් මැතිවරණයෙන් මැතිවරණය ගම්බද තිබෙන සමගිය, පවුල්වල තිබෙන සමගිය, තගරබද තිබෙන සමගිය නැති වී ඉතාමත්ම හයානක තත්ත්වයකටයි, අද රට මුහුණ පා තිබෙන්නේ. ඒ ක්‍රමය එහෙම පිටින්ම වෙනස් කරනවාද කියන එක නොවෙයි, මා කියන්නේ. නමුත් අද තිබෙන අසමගි තත්ත්වය නැති කරන්නට, අපට හැකියාවක් ලැබෙනවා නම්, මහජනතාවගේ සුභ සිද්ධිය සඳහා ගන්නා සෑම පියවරකටම අපේ සහයෝගය දීමට සූදනමිට සිටින බව මේ අවස්ථාවේදී ප්‍රකාශ කළ යුතුයි. එදා මා එම ප්‍රකාශය කරන අවස්ථාවේදී ඉදිරිපත් කළ ඉල්ලීම් හතර මෙන්න :

1. දෙවසරකට වැඩි කාලයක් තිස්සේ දහදුක් විඳිමින් මහ මහට බැස සිටින වර්ජකයින්ට වන්දිත් සමග රැකියා ලබා දීම.
2. 1977 මහ මැතිවරණයෙන් පසු දේශපාලන හේතූන් උඩ රැකියා අභිමිච්චන්ට එම රැකියා සුදුසු පරිදි ආපසු ලබා දීම.
3. අළුත් රැකියා සැපයීමේදී දැනට අනුගමනය කරන ඒකපාක්ෂික ප්‍රතිපත්තිය වෙනස් කර පොදුවේ කාටත් රැකියා ලබාගත හැකි ලෙස වැඩපිළිවෙලක් ඇති කිරීම.
4. සිග්‍රයෙන් ඉහළ නගින ජීවන වියදම පහළ දැමීමට ඵලදායී ක්‍රමවත් වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් යෙදීම.

අපේ කාලයේදී කළාය, නොකළාය කියන ප්‍රශ්නය නොවෙයි මා ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නේ. අප කවුරුත් අද තියෙන තත්ත්වයට වගකිව යුතුයි. මේ රට නිදහස ලබා, අවුරුදු 35 ක් ගිය තැනදීත් අද තියෙන තත්ත්වයට නම් පැමිණ සිටින්නේ, අප කවුරුත් ආණ්ඩු පක්ෂයේය, විරුද්ධ පක්ෂයේය කියා කල්පනා නොකර, මේ ප්‍රශ්න වලට මුහුණ දෙන්නට ඕනෑ. ඒ නිසා මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා ඉදිරිපත් කළ අදහස් සාර්ථක කර ගන්නට යන හැකි සෑම පියවරකටම අපේ සහයෝගය දෙන බව ප්‍රකාශ කළ යුතුයි. ඒ අදහස අප ජනාධිපතිතුමාත් සමග සාකච්ඡා කළා. ජනමත විචාරණය සම්බන්ධව අපගේ සහයෝගය දෙන අවස්ථාවේදී ඒ කාරණා හැකි පමණ ක්‍රියාත්මක කිරීමට පොරොත්තු වුණා. මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාගේ දේශනයේ ඒ කාරණය ගැන සඳහන් විම ගැන







ඒ සුභ ලකුණ නම් අළුත් මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක් මේ සභා ශාඛාවේ ඇතුළු වීමයි. ඒක හොඳ ලකුණක්. සභාවෙන් ඉවත්වෙලා යනවාට වඩා සභාවට එන එක හොඳ ලකුණක්. ඒ අළුත් මන්ත්‍රීවරයා වඩිඞුකෝඩිඩෙයි මන්ත්‍රී තුමා (ආචාර්ය නීලන් නිරුවෙල්වම් මහතා) එදමයි දිවුරුම් දුන්නෙ.

"I want to congratulate him openly today, Mr. Speaker, on his entry to this House of Parliament".

මා මේ සභාවේදීම එතුමාට සුභ පතන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වෙන්න සිටියා. එතුමා ගැන මා පාසල් යන අවධියේ ඉඳලා දන්නවා. එතුමාගේ පියා මා සමග එකට සිටිලා සේනානායක රජයේ ක්‍රියා කළා. එතුමාගේ පියාගේ උප ආමති හැටියට මා එම රජයේ ක්‍රියා කළා. මගේ විශාල ගෞරවයක් තිබුණු පුද්ගලයෙක් තමයි එතුමාගේ පියා, දිවංගත එම්. නිරුවෙල්වම් ආමතිතුමා. එතුමා මේ රටේ නීති ක්ෂේත්‍රයටත්, දේශපාලන ක්ෂේත්‍රයටත් ඉතා වැදගත් සේවයක් කළ ශ්‍රේෂ්ඨ පුද්ගලයෙක් හැටියට අපට සළකන්නට පුළුවන්. මා ඒ කාලයේ ඉඳලමයි නීලන් නිරුවෙල්වම් තරුණයාට හඳුනන්නේ. එතුමා යම් දවසක මේ සභා ශාඛාවට එයි කියා ඒ කාලයේ මගේ විශ්වාසයක් තිබුණා. දේශපාලන පොර පිටියට එන්න එතුමාගේ ඒ තරම් කැමැත්තක් තිබුණේ නැති බව මා දන්නවා. එතුමා මේ සභාවේ මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක් ලෙසට පත් වී පැමිණීම ගැන මා ඉතාමත් සන්තෝෂ වෙන්නවා. එතුමා මේ සභාවට ප්‍රයෝජනවත් මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක් වෙන්න වාට කිසිම සැකයක් නැහැ.

ඊයේ පෙරේදා මට ලන්ගල මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (පේ. ජී. විජේ රත්න බණ්ඩා මහතා) ඇවිත් තවත් සුභ ආරංචියක් කීවා. එනම් මේ අළුත් පාර්ලිමේන්තුවට බඩරු ඇවිත් කීවා. දෙබරු එන්නේ නැතිව බඩරු ආපු එක සුභ ලකුණක්. මට මතකයි, ජනාධිපතිවරණය තිබෙන දවස් වල නුවරඑළිය ප්‍රදේශයට යන්න මම ලැහැස්ති වෙන කොට මට ටෙලිපෝන් පණිවුඩයක් ආවා, එහෙ අගමැති නිල නිවාසයේ එදා බඩරු ඇවිත් ඔවුන්ගේ නිවාස බඳින වාස කියල. ඒ එක්කම ඒ ටෙලිපෝන් පණිවුඩයෙන් කීව්වා, මේක බොහොම හොඳ සුභ ලකුණක් කියල ඒ ප්‍රදේශයේ උදවිය කියනවාය කියල. මම එහෙ යනකොට ජනාධිපති නිල නිවාසයෙන් බඩරු බැඳලා තිබෙනවා, මී වද අටක්. ඒ ගොල්ලන් ඔක්කොම කීව්වා, ඒක බොහොම සුභ ලකුණක් කියල; ජයග්‍රහණයේ සංකේතයක් කියල. එහෙම කල්පනා කර බලන කොට අපි ඒ මැතිවරණයෙන් ජය ලැබුවා. මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාට මට කියන්න තිබෙන්නෙ මේ අයවැය විවාදය අවසන් වෙන්න ඉස්සර බඩරු ඒම සුභ ලකුණක් බවයි.

ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, අපේ අලුත් මන්ත්‍රීතුමා කළ කතාව අපි කාගේත් සැලකිල්ල යොමු විය යුතු කතාවක්. It was a good speech and it deserved listening; consideration and analysis by all of us. So I must congratulate him on his maiden speech. There are one or two matters in his speech which I would like to touch on, and which I would do so in my speech.

ඒ කතාව පමණක් පොවෙයි, සාමාන්‍යයෙන් පොදුවේ ගත්තාම මෙවර මේ විවාදයේදී අපේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරු කළ කතා කරුණුවලින් බොහොම සම්පූර්ණ බව මට

පෙනුණා. විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයෙකුත් හොඳ කතාවලි කීපයක්ම කෙරුණා. ඒවා අපේ සැලකිල්ලට හාජන කරන්න ඕනෑ. ඒ අතර මේ පරිසරය විකක් දූෂණය වන විධියේ කතාවක්—දෙකකුත් කෙරුණා. ඒක ගැන අප කණගාටු වෙන්න නරකයි. ඒ කතා කියවීම, ඒවා පොඩි අපීර්ණයක් ඇතුළු කළ කතා බව මට පෙනුණා. මම දන්නවා, ඒ කතා කළ දෙදෙනාට එහෙම ඉඳ හිටලා අපීර්ණ ඇති වන බව. දේශපාලන හා පෞද්ගලික අපීර්ණ ඇති වන බව. නරක කැමක් කැඩාමත් බඩේ අපීර්ණයක් ඇති වෙනවා. නරක බලාපොරොත්තු තිබෙන කොටත් දේශපාලන අපීර්ණ ඇති වෙනවා ඉතින් ඔවාට බෙහෙත් දෙන්න ගියාම එක්කෝ වමනය දමනවා. එහෙම නැතිනම් පාවනය ඇති වෙනවා. ඒ දෙකම සිද්ධ වුණු බවයි මගේ කල්පනාව. ඒක නිසා මම ඒක වැඩිය අවුස්සන්න කැමති නැහැ, මොකද? මේ පරිසරය තවත් දූෂණය වෙන්න පුළුවනි.

ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, මේ සභාවේදී අපේ සැලකිල්ල යොමු විය යුතු කරුණු ඉදිරිපත් වුණාම මුදල් ඇමති තුමාගේ පමණක් නොවෙයි, සියලුම ඇමතිවරුන්ගේ සැලකිල්ල යොමු වෙනවා, ඒ කරුණු සම්බන්ධයෙන්. අපි කවුරුත් මේ රට ගැන ලොකු ආදරයකින්, හැඟීමකින් අපේ යුතුකම් ඉටුකරන්නට බැඳී සිටින අය. එම නිසා මේ ඉදිරිපත් කරන අදහස් උදහස් ගැන අපේ සැලකිල්ල යොමු වෙන්න ඕනෑ.

ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, වඩිඞුකෝඩිඩෙයි මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ආචාර්ය නීලන් නිරුවෙල්වම් මහතා) මා විශ්වාස කරනවා මෙයට වඩා හොඳ කතාවක් කරනවා, එතුමා එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂය වගේ ජාතික පක්ෂයක මන්ත්‍රී වරයකු වෙලා සිටියා නම්. එතුමා පෙනී සිටින පක්ෂය ප්‍රාදේශික පක්ෂයක් නිසා එතුමාට සිද්ධ වුණා, එක්තරා සීමාවක් තුළ කතා කරන්න.

He belongs to a regional party. I do not think he had the freedom to think as a free citizen belonging to Sri Lanka. If he had that opportunity he would have made a better speech. All of you will perform better if you all form part of a national party in Sri Lanka without belonging to a regional district party, because you are very capable people. Your capabilities are just wasted. So I would like to invite you to join us or whatever national party you wish to and work for the upliftment of the country without wasting your energies.

Now Sir, the hon. Member for Vaddukkodai (Dr. Neelan Tiruchelvam) was telling us in very many words that our free economy, or our free economic policy, the competitive economy we are creating has failed. I do not think it is fair to pass judgment like that. It is not fair because of the point from where we started. He must understand that. He must look back at the economic situation we were in. He was referring to doctrinaire policies and said that our free economic policy has failed. I do not think it is fair to say that because in a free economy there are no doctrinaire policies. Free economy means a practical policy, it follows only one 'ism' namely, 'pragmatism', but if it



[ආර්. ප්‍රේමදාස මහතා]

was a socialist economy, then you can call it 'doctrinaire', because they are bound by certain limits, they do not get out of it. The hon. Member for Kalawana (Mr. Sarath Muttetuwegama) represents that doctrine. In our case we are following a pragmatic economy. We are trying to find a solution to the problems as they come up. We are not bound by 'isms'. We seek realities. The hon. Member for Nallur said that the Minister of Finance did not name his budget. I would like to give it a name. It is a "Realistic Budget"—a pragmatic budget.

කථනායකතුමා,

(ආරාධනාකරු අයුරු)

(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please!

The sitting is suspended till 2 p.m.

දැවිමේ වේ අනුකූලව නවකාලිකව දන් සිටුවන ලදීන් අ. හ. 2 ට නියෝජ්‍ය කථනායකතුමා, [නෝමන් වේද්‍යරත්න මහතා] ගේ සහසභිත් වශයෙන් නැවත පවත්වන ලදී.

අනුසාරය, අරාධනා පි. ප. 2 මණිවතරා ඉඩකඩ නිවැරදි කරනු ලැබූ පසු, පිටුපසට ආරාධනා කළේය. ආරාධනාකරු අයුරු [මු. ජයවර්ධන මහතා] තර්කයක් කළේය.

Sitting accordingly suspended till 2 p.m. and then resumed.  
MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER [MR. NORMAN WAIDYARATNA] in the Chair.

ආර්. ප්‍රේමදාස මහතා

(මු. ජයවර්ධන මහතා)

(Mr. R. Premadasa)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was referring to the argument adduced by the hon. Minister for Vaddukodai (Dr. Neelan Tiruchelvam) in regard to his reference to our policy as a doctrinaire policy. But I said in this House that if our economic policy is based on a particular doctrine, we would not be able to face the reality of the world, the realities of our country. We follow a pragmatic policy and that is how we are able to face the situations as they arise.

Now, Sir, we evolved this policy as a response to the particular economic situation that had arisen. The complaint against us by the Left is that we do not follow a doctrinaire policy. That is the complaint against us. We do not want to do that because we are keen to meet the challenge as far as possible, successfully. You cannot do that if you stick to some 'ism' or a particular doctrine.

Let us presume that our present economic policy which we call a liberalized economic policy, a competitive economic policy, an open economic policy, or presuming that it is a doctrinaire policy, it leads to the conclusion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it is inflexible and that we would not change even if the circumstances favoured us. But look at our

performance in the economic sphere. Even in this Budget, we have taken certain steps in view of the changing economic situation. Now, when we found that the capital expenditure was rising to unreasonable limits, we made a decision that for the time being we will not embark on new projects but continue to complete the projects that we have already undertaken until we get over this situation.

Sir, this economic recession, the inflation that is prevailing, is not going to be there for all time. You can see things are changing like the weather. We cannot say that it is going to be the same all the time. The world has passed through several situations like this. That is why we firmly believe in a pragmatic, realistic policy. Whether it be political, economic, social or whatever it is, we have to be pragmatic, and that is the very complaint that the Left movement in this country and their sympathisers are making against us. They are trying to put us into the capitalist camp, communist camp or some other camp. We prefer to remain in the pragmatic camp and face situations as they arise. We do not have a political or economic doctrine. That is why we would like to have discussions with the TULF. We do not have a particular limited area to work. We like to discuss with anybody and have dialogue with any shade of opinion because we believe in this pragmatic approach.

Now when we found that the import bill was going higher and higher, we reduced imports by imposing duties on a range of imported goods. So, I want to impress upon the new member that we do not follow a particular doctrine. If he wants to put us into a particular doctrine he can put us into the doctrine of pragmatism.

There is another point I would like to take up from the speech of the hon. Member for Vaddukodai. He spoke about the disparity between what is spent per person in the Sinhala areas and in the Tamil areas. When he made that point I myself was a little alarmed. He took the total capital investment and he related it per person specially in the Jaffna and the Batticaloa districts. When he referred to it, actually I was also surprised. I thought I should examine it. He tried to make a complicated matter very simple. He is such an intelligent person that he is capable of doing that. I do not think even the Leader of the Opposition or any of his Colleagues tried this earlier. What he has done is to take the capital expenditure of the whole country, divide it by the total population and get the average per capita figure. I think that is what he had done. Then, he separately took the capital expenditure which was to be spent in the Jaffna district divided it by the population in Jaffna and found that figure was much lower than the national average.



Sir, when I went into this matter I found that this would be so not only in Jaffna even in the other areas. Take Kalutara, for instance, where you do not have a big capital investment. Or for that matter, take Galle. If you go on adopting this measure in every other district everybody will get alarmed. The capital expenditure is not allocated on a district basis or regional basis. It depends on the projects which are economically feasible. Take a project like the Mahaweli. Mahaweli Diversion Project. It is a multi-purpose project which is designed not only to provide irrigation but also for the purpose of flood protection and generation of power. Now, Mahaweli does not flow into the Jaffna District but as a result of the power generated by the Mahaweli project people in Jaffna will certainly be benefited. It is so not only with Jaffna, but Kalutara, Galle, the rest of the country because these major projects are designed and executed not only for that particular area.

Sometimes, Sir, these major projects would not benefit the area where they are being done. It helps some other area and the rest of the country. Take, for instance, the Maduru Oya Scheme. The headworks are in the Sinhala area and there is a lot of expenditure incurred there, but the benefit will be in the Batticaloa District. The Maduru Oya Project will help the Batticaloa District very much. I do not think the hon. Member for Vaddukkodai had looked into that aspect. So, by merely taking the capital expenditure and seeing where it is expended would not give a clear picture. We have to look at where the benefits go.

Now, take the case of Kankasanturai Cement Factory. Can the rest of the country say, "You are dumping so much of Money on the cement project? See how much you are spending on the people of Kankasanturai!" I must tell you that the people living around that project are complaining—

ඒ. අමීර්තලිංගම් මහතා  
(திரு. ஏ. அமிர்தலிங்கம்)  
(Mr. A. Amirthalingam)

We are only getting the dust.

ආර්. ප්‍රේමදාස මහතා  
(திரு. ஆர். பிரேமதாச)  
(Mr. R. Premadasa)

Yes, you are getting the dust. In the same way, people in the other parts of the country are also getting the dust as a result of certain projects. Take the metal quarries in various areas. They exploit the metal there and the people living in that area only get the dust. The metal is transported to other areas. So, I think, we should look into that aspect also.

That is why I said that the hon. Member for Vaddukkodai would have been a very useful Member of Parliament if he is a Member of our party or any

other national party. The only thing is that he has to base his arguments within a certain limited area, compelled by his politics.

Now, Sir, although the hon. Member thinks of the Jaffna District, think of the number of Jaffna people living in Colombo! Do they not enjoy all the benefits of the capital expenditure incurred by the Colombo Municipal Council? The 1981 census figures indicate that about 30 per cent of the municipal population are Tamils. There are, similarly, Tamils in other parts of the country. If you take Kandy and the capital expenditure incurred in the Kandy District as a result of Victoria or the Nuwara Eliya district and the capital expenditure at Kotmale, in those two districts you will find that they have a very high per capita figure as far as capital expenditure distribution is concerned. I think this only shows that statistics can be used to prove anything.

Now, Sir, the hon. Member made several other suggestions. He made a very important point about which I am very much impressed.

වඩබුකෝඩ්ඩෙයි මන්ත්‍රීතුමා ඇස්තමේන්තු පිළිබඳව අප කාලේන් සැලකිල්ලට යොමු වන ඉතා මත් වැදගත් යෝජනාවක් ඉදිරිපත් කළා. ඇස්තමේන්තු පිළිබඳව, යම් අදියරයකදී සමීක්ෂණයක් කරන්න බැරිද කියා එතුමා ඇහුවා. එය ඉතාමත් අවශ්‍ය දෙයක්. ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම සංවර්ධන සහා ක්‍රමය ඇති කර තිබෙන්නේ, ඒ සඳහායි. ප්‍රදේශීය මණ්ඩල ක්‍රමය, ග්‍රාමෝදය මණ්ඩල ක්‍රමය අප ඇති කළේ, ඒ සඳහා තමයි. එය, එම මණ්ඩල වල, සහා වල අවධානයට යොමු විය යුතු විශේෂ කාරණයක්.

නෙයෙක් කාරණා සඳහා අප මුදල් වෙන් කරනවා; ඇස්තමේන්තු පිළියෙල කරනවා. ඒ ඇස්තමේන්තු පිළිබඳව දේශපාලනික වශයෙන් හා ප්‍රායෝගික වශයෙන් සමීක්ෂණයක් කෙරෙන්න ඕනෑ. එහෙම කෙරුණු තැන්වල, වෙන් වුණු මුදලින් හිතුවාටත් වඩා, ප්‍රමාණයක වැඩ කොටසක් කෙරී තිබෙනවා. මො දන්නේ නැහැ, හැම ඇස්තමේන්තුවක් සම්බන්ධයෙන්ම එය කරන්න පුළුවන් වෙයිද කියා, නමුත් ඇස්තමේන්තු පිළිබඳ මේ සමීක්ෂණය හුහක් දුරට අවශ්‍ය දෙයක්. ඒ බව මො කිප විටක්ම—සංවර්ධන සහා වැඩ පිළිවෙල ගැන කථා කරන අවස්ථාවලදී—මේ ගරු සභාවේදී කියා තිබෙනවා.

රජය ගිණුම් කාරක සභාවක්—'පබ්ලික් එකවුණ්ඩ්ස් කමිටි'—අපට තිබෙනවා. නමුත් විගණකාධිපතිවරයාගේ වාර්තාව අනුව ඒ කාරක සභාව සමීක්ෂණයක යෙදෙන්නේ, ඒ වියතියදම් කළාට පසුවයි. එම නිසා මේ වැඩ පිළිවෙල ගැන අපේ විශේෂ අවධානය යොමු වන්න ඕනෑ. වෙන් කෙරෙන මුදල් වියදම් කිරීම සඳහා පිළියෙල කෙරෙන ඇස්තමේන්තු මොන අකාරයට සකස් වෙනවාද කියා සොයා බලන්න ඕනෑ. ඒ අදහස ඉදිරිපත් කිරීම ගැන වඩබුකෝඩ්ඩෙයි මන්ත්‍රීතුමාට



[ආර්. ප්‍රේමදාස මහතා]

ස්තූති කරන්න ඕනෑ. ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් වැඩි කාලයක් ගත කරන්න මේ අවස්ථාවේදී මට පුළුවන්කමක් නැහැ. නමුත් මට වුවමනා කලා, ඒ ගැන මේ ගරු සභාවේ අවධානය යොමු කරවන්න.

By pre-audit, pre-evaluation of the estimates you can prevent a lot of waste. Many estimates overlap. These things are not looked into in the correct perspective. Actually, the executive committees of the Development Councils must do this. When estimates are prepared these executive committees must function like the district cabinet. They must summon the officials to the executive committee. They must question them: "Why are you setting apart this amount for this purpose?". "Why can you not do it this way?", and so on. You must go through the estimates, not for the purpose of cutting down or pruning but for the purpose of getting more work with the same amount, which can be done. And this must flow down to the Pradeshiya Mandalayas in the AGA's division.

The executive committee need not arrogate everything to themselves. They can examine the main estimates. The estimates dealing with the AGA's division can go to the Pradeshya Mandalayas and the Gramodaya Mandalayas at the Grama Sevaka Division level where the people can participate, They might tell the officials, "Do not waste this money; you can utilize it this way". They might say, "you can bring metal from such and such a area". The people of the area, that is the representatives, might say, "Why do you want to go so far?" Then the official might say, "I do not know; I am not a man from this area; I have come from such and such a area". Then the people will say, "yes, we do not blame you, but metal is available at such and such a place, earth is available at such and such a place" or "a bulldozer is working at such and such a place; why not talk to them, instead of getting down a bulldozer for this purpose from somewhere else?"

You know, I am just giving you various instances where you can make better use of the monies that you are spending. I think we must look into this aspect, I must tell you we are very keen that the Development Councils should function on this basis. We are national Parliament, we can approve plans that are submitted through the Budget every year. But that does not mean that we have to go into all the estimates. We cannot do that. We are not here for that purpose. We are here to decide national policies and national planning. The purpose of the Development Council is to go into these things in relation to their districts. That is why we have adopted the system of Development Councils. I know that certain people do not like this system, especially some of the officials who want to have their own way.—(Interruption). Yes, we have to break through this. Members of Parliament must take an interest at the district level and see to this.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මේ සංවර්ධන සභා ක්‍රමය විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වය කොසි තරම් විවේචනය කළත් මම කියන්න කැමතියි, මේ ක්‍රමයෙන් පමණකි මහජන තාවගේ සහයෝගය ලබා ගන්නට පුළුවන් වන්නේ සංවර්ධන වැඩවලට. ඒ සම්බන්ධය ඉතාමත්ම අවශ්‍යයි. මේකට විශේෂයෙන්ම ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂය විරුද්ධයි; සමසමාජ, කොමියුනිස්ට් පක්ෂ විරුද්ධයි. ඒ අය දන්නවා, මොකක්ද මෙයින් ඇති වන ප්‍රතිඵලය කියා. ජනතා සහභාගිත්වය ලැබෙනවා. ජනතා සහභාගිත්වය ලැබුණු හැටියේම ජනතාව මුලා කරන්න බැහැ. අන්න ඒකයි, ඒ උදවිය විරුද්ධ. ඒකයි, ඒ උදවිය ඒක වර්ජනය කර තිබෙන්නේ. එහෙත් අපි මේක ඍජුවක ලෙස ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්න උත්සාහ ගන්න ඕනෑ. එපමණක් නොවෙයි, මේ රටේ තිබෙන සංවර්ධනය නිෂ්පාදනය ආදී පුශ්කවලට ජනතාව සහභාගි කරවා ගැනීම මේ වැඩ පිළිවෙළ පිළිබඳ අවබෝධය ඇති කර ගැනීමට පමණක් නොවෙයි, නාස්තිය නැති කර ගැනීමට පමණක් නොවෙයි, ඔවුන්ගේ සහභාගිත්වය ලබා ගැනීමටත් ඇති එකම එක ක්‍රමය බව තමුන් තාත් සේලා පිළිගන්නවා ඇති.

මම කල්පනා කර තිබෙන්නේ හුඟක් දුරටම අපේ වැඩ පිළිවෙළවල් ගමේ මට්ටමට විමධ්‍යගත කරන්නයි. ඉම සේවක කොට්ඨාශ මට්ටමට යන්නට ඕනෑ. අපට තිබෙනවා ඉම සේවක කොට්ඨාශ 4,410 ක්. ඒ කොට්ඨාශ ශක්තිමත් කරන්න ඕනෑ. මේ රටේ ජනගහනයෙන් සියයට 75 ක් පමණ ඉන්නේ ගම් බද ප්‍රදේශවල, නොදියුණු පළාත්වල. ඒ අයට මේ කෙරෙන වැඩ පිළිවෙළවල් පිළිබඳ දැනුමක් තිබෙනවාද කියන එක ප්‍රශ්නයක්; සහභාගි වන්නට අවකාශයක් තිබෙනවාද කියන එක ප්‍රශ්නයක්. ඔවුන්ට ශක්තිමත් කරන්නට අපේ අර්ථික තත්ත්වයේ දියුණුවක් ඇති වන්නේ අපේ නිෂ්පාදනය වැඩි වුණොත් පමණකි කියන එක අපි පිළිගන්නා දෙයක්. එය දැන් සටන් පායක් වී තිබෙනවා පමණකි. නමුත් නිෂ්පාදනය සිදු වන්නේ කොහෙත්ද? නිෂ්පාදනය සිදු වන්නේ රට තුළින්. නිෂ්පාදනය කෙරෙන්නේ ගම්වල. නිෂ්පාදනය කරන්නේ කවුද? ගැමියා. එහෙනම් ශක්තිමත් කළ යුත්තේ ගැමියායි. ගමේ මට්ටමට අපි විශේෂ සැලකිල්ලක් දැක්විය යුතුව තිබෙනවා. ඒ නිසා මේ ලහදී ලංකා බැංකුවේ සභාපතිතුමා මට ගහු වූ අවස්ථාවේදී මම මේ ගැන කිව්වා.

දැන් නගරවල හැම තැනම ලොකු බැංකු මධ්‍යස්ථාන පිහිටුවා තිබෙනවා. මම කිව්වා, ඒක නවත්තන්න කියා. බැංකු මධ්‍යස්ථානයක් පිහිටුවන්න ගියාම ලංසු ගන්නත් වියදම් කරනවා ගොඩනැගිලිවලට; ඒකට යකඩ කම්බි ගහන්නට; යකඩ සේප්පු ගෙනෙන්නට; නිලධාරීන්ට. එවිට අර ගැමියන්ට දිය යුතු ආධාර මුදල යන්නේ ගොඩ නැගිල්ලට, අතික නගරයක පමණක් බැංකු පිහිටවීමට ඇත පිවිසර ගම්බද අභියෝග මිනිසා එතනට එන්නේ නැහැ. එන්න ශක්තියක් නැහැ. ඒකෙ ගැමිහීරත්වය දැක්කමත් බය වෙනවා. ඒ නිසා මෙම කටයුත්ත පහසු වෙන් කර ගැනීම සඳහා මම එතුමාට යෝජනා කලා හැම ඉම සේවක කොට්ඨාශයකටම—හැම එකකම බැරි වෙන්න පුළුවන්, පුළුවන් තරමක—නියෝජිතයෙක් පත් කර ගන්න, ඒ මනුෂ්‍යයාට කොමිස් එකක්



දෙන්න, අර ඉස්සර ඉන්ෂුරන්ස් ඒජන්ට්ස්ලාට දුන්නා වගේ යම්කිසි ගණනක් දෙන්න කියා; එයා අදහනවා ගමේ මිනිස්සු, එයා මිනිස්සු සොයාගෙන ගොස් ණය දෙයි, එයාට ණය ලබා ගන්නන් පුළුවන්, එයා ගමේ එක්කෙනා, ගම ගැන දන්නාවා, අස්වැන් නෙහුන් ණය ආපසු ලබා ගනියි කියා.

නගරයක බැංකුවලින් ණය දුන්නම ආපසු ගෙවන්න ඔක්කොම එතැනට එන්නේ නැහැ. ඉතින් කැගහනවා ණය ගෙවන්නේ නැහැ කියා. සාමාන්‍ය සිටිනක් තමයි ණය ගත්තාම නොගෙවා ඉන්න කල්පනා කරන එක. දැන් ඉතින් රටවලින් එහෙමනේ කල්පනා කරන්නේ. ණය කපා හරින්න කියනවා. මම ඒකටත් එන්නම්. ඒකයි ස්වභාවය. ඒක මනුෂ්‍ය ගතිය. නමුත් ගමේ ඉන්නා මිනිසාගෙන් ඒක ගත්තොත් එයා දන්නවා ඒක ආපසු ගන්න. එයා අදහනවා. අතික එයා දන්නවා, දිය යුතු ප්‍රමාණය. මේ තැනැත්තා ගොවිතැන් කරන කෙනෙක්, මෙයාට දෙන්න ඕනෑ මෙන්න මේ ප්‍රමාණයයි කියා දන්නවා. එයා ඇවිත් රුපියල් 15,000 ක් ඉල්ලුවොත් "ඇයි පොඩ්සිංසෝ, උඹට බැහැ තේද රු. 15,000 ක් අරගෙන ගෙවන්න, රු. 5,000 ක් ඇති තේද, ඒ 5000 න් ගොවිතැන් කරපන්, නැත්නම් වෙළඳාමක් කරපන්, නැත්නම් පුංචි කර්මාන්තයක් කරපන්", මේ විධියට ගෙවාපන්" කියන්න ඔහුට පුළුවන්. නිතරම මුණගැසෙන මනුෂ්‍යයා, මතුල් තුලාවලට එන මිනිසා, කොහොමද ඒ මනුෂ්‍යයාගේ මුහුණ බලන්නේ මේ ගණන ගෙව්වේ නැත්නම් කියා ඔහු කල්පනා කරනවා. එතකොට බැංකුවටත් ලෙහෙසයි. මොකද, අමුතු වෙන් කාර්යාලයක් ඕනෑ නැහැ, ඒ සඳහා ඒ නියෝජිතයාගේ ගෙයම පාවිච්චි කරයි. මිනිසා හොඳට සේප්පු වක් එහෙම ගෙනාවත් තබා ගෙන එයාගේම ලමයෙක් පත් කර ගනියි, එතන ලියකියවිලිවල වැඩ කරන්න. ලොකු ගණනක් යන්නේ නැහැ. එතකොට, ලක්ෂ කීපයක ගණුදෙනුවක් ගම් මට්ටමෙන් කෙරෙන්නේ. වෙළඳාමේ නැත්නම් ගනුදෙනුවේ ප්‍රමාණයට එයාටත් කොමිෂන් එකක් ලැබෙනවා. එතකොට ගැමියාට ඒ ශක්තියත් ලබා දෙන්න පුළුවන්. ඒක ආපසුත් ලබා ගන්නට පුළුවන්. මම දැක්ක වාර්තාවක. අපේ ඇත පිපිසර ගමේ මට්ටමට මේ ණය මුදල් යන ප්‍රමාණය ඉතාමත්ම කණගාටුදායක අන්දමින් අඩුයි කියා තිබුණා. මොකින්ද මේකට දෙන පිළිතුර? අප්පෝ සල්ලි දුන්නට ගන්න බැහැ. ගන්න ක්‍රමයක් ඇති කරන්න එපාය. අන්න ඒකයි, මම ඒ ශෝඡනාව ඒ අවස්ථාවේ ඉදිරිපත් කළේ.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මොන පක්ෂ හේද අප අතර තිබුණත්, මේ රට හදා වඩා ගන්න ඕනෑ නම්, ගම ශක්තිමත් කරන්න ඕනෑ, ගැමියාට ශක්තිමත් කරන්න ඕනෑ, මේ අපෙන් ලැබෙන්නා වූ නොයෙකුත් පහසුකම් හුඟක් දුරට ගැමියා අතට ලැබෙන්නට ඕනෑ කියන එක අපි සියලු දෙනාම එකඟ වන දෙයක්. අද ඇම වාර්තාවකම කියන්නේ, කෘෂි කර්මාන්තය අතින් පුළු කර්මාන්ත අතින් මේ රටේ විශේෂ ප්‍රගතියක් ඇති කරන්නට පුළුවන්ය කියයි. ඒක කළොත් පමණයි, අපට මේ අමාරුවෙන් ගොඩ එන්නට පුළුවන් වන්නේ කියයි. ඉම සේවක කොට්ඨාශ මට්ටමෙන් ඒක කරන්න බොහොම හොඳ ක්‍රමයකුත් දැන් ඇති වෙලා

නිබෙනවා. දේශපාලන වාද හේද පැත්තකට දමලා, ගෘහි නිබෙන සමිති සමාගම්වල ප්‍රධානීන් එකතු කරලා, ගමේ සිටින නිලධාරීන් සම්බන්ධ කරලා අපි ඉමෝදය මණ්ඩල පිහිටුවා ඒ වැඩ පිළිවෙළ ඇති කලා. එහෙම නම් අපි ඒ ශක්තිය ගමේ මට්ටමට දෙන්න ඕනෑ. අද කෘෂිකර්මාන්තය අතින්, නොවිතැන් අතින් ඉතා විශාල වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් ප්‍රාදේශීය වශයෙන් මේ රජය දියත් කරලා තිබෙනවා. මේ පණිවිඩය දිගටම යන්න ඕනෑ, ඊට ඕනෑ කරන ශක්තිය ලබා දෙන්න ඕනෑ.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, කලවානේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (සරත් මුත්තෙට්ටුවෙගම මහතා) ඉදිරිපත් කළ කරුණු ගැන මම හිතන විධියට ඇමතිවරු කීප දෙනෙක්ම පිළිතුරු දී තිබෙනවා. එතුමා මේ වතාවේ පමණක් නොවෙයි, මීට කලින් වතාවලත් මෙය තර්කයම තමයි ඉදිරිපත් කළේ. මේ රජය අයවැය ලේඛනය ඉදිරිපත් කිරීම ප්‍රමාද කිරීමෙන් ලොකු රැවටිල්ලක් කලා කියා පෙන්වුම් කරන්න එතුමා උත්සාහ කලා. මේ අයවැය ලේඛනය ජනාධිපතිවරණයට, ජනමත විචාරණයට ඉස්සෙල්ලා ඉදිරිපත් නොකළේ මොකද කියා ඇහැව්වා. මම එක ප්‍රශ්නයක් එතුමාගෙන් අහන්නට කැමතියි. උත්තරයේලා මේක ජනාධිපතිවරණයටත්, ජනමතවිචාරණයටත් කලින් මහජනයාට කිව්වේ නැද්ද? මේ ඡන්ද විමසීම් දෙක ඉක්මන් කරන්නේ අයවැය ලේඛනය ඉදිරිපත් කරන්න බැරි නිසාය, රුපියල බාල්දු කරන්නය, ජීවන වියදම වැඩි කරන්නය, ඔන්න දීලා බලන්න සහනාධාර ඔක්කොම කපයි කියලා කිව්වේ නැද්ද? ඒක නැහැයි කියලා කියනවා නම් මා ලග වාර්තා තිබෙනවා. බොහොම ජයවම කිව්වා. ලිපිලේඛනවලින් කිව්වා. කථාවලින් කිව්වා. නොයෙක් ආකාරයෙන් පත්තරවලින් කිව්වා. රූප වාහිනියට හිඟින් කිව්වා, කපා කියක්ද? අවි එක කපා වක් කරනකොට ඒ පැත්තෙන් කපා හත අටක් කළේ නැද්ද? දැන් තමුත්තාත්සේලා හිතනවාද, අපට මේ ඡන්ද විමසීම් දෙකේදීම ඡන්දය දුන්නේ මහජනතාව මේවා නොදැනගෙනය කියා, රුපියලේ අගය අඩුවීම නොදැනගෙනයි කියා හිතනවාද? බී. ටී. ටී. එක, බඩු මිල ගණන් වැඩි වෙයි කියන එක නොදැන ගෙනයි කියා හිතනවාද? ඇයි ඉතින් තමුත්තාත්සේලාම කියනවාහේ, මේ අපි ආව දවසේ ඉදලාම බඩු මුට්ටුවල මිලත් වැඩි වුණාය කියා. වැඩි වුණා නේ. එතනොට අරහෙම කියනකොට වැඩිමෙන්ම විශ්වාස කරනවා නොවැ.

මේකෙන් තමුත්තාත්සේලා මොකක්ද කරන්න හදන්නේ? මහ ජනතාව බාල්දු කරන්න හදනව.

They are devaluing the people Sir, this is what they are doing by adducing these arguments. They are trying to show that our people are a set of unintelligent people-

ඒ ගොල්ල අමත පිරිසක්ය කියනවා.

-A set of foolish people, they are trying to make out. Please, do not do that. Do not insult our people. It is worse than devaluing the rupee. You are devaluing the intelligence of our people by saying that the people just went and voted in the two elections without knowing all these things. that is not fair by the people.



[ආර්. ප්‍රේමදාස මහතා]

කලදාන ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා කියන්න උත්සාහ කෙළේ ඒකයි. මහජනතාවගේ බුද්ධිය බාල දුර්වල කරන්නයි, උත්සාහ කෙළේ. නොදැන ජන්දය දන්නා කියලයි එහෙනම් කියන්නේ? මම කියන්න කැමතියි, මේ රටේ විරුද්ධ පක්ෂයේ විශේෂයෙන්ම වාමාංශික පක්ෂවල -- තර්ක විතර්ක මේ රටේ ජනතාවට හොඳට පුරුදු බව. කොයි තරමට මහජනතාව ඒ ගොල්ලන් මැනගෙන ඉන්නවාද කිව්වොත් අවුරුදු තිහක් හතළිහක් තිස්සේ මේ ගෙනගිය ව්‍යාපාරයට මේ රටේ පාලනයක් පිහිටුවන්න බැරි වුණොත්? ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයට හේත්තු වුණේ නැත්නම් බැහැ, ආණ්ඩුවක ඇමති කමක්වත් දරන්න. බලන්න ඇති වි තිබෙන තත්ත්වය. මහජනතාව මොන තරමට ඒ ගොල්ලන්ට බාල දුර්වල කර තිබෙනවාද?

The people have devalued the leftist parties of this country. Either they must coalesce with the SLFP or they must coalesce with the UNP. A part of the left movement came to the UNP in 1965. Am I right? The hon. Member for Kotmale accepts that Mr. Philip Gunawardena—that is right. The people know them, so do not get misled by their political theories. That is what I am telling you.—(Interruption). Yes. Why are you going after them?

**ආනන්ද දසනායක මහතා**  
(ශ්‍රී. ඉ. ආනන්ද තෙන්නකර)  
(Mr. Ananda Dassanayake)  
No, No.

**ආර්. ප්‍රේමදාස මහතා**  
(ශ්‍රී. ඉ. ප්‍රේ. ප්‍රේමදාස)  
(Mr. R. Premadasa)  
Why not, you are going after them.

**ආනන්ද දසනායක මහතා**  
(ශ්‍රී. ඉ. ආනන්ද තෙන්නකර)  
(Mr. Ananda Dassanayake)  
No! No!

**ආර්. ප්‍රේමදාස මහතා**  
(ශ්‍රී. ඉ. ප්‍රේ. ප්‍රේමදාස)  
(Mr. R. Premadasa)  
You have invited them together.

**ආනන්ද දසනායක මහතා**  
(ශ්‍රී. ඉ. ආනන්ද තෙන්නකර)  
(Mr. Ananda Dassanayake)  
No. Hon. Prime Minister, they will never mislead me.

**ආර්. ප්‍රේමදාස මහතා**  
(ශ්‍රී. ඉ. ප්‍රේ. ප්‍රේමදාස)  
(Mr. R. Premadasa)  
I know that, they will not mislead you. I will be the happiest man when you start leading the SLFP because you are more intelligent than the leaders who are now running that party; that much I must tell you.

You may not be a person who had gone to a University, but you have graduated in the University of the people. You will do a better job. Please ask Mrs. Bandaranaike to give up that leadership and hand it over to you.

ආත්ත වශයෙන්ම මම මේ කියාගෙන ආවේ මේ රටේ වාමාංශික පක්ෂ හැම තර්කයකින්ම උත්සාහ කරන්නේ මේ රටේ මහජනතාව බාල දුර්වල කරන්න බවයි. කපානායකතුමානි හැම අයවැය විවාදයකදීම සිටි තක් තිබෙනවා. ඒක මේ අවස්ථාවේදීත් පිළිපැදල තිබෙනවා ඉහත දුරටම අපි මේ පැත්තෙ ගිටියත් ඒ පැත්තෙ ගිටියත්, විරුද්ධ පක්ෂය මේ පැත්තෙ ගිටියත් ඒ පැත්තෙ ගිටියත්, අවුරුදු පහ අයවැය වාර්තා ඉදිරිපත් කළාම ආණ්ඩුව ඊට පක්ෂව කපා කරන විට විරුද්ධ පක්ෂය ඊට විරුද්ධව කපා කරනවා. ආණ්ඩුව කියනවා, “ තමුත්තාන්සේලා මේක විවේචනය කරනවා. හොඳයි තමුත්තාන්සේලා කොහොමද කරන්නෙ කියල කියන්න ” කියා. එතකොට විරුද්ධ පක්ෂය කියනවා, අපි කියන්න කැහැ අපි කරන තාලෙ. අපට ආණ්ඩුව හාර දෙනවා, එතකොට අපි කරල පෙන්වන්නම් ” කියල. ඒ නිසා මම කැමති නැහැ මේ අවස්ථාවේදී ඒ ප්‍රශ්නය විරුද්ධ පක්ෂයෙන් අහන්න. එනම්, මොනවද ඔය ඉදිරිපත් කරන ප්‍රශ්නවලට තමුත්තාන්සේලාගේ විසඳුම්? තමුත්තාන්සේලා කරුණාකර අපට විසඳීම් දෙන්න කියා කියන්න මම මේ අවස්ථාවේදී බලාපොරොත්තුවක් නැහැ.

I do not want you to get into that difficulty.—(Interruption) I know that, but I am only going to point out here how the Opposition when they were the Government solved the problems. I do not want to burden you by asking you to give the solutions to the problems that we are facing, but in a situation like this how the Opposition will behave can be projected by bringing out their past performance.

මේ විවේචනයන්ටම මේ කායකී භාර දුන්නොත් මොන විධියේ තත්ත්වයක් ඇති වේවිද කියා මම පෙන්වා දෙන්නම්, තමුත්තාන්සේලාට.

තමුත්තාන්සේ දන්නවා ඇති, විපක්ෂයක ඉන්න විට කවදවත් රජයක් වර්ණනා කරන්නෙ නැහැ. විපක්ෂය ඉන්නේ එයට නොවෙයි කියන කල්පනාවයි තිබෙන්නෙ. ආණ්ඩුවක් පිහිටුවන්න බලාගෙන ඉන්න අය තිබෙන ආණ්ඩුව වර්ණනා කරයිද? එවැනි දෙයක් බලාපොරොත්තු වීමත් වැරදියි. එතකොට කොහොමද ඒ අය මේ පැත්තට එන්නේ? එය සාමාන්‍ය සිටින්නක්. ගරු කපානායකතුමානි, ඔය සෙල්ලම් දීර්ඝ කාලයක් කළා. කොහොමද මේ ප්‍රශ්න විසඳන්නෙ කියන ප්‍රශ්නයක් කීප විටක් ම අසා තිබෙනවා. ඒ හැම විටකම කිව්වේ “ අපට දීල බලන්නකො. අපි විසඳන්නම් ” කියලයි.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කපානායකතුමානි, මට එකක් කියන්න තිබෙනවා. මේ විවාදයේදී විශේෂ කාරණයක් ඇති වුණා. මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා කිව්වා, එතුමාට බොහොම අමාරු වැඩක් කරන්න සිදු වුණය කියා. ඒ වගේම අයවැය ලේඛනය ගැන කතා කළ අයත් කිව්වා, මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා බොහොම අමාරු වැඩක් කළාය කියා. ලෝකයේ පවතින ආර්ථික



තත්ත්වයේ බලපෑම් පදව තිබෙන නිසා මේ වගේ අය වැය ලේඛනයක් ඉදිරිපත් කිරීම ලෙහෙසි කාර්යයක් නොවන බව කවුරුත් පිළිගන්නා කාරණයක්. නමුත් ඒ අතර මේ කෙරුණ කතා කතාබහ ගැන කල්පනා කරන විට, විශේෂයෙන්ම මේ අයවැය ලේඛනය ගැනවිපක්ෂ යෙන් කෙරුණ කතා ගැන කල්පනා කර බලන විට, මට පෙනුණු දෙයක් තමයි, මෙම අයවැය ලේඛනය ඉදිරිපත් කිරීමටත් වඩා විපක්ෂයට එය විවේචනය කිරීම අමාරු දෙයක් වුණු බව. අපි ඒ බව දැක්කා. තමුත් නාන්සේට පෙනෙන්න ඇති, විරුද්ධ පක්ෂයේ ඇතැම් කපිකයින්. කතා කළේ මොන තරම් අමාරුවෙන්ද කියා. ඇයි එහෙම වුණේ? ඇයි මෙහෙම වුණේ?

තනිකර බනවාදී අයවැය ලේඛනයක් ඉදිරිපත් කිරීම මීට වඩා ලෙහෙසියි නේද කියා මම මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාගෙන් ඇහුවා. එතුමා කිව්වා ඉතාම ලෙහෙසියි කියා. තනිකර කොමියුනිස්ට්වාදී අයවැය ලේඛනයක් ඉදිරිපත් කිරීම ගැනත් ඇහුවා. ඊටත් වඩා ලෙහෙසියි කියලා එතුමා කිව්වා. මම ගිනත්තේ කලවාන මන්ත්‍රීතුමාත් (සරත් මුත්තෙට්ටුවේගම මහතා) එය පිළිගන්නවා ඇති. මුළු රටේම නිෂ්පාදනය, බෙදා හැරීම ආදී හැම දෙයක්ම රාජ්‍ය සන්තක කරලා, පෞද්ගලික අයිතිය සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම නැති කරලා, රටේ හැම කාර්යයකම වගකීම රජය අතට අරගෙන, රජය කියන හැටියට රටේ හැම මනුෂ්‍යයෙක්ම ක්‍රියා කරන විධියට දේශපාලන හා ආර්ථික වැඩපිළිවෙලක් සකස් කිරීම ඒ තරම් අමාරු නැහැ. හැබැයි එතුමන් ලා පිළිගන්නවා ඇති, එවැනි වැඩ පිළිවෙලක පක්ෂ දේශපාලනයට අවකාශයක් නැති බව. පක්ෂ දේශපාලනයට අවසරයක් නැහැ. ඒක කරන්න බැහැ. පාර්ලිමේන්තුව ඕනෑත් නැහැ. ඒක පාක්ෂික වැඩ පිළිවෙලක්. පාර්ලිමේන්තුවක් කියලා එකක් ඕනෑ නම් අපි ඔක්කොම කට්ටිය—එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ විධායක මණ්ඩලය වගේ, කොමියුනිස්ට් පක්ෂයේ මධ්‍යම කාරක සභාව වගේ එකම පක්ෂයක කට්ටිය—එතු වෙනවා. බොහොම ලෙහෙසි වැඩක්. කවුරු හරි ඒ පක්ෂයේම එක්කෙනෙක් ගයිගෙන් කැගැහුවොත්, විවේචනය කළොත් ඒ පුද්ගලයා පටවා යවන්නත් කොහේ හරි ප්‍රදේශයක් වෙන් කරනවා. එය බොහොම ලෙහෙසි වැඩක්. “මොකක්ද උඹලා මේ බටහිර රටවල් අල්ලා ගෙන කරන නාඩගම? මොකක්ද මේ හිඳිලුව?” කියලයි, එතුමාගේ කතාවේදී පුන පුනා ඇහුවේ. එතකොට කහරු හරි මේ පැත්තෙන් නැගිට ඇහුවොත් “මොකක්ද විසඳුම?” කියා “ඇයි විසඳුම දන්නේ නැද්ද?” කියනවා.

තනිකරම බනවාදී වැඩපිළිවෙලක් සකස් කිරීමත් ලෙහෙසියි. සුළු පිරිසක් අතේ බන නිධාන, නිෂ්පාදනය, බෙදා හැරීම තබා ගන්නවා, අතික් මිනිසුන්ට මොනවා වුණත් කමක් නැහැ. ඕනෑ නම් ඒකාධිපති පාලනයක් ගෙන යන්නත් පුළුවන්. එතැන ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදයක් නැහැ. එතැන විවිධ පක්ෂවලට ඉඩක් නැහැ. ප්‍රතිපාක්ෂික ප්‍රවාහනි පත්‍රවලට ඉඩක් නැහැ. එතන එක වර්ගයක පෙළපාලිවලට මිස අනික් පෙළපාලිවලට ඉඩක් නැහැ. එක වර්ගයක රැස්වීම් පමණයි. තනිකර බනවාදී හෝ තනිකර කොමියුනිස්ට්වාදී හෝ වැඩපිළිවෙලක් ඉදිරිපත් කරන එක මගේ ගිනේ කිසිම අමාරුවක් නැ. එහෙම නම් අමාරුව මොකක්ද? ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදී සමාජ

යක් පවත්වාගෙන යමින්, ප්‍රතිපාක්ෂික දේශපාලන පක්ෂවලට අවකාශ දෙමින්, විවේචනයට ඉඩකඩ දෙමින්, ස්ඵට්ඨන ඡන්ද බලය මහජනතාව අතේ තබමින්, ප්‍රායෝගික අයවැයක්—යථාර්ථයට අනුව ලෝක තත්ත්වයට මුහුණ දීමට පුළුවන් අයවැයක්—ඉදිරිපත් කිරීම තමයි, ඉතාමත්ම අමාරු. අන්න ඒකයි මේක අමාරු අයවැයක් කිව්වේ. අන්න ඒ නිසයි මම කිව්වේ, විවේචනයත් බොහොම අමාරුවෙන් කළාය කියා.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මම අහන්න කැමතියි, එක ප්‍රශ්නයක්. මේ ශ්‍රී ලංකාවේ අපට පුළුවන්ද අද තිබෙන ලෝක වාතාවරණය අනුව තනි රටක් හැටියට මුළු ලෝකයෙන්ම කැපිලා ජීවත් වෙන්න? අපේ රටේම නිෂ්පාදිත දේවලින් යැපෙමින්, අපේ රටේම ආහාර ලබා ගනිමින්, ඇදුම් පැළඳුම් ලබා ගනිමින්, හැම දෙයක්ම අප රට තුළටම සීමා කරගෙන අපට ජීවත් වෙන්න පුළුවන්ද කියන ප්‍රශ්නය ගැන අපි විකක් අවධානය යොමු කළොත් ලෝක බැංකුව, අයිඑම්එච් එක, ඒඩ්බ් එක ආදී ඔය එක එක ණය දෙන සංවිධානවල එකක්වත් අපට වුවමනා නැහැ. අතික මේ රුපියල ඩොලරයට හේත්තු කරන්න, රුපියල පවුමට හේත්තු කරන්න—ඒකත් වුවමනා නැහැ. අපි අපේ රුපියල්වලට රුපියල්ම හේත්තු කරගෙන, බලන්න කරල බලමු. කවිද මේ අහි යෝග්‍ය භාරගන්න ලැස්ති? ස්ඵට්ඨන ඡන්දයත් තිබෙන්නට ඕනෑ, මහජනතාවට. පක්ෂ දේශපාලනය තියෙන්නත් ඕනෑ. ඔක්කොම නිදහස් තියෙන්නත් ඕනෑ. මුළු ලෝකයෙන්ම වෙන් වෙලා අපි අපිම, අපේ රුපියල, රුපියලට හේත්තු කරගෙන, අපේ නිෂ්පාදන වලින්ම යැපෙමින්, අදිමින්, කමින්, බොමින් දැන කියා ගනිමින් ඉදිමු. පුළුවන්ද ඒක කරන්න? අපි අපෙන්ම ප්‍රශ්න කරමුකො. ඕක කාගෙන්වත් අහන්න ඕනෑ දෙයක් යැ? මොකක්ද අපේ හෘදය සාක්ෂිය දෙන උත්තරේ? ඒක කරන්න බැරි වැඩක්ය කියනඑකතේ?

ඉතින්, මේ මොකටද එක් එක් කෙනාට බණින්නේ? අයිඑම්එච්එච් එක අපේ පස්සෙන්, දුවගෙන ආවාද “ඒයි, ණය ගන්න. ණය ගන්න” කියාගෙන? ලෝක බැංකුව දුවගෙන අපේ පස්සෙන් ආවාද, “මේ අපේ සල්ලි ගොඩක් තියෙනවා, ගනිල්ලකො, ගනිල්ලකො මේ සල්ලි” කියාගෙන? නැහැ, එහෙම එකක් වුණේ නැහැ, ණය ගන්න අපි ගියා මිසක්. ඒ ගියෙන් එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ ආණ්ඩුවද? මුලින්ම ගියේ කවුද? කොහොමද යන්න සිද්ධ වුණේ? මම කියන්නම්, ආචාර්ය ඇන්. ඇම්. පෙරේරා මහතා කියා තිබෙනවා, මුලින්ම පටන් ගත්තේ කොහොමද කියා.

1956 දී මේ රට හාර දෙන කොට—ඔය 1956 සමාජවාදී මහා ප්‍රාතිහාර්යයේදී—මොන තත්ත්වයක්ද තිබුණේ? අපි අයිඑම්එච්එච් ගිය මිනිස්සුද? වර්ල්ඩ් බැන්ක් ගිය මිනිස්සුද? අර ඉඩම් ඇමතිතුමා ඊයේ කිව්වේ—මුළු ගල් ඔය ව්‍යාපාරයම තනිකර අපේ සල්ලිවලින් අපි ඇති කළේ. මොන සල්ලිද? අපට ඒ වෙලාවේ යන්ත්‍ර සූත්‍ර තිබුණේ නැහැ; කොන්ත්‍රාත්කාරයෝ හිටියෙන් නැහැ; පිට කොන්ත්‍රාත්කාරයන්ට අපි කොන්ත්‍රාත් දුන්නා; යන්ත්‍ර සූත්‍ර ගෙනාවා. ඒවා ගෙනාවේ මොන රේපරින් එක්ස්චේන්ජ් වලින්ද? අපේ රුපියල රේපරින් එක්ස්චේන්ජ් වලින්ද? අපේ රුපියල රේපරින් එක්ස්චේන්ජ් කරලයි, ගෙනාවේ. එවැනි තත්ත්වයක් තිබුණේ.



[ආර්. ප්‍රේමදාස මහතා]

ඇයි මතක නැද්ද නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, ෆිලික්ස් ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක, මුදල් ඇමති හැටියට වරක්, පාර්ලිමේන්තුවේදී කීව්වා, “මොනවාටද මේ ඒපාර්ට් එක්ස්චේන්ජ් පිට නියත්තේ? මම ඔක්කොම මොහොට ගේනවා” කියලා. ඒ තරම් විදේශ විනිමයක් අපි හම්බකර තිබුණා, ඒ වෙලාවේ. ඒ මුදල් ඇමතිවරයා එහෙම කීව්වා, මට මතකයි. මම නම් පාර්ලිමේන්තුවේ හිටියේ නැහැ. ඒ දවස්වල. එයා කීව්වා, “මගේ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය අපේ ඒපාර්ට් එක්ස්චේන්ජ් මොහොට ගේන එක; අපේ ඒපාර්ට් එක්ස්චේන්ජ් මොනවාටද එහෙ නියා තිබෙන්නේ?” කියලා. මේ අපි අපේ තේ, පොල්, රබර් ආදිය පිටරටට විකිණීමෙන් අපට එකතු වූ විදේශ මුදල් ප්‍රමාණය.

“ඒපාර්ට් එක්ස්චේන්ජ්” පිට නියත්තේ මොකටද මොහොට ගේනවා යයි කීව්වා. විදේශ විනිමය රැස් කළාටත් අපට දොස් කීව්වා. අපි අනෙක් අයගෙන් ඒපාර්ට් එක්ස්චේන්ජ් ගන්න යනවාය කියා දැන් අපට දොස් කියනවා. මේ උදවිය එකපාරටම ඉතිහාසය අමතක කරන්න හදනවා. 1956 න් පස්සේ ඇති වූණු විනාශය තමයි මේ. එක් මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක් කැහිටලා, උඹලා හරි මිනිස්සු, ණය ගන්නවා, දැන් ගෙවන්න බැහැයි කියනවා” ය කීව්වා. එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ ආණ්ඩුව විතරක් ගත් ණයද මේ? මොනවාද මේ ‘ඩෙවිස්’ කියන්නේ? 1956 ඉදලා නේද ‘ඩෙවිස්’ පටන් ගත්තේ? ඇවරිය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා මහතා, 1964 දී පලමු වැනි වරට මුදල් ඇමති වෙලා ඉදිරිපත් කළ අයවැය කතාව කියවලා බලන්න. කාලය ඉතුරු කර ගන්න ඕනෑ නිසා මම ඒවා කියවන්න ලැස්ති වන්නේ නැහැ. උත්තරාගේගේ විග්‍රහය කියවලා බලන්න.

එම්. ඩී. එච්. ජයවර්ධන මහතා මුදල් ඇමති හැටියට සිටි අවස්ථාවේදී සිදුවුණු දේවල් ඔක්කොම එහි විග්‍රහ කර තිබෙනවා. අන්තිමට ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයේ ස්ථාන ලී ද සොයිසා මහතා මුදල් ඇමති හැටියට පත් වීමෙන් පසු ඇතිවුණු තත්ත්වය එහි විස්තර කර තිබෙනවා. නුවරඑළිය-මස්කෙලියේ දෙවැනි මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (අනුර බණ්ඩාරනායක මහතා) දත් මෙහි ඇවිත් අපට අවවාද කරනවා, උඹලා ණය අරගෙන ගෙවන්න ලැස්ති කැතිවා වාගේය කියා. කවුද ණය ගත්තේ? ගත් ණය වලිකුත් මොනවාද කළේ? ඒවා ඔක්කොම එදිනෙදා වියදම්වලට, පාරිභෝජනයට පාවිච්චි කළා. ඒ ණය සංවර්ධනයට ආයෝජනය කළා නම් අද ඒවායේ ප්‍රතිඵල ලබන්නට තිබුණා.

අපි මේ ගන්න ණය පාරිභෝජනයට යොදවනවාය කියා අපට වෝදනා කරන්න විරුද්ධව පක්ෂයට ප්‍රථම වන්නේද? අපිත් ඒවා පාරිභෝජනයට යොදා එහෙම ක්‍රියා කළා නම්, ඊළඟට මේ උදවිය අපට මොනවාද කියන්නේ? “ඔ, උඹලා ජනතාවට ලාබේට බඩු දෙන්න මේ ණය පාරිභෝජනයට පාවිච්චි කරනවා, මොකක්ද මේ මුදල් ප්‍රතිපත්තිය” කියා ඒ අතිනුත් බණිනවා.

අපේ අයවැය දිහා බැලුවාම නමුත්තාත් සේට බොහෝ ම පැහැදිලිව මෙය ජේනවා. මම කියාගෙන ආවේ, අපට තනිවම ජීවත් වන්නට බැරි වාතාවරණයක් ඇති වී

තිබෙන බව පිළිගත යුතු බවයි. එහෙම පිළිගනිමින් අපි තේරුම් ගන්නට සිතා, මෙතන නිකම් ඒ වෙලාවට තර්කයක් ඉදිරිපත් කළාට පළක් නැති බව. මන්ද? ජනතාව අපට වඩා තේරුම්-බේරුම් ඇතිව සිටින නිසා, ජනතාවට මේවා ඔක්කෝම තේරෙනවා.

අපි රූපවාහිනිය මෙහි ඇති කරන්න යනවා යයි කියන විට අපට බැන්නා. අපට දන්නම් දොස් කියන්නේ නැහැ. නමුත් ඒ මාධ්‍යයෙන් විශාල ප්‍රයෝජනයක් අද අත්පත් වෙගෙන යනවා. මේ කරගෙන යන වැඩ මොනවාද, ලබා ගන්නා මුදල්වලින් මොනවාද කරන්නේ, අපේ ජීවන වියදම වැඩි වුණත් සංවර්ධනයක් ඇති වන නිසා, අපි පාරිභෝජනයට ගත් මුදල් අපට නැති වුණත් එය අපට වක්‍ර විධියට, වෙනත් ආකාරයකින්, අපේ දුරුවන්ට රැකිරීමේ ලාබේන ආකාරයෙන්, ගමේ-ගොඩේ සංවර්ධනයක් ඇති වන ආකාරයෙන්, අපේ වැඩ-අමුණු සකස් වී අපේ ජීවනෝපාය දියුණු වන ආකාරයෙන්, අප කාටත් ආදායමක් ලබා ගන්න පුළුවන් ආකාරයෙන්—කලින් පාරිභෝජනයට ගිය මුදල් මෙසේ වෙනත් ආකාරයෙන්—අපටම නේද මේ එන්නේ කියන එක ජනතාවට අවබෝධ වෙගෙන යනවා. නැත්නම්, අර ජනාධිපතිවරණයේදී, කපා දැමීම හැල් පොත් 70 ලක්ෂය ආයෙන් දෙනවාය, මෙන්න ඒකට සහතිකය, මෙන්න ඒ හැල් පොතේ ආකෘතියත්, 20 වෙනිදා පරද්ද වලා, 21 වෙනිදාට සමුපකාරයට එන්නය කියා කියද්දීත්, ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, ඉතිහාසයේ කවදා වත් කිසිම රජයකට නොදන්න සියයට 52 කට වැඩි ජයග්‍රහණයක් මේ රටේ ජනතාව ලබා දෙයිද? බඩු මිල වැඩි වන බව හොඳටම දැන දැන, හැල් පොත් 70 ලක්ෂයක් ඉවත් කර ගත් බව දැන දැන, අමාරු කම් තිබෙන බව දැන දැන, ලෝකයේ නොයෙක් ආයතනවලට ණයවී තිබෙන බව දැන දැන, අපයි එහෙම කළේ? එහෙම කළේ නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මේ රටේ ඇතැම් නායකයන්ට වඩා මේ රටේ ජනතාව බුද්ධිමත් නිසයි. ජනතාවට තේරෙනවා, ජනතාව ගුවන් විදුලියට ඇහුම්කන් දෙනවා. අපේ විවෘත ආර්ථික ප්‍රතිපත්තිය නිසා ගුවන් විදුලි යන්ත්‍ර සීමාවී නැහැ. වැඩි වැඩියෙන් ගුවන් විදුලි යන්ත්‍ර එනවා. ඒවා කරකවනවා. කරකවන්නේ නිදහස් වතුරුග්‍රයේ තිබෙන ලංකා ගුවන් විදුලි සංස්ථාවට පමණක් නොවෙයි, දැන්. ඉන්දියාවට කරකවනවා, එහි ප්‍රවෘත්ති අහනවා. ජංගලන්තයට කරකවනවා; එහි ප්‍රවෘත්ති අහනවා. යුරෝපයේ රටවල් වලට කරකවනවා. ඇමෙරිකාවට කරකවනවා. වෙනත් රටවල් වලට කරකවනවා. නිදහස් ගමන් ක්‍රමය නිසා පිටරටවලට ගිය හැනි මිත්‍රාදීන් ලියුම් ලියලා එවනවා, “අම්මේ අක්කෝ, නංගියෝ, අපේ රට දිව්‍ය ලෝකයක්. මෙහි ඇවිත් බලන්න ඕනෑ. පාන් රාත්තල මෙව්වරයි. සීනි රාත්තල මෙව්වරයි. මෙව්වර හම්බ කළත් මෙව්වර යනවා. අපේ රට ආසනාවක්. මම අවුරුදු දෙකක් කුතක් අමාරුවෙන් කියක් හරි හොයාගෙන එන්නටයි බලාපොරොත්තුව. ඉඩම් කැල්ලක් ගන්න බලා පල්ලා. ගෙයක් හදන්න බලපල්ලා. වෙළඳාමක් කරන්න බලපල්ලා. මම එනකොට ඔස් එකක් ගෙනෙන්නටයි බලාපොරොත්තුව. වැන් එකක් ගේන්නටයි බලාපොරොත්තුව, කියා.



1977 න් පසු ලංකාව ලෝකයට විවෘත වූවා. මොනවාද මේ ලෝකයේ වෙන්තේ කියලා ජනතාවට ඇහෙනවා, පෙනෙනවා, අපට කවදාවත් මෙය නතර කරන්නට පුළුවන් කමක් නැහැ. අතිසාරය පුළුවන්ද අමුඩයක් ගහල නතර කරන්න.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මේ රටේ ජනතාවට විශාල අවබෝධයක් ඇතිවේගෙන එන බව මා කියන්නට කැමතියි. එය වලක්වන්නට බැහැ. තමුන් නාන්සේලා මොනවාද කීවේ? 1970 දී දුන්න විදියට ආයෙමත් කන්නට බොන්ට දෙනවාය කීවා. මිනිස්සු මක්කොම බය වුනා. ලාබෙට දෙනවාය කීවා. ලාබෙට දෙන්න පුළුවන්. වුවමනා ප්‍රමාණය තැනි බව මිනිස්සු දන ගන්නා. නුවරඑළිය-මස්කෙලිය දෙවන මන්ත්‍රිතුමා (අනුර බණ්ඩාරනායක මහතා) මා කළ කථා කියව්වා. අද මානිපායි මන්ත්‍රිතුමාත් (වී. ධර්මලිංගම් මහතා) මා කළ කථා කියව්වා. මා කී දෙයක් මා කවදාවත් නැතෙයි කියන්නේ නැහැ. මා කී මිල ගණන් කියව්වා. මා නැතෙයි කියන්නේ නැහැ. ගරු නුවරඑළිය- මස්කෙලිය දෙවන මන්ත්‍රිතුමා වගේ මා දවසින් දවස වෙනස් වන්නේ නැහැ. මානිපායි මන්ත්‍රිතුමා කීවා, ගිය රජය කාලයේ මා බඩු මුට්ටුවල මිල ගණන් කියව්වා, කියා. ඇත්ත. තමුන් ගිය රජය කාලයේ තිබුණේ විවෘත ආර්ථිකයක් නොවන බව මතක තබා ගන්න.

It was not an open economy. It was a closed economy, a controlled economy. The Government had a responsibility to the people to give them things at the controlled prices.

අද එහෙම නොවෙයි. අද සැපයීමේ ප්‍රමාණය ඇතිවත් නේ ඉල්ලුමේ ප්‍රමාණය අනුවයි. Supply and Demand. අද තිබෙන තත්ත්වය එයයි. අද තිබෙන්නේ තරගකාරී ආර්ථිකයක්.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මා ළඟ තිබෙනවා මා කළ කතාවක කොටසක්. 1974 දී මම මිල ගණන් ගැන සඳහන් කරමින් කළ කථාවෙන් මේ ගැන බොහොම ප්‍රවේශයෙන් මඟහරින කොටස තමයි මම දුන් කියවන්නට අදහස් කරන්නේ. මොකක්ද මේ අය මඟ හරින්නේ? මම ඇහුවා ගිය රජයෙන්, තමුන් නාන්සේලා සමාජවාදී ආර්ථිකයක් ගොඩනගාගෙන කරන්නට පොරොන්දු වුණේ මොකක්ද කියල. විවෘත ආර්ථිකයක් නොවෙයි පාලිත ආර්ථිකයක් ඇති කර ගෙන මොකක්ද පොරොන්දු වුණේ? අඩුවෙන් හැම දෙයක්ම දෙන්න. තමුන් මොකක්ද වුණේ? මිල ගණන් වැඩිවුණා. කමක් නැහැ කියමු මිල ගණන් වඩි වුණාට. මම මොකක්ද කීවේ? 1965 න් 1970 න් අතර කාලයේ මේ විධියට මිල ගණන් වැඩි වනවිට මා පෙන් නුම් කළ කාරණය මෙයයි.

මා දැන් කියවන්නේ 1974 නොවැම්බර් 19 වැනිදා හැන්සාඩ් වාර්තාවෙන්. 1305 වන තීරුව. මම එද මෙසේ කීවිම :

“රාජ්‍ය සේවකයින්ට පඩිනඩි වැඩි කලා. රුපියල් ලක්ෂ 2,500 ක් වැඩි කලා. සංස්ථාවලත් පලාත් පාලන ආයතනවලත් සේවක යින්ගෙ පඩි වැඩි කෙරෙව්වා. අපි හදිසි නීතිය දමා සේවකයන්ට වැඩි පඩි දෙන්න කියා භාමිපුත්තට බල කලා. අපි අපි පිලි

ගන්නවා, ජීවන වියදම වැඩි වන විට ජනතාවගේ අතට ඊට බරො ත්තු දෙන්නට පුළුවන් තත්ත්වයක ආදායමක් ලබා දෙන්නට ඕනා කියන එක. තමුන් තමුන් නාන්සේලා කරල තිබෙන ප්‍රමාණය අර මධ්‍යම බැංකු වාර්තාවෙන් පේනවා.

එහෙමයි මම මේ මිල ගණන් ගැන කීවේ? තමුන් ඒ සංසන්දනය කරන්නට බැහැ මේ රජයේ ආර්ථික ප්‍රති පත්තිය අනුව. ගිය රජයේ ආර්ථික ප්‍රතිපත්තිය සම් ඊණයෙන්ම පාලනය කළ ආර්ථික ප්‍රතිපත්තියක්. එසේ නම් රජයේ වගකීම තමයි පාලනය කරන කොට හැම දෙයකම පාලනය අතේ තියා ගන්න එක.

අද මොකක්ද තත්ත්වය? අද විවෘත තරගකාරී තත්ත්වයක් තිබෙන්නේ. යම් නිෂ්පාදනයක් අඩුවෙන් නිෂ්පාදනය වන විට මිල ගණන් වැඩියි. වැඩි දෙනෙකු නිෂ්පාදනය කරන්නට පටන් ගත්තාම මිල ගණන් අඩුයි. අර වැඩි දෙනාට නිෂ්පාදනය කරන්නට එපාය කියල අපි තහනම් කරන්නෙන් නැහැ. නිෂ්පාදනය වැඩි වෙනවා. මිල ගණන් අඩු වෙනවා. ඉල්ලුම වැඩි වෙනවා. නිෂ්පාදනය වැඩි වෙනවා. ඒක තමයි තරගකාරී ආර්ථිකය. ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයත් අනික් පක්ෂත් අපේ ආර්ථික රටාව ඒ අයගේ ‘කොන්ට්‍රෝල්ඩ්’ ආර් ජික රටාවට හේත්තු කරල සංසන්දනය කරන්නට උත් සාහ කරනවා. ඒක ඒ උදවිය කරන බරපතල වරදක්.

බලන්න, අද කෙනෙකුට ජීවනෝපාය කර ගන්නට, මොන තරම් අවකාශයක් ඇති වී තිබෙනවාද මොන ආකාරයට අවකාශ ඇති වී තිබෙනවාද? පඩිනඩි වැඩි කිරීම අතින් බලන්න. To compensate for the increasing cost of living the Government has, from time to time, increased the cost of living allowance which they freezed. ජීවන වියදමට—‘කොස්ට් ඔෆ් ලිවිං’ එකට—අයිස් තිබිබා. වැඩි වෙන්න ඇරියෙනැහැ. ඒකට අයිස් තියල තද කරල තිබිබා.

In 1977 public servants were granted a salary increase of 25 per cent of their salary, subject to a maximum of Rs. 50. In 1978 their salaries were increased by 10 per cent of the consolidated salary with a minimum of Rs. 50. All public servants were exempted from paying income tax. In 1980 public servants were given a pay rise of Rs.70. They were paid monthly allowances based on the increase in the cost of living in 1980. In the current budget we have given Rs. 100.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, ඒ හැර මා කියන්නට කැමතියි අමතර ආදායම් මාර්ග ඇති කර ගන්නට කොයි තරම් අවකාශයක් දී තිබෙනවාද යන්න. මේ රජයේ සංවර්ධන වැඩ පිළිවෙළවල් නිසා නිෂ්පාදන වැඩ පිළිවෙළවල් නිසා යම් කෙනෙකුට මොනව හරි කරල කියක් හරි හම්බ කර ගන්නට අද උටපුරාම මොන තරම් අවකාශයක් ඇති වී තිබෙනවා දැයි මා තමුන් නාන් සේට විස්තර කරන්නට ඕනාද? මේ අය මිල ගණන් ගැන කථා කරනවා. ආදායම් ඇතිවීම සම්බන්ධයෙන් වචනයක්වත් කථා කරන්නේ නැහැ. මට හමුවුණු තොර තුරු අනුව අද ඉන්දියාවේ පාන් රාත්තලක් ලංකාවේ සැල්ලුවලින් රු. 3.90 යි; මාලේසියාවේ රු. 6.00 යි;



[ආර්. ප්‍රේමආස මහතා]

බුරුමයේ රු. 4.80 යි; ඉන්දුනීසියාවේ රු. 13.00 යි; ඒ කීවේ 'ග්‍රේඩ් වන්' පාත් රාත්තලක්. 'ග්‍රේඩ් ට්‍රි' රු. 6.50 යි. පකිස්ථානයේ පාත් රාත්තලක් 1/2 රු. 2.25 යි; යුනෝස්ලාවියාවේ ලංකාවේ සල්ලිවලින් රු. 12.90 යි; හංගේරියාවේ රු. 3.71 යි. යුනෝස්ලාවියාවේ පාරිචල් ශැලුමක් රු. 76.50 යි; හංගේරියාවේ රු. 45.00 යි; අපේ රටේ රු. 54.00 යි; ඉන්දියාවේ රු. 57.60 යි. යුනෝස්ලාවියාවේ හරක් මස් රාත්තලක් රු. 107.00 යි. ඒ මා හිතන්නේ හරක් මස් කැමෙන් වලක්වන්නට වෙන්න ඇති! හංගේරියාවේ හරක් මස් රාත්තලක් රු. 34.22 යි. මුළු ලෝකය පුරාම මේ මිල ගණන් වැඩි වී තිබෙනවා. එය තතර කරන්නට කාටවත් පුළුවන් වෙයි කියා මා හිත ක්තේ නැහැ.

අපි මේ මුළු ලෝකයේම තිබෙන සම්පත් ගැන කල් පතා කර බැලුවොත්, එක එක රටවල තිබෙන සම්පත් ඒ ඒ රටවලට අයිතිය කියා, කියන්නට පුළුවන්. නමුත් මුළු ලෝකයේම මනුෂ්‍ය පරම්පරාව ගැන කල්පනා කරන විට, ලෝක ජාතීන්ගේ යුතුකමක් තිබෙනවා, මේ සම්පත් තමන්ට අයිති වුනත් මනුෂ්‍ය වර්ගයාගේ විපත සදහා නොව යහපත පිණිස—සුපත පිණිස—පාවිච්චි කරන්න. විශේෂයෙන් ඉන්ධන සම්බන්ධයෙන් අද ඒ තත්ත්ව යට මුළු ලෝකයටම මුහුණ පාන්නට සිදු වී තිබෙනවා.

ඉන්ධන මිල ගැන අපි නොයෙක් විට කපා කරනවා විශේෂයෙන්ම අපි ඒ ගැන කපා කරන්නේ, ගමනා ගමනයට, ඒ වාගේම අපේ යන්ත්‍රවලට, ට්‍රැක්ටර්වලට ලොරිවලට බස්වලට අපි ඉන්ධන පාවිච්චි කරන නිසා. මුළු ලෝකයම මේ විධියට ඉන්ධන පාවිච්චි කරනවා නම් ඉන්ධනවල අර්බුදයක් ඇති වෙන්නේ නැහැ. වුවමනා ප්‍රමාණයට ඉන්ධන තිබෙනවා, ඉල්ලුමේ ප්‍රමාණයට අනුව ඉන්ධනවලට සාධාරණ මිල ගණන් ලැබෙනවා. නමුත් අද ලෝක මහ බලවතුන් යුධ අව තැනීමට, ඒවා නඩ ත්තු කිරීමට විශාල වශයෙන් ඉන්ධන පාවිච්චි කරන බව කවුරුත් පිළිගන්නවා. ඔවුන් එක අතකින් ඉන්ධන පාවිච්චි කරන අතර, අනික් අතින් තමන්ගේ සම්පත් යුධ අව ආයුධ නිෂ්පාදනයට, ඒවා රැස් කර ගැනීමට පාවිච්චි කරනවා. අද මුළු ලෝකයේම අවධානය යොමු වී තිබෙන්නේ මේ කාරණය සම්බන්ධයි. අපේ ජනාධි පතිතුමා නොබැඳි සමුළුවට ගොස් මේ කාරණයයි මතු කර පෙන්වීමට උත්සාහ කළේ. දියුණුවන ලෝකයේ රාජ්‍යයන් විසින් මහ බලවතුන්ගේ අවධානයට මේ අපරාධය යොමු කළොත් නරකද කියා එතුමා යෝජනා වක් ඉදිරිපත් කළා. ඒ අතර වාරයේ තමයි, එතුමා පෙන්වුම් කළේ ලෝක බැංකු වත්, ජාත්‍යන්තර මූල්‍ය අරමුදලත් නොයෙක් රටවලට ණය දෙනවා මේ ආයතන දෙක මේ ණය දෙන්නේ කොහොමද, කාගේ සල්ලි වලින්ද, මේ ආයතන දෙක ණය දෙන්නේ ලෝකයේ රටවල සල්ලිවලින් නොවේද කියා. ගරු කථානායක තුමනි, මේ ආයතන දෙකට මුදල් අහසින් පහළ වෙන්නේ නැහැ. ලෝක බැංකුවත්, ජාත්‍යන්තර මූල්‍ය අරමුදලත්, පිටස්තර කොහෙන්වත් මුදල් ගෙනෙනවා නොවෙයි. ඒ ආයතනවල තිබෙන්නේ ලෝකයේ ඒ ඒ රටවලින් ලැබෙන මුදල්. අපිත් ඒ වාගේ කොටස් කාරයෝ. අපේ කොටසත් ඒවාට දී තිබෙනවා. මුළු ලෝකයේම රටවල් එකට එකතු

වී සහභාගිත්වයෙන් තමයි, මේ ජාත්‍යන්තර මූල්‍ය අරමුදල කියන ආයතනයත්, ලෝක බැංකුව කියන ආයතනයත් ඇති කර තිබෙන්නේ. එතකොට, ලෝක බැංකුවෙහි උදවියට මුදල් දෙන මේ රටවල්—විශේෂයෙන් වැඩියෙන් මුදල් හදල් දෙන රටවල්—“ඔව්, උඹලා දෙන ණය සම්බන්ධයෙන් මෙන්ම මේ සහන ඇති කරපල්ලා, අපෙන් ඒකට විරුද්ධත්වයක් නැත” කියලා කිව්වොත්, ඒක ලොකු දෙයක්. ගරු ජනාධිපති තුමාත් උත්සාහ කරන්නේ මේ ගැන කරුණු කියලා ඒ රටවලට මෙම අවබෝධය ඇති කරන්නටයි. ඒක කියන්නට ඕනෑ කරන පිළිවෙලට එතුමා ඒක කිව්වා. ඕක අල්ලාගෙන අපේ කලවානෙ මත්තීතුමා (සරත් මුත්තේවි ටුවෙගම මහතා) මෙතනට ඇවිත් කියනවා, “ඔ! ජනාධි පතිතුමා ඉන්දියාවේදී මෙහෙම කියනවා, මුදල් ඇමති තුමා කොන්දේසි නැත කියනවා, නමුත් එතුමා කොන්දේසි තියෙනවාය කියනවා” කියා.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, ණය දෙන උදවිය කොන්දේසි දමනවා. අපේ බැංකු කොන්දේසි දමන්නේ නැද්ද? අහවල් කාර්තුවට මෙපමණ ගෙවන්න ඕනෑ. මෙන්ම මේ ආකාරයට කටයුතු කරන්න ඕනෑ කියන්නේ නැද්ද? එහෙම නැතිනම් ගමේ ගොඩේ මතු ඡායයක් කාට හරි ණයක් දෙන කොට ඒ වගේ කොන්දේසි දමන්නේ නැද්ද? බේබද්දෙකුට ණය දෙනවා නම් “මීට පස්සෙ බොන්නේ නැතුව හිටියොත් තමයි උඹට මම ණය දෙන්නේ; සුදු කෙළින්නේ නැතුව හිටියොත් තමයි ණය දෙන්නේ” කියා කොන්දේසි දමන්නේ නැද්ද? ඉතින් මොනවාද මෙතැන ඇවිත් මේ කරන කතා? අපිට හොදයි ඔය තතාවල්! ගමේ ගොඩේ ගිහින් කිව්වොත් ඕවා තුම්බුවකටවත් ඒ අය ගණන් ගන්නේ නැහැ, ඇයි, ඕවා ගිහින් කිව්වොත්? ජාත්‍යන්තර මූල්‍ය අරමුදල කියන්නේ, ලෝක බැංකුව කියන්නේ කොන්දේ ඉදලා ආපු රාස්සයෝ, පරාස්සයෝ කවිටියක්; සල්ලි මල්ලක් තියාගෙන, ෂයිලොක් වගේ, කරන වැඩක් කියලා පෙන්වන්න වැයම් කළා. ඉතින් ඕවා අහගෙන හිටි ගෝලයෝ, බාලයෝ, ‘බලනවකො, අයි. එම්. එෆ්. එකට, වර්ල්ඩ් බැනක් එකට අපේ රට විකුණලානෙ, අපේ රට සින්න කරලානෙ.’ කියනවා. ලෝක බැංකුවට අපේ රට විකුණනවාය කියන්නේ ඇයි? එහෙම නම් අපටම නේද අපේ රට විකුණලා තියෙන්නේ. අපත් ඒකේ ‘ෂෙයා හෝල්ඩර්ස්’ ලා නෙ. මොන වාද මේ කරන කතාව?

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා කිව්වා, “අපි ආධාර ලබා ගන්නවා; අද අපේ අයට වඩා වැය වැඩි වී තිබෙනවා; ඒ වැය වැඩි වී තිබෙන්නේ, සංවර්ධනය සදහා වියදම් කරන්නට සිදු වී තිබෙන නිසයි” කියලා. ආධාර ලබා ගන්නා විට ජාත්‍යන්තර මූල්‍ය අරමුදල අපෙන් අහනවා, ‘හොදයි මේ සල්ලි අරගෙන ගිහින් මහවැලි සංවර්ධනයට යොදන්නේ නැතුව, වෙනත් එකකට යොදවනවාද? විදුලි බල නිෂ්පාදනයට යොදවන්නේ නැතුව වෙන එකකට යොදවනවාද? එහෙම නැතිනම් පරිභෝජනය සදහා ගන්නවාද? කියා. ඉතින් ඒ වෙලාවට අපි කියන්න ඕනෑ, “නැහැ, එහෙම නොවෙයි; අපි මෙන්ම මේ දේවලට මෙපමණ මුදලක් යොදවනවා; එහෙම යෙදවීම, මහවැලි යෝජනා ක්‍රම



යෙන් ලැබෙන ජලයෙන් මෙපමණ නිෂ්පාදනයක් ඇති වූණම මෙපමණ මුදලක් ලැබෙනවා; එහෙම ලැබුණම මෙපමණ මුදලක් අපි ආපසු ගෙවන්නම්. විදුලි බල නිෂ්පාදනයෙන් මෙපමණ මුදලක් මෙපමණ කාලයකින් අපට ලබා ගන්න පුළුවනි” කියා, “එහෙම නම් හොඳයි, අපි සම්මුතියකට එමු. අසූවල් කාලයේදී මෙහෙම ගෙවන්න. මෙපමණ කාලයක් ණය නොගෙවා ඉන්න.” කියා ඒ අය කියන්න පුළුවනි. ඒ විධියට සම්මුතියක් ඇති කර ගන්නවා. ඒක ගැන මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා කිව්වේ, සාකච්ඡා කරගෙන යනවාය කියලයි.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, අපේ ගරු ජනාධිපතිතුමා කිව්වේ මොකක්ද? ජනාධිපතිතුමා ඒ වෙලාවේදී කතා කළේ ණය ගන්නා ශ්‍රී ලංකාව වෙනුවෙන් පමණක් නොවෙයි; ලෝකයේ ණය ගන්නා අනිකුත් සියල්ලම වෙනුවෙනුයි කතා කළේ. සමාජවාදී රටවලත් ණය ගන්නවා. කිප විටක්ම මේ සභාවේදී ඒ නම් ලැයිස්තුව කියවුණා. මම ළඟ තිබෙනවා ඒ ලැයිස්තුව. කලවානෙ මන්ත්‍රීතුමාට (සරත් මුත්තේවිට්ටේගම මහතා) ඕනෑ තරම් එතුමාට ඒක දෙන්න මට පුළුවනි. ඒ ඔක්කොම රටවල් වෙනුවෙන් කිව්වේ මොනවාද? ජාත්‍යන්තර මූල්‍ය අරමුදලෙන් නොයෙක් නොයෙක් කොන්දේසි දමනවාය, එතකොට අමාරුකම් ඇති වෙනවාය, ඒ කොන්දේසිවල වෙනසක් ඇති කරන්න බැරිද, ආදී වශයෙනුයි එතුමා කතා කළේ. ඉතින් ඕකට වෙනත් අර්ථ කථනයක් දෙන්නට, ඇතැම් අය මොන තරම් උත්සාහ කළාද? ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, යුතුකමක් තිබෙනවා, ඒ ප්‍රබල ජාතීන්ට ගිහිත් කියන්නට “තමන් තාන්සේලාට සම්පත් වැඩියෙන් තියෙනවා; රත් ආකර තිබෙනවා; තෙල් ආකර තිබෙනවා තමුන්තාන්සේලා අද ඒ ධනයෙන් විශාල කොටසක් යුද අවි සඳහා යොදවනවා, ඒ නිසා තෙල් මිලත් වැඩි වී තිබෙනවා, කරුණා කර ලෝකයේ අනෙක් රටවල් ගැනත් කල්පනා කර බලන්න, තෙල් මිල වැඩි වීම නිසා අපිට සිදු වී තිබෙනවා, “අයි. එම්. එස්” එයෙන් වැඩිපුර ණය ගන්න, නමුත් වැඩි-වැඩියෙන් අවි-ආයුධ නිෂ්පාදනය කිරීම නිසා තමුන් තාන්සේලා ඊට දෙන අරමුදල් ප්‍රමාණයත් අඩු කරනවා, කරුණා කර තව විකක් වැඩියෙන් ඒ අරමුදල් සඳහා වැය කරන්න, එවිට ඒ අරමුදල් වලින් අපට තව විකක් වැඩියෙන් උදව් ලබා ගන්න පුළුවනි.” කියා.

මය වගේ කාරණා තමයි, ජනාධිපතිතුමා ඉදිරිපත් කළේ. ඒ ගැන අද ලෝකයේ ලොකු සාකච්ඡාවක් පැවැත්වෙනවා. ඒකට කියනවා, ‘North-South Dialogue’ කියා. ඒ ගැන කරුණු සොයා බැලීම සඳහා වෙනම කමිටුවකුත් පත් කලා, බටහිර ජර්මනියේ ගිටපු නායකතුමාගේ—විලී බ්‍රාන්ඩ් මහතාගේ—ප්‍රධානත්වයෙන්. මේ කාරණය සම්බන්ධයෙන් වැදගත් වාර්තාවකුත් නිකුත් වී තිබෙනවා. ඒ වාර්තාවේ මේ සියල්ල කියා තිබෙනවා. ලෝකයේ අවි-ආයුධ නිෂ්පාදනය කරන්නේ මේ මහ ප්‍රබල ජාතීන් පමණක්ය කියා අප හිතනවා. නැහැ. මේ දියුණු වන ලෝකයේ, මේ නොබැඳුණු ලෝකයේ අයත් දැන් අවි-ආයුධ නිෂ්පාදනය කරන්නට පටන්ගෙන තිබෙනවා. ඒ වාර්තාව නිකුත් කළ විලී

බ්‍රාන්ඩ් කොමිෂන් සභාවේ සාමාජිකයෙක් හැටියට කට යුතු කළ පොදු රාජ්‍ය මණ්ඩලයේ මහ ලේකම් ශ්‍රීදත් රම්පාල් මහතා කළ ප්‍රකාශයක් මම කියවන්නම්:

අ. හ. 3.12

“The world spends one million U.S. dollars a minute on arms—a sum that will double by the turn of the century,” according to the Commonwealth Secretary-General Mr. Sridath Ramphal. The arms race is self-perpetuating as a momentum of its own, needs no reason to sustain it, he told a Disarmament Conference organized by the Canadian Council on International Corporation. He said about one hundred and ten dollars is spent on military weapons annually for each person on earth, compared with less than eight dollars per person on aid from rich to poor countries.”

Very revealing—

“He said that although about three-quarters of military spending is concentrated among the developed countries, spending increases in the Third World are ominous.”

The Third World also spends.

“As the disparities between the North and South widen in economic terms and in the quality of life, the South is working hard at catching up with military expenditure with not a little help from the North, he told the Conference yesterday.”

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, 75% ක් අවි-ආයුධ නිෂ්පාදනය කරන්නේ ධනවත් රටවලයි. නමුත් ඒ අතර, දියුණු වේගෙන එනවාය කියන නොබැඳි සමුළුවට අයිතිය කියන රටවලත් 25% ක් නිෂ්පාදනය කරනවා ධනවත් රටවල ආධාරයක් නැතිවම, ඒ ඊස් එකට දැන් ඒ හෙල්ලොත් බැහැලා.

Sir, taking the expenditure on armaments that is, three-quarters, or seventy-five per cent by the rich countries, a twenty-five per cent by the poor countries with four thousand million people living in the world, means for each person it comes to about Rs. 2,500 rupees per year, but the amount as aid to poor countries from the rich is Rs. 200 per year.

මේ සත්‍යය ගැන සාකච්ඡා කරන්නට ඕනෑ; කථා කරන්නට ඕනෑ. අපේ ජනාධිපතිතුමාත් අර විධියට කරුණු ඉදිරිපත් කළේ ඒ ගැනයි. මා හිතන්නේ නැහැ, කවුරුවත් එතුමාගේ ප්‍රකාශය වැරදිය කියාමිය කියා. ඒ කථාව භාසාසයට ලක් විය යුත්තක්ද, නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි?

මා කලින් කීවා වාගේ මේ අයවැය ලේඛනය සම්බන්ධයෙන් මට කියන්නට තිබෙන්නේ මෙයයි: මේ එක් වර්ෂයක මුදල් ඇස්තමේන්තු අරගෙන අපේ රජයේ වැඩ පිළිවෙළ සැලකිල්ලට ගන්න අමාරුයි. මම කිව්වා මගේ කථාව ආරම්භයේදීම, අපි මහජනයා ඉදිරියට ගොස් අමුතු මැතිවරණ ප්‍රකාශයක් නොකොට 1977 තේ පටන්ගත් වැඩ පිළිවෙළ අවසාන කරන්නට තව භය අවුරුද්දක් දෙන්නාය කියා, සිටියේ ඒ නිසයි කියා. එම නිසා මේ ඉදිරිපත් කළ ඇස්තමේන්තු මේ අය යෝජනා හා වැය යෝජනා දෙස බලා මේ රජයේ වැඩ පිළිවෙළ ගැන විශේෂ තීරණයක් ගන්නට කිසි කෙනෙකුට පුළුවන්කමක් නැහැ. මෙය මුළුමනින්ම ගන්නට ඕනෑ.



[ආර්. ප්‍රේමදාස මහතා]

මට මතකයි වරක් 1965 න් 1970 න් අතර අයවැය විවාදයකදී එදා පාර්ලිමේන්තුවේ සිටි ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා, කොල්විතා ආර්. ද සිල්වා මහතා, ඔක් වාරණායක මහත්මිය, පිටර් කෙනමත් මහතා ආදී ඔක්කොම මේවගේම ඒ අයවැය ලේඛනය විවේචනය කළා. එක එක්කෙනා වත්තිනායක මහත්මියගේ ඒ අයවැය ලේඛනයට අලුත් අලුත් නම් දැමීම. අයවැය ලේඛනය විග්‍රහ කරන්න පටන් ගත්තා; ප්‍රතිශාමීයි කිව්වා; ධනවාදීයි කිව්වා. නොයෙක් ආකාරයේ නම් දැමීම. ඉතින් ලොබියට ඇවිත් අපේ මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා අපිත් එක්ක කතා කර කර ඉන්නා විට කිව්වා "අයිසෙ, මට තේරේන්නේ නැහැ මේ මිනිස්සු මොන වා කියනවාද කියල; මම ඔය එකක්වත් හිතාගෙන නොවෙයි මේ අයවැය පිළියෙල කළේ; මම බැලූවා ආදා යම මෙපමණයි විසදුම් මෙපමණයි; මේක කරන්න පුළුවන් ක්‍රමයක් මම බැලූවා," කියා. එවිට මම කිව්වා "වන්නි, ගිහින් උත්තර දෙන විට කියන්න හරියට අන්ධයින් කීප දෙනෙක් අලියෙක් අනගාලා කිව්ව කතාව වගේ කතාවක්" කියා. එක බොහොම අසුරු වට කිව්වා, උත්තරාගේ, එක එක්කෙනා අලියගේ එක එක කොටස් අනගාලා ඒ අන්ධයෝ වික අලියා කියන්නේ මෙන් මේ වගේ කෙනෙක්ය ජයන්න පටන් ගත්තා. හොච්චල අල්ලා ගත් අන්ධයා කිව්වද අලියා හරියට මෝල් ගහක් වගේය කියා. කැලල බදාගත් අන්ධයා කිව්වලු වංගෙඩියක් වගෙයි කියා. වලිගය අසු වූ අන්ධයා කිව්වලු අලියා කොස්සක් වගෙයි කියා. ඉතින් එතුමා කිව්වා, ඔය වගේ එක එක අංශ අල්ලා ගත් අය එක එක කියන්න පටන් ගත්තාය; මටත් අන්න ඒ වගේය මේ විවේචන තේරේන්නේ කියා. මේ විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයේ උදවිය කළ කතාවල් අයා ගෙන සිටි විට මටත් මේ අයවැය සම්බන්ධයෙන් කියන්නට තිබෙන්නේ ඒ වගේ කතාවක්. මේක හරි ගොඵවා දැක්ක හිතය වගෙයි. ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, ගොඵවෙක් හිතයක් දැකලා තිබෙනවා. නමුත් මිනිහට ඒක කියා ගන්න බැහැ. ඇයි, ගොඵවනේ. ගොඵවා හිතයක් දැක්කම කොහොමද ඒක විස්තර කරන්නේ? මේ අයවැය ලේඛනය විවේචනය කරන අයක් අන්න ඒ අමාරුවට පත් වුණා කියා මට කියන්න පුළුවන්, මෙහි දී කෙරුණු සමහර කතාවල් දෙස බලන විට. අවුරුදු 40ක් තිස්සේ කී සටන් පාඨමයි, අද මෙතනදිත් කිව්වේ. ඒ හැර වෙන දෙයක් කිව්වා කියා මම හිතන්නේ නැහැ. ඉන් විටස්තරව පරිපාලනය සම්බන්ධයෙන් යම් යම් අදහස් කීපයක් විපක්ෂයේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්ගෙන් පළ වුණා. මම මුලින්ම කිව්වා, ඒවා ගැන අපේ අවධානය යොමු කෙරෙනවා කියා.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මේ අයවැය ඒ තරම් සාරයක් නැහැ, පෙනුමක් නැහැ, ආදී වශයෙන් කියනවා. ඉතින් ඔක පාට කරන්න පෙනුම කරන්න අයවැයට සායම් විකක් දමන්නට ඉස්සර උත්සාහ කරලා වෙච්ච දේවල් තමුන්නාන්සේ දන්නවා. "සීමෝනිටියන්සන්" ගෙනාවා. "සිලින්ග් ඔන් ඉන් කම්" කියා එකක් ගෙනාවා. "සිලින්ග් ඔන් හවු සින්" කියා එකක් ගෙනාවා. "සිලින්ග් ඔන් ලන් ඩ්ව්" කියා එකක් ගෙනාවා, "පික්ස්" කියා එකක්

ගෙනාවා. ඔය ආදී වශයෙන් නොයෙක් දේවල්, නොයෙක් පාට, ගෙනාවිත් මේකට දැමීම. නමුත් ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මම හිතන්නේ නැහැ, ඔය එකකින්වත් මේ ප්‍රශ්නයට විසඳුමක් ලැබෙයි කියා, අපි ප්‍රායෝගිකව කල්පනා කළේ නැත්නම්.

තමුන්නාන්සේ, දන්නවා, අපට තිබෙන මූලික ප්‍රශ්නය. අපට අවශ්‍ය විදේශ විනිමය සොයා ගන්න ඕනා. රටට වුවමනා කරන ගොවිතැනට ඕනා කරන වාරි මාර්ග ඇති කර ගන්න ඕනා, කර්මාන්තවලට ඕනා විදුලි බලය ඇති කර ගන්න ඕනා, රක්ෂාවල් වැඩි වන ක්‍රම ඇති කර ගන්න ඕනා, මිනිසුන්ගේ ජීවන තත්වය උසස් කරන්නට. වැඩිවන ජීවන වියදමට මුහුණ දෙන්න පුළුවන් විධියට අපේ මිනිසුන් ශක්තිමත් කරන්න ඕනා. මෙන් ම මේවායි, අපේ වැඩ පිළිවෙලේ තිබෙන පරමාර්ථ. අමුතු සායමක්, අමුතු පාටක්, අමුතු වර්ණයක් මේකට දාන්න අපට වුවමනාවක් නැහැ. මෙන් ම මේ බලාපොරොත්තු ඉෂ්ට කරගැනීමයි අපට ඕනා. අපි ඒක අද කියන එකක් නොවෙයි, ඊයේ කියපු එකක් නොවෙයි, විරුද්ධ පක්ෂයේ ඉන්න අවස්ථාවෙන් කියපු එකක්. මම ඒකට බහින්නම්, තව ස්වල්ප වේලාවකින්.

නල්ලුර් ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමායි, (එම්. සිවයිතම්පරම් මහතා) මෙම අයවැය විවාදය ආරම්භ කෙලේ, අමාරු අය වැයක් ගැන කථා කිරීමත් අමාරු වැඩක්. නමුත්, එතුමා විශේෂයෙන් තීරණයෙන් තිසාත් ඒ වගේම එතුමා පළපුරුදු ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක් නිසාත්, ඒ අමාරු කටයුත්ත එතුමා අමාරුවක් නොපෙන්වා කළාය කියා මට කියන්න පුළුවන්. හැබැයි, එතුමා ඒකට හොඳ වචනයක් පාවිච්චි කළා. ඒ මොකක්ද? මේ අය වැයෙන් 'වික දෙනෙකුට සැප; හුණ දෙනෙකුට දුක' කියා. I hope I am quoting you correctly. "වික දෙනෙකුට සැප, හුණ දෙනෙකුට දුක." නල්ලුර් ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා දන්නවා, ඔය සටන් පාඨය, අද ඊයේ එකක් නොවන බව. It is an old slogan. It started with the Marxist leaders in the country. They always said that the vast mass of the people was suffering and a few people were enjoying. All right-

මම අහන්න කැමතියි, බැරි වෙලාවත් නල්ලුර් ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා මේ රටේ මුදල් ඇමති වුණොත්—එතෙම වේවා කියා අපි ප්‍රාර්ථනා කරනවා; වෙන් න අවකාශ තිබෙනවා; වෙන් න ඕනා. ඒක අමාරු වැඩක් කියා මම හිතන්නේ නැහැ, තමන්ම අමාරුකම් ඇති කර ගත්තොත් මිසක්; එතුමාගේ දක්ෂ පක්ෂ කම් ගැන කල්පනා කළාම මුදල් ඇමති ධුරයට නොවෙයි අගමැති ධුරයට වුණත්, මේ රටේ ජනාධිපති වෙන් න වුණත් එතුමාට පුළුවන්; හැබැයි, ජනතාවගේ කැමැත්තෙන්, ඡන්දයෙන්—ඒ වෙච්ච දාට මොන විධියේ අය වැයක් එතුමා ඉදිරිපත් කරනවාද කියා. එතකොට විරුද්ධ පක්ෂය මොනවා කියයිද? මෙන් ම මේක තමයි, ප්‍රශ්නය.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මම කියන්න කැමතියි, මේ අමාරුවට වැටුණ බව අපේ හිටපු මුදල් ඇමතිවරයෙක් කවුද? අවුරුදු විසි තිස් ගණනක් ඔය සටන් පාඨය



කියල කියල—මොකක්ද සටන් පාදය? 'වික දෙනෙකුට සෑප හුඟ දෙනෙකුට දුක'—මම දන්නේ නැහැ මොක කරමෙටද කියල, එයා මුදල් ඇමති වුණා. කවුද? ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා මහතා. බැරි වෙලාවත් නල්ලුරි ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා මුදල් ඇමති වුණොත් උන්තාගේ ඉදිරිපත් කරන අය වැය වාර්තාවෙන් මෙන් මේ වගන්තිය ඇතුල් වන බව මට ස්ථිරවම කියන්න පුළුවන්. මෙන්න මේක ලියා ගන්න :

"No doubt I would be taunted by copious extracts from my past speeches. This would be legitimate. I would expect my own arguments to be flung across at me to disprove the propositions I now advance. That would be part of the game of politics "

I am sure you will include that phrase in your first Budget speech. I wish that one day you would become the Finance Minister of this country so that I may hear these sentiments being expressed by you. Do you want to know who said that ?

**එම් සිවසිතම්පරම් මහතා (නල්ලුරි)**  
(කි.රු. எம். சிவசிதம்பரம்—நல்லூர்)  
**(Mr. M. Sivasithamparam—Nallur )**  
Dr. N. M. Perera.

**ආර්. ප්‍රේමදාස මහතා**  
(කි.රු. ஆர். பிரேமதாச)  
**(Mr. R. Premadasa)**

So, you know all these things. One day, when you have the Eelam government and you become the Minister of Finance you will have to say the same thing—

"No doubt I would be taunted by copious extracts from my past speeches. This would be legitimate. I would expect my own arguments to be flung across at me to disprove the propositions I now advance. That would be part of the game of politics."

That was from page 1 of Dr. N. M. Perera's Budget Speech of 1964/65. Here is another very interesting passage that the hon. Member for Nallur might include in his Budget speech. It is very important to record these things.

"All my life I have fought to ease the burdens of the poor and the humble, I am now the instrument not of easing but of heaping additional burdens on them. Even with a very heavy heart I have to act with a vision of the future".

You are definitely going to say that ! It is at column 66 of Dr. N. M. Perera's budget speech of 1971/72.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා මහත්මයා මොකක්ද කිව්වේ ?

"මා මගේ මුළු ජීවිතයම කැප කළේ දුප්පතුන් හා අශීඝකයන් ගේ බර සැඟලිලු කරනු සඳහායි. එහෙත් අද මා ඒ බර අඩු කරනු වෙනුවට තවමත් බර පවතින ආයුධයක් බවට පත් වී ඇත. පොළීන් බර හඳවනකින් යුතුව වුවද සැපෙන් පිරුණු අනාගතයක් පහා කටයුතු කරන්නට මට සිදු වේ."

සැලකුවේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා මුදල් ඇමති වුණත් මේ වගන්ති දෙක කියන්නට වෙනවා.

**මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්**  
(அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)  
**(A Member)**

පාර්ලිමේන්තුවක් නැහැ.

**ආර්. ප්‍රේමදාස මහතා**  
(කි.රු. ஆர். பிரேமதாச)  
**(Mr. R. Premadasa)**

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මම කියාගෙන ආවේ, මේ පවත්වන ලද මැතිවරණ දෙකේදීම මහජනතාව කල්පනා කරපු ආකාරයයි. ජනාධිපතිවරණය අවසන් වුණු හැටියේම නුවරඑළිය-මස්කෙළිය දෙවන ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාගේ (අනුර බණ්ඩාරනායක මහතා) කට්ත් පිට වුණා, යමක්. 'පිරිසිදු' පත්තරයේ ඒක පළ වුණා. ඔය ප්‍රකාශය දැන් එතුමාට හරිම හිසදරයක් වෙලා තිබෙන්නේ, මෙන්න එම ප්‍රකාශය :

'වැඩි මුදලක් දී හෝ දැන් වෙළඳ පොළෙන් ඕනෑ තරම් බඩ ගන්න තිබෙනවා. ඕනෑ ඕනෑ වර්ගයේ බඩ ගන්න තිබෙනවා. වැඩි මුදලක් දී හෝ කලට වෙලාවට තමන්ගේ ගමන බිමන යැමට බස් රථ තිබෙනවා. කිසිම දෙයකට පෝලිමේ ඉන්න ඕනෑකමක් නැහැ. පෝලිමේ සිටින ආර්ථික ක්‍රමයට මහජනතාව කැමති නැති බව ජනපතිවරණයේදී පෙනුණා."

මව්වරයි. මහජනතාව කල්පනා කළේ මය විධියටයි. නමුත් ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මේ විවේචන වලදී මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා මේ මුදල් වෙන් කිරීම ගැන ඉදිරිපත් කළ කරුණු සැලකිල්ලට ගත්තාය කියා මම හිතන්නේ නැහැ. මේක දිහා ඔය රුපියල් දස ලක්ෂ ගණන්වලින්, කෝටි ගණන්වලින් බලන්නේ නැතිව ඉලක්කම් හැටියට ගත්තොත් මේක තේරුම් ගන්න බොහෝම පහසුයි. මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා ආදායම සහ වියදම පිළිබඳව කියනවා. පුනරාවර්තන වියදම - Recurrent Expenditure- කෝටි දෙදහස් පන්සියයයි. We have a recurrent expenditure of Rs. 25 billion.

දැන් ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, අපි කල්පනා කරමු. මේ ඉලක්කම් සාමන්‍ය ඉලක්කම්වලින් බලන්න, කෝටි ගණන්වලින් නොවෙයි. අපේ සාමාන්‍ය ආදායම තාක්සේරු කර බලනවිට එක්තරා අඩුවක්—කෝටි දෙදහස් පන්සියයක අඩුවක්—තිබෙන බව එතුමාට පෙනුණා. මේ 1983 වර්ෂයේ වියදම සඳහායි. එමනිසා එතුමා බදු පනවා ඒ කෝටි දෙදහස් පන්සියය සම්පූර්ණ කළා. ඒ කියන්නේ ආදායම කෝටි දෙදහස් පන්සියයට ගෙනාවා.

Our revenue for 1983 with the Finance Minister's new tax measures is also just around Rs. 25 billion. Without the taxation proposals. It would have been about, Rs. 21 billion. So, that means we have to find Rs. 4 billion to meet the current expenditure. ආදායම සහ වියදම, වියදමට සරිලන ආදායමක් නොයන්න වෙනවා. Without the revenue from the taxation proposals, it would not have been possible to bridge the gap between



[ආර්. ප්‍රෝදාය මහතා]

total revenue and recurrent expenditure. That means we would not have been able even to keep the administration going.

අපේ පාලනය ගෙන යන්න, පඩි නඩි ගෙවන්න බෙහෙවින් අමාරු වෙනවා.

If our revenue without the taxation proposals is 21, then we would have to cut down our recurrent expenditure.

කෝටි 2,500 ක් කර ගන්න, අර කෝටි 400 සොයා ගන්නේ නැත්නම් දැනට කරගෙන යන වැඩ පිලිවෙල කපා ගන්න සිදු වෙනවා.

What the Budget does by the taxation proposals is to bring in four billion rupees.

දැනට ඇති වියදමට මුහුණ පාන්නට නම්, කෝටි 2,100 ආදායම, කෝටි 2,500 ක් කරගන්නට නම්, තව කෝටි 400 ක් සොයා ගන්න ඕනෑ. මේ ප්‍රමාණය එතුමා සොයා ගන්නේ කොහොමද?

The Business Turnover tax on trade will bring in Rs. 500 million; on manufactures will bring in Rs. 750 million. B.T.T. on imports will bring in almost Rs. 1,200 million. The increase in import duties will bring in the Rs. 775 million. The other revenue increases like increased duties on things like drink and smoke will bring in Rs. 500 million. This makes a total of almost Rs. 4,000 million.

පුනරාවර්තන වියදම සඳහා ඔය විධියට කෝටි 400 ක් එකතු කර ගන්න ඕන. ආදායම වශයෙන් තිබෙන්නේ කෝටි 2,100 යි. වියදම කෝටි 2,500 යි. තව කෝටි 400 ක් සොයා ගත යුතුව තිබුණා. ඒ කෝටි 400 සොයා ගන්නෙ මේ ආකාරයට.

So, the recurrent expenditure is taken care of by the revenue. But we cannot stand still. No country can stand still. We have to move forward, because we have to build today for the future. We have to build for our children and for the coming generation, so that they too can live as well as we are living today. So there has to be capital expenditure. The amount spent on what we are building for the future would be almost as large as what we are spending on recurrent expenditure. I think there are only a few countries in the world that do so. We are going to spend Rs. 24 billion on future development. Though the Finance Minister says he is not undertaking any new projects, let us not forget that he has to invest; he has to find Rs. 24 billion for capital expenditure. That will generate employment income for the people, benefits for the people.

Let us see how this Rs. 24 billion is made up. What are we going to spend this sum on? Is it for those things which are necessary for the future, or for those that are not? Is it wasteful? Is it unnecessary? Is it, for example on armaments, which I shall refer to later on when I discuss that aspect. Let us look at the major areas in which we are going to invest this Rs. 24 billion. Is it wasteful expenditure as some Members tried to make out? One is development of land; that

is, colonization schemes, minor irrigation, Kirindioya, Inginimitiya, etc. We are going to invest Rs. 1,000 million, that is Rs. 1 billion, in power-and energy, hydro-power works, etc; another Rs. 1,000 million, that is Rs. 1 billion. On providing water supply and housing; Rs. 2,400 million, that is Rs. 2.4 billion on the Mahaweli development; Rs. 7,000 million, that is Rs. 7 billion, on improvements to coastal and telecommunication facilities; almost Rs. 600 million on health, development of hospitals and things like that; Rs. 800 million on our plantation development. We also have to make provision in a big sum of Rs. 6,500 million for the settlement of past debts. These are not only the debts that we have got. When we take over a Government we take the responsibility for the past debts also. So we have to make provision for those too. Much of that has been debts incurred by our Friends in the Opposition many years ago. We have to repay the loans we borrowed. All this adds up to Rs. 24 billion. That is capital expenditure. Is this not necessary expenditure? Some countries spend a great deal on defence. Let us see how much we spend on defence. I will give you the figures. In the whole Ministry of Defence, the capital expenditure is about Rs. 580 million but Rs. 300 million of this is for the Katunayake Airport development. The actual capital expenditure on defence including the Army, Navy and Air Force and the Police is about Rs. 250 million. What is the percentage on the capital budget? Just around 1 per cent.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මම මේ පෙන්නුවෙ මේකයි: වියදමට 25 ක් අවශ්‍යයි. තියෙන්නේ 21 යි. 4 ක් සොයා ගන්නා බවටලිත්. නමුත් 24 ක් අපි යොදවන්න යන්නේ කුමක් සඳහාද? ආර්ථිකයේ වෙගවත් වැඩිදියුණුවක් ඇති කරන්න. මොකක්ද මේ ආර්ථිකයේ වෙගවත් වැඩිදියුණුව? මේ රට සංවර්ධනය කරන්න. ඒ සංවර්ධනය මගින් රටේ දුගී ප්‍රජාවක්ම, නැති බැරිකම නැතිකරන්න. මෙන්න මේක අපි තේරුම් ගන්න ඕනෑ. නිකම් ඇවිල්ල මෙතැන කතා කළාට මදි. මේ ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙන ඇස්තමේන්තු ගැන විශේෂ විග්‍රහයක් තම තමන් ඇතිකර ගන්න ඕනෑ.

Now Sir, I would like to answer the hon. Member for Attanagalla. When he spoke he made some incorrect statements. He referred to the President having made a statement at the Non-Aligned Meeting criticising the IMF and the World Bank. He went on to say that His Excellency had only made that statement when he discovered that India had been granted a massive loan by the IMF without any conditions while Sri Lanka had been given a small loan with many conditions. Sir, he is not here. It is a very serious statement to make. What he has said displays a lack of knowledge both of what the IMF and the World Bank stand for and the actual position with regard to India's relationship with the IMF. The President only



explained the plight of the developing countries, as I said earlier. He did not criticise anyone. First let me make a broad distinction between what the IMF does and what the World Bank does. As most of us know, the World Bank assists by supporting either projects or programmes with loans on very easy repayment terms. That is what the World Bank does. These loans are usually payable over 50 years with a grace period of five to ten years and with virtually no interest. That is why they are called soft loans.

I want to ask the hon. Member for Kalawana whether there is any other international lending institution or, for that matter, any country that will help us in that way. He was criticising us for going to the World Bank. Let him tell us, what is the other institution that we should go to ? I have explained how the World Bank helps projects and programmes with loans. They are called "soft loans" because these loans are usually payable over 50 years with a grace period of five to ten years and with virtually no interest.

අපට උදව් කරන නොයෙක් රටවල් තිබෙනවා; මම නැතැයි කියන්නේ නැහැ. අපි ඒ රටවලත් ස්තුති කරනවා. නමුත් සමහර රටවල් ඒ රටවල පාවිච්චි කළ පරණ වුණු මැෂින් එහෙමත්—යන්ත්‍ර සූත්‍රත්—අපට දීලා තිබෙනවා. මා හිතන්නේ මේ පුනරාවර්තන වියදමෙන් සැහෙන ප්‍රමාණයක් යනවා, ඒ යන්ත්‍ර සූත්‍ර නඩත්තු කරන්න. මගේ හිතේ මේ කර්මාන්ත ඇමතිතුමාට අද දරන්න වෙලා තිබෙන ලොකුම බරක් ඒක. ඔය සමහර රටවල දිරපත්වුණු කසිකබල් යන්ත්‍ර ගෙවල්ලා දීලා ගියා, එදා ආණ්ඩුවට. අපි ඒ දයාද ලබාගෙන දැන් ලොකු අමාරුවකට පත් වෙලා. ඒවාටත් මේ මේ සල්ලි හොයන්න වුණා. මම කැමති නැහැ ඒවා ගැන විවේචන ගියා, එදා ආණ්ඩුවට. අපි ඒ දයාද ලබාගෙන දැන් වුණේ ඒ අමාරුකම්වලින් බේරෙන්නයි. සමහර මැෂින් වලට මගේ හිතේ දැන් අමතර කොටස් ගන්නත් බැහැ. ඒ නිසා මහා විශාල කරදරයකටයි, මුහුණ පා තිබෙන්නේ. බටහිර රටවල් පුළුවන් තරම් විවේචනය කරනවා. නමුත් ඔය අංශය ගැන ටිකක් කල්පනා කරන්නේ නැහැ.

Sri Lanka continues to receive large quantities of World Bank assistance in this form, and we are grateful to the World Bank. Of course, like any other bank, the World Bank monitors the release of funds for the project after it has been approved and there are frequent project evaluations and appraisals. That is very necessary. As I said, we are partners in the World Bank. If the World Bank gives some money to a country for a particular project we also will insist on the World Bank monitoring it. That is very essential.

The IMF is concerned mainly with balance of payments support. That function is quite different from the functions of the World Bank. It is well known that most developing are faced with serious balance of

payments problems. This has been caused by the worsening terms of trade against these countries and the escalation of the cost of oil particularly. What the IMF does is to assist by giving balance of payments support in the way of foreign exchange, in the form of SDRs (Special Drawing Rights). Of course, there are conditions imposed by the IMF when it provides these facilities. I explained these in detail. Sometimes they feel that the countries themselves should remedy the situation by varying their exchange rates. If it is overvalued, they suggest devaluation. Many developing countries which are caught up in this situation protest against the conditions attached by the IMF to their foreign exchange loans.

India is no exception to this, although the hon. Member for Attanagalla (Mr. Lakshman Jayakody) seems to think so. In the "Illustrated Weekly of India" of January 23-29, 1983, there is an article by Ashok Mehta called "the Debt trap". I have brought it here to give the hon. Member a chance of reading it and becoming more knowledgeable of these things, though he professes to know everything on earth. The article refers specially to the "conditionality" attached to the IMF loan of Rs. 5,000 crores to India. I would suggest that the hon. Member reads this article.

The IMF conditions prescribe the liberalization of import controls. Is that not a condition ? Why are you not charging India with agreeing to these conditions ? There is no other alternative. India is now trying to devise means for curtailing imports. the article also refers to the fact that the IMF loans have a condition about the ceiling on credit, and that since the ceiling has been breached the IMF may not consider any further line of credit to India This is in an article that is published in an Indian magazine. Indian Economists have themselves said that : (a) the loan given in 1981 carried conditions derogatory to their economic sovereignty : (b) the loan was not necessary because they could have found the foreign exchange themselves : (c) that the consequence of the loan would be India's sliding into a "debt trap" from which one could only escape by going to foreign private commercial banks.

The hon. Member for Attanagalla's statement is wide off the mark as usual, Sir.—(Interruption.) I have all the details in regard to this loan.

Sir, I want to pose this question to the hon. Member for Kalawana (Mr. Sarath Muttetuwegama). Did he not support the proposal to take accommodation from the IMF and the World Bank when he was a member of the last Government ? Please answer that question. Was he not a party to that decision ? Why this hypocrisy ?



මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙකි

(அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(A Member)

He will not answer. He is silent.

ආර්. ප්‍රේමදාස මහතා

(திரு. ஆர். பிரேமதாச)

(Mr. R. Premadasa)

They come here and blame this government for taking assistance from the IMF and the World Bank. I know he will say, "Do not take loans on conditions". He might say it now. But what happened during their time? I have the letter of intent signed by Dr. N. M. Perera. Do you want me to read this? The letter of intent is here, signed by Dr. N. M. Perera. Page 10, "Stand-by Arrangement". You will notice that Dr. N. M. Perera and the Governor of the Central Bank have in their letter to Mr. Schweitzer set out what they would be doing. Paragraph 1 of the Stand-by Arrangement reads thus—

"Annexed hereto is a letter dated February 8, 1971, from the Minister of Finance of Ceylon and the Governor of the Central Bank of Ceylon transmitting a statement setting forth the objectives and policies which the authorities of Ceylon will pursue".

You will notice, Sir, that the proposals of Dr. N. M. Perera are in line with the conditions laid down by the IMF to earlier Governments of Sri Lanka. Exactly the same. They were, even at that time, blaming the UNP Government. I will read one or two conditions. Page 8, paragraph 6.

"...we intend to take steps during the next few months to increase the operating earnings of the Ceylon Transport Board and the Ceylon Government Railways, both of which have been incurring heavy losses. The Government Corporations sector would be required to make an additional contribution of Ceylon Rs. 45 million to government revenues in the financial year 1970-71 over and above the normal taxes and levies to which they are liable".

What does that mean? The corporations in turn will go and increase their prices when the C.T.B. and the C.G.R. put up their fares. They come here and talk about increased C.T.B. and railway fares. Did he not contribute to that exercise? I am asking this pointed question from the hon. Member for Kalawana. Let him get up on the Floor of this House and say 'I was not a party to it'. His party as represented by a powerful Minister. Now he comes and tells the Minister of Finance, 'Why are you agreeing to these loans given by imperial agencies?' What is this imperial agency? You were also partners of that agency.

Then, in page 8, paragraph 7:

"We have raised the interest rates on government securities of 10-12 year maturity from 6 1/2 per cent to 9 per cent and doubled the interest rate on the deposits in the Post Office Savings Bank to 7.2 per cent."

Then, page 8, paragraph 9:

"... we have had to further tighten import restrictions".

These are the conditions.

Then, page 9, paragraph 11:

"... we moved imports of sugar, maize and imports of the Sugar Corporation and the Ceylon Transport and Electricity Board from the par value to the certificate market".

What does it mean? Change of rate.

Page 9, paragraph 12:

"We have carefully reviewed the appropriateness of the present effective exchange rate in the certificate market in the light of our difficult balance of payments position and other considerations. This rate is now Ceylon Rs. 9.23 = US \$ 1".

What does it mean? You are tying up your rupee with the dollar.

"having been changed to that level from Ceylon Rs. 8.57 = US \$ 1 in June 1969, and compares with the par value of Ceylon Rs. 5.95 = US \$ 1 which itself was changed to that level from Ceylon Rs. 4.76 = US \$ 1".

Then page 8, paragraph 8:

"Further, as an instrument of overall control of monetary conditions the Central Bank intends to limit carefully the growth of total credit extended by the banking system (Central Bank and the Commercial Banks) to the Government and private sector.

The amount of such credit which was Ceylon Rs. 3,945 million on December 31, 1970 will not be allowed to exceed a total of Ceylon Rs. 4,145 million up to the end of June, 1971, Rs. 4,195 million up to the end of September, 1971 and Rs. 4,145 million at the end of the stand-by period".

Sir, you will see the result by looking back to what happened during that time when the prices went up, when the bus and railway fares were increased.—(Interruption)—yes, by letter dated 8th February 1971. I think you had better get this into HANSARD.

Now, Sir, let us see what Dr. N. M. Perera said about the International Monetary Fund. I am quoting from Parliamentary Debates Vol. 91 (1970-71) Column 476.

Dr. N. M. Perera—Minister of Finance.

"... We have to recognize the stark, naked reality that we cannot brush aside and completely ignore these international institutions."

Who is this? Dr. N. M. Perera referring to the IMF.

"We can repudiate and reject their advice and their terms and conditions. We can only do so if we are prepared to face the far-reaching dislocations that would be attendant upon such defiance....".



What have you got to say to that ? You will not accept when we say these things. You reject them with contempt. What have you got to say to this ? That is why I told the hon. Member for Nallur (Mr. M. Sivasithamparam) that when he becomes the Minister of Finance, he will have to repeat these things. Who Says these things ! Dr. N. M. Perera.

He further says :

“ It will be noticed, therefore, that the country has, at the same time, an enormous short-term unfunded debt—”

It was at that time.

—“ of Rs. 772 million which has been made available to us through the good graces of the IMF ”.

“ Good graces ”. See how obedient he is ?

**ආර්. ජේ. ජී. ද මැල් මහතා**

(*ශ්‍රී. ජ්‍ය. ජ්‍ය. ජී. ජ මෙල්*)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

I have never used that word.

**ආර්. ප්‍රේමදාස මහතා**

(*ශ්‍රී. ජ්‍ය. ප්‍රි. රො. ප්‍ර. ප්‍ර.*)

(Mr. R Premadasa)

Yes, you have never used such a word.

**ආර්. ජේ. ජී. ද මැල් මහතා**

(*ශ්‍රී. ජ්‍ය. ජ්‍ය. ජී. ජ මෙල්*)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

Never used such words—

**ආර්. ප්‍රේමදාස මහතා**

(*ශ්‍රී. ජ්‍ය. ප්‍රි. රො. ප්‍ර. ප්‍ර.*)

(Mr. R. Premadasa)

Yes. “ Through the good graces ”. It is a great grace. Good graces of the IMF.

**ආර්. ජේ. ජී. ද මැල් මහතා**

(*ශ්‍රී. ජ්‍ය. ජ්‍ය. ජී. ජ මෙල්*)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

I think the “ Aththa ” paper should write that tomorrow.

**ආර්. ප්‍රේමදාස මහතා**

(*ශ්‍රී. ජ්‍ය. ප්‍රි. රො. ප්‍ර. ප්‍ර.*)

(Mr. R. Premadasa)

They will write it the other way.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, අපේ ජනාධිපතිතුමා අයි.එම්.එස්. එකෙන්, ලෝක බැංකුවෙන් ආධාර ලබා ගත් රටක නායකයෙක්. එතුමා නොබැඳි සමුළුවට ගොස් කීවේ මොකක්ද? එතුමා කතා කළේ මේ රට ගැන විතරක් නොවෙයි. නොබැඳි සමුළුවේදී එතුමා ලංකාව ගැන පමණක් කතා කරන්න වුවමනා නැහැ. එතුමා කතා කළේ ලෝකයේ අනෙක් දුගී දුප්පත් රටවලින් වෙනුවෙන්

එතුමා කීවේ කුමක්ද? “ සමහර ණය කපා හරින්න ජාත්‍යන්තර මූල්‍ය අරමුදලට පුළුවන්කමක් තිබෙනවාද? නැද්ද? ” යන්නයි. නමුත් ජාත්‍යන්තර මූල්‍ය අරමුදලට එක කරන්න බැහැ, ඊට සල්ලි දෙන රටවල කැමැත්ත නැතිව, ඒ රටවල නායකයන් හමුවෙමුයි කියන අදහස එතුමා ඉදිරිපත් කළේ ඒ නිසයි. නමුත් ඒ විධියේ ආධාර නොගත් රටක නායකයෙක් මේ ගැන මොනවාද කියා තිබෙන්නේ ?

Sir, I am quoting from the report of a speech made by Mr. Lee Kuan Yew, the Prime Minister of Singapore. He was not thinking of Singapore when he made this speech, he was thinking of all the other poor countries.

“ Singapore Pime Minister Lee Kuan Yew has suggested that the world banking crisis could be solved if the governments of the United States, Western Europe and Japan took over the 700 billion U.S. Dollar bad debts accumulated by the Third World countries. ”

These are the countries that can help. That is why he makes this plea.

“ Excerpts from Mr. Lee’s speech at a Chinese New Year private reception at the Presidential Place were released to the press today. He warned that if a solution were not found, the system would malfunction creating great hardship in worldwide depression.

The amount of debt to be taken over by the rich countries would total less than ten per cent of their total gross national product and ‘a bearable loss compared to the disruption if defaults were to occur’.

Mr. Lee said that some 200 big banks beginning with the top ten in America had lent Third World countries 700 billion U.S. dollars.

He went on: ‘They just have not got the means. They have consumed or squandered the money. These loans appear in the ledger books of the banks. They are re-scheduled. That is more money is lent in order that these countries can pay the interest and the re-scheduling fee.’ ”

We have not done such things. All our money has gone to development, to production. But here, another leader of a country is making this plea. So what is the harm in our leader making this appeal to the IMF ? Here I have the HANSARD document of the letter of intent.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මම කියාගෙන ආවේ, යම්කිසි විධියකින් අපි අර කෝටි 2,400 ලබානොගත්තොත් මොකක්ද වෙන්නේ යන කාරණයයි. එහෙම වුණොත්, මහවැලි වැඩපිළිවෙළ නතර කරන්න වෙනවා, විදුලි බල සංවර්ධනය නතර කරන්න වෙනවා, නිවාස සංවර්ධනය නතර කරන්න වෙනවා, කර්මාන්ත සංවර්ධනය නතර කරන්න වෙනවා, පිරටරවලින් ගෙන්වන්න තිබෙන අවශ්‍ය ආහාර, රෙදි-පිළි ආදිය නතර කරන්න වෙනවා, දැන් ආරම්භ කර තිබෙන පාසල්, ඉස්පිරිතාල ගොඩනැගිලි ආදී සියල්ලම නතර කරන්න වෙනවා. නතර කරන්න වුණොත් මොකද වෙන්නේ? දොළොස් ලක්ෂයක් පමණ මිනිසුන් රුකියා නැතිව ගෙදරවලට යනවා. රුකියා නැති වන විට මොකද වෙන්නේ? බඩුමුට්ටු ගන්න මුදල්



[ආර්. ප්‍රේමදාස මහතා]

හදල් නැති වෙනවා. අපි ජාත්‍යන්තර මූල්‍ය අරමුදලෙන් මේ ආධාර ලබා නොගන්නොත් පිටරටවලින් ගෙන්වන හැම දෙයක්ම නතර කරන්න සිදු වෙනවා. එතකොට, අපේ උදවියට වැඩි මිලකට තියා, අඩු මිලකටවත් කිසිම දෙයක් ගන්න බැරි වෙනවා.

**නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා**  
(පිරිනිසි ජපානායකර් අචාර්යවරයා)  
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Order, please! The Sitting is suspended till 4.30 p.m.

රැස්වීම ඊට අනුකූලව නාවකාලිකව අත්සිටුවන ලදීත්, අ. හා. 4, 30 ව නියෝජ්‍ය කාරක සභාපතිතුමාගේ (එඩ්මන්ඩ් සමරවික්‍රම මහතා) සභාපතිත්වයෙන් නැවත පවත්වන ලදී.

அதன்படி அமர்வு பி. ப. 4 மணிவரை இடை நிறுத்தப்பட்டது. மீண்டும் ஆரம்பமாயிற்று. குழுப் பிரதித் தலைவர் [திரு. எட்மண்ட் சமரவிக்ரம] தலைமை வகித்தார்கள்.

Sitting accordingly suspended till 4.30 p.m. and then resumed, DEPUTY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (MR. EDMOND SAMARAWICKRAMA) in the Chair.

**ආර්. ප්‍රේමදාස මහතා**  
(திரு. ஆர். பிரேமதாச)  
(Mr. R. Premadasa)

නියෝජ්‍ය කරක සභාපතිතුමනි, මා කියාගෙන ආවේ අප මේ යන ගමනින් පිට පැත්තෙන් අපට මුහුණපාන්නට සිදු විය හැකි ආර්ථික අහේනිය ගැනා පමණක් නොවෙයි, දේශපාලන විගමනාවත් ගැනයි. මේ රට සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම අනා හිටින තත්ත්වයකට පත් වෙනවා. 1977 වන විට මෙත විදියේ තත්ත්වයක් මේ රටේ තිබුණාදැයි අප මතක තබාගත යුතුයි. ඒ තත්ත්වයෙන් මේ රට නිසි මහකට යොමු කරන්නට මේ වැඩ පිළිවෙල කොයි තරම් දුරට හේතු වුණා දැයි අප කල්පනා කළ යුතුයි. අපේ අඩුපාඩුකම් නැතිවා නොවෙයි; අපේ දුර්වල කම් නැතුවා නොවෙයි. නමුත් අප අනුගමනය කරන මේ ක්‍රමය හැර වෙන ක්‍රමයක් අපට නැහැ.

නොයෙක් කේන්ද්‍රවල මේ රජය පසුගිය කාලයේ විශේෂ ප්‍රගතියක් ඇති කළා. අපේ ඉතා වැදගත් බලාපොරොත්තු කීපයක් ගැනත් සඳහන් වුණා. මොනවාද මේ බලපොරොත්තු? මේ රටට වුවමනා කරන මූලික අවශ්‍යතාවන් මොනවාදැයි හමුත්තාත්සේ දන්නවා. මේ රටට අවශ්‍ය විදුලි බලය, වාරිමාර්ග, මහා මාර්ග, නිවාස සහ ඒ වාගේම විදුලි පණිවුඩ සේවය, අධ්‍යාපනය, සෞඛ්‍ය ගමනාගමනය යනාදි මේ සියල්ලම සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම කඩාකප්පල්කරී තත්ත්වයකට පත් වුණා. විවේචනය කරද්දී යම් යම් දේ කියන්නට යෙදුණා "ඔබ හමුත්තාත්සේලා හුඟක් බස් ගෙන්වා තිබෙනවා තමයි; හමුත් ඒ මාර්ගයෙන් පමණක් මේ ප්‍රශ්න විසඳන්නට පුළුවන්ද" කියා ඇහුවා නමුත්, ඒ එක මාර්ගයක්? එදා මහජනතාව බස් නැතිව මොන තරම් අමාරුවේ වැටී සිටියදැයි හමුත්තාත්සේ දන්නවා. "ඔබ, හමුත්තාත්සේලාගේ ආණ්ඩුව යටතේ විශාල පිරිසක් පිටරට ගියාය; දැන් දැන් ඒ රටවලත්, අහේනියක් ඇති වි තිබෙනවාය" කිව්වා. ඉතින්, එහෙම වෙනවා නම් අපි මොනවා කරන්නද? කොහොම හමුත් විකක් හරි හම්බ කර ගන්නා නේද? ඒ කාලය තුළ යමක් කමක් හොයා

ගන්නා නේද? ඒ නිසා එහෙම කල්පනා කරන්නට නරකයි. කෙසේ හෝ අපේ දෙපයින් හිටගන්නට පුළුවන් තත්ත්වයකට මේ රට පත් කරන්නට අපි ක්‍රියා කරන්නට ඕනෑ. මේ ගැන සභාවේ මන්ත්‍රීවරු කිව්වා, එදා තිබුණු තත්ත්වය. ශ්‍රී ලංකා, කොමියුනිස්ට් ආදී දේශපාලන පක්ෂවල සටන් පාඨ කියෙව්වා. "සිති නැතිව නේ බොන්නම්" කිව්වා; "හාල් නැතිව බත් කන්නම්" කිව්වා, "පිරි නැතිව පාන් හදන්නම්" කිව්වා; "මිරිස් නැතිව හොදි කන්නම්" කිව්වා; "රෙදි නැතිව පාපේ යන්නම්" කිව්වා. තවත් මොන මොනවා කිව්වාද? කථා නායකතුමනි, එවැනි තත්ත්වයක් ඉදලයි; අප මේ තත්ත්වයට ආවේ. අප ගමන් කරන මාර්ගය හැර වෙන මාර්ගයක් නැති බව මගේ කථාවේ ආරම්භයේදීම මම කිව්වා. අද රට පුරාම සංවර්ධනයේ සලකුණු තිබෙනවා. ඒවා මට කලින් කථාකළ ගැන මන්ත්‍රීවරු කියන්නට යෙදුණා. ඒවා පුත පුතා කියා හමුත්තාත්සේගේ කාලය මීඩංගු කරන්නට මම බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ නැහැ.

මේ අවස්ථාවේදී මා ආචාර්ය ඇන්. ඇම්. පෙරේරා මහතා විවාදයකට යොමු කර ගත්තේ ඇයි? එය ඉතා වැදගත් කාරණයක්. එතුමා සංකේතයක් කළා. ඒකයි කාරණය. එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ වැඩපිළිවෙලට විරුද්ධ වැඩ පිළිවෙල, අදහස් උදහස් තිබුණු නිසයි මා එසේ කළේ. එහෙම නැතිව එතුමා අපහාසයට, තිග්‍රහයට ලක් කරන්නට නොවෙයි.

He became the symbol of the anti-UNP opinion in this country, whether it be of the Communist Party, the LSSP or the SLFP, or whatever it is. You must not take the SLFP seriously as far as running of a government is concerned. Mrs. Bandaranaike had to have five Ministers in two years.—(Interruption)—You may be knowing better because you were with them. You see, there is no purpose in talking about their political or economic strategy, but Dr. N. M. Perera became the symbol of the anti-UNP forces and he tried to implement his vision, their vision, and what was the net result? A total failure, a complete collapse, so much so, the very party which invited him threw him out. You think Mrs. Bandaranaike was going to throw him out if his measures were popular with the people? Never! What happened? On the contrary, his measures became so unpopular that she could not face the people. She had ultimately to throw him out and others had to follow. Surely, a Leader of a Party or a Government would not send out a popular person. Even if she did not like him, she would have kept him. But all his measures, all his policies, all his programmes, and all his strategies miserably failed, so much so, he was also rejected by his own people who tolerated him for 35 to 40 years. So we must understand these realities. Our people want to see a better day, every day. They are hopeful with this Government; they have faith in this Government. They know that Mr. J. R. Jayewardene is the only Leader who can fulfill their hopes. That is why they returned him again, not because of anything else. We must understand these realities.



I will again quote Dr. N. M. Perera from his Budget Speech of 1973. Now, when I read this extract from his speech you will see how his mind was working. The great Left Leader who was thinking of his Marxist policies all the time during his 40 years of political life, with the responsibilities falling upon him, was quietly moving away from those ideas. He says :-

“The severe pressures of unemployment and the concomitant result of the restlessness of the youth of this country, to an extent to attempt to tear up the very social fabric of our democratic traditions, is the most fundamental one. The shortage of goods and their high prices, associated with the chronic shortage of foreign exchange are the other aspects which continue to inhibit our productive activities.”

Now, I want to pose this question : Are we not trying to solve these problems which he realized only in 1973 ? But earlier what was he saying ? Earlier, he was preaching a separate gospel. He tried to implement it. It did not work in this country.

මම කියන්නේ, බලයේ ඉන්න කොට එක විධියක්. විපක්ෂයේ ඉන්න කොට තව විධියක්. මට මේ අවස්ථාවේදී වුවමනා කරනවා මේ සභාවේ අවධානය යොමු කරන්නට අපේ පක්ෂයේ නායකතුමා හැන. එතුමා 1970 මහා පරාජයෙන් පසු විපක්ෂයේ නායකයා වුණා. බලන්න එතුමා කළ ප්‍රකාශය. අනිත් උදවිය විපක්ෂයේ ඉන්න කොට කියන දේවල් සහ බලයට පත් වුණාම කියන දේවල් එක්ක මෙම ප්‍රකාශය සංසන්දනය කර බලන්න.

The Leader of our party became the Leader of the Opposition after our defeat in 1970. I will now quote from his speech on the first Budget of the United Front Government, reported at Column 1112 of the Official Report of 1st November, 1970 :-

“The Hon. Minister of Finance can be fully confident that our Party, as it has done since 27th May . . . .”

That was the date of the elections—

“will extend the fullest co-operation to his Government in all measures which we think will help in the progress of this country, both in this House and outside. Though our numbers may be small in this House, they are not so small in the country and, if necessary, we can give trouble but, as I said, we will not do so”.

Whose words were they ? Those of the Leader of the Opposition ! He continued :-

“I think such an attitude of responsive co-operation would help you to achieve many of the objects which have been outlined in your programme and manifesto to the people”.

Here we find him telling the Government that he is ready to co-operate with the Government and implement the programmes in the Manifesto though the UNP were opposed to that Manifesto and campaigned against it. Here the Leader of the Opposition is saying that although their numbers were small in the House, their numbers were large in the country and that they could give trouble if they wanted to but they would not do so and were even ready to

implement their Manifesto. Just see ! He was going to help implement the programme in the Manifesto which he himself opposed. Why was he trying to do this ? To see whether at least through the Manifesto of the United Front Government the urgent problems of the people could be solved. Those, Mr. Speaker, were the words of our Leader.

He continues at Column 1114 and says :-

“After all, I think the vast majority of our people are not concerned with who is in power or what theories they propound to get into power and what theories they act upon once in power. They want employment, they seek a lower cost of living, they want clothes to wear and houses to live in. The basic requirements are employment, lower cost of living, housing and clothing, and that is what the vast majority of the people, not only in this country, but throughout the world yearn for. And to achieve that I do not think the uttering of *mantharams*, whether they be *mantharams* or capitalism or communism or democratic socialism, will help”.

I will continue to read the speech because it is very revealing. In the same speech at Column 1117, he says :-

“I feel there should not be strikes in corporations which belong to the State, to the people”.

This is what he said from the Opposition Benches as far back as in 1970. Just see how sincere he is ! Now some people blame him and abuse him and call him names. Hon. Member for Kotmale (Mr. Ananda Dassanayake), this is what our Leader said in 1970 after our defeat on the occasion of the first United Front Budget presented by Dr. N. M. Perera. I will repeat what our Leader said :-

“I feel there should not be strikes in corporations which belong to the State, to the people”.

He continues a little later :-

“You should have some machinery other than the ruinous and suicidal methods of stopping work”.

This is what he said from the Opposition Benches but what are you trying to do ? You are even inciting University students to strike. What could have happened if we gave some help to the JVP in 1971 ? (*Interruption*). Of course, I make that charge.

ආණන්ද දසනායක මහතා  
(திரு. ஆனந்த தலைநாயக்க)  
(Mr. Ananda Dassanayake)  
Not our party.

ආර්. ප්‍රේමදාස මහතා  
(திரு. ஆர். பிரேமதாச)  
(Mr. R. Premadasa)  
I make that charge against your party.

Are you going to say that there is no indiscipline in the universities encouraged by political parties ?



ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(A Member)

It is there.

ආර්. ප්‍රේමදාස මහතා

(திரு. ஆர். பிரேமதாசு)

(Mr. R. Premadasa)

That is what I am saying. Sir, we could have done that. What did our leader say ?

“You should have some machinery other than the ruinous and suicidal methods of stopping work”.

You cannot blame him if he is going to implement these policies. He said, as far back as 1970 from the Opposition benches :

“I feel there should not be strikes in corporations which belong to the State, to the people”.

He was very open.

“You should have some machinery other than the ruinous and suicidal methods of stopping work”.

At column 1119 he goes on :

“I would divide up the aspect of development under the following heads : firstly, the question of foreign exchange ; secondly, the cost of living ; thirdly employment ; fourthly housing and fifthly clothing”.

What are we doing ? Are we not doing everything to fulfil these aspirations which we voiced from the opposition benches ? He offered this at our assistance to the then government to solve these problems. Are we not doing this now ? In the same speech he quoted this extract from an article in a magazine. This is of column 1122 in HANSARD of 1st November, 1970. This is the question :

“This is not to say that no Government tried to solve these problems. they did. But what they all lacked was far-sightedness in their policies, the courage of their convictions, and most of all a set of honest politicians who believed in the promises they made to the electorate and who could think in terms other than that of just winning votes at the next election”.

This quotation appeared in Volume 22, No. 3 of a magazine called “Venture” published by the Fabian Society of England. the author is no less a person than Miss Sunethra Bandranaike, now Mrs. Sunethra Nanayakkara. After quoting her the President concluded thus :

“ She has put her finger on the spot. That is, what we need is a set of politicians who are honest, who believe in the promises made to the electorate and who think in terms other than of just winning votes at the next election. ”

Now, Sir, I have read to you what our leader said in November 1970 on the occasion of the first Budget of the United Front Government. He said that the people

want employment ; they want development ; they want housing ; they want clothing ; they want the essential supplies ; and no uttering of *mantharams*, whether they be *mantharams* of capitalism or communism or democratic socialism would help. So he was prepared. He said he would divide up the aspect of development under the following heads : firstly, the question of foreign exchange, secondly, the cost of living, thirdly employment, fourthly housing, and fifthly clothing. I quoted one of my speeches where I said that the only way to meet the cost of living was when we would be in a position to give more earning power to the people. That was also said when we were in the Opposition. That is why we increased their salaries ; that is why we gave them more opportunities to make their living.

ගරු ,සභාපතිතුමනි එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා මහතා කියනවා, සමාජවාදයේ ප්‍රාතිහාර්යක් නැතැයි කියල. නමුත් දැන් නම් කියනවා එහෙම ප්‍රාතිහාර්යක් තියනවා කියල.

What did he say ? He said, “ There are no socialist miracles.” I want to tell the hon. Member for Manipay that he is suffering from some socialist ailment. I am very sorry that he has got into that situation. He does not like the United States at all. Every time the Minister mentioned the United States he got into a rage. But I want to tell him that there are no socialist miracles. Dr. N. M. Perera himself has said :

“ In the field of political economy, certainly there are no miracles to be performed. The only miracle I know of is hard, consistent work. ”

Not strikes ! Nowhere has he said that.

“ The only mistake I know of is hard, consistent work. That, in essence, is the socialist miracle. If this country is to be restored to health and vigour, all of us in every walk of life, in every sector of our economy, must work, must work with devotion, with conscious desire to build both for ourselves and the generations to come ”.

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ නායකතුමා විරුද්ධ පක්ෂයේ ඉදහෙත අළුතෙන් පත් වුණ ආණ්ඩුවට මොකක්ද කිවේ? දැන්වත් මේ ප්‍රශ්න විසඳන්න උත්සාහ කරන්න, මෙන්ම අපි උදව් කරනවා, රාජ්‍ය අංශයේ ස්ට්‍රයික් කිරීම් වලින් කවදා වත් මේක දියුණු කරන්න බැහැ, අපි උදව් කරනවා මේවා නවත්වන්න, මේ රට දියුණු කරන්න නම් අපි රැකී රක්ෂා සලසා කරන්න ඕනෑ. සංවර්ධනයක් ඇති කරන්න ඕනෑ, මිනිසුන්ගේ අවශ්‍යතාවයන් සම්පූර්ණ කරන්න ඕනෑ, ඒවාට මන්ත්‍ර නැහැ, අපි උදව් කරන්න ලැස්තියි කියා කීවා. නමුත් විපක්ෂයේ ඉන්න විට බොහෝ විපක්ෂ නායකයෝ එකක් කීව්වා. ඒ අය බලයට ගිය පසුවයි කියන්නේ, මහත්සි වෙලා වැඩ කරන්න ඕනෑ කියා. විපක්ෂයේ ඉන්න තෙක් ස්ට්‍රයික් කරවනවා, වැඩ නවත්වනවා; ළමයින්, ශිෂ්‍යයින් උසි ගත්වනවා; පුළුවන් තරම් කඩාකප්පල්කාරී ක්‍රියා කරවනවා. නමුත් බලයට ආවට පසුව, “අනේ මොනව කරන්නද; විපක්ෂයේ ඉන්න විට මා කියාපු දේවල් දැන් මටම අරන් ගහයි; ඒක තමයි, දේශපාලන සෙල්ලම” කියනවා.



සහායකතාවය, විපක්ෂ නායකතුමාටත් කඩා කරන්නා අවකාශ දිය යුතු නිසා මගේ කථාව දීර්ඝ ලෙස කරන්නට මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙන්නේ නැහැ. මේ රටට මගේ අමාත්‍යාංශ වලින් කෙරෙන කාර්යයන් පිළිබඳ විස්තර මේ ගරු සභාවේ මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්ගෙන් ප්‍රකාශ වුණා. ඒ ගැන මා එතුමන්ලාට ස්තූති වන්න වෙනවා. නමුත් මා එකක් කියන්න ඕනෑ. 1970 සිට 77 වනතුරු, කලවාන ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාගේ නායකයා තමයි, නිවාස ඇමති වෙලා සිටියේ. ඒ හත් අවුරුද්දටම නිවාස වෙනුවෙන් යෙදවූ මුදල ලක්ෂ 500 යි. Rs. 50 million නමුත් 1978 සිට 1983 දක්වා ලක්ෂ 38,359 ක් -Rs. 3,835.9 million.- නිවාස සංවර්ධනය සඳහා අපි යොදවා තිබෙනවා. සංඛ්‍යා ලේඛණ ගැන නමුත් නාන් සේලා දන්නවා. අපි අද පියවර තබල තියෙනවා, නිවාස දස ලක්ෂයක් හැදීමේ වැඩ පිළිවෙලට, ගම්බද ප්‍රදේශවල හදාගෙන එන නිවාස වලට රුකුල් දෙන්න, උදව් දෙන්න, ආධාර දෙන්න, නාගරික නිවාස සංවර්ධනය හැරුණුවිට. ඒ අතරම මම කියන්න කැමතියි, අපි ජාතික නිවාස සංවර්ධන අධිකාරිය සහ නාගරික සංවර්ධන අධිකාරිය වශයෙන් ආයතන දෙකක් පිහිටවී බව. නාගරික සංවර්ධන අධිකාරිය ගැන මම යමක් කියන්න ඕනෑ. භාණ්ඩාගාරයෙන් මුදල් දීම අමාරු වූ අවස්ථාවේදී මෙම නාගරික සංවර්ධන අධිකාරියෙන් අපට විශාල ප්‍රයෝජනයක් අත්පත් වූ බව මා නමුත් නාන් සේලා කියන්න ඕනෑ.

I will enumerate what the Urban Development Authority has done to help the National Housing Development programme. We were able to find the money for our housing programme as a result of these measures.

The Army, the Police, the Quarantine Department, the NSB, the Land Development Department, the Registrar of Companies, the Fort Magistrate's Court and other minor offices were located in Echelon Square in buildings that were very old and needed repairs, renovations or demolition and rebuilding. You know, they were just on the other side of where we were. This land was just like a playing field. The decision of the Government to redevelop Echelon Square has benefited all those Government departments as they were all found better accommodation in new buildings or rented buildings.

The UDA alone, out of the sale proceeds of the land at Echelon Square, has spent over Rs. 100 million on these relocations, thereby minimizing the burden on the Treasury.

At the time the UDA was set up the infrastructure in the City of Colombo was in a badly run-down condition. The sewage pipes were leaking in several areas, the water pipes were corroded and unable to carry the full capacity that should be carried, electricity cables were outmoded and telephone lines were in disorder. Developers expect up-to-date infrastructure facilities before deciding to invest huge

sums of money on projects. The UDA, without waiting for the long-term development plans that have been initiated by this Government, was called upon to improve the infrastructure in the short-term immediately to cater to the development needs. It was estimated that Rs. 200 million would be needed for this short-term improvement, and the Treasury was not able to bear any part of this expenditure.

Here, again, the UDA was able to invest and advance out of the sale proceeds of the land all the money needed for the urgent infrastructure development.

A 100-foot-wide boulevard cutting across Echelon Square from Janadhipathi Mawatha to York Street costing Rs. 8 million is being undertaken by the UDA. The money was found from the sale/lease of land.

New houses in the city for occupants in the slum garden that is now the Liberty Plaza : The NHDA commenced the present Liberty Plaza Project. There were several families occupying that land and living in very poor and insanitary conditions. All these people have been benefited by beter accommodation under more hygienic conditions.

The land, which was grossly under-utilized, has been put to productive use with modern housing and shopping facilities. This will have a beneficial impact in bringing down further the high rentals in the city.

I am told that an investment of a million rupees in construction will create 4,000 man days of skilled work, 8,000 man days of unskilled work and 12,000 man days of indirect employment.

It was estimated that Rs. 10,000 million will be invested on all the UDA projects creating an unprecedented employment boom in the country.

This employment generation is not confined to the construction period only. Employment will continue to be generated by all the offices, banks, and other sectors that will continue to use these buildings.

Slum and shanty improvement Programme : Pure drinking water, sanitation facilities, playing fields and such other amenities for the slums and the shanty dwellers are being financed largely by the UDA programme.

So I want to tell you that we have taken meaningful steps in all spheres of social progress to raise the standard of living of our people.



[ආර්. ප්‍රේමදාස මහතා]

අවසාන වශයෙන් මට කියන්න තිබෙන්නේ මෙයයි : මේ රජයේ ගමන් මාර්ගය පැහැදිලියි. අපට වුවමනා කරන්නේ මේ රටේ ජනතාවට දුප්පත්කම බෙදා දෙන්න නොවෙයි ; සමෘද්ධිය බෙදා දෙන්නයි. නමුත් ඔය කියන්නාවූ ඊනියා සමාජවාදයෙන් එහෙම තැත්නම් 'කණ්ඩෝල්ඩ් ඉකොනොමි' එකෙන් සිදු වන්නේ ජනතාවට දුප්පත්කම බෙදා දීමකයි. අපට, එය කරන්න වුවමනාවක් නැහැ.

1970-77 යුගය, මේ රටේ ජනතාවට දුගී-දුප්පත්කම, ලෙඩ-රෝග, නැති-බැරිකම බෙදා දුන් යුගයක් හැටියට සංකේතවත් වෙනවා, හැදින්වෙනවා. නමුත් 1977-83 යුගය තුළ අප වැයම් කළේ මේ රටේ ජනතාවට සමෘද්ධිය බෙදා දෙන්නයි ; ඔවුන් ඒ සමෘද්ධියේ කොටස්කාරයන් කරන්නයි.

නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමනි, ජාතියක් හෝ රටක් හෝ ජීවත් වන්නේ ඒ රට, ඒ ජාතිය මුහුණ පාන ප්‍රශ්න වලට, අර්බුදවලට සාර්ථක අත්දැකීම් මුහුණ දෙමින් ක්‍රියා කරන වේගය උඩයි. මේ රජය, පුශ්නවලට හයෙන් මිටිකෙන රජයක් නොවෙයි ; පුශ්නවලට, අර්බුදවලට විසඳුම් හොයන්න උත්සාහ කරන රජයක්. අපට වුවමනා කරන්නේ මේ රටේ ජනතාවගෙන් හැම කොටසකටම සාධාරණය ඉෂ්ට කරන්නයි. අපට වුවමනාවක් නැහැ, කිසිම ජන කොටසකට අසාධාරණයක් කරන්න. ඒ සඳහා ඒ සියලුම දෙනාගේ සහයෝගය අපට වුවමනා කරනවා. ඒ සහයෝගය ලැබෙමැයි ප්‍රාර්ථනා කරමින් මගේ කථාව මෙයින් සමාප්ත කරනවා.

ඒ. අමීර්තලිංගම් මහතා (කන්කසන්තුරේයි)  
(திரு. ஏ. அமிர் தலிங்கம்—காங்கேசன் துறை)  
(Mr. A. Amirthalingam—Kankasanturai)

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am happy to follow the long and analytical speech made by the Hon. Prime Minister on the sixth Budget of this Government. There is no doubt, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that there is a lack of interest in the Debate on this Budget in this House as well as in the country. I think during the last five Budget Debates when the Hon. Prime Minister spoke we used to have a full House listening with rapt attention. But today I think three-fourths of the seats are vacant. I think the Members are engaged more usefully from their point of view elsewhere. Whatever that may be, Sir, I wish to say one thing : when I make my observations on the Budget, let it not be construed that I am seeking to score any debating points over the Government, because neither I nor my party have anything to gain by trying to score debating points as against the Government.

The Hon. Minister of Finance has been congratulated by everybody on the able manner in which he presented this Budget. But I found that he was congratulated more on the fact that he is the second man to present the sixth Budget than on the content of the Budget that he has presented. Though

the Hon. Minister of Finance called this the first Budget of the second Government of His Excellency the President, I think this should actually be called the last Budget of the Government elected in November 1982 and should have preceded a General Election to be held in August 1983. So we have to take this as the sixth Budget of the United National Party Government elected in 1977. And, as the Hon. Prime Minister said, I will not seek to judge the Government by what it has achieved in one year. I think we should take the total achievements of the Government over the last six years into consideration in assessing the success or otherwise of what the Hon. Minister of Finance set out to do in 1977.

With that in my mind, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I went through the Budget speech which my good friend delivered. I wish him many more years in that chair, because I personally have the highest affection and regard for him. So I am sure he will not misunderstand any comments I may make. I read through the Budget speech which the Hon. Minister delivered on the 15th November 1977. In that he analysed the various symptoms of the malady that the economy of this country was afflicted with. I think it may be relevant today to take some of those into consideration and to find out to what extent the Hon. Minister of Finance and this Government have succeeded in curing those ills over the period of six years. I am not seeking to quote, as the Hon. Prime Minister did, dead people against the living. I am only seeking to quote the Hon. Minister of Finance against himself. As he is here to reply to me, I will not be charged with misquoting or taking out of context anything he has uttered.

At page 2 of the Budget speech the Hon. Minister referred to the first ill that resulted from the economic policies pursued by the last Government for seven years ;

" The cost of living of the ordinary people went up by leaps and bounds, while real wages declined. "

Then he went on to say :

" Colombo Consumers Price Index reflected an increase from 138 in May 1970 when the last Government assumed office to 200 when it was thrown out of office by the long-suffering masses. "

That was the first ill-effect of the wrong economic policies, the wrong administration, as he characterized it, followed by the last Government.

May I ask hon. Members of the Government Party to answer their own conscience ? What is the position with regard to the cost of living today ? What stood at 200 at that time in 1977, according to your own Central Bank Report, stands at 375 at the end of December 1981. The Central Bank Report is available only for that period, the Table 58 of that report gives



the exact figure as they have computed it. So over the period of five years, because it is actually up to December 1981 that the computation is made, the cost of living, has gone up by 175 points. Is it an achievement to be proud of and have you achieved what you set out to do? Or has your prescription worsened the disease? I ask this question from hon. Members of the Government.

Then the Hon. Minister of Finance referred in page 3 to corruption and waste.

"Corruption and waste in all spheres of economic and political life became endemic in the last seven years."

He swore on that occasion that this Government would stamp out corruption, revamp the machinery of Government and see to it that a more efficient and purer administration was installed. May I ask the Government, have you succeeded in doing that? On the contrary, only yesterday, when the hon. Member for Mannar (Mr. P. S. Soosaithasan) was speaking, the Hon. Minister of Finance himself was giving instances of corruption. In fact, he said, today the position is such that in these various contracts the supervising officer, the contractor and the man who pays are all one. And in fact Sir, we have had bitter experience in regard to some of the decentralized budget work that had been undertaken. For instance, in the monies that were allocated for school buildings in 1982 the Education Ministry insisted that the school development societies should not be given the contracts, that they should be given to private contractors. And the amount of corruption and the shoddy work that was done have only to be seen to be believed. That is the degree of corruption that is ruining public life in this country. So the second matter that the Hon. Minister of Finance set out to cure—even that disease has got worse.

The third one he spoke of is the parlous state of the industries in this country. At page 4 he said:

"Mr. Speaker, industry has also been run down in the last seven years, both in the public sector and in the private sector. The lack of a coherent industrial policy based on practical, pragmatic and realistic lines"—

I think the Hon. Prime Minister also echoes those very same things. He called this a pragmatic Budget, a realistic Budget.

"The lack of a coherent industrial policy based on practical, pragmatic and realistic lines was a fundamental drawback of the Sirimavo Bandaranaike Government."

What is the position with regard to the industrial sector today? I think, Sir, the industrial sector is a very vital one for the export-oriented policy, what the Finance Minister characterized as the outward-looking policy of this Government. What is the state of the industrial sector in this country?

Let us take the public sector. The programme of rapid modernization, launched by the present Government with its emphasis on export growth, is clearly dependent on the success and growth of the manufacturing industrial sector. It is the central element of the strategy and the clue to meeting domestic consumption needs while promoting export earnings. Especially since we do not have an abundance of natural resources it has to be this sector which launches the so-called economic take-off. If it fails our strategy in development will also fail. If one looks at the so-called success stories of East Asia, countries like Hong Kong, South Korea and Taiwan which have in many ways given export growth a good name, it was indeed their industrial manufacturing sector which spearheaded growth. South Korea, during its expansion period, experienced growth rates of 18.4 per cent in the manufacturing sector and 19.1 per cent in the utilities. Studies in modernization of the Republic of South Korea, page 61, gives this:

"At present manufacture makes up 77 per cent of Hong Kong's exports, 92 per cent of Taiwan's exports and 97 per cent of South Korea's."

Now let us turn to our own performance during our so-called expansion period of 1977–1981. As opposed to 18 per cent growth rate in East Asia, the Central Bank Annual Review of 1981 states on page 7, that though our growth rate in the manufacturing sector was 5.1 per cent, the total output in real terms is estimated to have increased by only 2 per cent during this whole period of five years. As opposed to the high manufacturing content of East Asian exports, in Sri Lanka manufacturing remains a near constant 34.3 per cent of our exports, though our expansion period took place at a different and less favourable time. I am not denying that, that the world economic condition is also a factor to be kept in mind. But in assessing the success or otherwise of the strategy, realities have to be faced. Though our expansion period took place at different and less favourable time in the international economy, the comparative statistics are still glaring in the face of the strategy we wish to pursue. What is also remarkable is that despite recent policies for rapid modernization, the basic composition and structure of the manufacturing sector has not changed. It still depend heavily on the textile, petroleum and chemical industries. There are very few new types of industrial ventures even in the Greater Colombo Economic Zone. In assessing the success of East Asian export-led strategy, commentators have noted that the clue to expansion and modernization depend on growth in the following sectors: metallic products, electrical machinery and industrial equipment—a move away from consumer goods towards the development of a modern, integrated manufacturing structure that produces both intermediate and capital goods. In this light, the slow growth and lack of transformation in



[ඊ. අමරසිංහ මහතා]

the manufacturing sector must signal alarm for all those who are adherents of a policy of export-led growth in Sri Lanka.

Now let us consider what the present Budget, the 1983 Budget, offer to meet this sense of industrial stagnation. Except for the traditional subsidies for gem exports, the tourist industry and an outright grant to the Export Development Board – measures aimed more at a balance of payments deficit – there is very little in the Budget which attempts to provide incentives and guidelines with regard to new ventures. Instead of traditional subsidies to traditional exports which have to some extent already developed international linkages, perhaps we would have expected subsidies and grants to be given to ventures in certain ear-marked industries which are capable of developing export potential while meeting local demand. I think, Mr. Deputy chairman, the Hon. Minister of Finance's budget proposal has failed signally to meet this glaring discrepancy between their profession of export-oriented policy and the realities of what they are seeking to do.

The growth of the manufacturing sector is integrally linked with the need for new investment. So far we have relied heavily on foreign investors to provide us with venture capital usually in the well-exploited tourist industry. Foreign entrepreneurs have come in, but the biggest investment has been in the tourist industry. This is also a disturbing reality, especially when one considers the fact that the GNP was 4.1 per cent during the year 1981 though the GDP was 5.08 per cent. The difference is, of course, due to the outflow of incomes by way of interest, profits and dividends associated with foreign participants. Already, the GNP falls short of the GDP because of expatriation of profits, interests and dividends by the foreign participants, with the more and more foreign capital brought in, though there may be an apparent growth in real terms, in terms of GNP it will not be equal to the growth that we really see.

So that, one has to ask the Hon. Minister of Finance what measures does the Budget for 1983 take with regard to stimulation of local investment. The high rate of luxury consumption in this country is evidence of the fact that there are large amounts of financial resources awaiting to be put into productive use. But has the Government taken any positive steps to harness these financial resources available locally in investment? Your merely saying, "We can only take the horse to water but we cannot make it to drink" will not do where the Government has to take the initiative in fostering industrial development. That is where the Government has failed. The strategy of the Government over the few years has failed in that respect.

In fact, Mr. Deputy Chairman, let us consider what has happened in the public sector. I think, with the exception of the Cement Corporation which has been growing and growing – that too with private participation in the third stage – most of the public sector ventures are in the doldrums. There is not doubt about that. The textile mills have been handed over to various foreign private entrepreneurs, and one of the biggest national ventures the Central Transport Board, is in the process of being dismantled. Decentralization was a very salutary move, but it is now in the process of being slowly but surely destroyed.

So that, Sir, do you not see that the public sector which has a very vital role to play in industrial development is being given the cold shoulder in the name of private enterprise, in the name of a free economy, by this Government? In a country like Sri Lanka, the public sector must play a very big part in industrial development. After all I have a partiality for the public sector. There was no doubt about corruption in the public sector under the last Government. Corruption is anathema to socialism. Corruption cannot go hand in hand with socialism, but that is no reason to dismantle the public sector. You should do away with corruption. Because you are not able to cure disease, you are seeking to kill the patient. That is not what a doctor is expected to do. That is not what a physician is required to do. You are seeking to destroy the public sector merely because there was corruption under the last Government. The last Government was reeking with corruption. There is no doubt about that. I hold no brief for them. But because of that you cannot destroy the public sector altogether or allow it to be destroyed or allow it to be run down.

Actually the public sector was not built up by the last government. Ever since industrial development started in this country it was the State that played a very big part in fostering industrial development. If not for the State playing a part in it, we would not have had any industrial development in this country. So that I think the Government has failed.

In analysing the figures with regard to public sector performance in the last two years, one has to constantly consider what role is the public sector corporations to play with the present Government's strategy of economic development. One is specially confounded when one looks at the performance of the Fertilizer Manufacturing Corporation, the most expensive capital intensive venture in the public sector, in its first year of operation.

According to the Central Bank Annual Review, page 60, during its first year of operation the Fertilizer Corporation incurred a loss of Rs. 679 million, and the reason for this loss, according to the Central Bank Review, is that the production costs were in excess of



fertilizer prices, the prices which are determined by the Government on the basis of the world market. Thus we have the strange phenomenon of the Government undercutting its own corporation to protect the consumer from higher prices.

I think in the initial stage the Government should give subsidies and encourage these public sector corporations. I am not saying that inefficiency should be fostered but inefficiency is due to corruption and the placing of the wrong man for political reasons in charge of these corporations. If you have the correct man, men with the required know-how, men with the required expertise, men with the required background knowledge, in charge of these corporations and charge them as they have done in the socialist countries, with full responsibility, without any political interference without Ministers and parliamentarians trying to use the corporations as employment exchanges to give employment to their constituents, if you charge those who are put in charge with full responsibility for the efficient running of these corporations, I am sure, the public sector can be made to work efficiently and to work satisfactorily. I think this Government, during the last six years of stewardship, has failed in that respect. Now Sir, so that what the Hon. Minister of Finance, in his first Budget Speech set out to do with regard to industry, he has signally failed to do.

Then I come to another point. He spoke of the debt burden, the burden of the foreign domestic debts that the Government was saddled with. At page 7 he said :

"During the last seven years Sirima Bandaranaike Government increased the debt burden of the country in a manner unprecedented in our history since independence. Our total domestic debt rose from Rs. 6,295 million in 1970 to Rs. 12,691 million in 1976. Our foreign debt rose from Rs. 1,578 million in 1970 to Rs. 17,659 million in 1976. A proportion of the foreign debts had been incurred at high rates of interest and even our future tea crops had been mortgaged to foreign countries. The burden of debt repayment and debt servicing will be a heavy one and will be a permanent drain on the exchequer."

This was the gravamen of the charge that the Hon. Minister of Finance made in his first Budget Speech against the last Government. May I ask the Hon. Minister of Finance, what is the total public debt today? I think at the end of December 1981, the total public debt stood at Rs. 58,659 million. It is Rs. 58 billion. The Hon. Minister was very angry when the last Government left us with a public debt of Rs. 17,659. That is about Rs. 17 billion. Today, after six years of his prescription, after six years of taking his medicine, the public debt stands at Rs. 58 billion. I think after this Budget, it will be much higher than even this Rs. 58 billion. Can the Hon. Minister of Finance say that he has solved, that he has in any way cured what he set out to cure?

I wish to say something about the foreign debt. This public debt is composed of both foreign and domestic borrowing. What is the position about the foreign debt? According to the Central Bank Annual Review of 1981, the total foreign debt outstanding as at December 1981 was Rs. 29,17 million, that is Rs. 29 billion. That was at the end of December 1981. At the end of 1982 it would have been, and after this Budget, it will be, much higher. According to the Minister, foreign financing is now 10.3 per cent of our GDP with bank borrowing of 3.9 per cent of our 1982 GDP. He himself warns us that unless corrective action is taken now, by 1986 our debt service burden would be as high as 27 per cent of our export earnings. When that happens Sri Lanka will be seen as a high credit risk and will receive the same callous treatment from the international banking system, which is today being meted out to Mexico, Poland, Brazil and Argentina. Let us hope that that situation will never arise.

In the light of the possible pitfalls of the present strategy, what action has the Government to resolve the present crisis? The Hon. Minister assures us that most of our loans have been from Governments and from international institutions. These loans have been mostly granted on very soft terms with long repayment periods and concessional rates of interest. However, the Central Bank Review of 1981, at page 257 shows that interest paid on foreign debt is 4.4 per cent of our recurrent expenditure, rising from 2.1 per cent in 1977. When the Hon. Minister of Finance took over, the interest paid on foreign debt was 2.1 per cent of the recurrent expenditure. At the end of 1981, it was 4.4 per cent of the recurrent expenditure. I am sure it will be much higher today. The Hon. Minister has assured us that he has not borrowed extensively from foreign private banks, but he cannot deny that a certain amount of borrowing has taken place from foreign private banks and that there is scope for increasing amounts of Euro-dollars to be invested in Sri Lanka. I am not saying that he should not borrow. In emergency situations, in difficult contingencies, Finance Ministers are sometimes forced to resort to commercial bank borrowing. But, I think, Government borrowing from foreign private banks is an invitation to disaster.

Yesterday, I was rather surprised when the Hon. Minister of Lands and Land Development took the hon. Member for Kalawana to task for saying that we are on the brink of a disaster. But, actually I was surprised on a re-reading of the Hon. Finance Minister's speech that he himself says that we are on the brink of a disaster. I think, in Column 568, of the Finance Minister's speech, he says :

"Consequently, there has been heavy recourse to the domestic banking system as well as foreign commercial borrowing. This simply cannot continue. It will lead us to disaster".



[ඒ. අමිණිප්පාලි මහතා]

Apparently, Sir, in this Government, as in Gonsalo's "Republic" in Shakespeare, the end forgets the beginning. The Hon. Minister of Lands and Land Development who spoke towards the end of the debate has forgotten what the Hon. Minister of Finance who opened the debate said at the beginning. He said it will lead us to disaster. What does it mean? That we are on the brink of a disaster! And when an hon. Member of the Opposition says, "We are on the brink of a disaster", the Hon. Minister of Lands, Land Development and Mahaweli Development takes up cudgels and says, "how dare you say we are on the brink of a disaster. Oh! we are in the pink of economic health!" That was what he was trying to say. I am sure that it is people who try to lull the public into a false sense of economic security, who are doing the greatest damage. I should compliment the Hon. Minister of Finance in that respect. He has not tried to pull the wool over our eyes. He has been very frank for the most part, though not in all parts, in his assessment of the situation.

This now brings us to the very realistic, I should say very frank, suggestion made by his Excellency the President in New Delhi. Though it may hamper the loan-seeking activities of the Hon. Minister of Finance, I think, his Excellency was quite realistic. He knew that ultimately most of these countries will not be able to pay. The Prime Minister himself quoted what Lee Kuan Yew said, that these people should writeoff. This, exactly, is what is his Excellency the President said. I see nothing to be flabbergasted about what his Excellency is supposed to have said, though it may not be very conducive to future expeditions of the Hon. Minister of Finance in search of aid.

I think the Government should, along with other under-developed countries, seek to pursue the suggestion of His Excellency the President. We have, to a great extent, kept our distance from other developing countries. I think our policies from 1977 onwards show that we cannot go it alone and that international institutions like the IMF and the World Bank are not value-free, public spirited donors.

The Hon. Prime Minister said that, after all, we are shareholders in the IMF and the World Bank. But, His Excellency had quoted Dante and said,

"Abandon all hope ye who enter here".

This was Dante's conception of the Inferno. Does the Hon. Prime Minister say that we are partners in the Inferno, in the new Hell? No doubt we hold very small shares in the IMF and the World Bank but the policies of the World Bank and the IMF are dictated by the big capitalist countries of the Western world and they are not motivated by any public spiritedness or philanthropic ideas.

I think it will be relevant to quote the "Hindu" of 10th March 1983, which reported a part of the proceedings of the Senate Appropriations Committee of the United States:

"Testifying before the Senate Appropriations Committee on the issue of US funds for the voluntary agencies of the UN system, Mrs. Kirkpatrick urged that American assistance should be linked to the support by countries in the world body. She made the suggestion as a means of curbing criticism of the US in the UN. Mrs. Kirkpatrick said that we must communicate that it is not possible to denounce us on Monday, vote against us on important issues perhaps on Tuesday and Wednesday and pick up assurances of our support on Thursday and Friday".

These are the guidelines that control the disbursement of aid. They have also given the percentage or the number of occasions when various developing countries have voted with the United States. India has voted only 17 times while Sri Lanka has voted 22 times. So, we are getting closer and closer. I have nothing against the United States. Let not the Hon. Prime Minister think that I have a phobia against any of these countries. Nor should we get further and further away from other countries as we get closer and closer to the United States so that our non-alignment gets tarnished to that extent. One has to keep that in mind when seeking to rely on these foreign loans.

Let us admit the mistakes of our past reticence and return to the multilateral fora. As leaders of the non-aligned, let us help formulate creative suggestions for a collective Third World Programme of action.—*(Interruption)*. Yes, we have done that but some people are seeking to disown it. They dare not disown it openly but they are quietly trying to take away the effect of it. I am merely saying that the Government should pursue it as a positive policy. I think there should be co-operation at a regional level—not standing in isolation, leaning heavily on the Western world, but co-operation at a regional level among the countries of Southern Asia—India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka, not the ASEAN countries. These countries of Southern Asia should develop strategies of co-operation—economic co-operation and development.

Perhaps somebody may turn round and say, "Oh, you who are seeking to establish a separate state, are advising collaboration and co-operation with other countries." Even when we get our separate state we will collaborate and co-operate with you and with the other countries of the region. Otherwise there is no future for any of these countries.

We must be realistic. The economic life of countries cannot be pursued in isolation. That is a fact that we have to take into consideration. Even the developed Western countries, the European countries, have set up the European Economic Community. We are seeking to rely, to depend on the aid of these Western imperialist countries



who give aid with one hand and take it away in a different form with the other. That is why we are in this mess. Our development strategy should be evolved on a basis of co-operation on a regional footing with other countries of Southern Asia. That is what I would like to say. Let the issue of foreign debt be one of the primary motivating factors in a new era of South-South dialogue. Our recent cynicism with regard to Third World joint action must be replaced with a new hope if we are to escape from the present crisis of a dependence.

Now I come to the next point that the Hon. Minister of Finance set out to do. He spoke of the Budget deficit and said, "Oh, how atrocious! The last Government left us their budgeting. They resorted to deficit budgeting." This is what he said:

"Mr. Speaker, I need hardly enter into a scholarly discourse on the effects of an excessive increase in the money supply. Suffice it to say that the unprecedented monetary expansion in the past seven years has eaten very much into the value of the rupee imposing in the process intolerable burdens on the common man."

He said something in Sinhala, which, for fear of mispronouncing, I dare not repeat. But the translation is, "The value of the rupee has declined so much that the rupee is now in tatters." He says, "The money supply has continued to increase rapidly up to the time the present Government took office and our own efforts to ease the burdens of the people will be rendered that much more difficult in the coming months because increase in the money supply reacts on prices with a time lag."

You cannot say after six years that you are suffering from what they did? What is the position of the Rupee today? You said in 1976 that the Rupee was in tatters. I think today it must have disintegrated beyond recognition. Today the tatters must have reduced to pulp! I do not have to labour the point very much. I think in 1977 as against the US Dollar the parity value of the Rupee was Rs. 7.89. Even in 1981, at the time of the 1981 Budget, it was Rs. 20.80 to the Dollar. What is it today? According to today's paper, it is Rs. 22.98, that is, Rs. 23 to the Dollar. Between November 1981, that is, the time of the last Budget Debate, and today there is a 10 per cent devaluation. Actually, between 1977 and 1983 I think the drop in value is almost 190 per cent.

I recently read an article in the "Sun" newspaper by one of our economists, Mr. N. U. Jayawardena, where he says that at the time Sri Lanka became independent the parity value of the rupee was Rs. 4.75 to the US Dollar. Today it is Rs. 23 to the US Dollar. You can calculate the percentage of devaluation that has taken place over this period. In that article Mr. N. U. Jayawardena says, "By contrast the Indian Rupee has over the last 35 years been devalued only by 13 per cent and it has reached a position

of stability." In fact, as against the Indian Rupee, in 1977 when you took over one Rupee of Sri Lanka currency was equivalent to 89 cents of Indian currency. Our currency had a higher value than the Indian currency. Today one Indian Rupee is equivalent to Rs. 2.31 according to today's paper.

The Hon. Minister of Finance said that the wrong policies of the last Government had reduced the Rupee to tatters. What has he to say with regard to the position of the Rupee today? In fact, Sir, the position is so uncertain that the Hon. Minister of Finance in his own Budget speech said this—column 569:

"Mr. Speaker, the exchange rates of the Rupee vis-a-vis foreign currencies have changed since the Draft Estimates were prepared."

So, we are not sure what the value of the Rupee will be tomorrow and what it will be day after.

I think one of the primary functions of a currency, if I remember the little economics I studied under professor Das Gupta those days correctly, is that it is a store of value. Currency function is that of a store of value. What is the worth of this currency which between the date the Draft Estimates were prepared and the date the Draft Estimates were presented in Parliament has got devalued? It has got depreciated further. That shows the parlous state our currency is in.

Now, Sir, the Hon. Minister of Finance spoke of the balance of payments position that the last Government left behind. He spoke of bank borrowing which, he said, was very dangerous. What is it today? I think we are faced with a crisis as far as our balance of payments are concerned. The trade deficit in 1982 stood at SDR 898 million. I hope I am correct. The Hon. Minister of Finance is mainly concerned in this Budget with trying to bridge this yawning gulf, this gaping abyss between our export earnings and our imports. Is it not clear, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that we have been living beyond our means and we are in this parlous state today?

பேரவைத் தலைவர் அவர்களே:

(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. ச. மெல்)  
(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

I have said it many, many times.

பு. அமீர்தலிங்கம் அவர்கள்:

(திரு. ஏ. அமிர்தலிங்கம்)  
(Mr. A. Amirthalingam)

You have said so. I know the Hon. Minister of Finance's difficulty. This is like the physician who is treating the patient who says, "You know, I gave the correct prescription but the patient did not take it. What am I to do?"







பி. ஐரீதலிங்கம்

(திரு. ஏ. அமிர்தலிங்கம்)

Mr. A. Amirthalingam

29.98 per cent in 1973, as against 39.03 per cent in 1979. Then the second ten had 15.91 per cent. In 1979, even that got reduced to 15.27 per cent. The third class with 12.65 per cent got reduced to 11.23 per cent. The fourth class with 10.56 per cent got reduced to 9.12 per cent. The fifth class with 8.75 per cent got reduced to 7.29 per cent. Anyhow I want to bracket the top five together—all those that I have mentioned together—and you will find that the affluent half of our society holds 81.94 per cent of the wealth and the other half holds a mere 18.06 per cent of the wealth. This is as in 1979. I am told, according to economic surveys which have been carried out, that the disparity is even greater today. It is not yet published may be advisedly. Fifty per cent of the population holds 18 per cent as against the other 50 per cent holding 82 per cent. And the Hon. Minister is pleading for austerity! Can the poor who hold only 18 per cent tighten their belts any further? And, in act, this survey was before the impact of your food stamps was felt. Today it is much higher. I have certain notes on that matter.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, as many speakers have reiterated before me, this Government, in furtherance of a policy of economic growth, has removed the system of subsidies which earlier provided low income groups with a cushion against adversity. The Consumer Finance Survey indicate that an individual living in Sri Lanka in 1973 would have required at least Rs. 147 a month to meet the minimum needs. By 1979, taking into account inflation but not taking into account the removal of subsidies, an individual would need Rs. 480 a month just to meet the basic minimum needs. If the Food Stamps Scheme is an indicator, over fifty per cent our population lives below the level of poverty. If Rs. 480 is accepted as the minimum income for a man to meet his basic needs, you give the food stamps only to people getting under Rs. 300—under the deflated Rs. 300, and you give deflated food stamps. They are not given the minimum needs for a human being to live with dignity and self respect. In this context, Mr. Deputy chairman, I am not talking about the relative position of the poor vis-a-vis the rich, I am talking about a situation of absolute poverty. The Food Stamp Scheme provides some relief from the problem, but the fixed value of the food stamps in the face of over 75 per cent increase in the price of foodstuffs since 1977 cannot really come to terms with the depth of our poverty problem. What have you to say, Mr. Finance Minister? Have you even touched the fringe of this poverty problem? What have you done to the under-privileged, to the deprived half of the community?

In fact, the policies of this Government and also the preceding government has resulted in the fact that the per capita availability of calories in 1982 was less than it was 12 years ago in 1970, and the per capita intake of protein is also less than the protein intake in 1970. There have been surveys done and it has been found to be so. They have done some survey in some villages. One of the villages in which the Marga Institute has done a survey is a village called Walgampaya—I think it must be in the central part close to where that Hon. Minister of Defence comes from—and they have found that the living conditions of those people in that village had deteriorated, that they have just one meal a day. Earlier when there was this food subsidy available, they were able to have more food; today they have only one meal of rice and yam; no protein. The survey was done by a team. As I said, Sir, the proof of the pudding is in the eating! I think this survey was done last year by the Marga Institute. As I said we have a glittering surface decoration, TV antennas which have gone up in a number of rich homes, and in several villages—not in every house. In every village, there is a rich money-lender and a rich mudalali who can afford to have a TV set and everything. I do not deny that every village has a TV set.—(Interruption).

I think the Hon. Minister must be looking after the Southern Province and not the rest of the country. I am referring to the condition in Walgampaya. As a Minister you must know that the Southern Province has rejected your Government. They have defeated you in the Referendum in the Districts of Galle, Matara and Hambantota. The politically enlightened Districts of the South—up to Kalatura—have rejected you. You cannot forget that. Those are politically conscious areas.

மன் திவரேசன்

(அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(A Member)

What about Kotmale?

பி. ஐரீதலிங்கம்

(திரு. ஏ. அமிர்தலிங்கம்)

(Mr. A. Amirthalingam)

It was not a politically conscious area.

மன் திவரேசன்

(அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(A Member)

What about Anuradhapura and Medawachchiya which was twice affected?

பி. ஐரீதலிங்கம்

(திரு. ஏ. அமிர்தலிங்கம்)

(Mr. A. Amirthalingam)

In fact, Sir, the matter that I was referring to is this, that the Marga institute has studied the absolute poverty, and shows that in the central areas, in a



[ஈ. டிபார்ட்மென்ட் மெம்பர்]

village like Walgampaya for example, a large percentage of the people continue to live in a desperately poor condition, with very little hope of relief. They eat one meal a day—a course of yam and rice—in a poor environment with poor sanitation and the inadequacy of living space. Their conditions have not changed since 1977. They have not experienced any of the positive aspects of economic development. So that our talking big of economic activity of affluence has no meaning. There is no doubt as I pointed out that the top ten per cent are getting richer and richer. This is not a sweeping statement I am making. My statement is borne out by the Central Bank survey; the top ten per cent who in 1973 had only 29.9 per cent, that is about thirty per cent of the wealth to day have nearly forty per cent of the wealth. The hon. Member for Nallur in the course of his speech said that your Government's stewardship of this country has only resulted in giving pleasure for the top ten per cent and pain for at least the bottom fifty per cent, an may be a neutral situation for the other 40 per cent. But in this situation, what have you done with your tax proposals ?

Sir, I have no time to enter into a discussion or a discourse on the comparative advantages and disadvantages of direct taxation and indirect taxation. The income tax, death duty and taxes like that are something where you directly take into consideration the wealth of the man, the income of the man and recover a percentage as tax. But this BTT hits all and sundry equally. Everyone from the poorest to the richest are equally hit. This is the sort of equality that you are doing. You are hitting the poor in the same way you are hitting the rich. I am sure this will make the poor poorer and the rich richer. That is, in other words, the outcome of the policy that this Government is pursuing. Had I more time I would have dwelt with it at greater length, but I have to deal with another point that the Hon. Prime Minister made.

The Hon. Minister of Finance claimed that the fruits of growth had been shared by all sectors, all regions and all economic classes. I shall show how all economic classes have not shared the fruits equally.

Let us see how the regions have fared. The hon. Member for Vaddukkodai (Dr. Neelan Tiruchelvam) in the course of a masterly analysis of the capital expenditure, supported with facts and figures, said that there has been discriminatory expenditure of the capital allocation. He pointed out how when one takes into consideration the total capital expenditure in 1981, which is Rs. 9,746,220,000, it works out to a per capita expenditure of Rs. 656, but he pointed out that in the Jaffna District, the total that was spent was Rs. 260,329,000 which works out to a per capita

expenditure of Rs. 313, and in the Batticaloa District it is far worse. The Batticaloa District has two Ministers in the ranks of the Government and one Member. Three Members representing that district are with the Government.

ஈ. டிபார்ட்மென்ட் மெம்பர்

(திரு. எம். சிவசிதம்பரம்)

(Mr. M. Sivasithamparam)

One District Minister.

ஈ. டிபார்ட்மென்ட் மெம்பர்

(திரு. ஏ. அமிர் தலிங்கம்)

(Mr. A. Amirthalingam)

No, that District Minister is from the Amparai District. In the Batticaloa District the total capital expenditure in 1981 was Rs. 61,404,000 which works out to a per capita expenditure of Rs. 185 per individual.

I do not want to go into what was spent in the Vavuniya, Mullaitivu and the Mannar Districts. I will take these two districts only. The Hon. Prime Minister in his reply to that had said that the hon. Member for Vaddukkodai had not taken into consideration the big development schemes like the Mahaweli. To some extent that is true. But this total in Jaffna includes the expenditure that was incurred on the Cement Corporation which was in that year Rs. 180,236,000. That is included. If you exclude that, it will be just a paltry sum of Rs. 80 million that has been spent in the North, working out to about Rs. 100 per person. That is an expenditure, as the Hon. Prime Minister said quite correctly, not meant for the people of Jaffna, but meant for the whole island. But even including that, taking that into consideration, we find that the per capita expenditure on capital works has been Rs. 313 in the Jaffna District and Rs. 185 in the Batticaloa district, whereas the Island's average is Rs. 656. That does not mean that in the other districts—

ஈ. டிபார்ட்மென்ட் மெம்பர்

(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த மெல்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

Will you please table for our information, the figures from the Marga Institute as to what the average is for Galle, Matara, Kalutara and Hambantota Districts ?

ஈ. டிபார்ட்மென்ட் மெம்பர்

(திரு. ஏ. அமிர் தலிங்கம்)

(Mr. A. Amirthalingam)

This is not from the Marga Institute.

ஈ. டிபார்ட்மென்ட் மெம்பர்

(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த மெல்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

I assure you that the Southern Province has got worse treatment than Jaffna.







[ඊ. අමේන්තුවේ මෙහෙය]

to realize, that you cannot continue to do injustice to people and expect them to take it lying down. That is what I say.

This Government, at the time of the Elections, set out certain matters on which they said that the Tamil people have a grievance. They said language was one. You included certain provisions in the Constitution for the use of the Tamil language. What have you done? Has even one of those provisions been implemented? Even I continue to get letters in Sinhala only, without any translation. I have to go in search of some person to get it translated. That is the position, even as a Member of Parliament, I am in today. What is the point in having in your Constitution certain rights for the Tamil language? In the Vavuniya District, you have appointed Judicial officers who do not know the Tamil language. In the Vavuniya District records are being kept in Sinhala. Is it in keeping with your Constitution? What remedy do we have? What is the use of merely writing sugar on a piece of paper and licking it? You cannot get the taste of sugar. You must have sugar in your hand. You have not done anything to solve the language problem.

We have been trying to negotiate with the Government. We sat round a table and enjoyed His Excellency's tea for one whole year. What have we achieved? A number of matters agreed upon have not been implemented. Take one small matter; some person in an unauthorised way set up a Buddha statue at the Mannar-Jaffna-Vavuniya Junction. His Excellency agreed that it was disgraceful, that it should be removed. The Hon. Minister of Cultural Affairs agreed that it should be removed. It is two years since you agreed but the status remains there. Is the Government powerless? Is the Government unable to get its own servants, to get its own armed forces, to get its own police force to remove it? What is the position? That was agreed two years ago. That statue was taken from the Ceramic Corporation and planted there by the AGA, an employee of the Hon. Minister of Home Affairs. They are unable to do anything. When it comes to corrective measures, where there has been a wrong done to the Tamil people, the Government is helpless.

In the matter of employment, His Excellency wrote to me as early as 1979 that, "there is no doubt discrimination, that there was a grievance in the matter of employment. I will see that recruitment for employment in the public and semi-public sectors is on a population ratio," but up to date, for six long years, nothing has been done to put this matter right. The same thing continues. Good-hearted persons like the District Minister for Colombo—I have a lot of affection for him—and a number of others may not be aware of these facts. They come and preach to us, to be

good, to co-operate, to do this and that. How can we co-operate when not one of the grievances that the Tamil people have put forward has been remedied. Some of the Hon. Members in the back benches, of the Government seem to think that everything has been done, that they have done a lot for us. I ask any Hon. Minister to get up and say one matter that they have done to remove the grievances; one substantial matter that they have done to remove the grievances of the Tamil people, after they came into power in 1977.

You introduced the District Development Councils as a measure of decentralisation. The Hon. Minister of Finance knows that even last year we had conferences with him and the treasury officials on a district budget, so that the District Development Councils may have sufficient funds—not for the North and the East, but for the whole Island—so that they may function effectively. Has it been done? District Development Councils came into existence in 1981; we are now in 1983, more than 2 years since the Councils came into operation. No funds have been made available to them though these laws lay down that there will be a District Service established. Has anything been done to establish a District Service? On matters where the remedying of grievances of the Tamil people are concerned, the Government moves at a snail's pace, but on matters where the Tamil people had to be put down, they move at jet speed.

In 1978, you introduced a law, an obnoxious law, a Draconian law to, as you said, stamp out terrorism in the North and his Excellency commissioned Brigadier Weeratunga, in the words of Hitler, to go forth and stamp out terrorism before 31st of December 1978. Now, we are in March 1983. Has terrorism been stamped out? Has terrorism been stamped out by oppression, by counter-terrorism in any part of the world? The British tried to stamp out terrorism of the IRA by measures like that. They have only made matters worse. It has only multiplied. Violence feeds on itself. Violence begets violence and leads to more and more violence. His Excellency realises that and he has in his discussions with us shown an interest, shown a desire to find a peaceful solution to this problem, but intentions alone will not do. The pathway to hell, it is said, is paved with good intentions, but what is necessary is action. An ounce of action is worth more than a pound of words. In words you say that you have done this and that, but in actual fact you have not done anything to solve the problems. That is why you will not be able to have the peace that is necessary to solve the economic problems. It is in this situation that we have, since 1976, put forward the demands that our rights of self-determination should be recognized, that we should have the right to rule ourselves as free people and that is the only way in which we can live as equals in this country.



You may trot out a few examples of some Tamils, V.I.P.P, some Tamils in the Diplomatic Service, but these are all carry-overs of the past. Today, take the lower rank in the service, take the juniors in the service, take the administrative service – in fact, the Hon. Minister of Public Administration does not have enough Tamils in the Administrative Service to be Assistant Government Agents in the Tamil areas. That is the position in which the Tamil speaking public servants are today. The Hon. Minister of Home Affairs has said that on the Floor of this House; he has admitted that in the course of discussions with His Excellency. What have you done to rectify that ?

In fact, the International Commission of Jurists in their report published in December 1981, have said that one of the biggest drawbacks in the body politic in this country is that the armed forces are lop-sided. There are not even 1 per cent Tamil-speaking people in the armed forces. The Government promises to rectify this but what have they done ? The other day a young man from my electorate came to see me. He had applied to join the Air Force. He had his A-Levels, was an athlete and had all the necessary qualifications. He went through the physicals and other tests and came up to the final examination. At the final interview, the Air Force officer asked him, “ How can we trust you ? How can we be sure that you will not fly away with one of these planes ? ” If that is your attitude, then allow us to go. You cannot keep us with you and ask us to be under you forever.

I daresay, that a self-respecting person whether he be a Tamil or otherwise, would not want to be in that position. If you distrust us, then allow us to go and look after ourselves. This is what we have been saying. There must be a change of heart. If you want to have peace in this country and if you want to have economic development, the only way in which you can achieve that is by seeing that justice, equality and freedom for all sections of the Tamil speaking are ensured. I am sorry if I have got a bit worked up in referring to this.

**சென்ட்ரல்களின்**  
(அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)  
(A Member)

You are off the track !

**பி. அமிர்தலிங்கம்**  
(திரு. ஏ. அமிர்தலிங்கம்)  
(Mr. A. Amirthalingam)

For the back-benchers it is a laughing matter but for me it is a matter of life and death ! That is why I speak with some emotion. I want the back-benchers to understand this. We would like to be friends, to be chums and patted on the back but we cannot when we are trodden under the feet of authority. When a

third-rate army officer stops us and sits on us, do you think we can take that lying down ? I appeal to hon. Members to realize this.

You say this is a new Government. Whether old or new, it is His Excellency J. R. Jayewardene’s Government. We have always said that we are willing to negotiate and settle this matter with peace and honour. But, if agreements reached, if understandings reached are not carried out, if those understandings remain dead letters on pieces of paper and files, what is the use of talking ? That is the question our youth are asking.

Having dealt with the economic aspects. I would say that if you want economic development, a correct political solution to this problem between the two nations in this country has to be worked out. I hope that the Government will in its wisdom or will have the wisdom or get the wisdom to work out the solution peacefully.

I thank you, Sir.

**நியோகக் கமிட்டி**  
(குழு உப தலைவர்)  
(Mr. Deputy Chairman of Committees)

The Hon. Speaker will now take the Chair.

**உறுப்பினர்** நியோகக் கமிட்டி இரவுகளில் ஓய்வூதியக் கமிட்டியை [ஈல் லைட் பி. ஈல் லைட் லைட்] இரவுகளில் இல்லை.

அதன் பிறகு, பிரதிக் குழுத் தலைவர் அவர்கள் அக்கிராசனத்தி னின்று அகலவே, சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள் [அல்லஹாஜ் எம் அப்துல் பாகிர் மாகார்] தலைமை வகித்தார்கள்.

Whereupon MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES left the Chair, and MR. SPEAKER [AL HAJ M. ABDUL BAKEER MARKAR] took the Chair.

**பி. ஜி. டி. டி. டி. மெல்** (இடல் லைட் சபாநாயகர்)  
(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. ஜி. த. மெல்—நிதி, அமைப்புத்திட்ட அமைச்சர்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel—Minister of Finance and Planning)

Mr. Speaker, the fight for self-determination of the Tamil United Liberation Front is strictly outside the purview of my Budget. I do not propose to deal with it. After all the heat that has been engendered by my Friend, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I would like to divert this Debate to its proper subject, which is the economic and financial management of this country.

I was listening with great patience to the many speeches, particularly from the Opposition benches. I was reminded of a little line that I used to learn in school from Alexander Pope’s “Rape of the Lock”–

“What mighty contests rise from trivial things”

I think the other line is :

“What dire offence from am’rous causes spring”



[சுடர். சே. சி. டி. டி. மென்]

I am not going to deal with the second line. That, I am going to leave for the younger Members of this House like my good Friend from Nuwara Eliya-Maskeliya.-(*Interruption.*) No, both of them. Let them share it. Anyway, what a lot of sound and fury both sense and nonsense, was generated for example during the course of this Debate, by a chance reference that His Excellency the President made in New Delhi when he said-

"Abandon hope all ye who enter here"

-a perfectly harmless reference, Sir. I would almost say, a perfectly casual reference in the course of a press conference ; a most quotable quote from Dante's "Divine Comedy". I do not understand what all this fuss is about. A veritable inferno was raised by my good Friend, the hon. Member for Kalawana (Mr. Sarath Muttetuwegama), by my good Friend the hon. Member for Nuwara Eliya-Maskeliya (Mr. Anura Bandaranaike) and I think even by my good Friend, the hon. Member for Nallur (Mr. M. Sivasithamparam). I propose to divert this Debate a little bit at this late stage to Dante. Canto III, from which His Excellency the President has taken this quotation. This is a Canto, you must deal with it in its proper context, and I propose to do so particularly because my good Friend from Nuwara Eliya-Maskeliya dealt with it at such great length. In Canto III, Virgil is leading Dante to the gates of Hell, to டிபூச, to inferno. Sir, I will read the entire quotation and then we will see how harmless this quotation is-

"Dante, following Virgil, comes to the gate of Hell ; where, after having read the dreadful words that are written thereon, they both enter. Here, as he understands from Virgil, those were punished who had passed their time in a state of apathy and indifference both to good and evil".

I think there are many such people in this country.

"Then pursuing their way, they arrive at the river Acheron ;"

We used to call it the *styx* in the old days when we did Latin.

"and there find the old ferryman Charon, who takes the spirits over to the opposite shore ; which as soon as Dante reaches, he is seized with terror and falls into a trance."

This is how the verse goes :

"Through me you pass into the city of woe :

Through me you pass into eternal pain :"

I think it is very appropriate for the SLFP now-passing through pain.

"Through me among the people lost for aye,  
Justice the founder of my fabric moved ;  
To rear me was the task of power divine,  
Supremest wisdom, and primaeval love.

Before me things create were none, save things  
Eternal, and eternal I endure.  
All hope abandon, ye who enter here."

Italian sounds better, Sir-*Lasciate ogni speranza, voi entrate.* Then he goes on :

"Such characters, in colour dim, I marked  
Over a portal's lofty arch inscribed.  
Whereat I thus : 'Master, these words import  
Hard meaning.' He as one prepared replied :  
'Here thou must all distrust behind thee leave :  
Here be vile fear extinguished. We are come  
Where I have told thee we shall see the souls  
To misery doomed, who intellectual good  
Have lost. ' And when his hand he had stretched forth  
To mine, with pleasant looks, whence I was cheered,  
Into that secret place he led me on."

Then we come to the real passage.

"Here sighs, with lamentations and loud moans,  
Resounded through the air pierced by no star,  
That e'en I wept at entering. Various tongues,  
Horrible languages, outcries of woe,"

I am sure the hon. Second Member for Harispattuwa was describing this-what happened at a building at Darley Road.

"Accents of anger, voices deep and hoarse,"

The Member for Kotmale.

"With hands together smote that swelled the sounds,  
Made up a tumult, that for ever whirls"

That is what the hon. Second Member for Harispattuwa was describing.

"Round through that air with solid darkness stained,  
Like to the sand that in the whirlwind flies.  
I then, with error yet encompassed, cried :  
'O master ! what is this I hear ? what race  
Are these, who seem so overcome with woe ?'  
He thus to me : 'This miserable fate  
Suffer the wretched souls of those, who lived  
Without or praise or blame, with that ill band  
Of angels mixed, who nor rebellious proved,  
Nor yet were true to God, but for themselves."

Then he goes on to say :

"Woe to you, wicked spirits ! hope not  
ever to see the sky again. I come  
To take you to the other shore across,  
Into eternal darkness, there to dwell  
In fierce heat and in ice."

Dante's epitaph to the Sri Lanka Freedom Party !

ஊர் நினைவரணைகை மென்

(திரு. அனூர் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. Anura Bandaranaike)

A good way to fill the gap.







ஈ. சே. சீ. டி. டி. டி. டி.

(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த. மெல்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

The hon. Member for Attanagalla should know that office minutes and staff reports are not tabled in Parliament. We will table the agreement in Parliament.

ஈ. சே. சீ. டி. டி. டி. டி.

(திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி.)

(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

Will you table the IMF staff report of July 1982 ? I Will give the date—July 1982. It is by Chibriya.

ஈ. சே. சீ. டி. டி. டி. டி.

(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த. மெல்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

I have tabled two agreements in this House and I will table any agreements that I enter into in future. We tabled Dr. N. M. Perera's—

ஈ. சே. சீ. டி. டி. டி. டி.

(திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி.)

(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

Please table the one I am asking for. I know you read from the “ Illustrated Weekly ” of India.

ஈ. சே. சீ. டி. டி. டி. டி.

(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த. மெல்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

No, not the “ Illustrated Weekly ” of India.

ஈ. சே. சீ. டி. டி. டி. டி.

(திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி.)

(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

I do not think any of the Ministers know about this.

ஈ. சே. சீ. டி. டி. டி. டி.

(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த. மெல்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

If you table all the reports and minutes in the Ministry of Defence & External Affairs for the 1971 period, I will table this.

ஈ. சே. சீ. டி. டி. டி. டி.

(திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி.)

(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

Have you shown this to the other Ministers ?

ஈ. சே. சீ. டி. டி. டி. டி.

(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த. மெல்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

Have you taken those files home ?

ஈ. சே. சீ. டி. டி. டி. டி.

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please !

ஈ. சே. சீ. டி. டி. டி. டி.

(திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி.)

(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

Have you shown this to the Ministers ?

ஈ. சே. சீ. டி. டி. டி. டி.

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please !

ஈ. சே. சீ. டி. டி. டி. டி.

(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த. மெல்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

I give the assurance that when an agreement is entered into I will table it in the House. I Cannot table office minutes in this House. It has never been done.

ஈ. சே. சீ. டி. டி. டி. டி.

(திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி.)

(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

No, Sir, this is a staff report. It is an IMF staff report.

ஈ. சே. சீ. டி. டி. டி. டி.

(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த. மெல்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

These reports are not meant for the House.

ஈ. சே. சீ. டி. டி. டி. டி.

(திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி.)

(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

The date is also given. It is by a person called Chibriya. Why are you hiding it ? I do not think any of the Ministers know about this.

ஈ. சே. சீ. டி. டி. டி. டி.

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please! The Minister said he will table all agreements.

ஈ. சே. சீ. டி. டி. டி. டி.

(திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி.)

(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

I also hope that he will table this particular report that I am asking for (*Interruption*).

ஈ. சே. சீ. டி. டி. டி. டி.

(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த. மெல்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry Sir, for the interruption. It has been a most difficult relationship with the IMF, a relationship of ups and downs. I never have been a lover of the IMF or of the World Bank. In fact, I have even demonstrated against the visit of Mr. Mc Namara to this country about 15 years ago.

The Second Member for Nuwara Eliya-Maskeliya has affirmed quite categorically, not once, not twice, but many times recently that he does not want to go back to the era



of shortages, the era of scarcities, the era of queues, the era of rationing, the era of the *කල් පොල*, *මිනිස් පොල* and the “*ලුහු පොල*” and the “*පාන් පෝලිමි*”. Quite rightly. I appreciate the frankness of my good Friend for Nuwara Eliya-Maskeliya, but he must also appreciate the circumstances under which we liberated this country from those shortages, scarcities and queues to which the previous regime condemned it. How did we liberate this country from that era of shortages scarcities and queues; from those *කල් පොල* and those “*පාන් පෝලිමි*”. We did so by liberalising our economy. How did we liberalise our economy? Let us go step by step. By abolishing the import and exchange controls as far as possible. How did we abolish import and exchange controls, which neither Dr. Perera nor Mr. Felix Dias Bandaranaike could do, in fact what this country could not do for 15 years? We abolished import and exchange controls. We abolished scarcities shortages and queues, only by entering into an agreement with the IMF in 1977. Whether we like the IMF or not, the IMF and the IMF alone underwrote the entire liberalisation of our trade and payments. The IMF and IMF alone was responsible for freeing our country from those shortages, scarcities and queues. Without them, we would simply not have been able to do this—never, never on our own resources. Without them we would still be living in the “*Illangaratne era*” of which you are aware, I know that you are aware about that era, the *Illangaratne* trade policies without the IMF. Without the IMF and the IMF agreement, we would still be having “*කරවල කුමරයෝ*”, not “*කරවල කුමරයෝ*” but *කුණු කරවල කුමරයෝ*”. I can assure you that only the IMF by entering into this agreement with us saved us from this situation. At least whether we like them or not, we have to thank them for that balance of payment support which enabled us to liberate our economy and free this country from those shortages, scarcities and queues, from those “*කල් පොල*” and “*මිනිස් පොල*”. Without an agreement with the IMF Sir, there would have been no World Bank aid, because world bank aid only follows an agreement with the IMF. Without an IMF Agreement the Sri Lanka Aid Consortium would not have come and aided us in the way they did with fifteen to sixteen thousand million rupees every year. In the SLFP times they gave 500 million rupees as against our 15,000 million rupees. Without the agreement with the IMF, which we entered into in 1977, there would have been no accelerated Mahaweli. The Mahaweli would have taken us thirty years, as they planned to do it. Without the agreement with the IMF there would have been no development and no growth in this land. Without the IMF there would have been no employment, no Free Trade Zone, no foreign investment, no integrated rural development.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. A. Amirthalingam), the hon. Member for Mannar (Mr. P. S. Soosaitathan) and the hon. Member for Vavuniya (Mr. T. Sivasithamparam) cry out aloud for integrated rural development. You will have integrated rural development in Vavuniya and Mannar this year. Why? Because we entered into that agreement with the IMF in 1977. Did we have any integrated rural developments before 1977? Nowhere did Dr. N. M. Perera get money for integrated rural development. We have been able to get integrated rural development schemes going in Hambantota, Puttalam, Matara, Badulla, Kurunegala, Matale, and now in Vavuniya and Mannar, and very soon in Moneragala, next in Kegalle and Ratnapura—all because we entered into that agreement with the IMF. Rural development, rural electrification. We would not have had roads. We would not have been able to allocate money for the housing programme. For seven long years Mr. Peter Keuneman—I mean no disrespect to him; he is an old friend of mine and a very capable man—was only able to build about 450 houses, as against the 100,000 houses, for which money could be allocated to the Hon. the Prime Minister by me because of our agreement with the IMF.

The hon. Member for Attanagalla (Mr. Lakshman Jayakody) is still huffing and hawing! I will give him some more statistics which will send him home.—(Interruption) You would be back to square one without that agreement with the IMF. We would be back to stagnation, acute unemployment, youth unrest, blood shed, and starvation that characterised the period from 1970 to 1977. Whatever growth, whatever development we have been able to achieve in the last six years, all stem from that foundation, the agreement with the IMF in 1977.

Not that we like the IMF. We still fight with them. I will tell you the history of our relations. Let us analyse our relationship with the IMF. I will give you the whole truth, the entirety of our relationship with them. I will table all the agreements. We have had discussions, intricate discussions, debates, long negotiations and many quarrels. We have agreed to disagree. We have had suspensions. We have had estrangements. It had been, in short, a love-hate type of relationship. It has been something like the relationship between Elizabeth Taylor and Richard Burton—marriage, divorce and re-marriage! It has been that type of relationship. It has been a very difficult relationship with many ups and downs. The agreement was suspended in 1980 because we did not agree to their conditions. I refused to agree to their conditions. It was suspended for one whole year and we got no money at all from the IMF in the entire year 1980, because we did not agree to their conditions. It was renewed again in 1981 after one year of intricate



[ආච්. ජේ. ජී. ද මැලේ මහතා]

negotiations. Then for the whole of 1982 we had no agreement with them at all. Now we are again in the process of re-negotiating an agreement, if possible. The Agreement has not yet been concluded. Discussions are going on. I do not know whether we will succeed. It will take time. In a few month's time I will come back to this House, if we do not succeed in negotiating an Agreement, because if we do not sign an Agreement with the IMF we will have to rethink all our strategy for the future. We will have to inaugurate policies of greater self-reliance. Then, Sir, at that stage, I hope, if it happens, that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and everybody will give me one hundred per cent support to carry on the development of this country without IMF support in the future.

So what is all this fuss about His Excellency's statement about the IMF? I have said worse things against the IMF and the World Bank. I have brought with me one of the volumes of the minutes of annual meetings of the World Bank and the IMF. I have spoken at six of them, and in every one of my speeches I have taken up the issue that His Excellency took up in New Delhi. I have said worse things about the IMF in my speeches. Does the hon. Member for Nuwara Eliya-Maskeliya or the hon. Member for Kalawana, who is a deep student of the international monetary institutions although he does not believe in them, say that there was a lack of communication, as you are trying to make out, between His Excellency's speech and our approach here? His Excellency was just endorsing the same sentiments that every Minister of Finance of the Third World countries has been expressing for the last six years and even more. His Excellency's statement and proposals are also embodied, as you know, in the Brandt Commission Report, the North-South dialogue, a programme for survival. The Prime Minister also referred to it in his speech earlier. The Brandt Commission published their report in 1979, and nothing has been done to implement the main recommendation of this Brandt Commission Report. To all intents and purposes the Brandt Commission Report remains a dead letter even today. The Brandt Commission Report has been followed up in December last year with a report which they call "Common Crisis - North-South Co-operation for World Recovery." It is on the recommendation of this follow-up report of the Brandt Commission that His Excellency made all his proposals to the Non-Aligned Summit.

There has been nothing like a new departure in policy. It was not a cry of desperation. It was a message which His Excellency wanted conveyed to the developed nations of the world on behalf of the Third World countries, including Sri Lanka, who are suffering today due to world recession and inflation

and burdened by debt. Therefore, Sir, it is not correct in any way to say that there has been a new departure in policy, that Sri Lanka will be defaulting in her debts. We have no such intention. Sri Lanka has never defaulted even in one instalment of its debts up to date, either interest or instalment. Thirty-one countries of the Third World have defaulted on their debts. Many countries have asked for rescheduling - some for moratorium, others just refusing to pay their debts. His Excellency the President is really taking up the cause, essentially, of those Third World countries, taking up the cause of all Third World countries oppressed by debt.

I have brought with me for the edification of the hon. Member for Attanagalla - he needs some education on this subject - the entire history of our relationship with the IMF. I now propose to deal with the entire history from 1977 because he came out with a lot of arrant nonsense in this House which has got to be contradicted.

Soon after the present Government came into power in July 1977 it embarked upon a far-reaching programme of economic reform, development growth and employment to strengthen the balance of payments. It involved a structural transformation of the economy. The essential elements of this policy package were the removal of a complex array of trade and payment restrictions and exchange and import controls. This Government, through me, sought balance of payments assistance from the IMF on 16th November 1977 - I will give you the entire history - under a one-year stand-by arrangement amounting to SDR 93 million, which is about Rs. 2,000 million. This was approved by the IMF on 2nd December 1977, and the Government drew this stand-by credit in three instalments of SDR 55 million in December 1977, SDR 25 million in August 1978 and SDR 13 million in October 1978. It was with this allocation of SDR 93 million or Rs. 2,000 million that we embarked on the liberalization of the economy. If I did not get this, there would have been no liberalization of the economy. You would have had exchange and import control. There would have been no development and no employment.

Then, Sir, we found that the economic problems emanating from structural weaknesses of Sri Lanka's economy could not be solved by resorting to short-term financing arrangements such as stand-by credits which are given for one year. Sri Lanka required medium-term financing arrangements which covered a period of at least three years. Hence, on 22nd December 1978 the Government requested the IMF to provide a programme of medium-term balance of payments assistance designed to achieve further structural adjustments in the economy and to keep our



liberalization economy going. On 26th January 1979 the Fund approved a sum of SDR 260 million – that is about Rs. 6,000 million – for three years from January 1979 to December 1981 under the Extended Fund Facility, which we call an EFF.

Now, the hon. Member for Kalawana tried to make out that the EFF is something that the IMF gives its poor relations and that only four countries have got it. I must disabuse my hon. Friend of this misconception. Many countries have received an EFF. It is much more privileged to get an EFF for medium-term financing than a stand-by credit, which is only a short-term loan. The hon. Member will surely understand, Sir. He is a very intelligent man. If you are creditworthy, you get medium-term financing. If you are not creditworthy, you get a “santhosam” or a short-term loan. We were considered credit-worthy to get medium-term financing and an EFF in 1979. India has got an EFF. Pakistan has got an EFF. Indonesia has got an EFF. Beirut has got an EFF. Many countries have got an EFF. So it is not correct to derogate Sri Lanka and say, “They have treated us like a poor relation. They have given us an EFF”.

**சுரத் முத்தேவகம**

(திரு. சரத் முத்தேவகம)

(Mr. Sarath Muttetuwegama)

At the time Sri Lanka got it, only four countries had taken it.

**ஆர். ஜி. டி. டி. டி.**

(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. டி. டி. டி.)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

That makes it even more privileged. We were one of the first five to get it.

**சுரத் முத்தேவகம**

(திரு. சரத் முத்தேவகம)

(Mr. Sarath Muttetuwegama)

Haiti and Jamaica were the others.

**ஆர். ஜி. டி. டி. டி.**

(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. டி. டி. டி.)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

India and Pakistan got it just after.

**சுரத் முத்தேவகம**

(திரு. சரத் முத்தேவகம)

(Mr. Sarath Muttetuwegama)

After.

**ஆர். ஜி. டி. டி. டி.**

(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. டி. டி. டி.)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

We led the way.

Under this arrangement, drawings could be made in instalments subject to the observance of mutually agreed performance criteria. The performance criteria

are mainly the Budget deficit, the balance of payments, export performance, and the performance of the plantation sector. Up to June 1980 Sri Lanka observed all performance criteria and drew a total of SDR 110 million in three instalments. In June 1980 the right to draw under this arrangement was interrupted due to disagreement, due to non-compliance of the conditions by Sri Lanka. So, to say that we go on bended knees to the World Bank and the IMF and agree to any conditions to get this money is completely untrue. For one year we had a disagreement with the IMF. We did not agree to their conditions, and as a result we were not able to draw any money even on the EFF which we had been given.

After successful re-negotiations with the Fund, after one year, we got the right to draw in June 1981. Between June 1981 and December 1981 Sri Lanka drew the balance of the EFF in four instalments. After December 1981 we have had no agreement with the IMF at all—the entirety of 1982 and these three months in 1983, up to date, there has been no agreement with the IMF. (*Interruption.*) I will come to that. Do not worry.

During this period Sri Lanka was also able to negotiate with the Fund relatively less stringent credit arrangements to support the balance of payments. In October 1981 the Government drew a sum of SDR 18.75 million under a reserve grant which is not subject to any condition. Once you enter into an EFF or a stand-by credit you get some side benefits. In June 1981 and August 1982 Sri Lanka drew sums of SDR 25 million and SDR 39.2 million respectively under the Compensatory Financing Facility—CFF—which is also given as a consolation prize if you enter into an EFF, which was designed to compensate estimated shortfalls in our export earnings.

Recently the Fund approved a drawing of SDR 5.8 million under the Buffer-Stock Facility under the Common Fund arrangement, under the international natural rubber agreement. Then we also received SDR 6.41 million under the Oil Facility. In 1976 IMF introduced a new mechanism called the Trust Fund. During the period 1978–80, under the Trust Fund Sri Lanka received a total sum of SDR 12.10 million, being Sri Lanka's share of the profits from the gold sales by the IMF. Further, between January 1980 and July 1980 Sri Lanka obtained concessional loans amounting to SDR 95.75 million from the Trust Fund. These loans are repayable in ten years and they carry an extremely low interest rate of 1/2 per cent on outstanding balances.

The value of gold received by Sri Lanka after 1977 under the Fund's gold distribution scheme was SDR 2.19 million. During July 1977 to February 1983 Sri Lanka was allocated a total sum of SDR 37.128



[ஈ. டி. டி. 4 மில்லியன்]  
million in SDR allocations. Therefore the total value of gross assistance received by Sri Lanka during the period 1977 to 1982, notwithstanding these little breaks, amounted to SDR 600 million, which is Rs. 14,500 million. Without this Rs. 14,500 million we would not have been able to keep the free economy going. This, of course, is apart from World Bank aid, IDA aid, aid from the Asian Development Bank, aid from the Aid Consortium, aid from the Saudi Fund, the Kuwait Fund, the OPEC fund, the EEC, all of which came in because we were underwritten by the IMF. Without this underwriting by the IMF nobody touches any country.

That, in short, was what happened to Dr. N. M. Perera and Mr. Felix R. Dias Bandaranaike from 1970 to 1977.

Now, Sir, we are negotiating for another agreement with the IMF. It has taken us a long time. I could have just signed on the dotted line if I had agreed to Rs. 26 for a Dollar. They wanted Rs. 28 for a Dollar, even Rs. 30 for a Dollar first. I could have got this agreement over the counter if I had agreed. But I refused to agree to this. We have had to agree to some Budget cuts, which we did. We are still negotiating, and, as I told you, if I fail I will come to this House and tell you so and ask for your co-operation perhaps to go back to a more self-reliant economy, maybe even to go back to controls. That, Sir, is the history of our relationship with the IMF.

I hope the hon. Member for Attanagalla, before he talks in this house next time, would be properly briefed, without talking utter nonsense.

**கனெக்ஷன் பீல்டிங் மெம்பர்**

(திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி)

(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

Then show us the report that I quoted.

**ஈ. டி. டி. 4 மில்லியன்**

(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த. மெல்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

I am sorry that most Members of the Opposition are speaking without any sense of responsibility.

**கனெக்ஷன் பீல்டிங் மெம்பர்**

(திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி)

(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

Show us the report.

**ஈ. டி. டி. 4 மில்லியன்**

(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த. மெல்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

The hon. Member for Attanagalla spoke some absolute, arrant nonsense about India and the IMF. I will give all the facts of this case—about India and the IMF. It was arrant nonsense that India got so much of money from the IMF without any conditions.

**கனெக்ஷன் பீல்டிங் மெம்பர்**

(திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி)

(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

India will reply to you.

**ஈ. டி. டி. 4 மில்லியன்**

(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த. மெல்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

The hon. Member for Attanagalla does not even know that loans or arrangements with the IMF depend on the quota in the IMF. India's quota in the IMF is ten times as big as that of Sri Lanka, being a bigger country. So they are eligible for a loan or credit which is ten times the size of any credit given to Sri Lanka, which is based on its own quota. Our quota is small. India's quota is ten times our quota. They can get credit ten times the size of the credit that Sri Lanka can get based on its own subscription to the IMF. Without knowing these facts, Sir, the hon. Member for Attanagalla gets some *dirachcha lanu* from somebody and comes and talks some arrant nonsense in this House. We have to waste our time replying to this arrant nonsense.

**கனெக்ஷன் பீல்டிங் மெம்பர்**

(திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி)

(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

He cannot answer that report.

**ஈ. டி. டி. 4 மில்லியன்**

(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த. மெல்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

You do not know.

**கனெக்ஷன் பீல்டிங் மெம்பர்**

(திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி)

(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

The Ministers have not seen this. He is hiding it from the Ministers also.

**ஈ. டி. டி. 4 மில்லியன்**

(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த. மெல்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

Sir, he has made an allegation that I am hiding something from the Ministers.

**கனெக்ஷன் பீல்டிங் மெம்பர்**

(திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி)

(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

Yes.

**ஈ. டி. டி. 4 மில்லியன்**

(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த. மெல்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

There is nothing that I have hidden from the Ministers of my Government, unlike his Ministers.



**කේෂ්මන් ජයකොඩි මහතා**

(திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி)

(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

Please let us see the report. I have quoted the report and the date of the report.

**ආර්. ජේ. ජී. ද මෙල් මහතා**

(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த் மெல்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

They hid the Attygalle Report. They hid so many things.

**සභාපතිතුමා**

(தலைவர்)

(The Chairman)

Order, please! Hon. Member for Attanagalla, you have been emphasizing that too much. The Minister has given the reasons.

**ආර්. ජේ. ජී. ද මෙල් මහතා**

(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த் மெல்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

Sir, India has been given credit to the tune of SDR 5,000 million based on the quota of India in the IMF, which is ten times the size of the Sri Lanka quota. This is also an extended Fund Facility. The conditions are :

“The following ceilings on domestic credit of the banking system were called upon:-

- (a) The government was to limit the growth of total liquidity to about 15.7 per cent in 1981-82, total domestic credit expansion was to be limited to 19.4 per cent.
- (b) Ceilings were also placed on net credit to the government from the bankig system.

2. India was to observe certain limits on the authorization of new official and officially guaranteed foreign indebtedness. During the first year of the EFF, the Government was to limit the contracting or guaranteeing of non-concessional loans with an original maturity of between 1 and 12 years to no more than SDR 1.4 billion. Within the ceiling, the new commitments of between one and five years will be limited to SDR 400 million.

3. Throughout the period of the arrangement the Extended Facility would be suspended if India-

- (a) Impose or intensifies restrictions on payments and transfers for current international transactions.”

In other words, no increase of the present exchange controls and relaxations already done.

- “ (b) introduces multiple currency practices ”.

like the FEECs system we had here

- “ (c) concludes bilateral payments agreements which are inconsistent with Article 8 of the IMF Agreement ”.

- (d) imposes or intensifies import restrictions for balance of payments reasons. ”

There can be no further import controls. Relaxations have already been done in India. India was not required to make any specific exchange rate

adjustments because she was following realistic exchange rate policies already. India has already adjusted its Rupee to the Dollar. It adjusts it systematically. It was adjusted 24 times last year—every two weeks or so. It is adjusted, unlike our exchange rate which is kept pegged. It is noteworthy that between December 1980 and December 1981, the Indian Rupee depreciated by 22.7 per cent against the US Dollar at a time when the Sri Lanka Rupee depreciated by only 17.9 per cent. That is the mistake we made. During the period December 1981 to December 1982 the Indian Rupee depreciated by 6.2 per cent against the US Dollar while the Sri Lanka Rupee depreciated by only 3.9 per cent. India’s Budget and the balance of payments are much more in alignment than Sri Lanka’s. They follow a very conservative fiscal and monetary policy. They do not resort to expansionary budgets like Sri Lanka. Their deficit is hardly anything. So, they were having that amount of financial discipline and control. Also it is a very self-reliant economy with immense resources, with a market of 700 million people. How can you compare India and Sri Lanka ? Only the Member for Attanagalla will do that. It is the eighth in rank industrial country in the world, potentially a most powerful country although still poor. So that those are the conditions which India entered into.

Then about price adjustments; that is very relevant. I told you of the price adjustments that India made. They made one, two weeks ago, of kerosene, and a week ago of cement. In 1980, in anticipation of the EFF, on June 8th, the prices of all fertilisers were raised by 38 per cent. On June 8th again the prices of all petroleum products were raised, some from 5 per cent up to 79 per cent in certain cases. Kerosene was raised even three weeks ago. Then in various States electricity tariffs were raised by 9 per cent to 42 per cent. Aluminium prices were raised by 11 to 15 per cent; the procurement prices of paddy from 95 per cent to 105 per cent quintal; the price of white printing paper by 17 per cent ; simultaneously the price controls on two categories of paper were removed. The central issue price of common rice was raised from Rs. 150 to Rs. 165 per quintal. Prices of coarse cereals were raised by 10 per cent; the issue price of sugar from fair-price shops was increased by 23 per cent.

Then, Sir, in 1981, what they did was to raise all petroleum product prices by 7 to 17 per cent. If we had also raised our petroleum prices last year or the year before, we would not have been compelled to raise it now when petroleum prices are falling. The prices of steel items were raised by 20 per cent and of pig iron by about 37 per cent. The whole of the incremental proceeds were to be credited to the Steel Development Fund, with no increase in retention prices. Prices of coal products were raised by 37 per cent, coke by 29



[ආර්. ජේ. ජී. ද මැලි මහතා]

per cent. The railway budget included the following measures : 15 per cent surcharge on all railway freight traffic ; 10 per cent surcharge on luggage/parcel traffic ; 10-15 per cent surcharges on passenger traffic.

Controls on prices of selected steel products were lifted after a time. The procurement price for wheat for 1981/82 rabi season was raised by 11 per cent, from Rs. 1,170 to Rs. 1,300 per metric ton. On March 27, aluminium prices were raised again by about 20 per cent. These are the price increases. In India they do it as soon as the price in the world market or in their local market goes up. They increase their prices, they do not wait. That is the only difference.

The central issue price for wheat, for public distribution, was raised on April 1st from Rs. 1,300 to Rs. 1,490 per metric ton. That was the second time. On July 1st the power tariff of the Damodar Valley Corporation was raised by 20 per cent. At the same time, the power tariffs of the electricity boards of the States of Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Bihar were also raised.

On July 11th the prices of most petroleum products including kerosene were raised by 9-13 per cent. For the third time the petroleum prices were raised in one year. If we raised our petroleum, or oil prices three times in one year, we would not be forced to do it now when prices are coming down; we would have been bringing it down when prices were coming down.

The valuation of indigenously produced crude oil was increased from an average of Rs. 391 per ton to Rs. 1,182 per ton - India produces nearly 50 per cent of its crude oil today-that is 300 per cent increase of indigenously produced crude oil, their own crude oil. The price of urea fertilizer was raised by 17.4 per cent; it is their own urea, they do not import these things. They again raised it for the third time by 16 per cent. As I told you, kerosene prices were raised even three weeks ago, two weeks before their budget, along with the increase in the cement price.

Import and exchange controls have been relaxed somewhat. The Indian Rupee has been depreciated 25 times against the dollar last week, a total devaluation of 23 per cent. Sometimes they re-valued, also in accordance with the market. That is the correct way to do things. If we also had adjusted all these things at the correct time, we would not be forced to do one-shot devaluation. They adjusted the exchange rate as and when it was necessary. They do not delay. It is automatically done. The price adjustments for all their products are automatically done. That is the only difference.

All this talk of India getting a big credit line from the IMF without any conditions is only a figment of the imagination of the hon. Member for Attanagalla (Mr. Lakshman Jayakody). I hope he will not come and give us the benefit of his imagination any more in this House.

As I told you, our entire relationship with the IMF is like an open book that whoever runs may read. If we enter into any other agreement, I will table it just like the last one.

This Debate has been a long one and several interesting comments, criticism and recommendations were made by hon. Members on both sides of the House. I would particularly refer to the very valuable speech made by the hon. Member for Mullaitivu (Mr. X. M. Sellathambu), the new hon. Member for Vaddukoddai (Dr. Neelan Tiruchelvam), the hon. Member for Mannar (Mr. P. S. Soosaithasan) and many other hon. Members who made very useful proposals which will receive my most careful consideration and the careful consideration of the other Ministers concerned.

A Budget Debate as Harold Macmillan said, is something of a bore. It is something of a bore. I have received some bouquets-I do not take them seriously. I have also received some brickbats-I take them even less seriously. I have learnt, over a long period of time, to treat both these impostors just the same. For much of the time, the Debate was off the rails. My old Friend, the hon. Member for Chavakachcheri (Mr. V. N. Navaratnam) did not speak on the Budget at all. I am sorry that my Friend seems to be suffering from some incipient stage of senile decay. That is all I would say about his speech. There was nothing to reply to.

Speakers from the Opposition criticised the strategy which we have adopted but I would like to ask them, what is the alternative strategy you suggest ? It is easy to criticise the strategy which this Government has followed but none of the speakers from the Opposition suggested any alternative strategy for development and employment, whilst curbing inflation as much as possible, whilst avoiding scarcities, shortages and queues, whilst trying to increase production and export. I would have been very happy if the Opposition could have laid before us an alternative strategy on how we should manage the economy of this country with a revenue of Rs. 20,000 million and an expenditure of Rs. 49,000 million without going to the IMF, without increasing taxes, without going in for commercial borrowings, without printing notes. I am really at a loss as to how this can be done.

In the first place, there seems to be some misunderstanding of what a Budget really represents in the life of a country. It is not a list of prices of



consumer articles. It was never intended to be that or a list containing the reduction of prices of some articles or the increases in prices of others. Far from it! You do not need a Budget for that. A Gazette is quite enough. Dr. N. M. Perera did it. Mr. Felix Dias Bandaranaike did it. Every Finance Minister of the world has resorted to the Gazette. My good Friend, Mr. Pranab Mukherjee, the Finance Minister of India, just 3 weeks before their Budget, increased the prices of a whole series of consumer goods. It is only a fool who would come to the House and increase prices through a Budget when the Gazette is available. A Budget is not even a description of the salaries and wages. It is not necessary to come to this House and announce salary or wage increases though everybody does so. In fact, it should come on some other occasion through either a Treasury Circular or a circular of the Labour Department. A Treasury Circular or a Labour Department Circular is quiet enough for that. A budget in fact should be a description of the economy, our economic achievements in the last year—and in this case the last 5–6 years—a review of the economy, an unfolding of the proposals for our economic and financial strategy of the future, for the coming year in particular and succeeding years, details of our proposed expenditure, details of our revenue proposals and taxes.

Sir, at this stage I would like to ask the Leader of the Opposition and some of the Opposition speakers here, do you agree with our economic strategy and our economic and financial policy? No; it is obviously 'no'. From the speech of the hon. Leader of the Opposition I gathered that he completely disagreed with our economic strategy, with our financial policy. If so, what is the economic and financial strategy you would suggest to solve the pressing problems of this country?

The hon. Member for Kalawana, (Mr. Sarath Muttetuwegama) my good Friend, has a strategy I must say in fairness to him. None of the speakers of any of the three wings of the SLFP, none of the speakers of the TULF suggested an alternative strategy. But, the Member for Kalawana did so—a full Socialist State; fair enough. This is certainly a way out of our problems. I too agreed at some stage in my life with the strategy suggested by my good Friend from Kalawana. I still agree that this is a way out, a very hard way, a most painful way, a way in which there would be no individual freedom or parliamentary democracy. But it is still a way, a way which has been adopted by about 40 per cent of the countries of this world. Anyway, the people of this country did not accept this strategy. They rejected this strategy completely, they even rejected this strategy in Kalawana! So, what can I do about it? They want a different approach. So, however much I may

personally like a socialist economy or not, I have no mandate to introduce one, a full socialist economic strategy. In fact, as the Hon. Prime Minister said, it would have been much easier for me to be the Minister of Finance of a Socialist State. My economic powers would have been unlimited. I would have planned the economy from the cradle to the grave and nobody would have had the freedom to say 'no' to it. Life would not be so difficult for me if I had been the Minister of Finance of a Socialist State, but the people do not want it.

Then, Sir, the hon. Members spoke at quite a length about our debt position. I think it is my duty to give this House and the people of this country some idea of the debt position of this country vis-a-vis the debt position of similar countries all over the world. Sri Lanka, Sir, has never had to reschedule any of her debts; nor is she likely to do so in the future if the strictest financial discipline imposed by me is effectively followed. Sri Lanka's external debt as a percentage of GNP is lower than that of most Third World countries. Much of our borrowings is on concessional terms. Our debt service ratio at 11.8 per cent is still very low compared to many developing countries in our area. Indonesia at 21 per cent, Korea at 14 per cent, Pakistan at 19 per cent, the Philippines at 24 per cent, Thailand at 18 per cent, Algeria at 29 per cent, Kenya at 22 per cent are some of them. The average for all non-developing countries is 24 per cent. Sri Lanka's is half that—11 per cent; less than half. It is lower than the debt service rate of socialist countries—Hungary 30 per cent, Poland 44 per cent, Romania 22 per cent, Yugoslavia 23 per cent.

It is apparent from the figures quoted that Sri Lanka's position is still not bad. We can repay our debts. We have not defaulted any instalment of interest of capital. We have never delayed one payment. We have never asked for a rescheduling, like Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, Bolivia, Poland, Romania, Yugoslavia, Zaire, and several African countries.

As I have already pointed out, Sir, much of our debt was on highly concessional terms. We have got an array of donors who have given this country aid on the softest terms possible, because they are convinced that the Government's development programme is worth backing.

In view of the above, it is not possible to sustain the argument that the country has mortgage future generations to the IMF or the IBRD or the World Bank. On the contrary, the Government has been able to mobilize concessional assistance to develop the country, so that future generations will not be confronted with queues or scarcities or lack of employment.



[ආර්. ජේ. ජී. ද මැලේ මහතා]

The hon. Leader of the Opposition quite rightly pointed out that we seem to be living beyond our means. I have said that often both in this House and outside. But we should also remember that most countries in the world are living beyond their means. This must be a result of the Keynesian and neo-Keynesian policies which most countries have been following in recent times—heavy deficit financing. I will give you the details. Even amongst the most highly developed countries take Japan for instance, its total indebtedness in 1972 was 45 billion US dollars. In 1981, nine years later, it was 523 billion US dollars. Japan's indebtedness increased eleven times in nine years from 15 per cent of GNP to 47 per cent of GNP. One of the strongest economies in the world also living beyond its means!

The Federal Republic of Germany, another strong economy; 48 billion US dollars in 1972; 236 billion US dollars in 1981, five times more; 19 per cent of GNP in 1972, 34 per cent of GNP in 1981. Italy 46 billion US dollars in 1972; 168 billion US dollars in 1981. We are only 1 1/2 billion US dollars. Italy has 35 per cent of GNP in 1972; 49 per cent of GNP in 1981. It is not that I am saying that everything is fine and rosy. We should try to live within our means. But every country seems to be living beyond its means.

There are two exceptions. Great Britain, which was very bad earlier, 136 billion US dollars in 1972, has only increased its debts twice to 299 billion US dollars in 1981. The developed countries have no right to go to the IMF and the World Bank. It is only meant for the poor countries of the world. They take from banks at current rates of interest; when the interest on US dollars is 20 per cent, they take it at 20 per cent plus half. Today it is 11 per cent plus half. They have no right to go to the IMF, and the World Bank. In the case of the USA it was 650 billion US dollars in 1972, and 1,385 billion US dollars in 1981. As you know, President Reagan's present Budget is in deficit by about 200 billion US dollars this year. They had 54 per cent of GNP in 1972 and 47 per cent of GNP in 1981. I am not for one moment comparing the economy of Sri Lanka with theirs. They have a greater capacity to repay than we have—I fully agree with you—but still all of them seem to be living beyond their means.

Then, Sir, I come to the rapid growth in external debts of the developing countries including OPEC and COMECON countries. At the end of 1972 the total external debt of the developing countries including the OPEC countries and the COMECON countries which are developing—not the Soviet Union—was 120 billion US dollars. Nine years later in 1981 it was 700 billion US dollars, that is, six times more. At end of 1982 it is estimated at 800 billion US dollars—the total debt of

developing countries. 31 of these developing countries have already asked either for moratoria or for rescheduling of their loans. Some of them had just refused to pay, and the IMF or the World Bank had to come to their rescue. At the end of 1981, roughly 30 per cent of the 700 billion US dollars owed by developing countries was regarded by the banks as endangered. That is why His Excellency had to make that appeal—not because Sri Lanka cannot pay her debts. Approximately 200 billion dollars was endangered, and there was no capacity to repay. In mid October 1982, that is one year later, more than 60 per cent of the total indebtedness, which had meanwhile risen to practically 800 billion US dollars, was regarded as endangered. That is, approximately 500 billion US dollars was regarded as endangered debts of Third world countries. You will realize what holocaust there will be in the world Banking system if this 500 billion US dollars is not repaid. Every one of the big banks in the world will collapse, including banks like the Bank of America, The City Bank, Chase Manhattan, Deutsche Bank, Lloyds Bank and so on and so forth. It is for this particular reason that His Excellency the President made this appeal, not because of Sri Lanka. We are quite able to repay our debts now.

Sir, I have no time to deal with this at length. I have here figures of the entire state of indebtedness of socialist countries, some of them OPEC countries, hard currency debts of European COMECON countries, that is dollars and so on borrowed from Western banks, not debts in roubles.

**මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්**

(அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(A Member)

You must give the countries.

**ආර්. ජේ. ජී. ද මැලේ මහතා**

(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த மெல்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

I will give the countries. Bulgaria's gross debt is 300 billion US dollars and the debt service ratio is 30 per cent whereas Sri Lanka's debt service ratio is only 11 per cent. Bulgaria's position, is three times worse than Sri Lanka's, Czechoslovakia's total debt is 4 billion US dollars and the debt service ratio is 20 per cent, higher than Sri Lanka's. German Democratic Republic: the total debt is 13.5 billion US dollars—that is 10 times higher than Sri Lanka's—and the debt service ratio is 45 per cent, as against Sri Lanka's 11 per cent. Hungary: the total debt is 8.5 billion US dollars and the debt service ratio is 35 per cent. Poland—this is very revealing—the total debt is 29 billion US dollars and the debt service ratio is 140 per cent—140 times the total export income to service



the debts. They have to pay 140 times their export income every year to service their debts. Romania: total debt 10 billion US dollars and debt service ratio 50 per cent. The Soviet Union is better, Sir. It is a strong country, but still it has a total debt of 19 billion US dollars to Western banks. Though the Communist Party of Sri Lanka asked us not to borrow from Western banks, the Soviet Union has borrowed 19 billion US dollars from Western banks and its debt service ratio is 15 per cent—slightly higher than Sri Lanka's. That is the position, Sir.

I can give some of the Asian and African countries for comparison's sake. Developing countries: Argentina: the total debt is 80 billion US dollars, 60 times that of Sri Lanka; the debt service ratio is 50 per cent. Half the export income goes to pay debts. Brazil: the total debt is 80 billion US dollars—50 times that of Sri Lanka, and the debt service ratio is 65 per cent. A very rich country, but 65 per cent of the export earnings go to service debts. Chile: the total debt is 4 billion US dollars and the debt service ratio is 40 per cent. Greece: the total debt is 2 billion US dollars and the debt service ratio is 50 per cent. India, a very good country, economy well managed, though very poor—I have great admiration for the management of the Indian economy, though very poor. India's total debt is 3 billion US dollars and the debt service ratio is 10 per cent—one per cent less than ours, I must admit. Mexico: the total debt is 80 billion US dollars and the debt service ratio is 50 per cent. Philippines: the debt service ratio is 20 per cent. Thailand: the debt service ratio is 20 per cent. Turkey: the debt service ratio is 20 per cent. Cuba completely reneged on all their debts about 10 years ago—they just refused to pay—and after that they resorted to selling their entire sugar crop to the Soviet Union for which they get 300 million US dollars a year.

**சீனா இன்றையதினமே இலங்கை**

(திரு. சரத் முத்தெட்டுவெகமா)

(Mr. Sarath Muttetuwegama)

Cuba refused to pay debts incurred by Batista.

**இன்றையதினமே**

(அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(A Member)

Are you going to refuse to pay your debts?

**அனுர பண்டாரநாயக்க**

(திரு. அனுர பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. Anura Bandaranaike)

You are refusing to pay your own debts. There is a slight difference between Castro and you!

**சீனா இன்றையதினமே இலங்கை**

(திரு. சரத் முத்தெட்டுவெகமா)

(Mr. Sarath Muttetuwegama)

Batista ran some brothels.

**அனுர பண்டாரநாயக்க**

(திரு. அனுர பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. Anura Bandaranaike)

Aloysious Mudalali.

**ஈ. ஜி. டி. டி. டி. டி.**

(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த. மெல்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

I am not making any excuses for Sri Lanka's debt position. I hope we will learn to live according to our means, to cut our coat according to our cloth. But certainly our position is not as bad as some speakers on the Opposition side tried to make out.

Then, Sir, I come to the rates of inflation. That is also very vital. Despite our immense development programme and also world inflation we have brought down our rate of inflation. (Interruption).

**இன்றையதினமே**

(அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(A Member)

The World Bank does not have those figures.

**ஈ. ஜி. டி. டி. டி. டி.**

(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த. மெல்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

I have managed to get them. I will give them.

**சீனா இன்றையதினமே இலங்கை**

(திரு. சரத் முத்தெட்டுவெகமா)

(Mr. Sarath Muttetuwegama)

But what is your authority. You just read out figures.

**அனுர பண்டாரநாயக்க**

(திரு. அனுர பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. Anura Bandaranaike)

Somebody has given you a dead rope! Be careful.

**லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி**

(திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி)

(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

I saw the Prime Minister passing it to you.

**ஈ. ஜி. டி. டி. டி. டி.**

(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த. மெல்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

I can tell my hon. Friend from Kalawana the banks from whom the socialist countries take most of their loans. One is the West German Bank.

**சீனா இன்றையதினமே இலங்கை**

(திரு. சரத் முத்தெட்டுவெகமா)

(Mr. Sarath Muttetuwegama)

I suppose after they give you the loan they tell you how much they have given?



**ஈ. ஜி. டி. டி. டி. டி. டி.**

(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த. மெல்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

This is a statement prepared by Deutscher Bank, which has given more than 50 per cent of the debts of the socialist countries. It is the account of Deutscher Bank, from whom they have borrowed.

We have been able to bring down our rate of inflation from 35 per cent in 1980, which was very bad—when our budget went haywire and we had to bring certain cuts and restrict bank credit and so on—to 18 per cent in 1981 and to 5 per cent in 1982. This year, due to increased prices and the BTT and import duties, I think, the rate of inflation will go up again—from 5 per cent it will go up to 10 or 12 per cent. If we can contain it within 15 per cent, I will be very happy.

**கலாநாயகர் அவர்கள்**

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please!

Does the House agree to go on till we conclude the Budget debate?

**உறுப்பினர்**

(அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(Members)

Aye!

**ஈ. ஜி. டி. டி. டி. டி.**

(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த. மெல்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

I will give some rates of inflation of Third World countries as against our 5 per cent last year. Argentina 130 per cent, Bolivia 62 per cent, Brazil 98 per cent—but I think it is over 100 per cent. Though the official rate is 98 per cent—Columbia 24 per cent, Mexico 44 per cent, Peru 60 per cent, Uruguay 20 per cent, Bangladesh 12 per cent, India 7 per cent—very good, Sir, India's economy is well managed. Indonesia 9 per cent, Malaysia 5 per cent—another well managed economy—Philippines 14 per cent, Singapore 4 per cent—the lowest in Asia—Egypt 15 per cent, Ghana 21 per cent, Israel 110 per cent—one of the worst—Ivory Coast 9 per cent, Kenya 21 per cent, Morocco 11 per cent, South Africa 16 per cent, Syria 14 per cent, Turkey 34 per cent, Zaire 35 per cent, Zambia 10 per cent, Canada 11 per cent, Yugoslavia 30 per cent—30 per cent is high inflation—France 13 per cent, Greece 22 per cent, Italy 15 per cent, New Zealand 17 per cent, Norway 11 per cent, Portugal 25 per cent, Spain 15 per cent. Of course, the U.S., U.K., Germany and Japan have brought down their inflation rates this year—a very healthy sign for the world economy.

I will give you some of those countries that took EFF, India, Pakistan, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Mexico, Peru were the first.

Real Wages. (Interruption). That you must ask papa doc and mamma doc and also putha doc!

**ஈ. அனூர் பண்டாரநாயக்க**

(திரு. அனூர் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. Anura Bandaranaike)

Do not insult friendly countries like that.

**சரத் முத்தெட்டுவெகமா**

(திரு. சரத் முத்தெட்டுவெகமா)

(Mr. Sarath Muttetuwegama)

Non-Aligned countries.

**ஈ. ஜி. டி. டி. டி. டி.**

(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த. மெல்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

The hon. Member for Kalawana also raised the question of real wages. There he did a real கைலே விலை எதிர்த்தல். கைலே விலை வலி எதிர்த்தல்.

The Member for Kalawana has only considered part of the picture.

**சரத் முத்தெட்டுவெகமா**

(திரு. சரத் முத்தெட்டுவெகமா)

(Mr. Sarath Muttetuwegama)

I have given you my authority from the Central Bank Report and the Central Bank Review of the Economy.

**ஈ. ஜி. டி. டி. டி. டி.**

(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த. மெல்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

Quite right. Only part of it!

**சரத் முத்தெட்டுவெகமா**

(திரு. சரத் முத்தெட்டுவெகமா)

(Mr. Sarath Muttetuwegama)

Mr. Panditharatne is also on the Monetary Board.

**ஈ. ஜி. டி. டி. டி. டி.**

(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த. மெல்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

Sir, it is not correct to look at only one year when assessing the record of the government for five years. If you take the whole period 1977 to 1982 you come across a completely different picture. I will give you the real wages. Central Government employees. 1977—118.3 real wages index. 1982—131.8—an increase of nearly 13 per cent. From 1977 to 1982 Wages Board workers: 1977—151.9 per cent. 1982 188.9 per cent, an increase of nearly 26 per cent. There is one sector which has been unsatisfactory. I must admit it. Government school teachers! 1977—90.9 per cent; 1982—86.6 per cent, a decline of 4.10 per cent. The teachers have recorded a marginal decline during the period. But their salaries have been increased during 1982 by 14.4 per cent as measures were taken to remedy the anomaly; The Central Government Employees increased by 18.6 per cent and the Wages Board categories by 1.93 per cent during 1982. So that the figures the hon. Member for Kalawana based on one year are extremely deceptive.



I must come to some of the points raised by the hon. Second Member for Nuwara Eliya-Maskeliya. I have already replied to some of his points. He talked of Treasury Bills. I must give him the figures. I agree, Sir, that the outstanding amount of Treasury Bills has certainly increased from Rs. 2,700 million in July 1977 to Rs. 16,480 million on 15th March, 1982. But when we think of Treasury Bill Limits—although I am not an advocate of Treasury Bill financing; I would prefer not to do it if I had some option in the matter, but the country's expenditure has got to be financed—so let us take the percentage of the expenditure. In 1970 the Treasury Bill limit was 2,050 million, 50 per cent of the total expenditure of the Government. In 1982 it was Rs. 18,000 million, that is 46 per cent of the total expenditure. There has been a decline in 1983. We estimate the limit will be Rs. 21,500 million, that will be 43 percent of our expenditure which is less than 1970 and less than 1960. In the '60s it was 72 per cent of the total expenditure although the limit was small. I am not advocating the Treasury Bill financing, but here too, the situation is not as bleak as some of the members of the Opposition tried to make out.

The Member for Mullaitivu made a most constructive speech. I am looking into most of the proposals made by him and also by the hon. Member for Mannar. The hon. Member for Vaddukoddai also made an extremely interesting speech, although he did not make many proposals. All speeches, both of the Opposition and of the Government side, where constructive proposals were made, will be studied by me and my Colleagues.

The hon. Member for Kalawana also quoted the "Financial Times". I will be failing in my duty if I do not read the relevant section from this article—the "Financial Times" of Tuesday, 8th March—It is a long article with a nice picture of our President, the heading—, "JAYAWARDENE CONFIDENT AS COLOMBO PREPARES FOR TODAY'S BUDGET" by Alain Cass, Asia Editor. Even the "Financial Times" from which the hon. Member for Kalawana often quotes and the "Economist" which my good friend from Nuwara Eliya-Maskeliya often quotes, even these journals are not hundred per cent accurate like all newspapers and journals. They start off, by giving the name of our President wrong. They called him—"Julius Jayawardene" probably confusing him with Julius Nyrere, so you can understand the rest of it.

Even the name is wrong.

"Julius Jayawardene, Sri Lanka's 76 year old President emerged yesterday from the non-aligned summit in New Delhi and announced confidently that his country had reached agreement with the International Monetary Fund on a stand-by credit of about S 200m as part of Western efforts to prop up his free market policies.

Contacted in Colombo—"

But I told you when you made your speech--

"Mr. Ronnie de Mel, Mr. Jayawardene's able Finance Minister--"

**ආනුර බණ්ඩාරනායක මහතා**  
(திரு. அனூர பண்டாரநாயக்க)  
(Mr. Anura Bandaranaike)

Hear! hear!

You wanted to quote that. That is what you want to get on record. That was a neat shot.

**ආනන්ද දසනායක මහතා**  
(திரு. ஆனந்த தஸநாயக்க)  
(Mr. Ananda Dassanayake)

Very neat!

**ආර්. ජේ. ජී. ද මෙල් මහතා**  
(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த மெல்)  
(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

The hon. Member for Kalawana asked me to bring this along—

**ආනුර බණ්ඩාරනායක මහතා**  
(திரு. அனூர பண்டாரநாயக்க)  
(Mr. Anura Bandaranaike)

No. no, we are very grateful to you for that!

**සරත් මුත්තේවිටුවෙගම මහතා**  
(திரு. சரத் முத்தேட்டுவெகம)  
(Mr. Sarath Muttetuwegama)

Hear, hear!

**ආර්. ජේ. ජී. ද මෙල් මහතා**  
(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த மெல்)  
(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

"who today presents wht may be the country's toughest ever budget"

One thing they have said is true.

"said, 'It was not quite like that'".

An agreement has not been reached.

"His version is that there is still a gap between the IMF and Sri Lanka and that the two sides will meet in three weeks to tie up the loose ends.

These revolve, in essence, around the Fund's insistence that Sri Lanka devalues the rupee to around 26 to the U. S. dollar. Mr. de Mel insists that the present exchange rate of around 23 to the dollar is 'as far as we can go'.

There is little doubt that the Fund and Sri Lanka will reach agreement."

This is what they say. I do not know. I have my doubts still.

"Mr. Jayewardene was no doubt applying some--"

I do not like to read the rest of it.

"to give the process a little nudge on the way. Or, perhaps, he was merely prejudging the outcome".



[ආර්. ජේ. ජී. ද මැල් මහතා]

Then, Sir, in the other quotation, they also say—

“‘Developed countries’, said Mr. Jayewardene, ‘should wipe out all the debts of the developing countries and start afresh. We just cannot pay’”.

Referring to developing countries, not to Sri Lanka, Sir.

“Sri Lanka’s foreign debt stands at around \$ 1.5 bn.

Mr. Jayewardene—who is, above all else, a realist—realises that this is unlikely to happen, especially in the present international banking climate”.

I do not know how they got that idea.

So, Sir, there is not break down of communication between me and the President. He also referred to the lack of political clout. I will tell the hon. Member for Kalawana not to be worried about my political clout. He should be worried about his own political clout with my dear old friend, comrade K. P. Silva, and comrade H. G. S. Ratnaweera in his own party.

සරත් මුත්තේවුට්ටෙම මහතා

(තිரு. සරත් முத்தேட்டுவெகம்)

(Mr. Sarath Muttetuwegama)

Do not worry about that either. I am worried about Geekiyanakanda.

ආර්. ජේ. ජී. ද මැල් මහතා

(තිරු. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த மெல்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

Do not worry about that. I have 37 acres of tea and a house. That is all that I have.

සරත් මුත්තේවුට්ටෙම මහතා

(තිரு. சரத் முத்தேட்டுவெகம்)

(Mr. Sarath Muttetuwegama)

No, no! I am talking of the electorate, Bulathsinhala. Just for joy. He is worrying type!

ආර්. ජේ. ජී. ද මැල් මහතා

(තිரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த மெல்)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

That is a matter for the people of Bulathsinhala to decide in due course. I am worried about Kalawana.

Then, Sir, since the hon. Member for Kalawana drew my attention to the “Financial Times”, I suddenly saw two short articles about Venezuela and Yugoslavia which are worth reading. Every day if you read this paper, you will see countries going to the IMF and the World Bank. Here is Yugoslavia going to the World Bank and what they are about to do.

Yugoslavia is a socialist country with which I do not know what the relations of the hon. Member for

Kalawana are, but I know that the Second Member for Nuwara Eliya-Maskeliya and his party had very close relations. I do like Yugoslavia.

“Yugoslavia secures first part of \$ 500 m. loan”.

In this case, they have not even gone to the IMF. They had gone to the Bank for International Settlement, what is known as the BIS in Basle.

“Yesterday agreed to lend Yugoslavia \$ 300 m. immediately—”

They are so hard-up.

“with a promise of \$200m. to follow once final arrangements for collateral are in place”.

We have not been asked to provide collateral so far. Their position is so non-creditworthy that they have been asked to provide collateral—gold. Dollars 4.5 billion international rescue package. We have not been rescued yet.

“... international rescue package being arranged for Yugoslavia to help it through problems to service its \$ 19 bn. foreign debt.

It has been delayed for several weeks because of problems with collateral affecting the \$ 200 m. portion that is to be secured by Yugoslavia’s gold reserves.”

They are not getting money like we are getting. They have to pledge their gold.

“\$ 300 m. made available yesterday is guaranteed by member central banks of the BIS.

The collateral problem arose because Yugoslavia had first to obtain authorisation from other creditors to pledge its gold to the BIS.”

Lots of creditors.

“Such and authorization is required under so-called ‘negative pledge clauses’ in existing loan agreements with commercial banks which do not enjoy the benefit of gold collateral in their loans”.

“Yugoslavia has had to ask its commercial bank creditors to waive such negative pledge clauses. It is understood that not all such waivers are yet formally in place, although senior central bankers said yesterday that all banks involved had now agreed verbally to waive the clauses.

The decision to go ahead with the loan marks an end to one of the most difficult negotiations ever undertaken by the BIS. Yugoslavia met strong opposition from member central banks when it asked for a three-year loan last autumn.

The BIS lends only short-term money—”

Not long-term or medium-term like us.

“in the form of bridging finance. This transaction for Yugoslavia is intended to tide it over until an expected drawing of about \$ 600 m. from the International Monetary Fund.”



They are taking a "santhosam" to tide over their problems till they get their loan from the IMF. They are so broke. We have not gone for bridge financing up to date.

"Yugoslavia badly needs the cash to see it through until tourist revenues start to flow in two to three months' time".

Until tourist come they are broke. They cannot carry on.

"These revenues are a vital part of the country's foreign exchange cash flow, and some central bankers are now worried that the country's well-publicised economic problems could put a damper on tourism business this year".

Then, Sir, about Yugoslavia and the IMF, I will tell you what happened.

The next day, March 9th, "Prices Rise in Yugoslavia" page 2. You told us that we make various price rises in anticipation of IMF loans to please the IMF. See what Yugoslavia is doing.

"Prices rise in Yugoslavia" by David Buchan. The Yugoslav Government has announced stiff price rises for selected consumer goods and utilities, including increases of 25 per cent in coal".

In that country coal is much more important than kerosene to us.

"25 percent in electricity rates, 22 percent in butter".

Butter is like rice to us

"18 per cent in meat and fish prices.

The measures, which will add 1.7 per cent to the cost of living, are designed to win approval-

Mark the words, 'designed to win approval'

from the International Monetary Fund,-

-(Interruption).

"in advance of the Fund's consideration laer this month of a final 500m tranche of its standby credit for Yugoslavia".

Everybody has to do these things.

මත් තුවරයෙක්

(அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(A Member)

It is very embarrassing.

டி. ஜி. சி. டி. டி. டி. டி.

(திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. டி. டி. டி.)

(Mr. R. J. G. de Mel)

There are 145 countries who are members of the IMF and the World Bank. All of them have done it. Even Britain has done it. Britain went to the IMF in 1976. When I met the then Chancellor Denis Healey he told me that what stiff conditions they imposed on

him. It was Denis Healey who told me in 1977 as a tiro, as a novice, in this business, "fight them tooth and nail every time". And I have fought them tooth and nail for five years. For one year they suspended negotiations with me. Very few Finance Ministers in the world have fought them so hard as I have done. For the whole of last year we had no agreement with them because we did not agree to their conditions. I will never sacrifice the interests of this country either to the World Bank or the IMF. I have argued with them that exchange rates should not be adjusted any more. I have argued with them that exchange rates have a judgmental element in them, a discretionary element in them, that Sri Lanka is basically an agricultural country, that 80 percent of our exports consist of tea and rubber, where the exports depend, one, on production and, two, on world prices, and that even our little industrial exports are mainly garments which depend on quotas and petroleum products which depend on petroleum prices. I have argued with them on all these grounds for years. I have brought it down from Rs. 30 to 23 to the US Dollar. I hope they will accept it. So do not think that we are sacrificing the interests of this country to the World Bank or the IMF. We fight them tooth and nail all the way and try to get the best terms for Sri Lanka. But, as I told you earlier, it is a question of options.

If we do not get IMF backing and IMF support, I will have to come to this House and within six months I will have to introduce import controls and exchange controls. I will have to go back to the control department. Let me not mince my words; there will be shortages, scarcities and queues; there will be rationing once again. We will not have money to complete the downstream of Mahaweli; we will not have any more rural integrated schemes. So, the options that we have are very limited. We have to make our Budget deficit lower than it is today; we have to make our balance of payments more aligned; we have to control our expenditure; we have to increase production and exports; we have to increase our revenue and above all we must cut our coat according to our cloth and not try to live beyond our means.

I entirely agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition. The position is not as desperate as you make out. There are some silver linings in the world economy. President Mr. Reagan, as I told my good friend from Kalawana, has seen a rainbow in the sky. I have not yet seen it. He talks of an economic recovery. But there are some faint signals of some recovery. I do not know whether it will last or whether the recovery will be long and widespread or whether it will be short or even whether a recovery will take place. But there are some faint signals: Inflation rates in the world have come down. For example the U.S. inflation rate which reached double-digit figures about



[ஈ. சீ. டி. ௨ மூலே மஹா]

three years ago has come to 4.9 per cent. Britain's inflation rate has come down to 6 per cent, Japan's to 4 per cent, all from double-digit figures. these are very healthy signs—when world inflation in the highly developed countries comes down, when the interest rates have come down from a high of 20 and 21 per cent in the London Inter-Bank Market for the dollar to about 11 per cent. The tea prices have gone up—we have been fetching record prices for tea in the colombo auction. The tea prices which used to average between Rs. 18 and Rs. 20 per kilo last year went up to an average of Rs. 35 per kilo in the sales this year which is about double the price of last year. It is the highest price ever recorded by Sri Lanka Tea in the whole of the tea industry in the last 100 years. I wish these prices will last. As a result of the devaluation, from 21 to 23, the prices shot up by about Rs. 8 per kilo, which is more than what I expected. The rubber prices which were at Rs. 11 per kilo before the devaluation have already shot up from Rs. 13.50 to Rs. 14 per kilo RSS No. 1. the rubber prices are still very weak in the world market because recovery in the automobile industry has not taken shape. There is supposed to be an increase in the housing staff in the US which is a sign of recovery. I hope this recovery will last and becomes firm because, as I have told this House often, Sri Lanka is like a reed, like a broken reed swept by every wind that blows in the world economy. But, if this little rainbow that President Reagan sees in the sky turns out to be a real recovery, prolonged recovery, I think, we have some hope that our economy too will benefit in the months and years to come.

There is one more correction which the Hon. Prime Minister asked me to make. It is about the MARGA Report on the Walgampaya Village Survey done. I understand that this survey was done on the basis of 1973 figures. It is almost ten years out of-date. I hear that the people of Walgampaya Village, which is in the Constituency of the Deputy Minister of Fisheries, my good Friend Mr. Abeyesundera, are having three meals a day, not one meal a day.

“ உதவியுள்ள துடு டெவலப் வர கிசலிச டுதுவ ”, டத ப்ரீஸிடி விசலிச டுது.

கலகலவலே டுது “ உதவ ” மன்திதவ ப்ர லவ கலகலகலகலகல விசின ப்ரகல கர்வ டுது.

“ சட்டமூலம் இப்பொழுது இரண்டாம் முறை மதிப்பிடப்படுமா? ” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டது.

குரல்களின்படி “ ஆம் ” என்றவர்களுக்கு வெற்றியென சபாநாயகர் அவர்களால் பிரகடனப்படுத்தப்பட்டது.

Question, “ That the Bill be now read a Second time, ” put.

MR. SPEAKER, having collected the Voices, declared that “ Ayes ” had it.

லக்ஷமன் ப்ரகலவி மஹா

(திரு. லக்ஷமன் ஜயகோடி)  
(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody)

Divide !

பாடலிசேனே துடு 43 வத ஈபவர கிசலிச டெவலே—பக்ஷி 117 ; டிரீடவ 13 ; டதுவலே—லெடேனே ட.

பாராளுமன்றம் 43 ஆம் நிலைக் கட்டளையின் கீழ் பிரிந்தது : சார்பாக 117 ; எதிராக 13.

The Parliament divided (under Standing Order No. 43): Ayes 117; Noes 13.

உதவ கெடுவிசலிச டெ டுதுவலே டெவல வர கிசலிச டுது.

அதன்படி, சட்டமூலம் இரண்டாம் முறையாக மதிப்பிடப்பெற்றது.

Bill accordingly read a Second time.

உதவ கெடுவிசலிச, டுது 52 டுத ஈபவர கிசலிச டெவலே, 1983 மார்ச் 21 வத டுதுவலே ப்ரீஸிடி, பாடலிசேனே துடு கர்வ டுதுவலே ப்ரீஸிடி டுது.

சட்டமூலம் நிலைக்கட்டளை இல, 52 இன்படி, எதிர்வரும் 1983 மார்ச் மாதம் 21 திங்கட்கிழமை நடைபெறவிருக்கும் முழுப் பாராளுமன்றக் குழுவுக்குச் சாட்டப்பட்டது.

Bill committed to a Committee of the whole Parliament under Standing Order No. 52 for Monday, 21st March, 1983.

கல்கலிச

இந்திபோடல்

ADJOURNMENT

லி. வின்கலிச ப்ரீஸிடி மஹா

(திரு. எம். வின்கலிச ப்ரீஸிடி)  
(Mr. M. Vincent Perera)

I move,

“ That the Parliament do now adjourn. ”

ப்ரீஸிடி விசலிச டுது, டுது கல்கலிச விசலிச.

வினா விடுக்கப்பெற்று ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

Question put, and agreed to.

பாடலிசேனே துடு டெ டுதுவலே டுது. எ. 8.27 ட 1983 டுதுவலே 25 வத டுதுவலே டுது கல்கலிச டுது, 1983 மார்ச் 21 வத டுதுவலே ப்ரீஸிடி, எ. 10 வத டுதுவலே டுது.

அதன்படி டுது, 8.27 மணிக்கு பாராளுமன்றம், அதுவது 1983 பெப்ரவரி 25 ஆம் தேதிய திர் மானத்துக்கிணங்க 1983 மார்ச் 21 திங்கட்கிழமை மு. ப. 10 மணிவரை இத்தலைக்கப்பட்டது.

Adjourned accordingly at 8.27 p.m. until 10 a.m. on Monday, 21st March, 1983, pursuant to the Resolution of the Parliament of 25th February, 1983.



௩. ௪.

மேலே உரையின் அடிப்படையிலான உத்தரவுகளைக் கையாண்டு கட்டுரை செய்து தரவேண்டிய விஷயங்களைக் குறித்து உறுதிப்படுத்தும் வகையில் உறுப்பினர்கள் கவனம் செலுத்தவேண்டுகிறோம்.

1983 ஏப்ரல் 4 வது பக்கம்

தொகுப்பின் மூலக்கோவை பற்றிய விவரம்.

குறிப்பு

அங்கத்தினர்கள் இறுதிப் பதிப்பிற்கு செய்யவிரும்பும் மாற்றங்களை அறிக்கையிற்றொழிவாகக் குறித்து மாற்றங்களைக் கொண்ட பிரதியை ஹன்சார்ட் பதிப்பாளியருக்கு

1983 ஏப்ரல் 4, திங்கட்கிழமைக்குப் பிந்தாமல்

கிடைக்கக்கூடியதாக அனுப்புவதில் வேண்டும்.

NOTE

Corrections which Members suggest for the Final Print should be clearly marked in this Report and the copy containing the corrections must reach the Editor of HANSARD,

not later than

Monday, 4th April 1983





B

**දයක මුදල් :** පාර්ලිමේන්තු විවාද වාර්තාවල වර්ෂික දයක මිල රු. 200/- කි. (අශෝචිත පිටපත් සදහා නම් රු. 175/- කි). පිටපතක් ගෙන්වා ගැනීම අවශ්‍ය නම් ගාස්තුව රු. 2.50 කි. තැපැල් ගාස්තුව 90 කි. කොළඹ 1, තැ. පෙ. 500, රජයේ ප්‍රකාශන කාර්යාංශයේ අධිකාරී වෙත සෑම වර්ෂයකම නොවැම්බර් 30 දින ප්‍රථම දයක මුදල් ගෙවා ඉදිරි වර්ෂයේ දයකත්වය ලබාගෙන විවාද වාර්තා ලබාගත හැකිය. නියමිත දිනෙන් පසුව එවනු ලබන දයක ඉල්ලුම්පත් භාරගනු නොලැබේ.

சந்தா : ஹன்சார்ட் அதிகார 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.







