



# පාර්ලිමේන්තු විවාද

(හැන්සාඩ්)

නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ

නිල වාර්තාව

අත්තිකාරම් ප්‍රධාන කරුණු

ලංකා හෝටල් නීතිගත සංස්ථා (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත [නි. 1982] :  
පළමුවන වර කියවන ලදී

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත (1969-70) [නවවන වෙන්කළ දිනය]  
[නි. 1984] :

දෙවන වර කියවීම—විවාදය අවසන් කරන ලදී.

කෙටුම්පත් පනත පූර්ණ මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩල කාරක සභාවකට පවරන ලදී.

ප්‍රශ්නවලට ලිඛිත පිළිතුරු [නි. 2193]

# பாராளுமன்ற விவாதங்கள்

(ஹன்சார்ட்)

## பிரதிநிதிகள் சபை

அதிகார அறிக்கை

பிரதான உள்ளடக்கம்

இலங்கை விடுதிகள் கூட்டுத்தாபன (திருத்தம்) மசோதா [ப. 1982] :

முதன்முறை மதிப்பிடப்பட்டது

ஒதுக்கீட்டு மசோதா (1969-70) [ஒதுக்கப்பட்ட ஒன்பதாம் நாள்] [ப. 1984] :

இரண்டாம் மதிப்பு—விவாதம் முடிவுற்றது

மசோதா முழுச்சபைக் குழுவுக்குச் சாட்டப்பட்டது

வினாக்களுக்கு எழுத்துமூல விடைகள் [ப. 2193]

Volume 86  
No. 11

Saturday  
23rd August 1969

## PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OFFICIAL REPORT

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

CEYLON HOTELS CORPORATION (AMENDMENT) BILL [Col. 1982] :

Read the First time

APPROPRIATION BILL (1969-70) [Ninth Allotted Day] [Col. 1934] :

Second Reading—Debate concluded

Bill Committed to Committee of Whole House

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 2193]



ලිපි ලේඛනාදිය පිළිගැන්වීම

නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය

பிரதிநிதிகள் சபை

House of Representatives

1969 අගෝස්තු මස 23 වන සෙනසුරාදා  
சனிக்கிழமை, 23 ஐகஸ்ட் 1969  
Saturday, 23rd August 1969

පූ. හා. 100 මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය රැස් විය. කථා  
නායකතුමා [ගරු. එස්. සී. හර්ලි කොරියා] මූලාසනය  
රැස් විය.

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

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

ලිපි ලේඛනාදිය පිළිගැන්වීම

சமர்ப்பிக்கப்பட்ட பத்திரங்கள்

PAPERS PRESENTED

Supplementary Estimate No. 28 of  
1968-69.—[The Hon. Dudley Senanayake.]

සහමාජිකයා මත නීතිය යුතුයයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.  
சபாபீடத்தில் இருக்கக் கட்டளையிடப்பட்டது.  
Ordered to lie upon the Table.

1965 අංක 17 දරණ නිවාඩු පනතේ 11 වැනි  
මගන්විය ඉටුකර පනවන ලද නියෝගයක්.—  
[ගරු ආචාර්ය දහනායක]

සහමාජිකයා මත නීතිය යුතුයයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.  
சபாபீடத்தில் இருக்கக் கட்டளையிடப்பட்டது.  
Ordered to lie upon the Table.

A Rule made under Section 3 of the  
Public Performances Ordinance (Cap.  
176).—[The Hon. N. H. A. M. Karunaratne  
on behalf of the Minister of Local Govern-  
ment.]

සහමාජිකයා මත නීතිය යුතුයයි නියෝග කරන  
ලදී.  
சபாபீடத்தில் இருக்கக் கட்டளையிடப்பட்டது.  
Ordered to lie upon the Table.

කෙටුම්පත් පනත් පිළිගැන්වීම

A set of Regulations made under Sec-  
tion 69, (2) of the Port (Cargo) Corpo-  
ration Act, No. 13 of 1958.—[The Hon.  
Sugathadasa.]

සහමාජිකයා මත නීතිය යුතුයයි නියෝග කරන  
ලදී.  
சபாபீடத்தில் இருக்கக் கட்டளையிடப்பட்டது.  
Ordered to lie upon the Table.

Supplementary Estimates Nos. 26 and  
27 of 1968-69.—[The Hon. Hugh  
Fernando.]

සහමාජිකයා මත නීතිය යුතුයයි නියෝග කරන  
ලදී.  
சபாபீடத்தில் இருக்கக் கட்டளையிடப்பட்டது.  
Ordered to lie upon the Table.

ප්‍රශ්නවලට වාචික පිළිතුරු

வினாக்களுக்கு வாய்மூல விடைகள்

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

කථානායකතුමා  
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)  
(Mr. Speaker)  
Of the hon. Members who have  
given notice of Questions not a  
single hon. Member is present. The  
Answers to Questions that have been  
received from the Ministers will be  
published as Written Answers.

As regards Question No. 2, one  
week's time has been asked for, and I  
allow the request.

කෙටුම්පත් පනත් පිළිගැන්වීම

சமர்ப்பிக்கப்பட்ட மசோதாக்கள்

BILLS PRESENTED

ලංකා හෝටල් නීතිගත සංස්ථා  
(සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

இலங்கை விடுதிகள் கூட்டுத்தாபன(திருத்தம்) மசோதா

CEYLON HOTELS CORPORATION  
(AMENDMENT) BILL

“to amend the Ceylon Hotels Corpo-  
ration Act, No. 14 of 1966.”

පිළිගැන්වන ලද්දේ රාජ්‍ය ඇමති සහ අනුමාන  
තුමාගේත් ආරක්ෂක හා විදේශ කටයුතු පිළිබඳ  
ඇමතිගේත් පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම් ගරු ජේ.  
ආර්. ජයවර්ධන විසිනි.



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70  
—දෙවන වර කියවීම

தென்தி தென்கிலகை ருசுவிதி  
சுபை அமாவு

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

செ. ஜே. ஐ. பி. பி. பி. பி.  
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)  
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)  
I move,

“That this House at its rising this day do adjourn until 10 A.M. on Friday, 29th August, 1969.”

මන්ත්‍රි මණ්ඩලයේ කටයුතු

විසර්ජන පතත් කෙටුම්පත  
1969-70

ஒதுக்கீட்டு மசோதா, 1969-70

APPROPRIATION BILL, 1969-70

කලි තබන ලද විවාදය තව දුරටත් පවත්වනු  
පිණිස නියෝග කියවන ලදී. ඊට අදාළ ප්‍රශ්නය  
[අරෝස්තු 2.]

“කෙටුම්පත් පණත දන් දෙවන වර කියවිය යුතුය.”—[රු වන් නිත්‍යායක.]

ප්‍රශ්නය යළිත් සහතික කරන ලදී.

ஒகஸ்ட் 2 ஆம் தேதிய வினா மீதான ஒத்திவைக்கப் பெற்ற விவாதம் மீள ஆரம்பிப்பதற்கான கட்டளை வாசிக்கப்பட்டது.

“மகிசாதா இப்பொழுது இரண்டாம் முறை மதிப்  
பிக்கப்படுமாக” [கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க].

வினா மீண்டும் எடுத்தியம்பப்பெற்றது.

Order read for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question—[2nd August.]

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



விசேஷ பணம் ஹெபேசன், 1969-70

—உலக உர கிணை

இந்த வரவு செலவுத்திட்ட விவாதம் நடந்து கொண்டிருக்கின்ற விதத்தைப்பார்த்தால் வரவு செலவுத்திட்டத்தைப் பற்றியோ நாட்டின் பொருளாதாரத்தைப் பற்றியோ நடக்கின்ற பேச்சு மிகக் குறைவாகவும், அடுத்த தேர்தலுக்கான ஒத்திகையாகக் கட்சிகளுக்கிடையிலே ஏற்படுகின்ற மோதல் நடக்கின்ற பேச்சு அதிகமாகவுமிருப்பதை நாம் காணக் கூடியதாக இருக்கிறது. அந்த மோதலும் இரண்டு பிரிவாக இந்தச் சபையிலே நடந்து கொண்டிருக்கின்றது. ஒரு புறத்திலே ஆளும் கட்சியிலேயுள்ள ஐக்கியதேசியக் கட்சியினருக்கும் எதிர்க் கட்சியிலே உள்ள கூட்டாட்சிக் கட்சியினருக்கும் இடையிலே ஒரு மோதல் நடைபெறுகின்றது. இன்னொருபுறத்திலே வடக்கு, கிழக்கு மாகாணங்களின் பிரதிநிதிகளாக இருப்போரில், அரசாங்கக்கட்சியில் இருப்பவர்கள் ஒரு புறமாகவும் இலங்கைத் தமிழரசுக் கட்சியைச் சேர்ந்த நாங்கள் மறுபுறமாகவும் இன்னொரு மோதல் நடைபெற்றுக்கொண்டிருக்கிறது.

உண்மையிலேயே, அடுத்த பொதுத் தேர்தலிலே தென்னிலங்கையிலே எந்த எந்தக் கொள்கைகளின் அடிப்படையிலே தேர்தல் போராட்டம் நடைபெறப்போகிறதென்பதை ஐக்கிய தேசியக் கட்சியின் பேச்சாளர்களும் கூட்டாட்சிக் கட்சியின் பேச்சாளர்களும் பேசுகின்ற பேச்சுக்களிலிருந்து நாம் காணக் கூடியதாக இருக்கிறது. அதே போல வடக்கு, கிழக்கு மாகாணங்களிலே அடுத்த தேர்தல் எந்த அடிப்படையிலே நடைபெறப்போகிறதென்பதை எடுத்துக்காட்டுவது போல அரசாங்கக்கட்சியிலே உள்ள தமிழ்க் காங்கிரஸ் கட்சி அங்கத்தினர்களின் பேச்சும் அங்குள்ள ஒரே ஐக்கிய தேசியக் கட்சியின் தமிழ் அங்கத்தவரான கௌரவ கற்குடாப் பிரதிநிதி (கே. டபிள்யூ. தேவநாயகம்) அவர்களுடைய பேச்சும் அமைந்திருப்பதை நாம் காணக் கூடியதாக இருக்கிறது. இந்தச் சபையிலே மிகவும் அனுபவம் முதிர்ந்த, பழம்பெரும் அங்கத்தவராக இருக்கின்ற யாழ்ப்பாணப் பிரதிநிதி வரவு செலவுத் திட்டத்தை மறந்து தமது பேச்சு முழுவதையும் அடுத்த யாழ்ப்பாணத் தேர்தலுக்கு ஒத்திகையாகவே இங்கே நடத்தியிருக்கிறார் என்பதை நாங்கள் கவனத்திலெடுக்க வேண்டியவர்களாக இருக்கிறோம். அவரைத் தொடர்ந்து பேசு கௌரவ வவுனியாப் பிரதிநிதி (ரி. சிவசிதம்

பரம்) அவர்களும் இந்த விவாதத்திலே கலந்துகொண்டு பேசிய கௌரவ கற்குடாப் பிரதிநிதி அவர்களும் அதே தோரணையிலேயே, தமிழரசுக் கட்சியைத் தாக்குவதை நோக்கமாகக் கொண்டு தமது பேச்சுக்களை நிகழ்த்தினார்களே தவிர, அரசாங்கம் சமர்ப்பித்த வரவு செலவுத்திட்டத்தையோ அதையொட்டி எதிர்க்கட்சியினர் கொண்டுவந்த குற்றச்சாட்டுக்களையோ பற்றி அவர்கள் எதுவும் பேசவில்லையென்பதை நான் இங்கே குறிப்பிட வேண்டியவனாக இருக்கிறேன்.

கௌரவ யாழ்ப்பாணப் பிரதிநிதி குறிப்பிட்ட இரண்டு முக்கிய விடயங்களுக்கு நான் இங்கே சுருக்கமாக பதிலளிக்கக் கடமைப்பட்டவனாக விருக்கின்றேன். தமது கோரிக்கையான இராமநாதன் பல்கலைக்கழகத்தைப் பற்றி அவர் குறிப்பிட்டார். இதிலேயுள்ள விசித்திரமென்னவென்றால், 1966 ஆம் ஆண்டு இந்து கலாசாரப் பல்கலைக்கழகம் என்று ஆரம்பித்த கௌரவ யாழ்ப்பாணப் பிரதிநிதி அவர்களுடைய இயக்கம் இன்று மாறி பூரணத்துவம் பெற்ற ஒரு பல்கலைக்கழகம் வேண்டுமென்று வந்திருப்பதை நாங்கள் வரவேற்கிறோம்; பாராட்டுகிறோம். முன்பு மொழித் துவேஷ அடிப்படையிலே ஆரம்பித்த தமது இயக்கத்தைத் தேர்தல் நெருங்கி வருவதை உணர்ந்து—கத்தோலிக்க வாக்காளர்களைப் பெரும்பாலாகக்கொண்ட யாழ்ப்பாணத் தொகுதியிலே தாம் போட்டியிடுவதாகவிருந்தால்—கிறிஸ்தவர்கள், கத்தோலிக்கர்களுக்கு மாறான இந்து பல்கலைக்கழக இயக்கத்தைக் கொண்டு நடாத்த முடியாது என்று கண்டு, இப்பொழுது பூரணத்துவம் பெற்ற ஒரு பல்கலைக்கழகம் வேண்டுமென்று முதன் முதலாக இச்சபையிலே இவ்வருட வரவு செலவுத்திட்ட விவாதத்திலே கௌரவ யாழ்ப்பாணப் பிரதிநிதி எடுத்துக் கூறி இருக்கின்றார். நான் முன்பு கூறியதுபோல அவருக்கு ஏற்பட்டிருக்கும் இந்த மனமாற்றத்தை நாம் வரவேற்கிறோம். இப்பொழுது அவருக்கும் எங்களுக்கும் இடையில் இருக்கும் சர்ச்சை இந்த பூரணத்துவம்வாய்ந்த பல்கலைக்கழகத்தை யாழ்ப்பாணத்திலே நிறுவுவதா அல்லது திருமலையிலே நிறுவுவதா என்பதில்தான் போல் தோற்றுகிறது.

இந்தச் சந்தர்ப்பத்திலே இலங்கையிலே தமிழ் பேசும் மக்களுக்கு ஒரு பல்கலைக்கழகம் வேண்டுமென்று ஆரம்பிக்கப்பட்ட இயக்



பிப்ரவரி 1969-70

[தமிழ் மொழி அகாடமி]

கத்தின் வரலாற்றை நான் மிகவும் சுருக்கமாக இங்கு கூற வேண்டி இருக்கின்றது: 1956 ஆம் ஆண்டில் தனிச் சிங்களச் சட்டம் நிறைவேற்றப்பட்ட சூழ்நிலையில், இலங்கையில் தமிழ்பேசும் மக்களுடைய கலை, கலாசாரத்தை, பாரம்பரியத்தைச் சிதைத்து, அவர்களுடைய தனித் தன்மையை அழித்து, அவர்களை வேரோடு ஒழித்துக் கட்ட இந்த நாட்டிலே அன்று ஆட்சிக்கு வந்தவர்கள் முனைந்து நின்ற வேளையிலே இந்த நாட்டிலே உள்ள தமிழ் பேசும் மக்கள் தமக்கு ஒரு அரசியல் இயக்கம் மாத்திரம் போதாது, தமது பண்பாட்டை, கலையை, கலாசாரத்தைப் பேணிக்காக்க ஒரு பூரணத்துவம் பெற்ற ஒரு பல்கலைக்கழகமும் அவசியம் வேண்டுமென்று எண்ணினார்கள். இப்படி எண்ணியவர்கள் ஒரு பல்கலைக்கழக இயக்கத்தையும் ஆரம்பித்தார்கள். இது எங்கள் கட்சியால் ஆரம்பிக்கப்பட்ட ஒரு இயக்கம் அல்ல. பல்கலைக்கழகப் பேராசிரியர்களாக இருந்த பேராசிரியர் சின்னத்தம்பி அவர்கள், பேராசிரியர் எலிஜேசர் அவர்கள், பேராசிரியர் மயில்வாகனம் அவர்கள், இன்று மலேசிய பல்கலைக்கழகத்தில் பேராசிரியராக இருக்கின்ற வணக்கத்துக்குரிய தனிநாயகம் அடிகளார் போன்றவர்கள், இந்த நாட்டின் உயர்தர நிதி அரசர்களாக விளங்கிய காலஞ் சென்ற ஸ்ரீ. ஸ்ரீலக்ஷ்மணசா, கௌரவ சின்னத்தம்பி போன்றவர்கள், மேலும் அரசாங்க சேவையில் பல்வேறு அங்கங்களிலும் உயர்தர பதவிகளில் இருந்த தமிழ் மக்கள், இந்த நாட்டிலுள்ள முஸ்லிம் பிரமுகர்கள், எல்லோரும் ஒன்று சேர்ந்து தாமாக நிதி திரட்டி, மாதாமாதம் நூற்றுக்கணக்கான ரூபாக்களைத் தமிழ்ப் பல்கலைக்கழக இயக்கத்திற்குக் கொடுத்து இந்தத் தமிழ்ப் பல்கலைக்கழக இயக்கத்தை ஆரம்பித்தார்கள். இந்த நேரத்திலே கௌரவ யாழ்ப்பாணத் தொகுதிப் பிரதிநிதி இச்சபை அங்கத்தவராக இருந்தார். அப்பொழுது இந்த இயக்கத்திற்கு விரோதமாக அவர் எதுவும் சொன்னது கிடையாது. இந்தப் பாராளுமன்றத்தில் அவர் இந்த இயக்கத்தை எதிர்த்தோ அல்லது இன்று அவர் கூறும் இந்துப் பல்கலைக்கழகத்தை முன்நிறுத்தியோ எந்த விதமான கோரிக்கையையும் அவர் சமர்ப்பித்தது கிடையாது.

1956 ஆம் ஆண்டு ஆரம்பிக்கப்பட்ட இந்தத் தமிழ்ப் பல்கலைக்கழக இயக்கம் நாட்டின் மன்றங்கள் அத்தனையினதும் தலைவர்கள்

பல்வேறு பாகங்களிலுமுள்ள தமிழ் பேசும் மக்களை ஒன்றுபடுத்தும் நோக்கத்தோடு இந்த உத்தேச தமிழ்ப் பல்கலைக்கழகத்தை எங்கே, எப்படி அமைக்கலாம் என்று தீரயோசித்து ஒரு முடிவுக்கு வந்தது. தமிழ் பேசும் மக்கள் பாரம்பரியமாக வாழும் பூமியாகிய வடக்கு, கிழக்கு மாகாணங்களுக்கு மத்தியான இடத்தில் இந்தப் பல்கலைக்கழகம் நிறுவப்பட வேண்டுமென்று தமிழ்ப் பல்கலைக்கழக இயக்கம் முடிவு செய்தது. இந்த முடிவிற்படிதான் திருமலையிலே நிலத்தை வாங்கினார்கள். தமிழ் மக்கள் விரும்பிக் கொடுத்த பணத்தில் பல இலட்சம் ரூபாய் பெறுமதியான நிலத்தை அங்கே வாங்கினார்கள். அங்கே, முதன் முதலில், வெறும் எட்டுக் கல்வி உதவாதென்று விவசாயத் துறையிலே பட்டம் பெறக் கூடியவர்களைப் பட்டம் பெறச் செய்து எமது மக்களுடைய வருங்காலத்தைக் கைத்தொழில், விவசாயத் துறைகளிலே கூடுதலாகத் திருப்ப வேண்டுமென்ற நோக்கத்தோடு விவசாயக் கல்லூரியைத் திருகோணமலையிலே அவர்கள் கட்டி, இன்றும் ஒரு சில மாணவர்களோடு அங்கு வகுப்பு நடைபெற்று வருகின்றது.

1959 ஆம் ஆண்டு இந்தத் தமிழ்ப் பல்கலைக்கழகத்துக்குத் திருகோணமலையிலே பெருந் திருவிழாவாக அத்திவாரக்கல் நாட்டப்பட்டது. அந்த நேரத்திலே யாழ்ப்பாணப் பிரதிநிதி எங்கே போயிருந்தாரோ எனக்குத் தெரியாது. ஆனால், அவரது கட்சியைச் சார்ந்த சாதாரண அங்கத்தவர்கள் அத்தனை பேரும் அதனை வரவேற்றார்கள். அதற்கு மாறாக ஒருவராவது தமிழ் மக்கள் மத்தியிலே குரல் எழுப்பியது கிடையாது. இதை எந்தத் தமிழ்க் காங்கிரஸ் அங்கத்தவரும் மறுக்க முடியாது. அந்த நேரத்திலே நாம் அதனை அரசியல் கோரிக்கையாகச் சமர்ப்பிக்கவில்லை. அது கட்சிச் சார்பற்ற, அரசியல் தொடர்பற்ற, கல்விமான்களுடைய, தமிழ் மக்களின் வருங்காலக் கல்வியில் அக்கறை கொண்டவர்களுடைய இயக்கமாகவே நடைபெற்று வந்தது. அவர்களது அழைப்பின் பேரில் நாமும் கலந்துகொண்டோம். அவர்களது அழைப்பின் பேரில் முன்னாள் வவுனியாப் பிரதிநிதியும் கலந்துகொண்டார். அவர்களுடைய அழைப்பின் பேரில் வடக்கு,

கிழக்கு மாகாணங்களிலுள்ள உள்ளூராட்சி







ஹேதி ஹேதி ஹேதி, 1969-70

[ஹேதி ஹேதி ஹேதி]

ஹேதி ஹேதி ஹேதி, நாம் நமக்குள்ளே  
பேசி அதைத் தீர்த்துக் கொள்ளலாம். அதைத்  
தான் நான் கௌரவ யாழ்ப்பாணப் பிரதி  
நிதி அவர்களுக்குக் கூறுகிறேன்.

இந்த அரசாங்கம் அமைக்கப்பட்ட சில  
நாட்களில் பதினெட்டு அங்கத்தவர்கள் கைச்  
சாத்திட்டு கௌரவ பிரதம அமைச்சர் அவர்க  
ளுக்கு ஒரு மனுவைக் கொடுத்தோம், தமிழ்  
பேசும் மக்களுக்கு ஒரு பல்கலைக் கழகம் நிறு  
வப்பட வேண்டுமென்று. கௌரவ கற்குடா  
பிரதிநிதியும் அதிற் கையெழுத்திட்டிருந்தார்  
அவர் ஒரு வழக்கறிஞர். அவருக்கு எழுதப்  
படிக்க நன்றாகத் தெரியும் என்று நம்புகிறேன்.  
அதை அவர் வாசிக்காமல், வாசிக்கத் தெரியா  
மல், கண்ணாடி இல்லாமல் கையெழுத்திட்டி  
ருக்க மாட்டார். நிச்சயமாக அதனை வாசித்  
துத்தான் கையெழுத்திட்டார். அதிலே, நாம்  
திட்டவட்டமாக திருகோணமலை என்று  
கேட்கவில்லை. கிழக்கு மாகாணத்திலே,  
வடக்கு மாகாணத்திற்குச் சமீபமாக இருக்  
கிற ஒரு இடத்திலே தமிழ் பேசும் மக்களுக்  
குப் பூரணத்துவம் பெற்ற ஒரு பல்கலைக் கழ  
கம் வேண்டும் என்றுதான் அதிலே நாம்  
கேட்டிருந்தோம். அதை முழு மனதாக ஆத  
ரித்துத்தான் கௌரவ கற்குடா பிரதிநிதியும்  
கையெழுத்திட்டிருக்கிறார். அவர் தம்முடைய  
சுய கௌரவத்தைக்கூட விட்டு அப்படி  
நான் அறியாமையாலே நடந்து கொண்  
டேன் என்று கூறமாட்டார் என்று நிச்சய  
மாக நம்புகிறோம். திருகோணமலை என்று  
திட்டவட்டமாகக் குறிப்பிடப்பட வில்லை  
என்ற கருத்திலே அவர் கூறியிருப்பார்  
என்று நம்புகிறேன். பின்பு கௌரவ பிரதம  
அமைச்சர் அவர்களுடன் தொடர்பு கொண்டு  
பல்கலைக் கழகம் வேண்டும் என்று கேட்ட  
பொழுது நாங்கள் கொடுத்த அமைப்பு எப்  
படி என்பதை நான் இங்கே கூறவேண்டியிருக்  
கிறது.

திருகோணமலையைத் தலைமை ஸ்தானமாகக்  
கொண்டு விருஞானம், பொறியியல், விவசா  
யக் கல்வி கற்பிக்கின்ற நிலையமும், பல்கலைக்  
கழக நிர்வாகமும் அங்கு அமையவும், மட்டக்  
களப்பிலே, நண்பர் கற்குடா பிரதிநிதி அவர்  
களுடைய தொகுதியைச் சேர்ந்த வந்தாறு  
மூலையிலே கலைப் பகுதியும், யாழ்ப்பாணத்  
திலே வைத்தியக் கல்லூரியும் அமையவும் அந்  
தப் பல்கலைக் கழகம் நிறுவப்பட வேண்டும்  
என்பதுதான் எங்களுடைய அமைப்பு.

கௌரவ யாழ்ப்பாணப் பிரதிநிதி இராம  
நாதனுடைய சொத்து, மழவராயருடைய  
சொத்து, நாவலருடைய சொத்து என்றெல்  
லாம் பட்டோலை வாசித்தார். அந்தப் புண்  
ணியவான்கள் விட்டுச் சென்ற சொத்துக்களை  
வருங்கால சந்ததியினர் நினைக்கக் கூடியதாக  
அந்தப் பட்டியலை ஹன்சாட் புத்தகத்திலே  
பொறித்தது மகிழ்ச்சிக்குரியதுதான். ஆனால்  
அந்தப் பட்டோலை—ஏட்டிலே எழுதப்பட்டி  
ருக்கிற அந்தப் பட்டியல் கறிக்கு உதவாது.  
ஏட்டிலே இனிப்பு என்று எழுதிவிட்டு அதை  
நாவினால் நக்கினால் இனிக்க மாட்டாது, சபா  
நாயகரவர்களே! இதைப் போன்றதுதான்  
இந்தச் சொத்து விஷயமும். அந்தச் சொத்  
துக்களின் பெரும் பகுதி இன்று அரசாங்கத்  
துக்கு உரிய சொத்துக்களாகிவிட்டது. ஸ்ரீல  
ஸ்ரீ ஆறுமுக நாவலர் கிலையை அவர் விட்டுச்  
சென்ற காணியில் கௌரவ கல்வி அமைச்சர்  
அவர்கள் அனுமதி கொடுத்துத்தான் அமைக்க  
வேண்டி வந்தது. அது மாத்திரம் அல்ல.  
அந்த இடத்திலே ஒரு பரப்பு; இந்த இடத்  
திலே இரண்டு பரப்பு; இன்னும் ஒரு இடத்  
திலே முக்கால் பரப்பு. இப்படியானவைகளை  
யெல்லாம் சேர்த்துப் பிடித்து கணக்குப்  
பார்த்து ஒரு பெரிய பட்டோலை போட்டு இத்  
தனை சொத்துக்களும் வீண் போகின்றன.  
அதைக் கொண்டு ஒரு பல்கலைக் கழகத்தை  
அமைக்கலாமே என்று கேட்பது நகைக்கத்  
தக்கது.

தமிழ் பேசும் மக்களுக்கு பூரணத்துவம்  
பெற்ற ஒரு பல்கலைக் கழகம் வேண்டும். அந்  
தப் பல்கலைக் கழகத்தின் அங்கமாக இந்து  
கலையை, இந்து கலாசாரத்தை, துண் கலைகளை  
கற்பிப்பதற்கு யாழ்ப்பாணத்திலே ஒரு நல்ல  
கல்லூரியை நிறுவுவதற்கு நாங்கள்  
பூரணமாக ஆதரவளிக்க ஆயத்தமாக  
இருக்கிறோம். அதற்கு கௌரவ யாழ்ப்  
பாணப் பிரதிநிதியோடு ஒத்துழைக்க  
நாங்கள் ஆயத்தமாக இருக்கிறோம்.  
நாம் அமைக்க விரும்புகின்ற பல்கலைக் கழக  
மும் அப்படியானதுதான். எனது நண்பர்  
கௌரவ உடுவில் பிரதிநிதி (வீ. தர்மலிங்கம்)  
யாழ்ப்பாணப் பிரதிநிதியைத் தொடர்ந்து  
பேசிய பேச்சிலே கூறியதுபோல, இந்தப் பல்  
கலைக் கழகத்தை ஒரு சாட்டாக வைத்து  
தமிழ்பேசும் மக்களைப் பிளக்க—பிரிவுபடுத்த  
விடக்கூடாதென்பதற்காகவே நான் இங்கே  
இதைக் கூறுகிறேனே தவிரவேறென்றுக்கு  
மல்ல. நான் ஆரம்பத்திலே சொன்னேன்;  
கௌரவ யாழ்ப்பாணப் பிரதிநிதி இந்த இயக்



கத்தை ஆரம்பித்த இடத்திலிருந்து இன்றைக்கு எங்களோடு எவ்வளவோ தூரம் மனம் மாறி வந்திருக்கிறார். இன்னும் கொஞ்சம்தான் மாறவேண்டியிருக்கிறது. தேர்தல் முடிந்துவிட்டால் அதுவும் மாறிவிடும். தேர்தல் நேரத்திலே எங்களைத் தாக்குவதற்காக அதைப் பயன்படுத்த விரும்புகிறார் போலும். இங்கே பேசுகின்ற பொழுது “நான் ஒரு இந்து பல்கலைக்கழகமென்று சொல்லவேயில்லை” என்று சொல்லி முழுப் பூசனிக் காயைச் சோற்றிலே மறைத்தார். சென்ற மூன்று வருடங்களாக நாட்டின் பல பகுதிகளிலும் இந்த இந்து பல்கலைக் கழகம் என்ற தோற்றையிலே, இந்து கலாசாரப் பல்கலைக் கழகம் என்ற தோற்றையிலே அதுதான் வேண்டுமென்று அவர் பேசிய பேச்சுக்கள் அத்தனையையும் வெட்டி வைத்திருக்கிறேன்.

அது மாத்திரமல்ல, கிறிஸ்தவன் செல்வநாயகத்தின் தலைமையிலே இயங்குகின்ற காரணத்தால்தான் தமிழரசுக் கட்சி இன்று இந்து பல்கலைக் கழகத்தை எதிர்க்கிறதென்று ஓரிடத்தில் பேசினார்; இணுவிலிலே, எனது நண்பர் கௌரவ உடுவில் பிரதிநிதியின் தொகுதியிலே பேசுகின்ற பொழுது போதகர் செல்வநாயகம்—ஹெரண்ட் செல்வநாயகம் என்று கௌரவ யாழ்ப்பாணப் பிரதிநிதி சென்றவாரம் சொன்னார். ஏனென்றால் அங்கே அவர் கூற விரும்புவது, தாமே இந்துக்களுக்காக இந்து சமயத்துக்காக, இந்து பல்கலைக் கழக மொன்றை அமைக்க விரும்புவதாகத்தான். இங்கே, பாராளுமன்றத்திலே, பேசுகின்றது அங்கே எட்டாது என்று அவர் நினைக்கின்றார். ஒருவேளை அவர் அரசியல் வாழ்வு ஆரம்பித்த காலத்திலே அவர் இங்கே பேசுவது அங்கே விளங்காமலிருந்திருக்கலாம். இன்றைக்கு அப்படியல்ல. அவர் இங்கே ஒன்றைக் கூறிவிட்டு அங்கே ஒன்றைக் கூறித் தப்பிக்கொள்ள முடியாது.

ஆகையினாலே, கௌரவ சபாநாயகரவர்களே, இந்து பல்கலைக் கழகமென்பதை விட்டு தமிழ் பேசும் மக்களுக்கு ஒரு பூரணத்துவம் பெற்ற பல்கலைக் கழகம் என்று, இன்று கூறுகின்ற அதே தமிழ்க்காங்கிரஸ், வெட்ட வெளிச்சமாகச் சொல்லட்டும். நாங்களும் அவர்களும் இன்னும் கற்குடாப் பிரதிநிதி போன்றவர்களும்—ஏன் எனது நண்பர் மட்டக்களப்பு இரண்டாவது பிரதிநிதி, யாழ்ப்பாணப் பிரதிநிதியைத் தொகுதி

கின்ற பொழுது, திருகோணமலையிலும் வேண்டாம்; யாழ்ப்பாணத்திலும் வேண்டாம்; மட்டக்களப்பிலே வையுங்கள் என்று சொன்னார்—இப்படியாக நாங்கள் மோதத் தொடங்கினால், இது எப்படிப் போய் முடியுமென்பது எமக்கு நன்றாகத் தெரியும். ஆகையினால்தான் இந்த மோதலுக்கு இடம் கொடுக்கக் கூடாதென்று கூறுகிறோம். இதனால்தான் கடந்த காலங்களிலே எமக்குக் கிடைக்க வேண்டிய எத்தனையோ சலுகைகள், எத்தனையோ உரிமைகள் கிடைக்காமல் போய் விட்டன.

உதாரணமாக, வடபகுதியிலே ஒரு துறைமுகம் வேண்டுமென்று அரசாங்க சபையின் காலத்திலே தொடக்கம் எமது மக்கள் விடுத்த கோரிக்கைக்கு அந்த நேரத்திலே ஆட்சிபிடித்திலேயிருந்தவர்கள் என்ன செய்தார்கள்? அப்பொழுதிருந்த ஊர்காவற்றுறைப் பிரதிநிதியவர்களையும் காங்கேசன்துறைப் பிரதிநிதியவர்களையும் மோத விட்டு விட்டு—ஒருவர் காங்கேசன்துறைக்கு என்று சொல்லுவார்; மற்றவர் ஊர்காவற்றுறைக் கென்று சொல்லுவார்—காலஞ்சென்ற பிரதமர் அதாவது எங்களுடைய தற்போதைய பிரதமர் அவர்களின் தந்தையார், அவர்களுக்கு என்ன சொன்னாரென்றால், “நீங்கள் உங்களுடைய சண்டையைத் தீர்த்துக்கொண்டு வாருங்கள்; நான் ஒரு துறைமுகத்தை நிறுவுகிறேனென்று சொன்னார். இன்றைக்கு கௌரவ பிரதமர் அவர்களும் எங்களுக்கு அதைத் தான் சொல்லுகிறார். 18 பேர் கையெழுத்திட்டு, முஸ்லிம் பிரதிநிதிகள், தமிழ்ப் பிரதிநிதிகள்—இந்துக்கள், முஸ்லிம்கள், கிறிஸ்தவர்கள்—வடக்கு, கிழக்கு மாகாணப் பிரதிநிதிகள் 18 பேர் கையெழுத்திட்டுத் தமிழ்பேசும் மக்களுக்கு ஒரு பல்கலைக்கழகம் நிறுவவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டபொழுது, மூன்று பேர்—தமிழ்க் காங்கிரஸ் கட்சியைச் சேர்ந்த மூன்று பேர்—இந்து பல்கலைக் கழகம் வேண்டுமென்று கேட்டார்கள். பதினெட்டையும் மூன்றையும் எண்ணுகின்ற பொழுது, ஆறிலொரு பகுதியினர் கூட அதைக் கேட்காத நேரத்திலும் கௌரவ பிரதமர் எங்களுடைய தலைவர் காங்கேசன்துறைப் பிரதிநிதியவர்களுக்கு சதியாகச் சொன்னார்: “உங்களுடைய கோரிக்கையை நான் கல்வி அமைச்சர் அவர்களுக்கு அனுப்பியிருக்கிறேன்; அவர் அதைப் பரிசீலனை செய்வார்; ஆனால் இந்த நேரத்திலே, மூன்று அங்கத்தவர்கள் இந்து



1995

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

[අමර්තලත්තම් මය.]

[அதிர்ஷ்டத்தைக் கிணர்ந்து.]  
பல்கலைக் கழகம் வேண்டுமென்றும்\* கோரியிருக்கிறார்கள்; உங்களுக்கு அதையும் நான் கூற விரும்புகிறேன்” என்று.

ஊர் இரண்டு பட்டால் கூத்தாடிக்கு என்று  
என்று சொல்வார்கள். இதை யாழ்ப்பாணப்  
பிரதிநிதி இன்னும் மறந்து இருக்கிறாரே  
என்றுதான் எனக்கு வேதனையாக இருக்கின்  
றது. எங்களோடு சேர்ந்து அவர்கள் மூன்று  
பேரும் கேட்டிருந்தால்-பதினெட்டோடு அந்த  
மூன்றுதமிழ்க் காங்கிரஸ் பாராளுமன்ற அங்  
கத்தவர்களையும் சேர்த்து இருபத்தொன்றாக  
அரசாங்கக் கட்சியில் இருந்த அத்தனைபேரும்  
கேட்டிருந்தால்-1966 ஆம் ஆண்டிலேயே எங்க  
ளுடைய கோரிக்கையை நாங்கள் பெற்றிருக்க  
முடியும். தடுத்தவர்கள் யார்? நாங்கள் தடுத்தோ  
மா? நாங்கள் தடுத்தோம் என்று கூறுவ  
தில் அறிவு இருக்கின்றதா என்று நான் அவர்  
களைக் கேட்க வேண்டியவகை இருக்கின்றேன்.

சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்தப் பல்கலைக் கழகப் பிரச்சினையை வைத்து நீதாம் கமிஷன், சிசில்வைற் கமிஷன், குணவர்த்தனா கமிஷன் போன்ற பல்வேறு கமிஷன் அறிக்கைகளை எல்லாம் இங்கே படித்தார், கௌரவ யாழ்ப்பாணப் பிரதிநிதி. ஆனால் இந்தக் கமிஷன்களில் அங்கம் வகித்த பல்வேறு பேரும் ஒன்றை மாத்திரம் தெளிவாகச் சொல்லி இருக்கிறார்கள். அதாவது, தமிழ் பேசும் மக்களுடைய கல்வி அபிவிருத்திகளைப் பூர்த்தி செய்ய ஒரு பல்கலைக்கழகம் வேண்டுமென்று அவர்கள் எல்லோரும் சொல்லி இருக்கின்றார்கள். அதை எங்கே நிறுவ வேண்டும் என்பதை மக்கள்தான் தீர்மானிக்க வேண்டும்; தீர்க்க வேண்டும். தமக்கு இடையில் பிளவு ஏற்படாத வகையில் இதை நாம் தீர்க்க வேண்டும். மட்டக்களப்பு என்று ஒருவர் சொல்ல, திருகோணமலை என்று மற்றொருவர் சொல்ல, யாழ்ப்பாணம் என்று வேறொருவர் சொல்ல அது அந்தரத்தில் தொங்கும் ஒரு பல்கலைக் கழகமாகப் போய்விடாமல் நாம் எல்லோரும் சேர்ந்து ஒத்து, ஒரு இடத்தில் அல்லது பல கழகங்களைத் தொகுத்த ஒரு பல்கலைக் கழகமாக ஒரு தமிழ்ப் பல்கலைக்கழகத்தை நிறுவுங்கள் என்று அரசாங்கத்தைக் கேட்பதற்கு இன்னும் காலம் கடந்துவிடவில்லை என்றுதான் நான் கௌரவ யாழ்ப்பாணப் பிரதிநிதி அவர்களுக்குக் கூறிவைக்க விரும்புகிறேன்.

பூரணத்துவம் பெற்ற ஒரு பல்கலைக்கழகமே தமிழ் பேசும் மக்களுக்கு வேண்டும் என்று

எங்கள் கோரிக்கையை அவர் இன்றைக்கு ஒப்புக்கொண்டிருப்பது மகிழ்ச்சிக்குரியது. இடத்தைப் பற்றி நாம் சண்டை பிடிக்காமல் ஒரு முடிவுக்கு வரலாம். யாழ்ப்பாணப் பிரதிநிதி அவர்களுக்கு திரு. இராமநாதன் அவர்களுடைய சொத்து, திரு. இராமநாதன் அவர்களுடைய சந்ததியாருக்குப் போகாமல் காக்க வேண்டுமென்று கவனம் இருந்தால் அவர் நன்றாகக் காக்கட்டும். நான் அறிகிறேன், சர்பொன்னம்பலம் இராமநாதன் அவர்கள் விட்டுச் சென்ற தருமச் சொத்து தமக்குத் திருப்பி வரவேண்டுமென்று அவருடைய குடும்பத்தைச் சேர்ந்த அவருடைய வாரிசு வழக்குத் தொடுத்து இருக்கிறார் என்று. வேண்டுமானால் இந்த வழக்கில் கௌரவ யாழ்ப்பாணப் பிரதிநிதி அவர்கள் போய்ப் பேசட்டும். சதிவழக்குப் பேசியதுபோல அதையும் அவர் பேசிப்பார்க்கட்டும். ஆனால் எங்களைப் பிளவுபடுத்த வேண்டாம் என்று நான் அவரைக் கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.

சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, கௌரவ யாழ்ப்பாணத் தொகுதிப் பிரதிநிதி குறிப்பிட்ட இன்னும் ஒரே ஒரு விடயத்திற்கு நான் பதில் அளிக்க விரும்புகிறேன். தமிழ் மொழிச் சட்ட விதிகள் ஒரு ஏமாற்று என்று அவர் சொன்னார். அதே வாயால் அவர் சொன்னார், கௌரவ பிரதமர் டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க அவர்கள் ஒரு கண்ணியவான் என்று. இந்த இரண்டு கூற்றுக்களுக்கும் உள்ள முரண்பாடு அவருக்குப் புரியாது. கண்ணியம் மிகுந்த பிரதமர் அவர்கள் ஒரு ஏமாற்றுச் சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டு வந்தார் என்று யாழ்ப்பாணப் பிரதிநிதி கூறுகின்றாரா என்று நான் இங்கு கேட்கவேண்டியவனாக இருக்கிறேன். உண்மையில் கௌரவ பிரதமர் அவர்கள் இன்றுள்ள சட்டங்களுக்கு அமைய, உத்தியோக மொழிச் சட்டம் நியாயமான தமிழ் உபயோகச் சட்டம் ஆகிய இவை இரண்டிற்கும் அமைய தமிழின் உரிமையைச் சட்டபூர்வமாக எவ்வளவு கொடுக்க முடியுமோ அவ்வளவைக் கொடுப்பதற்குத்தான் அந்தச் சட்ட விதிகளைக் கொண்டுவந்திருக்கிறார். அந்தச் சட்ட விதிகள் கொண்டுவரப்பட்ட நேரத்திலே உலகப் பிரச்சினையைத் தீர்க்கப் போய் இருந்தவர், எங்களுடைய உலகத் தலைவர் கௌரவ யாழ்ப்பாணப் பிரதிநிதி அவர்கள். இங்கே எங்கள் பிரச்சினையைத் தீர்க்க மறந்து உலகப் பிரச்சினையைத் தீர்க்கப் போய் இருந்தவர் திரும்பி வந்ததும் அந்தச் சட்ட விதிகளைப் பற்றி ஒன்றும்



விவரணை பற்றி கையெழுத்து, 1969-70

—தேவன் 26 கி.பி.

பேசாமல் அதற்கு “ஆதரவாக வாக்களித்து விட்டு இன்றைக்குக் கூறுகிறார் அந்தச் சட்ட விதிகள் ஏமாற்று என்று. கௌரவ உடுவில் பிரதிநிதி குறிப்பிட்டதைப் போல எத்தனையோ எதிர்ப்புக்கு மத்தியிலே உத்தியோக மொழிச் சட்டம் செத்து விட்டது என்று புத்தபிக்குமாரும் மற்றவர்களும் ஆர்ப்பாட்டம் நடத்திய சூழ்நிலையிலே நிறைவேற்றப்பட்டவை அந்தச் சட்டவிதிகள். 1966 ஆம் ஆண்டு அவ்வளவு எதிர்ப்புக்கும் மத்தியிலே நிறைவேற்றப்பட்ட அந்தச் சட்ட விதிகளை இன்னும் சரிவர அமுல் நடத்தவில்லை என்பதுதான் எங்கள் குற்றச்சாட்டு முறைப்பாடே தவிர வேறொன்றுமில்லை. அதை அமுல் நடத்தினால் இன்றியிருப்பதிலும் பார்க்க தமிழ் மொழியின் நிலை, தமிழ் மக்களின் நிலை எவ்வளவோ உயர்ந்திருக்கும் என்பதைச் சட்டம் படித்த கௌரவ யாழ்ப்பாணப் பிரதிநிதி நிச்சயம் தெரிந்து கொண்டுதான் இருப்பார். நான் ஒரு சிறு உதாரணத்தைத்தான் இதற்குச் சொல்வேன். ஒரு குடும்பத்தில் அண்ணன், தம்பி இரண்டு பேர். அவர்களுடைய அன்னையின் ஆபரணங்களைத் திருடன் ஒருவன் அபகரித்துச் சென்றுவிட்டான், 1956 ஆம் ஆண்டிலே இந்த நாட்டுத் தமிழ் மக்களுடைய உரிமை, தமிழ் அன்னையுடைய உரிமை ஆட்சிபீடத்தால் அபகரிக்கப்பட்டது போல. அந்த நேரத்திலே இரண்டு புத்திரர்களில் ஒருவன் அன்னையின் ஆபரணங்களை அபகரிக்க வந்தவனோடு போராடினான்; அடிபட்டான்; இரத்தம் சிந்தினான்; எவ்வளவோ துன்பங்களை அனுபவித்தான். அவனிடமிருந்து தன் அன்னையின் உடைமைகளை மீட்க எவ்வளவு செய்ய முடியுமோ அவ்வளவையும் செய்தான். கடைசியாகப் பத்து வருடங்கள் போராடி 1966 ஆம் ஆண்டிலே ஒரு பகுதி உரிமைகளை—உடைமைகளை—அவன் பெற்றான். அப்போது அண்ணன் என்ன செய்தார்? வேடிக்கை பார்த்துக் கொண்டு நின்றார்! உன்னைச் சும்மா விடு வேனா பார் என்று இடையிடையே வெற்றி வேட்டுக் கிளப்பிக்கொண்டு நின்றார்! கடைசியாக தம்பி ஒரு பகுதி நகைகளை மாத்திரம் மீட்டுக் கொண்டு வந்தவுடன் அண்ணன் சொல்கிறார்: “அட பாவி, அட துரோகி முழு நகைகளையும் மீட்காமல் வந்துவிட்டாயே, உன்னை அன்னை மன்னிப்பாளா?” அதுபோலத்தான் இருக்கின்றது. கௌரவ அத்தனாக உழைக்கத்தான் போகிறோம்;

யாழ்ப்பாணப் பிரதிநிதி அவர்களுடைய பேச்சும்!

1956 ஆம் ஆண்டிலே தனிச் சிங்களச் சட்டம் நிறைவேற்றப்பட்டது தொடக்கம் நாம் எத்தனையோ இயக்கங்களை நடத்திய நேரத்திலெல்லாம், எமது மொழி உரிமையைப் பெற போராட்டங்களையும் வெவ்வேறு இயக்கங்களையும் நடத்திய நேரத்திலெல்லாம் படுதூறங்கிவிட்டு பத்து வருடங்களுக்குப் பின், இந்த அரசாங்கத்திலே ஓர் அங்கமாக நாம் சேர்ந்து, எம்மோடு ஒப்புக்கொண்ட பிரகாரம், தமிழ் மொழியின் உரிமைகளை ஓரளவுக் காவது பெற சட்ட விதிகளை நிறைவேற்றி வழி செய்த பின்னர் உறக்கம் தெளிந்து வந்த கௌரவ யாழ்ப்பாணப் பிரதிநிதி கண்ணீர் வடிக்கிறார். “இது ஏமாற்று. இதில் ஒன்றும் இல்லை. எமது அன்னையினுடைய உரிமையை விட்டுக் கொடுத்துவிட்டான் தம்பி” என்று கண்ணீர் வடிக்கிறார்.

1956 ஆம் ஆண்டு தொடக்கம் அவரும் இங்கே இருந்தார்கள். 1960 ஆம் ஆண்டிலே யாழ்ப்பாண மக்கள் அவரைத் தூரத்தி யடித்தது உண்மைதான். 1970 ஆம் ஆண்டிலே தூரத்தியடிக்க இருப்பதுபோல. ஆனால், நிச்சயமாக அவர் அரசியல் இயக்கங்களை நடாத்த முடியாதவராக இருக்கவில்லை. ஏன் அவர் நடத்தவில்லை? சட்ட நடவடிக்கையாவது எடுத்திருக்கலாம். அவருக்கு ஒருவேளை இயக்கங்களை நடத்தி, மறியல் செய்து அடிபட முடியாமல் இருக்கலாம். அதனால்தான் 1956 ஆம் ஆண்டிலே நாம் காலிமுகத்திலே அடிபடும் நேரத்தில் பொலிஸ் ஜீப்புக்குப் பக்கத்தில் வந்துநின்றார் அவர். அது அவருடைய கெட்டித்தனமாக இருக்கலாம். ஆனால், எங்களைப் பொறுத்த வரையில் நாம் இந்தச் சட்டவிதிகள் பூரணத்துவம் பெற்றவை என்று சொல்லவில்லை. இந்தச் சட்ட விதிகள் கொண்டுவரப்பட்ட அன்று, அதாவது 1956 ஆம் ஆண்டு ஜனவரி மாதம் 8 ஆந் தேதி எமது கட்சித் தலைவர் கௌரவ காங்கேசன்துறைப் பிரதிநிதி (திரு. எஸ். ஜே. வி. செல்வநாயகம்) அவர்கள், இந்தச் சட்ட விதிகளினால் வடக்கு, கிழக்கு மாகாணங்களில் தமிழ்மொழி உரிமை காக்கப்பட்டிருக்கின்றது; அதே போல எஞ்சிய பகுதிகளிலும் பூரண உரிமை பெற நாம் உழைக்க வேண்டுமென்று கூறினார்கள். நாம் உழைக்கத்தான் போகிறோம்;



விசேஷ பணை கெடுபிணை, 1969-70

—தேவன வர கியலே

[தேவனவர கியலே]

உழைத்துக் கொண்டும்தான் இருக்கிறோம். ஆனால், கடந்த நான்கரை ஆண்டுகாலமாக அகில இலங்கைத் தமிழ்க்காங்கிரஸ் தலைவர்—அங்கே தமிழுக்குச் சம அந்தஸ்து என்று கூறுபவர்கள்—இந்தத் தமிழ் உரிமையைப் பெறுவதற்கு இங்கே ஏதாவது செய்த துண்டா என்பதைத்தான் அவர்களைப் பார்த்து நான் கேட்க விரும்புகிறேன்.

இந்த வரவு செலவுத்திட்ட விவாதத்தில் இந்தப் பிரச்சினைகளையெல்லாம் அவர் கிளப்பிய காரணத்தால் அதற்குப் பதிலளிக்க வேண்டிய நிர்ப்பந்தம் எனக்கு ஏற்பட்டிருக்கின்றது. இந்த வரவு செலவுத்திட்டத்தை யொட்டிப் பேசும்பொழுது, சென்ற வரவு செலவுத்திட்ட விவாதத்தில் நான் பேசியதை வாசித்துக்காட்டி அப்பொழுது பேசியதற்கு முரணாக நான் இப்பொழுது பேசுவதாக கௌரவ வவுனியாப் பிரதிநிதி (திரு. ஈ. சிவசிதம்பரம்) குறிப்பிட்டார். அதே போல சிம்மாசனப் பிரசங்க விவாதத்திலே கௌரவ உடுப்பிட்டிப் பிரதிநிதி (திரு. எம். சிவசிதம்பரம்) குறிப்பிட்டார். இந்த இடத்திலே ஓர் உதாரணத்தை எனது பேச்சிலிருந்து வாசித்துக்காட்ட விரும்புகிறேன். சென்ற ஆண்டு வரவு செலவுத்திட்டத்திலே அரசாங்கக் கட்சியிலிருந்து நான் பேசிய நேரத்திலேகூட நான் குறிப்பிட்டது என்ன வென்றால்,

“காங்கேசன்துறைத் துறைமுகத்தை அபிவிருத்தி செய்ய வேண்டும்; அதையும் வர்த்தகத்துக்கான ஒரு துறைமுகமாக—பெரிய கப்பல்கள் வரக்கூடிய துறைமுகமாக—திருத்த வேண்டுமென்று முந்திய அரசாங்கத்தை நாங்கள் பலமுறை பணிந்து பணிந்து கேட்டோம். 15, 20 ஆண்டுகளாக நாங்கள் வேண்டுமோ விடுத்து வந்தோம். ஆனால் “செவிடன் காதில் ஊதிய சங்கு” போல அது அவர்கள் காதில் ஏறவில்லை. இந்த அரசாங்கம் காங்கேசன்துறைத் துறைமுகத்தை அபிவிருத்தி செய்ய இந்த வரவு செலவுத் திட்டத்திலே 40 இலட்சம் ரூபா ஒதுக்கியிருக்கிறது. கூடிய விரைவில் அதை அபிவிருத்தி செய்வார்கள் என்றே நாங்கள் நம்புகிறோம். சில சந்தர்ப்பங்களிலே ”தெய்வம் விடை கொடுத்தாலும் பூசாரி விடை கொடுக்கார்” என்ற மாதிரியாகச் சில காரியங்கள் நடந்து விடுகின்றன, அரசாங்கம் அதைச் செய்ய விரும்பிச் செய்ய முற்பட்டாலும் தடைக்கல்லாக இருக்கிறார்கள் முந்திய அரசாங்கத்திலே பழக்கப்பட்ட உத்தியோகத்தார்கள் சிலர். அவ்வுத்தியோகத்தார்கள் அதனைத் தடுத்துக் கொண்டு வருவதாக நாம் அறிகின்றோம். ஒவ்வொரு இலாகாவிலும் இந்த விதமான தடைகள் இருக்கின்றன”.

என்று நான் குறிப்பிட்டேன். Digitized by Noolaham பரிசீலனம். என்பதையும் ஒரு விதியாகச்

சபாநாயகரவர்களே, சென்ற வரவு செலவுத் திட்டத்திலே நான் குறிப்பிட்டது அத் தனையும் உண்மையாக அமைந்து விட்டது. காங்கேசன்துறை துறைமுக அபிவிருத்திக் காக சென்ற ஆண்டு 40 இலட்சம் ரூபா ஒதுக்கப்பட்டும் அதில் ஒரு சதம்கூட செலவு செய்யப்படாமல் தடுக்கப்பட்டு விட்டது. அதைத்தான் குற்றச்சாட்டாகக் கூறுகிறோமே தவிர பணம் ஒதுக்கப்படவில்லை என்று கூற வில்லை. ஒதுக்கப்பட்ட பணம் செலவிடப்பட வில்லை என்று கூறுவது தவறு?

இப்பொழுது எங்கள் கேள்விப்படி காங்கேசன்துறை துறைமுகத்தை நிறுவுவதற்காக அத்திவாரக்கல் நாட்ட கௌரவ தேசிய மய சேவைகள் அமைச்சர் ஏற்பாடு செய்திருப்பதாக அறிகிறோம். எங்கள் தலைவர் கௌரவ காங்கேசன்துறைப் பிரதிநிதி கௌரவ பிரதமர் அவர்களையே இந்த அத்திவாரக்கல் நாட்டும்படி அழைத்திருக்கிறார். கௌரவ பிரதமர் நவம்பர் மாதத்தில் வந்து அதனை நாட்டவிரும்பதாக அறிகிறோம். ஒரு வேளை அவர் வந்து அத்திவாரக்கல் நாட்டியவுடன் எதிர்க்கட்சியிலுள்ளவர்கள் “ஓகோ, மறுபடியும் ஒரு ரகசிய ஒப்பந்தம்” என்று சொல்வார்கள் என்பதற்காகவே இதனை இந்தச் சந்தர்ப்பத்திலே கூறினேன். எங்கள் பகுதியை அபிவிருத்தி செய்யவேண்டியது அரசாங்கத்தினுடைய கடமை. எங்கள் பகுதியை அபிவிருத்தி செய்யும்படி அரசாங்கத்தைக் கேட்பதற்கு எங்களுக்கும் உரிமை இருக்கிறது.

எனக்குத் தந்த நேரத்துக்கு அப்பால் செல்லாமல் இன்னும் ஒரு விஷயத்தையும் கூற விரும்புகிறேன். இது பிள்ளைகளுடைய போதனா மொழி பற்றிய பிரச்சினை. அதைப் பற்றி கௌரவ யாழ்ப்பாணப் பிரதிநிதி அவர்களும் குறிப்பிட்ட காரணத்தால் நானும் அதைப் பற்றிக் குறிப்பிட வேண்டிய வகை இருக்கிறேன்.

தேசிய அரசாங்கம் ஏற்பட்ட பின் கல்வி வெள்ளை அறிக்கையொன்று சமர்ப்பிக்கப்பட்டது. அந்த வெள்ளை அறிக்கையிலே, போதனா மொழி சிங்களம் அல்லது தமிழாக இருக்கும் என்று கூறி, பெற்றோர்கள் விரும்பினால் சிங்களப் பிள்ளைகள் தமிழ் மூலமும், தமிழ்ப் பிள்ளைகள் சிங்களம் மூலமும் கல்வி



பேரீக்கை உதவி கைப்பிடிப்பு, 1969-70

சேர்த்திருந்தார்கள். அதனை நாங்கள் ஆட்சேபித்தோம். பின்னர் கௌரவ யாழ்ப்பாணப் பிரதிநிதியும், நியமன அங்கத்தவர்திரு. எஸ். தொண்டமானும் ஆட்சேபித்தார்கள். எங்கள் எல்லாரையும் சேர்த்து கௌரவ பிரதமருடைய வாசஸ்தலத்திலே ஒரு மகாநாடு நடைபெற்றது. அந்த மகாநாட்டிலே தமிழ்ப் பிள்ளைகளின் போதனை மொழி தமிழ்தான் என்பதை ஒப்புக்கொள்வதாக கௌரவ கல்வி அமைச்சரும் கௌரவ பிரதம அமைச்சரும் ஒப்புக்கொண்டார்கள். பின்னர் அரசாங்கக் கட்சியில் விவாதிக்கப்பட்ட மசோதாவில் தாய்மொழிதான் போதனைமொழி என்று போடப்பட்டதேதவிர வேறு எப்படியும் போடப்படவில்லை. அந்த விவாதத்திலே தான் முஸ்லிம் பிரதிநிதிகளுடைய கேள்விப்படி முஸ்லிம் குழந்தைகளுக்குப் போதனை மொழியைத் தெரிவு செய்யும் உரிமை பெற்றோர்க்கு அளிக்கப்பட வேண்டும் என்பது ஒப்புக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது. அதை நான் சிம்மாசனப் பிரசங்க விவாதத்தில் குறிப்பிட்ட பொழுது கௌரவ பிரதமர் அவர்கள் “அரசாங்கம் அதை ஏற்றுக் கொள்ளவில்லை. நான் தான் அதை ஏற்றுக் கொண்டேன்” என்று கூறினார். ஆனால் என்னைத் தொடர்ந்து சிம்மாசனப் பிரசங்க விவாதத்தில் பேசிய கௌரவ உப சபாநாயகர் (திரு. எம். சிவசிதம்பரம்) அவர்களும், இந்த வரவு செலவுத்திட்ட விவாதத்தில் பேசிய கௌரவ யாழ்ப்பாணப் பிரதிநிதி அவர்களும்—இன்றைக்கும் அரசாங்கக் கட்சியிலே இருப்பவர்களும்—“கௌரவ பிரதமர் அவர்கள் மாத்திரமல்ல, அரசாங்கமும் ஏற்றுக்கொண்டது. போதனைமொழி தமிழ் மொழிதானென்பதை” என்று கூறினார்கள். அவர்கள் அதைக் கௌரவ பிரதமர் அவர்களிடம் கேட்டுத் தெளிவுபெற்றுக் கொள்ளட்டும்.

அரசாங்கக் கட்சி விவாதித்த சட்டமூலத்திலேயே தாய்மொழிதான் போதனைமொழி என்று இருந்ததை ஒருவேளை கௌரவ பிரதமர் மறந்து விட்டாரோ என்னவோ எனக்குத் தெரியாது. அந்த அரசாங்கக் கட்சிக் கூட்டத்திலே முஸ்லிம் குழந்தைகளுடைய கல்விக்கு அந்த விதியிலேயிருந்து விலக்களிக்க வேண்டுமென்று ஒப்புக்கொள்ளப்பட்டதே தவிர, தமிழ்க் குழந்தைகளின் கல்வியைப்பற்றிச் சர்ச்சை இருக்கவில்லை. ஆனால்

—தேவன வர் கியிலே

படியால், சிம்மாசனப் பிரசங்க விவாதத்திலே கௌரவ பிரதமர் அவர்கள் என்னுடைய பேச்சை இடைமறித்துக் கூறியது தவறுதலாகக் கூறப்பட்டதென்று அவருடைய தரப்பிலே இன்றும் இருக்கின்ற உப சபாநாயகரவர்களும் யாழ்ப்பாணப் பிரதிநிதி அவர்களும் கூறிய பின்னராவது—நான் கூறியதற்குச் சாட்சியாக இரண்டு பிரபல வழக்கறிஞர்கள், ஒருவர் ஒரு கியூ. ஸீ.—மற்றவர் உங்களுடைய உதவியாளர், உப சபாநாயகரவர்கள்—இந்த இரண்டு பேரும் கூறிய பின்னர், கௌரவ பிரதமர் அவர்கள் நடந்ததை இனியாவது சரியாக நினைவுபடுத்திக் கொள்வார்கள் என்று நான் எதிர்பார்க்கின்றேன். சபாநாயகரவர்களே, நீங்கள் கொடுத்த நேரத்தில் இன்னும் 5 நிமிடங்கள்தான் இருக்கின்றன. அதற்கு மேலாகச் சொல்ல நாம் விரும்பவில்லை. இந்த வரவு செலவுத்திட்டத்தைப் பொறுத்து, இன்னும் ஒரேயொரு விடயத்தைப்பற்றி நான் பேச வேண்டுமென்று இருந்தேன். அதாவது அரசாங்க ஊழியர்களைப் பொறுத்த விடயமே அது. நிதி அமைச்சின் மானியத்தின்மீது குழு நிலையிலே விவாதம் நடைபெறுகின்றபொழுது இதைப்பற்றி குறிப்பிடலாமென்று நான் எண்ணுகின்றேன்.

இந்த நாட்டைப் பீடித்திருக்கின்ற பொருளாதார வியாதி, முக்கியமாக இந்த நாடு சுதந்திரம் பெற்ற காலத்திலேயேயிருந்து விடப்பட்ட தவறுகளிலிருந்து எழுந்ததென்றே நான் கருதுகிறேன். 1948 ஆம் ஆண்டு நாம் சுதந்திரம் பெற்ற நேரத்திலே—நமக்குப் போதிய வெளிநாட்டு மூலதனம் இருந்த காலத்திலே—அவற்றைக் கொண்டு கைத்தொழில்களை ஆரம்பிக்கையிலே போதிய அளவு கைத்தொழில் மயமாக்குவதற்கு அரசாங்கங்கள் அக்கறை செலுத்தியிருந்தால், இன்றைக்கு இந்த நாட்டிலே இந்த நிலைமை ஏற்பட்டிருக்காது. அன்று வெளிநாட்டு மூலதனத்தை வீணாக விரயம் செய்ததுடன், போதிய கைத்தொழில் அபிவிருத்திகளையும் மேற்கொள்ளாத காரணத்தால்தான் இன்றைக்கு இந்த நிலைமை ஏற்பட்டது. இந்தச் சந்தர்ப்பத்திலே உண்மையிலே எமது நாட்டு மூலதனத்தைக் கொண்டு சோஷலிஸ நாடுகளின் உதவியோடுதான் சில கைத்தொழில்கள் ஆரம்பிக்கப்பட்டனவென்பதை நான் ஒப்புக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். முந்த



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[අමර්තලීන්ගම් මයා.]

திய அரசாங்கத்தின் காலத்திலே, ரஷ்ய நாட்டு உதவியோடு இங்கே நிறுவப்பட்ட ரயர் தொழிற்சாலைபோன்ற பல்வேறு தொழிற்சாலைகளும் தான், அதைப்போல உருக்குத் தொழிற்சாலை போன்ற பல்வேறு தொழிற்சாலைகளும் தான், பெருமளவிலே—கைத் தொழில் அபிவிருத்தியிலே—இந்த நாட்டிலே ஒரு புதிய திருப்பத்தை ஏற்படுத்தின. 1948 ஆம் ஆண்டிலிருந்தே, எந்தத் தொழிலை ஆரம்பிக்க முற்பட்டாலும் உலக வங்கியும் மற்றவர்களும் தலையிட்டு தடைசூறியவுடன், அதைக் கைவிடுகின்ற மனப்பான்மை, 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951 ஆம் ஆண்டுகளிலே இருந்ததாக நாங்கள் அறிக்கைகளிலே அறியக்கூடியதாக இருக்கிறது. அன்று விட்ட அந்தத் தவறுகளின் பலனைத்தான் இன்றைக்கும் இந்த நாடு அனுபவித்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறது. அன்று நமது நாட்டின் மூலப்பொருட்களைக் கொண்டு போதியளவு கைத்தொழில்கள் ஆரம்பிக்கப்பட்டிருந்தால்—எமக்கு வெளி நாட்டு மூலதனப் பஞ்சம் இல்லாத நேரத்திலே ஆரம்பிக்கப்பட்டிருந்தால்—இன்று நாம் இவ்வளவு தூரம் இன்னற்பட வேண்டியிராதென்று நான் கருதுகிறேன்.

இந்த வரவு செலவுத்திட்டம், சேற்றிலே சிக்கிய ஒரு வண்டிலை, வெளியேற்ற முடியாது, அந்த இடத்திலேயே விட்டு விட்டு அடுத்த தேர்தலிலே எல்லோரையும் சேர்த்து இழுத்துக் கொண்டு வர முயற்சிக்கின்ற ஒரு திட்டமாக அமைந்திருக்கிறதே தவிர வேறொன்றுமல்ல. இன்றைக்குச் சேற்றிலே தான் அரசாங்க வண்டி சிக்கியிருக்கிறது. அதை மீட்கப் போனால், தாங்கள் எல்லாம் சேறு பூசிக்கொள்ள வேண்டுமென்பதைக் கண்ட அரசாங்கத்தினர், அது அதிலேயே இருக்கட்டும்; அதை விட்டுவிடுவோம்; அடுத்த தேர்தலுக்குப் பின்னர் நாங்கள் வந்தாற் பார்ப்போம்; மற்றவர்கள் வந்தால் அவர்கள் பார்க்கட்டும் என்று இந்த வரவு செலவுத்திட்டத்திலே எந்தக் குறிப்பிடக் கூடிய முன்னேற்றத்தையும் எந்தக் குறிப்பிடக்கூடிய மாற்றத்தையும் செய்யாமல், மக்களுடைய வாழ்க்கைப் பிரச்சினையைத் தீர்ப்பதற்கு—வேலையில்லாத் திண்டாட்டத்தைப் போக்குவதற்கு—வாழ்க்கைச் செலவைக் குறைப்பதற்கு எந்தவகையான வழியையும் காட்டாது இந்த அரசாங்கம் தந்திரமாகவும், மந்திரமாகவும், ஒரு மானோசலயமாகவும்

இந்த வரவு செலவுத் திட்டத்தைச் சமர்ப்பித்து இருக்கிறதே தவிர வேறொன்றும் இல்லை என்று கூறி, நாற்பத்தைந்து நிமிடங்கள் பேசுவதற்கு எனக்கு அனுமதி தந்த கௌரவ சபாநாயகர் அவர்களுக்கு நன்றி கூறி, என்னுரையை முடித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.

ငြို့. အ. 10.50

පී. බී. සුබසිංහ මයා. (කටුගම්පොළ)

(திரு. ஈ. பி. சுபசிங்க—கடடுகம்பொள)

(Mr. T. B. Subasinghe—Katugampola)

ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, දැනට දින 10කට 12කට පෙර ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා විසින් ඉදිරිපත් කරන ලද අයවැය ලේඛනය සම්බන්ධ විවාදයයි දැන් අපි පවත්වාගෙන යන්නේ. මෙම කාලය තුළ මෙම සභා ගර්භය ඇතුළත නොයෙක් අදහස් උදහස් ප්‍රකාශ වී තිබෙනවා. සමහර අවස්ථාවලදී අපි සාකච්ඡා කරන ප්‍රශ්නවලින් ඇතටත් ගිහිත් තිබෙනවා. ඉලක්කම් බොහෝම විග්‍රහ කර තිබෙනවා. රටේ අනාගතය ගැන නොයෙක් දේ කථා කර තිබෙනවා. “රජ වරුන් ගැනත් ගෝවා ගේඩ් ගැනත්” යයි ඉංග්‍රීසියෙන් කියන්නා වාගේ අපි නොයෙක් දේවල් ගැන කථා කර තිබෙනවා.

එක අතකින් කල්පනා කර බලන විට මෙවැනි අවස්ථාවකදී ඒ නොයෙකුත් දේවල් ගැන කථා කිරීම වළක්වන්නක් බැහැ. ඒ මොකද? මුදල් සම්බන්ධ වාණිජ නාව නොහොත් අයවැය ලේඛනය ඉදිරිපත් කරන වේලාවේදී තමයි මේ රටේ මහජන නියෝජිතයන්ට රටට සහ මහජන යාට බල පාන ප්‍රශ්න ගැන පුළුල් වශයෙන් සාකච්ඡා කරන්නට ඉඩක් ලැබෙන්නේ. අපි කාරක සභා අවස්ථාවේදීත් ඒ ඒ ශීඝ්‍ර වෙනුවෙන් වෙන් කර තිබෙන මුදල් ගැන පරීක්ෂාකාරීව බලන්නට පුරුදු වී තිබෙන එක ඇත්ත. නමුත් අතින් අතින් පුළුල් ලෙස ප්‍රතිපත්ති අනුකූලව යම් යම් ප්‍රශ්න ගැන මේ අවස්ථාවේදී නොහොත් දෙවන වර කියවන අවස්ථාවේදී සාකච්ඡා කරන්නට සිද්ධ වී තිබෙනවා. ඒ නිසා සමහර විට මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාගේ කථාවට පමණක් සීමා නොකර ඉන් විකක් පිටට යන්න අපට සිද්ධ වෙනවා. ඒක වළක්වන්න අමාරුයි.

රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමාගේ චෝදනාවක් තිබේ නම්—චෝදනාවක් නොවෙයි පැමිණිල්ලේ තිබේ නම්—අයි ඩිකක් එහාට මෙහාට



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

ගොස් වෙන වෙන ප්‍රශ්නවලට බහිනවාය කියා. විශේෂයෙන්ම ලංකාව වැනි රටක පවතින යම් යම් ප්‍රශ්න ගැන බලන විට ඒ විධියට වෙන වෙන ප්‍රශ්නවලට බහින්නේ නැතුවත් මෙවැනි දේවල් ගැන සාකච්ඡා කරන්න පුළුවන් කියා මා විශ්වාස කරන්නේ නැහැ. ලංකාවේ පමණක් නොවෙයි, අලුතෙන් නිදහස ලබාගෙන තිබෙන ආසියානු අප්‍රිකානු සෑම රටවලටම මෙවැනි ප්‍රශ්නවලට මුහුණ දෙන්නට සිද්ධ වී තිබෙනවා. ඒ නිසා මෙවැනි අවස්ථාවකදී විරුද පාර්ශ්වයේ ඉදගෙන හෝ වේවා, ආණ්ඩු පාර්ශ්වයේ ඉදගෙන හෝ වේවා, ඒ ප්‍රථම ප්‍රතිපත්ති ගැන ටිකක් කථා කිරීම මගේ හිතේ අපටත් අපේ රටටත් ප්‍රයෝජනයි.

අද මේ රට, මේ සභා ගර්භය තුළම, කොටස් දෙකකට බෙදීලයි ඉන්නේ. එක පැත්තකින් ආණ්ඩු පාර්ශ්වයයි. ආණ්ඩු පාර්ශ්වයත් නොයෙක් නොයෙක් පක්ෂ එක්කාසු වෙලයි සැදී තිබෙන්නේ. අනික් පැත්තෙන් විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වය. විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයත් නොයෙක් නොයෙක් පක්ෂ එක්කාසු වෙලයි සැදී තිබෙන්නේ. අප දෙගොල්ලත් අතරේ නොයෙකුත් මත හේද තිබෙනවා. අප දෙගොල්ල වේදිකා වලත්, මේ සභා ගර්භයේදීත්, නොයෙක් චෝදනා නඟනවා; ප්‍රතිචෝදනා නඟනවා. නමුත් ඒ සෑම චෝදනාවක් ප්‍රතිචෝදනා වක්ම මධ්‍යයේ යම් යම් මූලික කරුණු අමතක නොකර සිටීම අපේ ඉතාමත් වැදගත් යුතුකමක් යයි මා කල්පනා කරනවා.

මේ රටට නිදහස ලැබී දැන් අවුරුදු 22 ක් පමණ ගත වී තිබෙනවා. අපේ රටටත්, ඒ වාගේම මෑත නිදහස ලත් ආසියා අප්‍රිකා රටවලටත් නිදහස ලැබුණු අවස්ථාවලදී ඒ ඒ රටවල ජනතාවගේ සිත් තුළ විශාල බලාපොරොත්තු ඇති වුණා. විදේශිකයන්ගේ පාලනයෙන් නිදහස් වී තමන්ගේ ජීවිතය එදාට වඩා පහසුවට පවත්වාගෙන යාමටත්, ලෞකික වශයෙනුත්, අධ්‍යාපනික වශයෙනුත්, සංස්කෘතික වශයෙනුත් දියුණුවක් ලබා ගැනීමටත් මහජන තාව තුළ ප්‍රථම බලාපොරොත්තු තිබුණා. ඒ කාරණය සම්බන්ධයෙන් අප කිසි කෙතකු අතර මතභේදයක් නැතැයි මා හිතනවා. එහෙත් එසේ නිදහස ලැබූ අපේ රටේත් අනික් රටවලත් මහජනයාගේ ඒ බලාපොරොත්තු ඉටු වී තිබෙනවාද? අපි තාවමේ යුගය වැය කොට කෙරෙන නිෂ්

රුදු 22 ක් ගත වී ඇති නමුත්, අප බලාපොරොත්තු වූ පරමාර්ථ ඉෂ්ට වී තැනි බවයි අපට කියන්න සිද්ධ වී තිබෙන්නේ. අප කුමන දේශපාලන පක්ෂයකට අයිති වුණත්, කුමන දේශපාලන පරිශ්‍රාන්තක් අනුගමනය කළත් අප කවුරුත් ඒ සත්‍යය පිළිගත යුතුයි. ඒ නිසා ඕනෑම වැඩියෙන් පොද්ගලික චෝදනා ආදියෙන් වැළකී කථා කිරීමට මා අදහස් කරන අතර, නොයෙකුත් පහර ගැසීම් පසු පස එළවන්නට මා බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නෙත් නැහැ. එහෙත් කථාකරගෙන යන විට ඒ සම්බන්ධවත් යමක් ඉද හිට කියන්නට සිද්ධ වෙනවා ඇති. මූලික ප්‍රශ්නයට මුල් තැන දී මගේ ශක්තියේ හැටියට මෙම අයවැය කථාව පිළිබඳ වචන ස්වල්පයක් ප්‍රකාශ කිරීමටයි මා අදහස් කරන්නේ.

තව අවුරුදු 3 ක් යන විට අපේ සංවර්ධන ගමනේ වේගය බටහිර ජර්මනියත් ඉක්ම යනවායයි මේ විවාදයේදී ආණ්ඩු පක්ෂයේ මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් හුඟ දෙනෙක් කීවා. තවත් සමහර මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් කීවා, තව අවුරුදු 5 ක් යන විට—ඒ කියන්නේ එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයට තව අවුරුදු 5 ක් සම්පූර්ණ වන විටදී මා දන්නේ නැහැ—මේ රටේ සියලුම ප්‍රශ්න විසඳා අවසාන කරනවාය කියා. “අප, රට සංවර්ධනය කරනවා; එහෙත් මොනවා කරන්නද, අප සංවර්ධනය කරන්නේ ණය වෙමිනුයි; එයින් මිදෙන්න බෑ; අපි සදාකාලික වම ණය වෙමු; එය ‘fපන්ඩ්’ එකක් කර ගනිමු; මොනවා වෙනවාදැයි අනාගතයේදී බලමු” කියා රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා කීවා. දෙවනුව මා ඒ ගැන යමක් කියන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. තර්කයකින් දිනීමට පමණක් නොව මූලික කරුණු කල්පනාවට ගෙන අපේ මත ප්‍රකාශ කිරීමයි, යුතුකම.

මා දැන් සඳහන් කරන්නට යන මාර්ග දෙකින් එකක් තෝරා ගැනීමේ ප්‍රශ්න යට මුහුණ පාන්නට ලංකාවට පමණක් නොව හැම රටකටම පාහේ සිදු වී තිබෙනවා. නිෂ්පාදනය, හුවමාරුව හා බෙදා හැරීම යන සියල්ලක්ම කෙරෙහි රජය මැදිහත් වෙමින් ක්‍රමයෙන් ආර්ථික සංවර්ධනය පිළිබඳ සම්පූර්ණ වගකීම රජයට පැවරෙන සමාජ ක්‍රමයත්, මුළු මහත් ජන



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

[සුබසිංහ මයා.]

පාදනය භුක්ති විඳීම වරප්‍රසාද ලත් සුළු පිරිසකගේ අයිතියක් බවට පිළිගැනෙන සමාජ ක්‍රමයක්, යන දෙකින් ඕනෑම ක්‍රමයක් උඩ, රටක පාලනය ගෙන යන්නට පුළුවනි. මේ ක්‍රම දෙකින් එකක් තෝරා ගන්නට අපට සිදු වෙනවා. එහිදී සමාජ වාදය ඔස්සේ යා යුතු යයි බහුතර ජනතාව පිළිගෙන තිබෙන්නේ සිය අත්දැකීම්වලිනුයි. ඒ සඳහා ඔවුන් මාක්ස්වාදය පිළිගැනීම අවශ්‍ය වන්නේ නැහැ. මේ තත්ත්වයට මුහුණ දෙන්නට සිදු වී තිබෙන්නේ අපට හා අසල්වැසි ඉන්දියාවට පමණක් නොවෙයි. ඊට මුහුණ දෙන්නට සෑම රටකටම පාහේ සිදු වී තිබෙනවා.

සිය ජීවන අත්දැකීම් මත බහුතර ජනතාව සමාජවාදී මාර්ගයට කැමැත්තක් දැක්වීම නිසා පරණ අදහස් විකස් වෙනස් කරන්නට, වරප්‍රසාද අහිමි කරන්නට, පරණ සංවිධාන වෙනස් කොට අළුත් සංවිධාන ගොඩ නගන්නට සිදු වුණොත්, ඒවා කළ යුතුමයි. කොපමණ කිවත්, එසේ නොකර නම් මේ රටේ සාමාන්‍ය ජනතාවට සුඛිත මුද්‍රිත භාවයක් ලබාදෙන්නට කටයුතු වන්නේ නැහැ. ඒ නිසයි, මේ රජය ගෙන යන ප්‍රතිපත්තියට අප විරුද්ධ වන්නේ. මහ ජන ශුභසිද්ධිය සඳහා කටයුතු කරන බවට මේ රජය කොතෙක් කිවත් එවැන්නක් ඉෂ්ට නොවන්නේත්, ජනතා බලාපොරොත්තු ඉෂ්ට නොවන්නේත් ඒ නිසයි.

1965 මාර්තු මාසයේදී වර්තමාන රජය බලයට පැමිණියේ ජනතාව ඉදිරියේ තැබූ නොයෙක් පොරොන්දු උඩයි. කෙසේ වෙතත් 1965 දී මේ උදවියට නිශ්චිත ආකාරයට මහජනයාගෙන් තීරණයක් ලැබුණේ නැහැ, පාලන බලය දරන්නට. එම නිසා ඒ මැතිවරණයෙන් පසු ව නොයෙකුත් අත්දැකීම් ගිවිසුම් උඩ මේ උදවිය පාලන බලය ලබා ගත්තා. එසේ බලය ලබා ගෙන ආණ්ඩුව පිහිටුවුවා. එයින් පසුව මේ ආණ්ඩුවේ ගරු අගමැතිතුමාට යම්කිසි තීරණයකට එළඹෙන්නට සිදු වුණා. එය කුමන ආකාරයේ තීරණයක්ද? මෙසේ භාරගත් කර්තව්‍යය ඉටු කරන්නේ කුමන ආකාරයකින්ද යන්න පිළිබඳ තීරණයකටයි එළඹෙන්නට සිදු වුණේ. [බාධා කිරීමක්]

ආර්ථික මාර්ගය පිළිබඳවයි මා දැන් කතා කරන්නේ. එතුමා එක්තරා තීරණයකට බැස්සා. “මේ රටේ සංවර්ධනයෙහි මූලික පදනම විය යුත්තේ—motive—පුද්ගලික ලාභය පිට මුදල් යොදවන්නට පුළුවන් උදවියට දෙන්නට හැකි සෑම ධෛර්යයක් ම දීමයි; ඒ මාර්ගයෙන් රටේ දියුණුව ඇති කිරීමයි” කියන තීරණයට එතුමා බැස්සා. මෙම තත්ත්වය නිසා ආණ්ඩු බලය ලබා ගත් හැටියේම එතුමාගේ ආර්ථික ප්‍රතිපත්තියෙහි මූලික කර්තව්‍යයක් වූයේ ධනපති කොටස්වල කරපිට දමා තිබුණු ආදායම් බද්ද පුද්ගල බද්ද සහ දේපොළ බද්ද වැනි දේ ගැන සලකා බැලීමයි. අර්ථ ශාස්ත්‍රඥයන් නීතිපතා උපදෙස් දුන්නා මේ පිළිබඳව. මේ රටේ සිටින පුද්ගලික ධනපති කොටස් රට දියුණු කිරීම සඳහා මුදල් නොයොදවන්නට හේතුව ඒ උදවියගේ කරපිට බදු බර පටවා තිබුණු නිසා බව ඔවුන් කිව්වා. එතුමා එම ප්‍රතිපත්තිය පිළිගෙන ඔවුන්ට පහසුකම් සියල්ලක්ම දුන්නා. ඒවාගේම පසුගිය ආණ්ඩුව විසින් මේ රටේ නිපදවෙන ධනය පිටරටට ගෙනයාම නවත්වාලීමට ගෙන තිබුණු ක්‍රියා මාර්ග වෙනස් කරන්නට තීරණය කළා. විදේශීය බැංකුවලට දමා තිබුණු යම් යම් සීමාවන් වෙනස් කරන්නට තීරණය කොට ඒ පිළිබඳව සාකච්ඡා ඇරඹුවා. ඒවා ගේම ඉඩම් ප්‍රතිපත්තියෙහිද මූලික වෙනසක් වුණා.

ගරු අගමැතිතුමාගේ පියා තමයි, මේ රටේ ඉඩම් සංවර්ධන ආඥා පනතේ ආදි කර්තවරයා වන්නේ. සාමාන්‍ය ගොවි ජනතාවට හැර ධනපති කොටස්වලට මේ රටේ රජය සන්නික ඉඩම් බෙදා දීම නොකළ යුතුය යන්න එදා ප්‍රතිපත්තියක් හැටියට පිළිගෙන තිබුණා. අපත් එය ප්‍රතිපත්තියක් හැටියට පිළිගත්තා. එහෙත් අප කියා සිටියා මුද්දර වාගේ පොඩි පොඩි කැලි වලට කඩා අක්කරය දෙක තුන බෙදා දෙන වාට වඩා ගොවි ජනතාවට ඒවායින් නියම ප්‍රයෝජනයක් ලබා ගන්නට හැකි වන ආකාරයට මාර්ග සලස්වා දීම සඳහා එම ඉඩම් විශාල ගොවිපොළවල් හැටියට පූර්වර්තනය කළොත් එය වැදගත් වන බව. [බාධා කිරීමක්] හතලිස් ගණන්වල; පණස් ගණන්වල අප දෙගොල්ල අතර මතභේද තිබුණා. ඒ කෙසේ වෙතත් අප



විපර්යාස පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

මෙන්න එතුමන්ලාත් පිළිගන්නා, ඉඩම් සංවර්ධන ආඥා පනත යටතේ එම ඉඩම් හිමිවිය යුත්තේ ගොවි ජනතාවට බව. එහෙත් 1965 දී මෙම ආණ්ඩුව පිහිටෙව් වාසින් පසු එම ප්‍රතිපත්තියෙහි සැලකිය යුතු වෙනසක් කර තිබෙනවා. මේ රටේ ගොවි ජනතාවට අපේ ආහාර ප්‍රශ්නය වත්, වෙනත් ගොවි ද්‍රව්‍ය නිෂ්පාදන ප්‍රශ්නයෙන් විසඳන්නට පුළුවන්වෙවිය කියා එදා එතුමන්ලාගේ විශ්වාසයක් තිබුණේ නැහැ. එම පිළිගැනීම උඩයි, මහියංගනය වැනි පළාත්වල විශාල ධනස්කන්ධයන් යොදා—[බාධා කිරීමක්] ආහාර ඇමතිතුමා ඒ ගැන තර්ක ඉදිරිපත් කරනවා. එහෙත් මට මතකයි, ආහාර ඇමතිවරයා මුලදීම එම ප්‍රතිපත්තිය පිළිබඳව දැරූ අදහස්. ඒ පිළිබඳව එතුමා මුලදී මාත් සමග කතා කරද්දී කියා තිබෙනවා. අප මෙපමණ මුදල් යොදවා තිබෙන නමුත් ගොවි ජනතාවගේ නිෂ්පාදනය මදිසි යනුවෙන්. ඒ නිසා විශාල ධනපති කොටස් මේ සඳහා පාවිච්චි කළ යුතු බවයි තමුන්නාන්සේලා අදහස් කරන්නේ. මා මොහොතකටත් කියන්නේ නැහැ, තමුන්නාන්සේලා සුළු ගොවියාට ඉඩම් දීම වළක්වා තිබෙනවාය කියා. මා දැන් කලින් කිව්ව මූලික ප්‍රතිපත්තිය තහවුරු කිරීමටයි මෙසේ කියන්නේ. තමුන්නාන්සේලා සුළු මිනිසා කෙරෙහි එදා තබා තිබුණ විශ්වාසය අද අඩු වී තිබෙනවා. ධනපතියන්ගේ මාර්ගයෙනුයි, ධන පති කොටස් සම්බන්ධ කරගෙනයි මේ සංවර්ධනය කරන්න පුළුවන් වන්නේ කියන විශ්වාසයයි දැන් තමුන්නාන්සේලාට තිබෙන්නේ. ගොවි කමින්නය සම්බන්ධයෙන් පමණක් නොව, අනිකුත් කමින්න සම්බන්ධයෙනුත් තමුන්නාන්සේලා ඒ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය පිළිගෙන තිබෙනවා. මා නොවෙයි, මේවා කියන්නේ. තමුන්නාන්සේලාගේ රජපේරු වලින්ම ඒවා ඔප්පු වී තිබෙනවා. තමුන්නාන්සේලා ගත් ඒ වෙනස් ප්‍රතිපත්තිය සාර්ථක වී නැති. බව තමුන්නාන්සේලාගේ ඉඩම් කොමසාරිස්තුමාගේ වාර්තාවෙන් හෙළි දරව් වී තිබෙනවා. මා ඒවා මේ අවස්ථාවේදී කියවන්න යන්නේ නැහැ.

ගරු ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන (කර්මාන්ත හා සිවර ඇමති)

(කෙළරඹ ම. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන—කෘත්‍ය මොහොත, කළුතර මුල් අවස්ථාව)

(The Hon. D. P. R. Gunawardena—Minister of Industries and Fisheries)

දෙමස මන්ත්‍රිතුමාගේ වාර්තාවෙන් ඊට වඩා හෙළිදරව් වෙනවා.

සුබසිංහ මයා.

(ශ්‍රී. ආපසිභාග)

(Mr. Subasinghe)

ඒ වගේම ගරු කළානායකතුමනි, පසු ගිය ආණ්ඩුව කමින්න සම්බන්ධයෙන් ගෙන ගියේ කුමන ප්‍රතිපත්තියක්ද? මේ රටේ කමින්න දියුණුවේ මූලික වගකීම ආණ්ඩුව සතු විය යුතු බවයි පසුගිය ආණ්ඩුව විශ්වාස කළේ. ඒ කියන්නේ රජයේ කාර්මික අංශය එන්න එන්නම පුළුල් කළ යුතු බවයි.

ගරු ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන

(කෙළරඹ ම. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන)

(The Hon. D. P. R. Gunawardena)

සිනි බෝල කර්මාන්ත.

සුබසිංහ මයා.

(ශ්‍රී. ආපසිභාග)

(Mr. Subasinghe)

වෙනත් ඇති. සිනි බෝල කර්මාන්ත නොවෙයි, අද බොහොම පුරාපේරු කියන වානේ කර්මාන්තය ආරම්භ කළේත් ඒ කාලයේ තමයි.

ගරු ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන

(කෙළරඹ ම. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන)

(The Hon. D. P. R. Gunawardena)

කොයි කාලයේදී?

සුබසිංහ මයා.

(ශ්‍රී. ආපසිභාග)

(Mr. Subasinghe)

1956ත් පසු ඒ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය [බාධා කිරීම]—

ගරු ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන

(කෙළරඹ ම. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන)

(The Hon. D. P. R. Gunawardena)

සිනි බෝලාකර්මාන්ත ආණ්ඩු කාලයේදී නොවෙයි.







වෙන කිසිදාක නොවුණු අන්දමින් ඉහළ ගොස් නැඳ්ද? ජීවන වියදම අන් කිසිම කාලයක නොතිබුණු තරම් ඉහළ නැග නැඳ්ද? එමෙන්ම අද සුළු වෙනන ලබන, නැත්නම් සුළු ආදායම් ලබන අයගේ ණය ගැන භාවය එදාට වඩා වැඩි වී නැඳ්ද, රැකිරීම් හිඟය අද වැඩි වී නැඳ්ද? ආර්ථික සංවර්ධනය කියා එක පැත්තකින් කිය නවා. එහෙත් එදාට වඩා අද රැකිරීම් හිඟය උග්‍ර වී තිබෙන බව කාටත් පිළිගන්නට සිදු වී තිබෙනවා නේද? උගත් අය අතර පමණක් නොවෙයි, පාසැල් ගිය නොගිය හැම කෙනෙක් අතරම රැකිරීම් හිඟ උග්‍ර වී තිබෙනවා. එය අපි කවුරුත් දන්නවා. එමෙන්ම අද ආහාර අනුභව කිරීම අතින් බලන විට මන්දපෝෂණය වැනි දේවල් වැඩි වී නැඳ්ද? මා මේ කරුණු ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නේ දැන් සියල්ලෙන්ම සම්පූර්ණයි කියා ආණ්ඩු පක්ෂයේ උදවිය ඔප්පු කරන්නට උත්සාහ කරන නිසයි. එමෙන්ම මේ ආණ්ඩුව ගෙන ගොස් තිබෙන ආර්ථික ප්‍රතිපත්තිය නිසා අද සිදු වී තිබෙන්නේ කුමක්ද? අතලොස්සක් අතට කළු මුදල් එකතු වී මහජනයාගේ බඩගින්නෙන් ප්‍රයෝජන ගෙන ඔවුන්ගේ ලේ සුරාගෙන ධනපතියන් වී, ඒ මුදල් සඟවා ගෙන සිටිනවා.

ණය ගැන මා කළා කරන්නේ නැහැ. එහෙත් ඉඩම් දීම ගැන කළා කරන්නට ඕනෑ. ඉඩම් නැතිකම අදත් එදා වගේම බරපතල ප්‍රශ්නයක්. එමෙන්ම විදේශ වෙළඳ අවාසිය අවුරුදුපතා ඇති වෙනවා. දවසින් දවස මේ රටේ සවිදේශීය ධනපති පත්තිය අතරත් විදේශීය ධනපති පත්තිය අතරත් සම්බන්ධකම් ඇති කර ගෙන යනවා. යම් කෙනෙක් කර්මාන්තයක් ආරම්භ කරන්න ඕනෑ යයි කීවිට යන්නේ එක්කෝ ජපන් ධනපතියන් සොයාගෙනයි, නැත්නම් ජර්මන් ධනපතියන් සොයා ගෙනයි, එහෙමත් නැත්නම් බ්‍රිතාන්‍ය ධනපතියන් සොයා ගෙනයි. මේ අන්දමට මේවා එකට සම්බන්ධ කර මේ රටේ ආර්ථිකයෙන් කොටසක් පාලනය කරන්නට ඒ අයට ඉඩ දුන් විට කල් යෑමේදී ඔවුන්ගේ ආර්ථික හා දේශපාලන බලපෑම් මේ රටේ මනුෂ්‍ය ජීවිතය කෙරෙහි ඇති වෙනවාද නැඳ්ද? මේ ප්‍රශ්නය ඇති වෙනවාද නැඳ්ද?

තේද අද ඉන්දියාවේ විශාල දේශපාලන අර්බුදයක් ඇති වී තිබෙන්නේ? අවුරුදු ගණනාවක් ඒ රටේ පාලනය ගෙන ගිය කොන්ග්‍රස් පක්ෂය පවා දෙකට කැඩෙන තැනට ඇවිත් තිබෙන්නේ මෙවැනි ප්‍රශ්න නිසා නේද? තමුන්නාන්සේලා ආර්ථික නිදහස ගැන කළා කරනවා. මේ විධියට ආර්ථික නිදහස ලබා ගන්නේ කොහොමද කියා ගරු අගමැතිතුමා අපට පැහැදිලි කරුවිය කියා අපි බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී කාලයේ මේ රටේ ආර්ථික ක්‍රමයේ සම්පූර්ණ අයිතිය නැත්නම් විශාල වශයෙන් අයිතිය තිබුණේ බ්‍රිතාන්‍යය වැනි විදේශිකයින්ටයි. ඒ අයිතිය තවම සම්පූර්ණයෙන් නිදහස් වී නැහැ. මෙසේ තිබෙද්දී තව තවත් විදේශීය කොටස් මෙහි අවුත් ව්‍යාපාර පටන් ගන්නට යනවා. මේ අන්දමට ඉදිරියට යන විට අපට මොන ආර්ථික නිදහසක් ලැබෙයිද? සමහර විට සමහර අංශවල නිෂ්පාදනය වැඩිවන්නට පුළුවනි. වෙනදා පිරිවිත් ගෙන්වූ නයිලෝන් රෙදි වෙනුවට මේ රටේම නිපද වූ නයිලෝන් රෙදි පාවිච්චියට ගන්නට පුළුවන් වෙනවා ඇති. එහෙත් අවසාන ප්‍රතිඵලය කුමක්ද? මේ අන්දමට එන්න එන්නටම ආර්ථික බලය විදේශිකයන් සතුවන විට මේ රටේ ජනතාවගේ නිදහස සීමාවන බව ගරු අගමැතිතුමා පිළිගන්නවා ඇතැයි මා හිතනවා.

අද ලතින් ඇමෙරිකාවේ ඇති වී තිබෙන්නේ මේ තත්ත්වයයි. ලතින් ඇමෙරිකාවේ පිරු වැනි රටවල මධ්‍යම පංක්තියට ඇමෙරිකානු ආයෝජනවලට විරුද්ධව නැගීටි සිටින්නට අද සිදු වී තිබෙනවා. අප මේවා කියන විට සමහරුත් අපට හිතා වේවි. එහෙත් අර්ථ ශාස්ත්‍රයේ යම් යම් සත්‍යයන්වලට අපට පිටු පාන්නට බරි බව මා මතක් කරන්නට කැමතියි. ලෝකයේ දේශපාලන ප්‍රශ්නවල නොයෙක් නොයෙක් සත්‍යයන් තිබෙනවා. අපට ඒවාට පිටු පාන්නට බැහැ. ඒවා අපටත් බලපාන නිසා මෙහිදී අපට ඒවා ගැනත් මතක් කරන්නට සිදු වෙනවා.

මේ කාලය ඇතුළත මේ ආණ්ඩුව ගෙන ගොස් ඇති ප්‍රතිපත්තිය නිසා අන් කිසිදිනෙක මේ රටේ ඇති වුණාට වැඩි ආර්ථික ඒකාධිකාරීත්වයක් මේ රටේ ඇති වී තිබේ. ඒ ඒකාධිකාරීත්වය දියුණු වීමෙන්



විචාර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

[සුබසිංහ මයා.]

මේ රටේ ආර්ථිකයට බලපා හැකි ශක්ති  
 යක් ලබාගෙන තිබෙනවා. අද ඇතුළත  
 කරුණු සහ පිටත කරුණු ගැන සැලකුවත්,  
 විදේශීය වෙළඳාම ගැන සැලකුවත්, මුදල්  
 සමාගම් ගැන සැලකුවත් අපට පෙනී  
 යන්නේ කුමක්ද? ඒ සියලුම කොමිෂනරී  
 වල අධ්‍යක්ෂවරුන් වශයෙන් මේ රටේ  
 25 ක් නැත්නම් 30 ක් ඇති. ඒ පිරිස  
 සියලුම අංශවලට ඇඟිලි ගසාගෙන සිටි  
 නවා. එන්න එන්නටම මේ රටේ “ඒජන්සි  
 හවුසස්” සීමිත පිරිසක් අතට පත් වීගෙන  
 යනවා. අපේ විදේශීය වෙළඳාම පාලනය  
 කරන්නේ ඒ උදවියයි. අපේ රාජ්‍ය ඇමති  
 තුමා ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදය ගැන කථා කරනවා.  
 කොතරම් දුරට ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදය ගැන කථා  
 කළත් ඒ ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදයේ අත්තිවාරම  
 දුර්වල කරනවා නම් ඇති වැඩේ කුමක්ද?  
 මේ වාගේ ආර්ථික ඒකාධිකාරීත්වයක්  
 ඇති කිරීමෙන් ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදය ආරක්ෂා  
 වන්නේ කොහොමද? ආර්ථික බලය කීප  
 දෙනකු අතට පත් වී වික කාලයක් යන  
 විට වෙනත් මාර්ගවලින් ඒ බලය තහවුරු  
 කර ගන්නට ඒ අය කල්පනා කරනවා.  
 එසේ කල්පනා කර ඒ සඳහා ඉදිරියට  
 එනවා. ඉතින් ආණ්ඩුව මේ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය  
 ගෙන යන්නට ඉඩ දීමෙන් ඒ පිරිසගේ  
 වැඩ පිළිවෙළේ කොටස්කාරයකු වෙනවා.

ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, ගරු රාජ්‍ය ඇමති  
 තුමාගේ කථාවේ වැදගත් කරුණු රාශියක්  
 සඳහන් වෙනවා. අයවැය ලේඛන 4 ක්  
 ගැන එතුමා සඳහන් කළා. රුපියල් අය  
 වැය ලේඛනය, විදේශ විනිමය අයවැය  
 ලේඛනය, විදේශ ආධාර අය වැය ලේඛ  
 නය, හිඟ අයවැය ලේඛනය යනුවෙන්  
 කොටස් හතරක් ගැන එතුමා සඳහන්  
 කළා. මා එය පිළිගන්නවා. ඒ සියල්ලම  
 ඇති වුණේ එකම මූලෙන් තේද? ඕනෑම  
 ආණ්ඩුවක් මේ රටේ පාලනය ගෙන යන  
 විට නොයෙක් නොයෙක් දේවල් කිරීමට  
 සිදු වෙනවා. ආණ්ඩුවේ සේවකයන්ට පඩි  
 ගෙවන්නට ඕනෑ. අවශ්‍ය ගොඩනැගිලි  
 සාදන්නට ඕනෑ. ගොවිතැන දියුණු කරන්  
 නට ඕනෑ. කර්මාන්ත දියුණු කරන්නට  
 ඕනෑ. සමාජ සේවාවලට මුදල් යොද  
 වන්නට ඕනෑ. ඔය වැඩ එකතු වී එන විට  
 එයින් මතු වන අවශ්‍යතාව පිරිමැසීම  
 සඳහා විදේශ විනිමය වුවමනා කරනවා.

වෙනත් දේවල් වුවමනා කරනවා. මේ  
 නිසා හිඟත් ඇති වෙනවා. ඉතින් මේ අය  
 වැය ලේඛන සියල්ල එකට සම්බන්ධයි.  
 අප සියලු දෙනාම එකට එකතු වී “මේ මේ  
 තත්ත්වයන් ඇති වුණේ කොහොමද?  
 මේ මේ විධියට මුදල් ගැනීම හරිද?”  
 යනාදි කරුණු සම්බන්ධයෙන් සාකච්ඡා  
 කරන්නට වුවමනා යයි ගරු ඇමතිතුමා  
 කීවා. ඒ නිසා ව්‍යවස්ථා වෙනස් කළ යුතුයයි  
 එතුමා කියනවා. මෙය වැදගත් ප්‍රශ්නයක්.  
 එතුමා එයින් අදහස් කරන්නේ, මේ  
 ආණ්ඩුව ව්‍යවස්ථා වෙනස් කොට ඉදිරිපත්  
 කරන ප්‍රතිපත්තිවලට මේ පැත්තේ  
 සහයෝගය ලබාගෙන ඒවා සකස් කිරීම  
 පිළිබඳ කිසිම වගකීමක් මේ පැත්තට නැති  
 ක්‍රමයක්ද? එතුමා කී සමහර දේවලට මා  
 එකඟ වෙනවා. විශාල නිලධාරී පැළැත්තිය  
 යක් අද මේ රටේ ඇති වී තිබෙන බව  
 එතුමා මෙන්ම මාත් පිළිගන්නවා. එය  
 අවුරුදු ගණනාවක් තිස්සේ ඇති වූවක්.  
 එසේ ඇති වුණු නිලධාරී පැළැත්තිය ක්‍රම  
 යෙන් මහජනයාගෙන් ඇත් වුණා. නිල  
 ධාරී පැළැත්තියේ බලය වැඩි වන්නට  
 වන්නට, ඒ අයගේ වැඩ කටයුතු මහජන  
 යා සමග සම්බන්ධකමෙන් ඇත් වන්නට  
 වන්නට නිලධාරී පැළැත්තියට යම් යම්  
 අදහස් ඇති වුණා. පාලනය පිළිබඳ කරුණු  
 තීරණය කරන්නේත් ප්‍රතිපත්ති සකස්  
 කරන්නේත් අප නේද යන හැඟීම, වැටහීම  
 ඔවුන් තුළ පහළ වුණා. ඒ උඩ අද මේ රටේ  
 මහජනතාවට විශාල බරකට කර දෙකුන  
 ටත් බරපතළ කරදරයකට මුහුණ පාන්න  
 ටත් සිදු වී තිබෙනවා.

රජයේ ප්‍රතිපත්ති සකස් කිරීම සම්බන්  
 ධව අද මේ පැත්තේත් ඒ පැත්තේත්  
 මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්ට තිබෙන වගකීම මොකක්ද?  
 කැබිනට් මණ්ඩලය පත් වෙනවා; යෝජ  
 නා ඉදිරිපත් කෙරෙනවා; සමහර ඒවාට  
 ඇමතිවරුන් එකඟ වෙනවා; සමහර ඒවා  
 වෙනස් කෙරෙනවා; ප්‍රතිපත්ති වශයෙන්  
 එම යෝජනා පාර්ලිමේන්තුවට ඉදිරිපත්  
 කෙරෙනවා; පිළිගත් ප්‍රතිපත්ති ක්‍රියාත්  
 මක කිරීම සඳහා වුවමනා මුදල් හදල්  
 හොඳා ගැනීමට අය වැය ලේඛනය ඉදිරි  
 පත් කෙරෙනවා. ඒ පැත්තේ පසුපස



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

ආසනවල සිටින මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්ගෙන් මේ පැත්තේ පසුපස ආසනවල සිටින මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්ගෙන් මා මේ අවස්ථාවේදී අහන්නේ, අප මේ රටේ පාලනය සම්බන්ධ කුමන කාර්යයටද සම්බන්ධ වන්නේ, යන ප්‍රශ්නයයි. අපට තිබෙන්නේ කුමන වග කීමක්ද? මෙහි පණතක් ඉදිරිපත් වුණු විට අපගේ දක්ෂතා අනුව ඒ පිළිබඳව මොනවා හෝ අප කතා කරනවා. එහෙත්, පාලන ප්‍රතිපත්ති සකස් කිරීමේදී අපගේ සහභාගිත්වයක් තිබෙනවාද? අද මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්ගේ පවා මේ පාර්ලිමේන්තුව කෙරෙහි විශ්වාසය අඩු වී තිබෙන්නේ එකී තත්ත්වය නිසයි. මහජනයාගේ විශ්වාසය අඩු වී තිබෙන්නේ ඒ නිසයි. ඒ අතින් බලන විට ගරු රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා කී දේට මට එකඟ වන්නට පුළුවනි. පාර්ලිමේන්තුව අද මහජනයාගෙන් බොහෝ ඈත් වී සිටිනවා. මේ ආණ්ඩුව බලයට ආවාට පසු එය වඩාත් මහජනයාගෙන් ඈත් වුණා. මහජනයා සම්බන්ධයෙන් අද මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්ට කරන්න තිබෙන්නේ මොනවාද? ගම්මානවල නගරවල ආණ්ඩුවේ සුළු නිලධාරීන් කරන වැඩයි අද මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්ට කරන්නට සිදු වී තිබෙන්නේ. ඉස්කෝල ගොඩනැගිල්ලක වහලයේ උළු තැබීම තීරණය කරන්නටත් අද බොහෝ දෙනා ඇමතිවරුන් ලඟට යනවා. කෙනකුට “ජොබ් එකක්” දීම මාරුවක් ලබා දීම වැනි දේයි අද මැති ඇමතිවරුන්ට කරන්නට තිබෙන්නේ. මේ රටේ පාලන ක්‍රමය දුර්වල වී තිබෙන ආකාරය මේ අනුව අප කවුරුත් විසිනුත් හිතට ගත යුතුයි. නිලධාරී බලය වැඩි වන්නට, වන්නට, මහජනයාගෙන් ඔවුන් ඈත් වන්නට වන්නට, පත් වන මහජන නියෝජිතයන්ගේ බලය සීමා වන්නට වන්නට පාලන ක්‍රමය තව තවත් දුර්වල වන බව කවුරුනුත් පිළිගත යුතුයි. මීට වඩා හොඳ සම්ප්‍රදායක් පැවති, පාලන ක්‍රමය කෙරෙහි ආණ්ඩු පක්ෂයේත් විරුද්ධ පක්ෂයේත් මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්ගේ සැලකිල්ල මීට වැඩියෙන් යොමු වුණු කාලයක් තිබුණු බව ගරු අගමැතිතුමා රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමාත් පිළිගන්නට ඇති බව මුදල් ප්‍රශ්න ආදිය ගැන

ගරු ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක (අග්‍රාමාත්‍ය, ආරක්ෂක හා විදේශ කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමති සහ ක්‍රම සම්පාදක හා ආර්ථික කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමති)

(කෙළරඹා උඩුබිහිවී සිටින අග්‍රාමාත්‍ය—ප්‍රධාන අමාත්‍යවරයා) (The Hon. Dudley Senanayake—Prime Minister, Minister of Defence and External Affairs and Minister of Planning and Economic Affairs)

කවදාද?

සුබසිංහ මයා.

(ති.රු. ආපසිඳු)

(Mr. Sugasinghe)

1948 න් පසු, මුල් කාලය.

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන

(කෙළරඹා උඩුබිහිවී සිටින අග්‍රාමාත්‍ය—ප්‍රධාන අමාත්‍යවරයා)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

දැන් තත්ත්වය හුඟක් දුරට වෙනස්වේ.

සුබසිංහ මයා.

(ති.රු. ආපසිඳු)

(Mr. Subasinghe)

ඔව්, අද තත්ත්වය හුඟක් දුරට නොවෙයි සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම වෙනස් වී තිබෙනවා. මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්ගේ වගකීම සීමා වී තිබෙනවා. ඊට හේතුවත් ආර්ථිකය පිළිබඳ ප්‍රශ්නයක්. රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා කියන හැටියට, මුදල් පිළිබඳ ප්‍රශ්න පමණක් සාකච්ඡා කිරීමට කාරක සභා පත් කිරීමෙන්වත් අර සංස්ථාව වැඩ කරන්නේ කොහොමද මේ සංස්ථාව වැඩ කරන්නේ කොහොමද යන වග සොයා බැලීමෙන්වත් මේ ප්‍රශ්න විසඳන්න බැහැ. ව්‍යවස්ථා සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම වෙනස් නොකර, අලුත් නොකර, සම්පූර්ණ පාරිපාලනය ක්‍රමය වෙනස් නොකර, මුළුමනින් ආර්ථිකයෙහි ගැඹුරු වෙනසක් නොකර අද තිබෙන ප්‍රශ්න විසඳිය හැකියයි රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා කියන්නේ අපට එය පිළිගන්නට බැහැ. මේ රටේ වර්තමාන සමාජයට ගැලපෙන, මේ රටේ මහජන සිතුවම් පැතුම් හා අවශ්‍යතා වත් පිළිබිඹු වන ආකාරයේ සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම අළුත් ව්‍යවස්ථාවක් මේ රටට අවශ්‍යයයි අප නිතරම කියන්නේ ඒ නිසයි. අපි දෙගොල්ල එකට එකතු වී මුදල් ප්‍රශ්න ආදිය ගැන



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

[සුබසිංහ මයා.]

සාකච්ඡා කරමු යයි රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා කරන යෝජනාව මහ විහිළුවක්. මේ සීමාකිරීම් තුළ ඒක කවදාවත් කරන්නට පුළුවන් කමක් නැහැ. රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා අපට කියනවා, “බලන්න, ඉස්සර අපේ ආදායම ලක්ෂ 830; අපි වියදම් කළේ ලක්ෂ 800යි. හැමදෙනාම සතුටු වුණා—The native are happy කියා. ඇත්ත, කළානායක තුමනි.

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

රාජ්‍ය මන්ත්‍රණ සභා කාලයේ

සුබසිංහ මයා.

(திரு. சுபசிங்க)

(Mr. Subasinghe)

ඔව්, රාජ්‍ය මන්ත්‍රණ සභා කාලයේ. ඇත්ත මම පිළිගන්නවා. මේ ආකාරයෙන් බලා ගෙන ගියොත් “නියැත්තර්මාලේ මැන්” ගේ කාලයේ දී මෙව්වරටත් වියදමක් නැහැ. “පිකිං මැන්” ට එන කොට ඊට විකක් වැඩියි. “හෝමෝ සපියෙන්” ට එන කොට තවත් වැඩියි. ඒ වගේ මේ රටේ කලින් කලට, යුගයෙන් යුගයට පරම් පරාවෙන් පරම්පරාවට වියදම් වැඩි වී තිබෙනවා. එහෙත් මේ වතාවේ අයවැය ලේඛනයේ විශාල ගණනක් තිබෙනවා. කියා, එනිසාම රටේ සංවර්ධනය විශාල තීරණාත්මක අවස්ථාවකට එළඹී තිබෙනවායයි අපට පිළිගන්නට බැහැ. මිනිසුන්ට පඩි ගෙවීම, නිලධාරීන්ට පඩි ගෙවීම, රටේ අවශ්‍යතා වත්, ආදී නොයෙක් දේවල් වැඩි වී තිබෙනවා. රුපියලේ අගය අඩු වීමත්, එදා රුපියලකට ගන්න බඩු අද රුපියලකට ගන්න පුළුවන්ද, යනාදී කරුණු ගැන මැන බලන විටත්, ඔය කියන තරම් වෙනසක් ඇති වී තිබෙනවා යයි මා හිතන්නේ නැහැ. මෙව් වර ප්‍රාග් ධනයක් යොදනවාය, අව්වර ප්‍රාග් ධනයක් යොදනවාය කියා. අවුරුද් දෙත් අවුරුද්දට සඳහන් කළත්, මුදල් ප්‍රමාණය පමණක් වැඩියෙන් පෙන්වූ තර මට ප්‍රශ්නය විසඳෙනවායයි මා විශ්වාස කරන්නේ නැහැ.

ගරු කළානායකතුමනි, පස්වෙනි වතාවටත් අයවැය ලේඛනයක් ඉදිරිපත් කිරීම ගැන මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාට අප බොහෝම

දෙනෙකු ප්‍රශංසා කළා. මමත් ඒ ප්‍රශංසාව එතුමාට පිරිනමන්නට සූදානම්. මට පෙර කළා කළ කවිකයන්ත් ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් යම් යම් දේවල් කිව්වා. මාත් ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් යමක් කියන්නට කැමතියි. මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා ක්‍රියා කළ යුතු රාමුව 1965 සිට ක්‍රමයෙන් හුඟක් දුරට වෙනස් වී තිබෙනවා. අද හුඟක්ම මුදල් පිළිබඳ ප්‍රශ්න නිරාකරණය වෙන්නේ මුදල් ඇමති අංශයෙන් නොවෙයි; ක්‍රම සම්පාදක ඇමති අංශයෙනුයි. ප්‍රතිපත්තියක් හැටියට මම ඒකට සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම විරුද්ධ වෙන්නේ නැහැ. මේ අංශ දෙක ඒකාබද්ධ වී කටයුතු කළ යුතු බව මා පිළිගන්නවා.

එහෙත් අද තිබෙන තත්ත්වය මේකයි. හැම අවුරුද්දකම මේ ආණ්ඩුවේ වැඩ කට යුතු කරගෙන යෑම සඳහා අවශ්‍ය මුදල් ප්‍රමාණය බදු හා වෙනත් මාර්ගවලින් මේ රටෙන් සොයා ගැනීමෙන් පසු, වැඩිපුර වුවමනා අමතර කොටස විදේශීය රටවලින් කොහොම හරි සොයා ගන්නට මේ ආණ්ඩුවට සිදු වී තිබෙනවා. විදේශීය රටවලින් මුදල් සොයා යෑමේදී ලෝක බැංකුව මූලික ස්ථානයක් ගන්නවා. අද මේ රටේ ආර්ථික තීරණ ගැනීමේදී මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාටත්, අග මැතිතුමාටත් සම්පූර්ණ නිදහසක් නැහැ කියා මම කියනවා. ලෝක බැංකුවත් සමග සාකච්ඡා කිරීමෙන් පසු ලෝක බැංකුව එකඟ නොවුණොත් ඔවුන්ට ඒ තීරණ ගන්නට පුළුවන්කමක් නැහැ. නොයෙක් කොමිෂන් සභා පත් කර මේ ආණ්ඩුවේ තීරණ පරීක්ෂාවට භාජන කරලා, ඒ උදවිය කියන පිළිවෙලට හැඩගැසී ක්‍රියා කරනවා මිස නිදහස් තීරණ ගැනීමේ ශක්තියක් දැන් මේ අයට නැති තැනට ඇතිවී තිබෙනවා. කොයිතරම් ඔළුව වැනුවත් ඒ තත්ත්වය කාටවත් නැහැ කියන්න බැහැ. ලෝක බැංකුවේ සැලැස්මවල් සෑදීමේ සංවිධාන අතරේ පවතින ඒ සම්බන්ධතා උඩ මේ සෑම දෙයක්ම ඉදිරිපත් වන්නේ ඒ මාර්ගයෙනුයි. ඒ වගේම ක්‍රම සම්පාදන දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවේ වගකියයුතු නිලධාරියාගේ ආර්ථික දර්ශනයත් හැඩගැසී තිබෙන්නේ ලෝක බැංකුවත් සමග පවතින සම්බන්ධතා අනුවයි. සෑම ප්‍රශ්නයක දීම ඒ අයගේ උපදෙස් ලබා නොගෙන ක්‍රියා කරන්නට බැරි තත්ත්වයක් ඇති වී තිබෙනවා. ගරු රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා, බ්‍රිතා



නායක ඉදිරිපත් කළ “ලෙටර් ඔෆ් ඉන් ටෙන්ට්” මෙම ගරු සභාවේදී කියවිණි. ඒ කෙසේ වුණත්, ජාත්‍යන්තර මූල්‍ය අරමුදල වැනි සංවිධානවලින් කෙටි කාලීන ණය බේරීම සඳහා ණය ලබා ගන්නා උත්සාහ කරන විට ඒ අය යම් යම් කොන්දේසි ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නේ නැත, එම කොන්දේසි මේ ආණ්ඩුව පිළිපදින්නේ නැත කියා නැද්ද, ශ්‍රී ලංකා මහ බැංකුවෙන් මැතිතුමාටවත් කියන්න පුළුවන්ද? ජාත්‍යන්තර මූල්‍ය අරමුදල, මෙම ආණ්ඩුවට කියා නැද්ද, ශ්‍රී ලංකා මහ බැංකුවෙන් වෙළඳ බැංකුවලට දෙන ණය සීමා කළ යුතුය කියා? ඒ වාගේම ආණ්ඩුවට දෙන ණය සීමා කළ යුතුයයි කියා නැද්ද? ඒ වාගේම සමාජ සේවා කටයුතුවලට වියදම් කරන මුදල අඩු කළ යුතුයයි කියා නැද්ද? ඒ වාගේම අධ්‍යාපනය සම්බන්ධයෙන් කරන වියහියදම් අඩු කළ යුතුයයි වරින් වර කියා නැද්ද? ඒ උපදෙස් මෙම ආණ්ඩුව පිළිගෙන නැද්ද? තමන් තාන්සේලා ඒ උපදෙස් පිළිගෙන තිබෙනවා, ක්‍රියාත්මක කර තිබෙනවා. තමන් තමන් තාන්සේලා හරියට ගිරියට අසුවුණු පුවක්ගෙඩිය වාගෙයි. එක පැත්තකින්, යම් යම් දේවල් කරන්නට එපායයි උපදෙස් දෙනවා. අනික් පැත්තෙන් ඒ දේවල් නොකර ගැලවෙන්නටත් බැහැ. ඒ දේවල් ඉටු නොකළොත් මහජනතාව කිපී, ඇවිස්සී විරුද්ධව නැගී සිටිය යුතුය කියන භයක් එක් පැත්තකින් තිබෙනවා. අනික් පැත්තෙන් දෙන කොන්දේසි පිළිනොපාද සිටින්නත් බැරි තත්ත්වයක් ඇති වී තිබෙනවා. මේ දෙකට මැදි වී සිරවී සිටින නිසා, වටපිට මාර්ගවලින් අධ්‍යාපනය සීමා කරනවා, වටපිට මාර්ගවලින් සෞඛ්‍ය සේවාව සීමා කරනවා. අන්න ඒ අන්දමට වංචනික ක්‍රියාවලින් මහජනතාව මුළු කරන්නටයි මේ ආණ්ඩුවට සිද්ධ වී තිබෙන්නේ, ජාත්‍යන්තර මූල්‍ය අරමුදල, ලෝක බැංකුවේ උපදෙස් පිළිපැදිය යුතු නිසා.

ගරු කපානායකතුමනි, එවැනි රාමුවක් ඇතුළේ වැඩ කරන මුදල් ඇමතිවරයකුගේ නිදහස සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම තැනි වීම පුද්ගලයන්ද? එතුමාට නිදහසේ තීරණ ගන්න පුළුවන්කමක් නැහැ. එතුමාත් හරියට අරපැරණි කඩවේරි මුදලි කෙනෙකුගේ තත්ත්වයට පත්වී තිබෙනවා.

වයට පත් වී තිබෙනවා. අරහෙන් ඒජන්ත උන්තැහේ කියනවා; මෙහෙන් ගම්මුලා දැනියා ගම්මුත්තට කියනවා, දිසාපති හාමුදු රුවො මෙහෙම කියනවාය, ඒ විධියට කරපල්ලය කියා. ඒ වාගේ තත්ත්වයට වැටී සිටීම නිසයි, එතුමාට අවුරුදු පහක කාලයක් එම තනතුරේ සිටින්නට පුළුවන් වුණේ. එයින් නිදහස්ව තීරණ ගන්නා නම් නොයෙකුත් ප්‍රශ්න මතු වී ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාටත්, රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමාට වුණ දෙයම වෙන්න ඉඩ තිබුණා. එම නිසා, වෙනදා වාගේ නොවෙයි, අප දැන් හොඳට ප්ලාන් කරනවාය කිවත් පිළිගන්නේ නොහොමද? ඒ ප්ලාන් සේරම හොඳයි. මට මතකයි කියපු දේවල්. ඉස්සර කාලයේ බොහොම සවුන්තුලු. කිසිම සැලැස්මක් තිබුණේ නැතිලු. ප්ලානිං රිපෝට් එක කඩදාසියට පමණක් සීමා වී තිබුණලු, දැන් ඒක බොහොම ලක්ෂණව ක්‍රියාවේ යොදනවාලු, දැන් ලක්ෂණව ප්ලාන් කරනවාලු. ඔන්න ඔය විධියේ අදහස් ප්‍රකාශ කළා. එහෙම නම් මා අහන්න කැමතියි, එතුමා අද ක්‍රියා කරන්නේ ඒ ප්ලාන් හැටියටමද කියා. පෞද්ගලික අංශයෙන් යම් කෙනෙකු විදේශික සමාගමක් සමග එකතු වී යම්කිසි කර්මාන්තයක් පටන් ගන්න යනවායයි කිවොත්, එම ඉල්ලීම ඇමතිතුමාගේ කාර්යාලයේදී පරීක්ෂා කර බලා, එතුමාගේ මාර්ගයෙන් ප්ලානිං කොමිසමට එවනවා, අපේ විදේශ විනිමය බලපාන තත්ත්වය අනුව මෙය අනුමත කරන්න පුළුවන්ද බැරිද කියා තීරණය කරන්නට. වෙන දෙයක් සම්බන්ධයෙන් වුණත් ප්ලාන් සකස් කිරීමේදී කටයුතු කරන්නේ විදේශ විනිමය ප්‍රශ්නය උඩයි. ලබන අවුරුදු 5 ඇතුළත තමන් තාන්සේලාට මේ මේ දේ බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නට පුළුවන්ය කියා අද අපේ ගම්වල මිනිසුන්ට අපට කියන්නට පුළුවන්ද? බැහැ. ඒ ගැන අපි දන්නේ නැහැ. සැලැස්මවල් සාදන විට ඒවා සාදන්නේ මහජනතා සම්බන්ධ කර ගෙනය කියා තමන් තාන්සේලා කිව්වා. එහෙත් මහජනතා ඊට සහභාගි වෙනවාද? ඇත්තයි, ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් අපෙන් දුර්වලත්ම තිබුණා. අපේ කාලයේදීත් මේ සම්ප්‍රදාය සම්පූර්ණ වෙලා තිබුනේ නැහැ. අද එදාට වඩා හොඳට කරනවාය කියා තමන් තාන්සේලා කියනවා නම් මහජනතා



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[සුබසිංහ මයා.]

මීට සහභාගි වන්නට ඔබා නේද? අද කිසිම සැලැස්මක් මේ රටට ගැලපෙන ආකාරයට හඳුන්වන බැහැ, මහජනයාගේ සම්බන්ධතාව නැතිව. ගරු ආහාර ඇමති තුමා ගොවි කර්මාන්තය පිළිබඳ සැලැස්ම වල් ගැන කියා තිබුණා. ගරු අගමැති තුමනි, තමුන් නාන්සේ මොනවා කිවත් ඒ සැලැස්මවල් සූදානම් කිරීමේදී ගම්බද මහජනයා සම්බන්ධ වුණේ නැහැ.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

සම්බන්ධ වුණා.

සුබසිංහ මයා.

(திரு. சுபசிங்க)

(Mr. Subasinghe)

නැහැ, අගමැතිතුමනි, මහජනයා සම්බන්ධ වුණේ නැහැ; ඔව්ව් සියර්වරුන් සම්බන්ධ වුණා. මහජනයා සහභාගි කරවා ගනිමුය කිව්වම සමහර නිලධාරීන් ඇසුවා, එතකොට අපේ තත්ත්වය මොකක්ද කියා. ගරු අගමැතිතුමනි, මම එකක් කියන්නම්. තමුන් නාන්සේ හෝ වේවා, වෙන කෙනකු හෝ වේවා ඔය අගමැති ප්‍රධුවේ වාඩි වුණාම සිදු වන්නේ මොකක්ද? රටේ සංචාරය කරන්නට යන විට තමුන් නාන්සේලා වට කර ගන්න පිරිසක් සිටිනවා. ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම තමුන් නාන්සේලාට සාමාන්‍ය මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්ට පමණ මහජනයාගේ සිතූම් පැතුම් මොනවාද කියා දැන ගන්නට ලැබෙන්නේ නැහැ. මා මේ තමුන් නාන්සේට දොසක් කියනවා නොවෙයි. තමුන් නාන්සේ මහජනයාගෙන් ඇත් වෙලා උඩගුවෙන් කටයුතු කරන පුද්ගලයකු හැටියට මා පෙන්නුම් කරන්නේ නැහැ. තමුන් නාන්සේගේ තානාත්තරය අනුව එවැනි තත්ත්වයක් ඇති වෙනවා. තමුනාන්සේට ලැබෙන ආරංචිවලට වඩා අපට ලැබෙන ආරංචි සත්‍යයි. තමුනාන්සේ කියන දේ බොරුය කියා මා කියන්නේ නැහැ. ගම්බද මිනිසුන් කියන දේ ඇහෙන, ඔවුන් සමග කථා කරන අපට ඇත්ත කුමක්ද කියා වැටහෙන නිසයි, මා එසේ කියන්නේ.

සැලැස්ම සෑදීමේදී මතු වන්නේ මුදල් සොයා ගැනීම පිළිබඳ ප්‍රශ්නය පමණක් නොවෙයි. කොන්සේටියම් එකේ රැස්වීමට මාස 3 කට හෝ 6 කට වරක් යාම පමණක් නොවෙයි, ප්‍රශ්නය. අපේ ඉලක්ක මේවාය, අපේ ආණ්ඩුව කරන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ මේවාය කියා මහජනයාට දැනුම් දෙන්නට ඔබා. තමුන් නාන්සේලාගේ අදහස් මොනවාද කියා මහජනයාගෙන් අහන්නට ඔබා. අපේ ප්‍රදේශයේ අඩුපාඩු මේවාය, ප්‍රශ්න මේවාය කියා දන්නට මහජනයාට අවස්ථාවක් තියෙන්නට ඔබා. ඔය අන්දමට දෙපැත්තටම ගමනාගමනය සිදුවන්නට ඔබා. දෙපැත්තේම අදහස් එකාබද්ධ කර සැලැස්මක් සාදන්නේ නැතිව එක පැත්තකින් පමණක් සැලැස්මක් සාදනවා නම් ඒ සැලැස්ම බොරුවක්. එහෙම සැලැස්මක් ශාස්ත්‍රානුකූලව හඳුන්වන කොහොමද, අපේ ආර්ථිකයේ වැඩි කොටස, බලවත් කොටස, ශක්තිමත් කොටස, පෞද්ගලික හිමිකම උඩ—විශේෂයෙන් විදේශිකයන්ගේ හිමිකම උඩ—පවතින විට? අර්ථ ශාස්ත්‍රඥයන් අද “සෙම් නාර්ස්” පවත්වනවා, “ක්‍රයිසිස් ඔෆ් ප්ලැනිං” ගැන. ධනපති රාමුව තුළම, ධනපති ක්‍රමයට ආරක්ෂා කරන චේතනාවෙන් සැලැස්මවල් සකස් කිරීමට පටන් ගෙන එරුනට පස්සෙ තමුන් නාන්සේලා කියන්නේ ප්ලැන් කිරීමේ අඩුපාඩු තියෙන බවයි. ලගදී සසෙක්ස්වල තිබුනා, සැලැස්ම වල් සෑදීම පිළිබඳව සෙම්නාර් එකක්. එහි සාකච්ඡා වි තිබෙන්නේ මොකක්ද? මට ආරංචි හැටියට, තමුන් නාන්සේලාගේ සැලැස්මවල් සෑදීම පිළිබඳ ඇමති අංශයේ නිත්‍ය ලේකම්වරයායි, එහි මූලාසනය ගත්තේ. මා එහි සාකච්ඡා වුණු සියල්ලක් ගැනම දන්නෙ නැහැ. එහෙත් මට දැන ගන්නට ලැබුණු පිළිවෙලට එහි සාකච්ඡා වුණු වැදගත්ම ප්‍රශ්නය මොකක්ද? තායිවාන්, හොංකොං වැනි ප්‍රදේශවල නිදහස් වෙළඳ ආර්ථිකයක් තිබෙන නිසා, සැපයීම හා ඉල්ලීම අනුව වෙළඳපොළේ මිල තීරණය වන නිසා, ඒ රටවල සංවර්ධනය ඉතාම උසස් අඩියකට නැග තිබෙන බවයි. එහෙත්, ඉන්දියාව සහ ලංකාව වැනි රටවල් සැලැස්ම සාදා වැඩ කරන්නට යාම නිසා එවැනි වේගයක් ලබා ගන්නට ඒ රටවලට බැරී තිබෙනවා. ඒ, සමහර උදවියගේ



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

මතයයි. කාලයක් තිස්සේ යටත් විජිත රට වල් හැටියට තුබූ රටවල් නිදහස් වුණාට පස්සේ සැලැස්මක් උඩ සංවර්ධනය කළ යුතුය යන පිළිවෙත පිළිගැනීමෙන් පසු ඒ අනුව වැඩ කරගෙන ගොස් තිබෙනවා. ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් එක් කාරණයක් මතක් කරන්නට ඕනෑ. ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම යුරෝපයේ ධනපති රටවල විශ්ව විද්‍යාලවල උදවිය—අර්ථ ශාස්ත්‍රඥයන්—සැලැස්මක් උඩ සංවර්ධනය කළ යුතුය යන අදහස පවා 1955-56 වන තුරු පිළිගත්තේ නැහැ. එහෙත්, ඒ උදවියත්, මෑතකදී මේවා ගැන කතා කරන්නට පටන් ගෙන තිබෙනවා. සැලැස්මවල් සාදමින් මේක කරන්නට බැහැ; ලොකු “ක්‍රයිසිස්” එකක් තිබෙනවා; ඒ නිසා මේවා ගැන කතා කරන්නට බැහැ; යනාදී වශයෙන් දැන් කියනවා. “fප්‍රි මාර්කට් ඉකොනොමි ක්‍රමයක් තිබෙන තයිවාන් සහ හොංකොං වැනි රටවල් ශීග්‍ර ලෙස දියුණු වී තිබෙනවා නම් ඒ අනුව ප්‍රශ්නයකට මුහුණ දිය යුතුද නැද්ද යන්න ගැනත් කල්පනා කරන්නට ඕනෑ.” ඒ විධියට කියන්නට දැන් පටන් ගෙන තිබෙනවා. අපේ රටෙන් ගිය ශාස්ත්‍රඥයන් එසේ කීවයයි මා කියන්නේ නැහැ. සැලැස්මක් උඩ සංවර්ධනය කළ යුතුය කියන විශ්වාසය කඩ කිරීමට නැවත වරක් නොයෙක් උපක්‍රම, නොයෙක් පරිශ්‍රම දරන බව නම් අපට පෙනෙනවා.

මෙතැනදී මට තවත් එකක් කියන්නට තිබෙනවා. ගනර් මිට්ඩල් මෑතකදී පොතක් පිට කර තිබෙනවා. තමුත්තාන්සේලා එය කියවන්නට ඇති. මාත් මේ පොත සම්පූර්ණයෙන් කියවලා නැහැ. එහෙත්, මටත් අප කාටත් අදහස පැහැදිලි කර ගැනීමට ප්‍රයෝජනවත් වන නිසා මම එයින් වාක්‍යයක් දෙකක් කියවන්නම්. මට මතකයි එතුමා බණ්ඩාරනායක අගමැතිතුමා හිටපු කාලයේදී උපදේශකයකු හැටියට මේ රටට පැමිණියා. එතුමාගේ වචනවලින්ම නොවෙයි, මම කියන්නේ. ඉන්දියාවේ ප්‍රසිද්ධ කරනු ලබන, “ඉකොනොමික් ඇන්ඩ් පොලිටිකල් වික්ලි”—Economic and Political Weekly—නැමැති සඟරාවක් තිබෙනවා. ලෝක ප්‍රසිද්ධ සංඛ්‍යාලේඛන

විශේෂඥයකු වන මහලා නෝබිස් නම් මහා චාර්යතුමා මේ පොත සම්බන්ධයෙන් ලියන විට සදහන් කර තිබෙන්නේ මෙහෙමයි:

“Development in South Asia have not been encouraging. Myrdal is deeply distressed at the absence among the countries in this region of any sign of a ‘take-off’ to self-sustaining economic growth. India had the strongest base for planning, but its achievements were so below expectations that Myrdal is obliged to conclude that the social and economic revolution which started after Independence, has failed in India. The position is much the same, or worse, in the other countries of the region.”

තවත් කොටසක් මම කියවන්නම්.

“Indians and South Asians, trained at Western centres of learning, or now increasingly in their own countries, who acquire skill in abstract exercises in economic model making involving mathematical acrobatics, enjoy high deputation, though such models may have no contact with reality.”

අපේ රටෙන් හුඟක් දුරට ඔය තත්ත්වයයි ඇති වී තිබෙන්නේ. “Planning” කීව්වාට, “no contact with reality” ඔය ප්‍රශ්නය විසඳිය යුතුයි. නියම පිළිවෙලට සැලැස්මවල් සාදා මේ රට සංවර්ධනය කරනවා නම් අප එක් කාරණයක් මතක තබා ගන්නට ඕනෑ. ධනපති ක්‍රමයටම මුල් තැන දී ඒක කරන්නට බැහැ. “මික්ස්ඩ් ඉකොනොමි” කියමින් මේ දෙකම එකට කසාද බන්දවා සදාකාලිකව ඒ පිළිවෙලටම කටයුතු කරන්නට ගියොත් කවදාවත් මේ රට සංවර්ධනය කරන්නට බැරි බව මා මතක් කරනවා.

ගරු ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන

(கௌரவ டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

(The Hon. D. P. R. Gunawardena)

දික්කසාද වෙන්නත් පුළුවන් නොවැ.

සුබසිංහ මයා.

(திரு. சுபசிங்க)

(Mr. Subasinghe)

තමුත්තාන්සේ දැන් සමාජවාදයෙන්

දික්කසාද වෙලා.







විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

වත් කරන්නට යනවා නොවෙයි. ඒ දියුණුව එක්තරා කාල සීමාවක් තුළ ඇති වුණු එකක්. මේ රටේ නිෂ්පාදනයේ වැඩි විමක් ඇති බවත් අප පිළිගන්නවා. එහෙත් ඒ වැඩි විම අවශ්‍යතාවන්ට සරිලන තත්ත්වයක පවතිනුවාදැයි අප පරීක්ෂා කර බලන්නට ඕනෑ. දළ ජාතික නිෂ්පාදිතය සියයට 8.3 කින් වැඩි වී තිබෙනවාය කිවත්, විමසා බැලීමේදී එහි නොයෙකුත් අඩුපාඩුකම් තිබෙන බව පෙනෙනවා.

ඉදිරිපත් කරන මේ සංඛ්‍යා ලේඛන කෙරෙහි සම්පූර්ණ විශ්වාසය තබන්නට අපට පුළුවන්කමක් තිබෙනවාද යන ප්‍රශ්නයක් මෙහිදී මතු වෙනවා. වර්තමාන තත්ත්වයට ගැළපෙන ආකාරයට සංඛ්‍යා ලේඛන දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව ප්‍රතිසංවිධානය කිරීමට අවුරුදු ගණනාවක් තුළම උත්සාහයක් දරා නැහැ. එම දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවේ ප්‍රධානියා හෙවත් අධ්‍යක්ෂවරයා වශයෙන් පත් කරන්නේ රුසියාවේ සාර් රජුන්ගේ කාලයේ සයිබීරියාවට යැවූ අය වාගේ රජයට එපා වුණු, රජයේ විශ්වාසයක් නැති උදවියයි. එසේ කුඩම්මාගේ සැලකිලි ලැබෙන දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවකින් ඉදිරිපත් කෙරෙන සංඛ්‍යා ලේඛන මත අප යම් යම් තීරණවලට, නිගමනවලට, බැස මේ රටේ අනාගතය විසඳීම හරිද? මා දන්න එක්තරා කාරණයක් කියන්නම්. මහ බැංකු වාර්තාවට ඇතුළත් කිරීම සඳහා සංඛ්‍යා ලේඛන පිළියෙළ කරන නිලධාරියා ඉතා මත් දක්ෂ හා මහත්සි වී වැඩ කරන කෙනෙක්. සංඛ්‍යා ලේඛන දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවෙන් ලැබෙන මෙවැනි සංඛ්‍යා ලේඛන කෙරෙහි සම්පූර්ණ විශ්වාසය තබන්නට බැරි නිසා “ස්පෙකියල්ට්” කරන්න, “කැල්කියුලේට්” කරන්න “ගෙස්” කරන්න ඔහුට සිදු වෙනවා. එම නිසා මේ වැනි සංඛ්‍යා ලේඛන මගින් කොතරම් හොඳ පිස්තුරයක් මවා පෑවත්, ඒ කෙරෙහි විශ්වාසය තබන්නට අපට කොහෙන්ම පුළුවන්කමක් නැහැ. මහ ජනයා සමග නිතර ගැටසෙන උදවිය වශයෙන් අප දන්නවා, ඔවුන්ගේ සිතුවම්, පැතුවම්, අදහස් උදහස්. ඔවුන් තුළත් මේ සංඛ්‍යා ලේඛන ගැන කිසි විශ්වාසයක් නැහැ. මෙවැනි සංඛ්‍යා ලේඛන මගින් ඉදිරිපත් කෙරෙන පින්තූරය බොහෝ

අනාගතය යහපත්යයි, අපේ ප්‍රශ්න නිරාකරණය වෙමින් පවතිනවායයි සිතුවොත් එය අප විසින් ම අප රටට හු ලැබීමක්.

දළ ජාතික නිෂ්පාදිතය සියයට 8.3 කින් වැඩි වී තිබෙනවාලු. හොඳයි, අපි ඒ සංඛ්‍යා ලේඛන පිළිගනිමු. ඒවායින් වාසි ලැබෙන්නේ කාටද? මුදල් ඉතිරි කිරීම ගැනත් මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාගේ කථාවේ සඳහන් වෙනවා. ඇයි සාමාන්‍ය මහජනතාව තැපැල් ඉතිරි කිරීමේ බැංකුවෙන් අස් කර ගෙන තිබෙන මුදල් ප්‍රමාණයත් ඉදිරිපත් නොකළේ? ඒ සමගම, මට ලැබී තිබෙන ආරංචියකුත් කියන්නම්. හැබැයි, එය ආරංචියක් පමණක් නිසා මා සරිවම කියන්නෙ නැහැ. ලාංකිකයන්ට විදේශීය බැංකුවල තැවතත් මුදල් තැන්පත් කරන්නට මේ රජය අවසර දුන්නට පසු දින කීපයක් ඇතුළත මර්කන්ටයිල් බැංකුවේ රුපියල් ලක්ෂ 900ක් තැන්පත් වුණාලු. ගම්වල සිටින ගොවිරාළලා නොවෙයි, ගම්වල සිටින කුලීකාරයන් නොවෙයි, කොළඹ නගරයේ පැක්ටරිවල වැඩ කරන කම්කරුවන් නොවෙයි. මේ රජය ආවාසින් පසු ඇති කරන ලද වෙළඳ ප්‍රතිපත්ති සහ කාර්මික ප්‍රතිපත්ති නිසා හම්බ කර ගන්නා ලද කළු සල්ෆී නමයි ඒවායේ ගොස් තැන්පත් කර තිබෙන්නේ. මට දැනගන්නට ලැබුණා, මේ රටේ එක්තරා විශාල ඒකාධිකාරී පොල්තෙල් කොම්පැනියක් හා සම්බන්ධ සිද්ධියක්. එම කොම්පැනියේ ආදායම් බදු පිළිබඳව සැක සහිත ආරංචියක් ලැබීම නිසා දේශීය ආදායම් දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවෙන් පරීක්ෂණයකට ගියාලු. එම අවස්ථාවේදී මුදල් හදල් එහෙම සොයා ගන්නාද කියන්නට මා දන්නේ නැහැ. එහිදී අසූ වී තිබෙන වැදගත්ම දේ මොකක්ද? රජය මගින් පිහිටුවා තිබෙන තෙල් සහ මේද සංයුක්ත මණ්ඩලය—Oils and Fats Corporation—දුර්වල කරන්නේ කෙසේද, වට්ටන්නේ කෙසේද යන කාරණය පිළිබඳව සකස් කරන ලද සැලැස්මකුයි හමු වී තිබෙන්නේ.

“Utilization of the private sector for the economic development of the country.”

I am not saying that of every private sector concern [බැංකු කිරීම්] තවත් තැන්වලටත් පැත්



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[සුබසිංහ මයා.]

නාය කියා ආරංචිය තිබෙනවා. ඒ ඒකායි හැටි වුණත්, පුද්ගලික අංශයත් රජයේ අංශයත් කියන දෙක කසාද බැන්දවීමේ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය නිසා ඇතිවන්නේ එය තමයි.

ගොවි කමිත්තය සම්බන්ධව කරුණක් දෙකක් කියන්නට මා කැමතියි. මා මෙන්ම මේ සභාවේ සිටින කවුරුත් පාහේ පිළිගන්නවා ඇති මෙම රජය සහ මිට පෙර පැවති රජය ගෙනගිය ප්‍රතිපත්ති නිසාත් ඊට ඉහතින් පැවති වැඩ පිළිවෙළවල් නිසාත් අපේ රටේ තේ නිෂ්පාදනය පිළිබඳ දියුණුවක් ඇති වී තිබුණු බව සහ රබර් නිෂ්පාදනය පිළිබඳ දියුණුවක් ඇති වී තිබුණු බව. පොල් නිෂ්පාදනයත් ටිකක් වැඩි වී තිබුණාට මොකද පොල්වලට තරම් නිතර නිතර අපල කාල උදා වන්නේ නැහැ, වෙන කිසිම දේකට. එහෙත් අද මේවායේ නිෂ්පාදනය වැඩි වෙනවාද? තේ වතු වල රක්ෂා හිඟය බලවත් සේ පව තිනවා. ඒවායේ තිබෙන්නේ අර්ධ රක්ෂා ක්‍රමයක්. එවැනි කරුණු නිසා තේ වතු පවත්වා ගෙන යන්නට බැරි තත්ත්වය කට පත්ව තිබෙනවා. චීන ගිවිසුමට පිං සිදු වන්නට රබර් කර්මාන්තයෙන් නම් අපට එහෙම අපහසුවක් ඇත්තේ නැහැ. ගිය අවුරුද්දේ පොල් මිළ නැංගාට මේ අවුරුද්දේ තත්ත්වය කොහොමද? බිංගිරියේ ගරා මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ජේ. එල්. සිරි සේන මයා.) දන්නවා ඇති, මේ අවුරුද්දේ සිදු වී තිබෙන්නේ කුමක්ද යන්න. මා මේවා ගැන කියන්නට බලා පොරොත්තු වන්නේ වෙළඳ ඇමති අංශය යටතේ කතා කරන විටයි. කෙසේ වෙතත් මෙම නැගීම උඩ අපට සන්නේෂයකට පත් වන්නට නොහැකියි. වෙළඳාම පිළිබඳව නියම ප්‍රතිපත්තියක් නැති නිසා එවැනි ප්‍රශ්න විසඳෙන තැනට ඇවිත් තිබෙනවායයි සිතන්නට බැහැ. මා ඒ ගැන කියන්නේ එපමණයි.

වි ගොවිතැන පිළිබඳව වචන කීපයක් කතා කරන්නට මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා අද මේ රටේ වී නිෂ්පාදනය වැඩි වී තිබෙනවාද නැද්ද කියන කාරණය ගැන ගරු අගමැතිතුමා සමගත් ගොවි කම් කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමතිතුමා සමගත්

ඒ පිළිබඳව තර්ක කරන්නට මා යන්නේ නැහැ. එහෙත් පසුගිය අවුරුදු විස්ස විසිපහ ඇතුළත ක්‍රමානුකූලව වී නිෂ්පාදනය වැඩි වී තිබෙන බව අප පිළිගන්නවා. ඊට හේතු වශයෙන් ගොවිතැන් කරන ඉඩම් ප්‍රමාණය පුළුල් වීම, වරින්වර හොඳ බිත්තර වී පාවිච්චි කිරීම, වැඩි වැඩියෙන් රසායනික පොහොර ද්‍රව්‍ය පාවිච්චි කිරීම යනාදී කරුණු දක්වන්නට පුළුවනි. ඒ වාගේම ඉස්සර තිබුණ ලී නගුල්, යකඩ නගුල් වෙනුවට අද ටරුක්ටර් පාවිච්චි කරනවා. අතික් අතින් වඩා වැඩි මාර්ග පහසුකම් ආදිය ලැබෙන බවත් අපි පිළිගන්නවා. ඔය විධියට එපමණ වැඩි වුණාය, මෙපමණ වැඩි වුණාය කියා අපට නොයෙකුත් විධියෙන් තර්ක කරන්න පුළුවන්. තමුත්තාන්සේලා කියනවා, මෙන්න මේකයි සාමාන්‍ය ගණන කියා. අපි කියනවා නැහැ, මෙන්න මේකයි සාමාන්‍ය ගණන කියා. එසේ කියමින් ඉලක්කම් ගැන නොයෙක් අතට තර්ක විතර්ක විග්‍රහ කරන්න පුළුවනි.

නීල් ද අල්විස් මයා. (බද්දේගම)

(තිල. நீல் டி அல்விஸ்—பத்தேகம)

(Mr. Neal de Alwis—Baddegama)

මිනිස්සු බඩගින්නේ.

සුබසිංහ මයා.

(තිල. சுபசிங்க)

(Mr. Subasinghe)

ඔව් ඒක එහෙමයි. මම මෙහිදී අගමැති තුමා වෙත ඉදිරිපත් කරන ප්‍රශ්නය මේකයි. මෙසේ වැඩිවනවාය කියන එක සදාකාලිකවම ගෙන යාමට නම් වෙනත් වෙනත් දේවල් කළ යුතුව තිබෙනවා නොවේද?

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

ඔව්.

සුබසිංහ මයා.

(තිල. சுபசிங்க)

(Mr. Subasinghe)

තමුත්තාන්සේලා ඒවා ගැන කල්පනා කරනවා නබා, තවම ඒවා ගැන කල්පනා කරනවා. සුදුනම් වන බවක ලකුණුවත්



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

නැහැ. මම කියන්නම් එක කාරණයක් පසු ගිය අවුරුද්දේ අය-වය විවාදයේදී අපේ අම්මාට ගරු මන්ත්‍රිතුමා (සෝමරත්න සෙනරත් මයා.) ඒ පැත්තේ විගෝවිතෘත සම්බන්ධයෙන් පවතින ආදායම සහ වියදම පිළිබඳව ගුණන් ඉලක්කම් වලින් පෙන්වා දුන්නා. ඒ මන්ත්‍රිතුමා පෙන්වුවා, ඒ පැත්තේ අක්කරයක් අස්වැද්දීම සඳහා යන වියදම රුපියල් 455.40 යි කියා. මේ අවුරුද්දේ වය වන මුදල ඊටත් වැඩි වෙන්න පුළුවන්. අක්කරයකින් ලබන ආදායම රු. 560 යි.

මේ ඊයේ පෙරේදා මම අපේ පළාතේ හොඳ ගොවි මහත්මයෙකු මුණ ගැසි—ඒ පැත්තේ විශාලම වෙල් යාය වන මාකඳුරේ වෙල් යායේ ගොවියෙක් මුණ ගැසි—ඒ ගොවියාත් සමග ගණන් බැලුවා. අපේ පළාතේ කපානායකතුමනි, ගොවිතැන් කරන්නේ අහස් දියෙන්, වාරිමාගී ක්‍රම එහේ නැහැ. එසේ ගණන් බැලීමේදී හෙළි වූ වියදම් ලැයිස්තුව මෙන්න මේ ආකාරයි: පළමු සි ඍමට රු. 40 යි. දෙවන සි ඍමට රුපියල් 40 යි. නියර මඩ තැබීමට රු. 50 යි. [බාධා කිරීම්] අනුරාධ පුරේට වඩා වැඩියි. රසායන පෝර යෙදීමට රුපියල් 56 යි. බිත්තර වි බුසල් දෙකකට රුපියල් 33.20 යි. වල් පැළෑටි නාශක බෙහෙත් යෙදීමට රුපියල් 20 යි. රෝග නාශක බෙහෙත් යෙදීමට රුපියල් 9 යි. කෘමි නාශක බෙහෙත් යෙදීමට රුපියල් 25 යි. ගොයම් පැළ සිටුවීමට රුපියල් 80 යි. ගොයම් කැපීමට රුපියල් 45 යි. ගොයම් ආදීමට රු. 15 යි. ගොයම් පැහීමට රු. 30 යි. වි පෙළීමට රු. 18 යි. ඔය විධියට මුළු ගණන රු. 461.20 ක් වෙනවා. දැන් මේ විධියට සි ඍම, පැළ සිටුවීම, වල් නෙළීම, පෝර දැමීම ආදී සියලුම දේවල් ශාස්ත්‍රානුකූලව කරලත් ඒ ගොවියන්ට ලබාගන්නට පුළුවන් වන්නේ අක්කරයකට බුසල් 80 යි කියා ඒ අය කියනවා. ඒකත් ලබාගන්නට පුළුවන් වන්නේ කලට වේලාවට වැස්ස ලැබුණොත් පමණයි. කිසිම දවසක ඒ ගොවියන්ට හරි හැටි කලට වේලාවට වැස්ස ලැබී නැතිලි. කලාතුරකින් තමයිලි හරියට ලැබෙන්නේ. ඒක මේ ආණ්ඩුවේ වරදක් කියා මා කියන්නේ නැහැ.

කෙසේ වෙතත් අක්කරයකට බුසල් 80 බැගින් ගෙන ගණන් බැලුවොත් අපට බුසලට රු. 14 බැගින් රුපියල් 1,120 ක ආදායමක් ලබනවා. රුපියල් 460 ක් වියදම් කර රුපියල් 1,120 ක ආදායමක් එක කන්නයකදී ලබාගන්නවා. හැබැයි සම්බ හාල් වුණොත් ඊට වඩා වැඩියෙන් ලබාගන්නට පුළුවනි. ඒ මොකද? සම්බ හාල් රුපියල් 16 කට පමණ විකුණන්න පුළුවන් නිසා. නමුත් මේකයි වැදගත් ප්‍රශ්නය. අද ආණ්ඩුවේ සංඛ්‍යා ලේඛන වල හැටියට අපට පෙනෙනවා, කුඹුරු ඉඩම් අක්කර 2,42,690 ක් තිබෙන්නේ අක්කර බාගයකට අඩු ඉඩම් කැලී වශයෙන් බව. අක්කර 2,53,823 ක් තිබෙන්නේ අක්කර බාගයකටත් අක්කරයකටත් අතර ඉඩම් කැලී වශයෙනුයි. ඉතිරි අක්කර 1,62,120 තිබෙන්නේ අක්කරයටත් අක්කර 2 ටත් අතරේ ඉඩම් කැලී වශයෙන්. මේ වගේ ඉඩම් කැලී වලට මේ විධියට වියදම් කර, යම්කිසි ආදායමක් ලබා ගෙන ඒ වගේම ලබා ගත් ණය ආදියත් ගෙවා දැමීමෙන් පසුව තවත් මුදලක් ඔවුන් අතර ඉතිරි වෙනවාද? මෙවැනි සුළු කුඹුරුවල, සදාකාලිකවම මේ වියදම් දරමින්, ගොවිතැන ගැන උනන්දු වක් දක්වමින්, ස්ථිරවම දිගටම ගොවිතැන් කටයුතු කර ගෙන යන්න පුළුවන් කමක් තිබෙනවාද? මොකක් හරි ප්‍රතිසංවිධානයක් කරන්නේ නැතිව ඒ විධියට දිගටම ඒ විධියට වැඩකරගෙන යන්න පුළුවන් කමක් නැහැ. එහෙම නම් මා කියන්නේ අද මේ ගොවිතැන් කටයුතු වල ස්ථිරවම යෙදීමට සුදුනම්ව සිටින උදවියට ගොවිතැන් කිරීමට සුදුසු “Economic holding” එකක් ලබා දෙන්න ඕනැ බවයි. ඒ කියන්නේ We will have to follow a policy of consolidation of fragmented holdings, granting of security of title and of registration. මෙන්න මේ වැදගත් ප්‍රශ්නය විසඳන්නේ නැතිව, මුදල් යෙදවීමෙන්ම, නිලධාරීන් යෙදවීමෙන්ම, ගොවිතැන් දියුණු කරන්නේ කොහොමද කියන කරුණයි මම අහන්නේ.

ඊළඟට තවත් කාරණයක් මා කියන්නම්. අපේ පළාත්වල මේ ගොවි මණ්



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[සුබසිංහ මයා.]

බල ආදිය බොහොම උනන්දුවෙන් කුමානු කුලව වැඩ කටයුතු කරගෙන යනවායයි කිව්වත් ඒ බවක් අපට පෙනෙන්න නැහැ. හුඟක් කුඹුරු යායවල එවැනි සංවිධානයක් තිබෙන බවක් පෙනෙන්න නැහැ. යම්කිසි කාලසටහනක් අනුව ගොවි තැන් කටයුතු කිරීමේ සිරිතක් පුරාණ කාලයේ නම් තිබුණා. සි සෑම, වැපිරීම ආදි කටයුතු සම්බන්ධයෙන් යම්කිසි කාල සටහනක් තිබුණා. නමුත් අද ඒවා හුඟක් දුරට මගහැරී ගොස් තිබෙනවා. ඒ නිසා මේවා ප්‍රතිසංවිධානය කර ගන්නේ නැතිව මුදල් පමණක්ම යෙදවීමෙන් ගොවි කර්මාන්තය දියුණු කරන්න බැහැ. පෝර වැඩියෙන් යෙදවූ පමණට, විරුක්ටර් වැඩියෙන් යෙදවූ පමණට ගොවිතැන් දියුණු කරන්න බැහැ. ඒ විධියට කටයුතු කරමින් මේ රටේ සුළු ගොවියා ලවා රට ස්වයං පෝෂිත කරවන්න සූදානම් වුණත් එය කරන්න පුළුවන් දෙයක් නොවෙයි. අද අගමැතිතුමාට එය කරන්න බැරි තත්ත්වයක් ඇති වී තිබෙනවා. ඒ දේවල් ප්‍රති සංවිධානය කිරීමට අද මොනවාද කර තිබෙන්නේ?

අද අගමැතිතුමාත්, ඒ වගේම ආහාර ඇමතිතුමාත් කියනවා මේ ගොවිතැන් කටයුතුවලින් ප්‍රයෝජන ගෙන තිබෙන්නේ සුළු ගොවියාය කියා. අගමැතිතුමා නම් මෙන්න මේ විධියේ දෙයකුත් කියා තිබෙනවා. අනුරාධපුරයේ ගොවියෙක් රේඩියෝ එකක් ගන්න ගියාලු. සිංහල අංශය පමණක් අසන්න පුළුවන් රේඩියෝ එකක් රුපියල් 400 ක් වන අතර, සිංහල හා දෙමළ අංශ දෙකම අසන්න පුළුවන් රේඩියෝ එකක් රුපියල් 500 ක් වන බව වෙළෙන්දා කිව්වලු. එවිට අර ගොවියා රුපියල් 500 රේඩියෝ එක අරගෙන ගියාලු. මේ පුවත මා පත්‍රයෙහි දැක්කේ. නමුත් ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, කී දෙනාටද අද එහෙම කරන්න පුළුවන්? කී දෙනෙකුටද අද එවැනි ශක්තියක් තිබෙන්නේ?

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

ගොවි රජ වරුන්ට ආණ්ඩුවෙන් ලැබුණ තැගි ගැන දන්නවාද?

සුබසිංහ මයා.

(திரு. சுபசிங்க)

(Mr. Subasinghe)

ගොවි රජවරුන් කී දෙනෙක් ඉන්න වාද?

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

අක්කරයකට බුසල් 200 බැගින් ගත් අය කී දෙනෙක් සිටිනවාද කියා දන්න වාද?

සුබසිංහ මයා.

(திரு. சுபசிங்க)

(Mr. Subasinghe)

අක්කරයක් ගොවිතැන් කිරීමට රුපියල් 460 ක් යොදවනවා. අක්කර බාගයේ හෝ ඊට අඩු කුඹුරු කැලී 2,42,690 ක් තිබෙන බව මා කිවා. ඔය අක්කර බාගයකට රුපියල් 230 බැගින් යොදවා වැඩ කරනවා. ඒ කුඹුරු කැල්ලකින් ලැබෙන වී ටික විකුණා ලැබෙන ආදායමෙන් රේඩියෝ එකකුත්, බයිසිකලයකුත් අනික් අවශ්‍ය දේවලුත් ලබා ගන්න කී දෙනෙකුට පුළුවන්කම තිබෙනවාද? අගමැතිතුමනි, අපි ඇත්ත දෙස ටිකක් බලමු. මේ වී මිළ නැගීමෙන් සිදු වී තිබෙන්නේ මෙයයි. වැඩි වශයෙන් බහුල වශයෙන් ගොවිතැන් කටයුතු කරන සුළු ගොවියාගේ ණයගැතිකම වැඩි වී තිබෙනවා. මැදින් සිටින මිනිසාට ලොකු ඉඩම් හිමියාට, විශාල මුදල් ලබා ගන්න මාර්ග සැලසී තිබෙනවා. එයයි අද සිදු වී තිබෙන්නේ.

ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, මා හුඟ වෙලාවක් ගත්තා. එහෙත් කියන්නට තවත් කරුණු රාශියක් තිබෙනවා. වෙළඳාම සම්බන්ධව කියන්නට ඕනෑ. මේ ආණ්ඩුව බලයට පැමිණියාට පසුව අභ්‍යන්තර වෙළඳ ප්‍රතිපත්තියේ වෙනසක් කළා. යම් රටක පාරිභෝගික භාණ්ඩවල හිඟයක් තිබෙනවා නම්—විදේශ විනිමය අඩුවීම හේතුකොට ගෙන හෝ යුද්ධ කලබලයක් වැනි යමක් හේතුකොටගෙන හෝ—තිබෙන ප්‍රමාණය සීමාසහිතව හරියාකාර බෙදා හැරීමට යුතු කමක් රජයට තිබෙනවා. එහෙත් මේ ආණ්ඩුව බලයට පැමිණියාට පසුව මේ රටේ 'කළේ' කුමක්ද? තොග වෙළඳාම සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම පොදුගලික වෙළෙඳුන්



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

අතට බාර දීමයි. ඒ නිසා අද සීමාසහිතව තිබෙන භාණ්ඩ ප්‍රමාණය මහජනයාට විකුණන්නේ විශාල වලාහයක් තබා ගෙනයි. කළු මාර්කට් එකේ මූලස්ථානය වී සිටින්නේ තොග වෙළෙඳුන්දැයි.

විදේශීය වෙළඳාම ගැන බලමු. විදේශ වෙළඳාමෙන් අපට ඇති වී තිබෙන විපාකය නම් ජාත්‍යන්තර වෙළඳ පොළේ මිල බැසීමයි කියා අපි හැමදාම කියනවා. එහෙත් මේ රටේ මිල වෙනස ඇති වන්නේ ජාත්‍යන්තර වෙළඳ පොළේ මිල උඩමයි කියා අපට තවම ඔප්පු කර නැහැ. මෑතදී තේ මිල රුපියල් 1.60 ටත් පහළ බැස්සා. එහෙත් ජාත්‍යන්තර වෙළඳ පොළේ එහෙම දෙයක් ඇති වුණද කියා මා අහනවා. බ්‍රිතාන්‍යයේ ඇති වුණද? ඇමෙරිකාවේ ඇති වුණද? ඔස්ට්‍රේලියාවේ ඇති වුණද? සත්‍ය කරුණ නම් විදේශ වෙළඳාම සම්බන්ධව පිහිටුවා ගෙන තිබෙන වෙළඳ අධිකාරය කැඩීමට මොනවා හෝ මාර්ග නොගෙන—විදේශ වෙළඳාම අප අතට නොගෙන—අපේ තේ ආරක්ෂා කරන්නට ඕනෑය කියා අපි මොනවා කළත් එයින් වැඩක් වන්නේ නැත කියන එකයි. මා පමණක් නොවෙයි, සමාජවාදී පක්ෂ පමණක් නොවෙයි, අද තේ වෙළඳාමේ යෙදී සිටින සමහර අයත් එය කියනවා. මා වෙළඳ ඇමතිතුමාට අභියෝග කරනවා ශක්තියක් තිබෙනවා නම් වෙළඳාමෙන් කොටසක්වත් ජනසතු කර වෙළඳ අධිකාරය කඩන්නට සංවිධාන යොදා ගන්නා කියා. පිටරට වෙළඳාම ආණ්ඩුව විසින්ම පිහිටුවන සංස්ථාවන් මගින් කරන්නට කටයුතු ආරම්භ කරන්න. එමෙන්ම අපේ වෙළඳ ගිවිසුම් තව තවත් පැවිවීම් කර විදේශ විනිමය අවශ්‍යයි කියා ඩොලර් සහ රන්පවුම් කලාපයේ රටවලින් බඩු ගෙන්වනවා වෙනුවට වෙනත් රටවලින් ගන්න. “ඩිරෙක්ෂන් ඔෆ් ට්‍රේඩ්” ටිකක් වෙනස් කරන්න. එවැනි ප්‍රතිපත්තියක් තමයි මූලිකම ඇති කරන්නට ඕනෑ. ශ්‍රී ලංකා මහ බැංකුව ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙන වාර්තාවේම තිබෙනවා අපට තේවලට නියම මිලක් ලබා ගැනීමට තිබෙන ප්‍රධාන බාධාව මේ ඒකාධිකාරයයි කියා. එය කඩන්නට වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් යොදන්නේ කැනිව මොන ආණ්ඩුවක් බලයට ආවත් අප පිට

රට යවන කෘෂිකාර්මික භාණ්ඩවලින් ප්‍රයෝජනයක් ගන්නට බැහැ.

තේ පමණක් නොවෙයි පොල් කර්මාන්තය ගැනත් බලන්න. ජාත්‍යන්තර සම්බන්ධකම් ඇති කී දෙනෙක් පොල් පිටරට යැවීමේ කටයුත්තෙහි යෙදී සිටිනවාද? ඒ අය තේද පොල්වල මිල ඇති කරන්නේ? එමෙන්ම විදේශ විනිමය හොරකම් කරන ආකාරය බලන්න. මේ ලගදී පිටරට බඩු පටවන තොග වෙළෙඳුන් දෙකේ භාණ්ඩර තුනේ බේල් භාණ්ඩර තුනහමාරට ගහලා භාණ්ඩර බාගයකට විදේශ විනිමය හිමි කර ගැනීමට තැත් කළා. අද මේ යන මාර්ගය ඔස්සේ ගොස් අපේ රටේ අර්ථ සංවර්ධනය ඇති කරන්නට, සෑම දෙයක්ම සම්පූර්ණ කර ගන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වුණත් එය ඉෂ්ට වන්නේ නැහැ. මේ ගෙන යන වැඩ පිළිවෙල අනුව ඒ බලාපොරොත්තු ඉෂ්ට කර ගන්නට බැහැ. ඒ නිසයි, අප ඊට ප්‍රතිවිරුද්ධ වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙන්නේ. මේ ප්‍රතිපත්ති දෙක උඩයි, අද මේ රටේ සිටින පවතින්නේ. අද අපේ දේශපාලන සටන පවතින්නේ මේ ප්‍රතිපත්ති දෙක උඩයි. අප මෙහි පැමිණි විට මේ ප්‍රතිපත්ති දෙක උඩ ඔවුනොවුත් හෙළා දකිනවා. ඒ පැත්තේ උදවිය විසින් මේ පැත්තේ උදවිය හෙළා දකිනු ලබන අතර මේ පැත්තේ උදවිය විසින් ඒ පැත්තේ උදවිය හෙළා දකිනු ලබනවා. ඒක ස්වාභාවිකයි.

ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, ඊයේ මගේ මිත්‍ර වෙළඳ ඇමතිතුමා ඉතා පහත් තත්ත්වයෙන් කථා කළා. දේශපාලන භූමියේදී අප මිත්‍ර වුණා. අප දෙදෙනාම මූලිකම තාත්තත්වය පැත්තෙන් සටන පටන් ගත්තා. 1951 දී අප ඇල්බට් පිරිස් මැතිතුමාට විරුද්ධව තාත්තත්වය පැත්තෙන් සටන පටන් ගත්තා. ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම පිරිස් පවුල අපේ පවුලක් සමග ලොකු සම්බන්ධතාවකින් සිටියා. ඥාතීන් මෙන් අප සම්බන්ධ වී සිටියා. එහෙත් දේශපාලනය නිසා ඒ පවුලක් සමග අපට හැපෙන්නට සිදු වුණා. ඇල්බට් පිරිස් මහතාත් සමග තාත්තත්වය කොට්ඨාශය තරග කිරීම සඳහා ඔය දුන් සිටින වෙළඳ ඇමතිවරයා ඉදිරිපත්



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[සුබසිංහ මයා.]

කර දේශපාලන වශයෙන් ඒ සවුලත් සමඟ හැප්පෙන්නට අපට සිදු වුණි. එදා අප මුත්තාහේගේ සටනට ආධාර දුන් බව මුත්තාහේට මතක ඇතැයි මා හිත නවා. 1956 දීත් අප එකට සිටියා. 1956 දීත් මුත්තාහේ තරඟ කෙළේ ස්වාධීන අපේක්ෂකයකු හැටියටයි. ඊට පසුව බණ්ඩාරනායක මැතිතුමාගේ ආධාරය පැතුවා. බණ්ඩාරනායක මහතාගේ ආණ්ඩුවට සම්බන්ධ වුණි. දේශපාලන ඉතිහාසයේ අප කවුරුත් නොයෙක් දේවල් කර තිබෙනවා.

ගරු හිසු ප්‍රනාන්දු (වාණිජ හා වෙළඳ ඇමති)

(කෙළරාව ඹුඹු පෙරුණ්ඩො—වර්ත්තක ඩිපාර්ට්මේන්ට්)

(The Hon. Hugh Fernando—Minister of Commerce and Trade)

බණ්ඩාරනායක මහතා හෝ, දේශපාලන පක්ෂයක වෙනත් කිසිම කපිකයකු හෝ, කටුගම්පොල මන්ත්‍රීතුමා හෝ 1956 දී මගේ උදව්වට ආවේ නැහැ.

සුබසිංහ මයා.

(තිරු. ජපසිංහ)

(Mr. Subasinghe)

එය එසේ වන්නට ඇති. කවුරුත් ගියා ද, කවුරුත් නොගියාදැයි මා දන්නේ නැහැ. 1952 දී එතුමා පක්ෂයකින් නොවෙයි, තරඟ කෙළේ. එදා එතුමා කපා කළ හැටි මට මතකයි. එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා, කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා වැනි අවංක මිනිසුන් මේ රටේ නැතැයි එදා එතුමා කියනු මගේ කනට ඇහුණි. [බාධා කිරීමක්.]

ගරු හිසු ප්‍රනාන්දු

(කෙළරාව ඹුඹු පෙරුණ්ඩො)

(The Hon. Hugh Fernando)

එදා එහෙම කිව්වා. [බාධා කිරීමක්.]

සුබසිංහ මයා.

(තිරු. ජපසිංහ)

(Mr. Subasinghe)

මනුෂ්‍යයකුගේ අඩුපාඩු තිබෙන්නට පුළුවනි. මුත්තාහේ වේදිකාවට ගිය විට සමහර විට මිනිසුන් මුරුංගා අත්තේ තබා තවා. ඒ වාගේම තවත් වේලාවක ඒ මිනිසුන්ටත් කුණු බල්ලන්ට මෙන් බණිනවා.

1952 දී මුත්තාහේ ඇල්බට් පිරිස් මහත්මයාට, ඩී. එස්. සේනානායක මහත්මයාට පෞද්ගලිකව බණින විට එසේ කරන්නට එපා යයි මුත්තාහේට කියන්නට අනෙක් කපිකයන්ට සිදු වුණි. [බාධා කිරීමක්.]

ගරු හිසු ප්‍රනාන්දු

(කෙළරාව ඹුඹු පෙරුණ්ඩො)

(The Hon. Hugh Fernando)

Sir, I want to make a personal explanation.

සුබසිංහ මයා.

(තිරු. ජපසිංහ)

(Mr. Subasinghe)

I am not giving way. I remember what you did yesterday.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා (යටියන්තොට)

(කලාතිථි භණ්. භණ්. පෙරේරා—යටියන්තොට)

(Dr. N. M. Perera—Yatiyantota)

That is what you did yesterday.—[Interruption].

කපානායකතුමා

(ජපානායකර් අවර්ගන්)

(Mr. Speaker)

Order please! If the hon. Member is giving way the Hon. Minister can make his personal explanation.

සුබසිංහ මයා.

(කෙළරාව ඹුඹු පෙරුණ්ඩො—වර්ත්තක ඩිපාර්ට්මේන්ට්)

(Mr. Subasinghe)

I am not giving way.—[Interruption.]

මෙම ගරු සභාවේදී තමා දේශපාලන වේදිකාවේදීවත් මා කාටවත් පෞද්ගලිකව අපහාස කරන්නේ නැහැ. එහෙත් ඊයේ මුත්තාහේ අපට නොසැහෙන අන්දමට අපහාස කළ නිසා, නින්දා කළ නිසා මට මේ කණගාටුදයක සිද්ධියට මුහුණ පාන්නට සිදු වුණි. මුත්තාහේ 1956 දී බණ්ඩාරනායක මහතාට එවූ ලිපියක් දැන් මම කියවන්නම්.

“The Hon. Bandaranaike,  
Hon. Sir,

The purpose of this letter is not to ask you for financial assistance. I fully appreciate your position and sympathize with you wholeheartedly.



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

Sir, in view of serious financial problems that face me in the event of elections, I am seeking many ways of solving them before the nominations. I cannot count on the rich and wealthy people here as they are all U. N. P. There are a few who have promised assistance. I have told all of them that unless I get it before the nominations, I shall hesitate to come forward.

Whether I contest or not I shall never join the U. N. P. but shall do my best with whatever resources at my command to defeat the U.N.P.

I am writing to you in order to keep you fully informed about my position. I think you are aware that I am not a person of means and I can illafford to face the hustings without financial backing."

He was not a man of means then.

දැන් එතුමා කොහොමදැයි මා දන්නේ නැහැ. මේ ලියුම ලියා තිබෙන්නේ 1956 දීයි. පසුව කරුණු වැටහීම නිසා එතුමා එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයට බැඳුණාලු. එහි වරදක් නැහැ. [බාධා කිරීම්.]

එහෙත් එතුමා ඊයේ කිව්වේ මොනවාද? විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයේ නායකාව 1959 දී ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයෙන් නාම යෝජනා බාරගත්තේ නැතැයි එතුමා කිව්වා. එදා එතුමිය මුහුණ පා සිටි තත්ත්වය අනුව එය පුද්ගලයක් නොවෙයි. පක්ෂය තුළම සිටි පිරිසක් එකතු වී ඇගේ ස්වාමි පුරුෂයා සාහසික ලෙස මරාදැමීමට පසු ඒ පිළිබඳ වගකිව යුත්තන් කවුරුන්දැයි හරි හැටි පැහැදිලි කර නොගෙන, තම ස්වාමියාගේ මරණයෙන් මාසයක්වත් ගත වන්නට පෙර එවැනි දේකට ඉදිරිපත් වීම මනුෂ්‍යයකුට කරන්නට පුළුවන් වැඩක්ද? වෙළඳ ඇමතිතුමා කියන්නේ එය ලොකු වරදක් බවයි. කරුණු හරිහැටි අවබෝධ වුණායින් පසු, තම ස්වාමි පුරුෂයාගේ ප්‍රතිපත්ති ඉදිරියට ගෙන යාම සඳහා තම විශ්වාසය පිට බණ්ඩාරනායක මැතිණිය ඉදිරියට ආවේ නැද්ද? මොකක්ද එහි ඇති වරද?

ගරු හිසු ප්‍රනාන්දු

(ශ්‍රේෂ්ඨ නීතිඥ හුග් ෆෙර්නාන්ඩෝ)

(The Hon. Hugh Fernando)

වරදක් නැ.

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

සිරිමාවෝ ආර්. ඩී. බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.  
(අත්තනගල්ල)

(තිරුමති නිරිමාවෝ ආර්. ඩී. බණ්ඩාරනායක  
නායක—අත්තනගල්ල)

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

ඊයේ කිව්වේ වරදක් බවනේ.

සුබසිංහ මයා.

(තිරු. සුපසිංහ)

(Mr. Subasinghe)

එතුමා එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයට බැඳී ම බොහොම හොඳ දෙයක්. එහි කිසිම වරදක් නැහැ. එහෙත් බණ්ඩාරනායක මැතිණිය තම අදහස් අනුව තීරණයකට එළඹීම එතුමාට බොහොම ලොකු වරදක්. [බාධා කිරීම්.]

ඊළඟට වෙළඳ ඇමතිතුමා මට කළ චෝදනාව කුමක්ද? 1959 පෙබරවාරි මාසයේදී මා මහජන එක්සත් පෙරමුණෙන් අස් වුණා. [බාධා කිරීම්] වැරදි ඉතිහාසය නොව හරි ඉතිහාසය මම කියන්නම්. 1958 අවුරුද්දේ ජාතිවාදී කෝලාහල කාලයේදී, අද ආණ්ඩු පක්ෂයේ සිටින සමහර අය—එදා ඒ ආණ්ඩුවේ ඇමතිවරුන්—පදවිය, මිත්තේරිය, හිඟ රක්ගොඩ, ආදී ප්‍රදේශවල ද්‍රවිඩ-සිංහල හේදය අවුස්සමින් ඉතාම කුරුතර දේවලට මිනිසුන් පොළඹවමින් ගෙන ගිය ප්‍රතිපත්තිය ගැන මගේ විරුද්ධත්වය එදා මා බණ්ඩාරනායක මැතිතුමාට ප්‍රකාශ කළා. මා පක්ෂයෙන් අස්විය යුතු බව 1958 අගෝස්තු මාසයේදී මා දැනුම් දුන්නා. දිවංගත බණ්ඩාරනායක අගමැතිතුමා මට කිව්වා, “කලබල වෙන්ට එපා; ටිකක් ඉන්න” කියා. මාව එක්සත් ජාතීන්ගේ මණ්ඩලයට යැව්වා. ආපසු ආවාට පස්සෙන් මට පෙනුණා, මහජන යාට දුන්න පොරොන්දු ඉෂ්ට කරන්නට ඇමතිවරුන් කිහිප දෙනෙකු—මම ඒ ගෞරවය මේ අවස්ථාවේදී ගරු කරමින් ඇමතිතුමාට පිරිනමනවා—කුඹුරු පනත, මහජන බැංකු පනත වැනි දේවල් ඉදිරියට ගෙන යන්නට සැරසෙන විට තවත් ඇමතිවරු කවිටියක් එකතු වී ඊට විරුද්ධතාවක් දක්වන බව. අන්න ඒ විරුද්ධතාවන්ටත්, මා කලින් සඳහන් කළ කාරණයටත් විරුද්ධව මා ඉල්ලා අස් වුණා. මා මගේ ඉල්ලා අස්වීමේ



විවර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[සුබසිංහ මයා.]

ලිපිය පුළුවන් තරම් සෙව්ව නමුත් සොයා ගන්නට බැරි වුණා. මේවා රැස් කරගෙන “ආකෘතිවිස්” වල දැගෙන ඉන්නට මට වුවමනා කළේ නැහැ. මම පොත් ලියන්නෙ නැහැ. මගේ ජීවිත කථාව මා ලියන්න යන්නෙ නැහැ. කෙසේ වෙතත් “අගමැතිතුමනි, තමුන් නාන්සේලාගේ මිත්‍රයන් හැටියට තමුන් නාන්සේ වට කරේ රොක් වි සිටින—මම ඒ උදවියගේ නම් පවා සදහන් කළා—උදවිය සමඟ මට ඉන්න බැහැ. ඒ නිසා මම යනව” කියා මම ඒ ලියුමේ ලිව්ව බව මට මතකයි. ඉතින් වරද මොකක්ද? මගේ හෘදය සාක්ෂ්‍යයට එකඟව අස් වීමේ වරද මොකක්ද?

ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, ඇත්ත තමයි, මම ඊට පසු කථානායක වෙලා හිටියා. මේවා කියන්නට සිදු වීම ගැන කනගාටුයි. එහෙත් උත්තර දෙන්නට ඕනෑ. කථානායක පදවිය මා ඉල්ලා ලබාගත් දෙයක් නොවෙයි. එදා විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයේ කණ්ඩායම් හැම එකක්ම එකතු වෙලා මට කථානායක පදවිය භාරගන්න කියා බල කළා. මම කවදාවත් ඉල්ලුවෙ නැහැ, ඒ දවස් 30 ට පසු අගමැතිතුමා මගේ බංගලාවට ආ බව එතුමාට මතක ඇති. මැදවිච්චියේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාත් (මෙමත්‍රීපාල සේනානායක මයා.) යටියන්තොට ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාත් (ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා) ආවා. මේ සියලු දෙනාම ඇවිත් මට කිව්ව, “උඹ මේ දවස් 30 තුළ කථානායක වශයෙන් ක්‍රියා කළ ආකාරය හොඳයි. උඹ ඒ කටයුත්තට දක්ෂ බව අපි පිළිගන්නවා” කියා. නැවතත් කථානායක හැටියට එන ලෙස ඔවුන් මගෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටියා. මම ආව. මට තව්‍ර වුණා. ඕක මේ රටේ කථානායකවරුන්ට සිදු වන මොකක්ද ආපදාවක්.

ඉතින් මේ වාණිජ හා වෙළඳ ඇමතිවරයා මෙතැන ඇවිත් “උඹට වැඩිය කල් මම කථානායක හැටියට හිටියා” කියා මහ ලොකුවට කියන එකේ තේරුම මොකක්ද? ඇයි දෙයියනේ, පුළුවන් නම් ඕක බදු ගන්නකො. මට එහෙම වුවමනාවක් නැහැ. “මම උඹට වැඩිය කල් කථානායක හැටියට හිටියා” කියන එක මහ වැඩක්ද? මගේ දේශපාලන ජීවිතයේදී මා කළ ලොකු

මෝඩම වැඩේ තමයි කථානායකකම භාර ගැනීම. මෙන්න මේ විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයේ ඉස්සරහ පෙළේ සිටින උදවිය නිසයි, මට එක සිදු වුණේ.

ගරු ඇමතිතුමනි, තමුන් නාන්සේලා ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නට තිබෙන්නේ මේ වගේ තර්කද? ඔව්, මම ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයට බැදුණා. මම එදා යම් යම් ප්‍රතිපත්ති නිසා මහජන එක්සත් පෙරමුණෙන් අස් වුණා. මම කවදත් කියා සිටියේ, “කවදා හෝ මේ රටේ ප්‍රගතිශීලීන් එක් වුණොත් මමත් එදාට ඒ ගොඩේ” කියායි. මන්ත්‍රී ධුරාපේක්ෂකයකු නැති නිසා ගෙන්වා ගන්න තුරු හෝ, ඇමතිකමක් අරකක් මේකක් දෙන තුරු හෝ මා බලා හිටියෙ නැහැ. බණ්ඩාරනායක මැතිනිය මාව පත් කළා. බණ්ඩාරනායක මැතිනිය වැටුණු වෙලාවේදී මගේ යුතුකමට තිබුණේ, එතැනින් ඉල්ලා අස් වී ආපසු එන එකයි. මම ඒක කළා. මම නැවතත් අනික් ආණ්ඩුව පස්සෙ යන්න ගියේ නැහැ. මට මේක තව කල් ගෙන යන්න දෙන්න කියාගෙන මම ගියෙ නැහැ. බණ්ඩාරනායක මැතිනිය මාව පත් කළා. පැරදුණාට මම මේ රටට නින්දා වක් කළේ නැහැ. මට කිසිම කෙනෙකු චෝදනා නැගුවෙ නැහැ.

1965 දී තරඟ කරන්නට මේ ඇමතිවරයාට ආත්මගෞරවයක් තිබුණේ නැහැ. ඇයි තමුන් නාන්සේ තරඟ නොකළේ? “මම නම්බු පිටින් ගියා; උඹ පැරදිලයි ගියේ” කියනවා. නම්බුව මම දන්නවා. තල්ගොඩපිටිය වාතාවේ—[බාධාකිරීමක්]—අන්න ඒකයි නම්බුව.

ගරු හිසු ප්‍රනාන්දු

(කෙනරාභ ඛ්‍යු පෙර්නාන්ඩෝ)

(The Hon. Hugh Fernando)

Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal explanation—[Interruption].

කථානායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

I do not think the hon. Member for Katugampola should have referred to that matter.



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

ශ්‍රී හිසු ප්‍රනාන්දු

(කෙළරාව ඹුඹු පෙර්නාන්ඩෝ)

(The Hon. Hugh Fernando)

I admit that my name transpired in the course of that investigation. No less a person than the late Mr. Bandaranaike—[Interruption]. He did not live long enough to get caught.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාභිති ංන්. ංම්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

No fear.—[Interruption]. You have not been exonerated.

ශ්‍රී හිසු ප්‍රනාන්දු

(කෙළරාව ඹුඹු පෙර්නාන්ඩෝ)

(The Hon. Hugh Fernando)

I was exonerated.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාභිති ංන්. ංම්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You were not. Read the Thalgodapitiya Commission Report.

ශ්‍රී හිසු ප්‍රනාන්දු

(කෙළරාව ඹුඹු පෙර්නාන්ඩෝ)

(The Hon. Hugh Fernando)

You shut up, you coward. Your leader was a bribe-taker. He did not live long enough to get caught.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාභිති ංන්. ංම්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

No fear. You read the Report.

ශ්‍රී හිසු ප්‍රනාන්දු

(කෙළරාව ඹුඹු පෙර්නාන්ඩෝ)

(The Hon. Hugh Fernando)

You read it.

සුබසිංහ මයා.

(තිරු. ජපසිභ්ග)

(Mr. Subasinghe)

You read the Report. I withdraw the remark I made.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාභිති ංන්. ංම්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Why should you withdraw it? Let him read the Thalgodapitiya Report.

ශ්‍රී හිසු ප්‍රනාන්දු

(කෙළරාව ඹුඹු පෙර්නාන්ඩෝ)

(The Hon. Hugh Fernando)

I know more about the Thalgodapitiya Commission Report than you.—[Interruption].

කථානායකතුමා

(ජපාභායකර් අචාර්ග)

(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please! It was started on this side, but I would appeal to the hon. Member for Katugampola not to continue it.

සුබසිංහ මයා.

(තිරු. ජපසිභ්ග)

(Mr. Subasinghe)

මා පෙන්වා දෙන්න හැදුවේ මෙයයි. මම බොහොම අගෞරව වන ආකාරයට හසුරු භාය. මම නම්බුකාර පිළිවෙලට ගියේ නැත; ඔය වගේ කථාවලින් වැඩක් තිබෙනවාද?

ශ්‍රී හිසු ප්‍රනාන්දු

(කෙළරාව ඹුඹු පෙර්නාන්ඩෝ)

(The Hon. Hugh Fernando)

I said that in answer to an interruption.

සුබසිංහ මයා.

(තිරු. ජපසිභ්ග)

(Mr. Subasinghe)

නමුසෙගෙ නම්බුව ගැන මම දන්නවා. නමුසෙ තමයි මම මොස්කව් ඉන්ද්ද්දි, කොට්ඨාශයේ මහ ජනතාවගෙන් බේරෙන් න බැරි තිසා මගේ ගෙදරට ගිහින්, මගේ ක්ලාප්ක් ලවා උයවා ගෙන කාලා, මගේ ගෙදරට වී බුදියා ගත්තේ, වරින්වර [බාඩා කිරීම්] එහෙම කරපු මිනිසා තමයි, මම ආපසු ආවාම—[බාඩා කිරීම්] කටුගම්පොල ලැතිවරණ රැස්වීම්වලට පැමිණ මට බැණ වැදුණේ.

ශ්‍රී කථානායකතුමා, මගේ කථාව අවසාන කරන්න පෙර තව එක වචනයක් කියන්න තිබෙනවා. ඔය මැති ඇමතිවරු මගේ කොට්ඨාශයට ආවා. නමුත් එයින්



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

[සුබසිංහ මයා.]

එක පුද්ගලයකුවත් මට ඇඟිල්ල දිගු කර කීවේ නැහැ, මේ මිනිසා හොරෙක්ය, මේ මිනිසා තරක මිනිසෙක්ය කියා. නමුත් මේ මිනිසා, එකට කාපු මිනිසා, එකට බිපු මිනිසා, එකට හිටපු මිනිසා තමයි, මගෙන් කිසිම වරදක් සිදු වී නැතත් කුණු බල්ලාට බනින්නා වාගේ මෙම ගරු සභාවට ඇවිත් මට බැන්නෙ. මෙවැනි මිනිසුනුයි අද දේශ පාලන ජීවිතයේ අවංක මිනිසුන් හැටියට පෙනී සිටින්නෙ. අවසාන වශයෙන් ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, මේ වගන්තිය කියා මගේ කථාව අවසන් කරනවා.

The way he spoke yesterday was disgraceful. I shall conclude by saying that the labourer is worthy of his hire.

කථානායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please! The Sitting is suspended till 2 P.M.

දස්විම ඊට අනුකූලව නවකාලිකව අත්සිටුවන ලදීන් අ. හ. 2ට නැවත පවත්වන ලදී.

அதன்படி அமர்வு இடைநிறுத்தப்பட்டு, மீண்டும் பி.ப. 2 மணிக்கு ஆரம்பமாயிற்று.

Sitting accordingly suspended till 2 P.M. and then resumed.

කථානායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Before we proceed with the Debate, I wish to read out to hon. Members the provisions of Standing Order 89.

"The conduct of His Majesty, Members of the Royal Family, the Governor-General or Officer Administering the Government, Members of either House of Parliament, Judges or other persons engaged in the administration of justice shall not be raised except upon a substantive motion; and in any amendment question to a member, or remarks in a debate in a motion dealing with any other subject, reference to the conduct of the persons aforesaid shall be out of order."

I read out this Standing Order because when I ruled in the morning that reference to the conduct of a Member was out of Order there appeared to be some doubt about the correctness of my Ruling. I would request hon. Members to observe the provisions of that Standing Order.

I should also like to mention the fact that there have been a number of interruptions in the course of this Debate, and when I call hon. Members to Order they flout my Ruling. If an hon. Member flouts my Ruling I have power under Standing Order 84 to order him to withdraw immediately from the House, and I shall do so, whoever he be.

I ask hon. Members for their co-operation.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Mr. Speaker, I am glad you have reminded all hon. Members of this House as regards the manner in which we should conduct ourselves in this House, and I shall in the course of my speech try to adhere scrupulously to that very—

කථානායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

I never had any fears that the Hon. Prime Minister would not observe the Standing Orders.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

—valuable admonition that you gave.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Some of his Colleagues might follow his example.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

It is only natural that in this last Budget Debate of this Parliament we should have heated arguments tossed across the Floor of the House. Either side is straining at the bit to start the election campaign throughout the country, and in spite of the unhappy interludes, we have had valuable discussion on policy matters, too in the course of this Debate.



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

But before I go on I must myself congratulate the Minister of Finance on his exemplary performance during his term of office. It compares favourably with the performance of the Government immediately previous. I believe that in the space of about four years they had five Ministers of Finance, starting with the hon. Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike), then my Hon. Friend on my left (Hon. C. P. de Silva) who was for a very short period Minister of Finance, then the hon. Member for Kegalle (Mr. Kalugalla), then from Dompe to Tumpane, the hon. Member for Kolonnawa (Mr. Ilangaratne) and finally winding up with my distinguished Friend, the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera), who is to speak next. So that, compared with that record I think the Minister of Finance of this Government has more than ample reason to pat himself on the back.

Moreover, before I finish my speech I shall strive to show that in spite of the economic difficulties that he was confronted with he has managed to steer the ship of State to its present position.

The hon. Fair Member for Mirigama (Mrs. Obeyesekere) made a very interesting speech. Although I was not in the House, I listened to every word of it—I am fortunately able to do so from my room here—and what she said was that everybody is getting tired of these charges that are being flung about—"You did that; we did this. We did this; you did that"—from this side of the House and from that side, and the people are tired of these things. Naturally, people would be tired of these things. But I should like to remind hon. Members opposite that it is they who start all this. They start these accusations and often we have to remind them that such accusations come with illgrace from some of them. That is what we have said. I do not subscribe to the view that if you have done something wrong, we

are entitled to do something wrong ourselves. But having done this, for God's sake keep your mouths shut. That is what I would like to say. Do not force us to come out with all kinds of things that happened in the past. That is all I ask of the hon. Members opposite.

There was this unfortunate exchange of words this morning. I must say a few things in fairness to the Hon. Minister of Commerce and Trade because I know the particular details about that matter. In the first instance, I think the hon. Member for Katugampola (Mr. Subasinghe) made the charge that the Hon. Minister was seeking a seat. He never was seeking a seat. I can emphatically deny that. The Hon. Minister of Commerce and Trade did not seek a seat. Secondly, it was said that he was seeking an Ambassador's post. He never did that. It is I who sought him for an Ambassador's post. Then I had to delay his appointment because there was a charge brought against him, which has been a subject over which some of the Members have been, bandying words across the Floor of this House.

There was an allegation which came to my knowledge. I myself had not the faintest doubt that he would clear his name, but with that allegation hanging over his head I could not have appointed him as High Commissioner. The moment his name was cleared I did so.

I think I asked the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) just before we retired for lunch, "Surely, you know that the Hon. Minister's name was cleared?" The hon. Member for Yatiyantota said, "No it was time-barred." Surely, the hon. Member for Yatiyantota knows that we in this country generally act on the principle that a man is not guilty until he is found guilty. Surely, he accepts that principle as much as any of us do. The fact is that, whether it was time-barred or whatever the reason, the Hon. Minister was freed of the allegation that was made against him. As regards his coming forward as a candidate to contest the Nattandiya seat



2051

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

[ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක]

again, at the by-election, I must say that too was not his decision. All kinds of wild accusations were made against the Hon. Minister. This morning I was here when that question was raised. I did not want to join and add to the confusion, but I owe it to hon. Members of this House to put the record straight. As a matter of fact I am very glad I wanted him to go as a representative of this country. He served our country well, and I am glad I have him in my Cabinet as a Minister.

Now, I do not wish to fling charges and counter-charges across the Floor of this House. I think our final Budget Debate should be treated with a great deal more respect than that. We have to account for our tenure of office. We have been here for more than four years and in spite of earlier gloomy prognostications I think we will be here for the full five years.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Ha! Ha!

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Are you doubting that?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

The voters will decide that.

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I have no doubt about that decision. None whatever.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

There are others who thought like that.

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I am talking of these five years at least. I am asking you whether you have any doubt that we will go through these five years.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

There is no doubt about that.

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

But there were grave doubts among some of you.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Do not include me.

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I am glad the Budget of the Hon. Minister of Finance removed all doubts about that. But there were very gloomy prognostications. I do not want to remind you about the three months becoming six months, the six months becoming one year, the one year becoming two years, the two years becoming three years, the three years becoming four years. And the four years will become five years. In relation to some of the accusations that you sometimes make, it will not be longer than five years.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Of course not.

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Of course, not. And it will be so.

Now let us come to the Budget. Apart from having to occasionally deal with some extraneous matters



that may have arisen during the course of this Budget Debate which demand an answer, I propose to confine myself mainly to the financial aspects as far as these years are concerned. But it is necessary for me to go as long back as 1956 to put before this House and the country the whole picture, and that is why I need a certain amount of time.

Why is 1956 significant? That was the year, after nine years' rule of this country by the United National Party, when another regime came into being, admittedly through the wish of the people. And 1965 was the year when that regime and its successors handed over the government of this country again to a coalition headed by the United National Party. So it is important to deal with the period from 1956. What was the situation then? Now, I remember that the hon. Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike), when he was Minister of Finance and endeavouring to acquaint himself with certain technicalities and terminology as regards finance, told us, on the occasion of a certain Budget speech, "We are not like the U. N. P. Government. We do not keep our external assets outside. We shall bring them inside." The hon. Member will bear me witness. He is laughing at the statement. He remembers that statement. In my speech from the Opposition I had to comment on that statement, "We are not like U. N. P. Why should we keep the external assets outside? We have brought them inside."

Now, I want to deal with the process of bringing these external assets inside. It is a very important matter. It is needless for me to explain to this august House that it is important and essential to have external assets at a certain satisfactory level, particularly for a country such as ours which is heavily weighted with an export-import economy, for the vagaries of international trade are such that you can suddenly have heavy deficits in the balance of payments. You can only face such a situation with a sufficient cushion of external assets.

Well, what was the level of external assets you inherited in 1956? External assets to the tune of Rs. 1,200 million. That was what you inherited from the outgoing U. N. P. Government. What has happened in the course of nine years? When we come to 1965 we find that external assets amounting to almost Rs. 1,000 million had been run down. That is the great process that the then Minister of Finance, the hon. Member for Dompe, spoke of. He said, "We are not like the U. N. P. We will bring the external assets home." They ran them down. Yes, they brought them home!

I would not criticize them at all if the external assets were run down for development purposes. While running down the external assets were you able to start different ventures of a developmental nature because of which you can do with a lower level of external assets? No.

I think the hon. Member for Yatiyantota and I were the biggest critics of that Government on that score, until, of course, he joined them. Both of us criticized that Government not for running down the external assets but for running them down without any development of a substantial nature. That was the main basis of our criticism. He even went on to refer to the *seeni bola* industries that were started. Now that was the situation, and that was the criticism. You had a very satisfactory cushion in regard to external assets. You ran them down in the course of nine years to the tune of Rs. 1,000 million. And what have you to show for those nine years in the nature of any substantial development to warrant a lower level of external assets? That is the first criticism I make. How did you do that? Look at the Budgets from 1956 to 1960—the tremendous overall deficits, overall deficits not covered by non-inflationary measures, overall deficits not covered by taxation, overall deficits not covered by borrowings. As I criticized then and as you, the hon. Members for Yatiyantota, criticized then, it was



[ගරු ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක]

covered by credit creation and, we had occasion to say, by the printing of money. What was the result?

Is it surprising that the external assets were run down? You create a greater purchasing power in the community, and while creating that greater purchasing power in the community by printing money, you do not step up production internally. Obviously, there is a greater propensity to import. Imports started pouring in at a very high rate, and you were able to allow those imports to come in for four years because of the cushion of external assets you inherited from the U. N. P. Government in 1956. You ran them down up to 1960. You created money, and the greater propensity to import resulted in greater imports. There was no production here to mop up the purchasing power.

Those goods had to come from abroad. The goods came unimpeded up to 1960, and you had an adverse balance of payments not as a result of an adverse turn in the terms of trade. If it had resulted from an adverse turn in the terms of trade I would not blame you: you cannot control the terms of trade. Look at the terms of trade indices for the period 1956 to 1960. You will find temporary monthly fluctuations, it is almost level or slightly favourable. For the period from 1956 to 1960 that was the situation. So you cannot blame an adverse turn in the terms of trade for the adverse balance of payments.

Your large Budgets deficits financed to a large extent by the creation of money was the sole cause of the running down of the external assets. That is why we blame you for that period. And I come to the next period.

At the beginning of the next period, the poor Member for Dompe—I do not say 'poor' in the literal sense; shall I say, unfortunate—became Minister of Finance. When he became Minister of Finance he was

faced with a situation of not being able to run down the external assets any longer. They were reaching dangerous levels. What had he to do? He started controls. It was the hon. Member for Dompe as Finance Minister who started import controls. That was the next barrier he set up to prevent the drain of external assets.

Then, of course, they speak about the World Bank. I shall deal at length with the World Bank and our dealings with the World Bank. Hon. Members speak about the World Bank and our being subject to their dictates. Did we not produce—I think the hon. Member for Yatiyantota was also on that side of the House—a Cabinet Paper where the hon. Member for Dompe as Minister of Finance had come forward with the suggestion of a cut in the rice ration after discussions with the World Bank representatives? What are you talking about the World Bank and us for?—[Interruption]. The hon. Member for Minuwangoda was probably not in the Cabinet then. I produced the Cabinet Paper, a copy of the Cabinet Paper, here in this House. If you refer to the HANSARD, you will find the contents of the Cabinet Paper there. I brought it here and referred to it in the Debate, even before the hon. Member for Dompe, as Minister of Finance, actually cut the rice ration.

Earlier he was preparing the Cabinet for the cut in the rice ration, and we know how the rice ration was cut subsequently, how the Ministers agreed.

There was a procession that went past this House shouting, "හැල් සේරු දෙකක් අපට එපා." Actually the demonstration was organized by the then S. L. F. P. I remember that procession going past this House and it was mainly from Dompe. And only a man from Dompe can say, "හැල් සේරු දෙකක් අපට එපා." It was a demonstration by some stragglers passing the House shouting, "හැල් සේරු දෙකක් අපට එපා."



And we had the extraordinary spectacle of a Cabinet having decided these budget proposals, rushing back and changing a fundamental proposal in the Budget as regards the reduction of the rice subsidy. And they dumped the hon. Member for Dompe overboard. And though he said, "I will never come back even to plant grass," it was to plant grass that he came back because he came back as Minister of Agriculture. After departing with the emphatic statement, "I will not come back even to plant grass," it was only to plant grass that he came back. He did not plant paddy, but he planted grass!

I was listening to the speech of the hon. Member for Dompe from my room. He said we must forget all these endeavours to score debating points. We must think of the national good. We want politicians who have the courage to do what they think is right. He had the courage and he got dumped. But how does he, after thinking that the right thing was to cut the rice ration without any other change—he thought the right thing was to cut the rice ration in the interests of the country—now get up and criticize our halving the rice ration and giving the remaining measure of rice free? I ask him that question.

Yes, the Government had the courage to do the right thing, which has turned out to be the right thing by subsequent events that have taken place in this country, by the development that has taken place. I shall deal with development on the agricultural front in this country. This Government had the courage to do the right thing regardless of consequences, the right thing in the best interests of the country.

Now, having inherited in 1965 that parlous situation—I am not contending that our external assets situation is today satisfactory by any means. No. I am definitely not making that statement. Having inherited that difficult situation as regards external

assets we had to build up. Up to about 1966 we were building up our external assets. But what happened in 1966? You know that forces entirely beyond our control dealt us some severe blows in 1966 and in 1967.

First of all, we had the drop in prices of tea followed by the drop in prices of rubber, and as a result of this adverse turn in the terms of trade we lost, I would like to inform hon. Members of this House, Rs. 1,041 million in exchange compared to 1965 which was not a boom year for our exports. Compared to our earnings in 1965, up to the end of 1968 we lost Rs. 1,041 million in exchange. That was due to the drop in prices of tea and the drop in prices of rubber. That was not all.

I would like to say this before I go on to the next point. Our external earnings for 1968 were the lowest since 1953, and I challenge any hon. Member to dispute that fact. The external earnings of our exports in 1968 reached the lowest level since 1953. Sixteen years have expired, and you can understand the population increase in that period of sixteen years. The external earnings are at about the same level or a little more. That is due to matters completely beyond our control—an adverse turn in the terms of trade. That is one.

What is the other? We experienced a steep rise in the price of rice. I have mentioned this matter earlier. In 1965 the Minister of Food was buying rice at £37 a ton. By the end of 1968 he was buying rice at £70 odd a ton, almost double the price he paid in 1965.

So we had on the one hand a considerable loss in external earnings due to the drop in the prices of tea and rubber; on the other we had a doubling of the price of rice, our chief article of diet. That was the



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70 :

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ගරු ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක]

situation. Apart from our having inherited from the previous Government an unsatisfactory level of external assets, we had to face those two blows as well.

In these circumstances, what had we to decide to do? There were three main things we had to decide upon. Our first objective was to cut down as much as possible, our imports by increasing our local production of food, industrial goods and various other things that can be produced locally which were hitherto imported. Secondly, we had to step up our export of products other than the traditional exports. There were certain crops that were grown earlier in this country which were languishing, crops such as cinnamon, citronella, cardamom and so on. Thirdly, we had to protect as much as possible our traditional export-earners such as tea, rubber and produce of that sort.

We are aware, hon. Members across are also aware, of the important position occupied by the tea industry in the economy of our country. The tea industry has had frequent unfortunate times during this period—in the years 1966 and 1967; then again today, that is an unfortunate fact. We had to take action, whilst diversifying our economy, whilst leaning much heavily on these traditional exports, to increase our other exports and to have substitutes for imports. Those were the main criteria, the objectives, we were guided by.

Now for the performance. Hon. Members, as I said on an earlier occasion, decry very often the figures or the statements in the Central Bank Report, but they themselves quote from it copiously, when it suits them, to support their own arguments—not that those statements do in fact support their arguments. But I have noticed that also happening. Let us be honest about this. Let us realize that the Central Bank performs an independent function, a very valuable function. It is very important for all Governments that that function should be performed in that

manner. In fact, I remember a time during the previous regime when it was contemplated to control the Central Bank as well, because the then Minister of Finance was not satisfied with some of the statements that emanated from the Central Bank in their reports. We have not done so and we do not intend to do so. But it is a fact.

You are talking about, “What is this 8.3 increase in Gross National Product?” But you yourself criticized us when the Gross National Product did not increase so much. Look at your speeches, hon. Member for Yatiyantota. You took the figures of the Central Bank in your earlier speeches on Budget Debates, and you said “the Gross National Product has only increased by so much.” You quoted a year when, in regard to the Gross National Product, the real increase went down. You relied heavily on those figures. You said that that was very bad. Now, say it is very good when it is 8.3. If the earlier figure of increase of the Gross National Product was unsatisfactory as quoted by you, have the kindness to admit and compliment the Government when the Gross National Product has increased by 8.3.

I am sorry that the hon. Member for Anuradhapura (Mr. Ratnayake) is not here. He ought to know best about the increase in the production of rice. He had occasion, in the course of his speech in the Throne Speech Debate, to cast doubts on this increase in the production of rice. I asked him to go with me when I went on a tour. Between that Throne Speech Debate and now I have appeared on a platform with him at Anuradhapura. I wish he was here now. I should like to ask him whether he still maintains what he said. In fact, when he was here I asked him across the Floor, “Now what do you say?” There was not a word from him. In the Anuradhapura District there were a number of farmers with achievements of over 200 bushels an acre—not just one isolated case. The hon. Member was there. I did not want to make him uncomfortable by



asking him to get up and say that all these were lies ; that all these were fictitious statements ; that all these cultivators were huribugs. I was tempted to ask him to do that. I knew he would be in a very uncomfortable situation. There were not one or two but fifty to sixty persons including two or three women. The Hon. Minister of Communications was also there.

You know very well that there has been a tremendous increase in production. Do not try to deny the obvious. You are hitting your heads against the rock when you try to deny the obvious. It was only the other day that I went to the Bibile area. I know what the yields there were some years back. The yield there now is 85 bushels an acre in an area which has still to be supplied with irrigation facilities. There has been a tremendous input—inputs of various kinds. Various factors have contributed towards this increase.

For instance, there is the input of fertilizer. You are talking of the price of fertilizer. Do you know that more fertilizer than ever before in this country has today been taken by the cultivators of Ceylon ?

The hon. Member for Katugampola (Mr. Subasinghe) quoted figures, probably to show that rice cultivation is a loss. Are these farmers cultivating for my sake ? Are all these paddy cultivators of Ceylon showing this tremendous enthusiasm for a national cause, at a loss ? No, they are making profits. They are making profits and you have only to go among them to realize what these profits are.

I would also like to quote some figures. In the case of flour, for example, imports in 1968 were much less than in 1967—359,000 tons in 1968 as against 517,000 tons in 1967. But consumption in 1968 was only slightly less than in 1967—423,000 tons as against 433,000 tons. This was because in 1967, after the rice ration cut, the Government over-imported

flour and there was a very large stock of flour. This was done because immediately after the rice ration cut there was a tremendous rush for flour. People got panicky ; the Government also got panicky because in the first month or two there was a tremendous draw. The Government started importing and thus there were over-imports. At the end of 1967 these stocks had been imported but not consumed.

In the case of rice, imports have come down from 374,000 tons in 1967 to 333,000 tons in 1968, while the quantity of imported rice consumed, that is, the rice issued on the ration, has come down from 351,000 tons in 1967 to 300,000 tons in 1968. The quantity of imported rice consumed in 1969 is likely to come down still further to about 270,000 tons.

Let us take rice and flour together. That was one of your big arguments. "They may be consuming less rice they may be importing less rice, but they are consuming more flour." There was also the big argument of the hon. Member for Dambulla (Mr. T. B. Tennekoon) about loaves of bread.

Take rice and flour together. The total consumption of imported cereals in 1968 amounted to 723,000 tons. In order to make a comparison with cereals consumed in previous years it is necessary to choose a suitable base year for the purpose. I do not think 1964 is suitable as a base year because in 1964, that is your period, there was a drought. If we do take 1964 as the base year, we find that the quantity of imported rice and flour consumed in that year was 834,000 tons. But it might be said that it is unfair—and I agree—to take that year as the base year because of adverse weather conditions. If, therefore we take the average for the years 1961-64, the imports of rice and flour together in this period average 763,000 tons a year. Between the mid-point of the period 1961-1964 and 1968 there has been an increase of over 10 per cent in the country's population. So, even if



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

[මැ. ඩබ්ලි සේනානායක]

the per capita consumption of cereals had remained constant—I say the per capita consumption of cereals had not remained constant—hon. Members will realize that people are eating more rice than they did before. The consumption of cereals has increased. The hon. Member for Baddegama (Mr. Neal de Alwis) is laughing. I shall gladly go with him to his constituency and talk to the cultivators. Will he extend that invitation to me?

නිල් ද අල්විස් මය.

(තිரு. நீல் டி அல்விஸ்)

(Mr. Neal de Alwis)

Yes.

මැ. ඩබ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I accept, it, as I accepted the invitation of the hon. Member for Anuradhapura (Mr. Rathnayake). In point of fact, because of the increase in incomes, the per capita consumption of cereals, particularly rice, has probably gone up in the last year or two. But I am not assuming that. I am assuming what you said, namely that it has not gone up.

Another indication of the increase in locally produced rice is the free market price of locally produced rice. Although imports of rice have been sharply reduced since the cut in the rice ration and the price increase under the G. P. S., the price of, locally produced rice in the open market is still of the order of 90 cents to Re. 1.10 per measure, which is not significantly different from that which prevailed before the rice ration was cut and the G. P. S. price was increased.

Those are the facts. I am glad that some of the hon. Members of the Opposition have confessed that it is so; some have given qualified approval in the sense that it is not to the extent that the Government claims, but there has been an increase. So, to say that there has

been no increase is to make yourself ludicrous in the eyes of the people themselves. I am glad you say that there is no increase. I want you to say that more. I am happiest when you go and say that there is no increase in the production of rice. I want you to go more and more to the cultivators and tell them that. Then they will realize the strength and validity of your other points of criticism. They can judge it by that very fact.

Another argument put forward by hon. Members of the Opposition is, "If you have increased the production of rice so much, why do you not give the two measures of rice?" Do you want me to deal with it here and now and dispose of it? Our target was a target of 75 per cent self-sufficiency by 1970. We claim that we have achieved that target a year ahead of schedule, that is, 1969. That means even 25 per cent of our requirements has still to be imported. We will have either to import or we will have to compulsorily acquire rice from the cultivator. You remember the war years, during which there was compulsory acquisition of rice at a price of Rs. 6 a bushel. I remember those war years. I was then a Member of the State Council and so was the hon. Member. You shouted against that. You worked up the people. You said that the Government was doing a heinous thing in compulsorily acquiring the surplus production of the cultivators.

Now, to give two measures of rice we will have to compulsorily acquire all the produce of the cultivator, beyond a certain amount necessary for the wife and family and a little extra for the cultivator. Are you advocating that we do that? This Government will never do that. It may be that you are intending to give two measures of rice by that process. Let the cultivators know that. Or, you will have to import rice and that will also be the death knell of the cultivators. If you flood the market with imported rice you would again be hitting the cultivator. That



is why I say that a change of government will bring ruin to the cultivators of Ceylon. The rural population and the cultivators of Ceylon never had it so good. You have by your own pronouncement given an indication to the cultivators of Ceylon what lies in store for them if you do assume the reins of office. So much for your giving two measures of rice.

It is not only agricultural expansion that has taken place. If you look at the Central Bank Report, you will see there has been an industrial expansion to the tune of 47 per cent for 1968. If you want me to quote the exact statement you will find it on page 21 of the Report :

".... It is mentioned elsewhere in this Report that agricultural production for domestic use rose by 29 per cent in 1968, while industrial production rose by 47 per cent."

So this has not been an expansion in agriculture alone. There has been an even greater expansion in 1968 on the industrial front. Now, in their time and until we started the FEECs scheme, industrial expansion was held up. With the bringing into being of the FEECs scheme there was a freeing, although at a higher price, to a certain extent, of exchange to import raw materials. Factories that were working at less than full capacity were able to go forward. That is how, to a great extent, this industrial expansion was brought about.

In spite of all these difficulties, I shall show you how we managed to find the resources, to find the exchange. I shall deal with that later. I have dealt with the difficulties we had; I have dealt with the agricultural expansion that has taken place; I have given facts and figures; I have dealt with the industrial expansion that has taken place, construction activity that has taken place. You will find the facts and figures relating to all that if you care to study them.

I wish to state that in spite of all these difficulties the current Budget provides more expenditure than any other Budget this country ever had, for various activities. The highest amounts were for development and capital activities. In spite of all these difficulties, in spite of the adverse turn in the terms of trade, the capital expenditure provided in the Budget the Hon. Minister of Finance has presented which we are just dealing with, is even higher than that record.

Now, before I go on to deal with the means by which we were able to do this, I would like to say a word as regards the tea industry.

Much criticism has been levelled against this Government in regard to the tea industry. The Minister of Commerce and Trade, I thought, would have dealt with it.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා  
(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)  
(Dr. N. M. Perera)  
He was otherwise occupied.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක  
(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)  
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

However, there was the Tea Commission report. The first thing we did when we realized that tea was coming in for a difficult time was to give it some encouragement. In fact there are various gentlemen in the planting industry who make statements of various sorts about tea. When I had the 'audacity' to state, at a function in regard to the encouragement of tourism, that we should seek other means of earning foreign exchange because tea would not give us the same exchange it has been giving us in the past, I was laughed at by the planting community. "What rot is this Prime Minister speaking?"—that was their attitude. And they are now running after us to save tea—the very people who were so optimistic about the



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

[මැ. ඩබ්ලි සේනානායක]

future of tea. I do not say tea is doomed. I say some very drastic steps have to be taken. For instance, it will be very necessary to reduce the acreage of tea with high yielding tea and to confine the growing of tea to certain areas.

These are matters we have to take up. Many of the recommendations in the Tea Commission report we have implemented. There is also this other factor that is staring us in the face, a matter in which Ceylon has played a big part in attaining certain objectives, and that is over-production of tea.

There is an F. A. O. report which has definitely predicted that, taking into account future consumption trends, by 1975, unless some measures are taken, production will be 13 per cent in excess of demand.

Now, considering that the F. A. O. report has been subject to scrutiny by a committee of experts and passed as correct, what had to be done?

There are countries which had started out in a big way to open up tea, the African countries. Kenya alone has a potential of 3 million acres that they can open up with tea. The climatic conditions are suitable, the soil condition is satisfactory. I do not think the labourers will have Trotskyite leaders.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

They may get them down.

මැ. ඩබ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

They might get our people to come there. After the next elections, they might get our leaders down.

Those are the conditions there. There is a potential of 3 million acres in Kenya alone.

Now what had to be done? We had to take action on that front too. And in certain cases World Bank loans were financing the opening up of tea. That was the situation. Even India did not think the situation was serious until Ceylon started agitating on this matter. You see, India is in a different position. Her internal consumption of tea is almost a bottomless pit. So it is difficult for India to agree to a scheme of restriction of production, but India can agree to a scheme of restriction of exports. So we first had to convince India. That matter was achieved.

There was then a meeting in Rome where a step forward was taken, and I am glad to be able to say that at Mauritius the other day the producer countries agreed on bringing into operation a scheme by January 1970. That is a tremendous achievement. We cannot wait till a tea agreement is signed. The procedures to sign a tea agreement will take a very long time because both the consumers and the producers have to get together. Pending the signing of a tea agreement at Mauritius the producer countries have agreed to a scheme by which they would voluntarily cut down production. I say that as far as this Government is concerned that has been one of the greatest achievements on the tea front.

The next point I come to is, how was this made possible? I heard some very amusing arguments. It is easier to hear these speeches in my room because there I can while listening smoke my pipe, which I cannot do here. I heard the argument decrying the manner in which aid has been used. I think it was the hon. Member for Kotte (Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne) who said that aid has been used for consumption; it should have been used for development.

Does the hon. Member realize that we have got to assess the total resources available each year for development and for consumption? That



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

is a stark fact. Once we have the total clear we use a portion for development and a portion for consumption. It does not matter whether you use for consumption the money given by A and you use for development the money given by B. You divide the total amount available for any given year and set aside a portion for consumption and you set aside a portion for development. That is what we have been doing.

And does the hon. Member think that we should not have taken this aid? The argument of the hon. Member was that we have done something terrible in taking this aid. I shall show hon. Members what the conditions of this aid have been and how terrible it would have been had we not had any aid. If it is bad to take aid, commodity aid, do they expect us to set aside money for development by cutting down on consumption by the people? We were able to maintain a certain level of consumption and bring about this unprecedented tempo of development because on the one hand we were assisted by local production, agriculturally and industrially, and on the other hand we had this assistance that was given by certain institutions and certain countries, which we appreciate very much.

They talk of the IMF. I do not know whether the hon. Member for Yatiyantota will be guilty of this howler. I do not think so, and I know he would not. The IMF does not belong to any particular country. The International Monetary Fund by its very name is an international fund. He knows very well that it is meant to assist countries when they have temporary balance of payments difficulties. We had balance of payments difficulties, as I said earlier, by an adverse turn in the terms of trade occasioned to a great extent by a drop in the prices of rubber and tea. And in that body we are a member, as every country is a member. It is not managed by any one country. Hearing some of these speeches, one would think that the IMF belongs to a particular country.

It is an international body, of which all countries are members. I think the socialist bloc of countries are also members of the IMF. All the countries are members and when they have temporary payments difficulties, when they anticipate these difficulties, they go for accommodation, and the hon. Member for Yatiyantota, when he was Finance Minister, was seeking that accommodation. Can he deny that? He will not deny that because he knows he was seeking that accommodation. He knows that the first instalment you get is without any conditions. He knows that very well. In regard to subsequent drawings from the IMF, the IMF as an international body, not a body belonging to a particular country, imposes conditions. He knows that very well. Their Government was lucky enough to get the first without a condition. But he knows very well that for the second and the third and thereafter conditions are imposed.

The IMF does not say, "You take this money." We can refuse to take the money. We can brush aside their conditions. Then we have got to open our mouth and find the money somewhere else or we have to cut down development or consumption or cut down both.

They spoke of aid. We are very glad that various countries have come to our assistance with aid at this critical time in the history of this country. I would like to take this opportunity of expressing my gratitude for, and appreciation of, the readiness with which those countries have come to our assistance. From the time we assumed office up to now, I want to tell hon. Members of this House, we have got in the shape of assistance of that nature on different terms up to Rs. 700 million—Rs. 700 million aid.

Hon. Members talk about various things, how we have tied down the future of this country, mortgaged the future of this country. Do they realize that certain countries have given this aid without any interest?



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ගරු ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක]

Do they realize that certain countries have given this aid free, *gratis*, as donations? I want to tell him that if you work out the different terms you find that some countries have allowed a grace period of a considerable number of years during which we need not pay back any instalments. Some countries have allowed us to pay back in 25 years or 50 years' time. Some countries charge no interest whatsoever. Rs. 700 million is the sum we have got as aid. Consider the different conditions. Some have charged interest; others have not. When we add it all up, it comes to 2½ per cent to 3 per cent interest. The hon. Member knows a lot about money-lending. I do not say he does it. I know he knows others who do. Give me some money at even double that rate of interest!

Now, that is the situation as regards aid. We have been criticized and told that we have sold our country for generations. Is that how, in spite of the adverse economic conditions and adverse terms of trade, we have been able to do an unprecedented amount of work in this country? If you travel the length and breadth of this country you cannot fail to notice that never has there been so much activity as you find today. And that is a stark fact.

Take the various projects. Take Maskeliya-oya. What is taking place there? Then you have the Walawe and the Mahaveli-ganga projects. I shall deal with that too because it is necessary.

The Mahaveli-ganga project is the biggest project this country will ever have, whether in the present, the past, or the future. Today our biggest river is going to waste. Only a fraction, an infinitesimal fraction of it, is being tapped for the Minipe scheme. I was surprised when the hon. Member for Medawachchiya (Mr. Maithripala Senanayake) spoke about the Mahaveli-ganga being tapped for Minneriya and Parakrama Samudra. He does not know even the facts of irrigation in his own pro-

vince. The Mahaveli-ganga was not tapped for those. The whole lot of those tanks—Elahera, Minneriya Kaudulla, Kantalai, Parakrama Samudra—are fed by the waters of the Amban-ganga alone, a tributary of the Mahaveli-ganga. In ancient times too the Mahaveli-ganga was tapped only for Minipe and for the extension of the Minipe-ela.

What does this scheme seek to do? The diversion of the Mahaveli-ganga to the North-Central Province and the North. The waters that are flowing now into the sea, sometimes doing harm and damage to mankind in the shape of floods, will be harnessed to irrigate the dry areas of our country. And what will eventually result from this diversion? Apart from the development of hydro-electric power, 250,000 acres of existing land will be assured of a water supply whether there is rain or no rain in those areas. Today, you know, the yala cultivation has failed because the tanks in the N. C. P. did not get filled. There will be no failures after this scheme comes into operation. In addition to the 250,000 acres a further 750,000 acres will benefit. The total paddy acreage in Ceylon is only fifteen lakhs. The Mahaweli Scheme covers an acreage of 2 1/2 lakhs of existing and 7 1/2 lakhs of new land. That is why I say that the scheme will be the biggest scheme that this country can ever have at any time.

The hon. Members spoke about the question of cost of living even in this Debate. I dealt with it in my speech on the Debate on the Address and I do not want to repeat the same arguments in this Debate. But I merely want to refer to it because the hon. Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike) in his Budget Speech has twisted a statement that was made by me. What did he say? He said, "The Prime Minister had developed a new theory and that is that the sign of prosperity is judged by the increase in the prices." I did not say that. I said that the criterion of the standard of living is not merely a decrease in prices. I said that there are countries



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

considered most developed in the world whose prices of goods are very high. I also said that in those same countries the wages of the community are correspondingly high and therefore they are able to purchase those goods. I used the same standard to judge the situation in Ceylon. Yes, our prices have gone up for various reasons.

Firstly, the hon. Members must know that devaluation means that there will be a rise in the prices of goods. It must be so. Devaluation must result in the rupee increase in the price of goods. It has to be so. You all criticized devaluation. The justification for the devaluation is that in spite of the devaluation still tea is having a difficult time. What would have happened to tea today if we did not devalue? I am asking that question from each and every hon. Member who criticized devaluation. In spite of the devaluation tea is facing a difficult situation. What would have happened if there was no devaluation?

Now, with regard to the question of wages of the rural population. Yes, their incomes have increased. I say that although the prices of goods have increased their incomes and wages have increased more and therefore they are able to buy more goods than they bought before. That is my answer to the argument that the cost of goods has increased, and I shall support it with facts and figures. This is also from the Central Bank Report. You find this in Table 45 of this report.

I shall first deal with the minimum wage rate index of workers in wages board trades. You find that the index of real wage rates of workers in agriculture when we assumed office in 1965 was 103.4. Is that correct? In 1968 it was 114.3. Is that correct? That is the increase in real wage rates of workers in agriculture. I shall now take workers in industry and commerce. In 1965, when we took over, the index of real wage rates was 118.0. Is that correct?

Contradict me if it is wrong. In 1968 the index of real wage rates of workers in industry and commerce was 133.1. There seems to be no contradiction. I now come to workers in wages board trades. When we took over in 1965 the index of real wage rates of workers in wages board trades was 105.0. At the end of 1968 it was 116.3.

I now come to wage rate figures of government employees. You find this in Table 46 of the Central Bank Report.—[Interruption].

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I shall answer.

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් ජේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

These things demand an answer. I shall now deal with wage rates of government employees, the section that you like to play about a lot with. The first category is technical and clerical employees. The index of real wage rates of technical and clerical employees when we took over in 1965 was 108.7. At the end of 1968 it was 115.4. All this is not taking into account the recent increase of Rs. 120 million. This is all before that. I shall deal with that Rs. 120 million and what you said when you were here. I have got it here too.

I now come to the index of real wage rates of minor employees. When we took over in 1965 the index of real wage rates of minor employees was 115.9; at the end of 1968 it was 134.3.

The next category is all Central Government employees. When we took over in 1965 the index of real wage rates of all Central Government employees was 112.6; at the end of 1968—this is also not taking into account the increase of Rs. 120 million it was 125.7.



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක]

The next category is government school teachers. In 1965 the index of real wage rates of government school teachers was 104.4; at the end of 1968 it was 106.7.

Those are the stark facts. That is why your every effort to create chaos has failed. Those are the stark facts and the workers realize what is the government that really looks after their welfare.

Now what did you tell them when you were Finance Minister?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා  
(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)  
(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Read it, read the whole thing.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක  
(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)  
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I am reading the whole thing that matters, as far as the public servants are concerned. The hon. Member for Yatiyantota came fresh after the 21 demands asked for at Galle Face. The hon. Leader of the Opposition responded, and lo and behold, he was Finance Minister! You see, හැන්දෑ අතටම ලැබුණා, බෙදන්න. He had proudly demanded that any Government must give these 21 demands. He assured that this wage increase was one of the demands that should be conceded. Well, as Finance Minister, I suppose these people all expected: දැන් අපේ මිනිහට හැන්දෑ ලැබුණා. දැන් සහෝදරය අපට බෙදයි. what did the *Sahodharaya* say? I am quoting from his Budget speech:

"Much no doubt remains. Of what remains, like the political rights of Government servants which do not involve any financial outlay, I would do my best to implement early within the course of this year."

That is, those that involved no financial outlay.

".... In regard to those which involve financial commitments I hope to provide some satisfaction as the financial situation improves. Indeed if the finances improve as I hope and expect, as a result of better co-operation ...."

And you have tried to get them to deny us all co-operation.

".... and greater efficiency, I shall seriously ...."

Not implement,

"consider the implementation of the Wilmot Perera Report with suitable changes and modifications."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 30th July 1964; Vol. 56, c. 1698.]

ඔන්න බෙදුවා, හැන්දෑ ලැබිලා, බෙදුව යකා වෙ! And the Wilmot Perera Report recommendations amounted to only Rs. 60 million. The hon. Member spent most of his time here saying that we have ruined the Finances of this country, we are in a terrible financial mess. Therefore, presumably, he was in a better financial situation. He did not give them an increase amounting to Rs. 60 million. We have already given two allowance—a cost of living allowance and after that another interim allowance. And we have now in this Budget accepted the recommendations of the Salaries Commission as regards the public servants' salaries. ඔන්න නමුසෙ හැන්දෙන් බෙදුව හැටි! මේතන අපි හැන්දෙන් බෙදන හැටි.

That is the stark fact. The increase recommended in the Salaries Commission Report amount to Rs. 120 million and when you take in the allowances and all that, it is very much more. However, the point I make is this. In spite of that this Government has had to face this difficult situation.

You refused to grant them a sum of Rs. 60 million. And look at the amount we have granted. They tried to have another strike saying that I was not going to agree to the recommendations in the Interim Report of the Salaries Commission. As I said earlier, what I told the public servants was, "You can strike or do anything you like, but I am not increasing one cent." I was referring to last year's Budget. I said, "I am waiting for the interim report which I know I will get before we formulate our next Budget, and I will then



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

and only then grant an increase in salaries." I have carried out my undertaking.

What was your strike worth? Even if they did not strike for one second, they would have got it because I had undertaken to do so. They struck work to get something immediately, and as to what they got immediately, let the hon. Member for Yatiyantota explain.

As regards employment, I must emphasize the fact that it is only by development activity that employment opportunities could be created. And this Government has set in being a rate of development that never took place in this country at any time before in its whole history.

And that is why you blame me. That is why you say, with some ulterior motives that I made the statement that after the next term of office I am retiring from politics. After the next term there will be nothing much to do, and I am retiring because if this tempo can be maintained, most of the difficult problems of this country will be solved. I have no doubt about it.

There is a special committee that I have appointed as regards unemployment among graduates. Now, they are trying to work up the graduates. Having failed dismally with the public servants, they are now trying one on the graduates.

I have appointed a special committee which has submitted a very useful report suggesting various avenues of employment that could be opened up. I want the Cabinet to consider this very early and put this into operation when a number of graduates will be employed in Government Service, in the private sector and in self-employment. We anticipate that. I do not want to mention all the proposals because it has still not received the approval of the Cabinet. A special committee has been appointed for this purpose and it has made its recommendations

about the various ways in which graduates could be put in employment before the end of the year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having dealt generally with the financial aspects of the Budget, there are certain corrections I am in honour bound to make since certain people have suffered as a result of statements made under the cover of Privilege in this House. They have no opportunity whatsoever to reply to those allegations.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike) read out the photostat copy of a letter which he said had been written by Mr. Weera Wimalaratne. He produced that photostat copy in the House. It related to a request for a car and various other things.

The first thing I want to dispose of is this. The hon. Member for Dompe tried to insinuate that the Hon. Minister of Land, Irrigation and Power had something to do with that by merely reading out the letter purported to have been written by Mr. Weera Wimalaratne, which in itself is grossly unfair because anybody can write a letter saying that he can get anything done by a certain Minister without the Minister himself knowing anything about it. That is what this letter was about.

This is what Mr. Weera Wimalaratne has written to me :

"I am writing this letter to you to categorically deny I ever wrote a letter of the sort tabled by Mr. Felix Dias Bandaranaike in the House of Representatives on 25th July 1969.

I have seen a photostat copy of the said document handed over to you that day, as subsequently published in the S.L.F.P. daily 'Sirilaka.'

This is a deliberately manufactured document.

I have been in hospital down with a heart attack for the last five weeks since 23rd June 1969 and am writing this to you from my hospital bed."



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

[ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක]

He goes on to deny the authenticity of the document. I replied to say that I certainly would make a correction at the appropriate time, because he had not the opportunity of saying anything about this matter.

Then yesterday the hon. Member for Medawachchiya (Mr. Maithripala Senanayake) referred in the course of his speech to a tank built at the oil refinery. He said that the tank, which was now tilting, was constructed by Bonars (Ceylon) Limited. I got this letter yesterday from Bonars:

"Dear Sir,

I see from the report of the Daily News of the 22nd August 1969, reporting the proceedings in the Hon. House on 21st August 1969, that the Hon. Member for Medawachchiya, Mr. Maithripala Senanayake had in the course of his Budget speech stated that 'a Naphtha Tank constructed by M/s. Bonars (Ceylon) Limited has tilted.'

This is a gross and serious error, and is a great injustice done to my firm, which is a hundred per cent Ceylonese firm.

The construction of this particular tank was undertaken by a Japanese Firm by the name of 'SUMITOMO'.

I shall be deeply grateful if you would be so kind as to rectify this error."

Look at the terrible injustice done to this firm. The hon. Member is a deputy leader of the S.L.F.P. Bonars had nothing to do with the construction of that tank, and the hon. Member's statement is a gross misrepresentation of the truth.

In fact, Mr. Weera Wimalaratne wrote a second letter to me, which I will not read out, in which he makes the most terrible allegations against certain members with whom he says he worked before. He says he knows all their secrets, but I cannot hold myself responsible for those terrible allegations he makes and I am not reading out that letter. That is the situation. He says he was in the party, and he knows. But I shall not read it because I cannot hold myself responsible for the truth of those

statements although Mr. Weera Wimalaratne has sent them on to me. So hon. Members must be very careful.

Look at the situation of a firm like Bonars, a 100 per cent Ceylonese firm?

The other day I saw in the newspapers what the hon. Member for Akuressa (Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe) has been talking about—you had pulled him up—regarding some galvanizing firm and a relation of mine. I do not know whether any galvanizing firm has been started by a relation of mine. If it has been started by a relation of mine, are not his relations doing business? Is not his relation Sarath Wijesinghe carrying on the biggest business in Ceylon? I do not know which relation of mine he was referring to, or what this factory is and quite rightly you have corrected him. But, unfortunately, that particular paper chose to print that allegation in thick letters. The very allegation that you said the hon. Member could not make, appeared in thick black type in that newspaper.

කළානායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

It is a pity that this matter was not brought to my notice. It would amount to a breach of Privilege.

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

The very thing that you asked the hon. Member to withdraw, Mr. Speaker, is the one that is printed in thick letters. That is what is going on.

No, Mr. Speaker. We have, under the most difficult circumstances, facing tremendous economic problems, done a job of work. We do not say that we have no faults. We do not say that we have solved all the problems of this country. If we tried to tinker about with each and every problem we would have made no progress whatsoever. We had to



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

give an order of priority to certain important problems and concentrate on that. We gave that priority and I am glad, on those specific matters that we gave priority, we can report definite progress of which we can well be proud. We are not afraid to go to the country on that record, and I have no doubts in my mind as to what the verdict of the country will be.

අ. සා. 3.50

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I should like to get rid of one or two extraneous matters before I come to the Budget.

The Hon. Prime Minister was good enough to give a certificate to the Minister of Commerce and Trade. All that I am saying is this. You were not here last evening. If you had listened to his speech you would have hesitated to give that certificate.

I endorse your views. In deference to your wishes, I have decided not to speak a word about the Minister of Commerce and Trade although it hurts me a lot to think of the manner in which he behaved last night. May I only be permitted to say this? It is to the lasting blot of this Assembly that we had the misfortune to have a Speaker against whom the Clerk of this House had to say that he was sorry that he had the misfortune of serving under a liar like that. That is the level of the gentleman to whom you have given a certificate. That is all. I would not say anything more.

කමානයකතුම

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Bad enough.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

All I am saying is that he earned it.

කමානයකතුම

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

I am glad that you stopped at that.

Order, please! The Sitting is suspended till 4.30 P.M.

යස්විම ඊට අනුකූලව නවකාලිකව අත් සිටුවන ලදීන් අ. සා. 4.30 ට නැවත පවත්වන ලදී.

அதன்படி அமர்வு பி. ப. 4.30 பரை இடைநிறுத்தப்பட்டு, மீண்டும் ஆரம்பமாயிற்று.

Sitting accordingly suspended till 4.30 P.M. and then resumed.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, but there are still one or two small matters which I should like to dispose of.

යැ මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

Trade?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

They have nothing to do with trade.

Sir, the Hon. Prime Minister's last statement took my breath away. I am sorry to say this, Mr. Prime Minister. The hon. Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike) quoted from a letter purporting to be a photostat copy of a letter sent by Mr. Weera Wimalaratne. I do not know whether this letter is authentic or not. The Hon. Prime Minister gets a letter from the party accused, Mr. Weera Wimalaratne, denying it. It is one person's word against somebody else's. Surely, you must find out before you come to a decision, irrespective of everything else, whether Mr. Weera Wimalaratne is telling the truth or not? Surely, an accused person is not going to admit that he had written the letter? That was a serious indictment of the man. The Hon. Prime Minister must find out the



பிப்ரவரி மாதம் கிடைத்தது, 1969-70

[அவரின் உண். சி. பி. பி. பி.]

truth. He could have handed the letter to a handwriting expert or a person who deals with that kind of thing. This is a photostat copy of the letter and his signature is there.

In addition to that there was another letter tabled here in regard to the same incident—a letter from Japan written in Japanese. There was a translation. All that I am saying, Mr. Prime Minister, is, please bear with us. We in the Opposition have a job to do, to help correct the wrongdoings of your administration and various other acts of omission and commission that are taking place. It is not easy for us. We get some information and we have got to use it, and it is up to the Minister concerned to follow it up.

I remember drawing the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a certain matter concerning an overseer. He immediately interdicted the man. I had some information which I passed on. He followed it up and interdicted him. I find that the overseer has been reinstated. That is neither here nor there. At least I did my job, and the Hon. Minister did his job of finding out whether it was true or not.

It was the same thing that the hon. Member for Medawachchiya (Mr. Maithripala Senanayake) did. I agree that there was a mistake. The charge should really have been made against Sumitomo and not Bonars Limited. In point of fact he was prepared to apologize to Bonars Limited. But that is not the end of the story. The Hon. Prime Minister must definitely find out whether that tank was done badly or not.

அவர் கிடைத்த கையொப்பம்

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனானாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Will the hon. Member give way? I got a letter from Bonars Limited.

அவரின் உண். சி. பி. பி. பி.  
(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)  
(Dr. N. M. Perera)  
I also got the same letter.

கலாநாயகர் அவர்கள்

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

I also got one.

அவர் கிடைத்த கையொப்பம்

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனானாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

In fairness to Bonars Limited, it was my duty to read it, because the hon. Member for Medawachchiya was making a charge against Bonars Limited when Bonars Limited had nothing to do with it. That does not mean that other things necessary should not be done. I want to put right the wrong done.

அவரின் உண். சி. பி. பி. பி.  
(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)  
(Dr. N. M. Perera)

On that I have no complaint or grouse against the Hon. Prime Minister. All that I am concerned with is that Hon. Ministers must help us because we have a job to do. This is part of the process of government. You are interested and we are interested in seeing that the Public Service functions properly and that our moneys are not wasted. We may be making mistakes. I am prepared at any time to stand up and apologize to any person against whom I have done wrong.

அவர் கி. பி. பி. பி. (கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(கௌரவ என். எம். பண்டா—விவசாய, உணவு அமைச்சர்)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda—Minister of Agriculture and Food)

The Minister of Commerce also ?

அவரின் உண். சி. பி. பி. பி.  
(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)  
(Dr. N. M. Perera)

The Minister of Commerce ? I have done no wrong to him. He has to apologize to me.



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

**කථානායකතුමා**

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Now do not try to provoke him unnecessarily.

**රු. ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන**

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. K. Jayewardene)

He apologized yesterday.

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

The Hon. Prime Minister quoted a part of my Budget speech. He is correct, but he must also admit that this is something which I have answered over and over again.

**රු. ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක**

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

No.

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Please let me explain. When did I take over duties as Finance Minister? It was on 11th June 1964. The Budget was presented on 30th July 1964, within a matter of six weeks. When I accepted this Ministerial office, in a sense all the expenditure proposals were already there.

**රු. ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක**

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I do not want to interrupt the hon. Member, but if he will give way I shall explain the position. When the interim report of the Salaries Commission was received involving Rs. 120 million the expenditure proposals were almost finished.

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Mr. Prime Minister, the difference is this: You have been in the saddle for four and a half years. I was

there barely for six weeks, and you are asking me why I did not implement the 21 demands. I did not have the chance of going through the estimates properly, or studying the revenue proposals properly. You can ask, "Why did you accept the office of Minister of Finance?" That is a different issue. Having accepted that position you are holding that against me.

In point of fact, in fairness to me, the Hon. Prime Minister should have read the next paragraph because then he would have got a better inkling of the position. I said:

"The Coalition Government has every desire to fulfil its obligations to the working class of Ceylon. Indeed it is our aim to ensure to the masses of this country substantial improvements in their economic conditions in a measurable time. Not merely that but also make them actively participate and share in the responsibility of governing. Some steps have already been taken towards achieving this objective"—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 30th July, 1964; Vol. 56, c 1698.]

Now, that sums up the position we took up. I just wanted to explain the exact position with regard to this matter before I embark upon discussing the Budget. The Budget is much more important a matter than all these side issues.

I listened to the Hon. Prime Minister and I must say that I do not know whether to congratulate the Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance. The Prime Minister made as good a case as can be made for a bad position.

I shall explain to you my own submission in this matter and, I think, the position that the Opposition holds with regard to it. According to the Prime Minister, he was quite happy, satisfied, contented, and he thinks that there is nothing more to do; he can retire, I can retire, and the world will go on merrily. He feels that everything is rosy in the garden. I should like, as perhaps this is the last Budget of this Parliament and perhaps the last speech from the Opposition, to congratulate the Hon. Prime Minister. I do not know whether I have to congratulate the Hon. Minister of



விசேஷப் பதவி கெட்டுப்பத, 1969-70

[அலுவல் பதவி. பதி. பதேர்]

Finance on the so-called five-year record. Really, I ought to congratulate him for the very sleek, the clever, spick and span performance. He was immaculately dressed. This was the first time that I saw him so nicely and neatly dressed.

சுரு. டி. வி. வன்னினாயக (இதே அமைதி)

(கௌரவ பூ. பி. வன்னினாயக—நிதி அமைச்சர்)

(The Hon. U. B. Wanninayake—Minister of Finance)

Improved conditions.

அலுவல் பதவி. பதி. பதேர்

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Anyhow, if the Hon. Minister of Finance will forgive me, this is rather a pedestrian Budget. Really there is nothing to oppose violently in this Budget.—[Interruption]. There is nothing startling or imaginative in it.—[Interruption]. That is the position. But, Sir, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of State and now the Prime Minister sang the same theme song. What did they say? "Conditions prior to our taking over were very bad. Look at what we have done; we have got hold of this economy, made something out of it, improved it and today it is going forward at a terrific pace." Well, you have been saying this. It is not enough to say this. Let us analyse these figures. That is what I am trying to do.

The Hon. Minister of State was certainly not fair to me when he said that I had advocated massive foreign aid. I have never at any stage—the speech is here; the Hon. Minister of State can read it—advocated massive foreign aid. It is true that I wanted foreign aid. What the Hon. Prime Minister said was true. I wanted foreign aid. Any developing country that thinks that it can function without foreign aid is in the clouds.—[Interruption]. No. That is not our charge against you. Our charge against you is that you are getting foreign aid for purposes for which foreign aid should not be got. I shall give you an example.

The Hon. Minister of Industries and Fisheries is not here. We are not objecting to the foreign aid that the Hon. Minister has got for the Plywood Corporation with Rumanian help. In point of fact, the Thulhiriya project came into being as a result of an agreement signed by me as Minister of Finance with the G. D. R. So we are not opposed to foreign aid. If we are opposed to foreign aid I would not have signed that agreement. So it is clear that we are not opposed to foreign aid. What we are opposed to is the kind of foreign aid that you have got. We are not opposed to all your foreign aid, but to some of the foreign aid that you have got. That is what we are objecting to. We object to foreign aid being obtained purely for the purpose of consumption. You have to think twice before you admit that foreign aid for consumption purposes is satisfactory. That is our charge. It is not necessary to labour this point.

Ceylon is an under-developed country. Why? It is because we have not developed our resources. That is why we are called under-developed. Why did we not develop our resources? It is because we did not have the personnel, the technical know-how, and machinery for this purpose. Well, we must get foreign aid in order to carry that out. That is incidental and that I think is axiomatic. Nobody wants to deny that position.

That is one thing, but what you are doing is something quite different. I shall take two matters, namely, the counterpart funds and the PL 480 Agreement that you have signed. I shall take both these matters and analyse and show you why we think that they are both undesirable. What are counterpart funds? In point of fact, if you read the Budget Speech



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

you will find that counterpart funds are utilized by the Hon. Minister of Finance to balance his Budget. Do not make a mistake. This is not project aid. These are not loans. This is a device by which you are asking foreign countries to give you loans in an indirect way, asking them to give you various articles of consumption—may be as intermediate goods, may be for pure consumption and sometimes even for machinery.

There are a number of reasons why we object to that. I shall give you two or three of the reasons. First of all counterpart funds are expansionary and inflationary. The Hon. Prime Minister can find that. I get that endorsement even from the Central Bank Report. The Hon. Prime Minister twitted me on the one hand for condemning the Central Bank Report and on the other for quoting statistics out of it. Mr. Prime Minister, I shall give you the answer. Counterpart funds have an expansionary effect. They are also inflationary. That is accepted even by the Central Bank. You find that at page 7 of the Central Bank Report. The next objection is this. You are getting particular commodities from particular countries. They are not even government to government agreements. The parties that import the articles are private companies, not Government, and those private companies make commissions also on all the imports that come by way of commodity aid. All the evils of overloading invoices and under-invoicing are there. And what is worse is that when you get this commodity aid you have no right to inquire about the quality of the commodities, you have no right to inquire about the prices at which they give them, and you have to accept what they give. These are given out of the largeness of their heart, and you must accept what they give. That is why it is disastrous, very often, to accept them.

I shall give you one example. Go to Walawe, and you will see a new type of lorry there—the Berliat lorry. They are not the lorries that they have been using in the past. These are part of the counterpart funds. They have come from England, and the agents are the Colombo Commercial Company. They make the money; in the process of getting them down they get the commissions. Ask the workers who are working in Walawe what they have to say about these lorries. They say that they are not worth the trouble you have taken to bring them. You cannot get half the service that you get from the lorries they have been using for the last three or four years. And half of those lorries are already on the scrap heap. I saw them with my own eyes. This is what is happening to your counterpart funds.

ශ්‍රී මන්නිනායක

(කෙළරඹ වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Counterpart funds?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාතිඨි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Yes, they are commodities. You get the funds and the commodities come here. That goes into a special fund in the Central Bank, and that is being made available to the Minister of Finance to balance his Budget. In your own Budget speech you have said that the deficit is being financed by counterpart funds to the extent of Rs. 335 million this year.

Take another case. For a long time we bought phosphate from the U. A. R. In return they bought tea from us. What happened as a result of counterpart funds? All those fertilizers are coming from England, Germany, Japan, and so on. We are not buying anything by way of fertilizer from the U. A. R., and therefore we are not able to sell our tea to the U. A. R.



விவரணை பற்றி கெட்டுப்போன, 1969-70

[அவர்கள் உள். உள். பேசுங்கள்]

Yes see the disadvantages. This is what is happening. But much more disastrous is PL 480. What is PL 480? It is Public Law 480 under which we get flour to Ceylon.

அவர் உள்நாட்டினர்

(கௌரவ வன்னினாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

There are a number of schemes.

அவர்கள் உள். உள். பேசுங்கள்

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Under PL 480 you have got mainly flour. You have bought 190,000 tons in 1968-69. At what price are you buying? You will remember, I told you that you have no right to determine the prices. I called for the agreement, and the agreement was tabled in this House. I have got a copy of the agreement with me. I got it tabled here. The Hon. Minister was good enough to table it at my request. If anybody wants to see it I can show it to him. This is the agreement. What does it provide? You are buying flour from the United States. At what price? Round about £ 40 a ton, and that includes cost plus freight. What is the price at which you buy flour normally? You buy at £ 30 in the European market. I have got full statistics here of the flour you have bought in 1968-69, the ships that brought them, the quantities that were brought, the dates on which they were brought, and so on. I have got the full list with me. I have not come here without facts.

Last year you bought 150,000 tons of flour under P.L. 480. This year you bought 190,000 tons of flour under P.L. 480. You are buying this at £ 10 more than the market price for flour. What does that come to in terms of rupees, Mr. Minister of Finance? It comes to Rs. 38 million more this year, and Rs. 30 million more last year. In all it comes to Rs. 68 million. In other words, we have paid Rs. 68 million more than we would have paid in the open market.

My good Friend the Hon. Minister of Local Government said that the greatest thing they have done is to win the confidence of all the foreign countries. Of course, you have won their confidence. If they can get Rs. 68 million *summa*, will you not win their confidence? They will give you a golden chair to carry you in. You have created confidence by losing to the tune of Rs. 68 million, by paying for flour over and above the normal market price.

My good Friend the Hon. Minister of Commerce and Trade talked about some transactions of mine supposed to have taken place twenty years back. He referred to some loans I had taken twenty years ago. Yes, Mr. Minister of Commerce and Trade, there is nothing dishonest in taking a loan.

அவர் கிணை பற்றி

(கௌரவ ஹியூ பெர்னாண்டோ)

(The Hon. Hugh Fernando)

I did not say so.

விவரணை

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

He did not say that. What he said was that borrowing is quite a customary thing.

அவர்கள் உள். உள். பேசுங்கள்

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

But why did he refer to my borrowing? The Hon. Minister of Commerce and Trade is not fit to hold that post if he does not understand the difference between private borrowing and a country borrowing money. Is there not a difference between a country borrowing money from a foreign country and an individual borrowing money? But may I say this? It is better to borrow money and do an honest trade than to sell your telephones.

அவர் கிணை பற்றி

(கௌரவ ஹியூ பெர்னாண்டோ)

(The Hon. Hugh Fernando)

Mr. Speaker—



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I am not giving way.

කථානායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

He did not refer to the Hon. Minister.

කථානායකතුමා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

He had his turn yesterday. I did not mention him. I am only saying it is much better to do honest borrowing than to be an Ambassador abroad. —[interruption].

කථානායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

The Hon. Minister did not make any insinuations. He said it was customary to borrow and that in business you need to borrow.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You were not here, Sir. I listened to his speech.

කථානායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

I was also listening to it.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

All that I am saying is, let people who live in glass houses not throw stones. We can retaliate with interest every time. That is what I want you to understand. I do not intend to throw flower pots. That is also in passing.

Now, this is what we are objecting to. The Hon. Minister must not say that we are objecting to all loans. We are objecting to loans of this type. That is what we are objecting to.

Mr. Prime Minister, you will appreciate, therefore—

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I will explain.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

However much you explain, Mr. Minister of Finance, you cannot justify purchasing flour under P.L. 480 at £ 10 more than the normal rate.

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

You will not wait for the explanation.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I shall tell you. I also did this. I know the explanation. Under P. L. 480, what happened in the past? In the past we paid that money in rupees. In the past you paid in rupees for P. L. 480 flour. That was the advantage or supposed advantage you had. India realized that this was an attempt to exploit them and they did away with this a few years back. Nevertheless we have continued with P. L. 480. You have paid back in rupees. The American Government utilized the money for a number of things. One was for ambassadorial requirements. That is what happened in the past. Subsequently they changed that, and up to 500,000 dollars they used for American tourists who came here. Out of the balance that was left a portion was re-lent to the Government for certain purposes. A portion was given as aid and a portion was sent back.



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා]

I think since last year we are paying back the whole amount in dollars. Are you denying this, because that is the PL 480 agreement tabled in this House. You have to pay in twenty instalments in dollars. What is the advantage of paying through your nose at £ 10 extra without any of the previous advantages? Why have you agreed to this?

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උඩුගිලි සේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Twenty years.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාතිථි ඒ. ඒ. ඩබ්ලිව්)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

There are a number of countries that are prepared to give you as much credit. If the Prime Minister thinks that paying Rs. 68 million more in twenty years is an advantage I am afraid I disagree with him.

That is not all. I have got some more information. I do not want to take up the time of the House by going into details. I have a full list of the flour bought, the names of the ships, the dates and the quantities, not only PL 480 flour but also other flour bought. The total amount of flour that you have bought up to 12.8.69 is 386,631 tons.

This is another factor that has to be looked into. When you get counterpart funds you cannot inquire into the quality of the product. American flour consists of two varieties. One is the general purpose flour where the protein content is only 9 per cent. That will be considered below the standard required for all purposes of American flour. Then there is the normal flour which has a protein content of 11 per cent. That is the standard protein content of flour. We have been forced to buy a substantial quantity of 9 per cent protein flour under PL 480, because we dare not question them. We have to pay £ 10 more and get inferior quality flour and repay in dollars. Are

you surprised then that we are objecting to your loans on this basis?

You talk about your foreign exchange difficulties. I shall give you some examples. You have lost in 1967-68 three ships. One loss amounts to Rs. 13 million and it is mentioned in the Auditor-General's report, Parliamentary Series No. 43 at page 42.

The other one is much more interesting. In 1968-69 we lost a ship called "Shungtai"—a very interesting name. It was carrying 10,000 tons of rice from China and it sank off the coast of China. The loss to the Ceylon Government was £ 500,000 sterling which is equivalent to Rs. 10 million. The story is the most important thing. These are things you do not know.

We hand over chartering to brokers. The Food Commissioner uses brokers to charter these ships. There is a condition that if you charter a ship, that ship must be not older than 20 years. In 1969 if you are using a ship to transport our rice from China, it should have been registered not earlier than 1949, in order to ensure that it is sea-worthy. That is the position.

What happened in the case of "Shungtai"? There was no insurance. The ship was actually registered in 1942. If anybody has doubts, I have the Lloyds Shipping Index and Register with me. I will give you the page; it is here. Anybody who wants to refer to it can do so. I have not come here unprepared. I have come prepared with all facts. "Shungtai" is on the Lloyds Shipping Index. It was registered in 1942. Therefore it had no business to be utilized by the broker. The Food Commissioner's Department had no right to accept this ship. Actually what is called a "charter party" is sent here. Certain documents are sent to us before the ship is loaded and despatched from China. They come to the Food Commissioner's Department. The Food Commissioner's Department, the officials, must satisfy themselves on the documents that the ship was registered not prior to 1949, that it is absolutely sea-worthy, that we are



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

running no risk. The Food Commissioner's Department has on a number of occasions—this is very wrong—permitted ships registered prior to the 20-year limit on the condition that the ship would be insured at the expense of the shipowner. They have allowed that. I think that is wrong because that enables the Food Commissioner's officials and the brokers to have special commissions and arrangements.

Now in this particular case of "Shungtai" what happened? When the documents came here, they found that the ship was registered in 1942. Therefore as a concession they called upon the broker to see that the ship was fully insured. Who is the broker? That is the important thing. Mr. D. D. Abeysinghe is the broker. Who is D. D. Abeysinghe? Patty Mahatmaya's son-in-law, one of the U.N.P. youth league organizers.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

No.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You may have dropped him now because he has gone up higher. He is on the Board of Directors of the new Shipping Corporation. He is a Director of the Bank of Ceylon also. This gentleman was ordered to see that the ship was insured. What did he do? He told the Food Commissioner's officers, "I am getting it insured." Apparently he sent a Telex to the owner asking him to insure. A letter was produced by Mr. Abeysinghe saying that full insurance has been taken. The ship left and it sank. The documents came back, and when the Food Commissioner's Department looked at the documents, insurance had not been carried out. This is a serious matter. Rs. 10 million has gone down the drain.

Then they called upon Mr. Abeysinghe to explain. He could not explain. Then what happened? He was blacklisted: "so and so, broker, cannot submit any more quotations hereafter." The name was actually put on the notice board of the Food Commissioner's Department. And, hey presto! within a week the name was removed. Who restored him? On the orders of the Hon. Minister for Food. That is my information.—[Interruption]. Ask him.

And today, Mr. Abeysinghe, notwithstanding the fact that he made this country lose Rs. 10 million, is back again in the trade as a broker. Have you removed him from the directorate of the Bank of Ceylon? Have you removed him from the new Shipping Corporation? No. He still continues to be in the Shipping Corporation. Instead of pointing the finger of accusation at us, why do you not cleanse your own stables? This is what is happening. This is D. D. Abeysinghe of Abeysinghe & Co.

Mr. Prime Minister, when you come here and tell us that your finances are in a very bad state, that you have to safeguard our exchange, do everything possible to make the best use of our foreign exchange, please look into these matters also, see how moneys have gone down the drain.

I shall give another example. On 31.10.68 you bought 12 cargoes of sugar in one consignment, that is 120,000 tons. I am not objecting to this sugar being bought. What I am objecting to is the opening of letters of credit immediately. You open letters of credit for items still to come, months hence. All this sugar is bought through brokers although you have an agreement, for instance, with the U.S.S.R. and Roumania. You do not go through them but you go through brokers.

What is the result? You are tying up Rs. 72 million by opening letters of credit immediately. And,



2099

නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

[ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා]

mind you, all the time you are paying interest at 8 per cent because this is done through private commercial banks. That is what you are doing.

Now, I quite agree that you bought on quotation at £30. I have no objection to it. But why are you wasting money like this? You open letters of credit immediately to the tune of Rs. 70 million and pay interest at 8 per cent. when you can spread it over a number of months because delivery is taking place over a period. You go through brokers, and commission has to be paid.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(කෙළරව எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

Let the hon. Member make his charges. When I speak during the Committee stage I shall meet all the points he is raising.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I am making no charges against the Hon. Minister.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(கெளரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

I know—

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I say this because I am quite satisfied in my own mind that the Hon. Minister of Food is absolutely honest. There is not the slightest doubt about it. I do not associate him with these things. But there is a large number of crooks attached to this department. One of the people whom I got rid of from that place was your Permanent Secretary, Mr. P. A. Silva. He was enjoying the privilege of the Officials' Box yesterday; he had no business to be there as he did.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(கெளரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

You did not get rid of him. You made charges against him.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I made charges against him and as in the case of Jayanetti I was responsible for sending him out of the place. If you say no, I am prepared to accept your statement.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(கெளரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

You made charges against him.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

And you were satisfied, otherwise you would not have removed him from there. He went to the Ministry of Commerce and Trade. I shall be coming back to him.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(கெளரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

That was a promotion.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Anyway, this Mr. P. A. Silva was in the Officials' Box. He had no business to be there. That is a matter for you, Mr. Speaker.

කථානායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

I was not here and it was not brought to my notice.



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(කලාநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Then, this purchase was made before the International Sugar Agreement. Subsequent to the International Sugar Agreement, you bought in June this year another 11 cargoes, and letters of credit were opened for these 11 cargoes straightway. Not only that, the Soviet Union offered five cargoes on the Agreement; that is to say, you would not have had to pay money to the Soviet Union if you bought sugar from them because under the Trade Agreement you set off what you purchase against what you sell, and if there is a balance left it has to be settled at the end of the year, on a Sterling basis. That means you have got about six months or eight months or sometimes about a year to settle; and if you are hard-pressed, surely the Soviet Union will be prepared to give you payment concessions under the Trading Agreement. Why do you not do that? You do not, because it does not suit the officers in the department, and also the brokers. All the sugar has been bought through brokers notwithstanding the trade agreements you have. All that is so much money gone, because letters of credit have to be opened through private banks on a commission of 8 per cent.

**නීල් ද අල්විස් මයා.**

(திரு. நீல் டி அல்விஸ்)

(Mr. Neal de Alwis)

Prosperity of the brokers!

**ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බන්ඩා**

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

You make your speech. I will answer you.

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

My next point is this. The most recent thing is your purchase of lentils. Tenders were called for the

purchase of lentils. Tenders closed on 7th August 1969. Several offers were received from Syria, Lebanon, Ethiopia, Pakistan, India, etc. On 10th August the award was given to Beirut Trading Company. Beirut is in Lebanon. Who are the local agents? They are Basil Rajanayagam and Company, a great buddy of Mr. P. A. Silva.

**ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බන්ඩා**

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

Mr. P. A. Silva had nothing to do with this.

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Basil Rajanayagam is his buddy. He was made by Mr. P. A. Silva. He was an unknown quantity. His children are being educated in Switzerland. He started as a clerk with nothing in his hand and he was made a man of by Mr. P. A. Silva because of his conjoint dealings with Mr. P. A. Silva. That is how Basil Rajanayagam is worth lakhs and lakhs today and his children are being educated in Switzerland.

The important point is not that. The quantity purchased was 14,000 tons of red, split Syrian lentils. You are buying Syrian lentils from Lebanon.

As a matter of fact, the representative of the Beirut Trading Company was in Colombo and had negotiations and conducted discussions along with their local agents, Messrs. Basil Rajanayagam & Co.

The important point in this matter is this. The contract stipulates that payment is authorized in sterling under the Trades and Payment Agreement between Syria and Ceylon. Now, according to the Hon. Minister, the trade arrangements between Syria and Ceylon fell through and did not really work because Syria could not provide the



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

[ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා]

lentils. That I accept. But this particular lentil contract stipulates that payment is authorised in sterling under the Trades and Payment Agreement between Syria and Ceylon.

The contracting party, the Beirut Trading Company in Lebanon is a private organization and the letter of credit, according to the contract, is to be made in favour of Sebai & Refai, a private trading organization in Syria. That is what I do not understand.

The Hon. Minister's department opens a letter of credit not with the Lebanon firm but with a Syrian firm called Sebai & Refai. In fact, my information is that the Syrian authorities have violently protested against this procedure, and this contract at the moment is under dispute.

What are all these wheels within wheels in this business? You are buying Syrian lentils, you are buying at Lebanon through a Lebanon firm; you are opening a letter of credit with a Syrian firm and you are buying stuff not at the lowest tender. What is all this?

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බන්ඩා

(කෙළරඹු ආර්. ඩී. පණ්ඩා)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

We are using a payment agreement with Syria. That is why letters of credit have been opened with Syria. And what is the quantity offered by the other tenderer?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාතිථි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I do not know.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බන්ඩා

(කෙළරඹු ආර්. ඩී. පණ්ඩා)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

The man who gave you the information, the other agent, what was the quantity he tendered for?

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාතිථි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I do not know. I am only telling you what your transaction was.

Mr. Speaker, I am not holding a brief for anybody here. I am only pointing out what I consider are malpractices in the Hon. Minister's department.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බන්ඩා

(කෙළරඹු ආර්. ඩී. පණ්ඩා)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

I shall answer point by point.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාතිථි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Agreed. I am quite prepared for that because this is not a fight between you, Mr. Minister, and me. I am only helping you to cleanse that department of yours. I am trying to help you to save money instead of wasting money. Otherwise I would not have brought this up now.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බන්ඩා

(කෙළරඹු ආර්. ඩී. පණ්ඩා)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

That is always what happens. I do not want to interrupt your speech. I prefer to make my reply to all this when I speak during the Committee stage. Although we tried our best, the arrangements you recommended so very much failed. So we had to buy this on tender. The board have gone into the matter and purchased this. I shall give the details when I speak.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාතිථි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

My objection is not to that. Let me finish and then you will understand what I am talking about. Lentils were purchased at £ 12 15s. per ton C. & F. Colombo. Shipment was to be in September 1969 and March 1970. But that was not the lowest tender. That is where the trouble lies. You are buying



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

through the Beirut Trading Company, Syrian lentils at a much higher price than the other quotations.

That is not all. That is what I object to. Hon. Minister, please follow me. Actually, the Beirut Trading Company had tendered but the tender was higher. What did the officials do? Notwithstanding the fact that that was a higher tender, they negotiated with the Beirut Trading Company and you said you would buy at a lower price.

ශ්‍රී. එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(කෙළරඹු ආර්. ඩී. පණ්ඩා)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

What was the quantity?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාතිථි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Fourteen tons.

Then why did you not ask the Lebanon people to come through Syria without coming here direct?

Surely, if your dealings are with Syria then the correct thing to do is to ask the Lebanese people to come through Syria. But, saying our dealings are with Syria, why are you allowing people like Basil Rajanayagam to go and poke their fingers?

ශ්‍රී. එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(කෙළරඹු ආර්. ඩී. පණ්ඩා)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

It is the same organization that has applied on comparable terms to supply lentils for the Egyptian Army itself. U.A.R. is closer to Syria than ourselves. They have given this company large contracts on comparable terms.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාතිථි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

All that I am saying is, we are wasting a lot of money by paying commissions to various brokers. Why

do we not have direct dealings on a government to government basis? If you have failed in one case why do you not try somebody else? Why not Beirut?

ශ්‍රී. එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(කෙළරඹු ආර්. ඩී. පණ්ඩා)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

It is from Syria that we get the lentils.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාතිථි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

If Syria has the lentils why cannot you get them from Syria, Mr. Minister? Please do not be led by your officials. That is my complaint against you.

ශ්‍රී. එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(කෙළරඹු ආර්. ඩී. පණ්ඩා)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

I am not being led by other people.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාතිථි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Your heart is very good. You have got too much of goodwill. You are taking all these officials on trust.

ශ්‍රී. වන්නිනායක

(කෙළරඹු ආර්. ඩී. පණ්ඩා)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

If the heart is good everything else is good.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාතිථි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

If the heart is good there is longevity, but I do not know whether anything else is good.

ශ්‍රී. එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(කෙළරඹු ආර්. ඩී. පණ්ඩා)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

That depends on what you do with yourself.



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I have set out these matters in order to prove to this Government what they have done year after year. Even last year I revealed other malpractices and waste of money, as I saw it. This is not something new. Every year this is what you have been doing, and the cumulative effect of all this is that too much of foreign exchange has been wasted.

So, when the Hon. Prime Minister gets up and says, "What are we to do, the country was in such a bad condition" and the Hon. Minister of State also says, "You left us a mess, we got hold of it and put it into shape," we are entitled to ask you, is this how you put things into shape?

I now come to another aspect of it. I raised the question of the 8.3 per cent rise in the G. N. P. In point of fact, I knew that this would be their main plank in the Budget Debate and their talk outside. Therefore, during the Debate on the Address of Thanks I looked carefully into the figure, analyzed it and proved to you that this is an impossible, utterly bloated and mythical figure that has no basis and cannot stand. Up to date nobody has dared to answer from that side. They put up poor Mr. Hameed, the hon. Member for Akurana.

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I will answer you.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You are answering me now, Mr. Finance Minister? I gave you more than a week.

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I did not get a chance to answer.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You could have answered in your Budget Speech. You are repeating in the Budget Speech precisely what you said in the Debate on the Address of Thanks.

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I have not had a chance of speaking.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You spent three hours on your speech but it gives no answer to my question. The hon. Member for Akurana was put up to answer my question regarding this 8.3 per cent rise in the G. N. P. Poor man, he got up and asked, "Why did you choose 1959 as the base?" Showing that he did not understand the question at all. I did not choose 1959 as the base. The Central Bank did. That is how the base comes.

I want to ask him, do current prices and constant prices have any meaning for him? Does he understand what is meant by "current prices" and "constant prices"? When you talk of constant prices you must relate it to some previous year. That is why 1959 is taken as the base.



**ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක**

(කෙළරාව වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Oh, yes, Why not ?

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(කලාநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

That is why he started by begging the question. He did not understand it and you put him up to answer me.

Well, your Government did. When I dealt with this matter on an earlier occasion who replied to me ? It was the hon. Second Member for Akurana (Mr. Hameed) who got up in this House and replied to the criticism that I made during the Debate on the Address.

**ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක**

(කෙළරාව වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

That does not mean that I asked him to answer

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(කලාநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You did not answer.

**ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක**

(කෙළරාව වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I will answer you.

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(කලාநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You are trying to answer now. Why did you not explain it in the Budget ?

**ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක**

(කෙළරාව වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

See the Budget.

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(කලාநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

There are something like 40 columns of your Budget Speech, but you could not

in those 40 columns give an answer. Now, you get up and say that you will try to answer. Even the Hon. Prime Minister during the Debate on the Throne Speech side-tracked the whole thing. He said that he would give an answer during the Budget Debate. I waited patiently to hear his answer on this question of 8.3 per cent but no reference at all was made to it.—[Interruption]. He left it to the Minister of Finance to answer. Now, the Hon. Minister of Finance will crack a joke and get out of it. He will talk about elephants.

The charge that the hon. Members of the Government made against me is that I quote from the Central Bank Report while condemning it. Mr. Prime Minister that is precisely my case, I am proving to the satisfaction of this House that your own argument and the figures of the Central Bank are wrong. They are wrong in their conclusions. That is the strength of my case.

**ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බන්ඩා**

(කෙළරාව எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

8.3 per cent ?

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(කලாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Yes, I am sorry that I have to repeat this again. The Hon. Minister of Finance said this in his Budget Speech :

"..... the success of our policies is clearly seen in the high rates of economic growth in real terms achieved in the last two years, i.e., 4.4 per cent in 1967 and 8.3 per cent in 1968."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 2nd August 1969 ; Vol. 86, c. 25].

I have already argued against this. There is nothing clearly seen in this. You will have to clearly show it.

**ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක**

(කෙළරාව වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I will show it.



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I do not want to go into the whole argument again. May I say roughly why I do not agree with this position? Why these exaggerated and bloated figures? I am taking the year 1968. According to the current figures they say there is an expansion of 19.3 per cent, that is as against 1967, under current market prices. Then they go on arguing that under constant prices, that is in relation to 1959, the difference in price level is 11 per cent and therefore the constant GNP is 8.3 per cent. Now, my good Friend must prove that between 1959 and 1967 the gap in prices was 11 per cent. This is nonsense. I want to prove how they came to this figure. They work out the implicit index which they say is 11 per cent. How did they work out the implicit index? They worked it out by dividing the current prices by constant prices. If you know the constant price why do you want to find out the implicit index? This is begging the question, going round and round in order to find out the constant price you want to work out the implicit index. This is all wrong. The difference between the Prime Minister and the other Ministers and myself is this: I am not prepared to accept any figures given either by you or by the Central Bank without examining them, analysing them, and satisfying myself whether they are correct or not. That is the difference between you and me. I shall point out to you from the document that you have placed before us that all these are bogus figures. I shall prove it in a moment.—[Interruption].

I am reminded of a very relevant thing to which I should have drawn his attention. Why are you going through brokers when you have already got a Shipping Corporation? As a matter of fact the information I got this morning is that there was a charter immediately arranged without any reference to your Shipping Corporation. The Shipping Corporation is there. A general manager has

also been appointed. Anyhow I shall leave it at that. We can discuss this matter during the Committee stage of the Budget.—[Interruption].

Sir, I am ruling out this so-called implicit index as utterly false and theoretically incorrect. Let me tell my Hon. Friend that this is a problem that any Minister of Finance will have to face in the future. By the way, there is nothing very recondite in economics, although, some people try to make out that it has something to do with esoteric doctrine. It is not so. Now there is no reason at all why the Central Bank which has existed for the last 20 years and more should not be able to produce a price index for Ceylon. A number of countries have price indices. What is there so recondite about it? What is the difficulty? Why do they not work out a price index instead of working out implicit price indexes with calculations all round the globe? Have a straightforward index. It is easily done. You can do it through the Census Department. The point is, that they do not want to do that. Instead of doing that they give bogus figures on which you are supposed to work.

My case is this. Their whole story of prosperity in the rural area is based on the argument that there has been an 8.3 per cent increase in the real growth rate of this country. Now if I demolish this so-called 8.3 per cent increase their whole case goes off.—[Interruption].

That is the difficulty. When I come to paddy I shall demonstrate it to you. You start on the assumption that the rural people are prosperous, but you do not try to analyse how they could be prosperous. Where is all this money? I shall give you the figures. All that you are doing is, you are accepting the figures given because they suit your purpose.



விசேஷப் பணம் கெட்டுப்பண, 1969-70

—தேவன் வர கியலி

It does not require much imagination for a person to understand that between 1959 and 1968 the gap in prices was more than 30 per cent. Actually the whole question of real wages is based on the cost-of-living index, inadequate as it is. I am going to answer the Hon. Prime Minister. The cost-of-living index is based today on the consumption of one measure of free rice. Is that correct? Is it correct to argue that the cost of living should be based on one measure of free rice? Do you think that working-class families in this country live on one measure of rice? Do they not buy an additional measure of rice a week per person at Rs. 1.40? In point of fact I read the speech of the hon. Member for Kelaniya (Mr. R. S. Perera) very carefully. Not one Member from that side of the House tried to argue against it. The hon. Member for Kelaniya gave a full index of all the increases that have taken place as given by the Marketing Department. He gave all the percentages of increases. On that you can find the increase in prices between 1959 and 1968. It is more than 30 per cent.

When you talk about prices you must remember that the cost-of-living index deals with only a certain number of articles. The cost-of-living index is not a universal price level index, or a price level index for the whole country. Even the increase in car prices comes into the price level index. Every article must come into it.—[Interruption]. Where is your index? There is no index of price levels. The Colombo Consumers' Index is not a price level index. That is a cost-of-living index. For working out the growth of the Gross National Product you must take into account the price level between 1959 and 1968, not only your cost-of-living index, but the price level of all the articles in this country including increased wages. That also goes into your price level index. So, if anybody seriously maintains that the difference in the price level between 1959 and 1968 is only 11 per cent he is talking nonsense. On the

face of it he is talking nonsense. If you work on the basis of a minimum 30 per cent increase your Gross National Product is not 9,809. It is 9,809 at current prices. Your Gross National Product on a 30 per cent difference between 1959 and 1968 is 6,866. That is your constant figure, and then you are back at the 1968 growth level. That is where you are. You are at the 1963 growth level, not 1968.

The per capita product then comes down to 638.

பி. ஷெல்டன் ஜயசிங்க மஹ. (கலீனியா) கி. பி. ஷெல்டன் ஜயசிங்க மஹ. (கலீனியா)

(திரு. டி. ஷெல்டன் ஜயசிங்க—கைத் தொழில், கடற்ருழில் அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி)

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

In 1964 you did not say that.

அவர்கள் உன். பி. பி. பி. பி.

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

The problem did not arise. I am prepared to admit that this is one of the things that we have to do. By working on false figures you are misleading the country, adopting wrong policy, and carrying out an entirely different policy from the correct one. Therefore, it is incumbent on all of us to get at the correct figures. I say, do not go on false figures that have been given to you. This 8.3 per cent increase in the G. N. P. is an untenable position so far as you are concerned.

Mr. Prime Minister, you were not here when I answered you as to why I quoted the Central Bank Report itself in order to refute the conclusions of the Central Bank. I am refuting them on their own premises, because according to them the import prices have gone up by 30 per cent.

டடலி சேனானாயக்க

(கௌரவ டடலி சேனானாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

You quoted it because I was not here!



விவரண பதன் கெடுதல்த, 1969-70

அவர்கள் உன். உம். பெரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

What could I do? I could not wait till the Prime Minister came back.

அவர்கள் உன். உம். பெரேரா

(கெளரவ டப்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I am sorry.

அவர்கள் உன். உம். பெரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

The Central Bank Report admits that all import prices have gone up by 30 per cent. If you want I will give you the page. The difference in import prices is 30.2 per cent. Mind you that is as between 1967 and 1968. The Central Bank says that the difference in import prices between 1967 and 1968 is 30.2 per cent. So, how much more should it be in 1969? A large portion of all the articles we consume in this country is imported, whether they be industrial raw material, whether they be for consumption purposes, or whether they be machinery. So, how can you possibly say that the difference is only 11 per cent, on which your whole case is based?

Take a simple case like rice. In 1959 two measures of rice cost 50 cents. What is the price today of two measures? On your figures it is Re. 1. Our figure is Re. 1.20.

அவர்கள் உன். உம். பெரேரா  
(அமைச்சர் அ. சண்முகனின் கையெழுத்தில்)  
அவர்கள் உன். உம். பெரேரா

(கெளரவ ஐ. எம். ஆர். ஏ. சரியகொல்ல—  
கல்வி, கலாசார விவகார அமைச்சர்)

(The Hon. I. M. R. A. Iriyagolle—  
Minister of Education and Cultural Affairs)

Ninety cents.

அவர்கள் உன். உம். பெரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

All right, ninety cents. What is the difference in percentage? If it is ninety cents now, on your own statement the difference in price is more than 11 per cent.

அவர்கள் உன். உம். பெரேரா

(கெளரவ டப்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

One measure is free.

அவர்கள் உன். உம். பெரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

That makes no difference. We are talking about two measures. Those days for two measures you paid fifty cents. Now for two measures you pay ninety cents. What is the difference?

அவர்கள் உன். உம். பெரேரா

(கெளரவ சரியகொல்ல)

(The Hon. Iriyagolle)

Fifty-five cents. Five cents cheaper.

அவர்கள் உன். உம். பெரேரா

(திரு. லெஸ்லி குனேவர்தன—பாணநதுறை)

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene—Panadura)

This is the Minister of Education!

அவர்கள் உன். உம். பெரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You have to send him to school to learn his arithmetic. What can I do?

அவர்கள் உன். உம். பெரேரா

(கெளரவ சரியகொல்ல)

(The Hon. Iriyagolle)

I will have to send you to school.

அவர்கள் உன். உம். பெரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I do not want to repeat what the hon. Member for Kelaniya said. I ask hon. Members to read it.



On your own admission, the market price of chillies today is Rs. 2.50 or Rs. 3. You take pride in that fact. I am not objecting to that. For my purpose, what is the difference in the price of chillies between 1959 and 1968? There is a big difference.

**ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් ජේනානායක**

(කෙළරඹ උද්ග්‍රී ජේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

To whom does the money go?

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(කලාතිථි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

That does not matter. I am now talking about your Gross National Product. I shall presently show to whom the money goes. At the present moment the question is, what is the difference in the price level between 1959 and 1968? You will find it is more than 11 per cent at the moment.

**ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩාර**

(කෙළරඹ ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

You are working it on the cost of living.

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(කලාතිථි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I am not working on the cost of living. I am working on the price level.

**ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩාර**

(කෙළරඹ ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

But in the production stage, it goes to the G.N.P.

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(කලාතිථි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I am trying to prove that the constant prices are different from the constant prices given in your Central Bank Report which entitle you to say there is an 8 per cent growth.

**ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩාර**

(කෙළරඹ ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

Production gets into the Gross National Product.

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(කලාතිථි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I have already pointed out that the cost of living has gone up. From 1959 to 1968 it has gone up by at least 22 points. It is an inadequate index. All the facts only go to prove that your 8.3 per cent increase is entirely wrong.

If you consider all the prices of all the commodities you will find that we are justified in saying that the difference between 1959 and 1968, at the minimum, is 30 per cent. On that basis I have shown that we are far from progressing. We have gone back to the 1963 level on the Gross National Product.

The Hon. Prime Minister is correct: there are certain sections which are very prosperous. Do you remember the time when you laughed at us for importing one or two Mercedes Benz cars? You have imported 105 Mercedes Benz cars.

**ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් ජේනානායක**

(කෙළරඹ උද්ග්‍රී ජේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Lotteries.

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(කලාතිථි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Not only lotteries. One hundred and five Mercedes Benz cars. That is apart from the other vehicles. Ten thousand vehicles have come in.

**නිල් ද අල්විස් මයා.**

(තිරු. ඒල් ඩී. ඇල්විස්)

(Mr. Neal de Alwis)

අපේ නුමුත්! බිප්ලි; කාප්ලි.



விசேஷ பதன் கெடுமபத, 1969-70

அவாட்சி உன். பி. பரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I have dealt with the question of the growth rate of 8.3 per cent and I hope I have satisfied you.

அ. மன்கிதா

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

No.

அவாட்சி உன். பி. பரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You are like Goldsmith's schoolmaster. You are similar. He was like that. Only, I do not know whether Goldsmith ever taught you.

Now I come to the next point. I am glad the Hon. Prime Minister is here because I want to deal with agriculture.

அ. டி. டி. சேனாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Golden brains?

அவாட்சி உன். பி. பரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Now, let me take agriculture. Many Members have dealt with various aspects. So I do not intend to go over all that again. But I was amazed at some of the things that were said. The hon. Member for Wariyapola and the hon. Member for Welimada said, "Why should we sell at Rs. 14 when other people are getting Rs. 16 and Rs. 18 with bol? Do they understand the implications of their statements? They are arguing our case.

பேர்ட்னே சலிங்கே

(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)

(Mr. Shelton Javasinghe)

There are different varieties of rice.

அவாட்சி உன். பி. பரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I am prepared to concede that you are selling at Rs. 16 per bushel, but that strengthens our case against you. I am glad the Minister of Food is here. Everything is referred to in glowing terms in the Minister of Finance's booklet "Economic and Social Progress 1965-1969." The Minister of State quoted from it. May I also quote from it? I am taking the agricultural section. This refers to a number of things. It gives the statistics of the bushels harvested from 1964-65 up to 1967-68. It gives the average yield per acre. Then you get the total acreage under cultivation.

Now, I ask the Minister of Food and Agriculture and the Minister of Finance, are all these figures given here correct? Mr. Prime Minister you quoted these figures with acceptance. Please tell me, are all these figures correct? The answer is no, because they have not studied these figures. If you have studied these figures you can answer the question I am asking you. You merely accept these figures without studying them.

One of these figures is obviously wrong. It is a question of simple arithmetic. It is stated here that the average yield per acre has increased to 47.5 bushels. That is at page 7. That is for the Maha crop. The total acreage for Maha is given as 1,146,958. Now multiply 1,146,958 by 47. What do you get?—[Interruption.]

அ. பி. டி. பண்டா

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

How much was harvested?

அ. டி. டி. சேனாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

You may cultivate, but you may not harvest.



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

**ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක**

(කෙළරව වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Then why do you give this average per acre?

**ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බන්ඩා**

(කෙළරව எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

The whole extent cultivated is not harvested sometimes.

**ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක**

(කෙළරව වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

You go round and see how many acres cultivated are not harvested.

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(කලාநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

That is the point. That is the case we are making. You have bloated the figures.—[Interruption]. That is precisely my case. Some of these figures are obviously wrong. I am not saying that you produced these figures. The officials produced these figures and you have accepted them without scrutiny.—[Interruption]. May I remind you that you had a man at Polonnaruwa, and you remember the houses he produced for you? What happened to him eventually? You had to get rid of him. He left the service. That is the kind of official we have.

**ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක**

(කෙළරவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Then he joined you.

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(කலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Agreed. And now he has come back to roost.

What is happening to us? Officials do not want to displease Ministers. They give figures in order to

satisfy them. Obviously, if low figures are given, you will turn round and say, "What the hell have you been doing? You are not doing your work." You are bound to pull up your officers. So they give you all these bloated and exaggerated figures.

**ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක**

(කෙළරவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Is that what they did for your budgets?

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(කலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

This is not only what we suffer or what you suffer. All of us are suffering. We must save honest officials who will serve this country with independent views and not just cow down to people. That is what we want in this country. That is why we are suffering in this country. That is why you get these wrong figures at the present moment.

**ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බන්ඩා**

(කෙළරவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

These are the figures of the Statistics Department

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(කலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

That makes no difference. After all, the Statistics Department must go to the local area and get the figures from them.

I was in my Constituency, at Matamagoda, the other day. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Food was with me. We had a prize-giving ceremony for people who had done cultivation. They did not call them "Govi Rajas".

**ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක**

(කෙළරவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Were their figures wrong?



பிஷர்பன பதன் கெடுபிபன, 1969-70

—தேவன வர கியலே

அலாபீய உன். உமீ. பரேரூ

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Please listen to me. What the first prize-winner got was 87 bushels per acre or so. But they also stated this: More than a third of that area could not be brought under cultivation. At the last moment the competition had to be cancelled. Why? Because something was wrong with all the paddy fields in that area. Some insects had attacked them and there was no produce. They got up at that function and blamed the officials in front of the hon. Parliamentary Secretary. If you look into the Kegalle Kachcheri figures, you will find that they are made up on the basis that those people produced their full quota of paddy!

சுரு விலி சேனாயக

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

No.

அலாபீய உன். உமீ. பரேரூ

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Do not shake your head. I know.

சுரு உமீ. டி. மனோ

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

General average.

அலாபீய உன். உமீ. பரேரூ

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You are taking the general average, not on the basis of the random sampling you used to do? You are doing a selective sampling because I have seen it in my constituency. In regard to Ganepalla, you remember that something has gone wrong? No help has come.

சுரு உமீ. டி. மனோ

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

District average. The Statistics Department goes exactly on the method you are talking of.

அலாபீய உன். உமீ. பரேரூ

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

They are not doing that.

I will not disclose the name, but a responsible official told me that if you cut down those figures by one-third, then you would get the correct figure. But, he told me, "I dare not do it."

சுரு விலி சேனாயக

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Did the Government Agent tell you?

அலாபீய உன். உமீ. பரேரூ

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

A government agent.

சுரு விலி சேனாயக

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Not that Government Agent?

அலாபீய உன். உமீ. பரேரூ

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

No.

சுரு விலி சேனாயக

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

A government agent of your area?

அலாபீய உன். உமீ. பரேரூ

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Not my area.

சுரு விலி சேனாயக

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

You are talking of something that happened in your area, and which you discussed with some other government agent?



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

No. I am talking of a person whom I met but not in my area.

You will find that it is not enough merely to accept the figures that have been given by officials. We have got to work out figures on the basis of a proper understanding of the position, because if these figures are correct then we are already self-sufficient; we should be having 76 million bushels. The Minister of Industries talks of exporting rice. He is the person who once said, as Minister of Food, that we do not want any more extensive cultivation. He wanted only intensive cultivation. Today he is enamoured of extensive cultivation at Minipe carried out by a large number of companies.

Now on this same page—"Economic and Social Progress 1965-69", page 8—we are told that you have increased your acreage by 287,120 during this period. Is that correct? But your own document gives a figure of 57,515 acres for the period 1967-68—that is the total extent of land alienated for cultivation under major colonization schemes.

ලො. වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Major cultivation?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I am reading from your book.

ලො. ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Major cultivation and minor cultivation.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Where are the others? All the other figures that are given—major, minor, village and so on—do not

—දෙවන වර කියමිම

come up to 287,120. Where is it? I looked up the Central Bank Report, and it says the Yala cultivation last year was less by 4,000 acres, compared to previous year's Yala cultivation.

ලො. එම්. ඩී. බන්ඩා

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

Quite possible.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

But according to this here is an increase. There are so many diverse figures given by various people.

ලො. එම්. ඩී. බන්ඩා

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

Major cultivation is expanding.

ලො. මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

Ha ! Ha !

ලො. එම්. ඩී. බන්ඩා

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

Why are you laughing? I am interrupting my hon. Friend because he is going on a series of presumptions. The hon. Member for Anuradhapura (Mr. K. B. Ratnayake) knows it. In the Anuradhapura District they have a recorded extent of 147,000 acres of paddy for any one Maha season, which is the season in which the largest extent is cultivated. In that area 97,000 acres was the maximum, but now they are cultivating over 120,000 acres. That is the position now.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Mr. Minister, you are taking my



விசேஷண பதத் கெடுபிண, 1969-70

[ஊவரீய உத். உதி. பரேரூ]

In fact, Sir, the Hon. Minister of Finance in his first Budget Speech said this :

"The Government has, after careful study, decided to undertake a programme of action which should bring under cultivation in the years 1965-66 to 1967-68 approximately 100,000 acres."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 9th August 1966 ; Vol. 61, c.95.]

Your target was 100,000 acres and suddenly you say you have 287,000 acres.

ஓர் ஐபிசி சேனானாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனானாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

You can exceed the target.

ஊவரீய உத். உதி. பரேரூ

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Mr. Prime Minister, are you telling me quite honestly that you have increased your acreage by 187,000 during this period ? Please get up and say that, if it is true. Obviously, the figures have been bloated because all other figures do not tally. Your own figures including major irrigation, village and lift irrigation, all add up to only 120,000 acres. Where are you having these 287,000 acres ?

ஓர் உத்ரினாயக்க

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Highland paddy.

ஊவரீய உத். உதி. பரேரூ

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

If they are rain-fed areas they are all included in the cultivated areas. In point of fact, Mr. Minister of Finance, your total acreage in production in 1964-65, Maha and Yala, was 129,000 acres—that is less than the 1964 acreage. You are saying no. These are your own figures taken from your own speech.

ஓர் உதி. டி. ஹெடா

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

Which year is that ?

—தேவன வர கியதி

ஊவரீய உத். உதி. பரேரூ

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

In 1964-65 the total acreage in production during Maha and Yala was 129,849 acres less than in 1963-64.

ஓர் உதி. டி. ஹெடா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

Not possible.

ஊவரீய உத். உதி. பரேரூ

(லாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Not possible ? These are your own figures which you have given in your own speech. All that I am saying is that you cannot now come here and tell us that there is an increase of 287,000 acres when in your first year you had 129,849 acres less than in 1963-64. In point of fact I have told you already what the Central Bank says. At page 35, the Central Bank Report states :

"With the availability of better irrigation facilities, the harvested area increased by 71 thousand acres in Maha 1967-68 compared with the previous Maha. This, however, dropped by 4 thousand acres in Yala 1968 compared with the corresponding season of the previous year."

That is what the Central Bank says, and can you now come and give us bogus figures ? We have got a bewildering variety of figures. We do not know where we stand. Your officers are feeding you with all sorts of fanciful ideas.

Let us look at this question in another way. Let us look at it from the point of the end-product.

ஓர் உதி. டி. ஹெடா

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

End-result.

ஓர் உத்ரினாயக்க

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

That is what counts.



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාநிති என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Let us see what your paddy purchases are under the G.P.S., and then we get some idea of it. In 1962, you purchased under the G.P.S. 25.3 million bushels. In 1963, you purchased 27.8 million bushels. In 1964, you purchased 29.8 million bushels. In 1965—your year—you dropped to 21.3 million bushels. Then you went up again in 1966 to 28 million bushels. In 1967, the year you had your bumper harvest and the 64 million bushels of production according to your figures, you purchased under the G.P.S. 13 million bushels.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

That is because after the one measure was removed they have had to buy one measure out, and that is fetching a better price.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I will give you the reason.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

They are getting better prices.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

In 1968, that is last year, you purchased under the G.P.S. 14.9 million bushels. That is half of what we produced.

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

Not produced.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

If, as you say, your production increased and assuming that the people purchased two measures, there should be enough supplies to meet all the demand. I will give you the total figures. If the supply was sufficient prices would not have shot up. Why are they selling less? That is what the hon. Member for Wariyapola asked. They are selling their paddy outside. Why? Because there is a bigger demand and the supply is less. Your total production figures are wrong. Your total production is less. If you look at the total cereal imports you will see that. I will give you the figures.

In 1962 rice imports amounted to 514,975 tons; and flour 202,839 tons. The total internal production was supposed to be 687,000 tons. In 1963, rice imports amounted to 558,702 tons.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

You are not referring to the Hon. Prime Minister's figures.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

The same figures.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

Not the same figures.



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාநிති என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

The same figures. Mr. Speaker, I have not given any of my figures.

These are figures given by the Central Bank and the Food Commissioner. Nothing is mine. I have only analyzed Government figures. These are the rest of the figures :

Year	Rice imports	Flour imports	Total local production
1963 ..	558,702 tons	205,000 tons	700,000 tons
1964 ..	546,805 tons	225,299 tons	721,900 tons
1965 ..	641,816 tons	311,939 tons	518,570 tons
1966 ..	494,000 tons	264,057 tons	652,860 tons
1967 ..	381,000 tons	517,930 tons	769,000 tons
1968 ..	344,000 tons	359,000 tons	900,000 tons

That is their claim. What is the total? For 1962 the total cereal content was 1,414,000 tons. In point of fact these figures show that up to 1966 the figure varied around 1,400,000 tons. In 1967 and 1968 it jumps to 1,660,000 tons. If, as you claim, you had such an increase in local production and if the cereal content is 2 million bushels more, then the price of rice in the market should certainly come down. And if the price in the market is low, purchases under the G.P.S. would have been more.

But what happened? The farmers have not sold to the department under the G.P.S. As the hon. Member for Wariyapola (Mr. D. M. T. Bandara) said, "Why should they sell to the department under the G.P.S.? Our fellows are getting Rs. 18 per bushel." Quite right! Why should they? The point is that production is not as high as you claim. So, when you look at it from the point of view of the end product also, you find that your figures do not tally with what you claim.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(කෙළරඹ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

I shall meet your end-product argument also.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You can meet the argument. In point of fact, they have imported up to August 1969, 231,580 tons and Mr. M. D. Peiris is now going to Burma to purchase some more rice.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

No, that is a wrong figure.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Why do you not correct the figure? I have got all the shipments here with me.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

You are getting wrong information about the department.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I have got all the details of shipments here. There are the countries of origin, the quantity imported, the names of the ships that brought the cargo and the dates. All are here.



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(කෙළරාව எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

There are chaps in the department who give you all sorts of information and figures.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

If you study the figures you will see that roughly about 60 per cent was bought earlier under the G.P.S. Today they are buying less than 25 per cent. That is the present position. And this is not withstanding the fact that they have raised the price of a bushel of paddy to Rs. 14. This clearly shows that your production figures are obviously wrong. The supply was not equal to the demand and that is why the market price is going up.

Therefore, the so-called leap forward this Government is supposed to have had looks like a leap in the dark. On this so-called leap forward you have built up a whole case of prosperity in the country.

I come to another aspect of this. The Prime Minister talks of prosperity in the villages. I am taking his own figures. I must say in fairness to the Prime Minister that he quoted some figures during the Debate on the Address of Thanks. I asked from where he got those figures; he said he got them from the department.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(கெளரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

What figures?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Figures of paddy holdings. I wrote to him and he sent me a reply on which I have based my calculation. I am grateful to him for giving me the figures.

Let us analyze those figures. According to the Hon. Prime Minister, as reported in Column 1343 of the HANSARD of 25th July, 16.3 per cent own over ten acres of land. His argument goes like this. The overwhelming majority of the people who own lands in the rural areas are poor people. He also says that there is prosperity in the villages. Therefore the poor people must be prosperous! He is begging the question.

Let me analyze the figures as given by the Hon. Prime Minister. According to him the total number of paddy holdings in the country is 769,908. These are figures given to him by the Ministry of Agriculture and Food. There are 769,908 owners of holdings. 31.4 per cent of the holdings are held by 242,690 owners. Then he is asked a question by the hon. Member for Dompe: "Arē they owners or cultivators?" The Hon. Prime Minister argued that nearly one-third of the paddy holdings owned by people are less than half an acre in extent. Then how much do they own? Let us assume that each owner represents a family. 242,000 odd families own 58,005 acres. The average holding is between a quarter of an acre and one-fifth of an acre. Some of them are *ande* cultivators. That makes the position worse. Let us take the highest figure of one-fourth of an acre. And let us assume that they cultivate this one-fourth of an acre. Then what do they get? Let us assume also that they get 48 bushels from an ~~acre~~ *acre*. Then what does each person get? Each one gets only 12 bushels for a Maha crop.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(கெளரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

Why?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

One-fourth of an acre is the holding; so a person gets 12 bushels. That is on the assumption that he gets 48



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා]

bushels per acre for a Maha crop. What is the gross income on that? We will assume that he sells to the G. P. S. at Rs. 14 a bushel. Then he gets Rs. 168.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(කෙළරව எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

There are some districts with an average of 70 bushels and other districts with an average of 68 bushels. Your analysis must take that into account. There are districts like Jaffna.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Mr. Minister, if you ask me to work on the average of 70 bushels per acre, your paddy production would be a 100 million bushels.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(கெளரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

You must analyse it district by district.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

That makes no difference. You are giving the total holdings for the whole country.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(கெளரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

Your analysis is wrong.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I am afraid you are deliberately trying not to understand. According to the figures supplied to me your average for the whole Island is 48 bushels. Am I wrong in assuming, when considering the holdings for the whole country, the average for the whole country? How can I take

70 acres in Badulla and another 35 acres in Kegalle and work out the average for the whole country?

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(கெளரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

You must break down the holdings.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You cannot do that. It is nonsense. This is what a normal person can get by way of income: at Rs. 14 per bushel under the G.P.S. he would get Rs. 168. What is the cost of production? I am putting it at Rs. 50.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(கெளரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

I contest your figures.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I am putting it at the lowest figure. It works out to Rs. 400 per acre, but I am putting it at Rs. 200 per acre.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(கெளரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

I am contesting your figures as well as those of the hon. Member for Anuradhapura (Mr. Ratnayake). You are talking with your tongue in your cheek.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

The net return for one-third of the holding is Rs. 118 for *maha*. Assuming that he works for *yala* also, what will he get? He will get 11 bushels for *yala* on their own figures.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(கெளரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

What figures?



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාநிති என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

On the figures in your book. You do not know what is there in your own book. What can I do about it? Yala, net income is Rs. 104. The total income for the whole year, assuming that he is cultivating in both seasons, is Rs. 272. According to you, only 50 per cent of the land is cultivated for Yala.—[Interruption]. What is wrong about the calculation? I am talking about paddy cultivation at the moment. For highland cultivation there may be a tremendous amount of land.

The other day the hon. Member for Agalawatta (Dr. Colvin R. de Silva) read out from a report what happened to nine of your best colonies. He pointed out that 66 per cent is below poverty line. That is the position.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

That was before the incentive scheme started.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

That is all nonsense. You are now trying to cover it up by saying that it was before the incentive scheme started.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

Look up the date.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I saw it. I saw the "Daily News." The newspapers are trying to cover up the position when they found that the figures were not satisfactory.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

You look up the report itself.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

All that I am saying is this.

කළානායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

How much longer will the hon. Member take?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Sir, I want at least another half an hour.

කළානායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

The hon. Member has already taken about one and a half hours. I will have to give two hours to the Hon. Minister. He must be given a chance to reply.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I agree.

කළානායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

As it is it may not be possible to give him two hours unless the House decides to go on till 8.30 p.m. Will the Hon. Member kindly finish his speech by 6.45 p.m.?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I shall try my best. I will run through these figures because I have more important things to discuss.

I am trying to point out that in relation to total holdings, actually the major section comprises 30 per



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

[ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා]

cent. The next category comprises 253,823 owners who hold between half an acre and less than one acre. What is the actual acreage? Half an acre is the average holding. On that basis their net income for the whole year, assuming that they sell the paddy under G. P. S. at Rs. 14 and cultivate both maha and yala, is Rs. 400 for the holding. That is 66 per cent of the paddy holdings. On that basis, in the one case you get less than seventy cents per day and in the other case you get Rs. 2.18 per day. That is their income. This is your rural prosperity!

Now, I come to the third category. There you get 162,000 holders, owning between one and two acres. They form 21 per cent of the total holdings. Then 193,794 persons own between one and one-fifth of an acre. On that basis the total income comes to Rs. 1,166 from paddy. That is roughly Rs. 100 per month or Rs. 3.35 a day. Of this category comprising 85.3 per cent of the total holdings, one section, the highest-paid section, gets Rs. 3.35 a day on paddy. That is their earning. Another section gets Rs. 2.18 a day, and the lowest-paid section gets 75 cents a day. That is their earning from paddy.

As against that, there are two other sections. 83,000 cultivators own 231,000 acres—that is, those who own between two acres and five acres. These cultivators get an annual income of Rs. 2,376—roughly Rs. 200 a month or Rs. 6.50 a day.

Then there is another section, a small one—1.1 per cent—about whose prosperity you are talking.

19,000 families, forming 2.8 per cent of the total, own 122,073 acres. That means they own at the rate of six acres or more.—[Interruption]. That is the section to which you cater. They get an income of Rs. 5,350 a year or Rs. 15 a day.

There is one other section. The average income of this section is Rs. 15,984 a year—a monthly income of Rs. 1,350 or a daily income of Rs. 45.

Now you are really thinking in terms of this 1.1 per cent of the paddy cultivators. They are prosperous. I have not the slightest doubt about it. There is a section on the margin earning about Rs. 15 a day. The balance 85 per cent of the cultivators earn less than Rs. 3.50 a day. That is the position.

I want to say just a word about subsidiary foodstuffs. There is no doubt that there has been progress in regard to the cultivation of subsidiary foodstuffs.

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක

(කෙළරඹා උද්ගිරි ජෙනරායාය)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

No progress in regard to paddy?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාතිඨි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I have already analysed the figures with regard to paddy. I am sorry, I cannot start all over again. I shall have to finish my speech in a short time.

We have no statistics of cultivators of subsidiary foodstuffs. But I do know this. In fact you are importing chillies and pulses. Up to date you have imported 34,453 tons of pulses, and 6,502 tons of chillies. I am prepared to admit that by giving a much bigger subsidy you have succeeded in encouraging production of subsidiary foodstuffs. But at whose expense? The consumer has had to pay for it. Look at the total number of people who are employed in the cultivation of subsidiary foodstuffs. Would you say the number employed in the cultivation of subsidiary foodstuffs is one lakh of families?

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩාර

(කෙළරඹා ආර්. ආර්. බණ්ඩාර)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

More.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාතිඨි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Two lakhs?



විකර්ෂන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බන්ඩා

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

Much more.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

We have no statistics. We can only surmise. Let us assume that there are two lakhs of people employed in the cultivation of subsidiary foodstuffs. You are charging 80 cents, Re. 1 or Re. 1.50 per pound of potatoes and Rs. 3 per pound of chillies.—[Interruption]. You are giving high prices? Admitted. You are asking 11 million people to pay through their nose in order that these cultivators of subsidiary foodstuffs may benefit. Is that fair? Look at the country as a whole. The rest of the population has to pay. They are not all paddy, chilli or onion cultivators. While I am prepared to admit that you must encourage it, the correct policy is obviously to give bigger subsidies. That I am prepared to admit. That will be a solution, and that will be fair by the consumer. See that the consumers pays a fair price, and give the producer also a reasonable price. That I am prepared to accept.

May I now pass on from agriculture to industry? But before I come to industries I want to deal with two other matters; because they are very important. One is taxation. For a long time in this country we have been working towards direct taxation as the corner-stone of our whole taxation policy because that is the system that gives a progressive incidence of taxation. We have been trying to break away from indirect taxation. You have reversed that policy; you have gone back. You are now making your turnover tax which is an indirect tax on the poorest of the poor, one of your corner-stones, making your taxation thoroughly regressive.

The turnover tax was utilized for one purpose—for a temporary prevention of expansion of consumption.

You are now using it as a major measure, increasing it by 20 per cent in certain cases. Whom are you penalizing in the process? The vast mass of consumers throughout the country. You have allowed industrialists to make 300 per cent profit. And who buys those articles? The poor consumer. Every time you increase the turnover tax who has to bear the burden? The consumer. That is one serious charge against this Government.

My next charge is much more serious. Nobody drew attention to this matter. The Minister of Finance also tried to pass it off as a matter of no consequence. I refer to columns 65 and 66 of the Budget speech in HANSARD:

“Firstly, a decision has been made by Government to bring the foreign exchange payments of all departments other than those of the Food Commissioner, the Railway and the Electrical Department, within the scope of the Foreign Exchange Entitlement Certificate Scheme. This decision does not affect the balance between revenue and expenditure as the additional expenditures arising from the purchase of FEECs by Government departments will be matched by an appropriate receipt of FEEC revenue by the Treasury.—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 2nd August, 1969; Vol. 86, c. 65.]

Mr. Minister, may I ask you what is meant by “all departments”. Are all corporations brought within this?

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

He does not know.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Mr. Minister, please do not try to fudge us by saying that you do not know. You are creating an entirely new situation in the country. Do you realize what you are doing? Either you do not understand the implications of this statement, because you have merely read out somebody else's statement, or, you understand the implications and do not tell us



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

[ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා]

the truth. Please tell us, what are the implications of this? You have kept out the Food Commissioner's Department, the Railway Department and the Electrical Department. Are you including under the FEECs Scheme all corporations, the Local Government Department, the Health Department, the Postal Department and all the other departments? Are you doing that? This will immediately mean an increase in prices to consumers, including an increase in bus fares. I will tell you why. This is another trick of theirs.

රු. මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය

(කෙනරා වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

All tricks!

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාතිඨි என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Wait a minute, Mr. Minister. Will you please follow this? What does he say? The FEECs rate now is 55 per cent. All your imports will cost 55 per cent more. Your G. N. P. also will go up by 55 per cent. Your expenditure also will go up by 55 per cent. Therefore, next time you will come here and say: "Look, our G. N. P. has gone up by 30 per cent, not 8.3 per cent."

ද. සොයිසා සිරිවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. டி. சொய்ஸா சிறிவர்தன)

(Mr. de Zoysa Siriwardena)

And the U.N.P. will go down!

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாதிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

What does this mean? It means that all the services rendered by your departments will cost more to the consumer. Your drugs and most other consumer articles, even your postal rates, will have to go up with the FEECs rate going up to 55 per cent. Why are you shaking your head? Is this not true? I charged you during the Debate on the Address that you were faced with the

condition laid down by the World Bank that you will not get the Rs. 80 million unless you extended the FEECs rate to all items, including food.

If what you say is true, if this is harmless, why have you restricted it and not applied it to food, railway and electricity? Electricity charges have already been increased as a result of a demand made by the World Bank. You have increased the electricity rates, without any reference to the House, at the request of the World Bank. That was the condition under which you got your loan.

සුබසිංහ මයා.

(திரு. சுபசிங்க)

(Mr. Subasinghe)

Why do you not table that letter?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாதிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Why do you not apply it, if it is harmless, to the railway and food? Is it going to apply to all corporations? All consumers will pay 55 per cent as a result of what is going to happen. Why do you not tell the country the truth? You are in duty bound to tell the country the truth. You are hoping against hope to put this off as long as you can, and now, at the tail end of your term of office, you just say, "the principal objective is to increase the total volume of the nation's foreign exchange payments coming within the scope of the FEECs scheme, which as I said earlier reflects a more realistic value of foreign exchange."

What is this? Is this a game that is being played? You are just entering on one side and entering again on the other side. Please tell us why you are doing this. You are talking about a realistic foreign exchange.

When you devalued the currency we were told that it was to meet a realistic foreign exchange. You said the rupee was overvalued and that it had to be devalued to get on to a realistic basis.



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

After that you introduced the FEECs scheme to achieve the same purpose and then raised the rate from 44 per cent to 55 per cent, again with a view to having a realistic foreign exchange. Now, you are going to apply FEECs to cover all departments except Food, Railway and Electrical, to have, again, a realistic foreign exchange.

What is the realistic foreign exchange you are aiming at? Have you eliminated the blackmarket? What is the price of sterling in the blackmarket today? It is between Rs. 30 and Rs. 32. The blackmarket goes on.

How do you increase your price of tea? The Hon. Prime Minister talked about what would happen if we did not devalue. Mr. Prime Minister, Kenya did not devalue. What has happened to Kenya tea? Have they not sold their tea?

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක

(කෙළරඹ උඩුගි ප්‍රේමනායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Because the cost of production is less.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාතිථි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

On the contrary. It is not very different from the cost of production that you have. Please ask yourself: How is it that your tea prices two months and go up again? If as you say there is over-production, there should be a continuous fall in prices. How can the prices go up and down like this, except by manipulation by middlemen? Is that not what is happening? That is the truth about this. But I want a categorical answer from the Hon. Minister of Finance. Without misleading the country, tell us truly and honestly, whether you are not imposing an additional burden on the consumers with an increase in the FEECs rate all round. Tell us the truth.

Then, I wish to say one word about industries before I close. One would have gathered that the Industries Department came into existence with the Hon. Minister's acceptance of the portfolio, and that earlier it had not existed at all. On the contrary I have a document which I can read out, from a gentleman who cannot be having views akin to us. He gives a glowing report of the industrial production. It is from "The Industrial Exhibition 1965", by Mr. G. V. S. Samarasinghe, who has no particular liking for all of us. He makes a very glowing report about the industrial development that took place under the previous regime.

I am not saying that you have not done anything, but please do not assume that the previous Government did nothing.

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක

(කෙළරඹ උඩුගි ප්‍රේමනායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Who said so?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාතිථි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

In point of fact the correct thing to say is that—I have stated it more than once in this House—the first break in industrial development began in 1956 with Mr. Bandaranaike's Government. Up to that time you tried your utmost to persuade the local capitalists to start industries which they never did. I have quoted the speeches of the Hon. Minister of State who complained bitterly about the failure of the industrialists to respond to all the benefits that he gave.

The first break began in 1956. The real start came in 1960 onwards when the principle of import substitution started, although, mind you, you from this side of the House thundered against the whole principle of substitution and attacked the Government saying that prices have increased.



செப்டம்பர் மாதம் செப்டம்பர், 1969-70

செ. தினாபதி

(செ. தினாபதி)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

You also attacked the Government.

செ. தினாபதி. எம். எம். பெரேரா

(செ. தினாபதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Certainly, I do not deny that. But I am prepared to recognize something when it has been demonstrated to be correct.

செ. தினாபதி

(செ. தினாபதி அங்கத்தினர்கள்)

(Hon. Members)

Hear! hear!

செ. தினாபதி. எம். எம். பெரேரா

(செ. தினாபதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Anybody who visited the industrial pavilion would have seen that considerable progress had been made by Ceylon in 1964.

In point of fact what really happened was this. A number of industries—the Tyre Factory, the Steel Factory, the Hardware Factory—all these industries were begun by the previous Government and came to fruition under the present Minister of Industries, but he is crowing as if he did the whole thing.

What have you to your credit for the last 4 1/2 years? You started the Thulhiriya Textile Project three years late. You have still not finished it. You started a plywood factory at Avissawella. You have still not completed it. That is what you have to your credit. What else did you do? You demolished the textile factory at Pugoda. Have you set it up yet?

—செ. தினாபதி

after 4 1/2 years? You talk about industrial development. Why did you not do that?

செ. தினாபதி. எம். எம். பெரேரா

(செ. தினாபதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

That went under water.

செ. தினாபதி. எம். எம். பெரேரா

(செ. தினாபதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

That is all right. You took it to some other place. What did you do to set it up for 4 1/2 years?

செ. தினாபதி. எம். எம். பெரேரா

(செ. தினாபதி அங்கத்தினர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

They are waiting for the Birlas.

செ. தினாபதி. எம். எம். பெரேரா

(செ. தினாபதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

They want the monopolists to come here to start factories.

Take the case of cement. The target set in 1964 for 1968 was 957,000 tons. But where are we now? And the Minister talks about the great progress he has made. He has not reached anywhere near the target set for 1968 in 1964.

Every one of the targets in the plan has been unfulfilled, and the Minister talks big about the industrial development that he has made.

Now, about capital formation: actually if you look up the constant figures, there is less capital formation compared to 1959. There are four categories: government, public enterprises, public corporations and the private sector. What are the figures?

	1959	1968
Government .. .. .	256.2	245.2
Public enterprises .. .. .	79.6	84.2
Public Corporations .. .. .	90.4	194.6
Private Sector .. .. .	691.9	576.7



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

Now, this is very important. What has happened to Tulhiriya? This is why I say that the expansion of the G. N. P. is unwarranted. There is a big tussle going on between the Planning Secretariat and the State Engineering Corporation. I am not taking sides in this matter—I do not know who is right and who is wrong but I am giving you the facts. A preliminary investigation showed that the cost of the Thulhiriya project has shot up from Rs. 198 million to Rs. 298 million. The cost of assembling and installing machinery has gone up from Rs. 3 million to Rs. 34 million. A circuit bungalow was to cost Rs. 1 million—must be a palace! Anyhow, I am not concerned about the rights and wrongs. Mr. Kulasinghe argues that machinery itself cost Rs. 130 million c. & f. and with FEECs that he had to pay it has gone up to Rs. 180 million. That is why I say your GNP does not really reflect the true increase in prices. He says that “since the building of the new factory began the rupee had been devalued, FEECs had been introduced and the scope of our work widened. That has put up the cost by over Rs. 100 million. “In view of this it would be a distorted picture that you see when you merely accept figures. You say capital formation has jumped from Rs. 1,118 million in 1959 to Rs. 1,567 million. It is a bogus figure. The correct figure is very much lower.

I have nearly done. I have tried to prove that the main basis of the so-called leap forward, the prosperity in this country, is based on bloated and exaggerated figures—perhaps not through the fault of the Government but because officials were anxious to please them and get their goodwill. Of course, they have satisfied them also. They talk of the goodwill and prosperity that exist. The Hon. Prime Minister thinks he and I have nothing more to do for the future, that enough has been done already, and that both he and I can retire in peace. On the contrary, I say our task is far

from done. The tremendous poverty that still exists, the tremendous amount of work that is still to be done, cannot be denied. The Hon. Prime Minister is confident that when he goes before the country, the country will endorse his stewardship. Good luck! I for my part am very reluctant to prognosticate what the voters will do in 1970. I might be defeated—I do not know. That is in the hands of the voters. There are people there who talk of being in power for 25 years. There are other people who have been talking of being in power for 25 years. Let us see. The people will determine that and then when the time comes I have not the slightest doubt that the people's verdict will be quite different from what you think it will be.

අ. හ. 6.45

කමානායකතුමා

(කෙළරාව පාඨාලයකරු අවරුන්)

(Mr. Speaker)

The Hon. Minister will reply now. The Hon. Deputy Speaker will take the Chair for half an hour.

අනතුරුව කමානායකතුමා මුලසනයෙන් ඉවත් වූයේ, නියෝජ්‍ය කමානායකතුමා [එම්. සිවසිතම්පරම් මහ.] මුලසනට විය.

அதன் பிறகு, சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள் அக்கிராசனத்தி னின்று நீங்கவே, உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள் [திரு. எம். சிவசிதம்பரம்] தலைமை தாங்கினார்கள்.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER [Mr. M. SIVASITHAMPARAM] took the Chair.

ගරු වන්නිකායක

(කෙළරාව වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, may I start by thanking hon. Members on both sides of the House for their participation in this Debate and for the contributions, criticisms and suggestions that they have made? Some of these contributions, criticisms and suggestions have been useful, others not so useful and still others destructive and politically oriented. However that may be, I think all



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

[ශ්‍රී ලන්කීයයක]

hon. Members for their participation in this Debate. I must also thank hon. Members on the Government side and my colleagues in the Cabinet, particularly the Hon. Prime Minister, who have replied more than adequately to the very few criticisms of the Budget that have been made. I am thankful to them.

There is one general observation that I must make before I proceed. Some of the criticisms made, I feel with justification, applied to Budgets that were presented in this House between 1956 and 1965. They applied more accurately and with greater force to those Budgets than to the Budgets that have been presented by me in this House during the last four years.

In fact, the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) asked, "What is there in this Budget to criticize violently? There is nothing." He said so. I thought I had achieved my purpose when he said that, because this is the fifth of a series of Budgets. I do not want to change horses during the last lap. I wanted this to be a continuation Budget, a continuation of the work we had started. I think the hon. Member for Yatiyantota was honest about it—he was more honest than some of the other Members of the Opposition—when he said that there was nothing in this Budget to criticize violently. Therefore he had to stray into other fields.

That is understandable. The trouble is that attention was concentrated on the forthcoming elections. I can understand that, too. I can understand that on the eve of an election Members of the Opposition would normally have one eye on the election and one eye on the Budget, but they were having one and a half eyes on the election and only half an eye on my Budget, with the result that they did not see the full implications of my Budget proposals.

The hon. Member for Yatiyantota as I said earlier, having admitted that there was nothing in this Budget to criticize violently, strayed into other

fields. I was surprised that he referred to malpractices and various such things that were taking place in various organizations. I was surprised that an hon. Member of the seniority of the hon. Member for Yatiyantota should make charges like that. There is a way of airing these grievances. There is a time to raise these questions. You must give the Ministers concerned time to answer these allegations. You are simply slinging mud without giving the Ministers a chance to find out facts and reply. I do not think the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill is the proper occasion for this type of thing.

There were various charges. I am not saying that they are not true or otherwise—I do not know. The only thing I can say about them is that it is not always at thieves that dogs bark. Dogs bark at people who are not thieves also.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.

(දෙමළ)

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க—தொம்பே)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike—Dompe)

It depends on the dog.

සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.

(திருமதி சிறிமாவோ பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)

Are you referring to the Hon. Minister of Commerce and Trade?

ටී. බී. ඉලංගරත්න මය. (කොළොන්නාව)

(திரு. பி. பி. இலங்கரத்ன—கொலன்னாவ)

(Mr. T. B. Ilangaratne—Kolonnawa)

Dogs bark at dogs.

ශ්‍රී ලන්කීයයක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Now, about this Budget itself there was disagreement among hon. Members of the Opposition. I shall come to that later.

I want to mention that this is the fifth of a series of Budgets. I also say it is continuation Budget, a continuation of the work we had started, whether you approve of it or not. I know you approve of it in your heart



of hearts, but, of course you cannot say that you approve of it and go to the country and say something else. You cannot support the Budget here and go outside the country for the votes of the people and expect to come back next time. Your position is understandable.

For a proper assessment of our achievements you must have an idea of the background in which we started and also the legacy that we inherited. I shall come to that towards the latter part of my speech.

First of all, I want to refer to the statistics of the Central Bank. That is an important matter. Right through, from the time the Central Bank was started, every Finance Minister in this House has quoted the figures supplied by the Central Bank and based all their theories and proposals on those figures.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උද්ගිරි ජේතනායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

The Opposition also.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බන්දා

(කෙළරාව எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

Including the hon. Member for Yatiyantota.

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක

(කෙළරාව வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

But this time they are peddling a different line. I know why they are doing that—because this 8.3 per cent growth is an eye-sore to them. They think that this 8.3 per cent is a blow to all their political aspirations. They are trying to create a certain amount of confusion in the country and among the people that these figures are all wrong. They are trying to create confusion and say that nothing like it has happened.

Well, leave the statistics alone. Anybody going round the country today in a car or train or bus or a

motor cycle or even in a tricycle can see for himself something that did not happen two or three years ago is happening today.

I should now like to deal with certain specific points raised by the hon. Member for Yatiyantota. He referred to the method of computation of the G. N. P. The basis of computation of the G. N. P. has not been changed. The first point he made was with regard to the gap between the G. N. P. at current prices and the G. N. P. at constant prices in 1966. The hon. Member for Yatiyantota says that he cannot understand why the G. N. P. at current prices is or was lower than the G. N. P. at constant prices. The mere fact that he cannot understand it does not mean the figures are wrong.—[Interruption]. This has occurred as a result of the prices of goods and services produced in Ceylon falling in 1966. This situation was brought about by a substantial fall in prices of export products like tea and coconut which more than offset the rise in the prices of other goods and services produced in Ceylon. The average f.o.b. prices of tea fell from Rs. 2.45 a pound in 1965 to Rs. 2.33 a pound in 1966. The average price per ton of coconut oil fell from Rs. 1,661 to Rs. 1,489 during the same period. I request the Hon. Member for Yatiyantota to go through this reply and see whether it does not meet his complaint.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You are replying to my speech of last year.

ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා

(අගලවත්ත)

(கலாநிதி கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. சில்லா—  
அகலவத்தை)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva—Agalawatta)

It takes one year to sink in.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

This is a point I raised last year.



விவரண சனத் கெவிலிமன, 1969-70

உத்ப. ஈர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

He is reading last year's notes.

உத்ப. ஈர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Anyhow, I am replying to something. The hon. Member for Yatiyantota questioned the magnitude of the growth rate in 1968. He tried to show that there has been no economic growth in 1968.

உத்ப. ஈர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க

(திரு. இலங்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Ilangaratne)

What is this report you are reading?

உத்ப. ஈர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

According to him, the growth rate was negative. Since import prices have increased by 30 per cent, the argument was that domestic prices also have increased by more than that. He assumes that there has been an increase of at least 20 per cent in prices between 1959 and 1968. On this basis he has worked out the figure of Rs. 7,487 million as the G. N. P. for 1968 compared to Rs. 8,181 million for 1967. This, he points out, was a negative growth.

The rise in prices of imports led to a rise in prices of domestic goods but the extent of this rise depends on the import content of the items consumed or produced. The prices of agricultural products and services are affected only to a small extent because the import content of agricultural products and services is small. All price indices used in calculating the G. N. P. at constant prices are not affected by the rise in import prices to the same extent. Hence, the rise in the average price level was much less than the magnitude mentioned by the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera).

உத்ப. ஈர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க

(திரு. எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Your Central Bank is answering the Central Bank.

உத்ப. ஈர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க

(திரு. எம். பெரேரா)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

The hon. Member for Kolonnawa (Mr. Ilangaratne) criticizes the G.N.P. figures on the ground that the Central Bank had been revising the G. N. P. estimates from year to year.

In 1967 a general revision was made to conform to the United Nations classification but all estimates from 1959 onwards had been revised so as to maintain year to year comparability. A revision also had been done by substituting final figures for provisional ones. This substitution, again, does not affect comparability as the method of computation remains the same.

The hon. Member for Kolonnawa has criticized the practice of revising the G. N. P. figures for past years which have already been published in the previous annual reports. He points out, for instance, that the G. N. P. figure for 1967 as appearing in the 1968 report differs from the figure for 1967 as appearing in the 1967 report.

Estimates of the G. N. P. are made by the Central Bank only two months after the close of the calendar year. At this time, except for the organized sectors, data are available only as provisional figures. When the final figures become available the estimates are revised by substituting final figures for the provisional ones. This substitution in no way affects the comparability of data from year to year as the method of computation remains the same.

I want this to be understood by hon. Members. That is why I am making this explanation.

I have given the G.N.P. figures already. Whatever statistics the Opposition uses, and whatever interpretations they give to them, I do not think they can get away from the fact that there has been an increase in production in this country during



the last few years. I gave the figures. The rate of growth was 4.4 per cent in 1967 and 8.3 per cent in 1968. These are only indicators and the figures may be slightly out one way or the other. They may be a little more, perhaps, or a little less. But the broad fact remains that there has been an expansion in production during the last few years.

The other important point that must be remembered is that this rate of growth was achieved in spite of a fall in the terms of trade. As hon. Members would know if they have read the Central Bank Report, there has been a fall in the terms of trade of 8 per cent in 1968. Despite this fall in the terms of trade we have managed to achieve this growth rate. Had the terms of trade been more favourable, the growth rate would have been much higher. Even the per capita figure, which is really the more important figure, has increased by 6.1 per cent, as was pointed out by the Hon. Prime Minister, due to the rapid growth in agriculture, manufacture, and construction.

According to constant prices agriculture has gone up by 7 per cent, manufacture by 7.7 per cent, construction by 27 per cent.

I shall now come to industrial production. The Members of the Opposition say that nothing has happened in the field of industry. I think before I come to that I should take paddy production first. I told you that in 1964 there were about 50 million bushels of paddy produced; in 1965 it came down to 36 million bushels, as pointed out by both sides. But in 1968 it went up to 65 million bushels of paddy and the target for 1969 is 71 million bushels.

You keep on saying that the production went down in 1965. You are talking a lot about our borrowing from foreign countries and that kind of thing. Look at the position of the tractor imports. What has happened in regard to tractor imports? In the year 1963 they had imported into this

country 700 four-wheeled tractors. In 1964, that is the year in which my hon. Friend was in charge, only 100 tractors came into this country. No wonder that paddy production went down in 1965.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

1965 was your year.

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I shall come to my year. It was our year all right, but it was partly yours. You were there for a few months. So, we increased the number of tractors to 300. And, naturally, paddy production went up again. In 1966 we stepped up the import of tractors from 300 to 846. Up goes paddy production again!

In 1967 the number of four-wheeled tractors imported into this country went up to 1,760. You are only talking about foreign debts and our having spent a little more money. Read about the number of tractors that we have imported. I am just taking one item only. In 1968 there came into this country 901 four-wheeled tractors and 1,657 two-wheeled tractors. If you like to convert the two-wheeled tractors into four-wheeled tractors, just divide 1,657 by two.

ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා

(கலாநிதி கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

That is how you worked out your G. N. P.

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I am telling you about the failure of those in charge of the Government of this country in the year 1964. I do not know who was responsible. They stepped down the number of tractors that came into this country from 300 to 100. In the following year, in 1965, it was reflected in a lower production



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

[ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීයක]

of paddy. I agree there was some drought also, but this was one of the contributory causes. I think the hon. Member for Yatiyantota must take responsibility as the then Finance Minister for reducing the number of tractors imported into this country.

Then in the field of subsidiary food crops also production has increased.

Another point made by the Opposition was that the benefit of the increase in the production of paddy has gone to big owners. The Hon. Minister of Local Government dealt with it and proved to you by statistics that the bulk, nearly 95 per cent, of the profit had gone to small-holders. I do not want to weary you by repeating the figures. Even the Hon. Prime Minister has dealt with it.

I shall come now to the question of industrial development. We say that there was a 7.7 per cent increase in constant prices. This was due to the liberalization of imports. FEECs is one thing. You are criticizing FEECs the whole time. Devaluation has helped us to liberalize imports and increase the production capacity of most of these industrial concerns.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You are only giving one side of the picture.

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීයක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Wait, wait! I shall come to the other side also.

Now, Sir, much was said about industrial development being started by the last Government and that this Government has done nothing. The hon. Member for Kolonnawa (Mr. Ilangaratne) said, "You are now getting money to finance your Budget from the industrial corporations that we started." I shall tell you what your industrial corporations were. I quote the hon. Member for Dompe

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike) who was the Minister of Finance in 1962-63. This is what he thought of your industries:

"The current account of the Government shows a deficit rather than a surplus. In addition, due to various reasons including lack of experience and requisite skills, and inadequate planning and inefficient operation, I regret to inform hon. Members of the House, a matter I suppose which they already well know, that most public corporations do not show profits."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 26th July 1962; Vol. 47, c. 1305.]

In my Budget speech I said that except for two corporations all the others are showing profits. See what your Finance Minister had to say about them at that time. I do not know whether the Minister of Finance at that time had any grievance against the Minister of Industries.

Now I wish to quote what the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) had to say in his speech in regard to your Budget for 1963-64. Of course, he was criticizing the S.L.F.P. Government in 1963. This is what he said of the S.L.F.P. I wish the Members of the S.L.F.P. would mark it, read it, and digest it, and would not talk about industrial corporations again in this House.

"That is not all."—

Of course, he said so many things. I am only going to quote a few of the things he said.

—"I have already indicated to you that, when you talk about a high proportion or the satisfactory increase of the industrial share of the gross national product, you must also bear in mind that you have invested not less than Rs. 100 million in various corporations for which we are getting absolutely no return. In the Minerals Corporation you have invested Rs. 8 million for which you have nothing to show by way of an end-product."—

There is no end product.

—"In the Small Industries Corporation you have invested Rs. 1.8 million and you have nothing to show by way of an end-product. In the Eastern Paper Mills you have invested Rs. 29 million, and the accumulated losses of the Eastern Paper Mills are Rs. 8 million. You have invested Rs. 15.7 million on Paranthan Chemicals; but



what is the return for that? In the Kantalai Sugar Corporation you have invested Rs. 28.9 million so far. What is the return you have got? You have produced a few hundred tons at an enormous cost to the taxpayers of this country."

[*Interruption*]. Wait for the end product. The hon. Member for Yatiyan-tota (Dr. N. M. Perera) went on to say:

"... You started three years back, and fine beginning this is! In the Plywoods Corporation you have invested Rs. 2.8 million and you still continue not to show any profits."

I thought it was to show a profit! He goes on to say:

"In the Bus Corporation—apart from nearly Rs. 80 million spent—our accumulated losses come to Rs. 28 million. The total is well over Rs. 100 million, entirely due to"—

This is the relevant part. This is the end product. He has no doubts at all about it in his mind.

"bad management, bad planning, inefficiency, incompetence and corruption, worst of all, corruption."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 20th August 1963; Vol. 52, cc. 2753-4.]

There are many other criticisms and I do not want to deal with them. This is the industrial performance of the S. L. F. P. Government which they are now boasting of. They say, "You are now getting profits out of these industries and trying to balance the Budget." It is the hon. Member for Kolonnawa (Mr. T. B. Ilangaratne) who made this point.

Sir, I am reminded of an anecdote which is very interesting. Close to a very thick forest there lived a family, only two, the husband and wife. They had been married for some time, but they had no children; they were living along by themselves. Please do not ask me why, if they had been married for some time, they had no children. One evening they were seated in the compound, having a pleasant chat, when they saw a bear coming from the jungle straight on towards the house.

The bear was coming closer and closer. They thought the fellow might change its direction. No. It was coming still closer to the house. The man looked round; there was nothing he could do. There was a wooden post and the man placed it against the wall and got on to the top of the roof of the house. The wife looked round, she tried to get on to the roof, she could not. She saw a club close by. She took it with both hands and dealt a blow as mightily as she could on the head of the bear, and the bear fell. I think the fellow got disabled, and the man from the top of the roof was watching. The bear appeared to be struggling for some time. After some time there was silence; the bear was dead. Then the man came down, went up to his wife, patted her on the back and said, "Darling, see what both of us have done." pointing out to the dead bear. Similarly, the hon. Member for Kolonnawa says, "See how you are now getting profits!"

අ. ආ. 7.15

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා

(උප සභානායකර් අවරුණ)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Order, please! The Hon. Speaker will now take the Chair.

අනතුරුව නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා මුලසනයෙන් ඉවත් වූයෙන්, කථානායකතුමා මුලසනාරුළු විය.

අදහස්පිටි, උප සභානායකර් අවරුණ අක්කිරාසනත් විලිඳුරුත්ත ඒකකය, සභානායකර් අවරුණ ත්වේශ්වරා, තාක්කිකරුණ.

Whereupon MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER left the Chair, and MR. SPEAKER took the Chair.

රු. වන්නිනායක

(කෙළරව වන්නිනායකර්)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Sir, you just missed a story. As I said the husband came down from the roof, went up to his wife, patted her on her back and said, "Darling, see what both of us have done," pointing to the dead bear. Similarly, the hon. Member for Kolonnawa says, "See how you are now getting



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ශ්‍රී ලන්කියායක]

profits." The husband at least had the good sense to say, "See what both of us have done". My hon. Friend says, "See what we have done." I think it is time we stopped talking about it."

The other point I want to deal with is this IBRD and IMF bogey. From the inception of the IBRD and the IMF we have been a member of both these institutions. Every Finance Minister has attended those conferences. I have taken the smallest delegation whenever I had to attend these conferences. Every Finance Minister has gone there and all the speeches made by them are there. The other day I read the speech made by the hon. Member for Yatiyantota. The hon. Member for Kolonnawa also went and I think he fell ill and came back. As I said, every Finance Minister has gone there, made his contribution, made his claim for loans and got loans. But now when I am getting loans they say, "The IBRD is a bad institution, the IMF is a bad institution."

Now, let us see what the hon. Member for Dompe as Minister of Finance said in 1962:

"I resorted to borrowing on two occasions two credit tranches, as they are called, from the International Monetary Fund, each of which amounted to Rs. 53.8 millions. The result is that, although external assets did in fact deplete, it was the international borrowing that cushioned the impact and not the actual depletion in the level of our reserves.—"

The reserves were going down, and he propped up the reserves by borrowing from the IMF.—[*Interruption*]. This is the important part:

—"These credit tranches, as I stated a moment ago, will fall due for repayment in the course of three to five years from the date of borrowing."—

He said in 1962 that they would fall due for repayment in 1967 or 1968.

Last year I paid it; this year also I am paying it. He said that they would

be due for repayment in three to five years. I do not know how he knew that he would not be here to repay those loans. And he says:

"There is still plenty of time for repaying and there is no urgency as far as repayment is concerned."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 26th July 1962; Vol. 47, c. 1347.]

That was the spirit in which they borrowed. He said, "there is time for repayment." Did he mean that the next Finance Minister will pay? I think at that time he had decided that the Government was not coming back. That was the spirit, the reckless abandon, in which they went for these loans. There was nothing wrong in getting loans. What was wrong was that they took the loans and applied them for wrong things. They did not use them for development which would have enabled them to get a return and pay back the loans and the interest.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මහ.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Are you doing that?

ශ්‍රී ලන්කියායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

That is what we are trying to do.—  
[*Interruption*.]

Let us see what the hon. Member for Kolonnawa has to say. He is the one who is most against foreign aid. Most hon. Members do not know these things. If they knew what he and the others who were Finance Ministers had said in their Budget Speeches, they would understand the position. This is what the hon. Member for Kolonnawa who is always against any foreign connections had to say. I am reading from page 32 of the printed copy of the Budget Speech for 1963-64, not very far off:

"Rs. 30.1 million of loans from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development which had been earlier negotiated are being utilized this year for work on—

Hydro Electric Scheme, Stage 2A

Hydro-Electric Scheme, Stage 2B, and



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

## The Second Thermal Set at Grandpass.

We have attempted to negotiate further loans from the I.B.R.D. this year but without success."

That is the point. They have tried to negotiate, but people who have money do not like to part with it unless they are sure that it would be returned. They must be sure of the return of their money. The hon. Member for Kolonnawa tried to negotiate further loans from the I.B.R.D. The I.B.R.D. must have said, "We are not sure whether you can repay this. We cannot allow it." That is the bitterness that he has, and now that I have succeeded, he says, "Why did you succeed where I failed?"

Then he again says:

"Of this sum Rs. 130.3 million has been allocated to specific projects in the Budget—"

He makes this declaration very positively convinced that he has made a big contribution.

—"and Rs. 11.5 million for purchase of materials and stores for Government Departments this year,—"

He is the one who said he would not take foreign aid for purchase of consumer goods.

—"to make it the largest sum on record to be utilized as foreign aid in an Annual Budget."

By this he was able to have a dig at the previous Ministers of Finance. They had tried to get aid but they could not go up to the limit that he went up to. That is how he has been talking about foreign aid.

Why, the hon. Member for Yatiyantota, when he was Finance Minister, invited a team from the I. M. F. to come here to examine the economy of this country. I know that. He wanted a loan. They went into it but they had second thoughts about it probably. They waited and waited. But as Minister of Finance he was not there for long. So he could not carry on the negotiations for long. Perhaps, if he

had carried on negotiations further, he might have got the loan. I do not say he would not have. And if he had got the loan I would be in a stronger position today. He only tried to negotiate. I know that negotiations went on. He consulted them when they came here.

Then the other point is about the cost of living. That is a very important subject. There is disagreement among a number of people. I find there is disagreement between the hon. Member for Yatiyantota and the hon. Member for Agalawatta.

ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා

(கலாநிதி கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)  
(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

On what?

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)  
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Wait till I say.

The hon. Member for Dompe said this in 1963 about inflation. He has said a few things in his time. The other day he was baiting us on the rising cost of living. But this is what he said in his Budget Speech of 1962-63:

"In every developing country some level of inflationary financing has been found to be necessary and, indeed inevitable."

The question is, what is the safe limit of deficit financing? "[OFFICIAL REPORT, 26th July 1962; Vol. 47, c. 1343.]

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මහ.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)  
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

That is my view even today.

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)  
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I have no quarrel with the hon. Member for Dompe on that.



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීයක]

The hon. Member for Agalawatta (Dr. Colvin R. de Silva) the other day said that he does not contribute to the theory at all that development necessarily results in inflationary finance.

ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා  
(කලාතිති කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා)  
(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

I said that inflation accompanies development only in the capitalist countries and not in the socialist countries. That is the point I made in the Sinhala language.

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීයක

(කෙළරව වන්නිනායක)  
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

This is what the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) said in his Budget Speech when he was Minister of Finance:

“Apart from this, the increased investment in both the public and private sectors creates new employment and new incomes which increase the demand for consumer goods. This increased demand in the context of restricted imports, the inevitable time-lag between the setting up of an industry and the realization of the product, and the inelastic supply of local foodstuffs inevitably leads to increases in prices. Thus, an increase in the price level is an inevitable phenomenon in under-developed countries such as Ceylon in the present context of economic development and of world price trends.”  
—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 30th July 1964; Vol. 56, c. 1612-3.]

So that there is nothing extraordinary about prices going up in the context of economic development, and if I understood the hon. Member for Agalawatta, he said that that need not necessarily happen.

ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා  
(කලාතිති කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා)  
(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

You read any passage of mine from which you can validate that statement. Whoever told you that has obviously read wrong, or not understood, or simply misinformed you.

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීයක

(කෙළරව වන්නිනායක)  
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Anyway, there is no doubt about what the hon. Member for Yatiyantota said and about what the hon.

Member for Dompe said when they held the portfolio of Finance. But I would like to ask the hon. Member for Agalawatta whether he agrees with that statement of the hon. Member for Yatiyantota.

ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා  
(කලාතිති කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා)  
(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)  
Agree with what?

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීයක

(කෙළරව වන්නිනායක)  
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

With that statement of the hon. Member for Yatiyantota which I just read out. I just want to know.

ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා  
(කලාතිති කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා)  
(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

Will you please sit down so that I may answer?

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීයක

(කෙළරව වන්නිනායක)  
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I have not much time left.

ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා  
(කලාතිති කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා)  
(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

Then do not tell me that you want to know.

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීයක

(කෙළරව වන්නිනායක)  
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

All right, later.—[Interruption].  
We do not know how long you will take once you start.—[Interruption].

ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා

(කලාතිති කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා)  
(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

Yelling from the other side is not going to stop me.

කථානායකතුමා

(ආපාතනායකර් අයුරු)  
(Mr. Speaker)

I would ask the hon. Member to resume his seat.



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

**ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීතුමා**

(කෙළරව වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I will find out from you later.

**ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා**

(කලාநிதி කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

You can look through my speeches for twenty years and you will not find a single contradiction on those matters.

**ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීතුමා**

(කෙළරව වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Now, Sir, on this question of the net public debt, in 1955, the last year of the U. N. P. Government, the net public debt stood at Rs. 894.1 million. When the Coalition Government went out of office the net public debt stood at Rs. 3,436 million. From Rs. 894.1 million in 1955 it had gone up to Rs. 3,436 million in 1964.

**ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්**

(කෙළරව අங்கත්තවාර් ඉරුවාර්)

(An hon. Member)

What is it now?

**ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීතුමා**

(කෙළරව වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Rs. 5,660 million. But there is a difference. What have we used this debt for, and what did you produce? That is the point that the Prime Minister made. The question is not so much how much was borrowed, but what use you have put the loans to and whether you have put them to productive purposes which will give an adequate return to pay back your interest and your capital. We say we have used these loans productively and as a result we have obtained a G. N. P. increase of 8.3 per cent which is anathema to you today. You do not want to look at this figure. If you look at the expansion in the economy, you will see that it is by the wise use of this money that we have been able to bring this about. That expansion, we say, justifies the loans we have raised and we feel as

a result of that development we will be able to get a sufficient return not only to pay back the interest in time but also to pay back the capital on the dates that the capital is due to be paid.

They were talking about intermediate goods and capital goods. I do not know from where they got that. If you look at page 267 of the Central Bank Report you will find that consumer goods have gone down as a fraction of the entire volume of imports and the intermediate goods and capital goods have gone up as a fraction of the entire volume of imports. That also, I think, is a healthy sign.

By devaluation and FEECs, we have brought about a more realistic exchange rate; we have the expansion of industrial output; we were able to get more raw material, machinery and spare parts which were necessary.

Then exports of minor products got a shot in the arm. We are having more of these exports now.

Invisible savings increased from tourism and private capital movement.

True, prices are going up. In regard to the cost of living, as I said in my Budget Speech, I am only talking of that category which is covered by the Colombo Consumer Price Index. According to that, in 1966 and till November 1967, there was no change. In 1965 and 1966 the index was the same. You are now attacking the basis on which the index is calculated. When it comes to my figures they always question the yardstick. This was the yardstick that was used right through. When it comes to measuring my figures, they say "lengthen your yardstick." It is not fair. Let us measure with the same yardstick.

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(කලාநிதி ආර්. එම්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

On this side you had a different yardstick.



நியோகித மந்திரி மன்றம், 1969-70

சுரு வந்தியாயக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

No.

சுருவரீய சந்த. சி. பரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You questioned what was in the index.

சுரு சி. டி. வந்திய

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

Not the figures.

சுருவரீய சந்த. சி. பரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Your whole election propaganda was that. I will quote the figures. I will bring the leaflet.

சுரு வந்தியாயக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

In regard to the cost of living, what we say is that in 1965 and 1966 we held it and up to December 1967 also we held it. In one year it had gone down by 2. In 1967 the devaluation came in. Then we made an adjustment on the other side to make up for the hardship that would be caused to the people who would be affected by this. We also increased the guaranteed price of a number of commodities so that the people who produce them will get more. I would not say with mathematical accuracy that one matched the other in each individual case, but by and large we gave some kind of relief to counter the hardships that people have to bear as a result of these FEECs and devaluation. That is the point we are making.

Then you were talking about balance of payments and trade balances. There is one point, we have got to remember in assessing those figures. We are getting foreign aid liberally. Naturally it helps to augment our imports. Naturally

there is a difference between our export earnings and the imports because we are getting a much bigger volume of imports by way of foreign aid. So the trade figures as well as the balance of payments figures have got to be interpreted in that light.

Capital formation has received a considerable impetus during these three years.

சுருவரீய சந்த. சி. பரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

On the constant prices ?

சுரு வந்தியாயக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

8.6 per cent in 1966, 15.1 per cent in 1967, 14.7—

சுருவரீய சந்த. சி. பரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Those are current prices.

சுரு வந்தியாயக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Then we get suppliers' credits.

Then they ask, "What have you done for the common man? Let me tell you what I have done for the common man. Now in the Budget for 1965-66 I abolished Customs duty on what? On kerosene oil, bombay onions—

சுருவரீய சந்த. சி. பரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

How much ?

சுரு வந்தியாயக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

How much? That does not matter. The duty on kerosene oil, bombay onions, red onions, dhall, gram and peas, and certain agricultural implements including alavan-



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[රු වන්තිනායක]

was abolished. The point is that not only did I abolish the duties in 1965-66, but I have also not re-introduced them since that time.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Who got the benefit of that ?

රු වන්තිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Now you are complaining.

රු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Those who got alavangoes.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

How many alavangoes do you buy during your life time ?

රු වන්තිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Every Government, until we came into power, charged Customs Duty on chillies, kerosene oil, bombay onions, red onions, dhall, gram, alavangoes and so on, which the poor man had to pay. For the first time this Government abolished the Customs Duty on all these articles. And you are asking me, "what have you done for the common man ?"

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Where are the goods to buy ?

රු වන්තිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I will tell you what we have done for the poor man. Take the Budget provisions for these years. They will show you what we are doing for the poor man.

Take the Ministry of Land, Irrigation and Power. The allocation made by the hon. Member for Yatiyantota when he was Minister of Finance was Rs. 304.7 million. The allocation we have made for the next year is Rs. 454.4 million. Then about the Ministry of Home Affairs, in 1964-65 the allocation made was Rs. 159 million, but it has now been increased to Rs. 230 million.

ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා

(கலாநிதி கொல்வின் ஆர். டி சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

How can the Minister of Home Affairs benefit the poor man ?

රු වන්තිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

He has a number of things useful for the poor man. Take textiles, for instance.

ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා

(கலாநிதி கொல்வின் ஆர். டி சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

The only thing on which the touches the poor man is the tavern.

රු වන්තිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

The whole trouble is that hon. Members on the other side do not move with the common man as we do.

Take the Ministry of Industries and Fisheries. The allocation in 1964-65 was Rs. 107 million and now it is Rs. 174 million. Ministry of Local Government: it was Rs. 67.5 million in 1964-65 ; it has now gone



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ශ්‍රී ලංකා විනයායක]

up to Rs. 102 million. These must have some effect on the common man.

Take the Ministry of Agriculture and Food. In 1964-65 my hon Friend allocated Rs. 422 million. It has now gone up to Rs. 571 million for the next year. The Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs: it was Rs. 359 million in 1964-65; it has gone up to Rs. 506 million.

I do not want to read the whole list. There is the Ministry of Public Works, Posts and Telecommunications. The allocation was Rs. 161 million in 1964-65, and it has gone up to Rs. 285 million for the next year. I shall not read any more figures now.

I have only a little time left. I must say that I have outlined the achievements of this Government in the supplement that I presented along with my Budget, and I have given other facts and figures in my Budget Speech. I do not want to weary the House with all those facts and figures again.

Of course, there was the question raised about the cost of living and what I have done about unemployment. There are certain categories of people in this country—young men and women—who are not able to find employment, chiefly for the reason that they do not possess the skills for which there are vacancies in the country. That is not a problem which you can adjust in one or two years. We are paying for the sins and omissions of the previous Government which did not see far ahead and organize the education system of this country so that at the end of their school career those who pass can be absorbed into some kind of useful activity. Well, there are problems like that.

Now, if the achievements outlined in the Supplement to the Budget Speech, and referred to in the speeches made by the hon. Members of the Opposition, are to be properly assessed, they must be taken as I

said earlier, against the background in which we started work. I do not want to repeat how the economy was stagnating in certain sectors, how it was deteriorating in other sectors, what the position of the external assets was, what our creditworthiness was, what Treasury balances were inherited by us, what Treasury balances we gave the previous Government when we handed over to them in 1956 and what external assets we handed over to them in 1956 and what they handed over to us in 1965. I have with me a whole list of these figures; I do not want to weary the House by repeating them.

Now, Sir, I must refer to one or two matters regarding planning. You will remember that the previous Government toyed with the idea of a Ten-Year Plan. For almost two or two and a half years they said, "Wait, wait, we are preparing a Ten-Year Plan. Once that Plan is implemented all your problems will disappear." But, what happened? The Ten-Year Plan was not implemented in any one of the ten years. Why, in 1960, when the hon. Member for Dompe became Finance Minister, his first announcement as Finance Minister was that the Ten-Year Plan would be immediately implemented. He waited for some time and found that he could not implement it; then he reduced it to a Three-Year Plan; and later he reduced it to a One-Year Plan. I do not know whether it was he or the hon. Member for Yatiyantota who reduced it to a One-Year Plan but anyway it was reduced to a One-Year Plan.

What were the targets in the Ten-Year Plan? Doubling the per capita income, and full employment. They were the targets of the Ten-Year Plan which the hon. Member for Dompe said he was going to implement immediately. He also said that he did not want any architects but only foremen. That is the trouble, Sir! When you build without architects and with only



விசேஷப் பதன் கெடுதல்கள், 1969-70

—தேவன் வர கியதே

foremen, the structure collapses. There was not a single architect, he was the only architect and he was responsible for the building. That plan had no effect at all except for its false propaganda value.

You beguiled the voters with the rosy promises of the Ten-Year Plan, the Three-Year Plan and the One-Year Plan, and you made the economy of the country worse and worse. On this question I can even quote the hon. Member for Agalawatte. Of course, he said, "You dare not quote me". His assessment of the S.L.F.P. Government—

அலுவலர் கெடுதல் அபி. டி. சிலுவா

(கலாநிதி கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

I cannot say it is entirely quotable !

அ. வன்னியாக்க

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I shall quote one sentence. He accused the S.L.F.P. and said that they did not know how to milk the cow.

அலுவலர் கெடுதல் அபி. டி. சிலுவா

(கலாநிதி கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

Do not relate me at second-hand. Quote me direct.

அ. வன்னியாக்க

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I shall do that on another occasion. The fact of the matter is this. The Coalition Government also had a hand in it for a short time. The S.L.F.P. Government, I boldly say, set fire to the economy of this country. There is no question about it. And they are now complaining that it is burning. When you set fire to something it must burn. The Hon. Prime Minister and the other hon. Members on this side are trying to extinguish that fire. When we

are trying to extinguish the fire what does the Opposition do? They bring bundles and bundles of straw and try to throw them into this fire—of course, we and the people of this country do not allow them to do it. If the Opposition will stop trying to throw bundles of straw into the fire I think we will be able to extinguish the fire faster.

And we say that with all the difficulties we had to face, with all the factors in an economy which was deteriorating or stagnating, we have been able to pick up and attain a level from which we can take off for a better rate of growth.

The Opposition made the point that our position is that everything is all right, that we have done our job. We do not say anything of the kind. We say we have only made a break-through. We say that we have achieved an 8.3 rate of growth last year, which is a record for this country. But that is only a beginning. If we do not maintain that, the whole thing will collapse. That is why that rate has got to be maintained.

The Opposition tried to make out that the Prime Minister and the other Members of the Cabinet and the Government seem to think that their job is done; that everything is all right; that there is nothing to fear; that everything has been done. We do not take up that position at all. We only say that we have made a reasonable breakthrough in spite of a number of difficulties, and this rate has got to be maintained in the months and years to come in order to improve the economic and social conditions of the people of our country.

அ. பி. பி. பெரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

What about the question about FEECs which I asked?



விவர்ப்பு பற்றி கெடுபித, 1969-70

சுரு வந்தியாயக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

In relation to departments and corporations? Well, Sir, the idea is that we want the realistic prices reflected in the accounts.

சுரு வந்தியாயக

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

That does not cover all corporations.

சுரு வந்தியாயக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

We have said that it will apply to as many as is possible, to as many as we think is desirable. We have got to examine each unit separately and do it. We do not want to do it one hundred per cent all at once. We have got to take them one by one, examine them and see whether they lend themselves to that kind of treatment. Then, if we think it desirable, we shall implement it. It will not be applied one hundred per cent to all departments and corporations.

Once again, Sir, I thank you for allowing me this indulgence. Many compliments have been paid to me on my being Minister of Finance for five years. If I have done this job a little longer than others I must say it is due to a number of factors.

First of all, I must express my gratitude to the Hon. Prime Minister, who has been very understanding and but for whose co-operation I might not have been able to go on so long.

I must also thank my Colleagues in the Cabinet who sometimes got angry with me for not allowing them

all the money they asked for. On such occasions I also got angry or pretended to get angry, and they also pretended to get angry, because I could not make available to them the funds they wanted. All in all, I have had their co-operation.

I must also thank hon. Members on this side of the House for the co-operation they have extended to me, and even hon. Members of the Opposition who, I must say, have let me off rather lightly. They have not taken me to task in the way they sometimes take certain people to task. I thank the House once again.

கலாநாயகர்

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

I shall now proceed to take the vote.

“பற்றி கெடுபித புன் தேவன வர் கிய விலே” யுத பூநிய விவன லே.

“மசோதா இப்பொழுது இரண்டாம் முறை மதிப்பிடப் படுமா” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டது.

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

கலாநாயகர் புது “புது” மன்றி மன விலே பிய விலே கலாநாயகர் விவன் பூநிய கர்ன லே.

குரல்களின்படி “ஆம்” என்றவர்களுக்கு வெற்றி யென சபாநாயகர் அவர்களால் பிரகடனப்படுத்தப் பட்டது.

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

சுரு வந்தியாயக

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Divide, by name!

மன்றி மனவிலே மூ படு வன புன்மே—புதுவ 83; விவன் 61; யுதமே—விவனேய :

சபை பிரிந்தது : சார்பாக, 83; எதிராக, 61.







பதந்

சார்பாக

AYES

கி. டி. கெடுபதித ம.

திரு. சி. ஆர். பெலிகம்மன

Mr. C. R. Beligammana

பி. பி. முசுதாபா ம.

ஜனாப் எம். எம். முசுதாபா

Mr. M. M. Mustapha

விவசாய மென் டிசு.

திரு. விஜயபால மெண்டிஸ்

Mr. Wijayapala Mendis

பி. பி. கெடுபதித ம.

திரு. என். விமலசேன

Mr. N. Wimalasena

கி. பி. கெடுபதித ம.

திரு. டி. பி. கெடுபதித

Mr. D. B. Welagedera

கி. பி. சி. கெடுபதித ம.

திரு. சி. பி. ஜே. கெடுபதித

Mr. C. P. J. Seneviratne

பி. பி. கெடுபதித ம.

திரு. வி. அண்ணாமலை

Mr. V. Annamalai

பி. பி. கெடுபதித ம., பி. பி. கி. பி.

ஜனாப் எம். பி. அப்துல் கபூர், எம். பி. பி.

Mr. M. Falil Abdul Caffoor, M.B.E.

பி. பி. கெடுபதித ம.

ஜனாப் எம். அப்துல் பாகிர் மாக்கார்

Mr. M. Abdul Bakeer Markar

பி. பி. கெடுபதித ம.

ஜனாப் எம். எ. அப்துல் மஜீது

Mr. M. A. Abdul Majeed

கி. பி. கெடுபதித ம.

திரு. ஜோர்ஜ் அபயகுணசேகர

Mr. George Abeyagoonasekera

பி. பி. கெடுபதித ம.

திரு. எஸ். எஸ். அபேசுந்தர

Mr. S. S. Abeysundera

பி. பி. கெடுபதித ம.

திரு. எம். எஸ். அமரசிரி

Mr. M. S. Amarasiri

பி. பி. கெடுபதித ம.

திரு. சுகததாச அரம்பவல்

Mr. Sugathadasa Arambewala

கி. பி. கெடுபதித ம.

திரு. அலிக் அலுவிறா

Mr. Alick Aluwihare

பி. பி. கெடுபதித ம.

ஜனாப் எம். இஸ்ஸதீன் முகம்மது, கி. பி. சி.

Mr. M. Izzadeen Mohamed, Q.C.

கி. பி. கெடுபதித ம.

திரு. சி. எப். டபிள்யூ. எதிரிசுரிய

Mr. C. F. W. Edirisuriya

பி. பி. கெடுபதித ம.

திரு. எச். பி. எக்கநாயக்க

Mr. H. B. Ekanayake

கி. பி. கெடுபதித ம.

திரு. சி. என். கன்னங்கர

Mr. C. N. Kannangara

பி. பி. கெடுபதித ம.

திரு. சந்திரா கருணரத்ன

Mr. Chandra Karunaratne

பி. பி. கெடுபதித ம.

திரு. எச். குலரத்ன

Mr. H. Kularatne

கி. பி. கெடுபதித ம.

திரு. ஜோர்ஜ் கொத்தலாவல்

Mr. George Kotelawala

பி. பி. கெடுபதித ம.

திரு. வேணன் ஜொங்க்ளஸ், கி. பி. சி.

Mr. Vernon Jonklaas, Q.C.

பி. பி. கெடுபதித ம.

திரு. எம். எ. டபிள்யூ.

Mr. M. A. Daniel

கி. பி. கெடுபதித ம.

திரு. டி. எ. திலகரத்ன

Mr. D. E. Tillekeratne

பி. பி. கெடுபதித ம.

திரு. எஸ். தொண்டமான்

Mr. S. Thondaman

பி. பி. கெடுபதித ம.

திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் டி. சில்வா

Mr. Lakshman de Silva

கி. பி. கெடுபதித ம.

திரு. கே. டபிள்யூ. தேவநாயகம்

Mr. K. W. Devanayagam







விசேஷ பதன் கெடுபித, 1969-70

பன்ம

சார்பாக

AYES

பி. எஸ். ஹெட்டிஜ்

திரு. எஸ். ஹெட்டிஜ்

Mr. S. Hettige

பி. எஸ். ஹெரத்

திரு. எஸ். பி. ஹெரத்

Mr. S. B. Herat

பி. எஸ். ஹெரத்

எதிராக

NOES

பி. எஸ். ஹெட்டிஜ்

திரு. ஆர். எம். அப்புகாமி

Mr. R. M. Appuhamy

பி. எஸ். ஹெட்டிஜ்

திரு. எ. எஸ். அப்துல் மஜீத்

Mr. A. L. Abdul Majeed

பி. எஸ். ஹெட்டிஜ்

திரு. எ. அமிர்தலிங்கம்

Mr. A. Amirthalingam

பி. எஸ். ஹெட்டிஜ்

திரு. வீ. எ. அழகக்கோன்

Mr. V. A. Alegacone

பி. எஸ். ஹெட்டிஜ்

திரு. எம். சி. அகமது

Mr. M. C. Ahamed

பி. எஸ். ஹெட்டிஜ்

திரு. டபிள்யூ. பி. ஜி. அரியதாசு

Mr. W. P. G. Ariyadasa

பி. எஸ். ஹெட்டிஜ்

திரு. கா. பொ. இரத்தினம்

Mr. K. P. Ratnam

பி. எஸ். ஹெட்டிஜ்

திரு. டி. பி. இலங்கரத்ன

Mr. T. B. Ilangaratne

பி. எஸ். ஹெட்டிஜ்

திருமதி. ஜே. பி. ஒபயசேகர

Mrs. J. P. Obeyesekere

பி. எஸ். ஹெட்டிஜ்

திரு. எஸ். கதிர்வேலுப்பிள்ளை

Mr. S. Kathiravelupillai

பி. எஸ். ஹெட்டிஜ்

திரு. பி. பி. ஜி. கலுக்கல்

Mr. P. B. G. Kalugalla

பி. எஸ். ஹெட்டிஜ்

திரு. எச். ஜி. அல்பட் காரியவாசம்

Mr. H. G. A. Kariyawasam

பி. எஸ். ஹெட்டிஜ்

திரு. ராஜா குலத்திலக்க

Mr. Raja Kulatillake

பி. எஸ். ஹெட்டிஜ்

திரு. சம்ஸி குணவர்தன

Mr. Cholmondeley Goonewardene

பி. எஸ். ஹெட்டிஜ்

திரு. லெஸ்லி குணவர்தன

Mr. Leslie Goonewardene

பி. எஸ். ஹெட்டிஜ்

திரு. பிரின்ஸ் குணசேகர

Mr. Prins Gunasekera

பி. எஸ். ஹெட்டிஜ்

திரு. சோமவீர சந்திரசிரி

Mr. Somaweera Chandrasiri

பி. எஸ். ஹெட்டிஜ்

திரு. எஸ். ஜே. வி. செல்வநாயகம் கியூ.சி.

Mr. S. J. V. Chelvanayakam, Q.C.

பி. எஸ். ஹெட்டிஜ்

திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி

Mr. Lakshman Jayakody

பி. எஸ். ஹெட்டிஜ்

திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க

Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike

பி. எஸ். ஹெட்டிஜ்

திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன

Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne

பி. எஸ். ஹெட்டிஜ்

திரு. பி. எஸ். துடாவ

Mr. B. Y. Tudawe

பி. எஸ். ஹெட்டிஜ்

திரு. கே. துரைத்தனம்

Mr. K. Thurairatnam

பி. எஸ். ஹெட்டிஜ்

திரு. எம். தென்னக்கோன்

Mr. M. Tennakoon



විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1969-70

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

විද්දාම

எதிராக

NOES

පී. එම්. කේ. තෙන්නකෝන් මයා.

திரு. பீ. எம். கே. தென்னகோன்  
Mr. P. M. K. Tennekoon

නීල් ද අල්විස් මයා.

திரு. நீல் டி அல்விஸ்  
Mr. Neal de Alwis

ආර්. ජේ. ජී. ද මැල් මයා.

திரு. ஆர். ஜே. டி மெல்  
Mr. R. J. G. de Mel

ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා

கலாநிதி கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா  
Dr. Colvin R. de Silva

එම්. පී. ද සොයිසා සිරිවර්ධන මයා.

திரு. எம். பீ. டி. சொய்சா சிறிவர்தன  
Mr. M. P. de Zoysa Siriwardena

ඩබ්ලිව්. ඒ. ධර්මදාස මයා.

திரு. டபிள்யூ. ஏ. தர்மதாச  
Mr. W. A. Dharmadasa

වී. ධර්මලිංගම් මයා.

திரு. வீ. தர்மலிங்கம்  
Mr. V. Dharmalingam

එම්. එම්. නවරත්න මයා.

திரு. எச். எம். நவரத்ன  
Mr. H. M. Nawaratna

ඩී. ටී. පස්කුටල් මයා.

திரு. டி. ரீ. பஸ்குவல்  
Mr. D. T. Pasqual

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா  
Dr. N. M. Perera

ආර්. එස්. පෙරේරා මයා.

திரு. ஆர். எஸ். பெரேரா  
Mr. R. S. Perera

බී. එම්. බණ්ඩාර මයා.

திரு. பி. எச். பண்டார,  
Mr. B. H. Bandara

එස්. ඩී. බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

திரு. எஸ். டி. பண்டாரநாயக்க  
Mr. S. D. Bandaranayake

සිරිමාවෝ ආර්. ඩී. බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

திருமதி சிறிமாவோ ஆர். டி. பண்டாரநாயக்க  
Mrs. Sirimavo R. D. Bandaranaike

මංගල මුණසිංහ මයා.

திரு. மங்கள முனசிங்க  
Mr. Mangala Moonesinghe

ආස්. බී. යාලෙගාම මයා.

திரு. எஸ். பி. யாலேகம  
Mr. S. B. Yalagama

ආර්. බී. රත්නමල මයා.

திரு. ஆர். பி. ரத்னமல்ல  
Mr. R. B. Ratnamalala

කේ. බී. රත්නායක මයා.

திரு. கே. பி. ரத்னாயக்க  
Mr. K. B. Ratnayake

එම්. ඊ. රත්වත්තේ මයා.

திருமதி எம். எ. ரத்வத்தே  
Mrs. M. E. Ratwatte

සී. රාජදුරේ මයා.

திரு. சீ. இராஜதுரை  
Mr. C. Rajadurai

ජෝර්ජ් රාජපක්ෂ මයා.

திரு. ஜோர்ஜ் ராஜபக்ஷ  
Mr. George Rajapaksa

ඩී. ඩී. එල්. ලෙටිසියා රාජපක්ෂ මයා.

திருமதி டி. டி. எல். லெலிஷியா ராஜபக்ஷ  
Mrs. D. D. L. Leticia Rajapaksa

රත්නසිරි වික්‍රමනායක මයා.

திரு. ரத்னவிரி விக்ரமநாயக்க  
Mr. Ratnasiri Wickramanayaka

පර්සි වික්‍රමසිංහ මයා.

திரு. பேர்வலி விக்ரமசிங்ஹ  
Mr. Percy Wickremasinghe

වෙඩ්‍රෙමාසිංහ එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ  
Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe

කේ. ඩබ්. එම්. විජේරත්න බණ්ඩා මයා.

திரு. கே. வை. எம். விஜேரத்ன பண்டா  
Mr. K. Y. M. Wijeratne Banda

ලීලාරත්න විජයසිංහ මයා.

திரு. லீலாரத்ன விஜேசிங்ஹ  
Mr. Leelaratne Wijesinghe

ඩී. පී. ආර්. වීරසේකර මයා.

திரு. டி. பீ. ஆர். வீரசேக்கர  
Mr. P. P. R. Weerasekera

හේමෙන්ද්‍ර සිරිසේන මයා.

திரு. ஹேமச்சந்திர சிரிசேன  
Mr. Hemachandra Sirisena



කල් තැබීම

කල් තැබීම

විරුද්ධව

භූමිකා

NOES

ම. බී. සුබසිංහ මයා.

திரு. ரீ. பி. சுபசிங்க

Mr. T. B. Subasinghe

එස්. කේ. කේ. සුරියරත්න මයා.

திரு. எஸ். கே. கே. சூரியாரச்சி

Mr. S. K. K. Suriarachchi

සෝමරත්න සෙනරත් මයා.

திரு. சோமரத்ன சேனரத்

Mr. Somaratne Senarath

මෙත්‍රිපාල සේනානායක මයා.

திரு. மைத்திரிபால சேனநாயக்க

Mr. Maithripala Senanayeke

පනත් කෙටුම්පත ඊට අනුකූලව දෙවන වර කියවන ලදී.

පනත් කෙටුම්පත, අංක 57 දරන ස්ථාවර නියෝගය යටතේ, 1969 අප්‍රේල් 29 වන සිකුරාදා පවත්වන පූර්ණ මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩල කාරක සභාවට පවරන ලදී.

அதன்படி, மசோதா இரண்டாம் முறை மதிப்பிடப் பெற்றது.

மசோதா, நிலையற் கட்டளை இல. 57 இன்படி, 1969, ஆகஸ்ட் 29, வெள்ளிக்கிழமைமையன்றைய முழுசபைக் குழுவுக்குச் சாட்டப்பட்டது.

Bill accordingly read a Second time.

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House under Standing Order No. 57 for Friday, 29th August 1969.

කල් තැබීම

ஒத்திவைப்பு

ADJOURNMENT

ශ්‍රී ඩී. පී. ද සිල්වා (ඉඩම්, වාට්මාජින හා විදුලිබල ඇමති හා සභානායක)

(கௌரவ சி. பி. டி சில்வா—காணி, நீர்ப் பாசன, மின்விசை அமைச்சரும் சபை முதல்வரும்)

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

I move,

“That the House do now adjourn.”

ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා.

திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனநாயக்க

Mr. R. G. Senanayake

බර්නඩ් සොය්සා මයා.

திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா

Mr. Bernard Soysa

ඩී. ඩ්. ඩ්. හෙට්ටියරච්චි මයා.

திரு. டி. எப். ஹெற்றியாரச்சி

Mr. D. F. Hettiarachchi

මී. බී. එම්. හේරත් මයා.

திரு. ரி. பி. எம். ஹேரத்

Mr. T. B. M. Herath

ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදින්, සභා සම්මත විය.

வினா விடுக்கப்பெற்று எற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

Question put and agreed to.

මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය ඊට අනුකූලව අ. හා. 8.1 ව, අද දින සභා සම්මතය අනුව, 1969 අප්‍රේල් 29 වන සිකුරාදා ප. හා. 10 වන තෙක් කල් ගිණිය.

அதன்படி பி.ப. 8.1க்கு சபை அதனது இன்றைய, தீர்மானத்திற்கிணங்க 1969, ஆகஸ்ட் 20 ஆம் தேதி, வெள்ளிக்கிழமை மு. ப. 10 மணிவரை ஒத்திவைக்கப்பெற்றது.

Adjourned accordingly at 8.1 P.M. until 10 A.M. on Friday, 29th August 1969, pursuant to the Resolution of the House this Day.



ලිඛිත පිළිතුරු

வினாக்களுக்கு எழுத்துமூலக் விடைகள்

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

විදුලිබල රෙදි විවිමේ මධ්‍යස්ථානය  
ඉහළ මකවිසුල්ල

மின் தறிநிலையம், இஹல மடம்பெல்ல

POWERLOOM CENTRE, IHALA MADAMPELLA

100/69

ලක්ෂ්මණ ජයකොඩි මයා. (දිවුලපිටිය)

1 (திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி—திருவலபிட்டுய)

(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody—Divulapitiya)

ස්වදේශ කටයුතු ඇමතිගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය : (අ) සීමාසහිත උතුරු අළුත්කුරු කෝරළේ රෙදි වියන්තන්ගේ සම්ප්‍රකාර සමිති සංගමය "විදුලි බලවේග යන්ත්‍ර මධ්‍යස්ථානයක්" කොළඹ දිස්ත්‍රික්කයේ ඉහළු මඩම්පැල්ල ගමේ පිහිටුවීම සඳහා ගොඩනැගිලි තැනීමටත් විදුලි බලය ලබා ගැනීමටත් වියදම් කළ මුදල එතුමා සඳහන් කරනවාද? (ආ) මෙතරම් විශාල මුදලක් අපතේ යෑම වැළැක්වීම සඳහා වහාම බල වේග යන්ත්‍ර 48 දී එය සවිකර 1970 වර්ෂයේ දීවත් විවෘත කිරීමට පියවර ගන්නවාද? (ඉ) නොඑසේ නම්, ඒ මන්ද?

உள்ளாட்டு விவகார அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா : (அ) கொழும்பு மாவட்டத்தில், இஹல மடம்பெல்லவிலுள்ள மின்தறி நிலைய மொன்றை அமைப்பதற்குரிய கட்டடங்களை நிர்மாணிப்பதற்கும், மின்சாரம் பெற்றுக் கொள்வதற்குமென அளந்தகுறு கோறனை வடக்கு துணி நெசவாளர்கள் கூட்டுறவுச் சங்கங்கள் சமூஹம் விமிட்டெட், செலவிட்ட தொகை யென்ன? (ஆ) செலவிடப்பட்ட பணத்தில் பெருந்தொகை வீண்போகாமல் தடுக்க, 48 மின் தறிகளையும் உடனடியாக அமைக்கவும், 1970 ஆம் ஆண்டு மட்டிலாவது இந்நிலையத்தை ஆரம்பிக்கவும் அவர் நடவடிக்கை எடுப்பாரா? (இ) இல்லையெனில் ஏன்?

asked the Minister of Home Affairs :

(a) Will he state the amount spent by the Aluthkuru Korale North Textile Weavers' Co-operative Societies Union Ltd., on the construction of

buildings and obtaining the supply of electricity for the establishment of a powerloom centre at Ihala Madampella in the Colombo District? (b) In order to prevent the large sum of money that has been spent going waste, will he take action to instal the 48 powerlooms immediately and to make arrangements to have this centre opened by 1970 at least? (c) If not, why?

ගරු ආචාර්ය ඩබ්ලිව්. දහනායක  
(සිව්වැන්නේ කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමති)

(கௌரவ கலாநிதி டபிள்யூ. தகநாயக்க—  
உள்நாட்டு விவகார அமைச்சர்)

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

(අ) රුපියල් 1,26,624.41. (ආ) නැත.  
(ඉ) මෙම වැඩපල ඉහළ මඩම්පැල්ල සමූපකාර පෙහෙකම් සමිතිය මගින් ආරම්භ කළ යුතු වෙයි. ඉහළ මඩම්පැල්ලෙහි ඉදිකිරීම පිණිස බලවේග යන්ත්‍ර 48 ක් සහ අනිකුත් යන්ත්‍ර මිලියට ගැනීම පිණිස මහජන බැංකු වෙන් ණය මුදලක් ලබා ගැනීමට සමිතිය කටයුතු කර ඇත. මෙකී වැඩපල හැකි තරම් ඉක්මණින් ආරම්භ කිරීමට ග්‍රාම සංවර්ධන හා කුඩා කර්මාන්ත දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව විසින් හැකි සෑම ආධාරයක් ලබා දෙනු ඇත.

(அ) ரூ. 1,26,624.41. (ஆ) இல்லை. (இ) இகல மடம்பல்ல துணி நெசவாளர் கூட்டுறவுச் சங்கத்தினரால், இந்த வேலைத்தலம் நிறுவப்பட்டு விருக்கிறது. இந்தச் சங்கம் இகலமடம்பல்ல வில் நிறுவுவதற்கென 48 மின்சக்தித் தறிகளையும் ஏனைய இயந்திர சாதனங்களையும் கொள்வனவு செய்வதற்காக, மக்கள் வங்கியிடம் கடன் பெறுவதற்கு ஂடவடிக்கைகள் எடுத்துள்ளது. இந்த வேலைத்தலத்தை விரைவில் நிறுவுதற்குரிய எல்லாவிதமான உதவிகளையும் கிராமாபிவிருத்தி சிறுகைத்தொழில் துணைக்களம் செய்து வரும்.

(a) Rs. 126,624.41. (b) No. (c) This workshop is to be established by the Ihalamadampella Textile Weavers' Co-operative Society. This society has taken action to obtain a loan from the People's Bank for the purchase of 48 power-looms and other machinery to be installed at Ihalamadampella. Every assistance will be given



ලිඛිත පිළිතුරු

[ගරු ආචාර්ය ඔබ්ලිව්. දහනායක]  
by the Department of Rural Development and Small Industries to have this workshop established early.

[illegible]

நுவரெலிய இலுக்கேலஸ்ஸ முதலான  
இடங்களில் காணி ஒதுக்கு

ALLOCATION OF LAND IN ILLUK PELESSA, ETC.,  
NUWARA ELIYA DISTRICT

106/69

පී. බී. එම්. හේරත් මයා. (විලසනේ)

(திரு. ரி. பி. எம். ஹேரத்—வலப்பனை)

(Mr. T. B. M. Herath—Walapane)

(Mr. T. B. M. Herath—Warakumbura.)

ඉඩම්, වාරිමාලී හා විදුලිබල ඇමතිගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය : (අ) නුවරඑළියේ ඉඩම් නිලධාරීන් විසින් පහත සඳහන් ඉඩම් කවිවේරි පවත්වන ලද (අවසාන තෝරීම්) දින මොනවාද? (i) ඉඑක් පැලැස්ස වාරි මාලී ඇල යටතේ ඉඩම්; (ii) කිනවෙල වාරිමාලී ඇල යටතේ ඉඩම්; (iii) බොල ගත්දාව වාරිමාලී ඇල යටතේ ඉඩම්; (iv) රාගල අල ගොවිපල අසල ඉඩම්; (v) වතුමුල්ල (මුල්හල්කාලේ) වත්ත ඉඩම්; (vi) අරුක් වත්ත රජයේ ඉඩම්; (ආ) එක් එක් ඉඩම් කවිවේරියෙන් තෝරුණු අයගේ නම් හා ලිපිනයන් කවි රේද? (ඉ) මෙතෙක් තෝරාගත් අය වලුන්ට එම ඉඩම් බෙදා නොදෙන ලද නම් ඊට හේතු මොනවාද? (ඊ) මෙම ඉඩම් බෙදාදීමට අදහස් කරන්නේ කවදාද? බෙදා නොදෙන්නේ. නම්, ඊට හේතු මොනවාද?

காணி, நீர்ப்பாசன, மின்விசை அமைச்சரைக்  
கேட்ட வினா : (அ) நுவர எலியவிலே காணி  
உத்தியோகத்தார்களால் பின் கூறப்படுங்  
காணிக் கச்சேரிகள் (இறுதித் தேர்வு) எந்  
தெந்த தேதிகளில் நடத்தப்பட்டன : (i)  
இலுக் பேலஸ்ஸ நீர்ப்பாசன வாய்க்காலின்  
கீழ் உள்ள காணி ; (ii) கிளவெல நீர்ப்பாசன  
வாய்க்காலின் கீழுள்ள காணி ; (iii) பொல  
கந்தவெல நீர்ப்பாசன வாய்க்காலின் கீழுள்ள  
காணி ; (iv) ரோகல உருளைக் கிழங்குப் பண்  
ளைக்கருகாமையில் உள்ள காணி ; (v) வத்து  
முல்லைத் (முல்கல் கெலே) தோட்டத்தில்  
உள்ள காணி ; (vi) அருகுவத்தையிலுள்ள  
முடிக்குரிய காணி ? (ஆ) ஒவ்வொரு காணிக்  
கச்சேரியிலும் தெரிவு செய்யப்பட்டோரின்

பேர், முதலி என்ன? (இ) குறிப்பிடப்பட்ட  
காணிகள் தெரிவு செய்யப்பட்டோருக்கு இது  
வரை பங்கிடப்படாவிடில், காரணம் யாது?  
(ஈ) இக்காணிகளை எப்போது பங்கிட உத்  
தேசம்? இக்காணிகள் பங்கிடப்படாவெனில்  
ஏன்?

asked the Minister of Land, Irrigation and Power : (a) On what dates were the following land kachcheries (final selection) held by the Land Officers at Nuwara Eliya : (i) land under Iluk Pelessa irrigation channel area ; (ii) land under Keenawela irrigation channel area ; (iii) land under Bolagandawela irrigation channel area ; (iv) land near Ragala Potato Farm ; (v) land in Wathumulla (Mulhal Kele) estate ; (vi) Arukwatte Crown lands ? (b) What are the names and the addresses of the persons who were selected at each land kachcheri ? (c) If the lands referred to have not been distributed among those selected so far, why ? (d) When is it proposed to distribute these lands ? If the lands will not be distributed, why ?

ගරු සී. පී. ද සිල්වා (ඉඩම්, වාට්ටාපිටි හා විදුලිබල ඇමති හා සභානායක)

(கௌரவ சீ. பி. டி. சில்வா—காணி, நீர்ப் பாசன, மின்விசை அமைச்சரும் சபை முதல்வரும்)

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

(අ) (i) 1968. 5. 28 ; (ii) 1968. 5. 28., (iii) අවසාන තේරීම් කර නැත, (iv) අවසාන තේරීම් කර නැත, (v) අවසාන තේරීම් කර නැත, (vi) අවසාන තේරීම් කර නැත. (ආ) (i) ලේඛනය අමුණා ඇත, (ii) ලේඛන අමුණා ඇත, (iii) පැන නොනගී, (iv) පැන නොනගී, (v) පැන නොනගී, (vi) පැන නොනගී, (ඉ) (i) ඉඩම් බාරදීම සඳහා මැණුම් නියෝගයක් 68. 7. 21 දින උච්ච කොටසේ මැණුම් අධිකාරී වෙත යවා ඇත. (ii) ඉඩම් බාරදීම සඳහා මැණුම් නියෝගයක් 68. 7. 21 දින උච්ච කොටසේ මැණුම් අධිකාරී වෙත යවා ඇත. (iii) අනවාරයෙන් අල්ලා ගෙන ආර්ථිකයින්, (iv) අනවසරයෙන් අල්ලා



ලිඛිත පිළිතුරු

ගෙන ඇති බැවින්, (v) අනවසරයෙන් අල්ලාගෙන ඇති බැවින්, (vi) යෝජිත රත්දෙනිගල ජලාශයට මේම ඉඩම් යට වෙන බැවින් ඉඩම් කවිවේරිය පැවැත්වීම අත්හැර ඇත. (ඊ) (i) මැණීමේ කටයුතු

ලිඛිත පිළිතුරු

නිමකළ විගස, (ii) මැණීමේ කටයුතු නිම කළ විගස, (iii) අනවසර අල්ලා ගැනුම් කරුවන් ඉවත් කළ විගස, (iv) අනවසර අල්ලා ගැනුම් කරුවන් ඉවත් කළ විගස, (v) අනවසර අල්ලා ගැනුම් කරුවන් ඉවත් කළ විගස, (vi) පැන නොනගී.

කිණ්වෙල සහ ඉඑක්පැලැස්ස ව්‍යාපාර සඳහා අවසාන වශයෙන් තෝරාගනු ලැබුවත්ගේ නාම ලේඛනය.

## කිණ්වෙල ඇළ සඳහා

නම සහ ගම

ග්‍රාම සේවක වසම

1. කේ. ඇම්. උක්කුබණ්ඩා, මඩුල්ල	...	... මඩුල්ල
2. ඇස්. පී. පොඩියා, හෙලගම	...	... මඩුල්ල
3. ආර්. ඒ. උදාරිස්හාමි, තුංගිටියාව	...	... මඩුල්ල
4. ආර්. ඇම්. විදානේ, මඩුල්ල	...	... මඩුල්ල
5. ඊ. ඩී. පොඩිනේරිස්, මඩුල්ල	...	... මඩුල්ල
6. ඩබ්. ඇම්. කිරිබණ්ඩා, පරගහඅරාව	...	... මඩුල්ල
7. ආර්. ඇම්. උක්කුබණ්ඩා, කොහොඹගහඅරාව—හෙලගම	...	... මඩුල්ල
8. ඩබ්. ඩී. සුදුහාමි, හෙලගම, මඩුල්ල	...	... මඩුල්ල
9. ඩබ්. ඇම්. සිරිසේන, කපුකොටුවේගෙදර	...	... මඩුල්ල
10. කේ. බී. සිමන්හාමි, කම්මලේ	...	... මඩුල්ල
11. ඒ. ඇම්. පුංචිබණ්ඩා, අවුච්චගහවත්ත	...	... මඩුල්ල
12. කේ. සෙලෙම්බුම්පිල්ලේ, මඩුල්ල	...	... මඩුල්ල
13. එච්. ඇම්. පුංචිරාල, හෙලගම	...	... මඩුල්ල
14. ආර්. ඩී. මැණිකා, මාලියද්ද	...	... මාලියද්ද
15. ටී. බී. ඩබ්. ඇම්. අප්පුහාමි, මිපනාව, මුකලානහේන	...	... මාලියද්ද
16. එච්. ඇම්. කිරිවත්තේ	...	... මාලියද්ද
17. ඩී. ජී. පුංචිරාල, මිපනාව	...	... මාලියද්ද
18. ඩබ්. ඇම්. කළුබණ්ඩා	...	... මාලියද්ද
19. ඩබ්. ඇම්. සෝමපාල, අඹගහවත්තේගෙදර	...	... මාලියද්ද
20. ඩී. ඩී. සෝමාවතී, පිරුහාගෙදර	...	... මාලියද්ද
21. බී. එච්. සුදුබණ්ඩා, බෝගහවත්තේගෙදර	...	... මාලියද්ද
22. එච්. ඇම්. පුංචිරාල, වක්කුමුරේගෙදර	...	... කුරුපණාවෙල
23. ඇම්. කිරිබණ්ඩා, දඹේතැන්න, තුරුපණාවෙල	...	... කුරුපණාවෙල
24. එච්. ඇම්. බී. කිරිබණ්ඩා, බුලත්ගහපිහිටිය	...	... කුරුපණාවෙල
25. ඇම්. ඇම්. පුංචිබණ්ඩා, දඹේතැන්නේගෙදර	...	... කුරුපණාවෙල
26. ඇල්. ඇම්. හින්නිඅප්පුහාමි, ගොඩමුදුනේගෙදර	...	... කුඹුක්වෙල
27. එච්. ඇම්. වාර්ලිස් අප්පුහාමි, උඩලියද්ද	...	... කුඹුක්වෙල
28. ඩබ්. ඇම්. කේ. බණ්ඩා, උඩලියද්ද	...	... කුඹුක්වෙල
29. ආර්. පී. පුංචිබණ්ඩා, දෙහිගොල්ල අළුත්ගෙදර	...	... දෙනමුරේ



## නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය

2199

ලිඛිත පිළිතුරු

ලිඛිත පිළිතුරු

නම සහ ගම

ග්‍රාම සේවක වසම

30. ආර්. ඇම්. ගුණසේකර, වලස්කැලේ	...	දෙනඩුරේ
31. ඩී. එම්. ඒ. බණ්ඩා, කිරියගොල්ල	...	දෙනඩුරේ
32. යූ. බී. ඉලුක්වෙල	...	දෙනඩුරේ
33. ඩබ්. ඇම්. කිරිවත්තේ, රාසිංගොල්ල	...	දෙනඩුරේ
34. ඩී. ඇම්. කිරිබණ්ඩා, පල්ලේගම	...	දෙනඩුරේ
35. පී. ඇඩ්විත්, කිරිමැඩිල්ල	...	දෙනඩුරේ
36. ඇස්. එච්. ඇල්බට්, පල්ලේගම	...	දෙනඩුරේ
37. ඩී. ඇල්. ඒ. පුංචි සිංඤ්ඤ, තෙපුගොල්ලේගෙදර	...	අඹන් ඇල්ල
38. ඩබ්. ඇම්. උක්කුරාල, දෙමටආරාව	...	අඹන් ඇල්ල
39. ඩබ්. ඇන්. ඇම්. පුංචිබණ්ඩා, හැගම	...	අඹන් ඇල්ල
40. අයි. ඩී. ඇම්. රම්බණ්ඩා, මාහේන	...	අඹන් ඇල්ල
41. ඩී. එම්. ඒ. අප්පහම්, වේගොල්ල	...	වේගොල්ල
42. ඒ. ඇම්. පුංචිබණ්ඩා, මදුරාපාන	...	අඹන් ඇල්ල
43. ඩබ්. ජී. පුංචිකිරා, දෙමටආරාව	...	අඹන් ඇල්ල
44. ඩබ්. ඇම්. පුංචිබණ්ඩා, මදුරාපාන	...	අඹන් ඇල්ල
45. ඩබ්. පී. හින්මලයා, වත්තේගෙදර	...	අඹන් ඇල්ල
46. බී. සුදුබණ්ඩා, තුංහිටියාව, අඹන් ඇල්ල	...	අඹන් ඇල්ල

## ඉලුක්පැලැස්ස ව්‍යාපාරය සඳහා

1. ආර්. පී. මද්දිලියා, හංගරාගොල්ල, හෙලගම	...	මඩුල්ල
2. බී. සිංඤ්ඤ, අංගොඩයාවත්තේ ගෙදර	...	මඩුල්ල
3. ඩබ්. ඇම්. ගුණතිලක	...	මඩුල්ල
4. ඩී. පී. පොඩිසිංඤ්ඤ, නිකේමඩහේන, හෙලගම	...	මඩුල්ල
5. ආර්. ඩී. සයිමන්, හෙලගම	...	මඩුල්ල
6. එච්. ඇම්. පුංචිබණ්ඩා, කෝන්ගොල්ල	...	මඩුල්ල
7. ඇස්. ඇම්. ටිකිරිබණ්ඩා, කන්දේයාය	...	මඩුල්ල
8. ඩී. ඇල්. පුංචිරාල, හපුකොටුවේගෙදර	...	මඩුල්ල
9. ඩබ්. පී. සිරිපිනා	...	මඩුල්ල
10. ආර්. ටී. පී. මද්දිලියා, මාලියද්ද	...	මාලියද්ද
11. ඇන්. ඇම්. පුංචිබණ්ඩා, දළක්ගස්වත්තේගෙදර	...	මාලියද්ද
12. බී. එච්. ටිකිරිබණ්ඩා	...	මාලියද්ද
13. ඩබ්. ඇම්. සයිමන් සිංඤ්ඤ, අදියරවත්ත	...	මාලියද්ද
14. ඇම්. එච්. ඇම්. කිරිබණ්ඩා, අංගොඩයාවත්ත, මිපනාව	...	මාලියද්ද
15. ඩබ්. ඇම්. සිරිසේන, මිපනාව	...	මාලියද්ද
16. හිටිහාමිලාගේ පුංචිබණ්ඩා, පල්ලේවත්තේගෙදර	...	මාලියද්ද
17. ජේ. ඇම්. ජේමිස් අප්පහම්, කලගහහේනේගෙදර	...	කුරාපණුවෙල
18. ඇන්. ඇම්. ටිකිරිබණ්ඩා, පල්ලේවත්තේගෙදර	...	කුරාපණුවෙල



## பெரிய பிழைகள்

## தமிழ் மொழி

19. டி. டி. பூமிநாதன், மெய்யோர்
20. பி. சேஷன் பூமிநாதன், மெய்யோர்
21. பி. பி. பூமிநாதன், மெய்யோர்
22. பி. பி. பூமிநாதன், மெய்யோர்
23. பி. பி. பூமிநாதன், மெய்யோர்
24. பி. பி. பூமிநாதன், மெய்யோர்
25. டி. பி. பூமிநாதன், மெய்யோர்
26. டி. பி. பூமிநாதன், மெய்யோர்
27. டி. பி. பூமிநாதன், மெய்யோர்
28. பி. பி. பூமிநாதன், மெய்யோர்
29. பி. பி. பூமிநாதன், மெய்யோர்
30. பி. பி. பூமிநாதன், மெய்யோர்

## பெரிய பிழைகள்

## தமிழ் மொழி

- ... கருப்பன்வேல்
- ... கருப்பன்வேல்
- ... கருப்பன்வேல்
- ... கருப்பன்வேல்
- ... கருப்பன்வேல்
- ... கருப்பன்வேல்
- ... கருப்பன்வேல்
- ... கருப்பன்வேல்
- ... கருப்பன்வேல்
- ... கருப்பன்வேல்
- ... கருப்பன்வேல்
- ... கருப்பன்வேல்

(அ) (1) 1968-5-28 (2) 1968-5-28 (3) இறுதித் தேர்வு நடாத்தப்படவில்லை. (4) -அதே- (5) -அதே- (6) -அதே- (ஆ) (1) அட்டவணை அளிக்கப்பட்டுள்ளது. (2) அதே- (3) எழுத்து (4) -அதே- (5) -அதே- (6) -அதே- (இ) (1) காணி பாரம் கொடுப்பதற்காக கடைசி அறிக்கை நுவரேலியா அளவை அதிகாரிக்கு 68-7-21 ஆம் தேதி கொடுக்கப்

பட்டுள்ளது. (2) -அதே- (3) சட்டவிரோதமாகப் பிடித்திருப்பதால், (4) -அதே- (5) -அதே- (6) உத்தேசித்த காணி நன்தெனிய கல நீர்வீழ்ச்சிக்கு உட்படுவதால் இக்காணிக் கச்சேரி கைவிடப்பட்டுள்ளது. (ஈ) (1) அளவை வேலை முடிவடைந்ததும் (2) -அதே- (3) சட்டவிரோதமாகக் காணியைப் பிடித்திருப்பதால் (4) -அதே- (5) -அதே- (6) எழுத்து.

கீழ்வெல, இலுக்கப்பெல்லா திட்டங்களுக்காக இறுதியாகத் தெரிவு செய்யப்பட்ட குடியேற்றக்காரரின் பெயர் அட்டவணை

கீழ்வெல திட்டம்

பெயரும் இடமும்

கிராம சேவகர் பிரிவு

- |                                                   |    |    |    |          |
|---------------------------------------------------|----|----|----|----------|
| 1. கே. எம். உக்குபண்டா, மருள்ள                    | .. | .. | .. | மருள்ள   |
| 2. எஸ். பி. பொடியா, கெலகம்                        | .. | .. | .. | கெல      |
| 3. ஆர். எ. உதாரிஸ்காமி, கற்கிட்டியாவ              | .. | .. | .. | கெல      |
| 4. ஆர். எம். விதானே, மருள்ள                       | .. | .. | .. | கெல      |
| 5. ஈ. டி. பொடிநேரிஸ், மருள்ள                      | .. | .. | .. | கெல      |
| 6. டப். எம். கிரிபண்டா, பறக்களல்                  | .. | .. | .. | கெல      |
| 7. ஆர். எம். உக்குபண்டா, கொகம்பககஅருவ, கெலகம்     | .. | .. | .. | கெல      |
| 8. டப். டி. சுதுகாமி, கெலகம், மருள்ள              | .. | .. | .. | கெல      |
| 9. டப். எம். சிறிசேன, கப்புகொட்டுவே கெதற          | .. | .. | .. | கெல      |
| 10. எ. எம். புஞ்சிபண்டா, அட்டுவேககவத்த            | .. | .. | .. | கெல      |
| 11. கே. வி. சீமன்காமி, கம்மலே                     | .. | .. | .. | கெல      |
| 12. கே. செலம்பிரம்பிள்ளை, மருள்ள                  | .. | .. | .. | கெல      |
| 13. எச். எம். புஞ்சிபண்டா, கெலகம்                 | .. | .. | .. | கெல      |
| 14. ஆர். டி. மெனிக்க, மாலியத்த                    | .. | .. | .. | மாலியத்த |
| 15. ஈ. வி. டப். எம். அப்புகாமி, மிபலான, முபலானகேன | .. | .. | .. | கெல      |
| 16. எச். எம். கிரிவந்தே                           | .. | .. | .. | கெல      |
| 17. டி. பி. புஞ்சிபண்டா, மிபலான                   | .. | .. | .. | கெல      |
| 18. டப். எம். கருபண்டா                            | .. | .. | .. | கெல      |
| 19. டப். எம். சோமபால, அம்பககவத்த                  | .. | .. | .. | கெல      |
| 20. டி. டி. சோமாவத்தி, பிருககெகெதற                | .. | .. | .. | கெல      |
| 21. பி. எச். சுதுபண்டா, பாகககெகெதற                | .. | .. | .. | கெல      |



பெயரும் இடமும்

பெயரும் இடமும்

கிராம சேகவர் பிரிவு

குறுப்பணவெல

ஷெ

ஷெ

ஷெ

கும்புக்வெல

ஷெ

ஷெ

தெனம்புரே

ஷெ

ஷெ

ஷெ

ஷெ

ஷெ

ஷெ

ஷெ

அம்பன்எல்ல

ஷெ

ஷெ

ஷெ

ஷெ

மருள்ள

ஷெ

ஷெ

ஷெ

ஷெ

ஷெ

இலுக்கலஸ் திட்டம்

மருள்ள

ஷெ

ஷெ

ஷெ

ஷெ

ஷெ

ஷெ

ஷெ

ஷெ

ஷெ

ஷெ

ஷெ

ஷெ

ஷெ

ஷெ

ஷெ

மதியத்த

ஷெ

குறுப்பணவெல

ஷெ

ஷெ

கும்புக்வெல

ஷெ

தெனம்புரே

ஷெ

ஷெ

அம்பன்எல்ல

ஷெ

ஷெ

ஷெ

ஷெ



ලිඛිත පිළිතුරු

ලිඛිත පිළිතුරු

(a) (i) 28.5.1968. (ii) 28.5.1968. (iii) No final selection made. (iv) No final selection made. (v) No final selection made. (vi) No final selection made. (b) (i) List annexed. (ii) List annexed. (iii) Do not arise. (iv) Do not arise. (v) Do not arise. (vi) Do not arise. (c) (i) & (ii) Requisition for survey and handing over of allotments have been sent to S.S. Uva on 21.7.68. (iii) The lands have been encroached. (iv) The lands

have been encroached. (v) The lands have been encroached. (vi) Land Kachcheri abandoned as this area will be innudated by the Randenigala Reservoir Scheme. (d) (i) As soon as the S.G. completes surveys. (ii) As soon as the S.G. completes surveys. (iii) As soon as encroachers are evicted. (iv) As soon as encroachers are evicted. (v) As soon as encroachers are evicted. (vi) Does not arise.

*List of final allottees under Keenawela Ela and Ilukpelessa schemes*

KEENAWELA ELA

Name and Village		Grama Sevaka Division
1. K. M. Ukkubanda, Madulla	...	Madulla
2. S. P. Podiya, Helagama	...	Madulla
3. R. A. Udarishamy, Tunhitiyawa	...	Madulla
4. R. M. Vidane, Madulla	...	Madulla
5. E. D. Podineris, Madulla	...	Madulla
6. W. M. Kiribanda, Paragaha-arawe	...	Madulla
7. R. M. Ukkubanda, Kohombagaha-arawe	...	Madulla
8. W. D. Suduhamy, Helagama	...	Madulla
9. W. M. Sirisena, Kapukotuwegedera	...	Madulla
10. K. B. Simanchamy, Kammale	...	Madulla
11. K. M. Punchibanda, Atuwegahawatte	...	Madulla
12. K. Sellambarampillai, Madulla	...	Madulla
13. H. M. Punchirala, Helagama	...	Madulla
14. R. D. Menika, Maliyadde	...	Maliyadde
15. T. B. W. M. Appuhamy, Meepanawa, Mukalanahena	...	Maliyadde
16. H. M. Kiriwanthe	...	Maliyadde
17. D. P. Punchirala, Meepanawa	...	Maliyadde
18. W. M. Kalubanda, Maliyadde	...	Maliyadde
19. W. M. Somapala, Ambagahawattegedera	...	Maliyadde
20. D. D. Somawathie, Pitahegedera	...	Maliyadde
21. B. H. Sudubanda, Bogahawattegedera	...	Maliyadde
22. H. M. Punchirala, Watukumburegedera	...	Kurupanawela
23. M. Kiribanda, Dambattenne	...	Kurupanawela
24. H. M. B. Kiribanda, Bulathgahapitiya	...	Kurupanawela
25. M. M. Punchibanda, Dambawinnegedera	...	Kurupanawela
26. L. M. Hinniappuhamy, Godamundunegedera	...	Kumbukwela
27. H. M. Charlis Appuhamy, Udaliyadde	...	Kumbukwela
28. W. M. K. Banda, Udaliyadde	...	Kumbukwela
29. R. P. Punchibaba, Dehigolla, Alutgedera	...	Denamure
30. R. M. Gunasekara, Walaskelle	...	Denamure
31. D. M. A. Banda, Keeriyagolla	...	Denamure
32. U. B. Illukwela	...	Denamure
33. W. M. Kiriwanthe, Ransingolla	...	Denamure
34. D. M. Kiribanda, Pallegama	...	Denamure
35. P. Edwin, Kirimedilla	...	Denamure
36. S. H. Albert, Pallegama	...	Denamure
37. D. L. A. Punchisingho, Tepukollegedera	...	Ambanella
38. W. M. Ukkurala, Lemata-arawe	...	Ambanella



ලිඛිත පිළිතුරු

ලිඛිත පිළිතුරු

Name and Village

Grama Sevaka Division

39. W. N. M. Punchibanda, Hegama ...
40. I. D. M. Ranbanda, Mahena ...
41. D. M. A. Appuhamy, Dehigolla ...
42. A. M. Punchibanda, Madurupana ...
43. W. P. Punchi Kira, Demata-arawe ...
44. W. M. Punchibanda, Makurupana ...
45. W. P. Heenmalaya, Wattegedera ...
46. Sudubanda, Tunhitiyawa, Ambanella ...

... Ambanella  
 ... Ambanella  
 ... Ambanella  
 ... Ambanella  
 ... Ambanella  
 ... Ambanella  
 ... Ambanella  
 ... Ambanella

## ILLUKPELLESA SCHEME

1. R. P. Maddiliya, Hangarangolla, Helagama ...
2. B. Sungho, Angodayayewattegedera ...
3. W. M. Gunatillaka ...
4. D. P. Podisingho, Nikemadahena, Helagama ...
5. R. D. Simon, Helagama ...
6. H. M. Punchibanda, Kongolla ...
7. S. M. Tikiribanda, Kandeyaya ...
8. G. L. Punchirala, Hapukotuwegedera ...
9. W. P. Siripina ...
10. R. T. P. Maddiliya, Maliyadde ...
11. N. M. Punchibanda, Dalugaswattegedera ...
12. B. H. Tikiribanda ...
13. W. M. Simon Singho, Adiyarawatte ...
14. M. H. M. Kiribanda, Angodayayewatte ...
15. W. M. Sirisena, Meepanawa ...
16. Hitihamilage Punchibanda, Pallewattegedera ...
17. J. M. James Appuhamy, Kalagahahenegedera ...
18. M. M. Tikiribanda, Pallerangitenne ...
19. A. M. Punchibanda, Medegadera ...
20. T. Joseph Fernando, Udagama ...
21. W. D. Punchibanda, Udaliyadde ...
22. H. M. Punchirala, Keeriyagolla ...
23. W. M. Lokubanda, Keeriyagolla ...
24. W. M. Appuhamy, Keeriyagolla ...
25. S. P. Andiris, Erantalawa ...
26. S. P. Nandina, Wattegedera ...
27. P. Panikkaya, Demata-arawe ...
28. W. M. Sugathadasa, Hegama ...
29. D. M. Ganethirala, Elwattegedera ...
30. E. P. Hinniappuhamy, Hegama ...

... Madulla  
 ... Madulla  
 ... Madulla  
 ... Madulla  
 ... Madulla  
 ... Madulla  
 ... Madulla  
 ... Madulla  
 ... Madulla  
 ... Maliyadde  
 ... Maliyadde  
 ... Maliyadde  
 ... Maliyadde  
 ... Maliyadde  
 ... Maliyadde  
 ... Kurupanawela  
 ... Kurupanawela  
 ... Kurupanawela  
 ... Kumbukwela  
 ... Kumbukwela  
 ... Denamure  
 ... Denamure  
 ... Denamure  
 ... Denamure  
 ... Ambanella  
 ... Ambanella  
 ... Ambanella  
 ... Ambanella  
 ... Ambanella

පිරිසින් ගෙන්වන ලද දුම්රිය යන්ත්‍ර

இ. ஏ. சி. எஞ்சின்கள் இறக்குமதி

C. G. R. : IMPORTS OF LOCOMOTIVES

107/69

පී. එම්. කේ. තෙනෙකෝන් මහා.  
(මිහින්තලේ)

(திரு. பி. எம். கே. தென்னகூன்—மிறிந்தலை)

(Mr. P. M. K. Tennekoon—Mihintale)

ප්‍රවාහන ආමනිගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය :  
ලංකානුවෝ දුම්රිය සේවය සඳහා ගලික සමාගම්වලට යවන ලද මුළු මුදල.

1965.4.1 දින සිට මේ දක්වා පිරිසින් ගෙන්වන ලද දුම්රිය යන්ත්‍ර පිළිබඳව පහත සඳහන් විස්තර එතුමා ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නේද? (i) ගෙන්වන ලද යන්ත්‍ර ගණන හා ඒවා ගෙන්වූ රටවල්; (ii) රජය මගින් හා පෞද්ගලික සමාගම් මගින් වෙන් වෙන් වශයෙන් ගෙන්වන ලද යන්ත්‍ර ගණන; (iii) මෙම යන්ත්‍ර ගෙන්වීම සඳහා වැය කරන ලද මුළු මුදල; (iv) යන්ත්‍ර ගෙන්වීම සඳහා පෞද්ගලික සමාගම්වලට යවන ලද මුළු මුදල.







ලිඛිත පිළිතුරු

asked the Prime Minister, Minister of Defence & External Affairs and Minister of Planning & Economic Affairs : (a) Was a troupe of dancers calling itself the Ceylon National Ballet given permission to tour Latin America ? (b) Was this troupe recommended by any well-known dancing school in Ceylon ? (c) If not what was the basis on which this permission was granted ? (d) Who are the members of this troupe ?

ගරු බඩිලි සේනානායක (අලුමාන,  
ආරක්ෂක හා විදේශ කටයුතු පිළිබඳ  
ඇමති සහ කළ සම්පාදක හා ආර්ථික  
කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමති)

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க—பிரதம அமைச்சரும் பாதுகாப்பு, வெளி விவகார அமைச்சரும் திட்ட அமைப்பு, பொருளாதார விவகார அமைச்சரும்)

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

(අ) තැන. ලතින් ඇමරිකානු රටවල සංචාරය පිණිස ගිය නාට්‍යකරුවන් කණ්ඩායම “එෂියන් ආටිස්ට්ස් ඇන්ඩ් ස්පිකර්ස් බියුරෝ” නමැති පෞද්ගලික සංවිධානයක අනුග්‍රාහයෙන් මෙහෙය වන ලදී. නාට්‍ය කණ්ඩායමේ ලතින් ඇමරිකානු සංචාරයේ අනුග්‍රාහකයන් ලෙස ක්‍රියා කළ එම. එන්ජිලිකා ඇග්ලියේරා නම් වූ විලි රටේ දකුණු ඇමෙරිකානු පෞද්ගලික සංවිධානයන් සමග ඔවුන් කොන්ත්‍රාත්තුවකට ඇතුළත් වී තිබුණි.

(ආ) ඉහත (අ) අකුරින් සඳහන් පිළිතුර  
ප්‍රකාශය මේ ප්‍රශ්නය වැන නොවෙයි. (ඉ)

(අ) අකුරින් සඳහන් පිළිතුර සලකා මේ ප්‍රශ්නය පැන නොනගි. (ඊ) 1. ශ්‍රී ජයනා, 2. පිටරි සුරසේන, 3. එ. ආර්. ජී. ශ්‍රේණි දාස, 4. කේ. සෝමපාල, 5. විරසංගිලි එච්චන්, 6. ජී. සවනේරිස්, 7. ශාමලී එදිරි සිංහ මෙනෙවිය, 8. සුසිලා වික්‍රමසිංහ

ලිඛිත පිළිතුරු

මෙතෙවිය, 9. සුමනා ගෝතද්ව මෙනෙ  
විය, 10. රත්නාවලී රාජපක්ෂ මෙනෙ  
විය, 11. කල්ගෙගෙදර පුවිගුරු, 12. ආර්.  
වී. චන්ද්‍රදාස, 13. පී. විතානගේ, 14. ජේ.  
සිරිනාම, 15. නිලිකා පෙරේරා මෙනෙවිය,  
16. මාලනි ලංකානිලක මෙනෙවිය.

මොවුන් අතුරින් පිටර් සුරසේන, ඒ.  
ආර්. ජී. ඥානදාස සහ කේ. සෝමපාල  
යන අය රජයේ ගුවන්වාහන. මේ සංචාරය  
සඳහා මොවුන් මුදා හැරිය හැකි බවට  
අධ්‍යාපන අමාත්‍යාංශය කර සිටි තීරණය  
ශය මත ලැබීය. අමෙරිකානු රටවල සංචා  
රය සඳහා ගිය නාට්‍ය කණ්ඩායමට එක්  
වීමට ඔවුන්ට අවසර දෙන ලදී.

(அ) இலலை—இலத்தின் அமெரிக்காவில் சுற்றுப்பயணஞ் செய்யச் சென்ற நடனக் குழுவினர் ஆசிய கலைஞர்கள், பேச்சாளர்கள் பணியகம் (“ஏஷியன் ஆட்டிஸ்ஸ் அன்ட் ஸ்பிக் கோர்ஸ் பியூரோ”) எனப்படும் தனியார் நிறுவனம் ஒன்றின் ஆதரவில் அங்கு சென்றனர். அவர்கள், இந்த நடனக் குழுவினரின் இலத்தின் அமெரிக்கச் சுற்றுப் பிரயாணத்தின் ஆதரவாளர்களாகச் செயலாற்றிய எம்—அஞ்செலிக்கா அகியூலியா எனப்படும் தென் அமெரிக்க தனியார் நிறுவனம் ஒன்றுடன் ஓர் ஒப்பந்தம் செய்து கொண்டனர்.

(ஆ) (அ)—வுக்குரிய விடை காரணமாக இவ் வினா ஏழாது. (இ) (அ)—வுக்குரிய விடை காரணமாக இவ்வினா ஏழாது. (ஈ)

1. சிறீ ஜயனா 2. பீற்றர் சுரசேன 3. ஏ. ஆர். ஜி. ஞானதாசு 4. கெ. சோமபால 5. வீரசங்கிலி ஏடிஸ் 6. ஜி. சுவநேரிஸ் 7. செல்வி ஷார்மனி எதிரிசங்க, 8. செல்வி சுசீலா விக்கரமசிங்க 9. செல்வி சுமணா கோனதாவ 10. செல்வி இரத்தாவலி இராஜபக்ச 11. தல்கண்டா—கெதற புஞ்சிசுரு 12. ஆர். வி. சந்திரதாசு 13. பி. விதானகே 14. ஜெ. சிறிநாம 15. செல்வி நீலிகா பெரேரா 16. செல்வி மாலனி

இலங்கத்நிலக்க.



ලිඛිත පිළිතුරු

Out of these Peter Surasena, A. R. G. Gnanadasa and K. Somapala are Government teachers. On recommendation from the Education Ministry that they could be released for this tour, permission was granted to them to be on the troupe to tour Latin America.

£ 350. Allowed on the condition  
that this amount of Foreign Exchange  
is brought back to Ceylon.



