

78 වන කාණ්ඩය

17 වන කලාපය

මහස්මතීන්ද  
1968 ජූනි 13



# පාර්ලිමේන්තු විවාද

(හැන්සාඩ්)

නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ

නිල වාර්තාව

අත්තිකාරම් ප්‍රධාන කරුණු

ලිපි ලේඛනාදිය පිළිගැන්වීම [නි. 3005]

ආණ්ඩු ක්‍රම ව්‍යවස්ථා සංශෝධනය : ඒකාබද්ධ විශේෂ කාරක  
සභාවේ වාර්තාව [නි. 3006]

කල් තැබීමේ යෝජනාව [නි. 3008]

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීම සඳහා ඉදිරිපත් කරන ලද යෝජනා

# பாராளுமன்ற விவாதங்கள்

(ஹன்சார்ட்)

பிரதிநிதிகள் சபை

அதிகார அறிக்கை

பிரதான உள்ளடக்கம்

பத்திரங்கள் சமர்ப்பணம் [ப. 3005]

அரசமைப்புப் புனராய்வு [ப. 3006]

கூட்டுத் தெரிவு அறிக்கை

ஒத்திவைப்புப் பிரேரணை [ப. 3008]

மாவட்ட சபைகள் தாபித்தற்கான கருத்துரைகள்

Volume 78

No. 17

Thursday

13th June 1968

## PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OFFICIAL REPORT

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

PAPERS PRESENTED [Col. 3005]

REVISION OF THE CONSTITUTION [Col. 3006]

Report of the Joint Select Committee

ADJOURNMENT MOTION : [Col. 3008]

Proposals for the establishment of District Councils

இதே லேவண்டிய பிளேஸுக்கு

நியோகித மன்றி மனவரைய

பிரதிநிதிகள் சபை

House of Representatives

1968 ஜூன் 13 வுதி வகைச்சிந்தி

வியாழக்கிழமை, 13 ஜூன் 1968

Thursday, 13th June 1968

ஈ. ஸ. 20 மன்றி மனவரைய ருள் விச.  
நியோகித கட்டாயமாக [உதி. சிவசிதம்பரம்  
மைய.] இலககாரக விச.

சபை பி. ப. 2 மணிக்குக் கூடியது. உப சபாநாயக  
அவர்கள் [திரு. எம். சிவசிதம்பரம்] தலைமை  
தாங்கினார்கள்.

The House met at 2 P.M., Mr. Deputy  
Speaker [Mr. M. SIVASITHAMPARAM] in  
the Chair.

இதே லேவண்டிய பிளேஸுக்கு

சமர்ப்பிக்கப்பட்ட பத்திரங்கள்

PAPERS PRESENTED

Rule made under Section 3 of the  
Railways Ordinance (Cap. 200).—[The  
Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena on behalf of  
the Minister of Communications.]

ஸகலேசய மன நிநிய ஸ்துயகி நியோக கர்ன  
கே.

சபா பீடத்தில் இருக்க வேண்டுமென ஆணையிடப்  
பட்டது.

Ordered to lie upon the Table.

Rule made under Section 3 of the  
Public Performances Ordinance (Cap.  
176).—[Mr. Premadasa.]

ஸகலேசய மன நிநிய ஸ்துயகி நியோக கர்ன  
கே.

சபா பீடத்தில் இருக்க வேண்டுமென ஆணையிடப்  
பட்டது.

Ordered to lie upon the Table.

2—பி 14464—794 (68/6)

காணவகூழ மவவசய ஸகலேவகய

காணவகூழ மவவசய ஸகலேவகய:  
பீகாவர்டி விசேஷ காரக ஸகலே  
வாரகாவ

அரசமைப்புப் புனராய்வு:  
கூட்டுத் தெரிசூழ அறிக்கை

REVISION OF THE CONSTITUTION :  
REPORT OF THE JOINT SELECT  
COMMITTEE

கரு வகிளி ஸேநானாயக (ஈலாமை,  
காரகிதக ஸ விசேஷ கவஸ்து பிளேசு  
கூழ, கூழ ஸகலேவகய ஸ காரகிதக கவஸ்து  
பிளேசு கூழ ஸகலேவகய கூழ ஸகலேவகய  
விசேஷ காரக ஸகலேவகய  
ஸகலேவகய)

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க—பிரதம  
அமைச்சரும் பாதுகாப்பு, வெளி விவகார  
அமைச்சரும் திட்ட அமைப்பு, பொரு  
ளாதார விவகார அமைச்சரும், தகவல், ஒலி  
பரப்பு அமைச்சரும், தெரிசூழத் தலைவரும்)

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

I present the Second Report from  
the Joint Select Committee of the  
Senate and the House of Representa-  
tives appointed to consider the  
Revision of the Constitution, together  
with the Proceedings of the Commit-  
tee and the Minutes of Evidence.

கரு உதி. கி. உதி. ஸகலேவகய (விசயத்  
கூழ பீசேஷக ஸ நிவாச கூழ)

(கௌரவ எம். டி. எச். ஜயவர்தன—  
விஞ்ஞான ஆய்வு, வீடமைப்பு அமைச்சர்)

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

I move,

“That the Second Report from the Joint  
Select Committee of the Senate and the  
House of Representatives appointed to  
consider the Revision of the Constitution,  
together with the Proceedings of the  
Committee and the Minutes of Evidence,  
be printed.”

புலகய விசேஷ கேள், ஸகலேவகய விச.

வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

Question put, and agreed to.

කළු තැවීම :

කල් නැවීම

ஒத்திவைப்பு

## ADJOURNMENT

මත්ත්ව මණ්ඩලයේ රැස්වීම්

சபை அமர்வு

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

ගරු එම්. ඩී. එච්. ජයවර්ධන

(கௌரவ எம். டி. எச். ஜயவர்தன)  
(The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena)

I move,

“That this House at its rising this day do adjourn until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, 18th June 1968, and that the hours of Sitting that day shall be as though it were a Second day from the Poya Day.”

ප්‍රශ්නය සහතිමුඛ කරන ලදී.

வினா எடுத்தியம்பப்பெற்றது.

Question proposed.

මෙම පොත සකස් කළේ ඩී. ඩබ්ලිව්. ඩබ්ලිව්. (ඩී. ඩබ්ලිව්. ඩබ්ලිව්.)

(திரு. மைத்திரிபால சேனாநாயக்க--மத வாச்சி)

(Mr. Maithripala Senanayake—Medawachchiya)

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මේ යෝජනාවට අප විරුද්ධ නැහැ. එහෙත් අපට එක් කාරණයක් දැනගන්නට ඕනෑ සාමාන්‍යයෙන් අප රැස්විය යුතුව තිබෙන්නේ මේ මාසේ 21 වැනිදා නිසා දැන් ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙන යෝජනාව අනුව රැස්වන්නට අදහස් කරන්නේ 18 වැනිදා පමණක්දැයි ගරු අගමැතිතුමාගෙන් දැනගන්නට සතුටුයි. 19 වැනිදාත් රැස් වෙනවාද යන්නත්, සභාවාරය කල් තැබීම සඳහා දිනයක් නියම කර තිබෙනවාද යන්නත් දැනගන්නට සතුටුයි. මේවා නොදැන කිසිම වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් යොදාගන්නට බැරි නිසයි එසේ අහන්නේ.

ගරු ඩබ්ලි ජෝ නානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

18 වැනිදා පමණක් රැස් වන්නේ. ඊට පස්සේ සභාවාරය කල් දමනවා.

ဗြဟ္မာ့ဘေသာ ခိဝေသာ ဇေယျာ၊ နာမာဓိဓာ ခိဝေသာ.

வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

Question put, and agreed to.

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීම සඳහා ඉදිරිපත්  
කරන ලබන යෝජනා

மாவட்ட சபைகள் தாபித்தற்கான கருத்துரைகள்

## PROPOSALS FOR THE ESTABLISHMENTS OF DISTRICT COUNCILS

ගුරු චම්. ඩි. චම්. ජයවර්ධන

(கௌரவ எம். டி. எச். ஜயவர்தன)  
(The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena)

I move,

"That the House do now adjourn".

ප්‍රශ්නය සහතිමුඛ කරන ලදී.

வினா எடுத்தியம்பப்பெற்றது.

Question proposed.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)  
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Ten Members have given in their names and wish to speak today. I would earnestly request hon. Members who are down to speak to be as brief as possible. If the House agrees, we can proceed with the Debate on the White Paper without a break for tea, so that a further half hour would be available.

ကော မော<sup>၂</sup> ဘိဝော

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர்கள்)

(Hon. Members)

We agree.

අ. හා. 2.05

පී. පී. පොත්තම්බලම් මයා. (යාපනය)

(திரு. ஜி. ஜி. பொன்னம்பலம்—யாழ்ப்பாணம்)

(Mr. G. G. Ponnambalam—Jaffna)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, may I, before I speak on the White Paper itself, be permitted to make the observation that it is a tragedy, an irony in the working of parliamentary institutions in this country that, within the short space of just over two years, this

කල් තැබීම:

දිස්ත්‍රික් සහ පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

House and this country have had to witness the progress of two Debates on fairly consequential matters either with empty benches in front of us or in both cases with barricades erected at some distance from the House. I sincerely hope that with the progress of time democracy, as it will fructify in this country, will make it possible for those who hold different views to consider it palatable to listen to and hear views opposed to theirs.

So much for that. May I now say why my party and I, after the most anxious consideration, have come to the conclusion that we will not be able to support a Bill containing the principles enunciated in the White Paper.

I shall say that very briefly, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We as a party, through fair weather and foul, in sunshine and in rain, have held aloft the ideal of a united Ceylon in a unitary government. We have suffered the consequences, sometimes not very palatable, for adhering loyally to our convictions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, even today, through times that have not been very propitious, we adhere to that ideal of a united Ceylon. This is not lip service. We feel that an integrated Ceylonese nation is the only answer to the ills that confront this country. It is an absolute *sine qua non* for progress, for development, and for the advancement of the economy of this country.

Why then do I say that we cannot support this Bill or the principles of this White Paper? May I say this in passing, as a Tamil? I say that the passage of a Bill incorporating these principles, if I may put it very succinctly, will lead to segregation of the two major communities of this Island eventually, if not immediately. It will, as far as the Tamils are concerned, lead to compartmentalization, to regionalization, and to provincialization, and this, if I may say so, in my view, in a small country such as this, with

a history of lives lived with the utmost cordiality, particularly between the Buddhists and the Hindus, will be bad for the whole Island and worse for the Tamils, being the smaller entity. We believe in equality of opportunity for every citizen of this country to whatever community he may belong, equality of status wherever he is residing. In other words, a Tamil, whether he is resides in Point Pedro or Point Dondra, must be in a position to enjoy equal rights with his Sinhalese brothers. If that ideal cannot be achieved, I shall say at the end of my speech what inevitably will be the result. In my view, those—I give them full marks for honesty and sincerity—who feel in a spirit of defeatism that the only way in which we can preserve our identity is by becoming segregated in the Northern and Eastern Provinces in the fond hope that there at least we may be able to enjoy some kind of liberty, are actually hugging a delusion because, in my respectful submission to this House and to my Friends who hold that view, if we Tamils cannot live as equal in the South and other parts of Ceylon, if we think we can retain our rights only in the Northern and Eastern Provinces, then, I very much fear, those rights will tend to diminish and eventually disappear even in the Northern and Eastern Provinces. That is my considered and solemn conviction.

We are opposed to the principles of this White Paper for another reason which I shall go into later—I am merely saying this in summary—namely, that the poor districts in this country will tend to become poorer. I repeat, the poor districts in this country, irrespective of the community inhabiting them, will tend to become poorer and the richer districts will tend to become richer. That is why I repeat that the principles of this Bill, as we see in the White Paper, are bad for Ceylon and worse for the Tamils.

I hope that at the end of these remarks, which I am now making

[සෞන් නම්බලම් මයා.]

in English, you will extend to me the indulgence of saying a few words in my mother tongue in the hope that they will be reflected and carried to my people in the original and not in translation, but out of courtesy to those of my hon. Friends who are here I propose to continue my speech for the major part in English.

The two main reasons, as stated by the Hon. Prime Minister, for the introduction of the White Paper and the draft Bill are to be found in the Throne Speech of 1965, in which there is the reference to the general objective of the establishment of district councils. The first main reason is—I am putting it briefly without quoting the words—to increase the efficiency of the existing structure and machinery of local government. May I be permitted to examine whether even remotely throughout the pages of this White Paper there is any indication of any measure in any clause in the draft Bill directed towards increasing the efficiency of the existing structure and machinery of local government.

Indeed, it would be my submission—and I do not think anybody will cavil at it; I think the Hon. Prime Minister will agree with me—that there is no attempt, that there is no pretence to improve, to expand, or to aid in any form or in any measure, the existing structure and machinery of local government. Local bodies are left completely intact. The subjects coming under their control are untouched. Their powers remain unchanged. Whatever control they may exercise remains untouched. Their sources of revenue are not enhanced. They remain in a very static position. What, I ask you, is the use of several pages of history in this White Paper relating to the development of local government institutions?

Indeed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, everybody will agree that there has been a general demand for improvement in the structure of local government. I

think there are any number of avenues for such improvement. This was felt, I believe, from the time these local government institutions came into being. We have a complete, composite structure of local government in this country, starting at the base with village councils and going up to the apex of municipal councils. All of them remain untouched by the proposals in this White Paper.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, for the first time in 1953 or 1954, the then Government appointed the Choksy Commission to report on the subject of improving the structure and machinery of local government. That commission reported and made certain recommendations. They remain up to date untouched and unimplemented over a period of nearly 15 years.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is something else. Not only are the powers, the functions, the responsibilities and the revenues of local bodies untouched or unenhanced but in the very composition of the contemplated district councils you have the seeds of disruption of local government. I will tell you why I say this. You have chairmen of local bodies who would function *ex officio* as members of district councils in their respective districts. These chairmen of local bodies, as heads of these local institutions, enjoy a degree of autonomy which is not to be found in the district councils. They have jurisdiction over a number of subjects—true enough, at certain levels—in which they are autonomous, virtually independent, unless you have an interfering Minister.

In other words, if you examine the proposed schedule to the proposed district councils, you will see identical subjects coming under the jurisdiction of local bodies within a district and district councils. In other words, you have the immediate phenomenon of concurrent jurisdiction between local bodies and district councils within whose areas these local bodies are situated. You know very well, and it is hardly necessary for me to say, that concurrent jurisdiction at the

කලී තැබීම :

level of local government and district government is the most fruitful source of disruption, of opposition, and generally of absence of co-operation. And you have that very chairman functioning in the district council.

So, it would be my submission that, far from improving the structure and machinery of local government, you would have succeeded in bringing about any form of progress in the matter of local government to a standstill, if not to a point of destruction.

Then, has there been any attempt to demarcate, as is being done in other countries, the sphere of revenue or the sources of revenue of local government bodies, differentiating these sources from possible sources of revenue for district councils? No. That would again be a fruitful source of friction and opposition.

We today witness an extraordinary phenomenon. Here is something that has been loosely worded as a great advance in local government. What happens? I have yet to hear—I may be corrected if I am wrong—of one local body, whether it is in the North, South, East or West, which has welcomed the proposals in the White Paper. Indeed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think I am not overstating the case if I say that there is almost united opposition and there is no differentiation as far as I know among these local government bodies whether they are situated in the traditional Tamil areas or in the traditional Sinhalese areas. Why? Because their position becomes not better but worse and more insecure. As a result today there is opposition. If, in point of fact, the White Paper proposals were directed towards enhancing and increasing the powers of local government bodies we would not witness the sad spectacle of empty Opposition benches. Local bodies would have accepted this with open arms. They would have said: "This is an extension of local government and therefore we like it. What

දිස්ත්‍රික් සහ පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

happens is that they have been bypassed, and quite rightly and quite understandably there is united opposition by local bodies, irrespective of the communities to which they belong, to the proposals underlying this draft Bill contained in the White Paper.

In this connection, as early as 1956, the late Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike's Government in their Throne Speech used almost identical words or words with the identical connotation. Again, I do not believe in taxing the House by reading out passages. I shall summarize it, and you can take it from me that I shall summarize it correctly. In the Throne Speech of 1956, Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike speaks of giving early attention to the Choksy Report on local government, and of taking steps to remedy defects in local government, structurally, financially and administratively. So, if the development and the line of thinking has been the same without any kind of violent departure—violent departure, may I say, cannot be attributed to this government; it may be attributed to the infamous Horagolla meeting in 1957, when for the first time something which was contemplated as an advance in local government was attempted to be manipulated for political ends and purposes—then indeed I do not think. I need labour this point much further because the Hon. Prime Minister in his speech and in the White Paper at page 9 says that district councils will not be local authorities but would be an extension of the Central Government.

වෛද්‍යවෘද්ධ ඩී. එම්. ඩී. නාගනාතන්  
(නල්ලූර්)

(டொக்டர் ஈ. எம். வீ. நாகநாதன்—  
நல்லூர்)

(Dr. E. M. V. Naganathan—Nallur)

Hear! Hear!

කල් තැබීම:

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

පොත්තම්බලම් මයා.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)  
(Mr. Ponnambalam)

I think in fairness I should give the exact words. This is what is stated at page 9 of the White Paper :

“These Councils will not be local authorities but would be an extension of the Central Government activities taking over some functions now performed by the Kachcheries.”

In that case it is neither fish nor flesh nor good red herring. I shall come back to that in a moment when I deal with the second aspect of this matter.

In this connexion, yesterday a Member of this House thought that he will fix me in anticipation, so to speak, by referring to a speech I made in the Debate on the First Throne Speech of this Government in April 1965. With some difficulty I was able to get the reference. I still have a good enough memory, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I do not go about swinging like a pendulum and I know precisely what I said.

Unfortunately I was induced to make that observation as usual in reply to my good Friend the hon. Member for Dambadeniya (Mr. R. G. Senanayake). He acts like a particular kind of stimulus to some of us sometimes. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. Member for Dambadeniya went on in his own inimitable fashion, almost in the tones of a soliloquy, to try and possibly satisfy himself, to convince himself, that the bare skeleton of the proposal, the mere reference to district councils, would usher in doom, namely the division of the country. Then I quite naively said, “Surely what objection can one have to district councils if they are for the extension of local government?” That was my reply, and I sincerely trust that those who come from the same ranks will not quote me out of context. I said I could see no objection to district councils as an institution if indeed they are to be an extension of local government. Surely I would have given credit for more

intelligence. The hon. Member quoted my speech when in the very first pages of the White Paper the Prime Minister makes a frank and candid admission that this has nothing to do with local government. There is no extension of local government. It is not a local authority at all.

So I stand, shall I say, without any kind of retraction from the views I expressed in 1965. I see no reason to retract anything, and my present position is totally consistent with every word I then said. I hope that will be understood, and I repeat I will not be quoted out of context, and people misled.

I get on to the second limb of this objective, namely, popular participation. In other words what was contemplated in the Throne Speech was that it would increase the efficiency of local government institutions and then harness the co-operation of all classes of citizens in the administration. That is what I summarized as popular participation.

Will you allow me a few minutes to examine whether there is the remotest semblance, whether there is the slightest justification, for the claim that there is to be popular participation? No, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not want to be elementary, but the basis of all local government is the, shall we say, transfer of certain functions normally performed by the central government through its central government machinery to local authorities in which people at different levels will jointly and collectively participate in administering their affairs on the basis that they will understand their needs better, they will be anxious to push things through, there will be no delays, there will be no stagnation, and so on.

Now, what is the first prerequisite of popular participation? In my submission, there can be no popular participation in any institution with any pretence to democracy unless there is a direct election. In this case, there is a total denial of direct election from the start.

කල් තැබීම:

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ සේපතා

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the constitution of the personnel of these district councils there is a denial of popular participation. That is my submission. What happens? Chairmen of the various local bodies, *ex officio* members, and Members of Parliament, also *ex officio*, constitute them. I fail to see how even remotely you can interpret a body so constituted and composed to be an institution of popular participation.

Let us see in its application who are the people who are left out from the functioning of district councils. May I be permitted to advert to that section of the Tamil population about whom some of my Friends opposite have been so concerned in the past, namely, the Tamils of Indian origin? Mr. Deputy Speaker, a million or nearly that number who normally reside on estates are denied village councils' franchise. They are totally without it. Some of them who are registered citizens may enjoy parliamentary franchise, but if they happen to be resident on estates none of them has a vote in any village council in his respective area. So for a start we have this great advance, which is being ushered in, in which there can be no direct or indirect participation by nearly a million Tamils. Well, if those who have been saviours, pretending or otherwise, of the Indian population are gratified with it, all that I can say is, I beg leave to oppose it. I say this is a complete denial, a complete anathema, as far as popular participation is concerned.

Let us take the Muslims. Except for my good Friend the Appointed Member (Mr. Izadeen Mohamed), I do not think any elected Muslim Member has spoken so far.—[*Interruption*]. Yes, one. May I say this: There is no question about it that in districts where there is a mixed population, as you have in the Eastern Province—Tamils and Sinhalese; Tamils and Muslims; Tamils, Muslims and Sinhalese—you will have district councils which do not

reflect the composition, the complexion, or the character of the population of those areas.—[*Interruption*]. I am taking the White Paper as it is.

As far as minority communities are concerned, may I refer to a very important section of the Tamil population to whom my hon. Friend the Member for Dambadeniya referred in such unctuous tones, namely, the million and two hundred thousand Tamils from the Northern and Eastern Provinces who are residing in the Sinhalese areas. I do not know whether the figure is accurate, but that is by and large correct. Have you ever considered the position of the Tamils living in the Sinhalese areas in this matter?

Indeed, if I may be permitted to digress for one minute, I am amazed that a gentleman with whom I have had the pleasure and the privilege of being associated during my school days—I am referring to Mr. Basnayake—could carry on such a virulent and blatant campaign, shedding tears for the few thousand Sinhalese who may be resident in the Northern and Eastern Provinces. He did not know that he was inviting the rejoinder which I am now making, namely, that over a million Tamils living in the Sinhalese areas are going to suffer a worse fate with these district councils.

May I ask my Friend the Member for Dambadeniya kindly to convey this to his legal adviser?—[*Interruption*]. I do not mind interruptions provided they make me make a contribution or the interruptions themselves are intelligent.

My learned Friend just now said: "What about the three nominees?" I ask, do you seriously say that a million Indians who have been disfranchised under the Village Councils Ordinance, who have no say, should have to look to some nomination by the Government in power? I thought we were going away from those reactionary and antiquated ways.

My hon. Friend the Member for Dambadeniya talked about the minority Tamils. I endorse it. In a state

කල් තබම:

දිස්ත්‍රික් සහ පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

[පොත්තමලම් මයා.]

of affairs where you have single-member constituencies, you have the most extraordinary phenomena arising as a result of that.

The minority Tamils who are in a minority in a number of single-member constituencies have not found representation in the legislature. Then what representation will they have in a district council? Nothing at all or hardly any.

Apart from these categories of people I have referred to, Mr. Deputy Speaker, may I also say this: popular participation presupposes an active participation of large, educated sections of the community, and it is a stark, realistic fact that those sections of the people of this country who are in government employment or quasi-government employment have no political rights.

Today, literally about 100,000 teachers or more, who have played a significant and distinguished part in local government, have no political rights. They cannot even serve in local government institutions. They are out. As for government servants, I do not say they should take an active part in politics. Anyway, they have no political rights. Employees in corporations have no political rights.

And yet can it be claimed that that second limb of the objective, namely, harnessing the co-operation of all classes of citizens, is being supported by this truncated, emasculated—I will not use the other word—institution called the district council?

May I, purely in passing, refer to how popular participation is achieved in large areas in India? I do not know whether I am letting anybody down coming out with a secret I should not come out with, but I think it is well known that the original framers of what has led to this draft Bill were not merely influenced but, I believe, copied literally chunks out of the Jilla Parishad Act of 1961 of

Maharashtra. It is also, I believe, known that the Mahantantila Commission that inquired into the possibility of reforms in local government institutions under the Sirimavo Bandaranaike Government was also greatly influenced by the Jilla Parishad Act of 1961.

Let us examine, very briefly, how they achieved popular participation. "Jilla Parishad", incidentally, is the Indian word for district council. I think I must make that point clear. These areas are largely rural areas. The various states in which the district council or jilla parishad functions in India expressly excludes municipalities and municipal corporations. Be that as it may, in respect of the rest of the area you have one uniform electoral system for the whole area, with a large number of wards. There is one election held for the whole area. A few wards constitute what is known as a panchayat. A number of panchayats constitute the next step in the ladder—I forget the name—and a number of those units in that district constitute the jilla parishad. In other words, you have a tier system, a ladder system, step by step from the lowest to the highest, and the jilla parishad, namely, the district council, is a coping-stone for the entire local government structure. It has functions above a particular financial level. It has supervisory functions in respect of local bodies in that whole area. They all come together. The whole scheme of development and programme is worked out together. Subjects are apportioned. There is no conflict. That is how the jilla parishads or district councils in India function.

Now, as regards popular participation, how do they achieve it? In regard to each subject the entire jilla parishad—let us call it district council for greater ease—divides itself into functional committees—health, education, communications and so on—and each of these committees is responsible for its respective subject.

කල් තැබීම:

දිස්ත්‍රික් සහ පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

In other words, there you have what the Donoughmore Commissioners themselves recommended for Ceylon. In their sojourn in this country, in their investigation of the constitutional landscape, they came to the conclusion that the Ceylonese were eminently fitted for local government. Indeed they must have been influenced by their observations to recommend an executive committee system of government for this country.

That is precisely what is wanted in local government—the association of the largest number of elected representatives in administering and conducting the affairs of that area.

Instead, what is contemplated? Here, again, I do not know whether I am at liberty to tell you what was the original plan of the original designers of this Bill. But today the Bill has been drawn up. Even so, there is a concentration of power in an executive committee, the largest number being either seven or one-fifth of the total number whichever is less. That means that the district council will meet once a month, twelve times a year, to pass resolutions, collect their travelling allowances and any honoraria which may be contemplated, and off they go, allowing it to the tender mercies of the chairman and his executive committee thereafter to carry out the affairs of the district council. That is the position.

I say, therefore, on the second limb of the objective there is a total failure, namely, there is no attempt at popular participation or at successfully harnessing the energies and the capabilities of all classes of citizens in this country.

I now pass on to the next theme, decentralization. This is a peculiar thing. Sometimes we use this word “decentralization” almost without any kind of relationship. What is local government except decentralization from the central government

of certain functions to local authorities? So decentralization cannot be taken *in vacuo*. Decentralization has been referred to in the speech of the Hon. Prime Minister and also in the White Paper.

May I now very briefly—if I traverse the whole ground I will be taking a lot of the time of this House—just refer to—I wish the Hon Minister of Education were here just now—the transfer of subjects under the Education Ministry in the schedule of transferred subjects. I must deal with this subject of education. The subject of education is one which deeply and fundamentally affects the interests of and concerns the Tamil people just as much as it does the Sinhalese. We have suffered—there is not one hon. Member here, to whichever party he may belong who will not agree with me that we have suffered—grievously under the Education Ministry in regard to the maintenance of standards of education in the North—and I dare say that applies equally to the South, the West and the East.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, look at pages 36 and 37 of the draft Bill. It speaks of the most important thing—the establishment and maintenance of new kanista vidyalayas with the prior approval of the Director-General of Education. I just do not understand it unless, if this means anything at all, it means that, if within an area there is a dispute locally as to whether a kanista vidyalaya should be located in village A or village B, the district council, usually governed by the dominant party in power, will decide either on village A or village B to the neglect of the other; but as to the necessity of adding to the kanista vidyalayas in a district, it is a matter that is subject to the approval of the Director-General of Education.

Incidentally, one would like to know what the word “maintenance” of these vidyalayas means. In regard to finance, does it mean that in the

කල් තැබීම:

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

[සෞන් නම්බලම් මය.]

matter of capital expenditure the central government contributes or makes the entire contribution, and in regard to maintenance it has to be by local government contributions? That is not clear. Be that as it may, I will come to finances in a minute.

This is where I feel that these district councils are a chimera and a fraud. The schedule expressly excludes—let hon. Members deny it if they can—the question of textbooks. Textbooks have to come from the holy of holies in the Education Ministry. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was not a long time ago that we were allowed to take examinations held by authorities in England. Those authorities did not prescribe the textbooks we should follow. The curricula or the syllabuses were known. We knew we had to face examinations. Teachers and parents were sufficiently well acquainted and sufficiently advanced to be able to decide on texts. Besides, well-known textbooks were available. Indeed, regimentation and control in regard to textbooks is anathema in the matter of liberalization of education. That is expressly excluded from the purview of district councils.

Next what is excluded? Standardization of buildings and nature of equipment. In other words, the Ministry of Education makes sure that buildings must not be, shall we say, comparable or standardized between the various areas. Apparently, sub-standard buildings are good enough for a sub-standard population, as in the case of the junior university colleges. The junior university college in Kuliyaipitiya, I believe, received half a million rupees or more, whereas the junior university college at Kankasanturai received the handsome sum of Rs. 100,000. We do not know whether the hon. Member for Kankasanturai (Mr. Chelvanayakam) is aware of it. What I cannot understand is what is meant by eliminating standardization of buildings. Is

it that in various areas buildings of different standards must of necessity be maintained?

Then there is equipment. These are excluded from the purview of district councils. I have seen so-called science laboratories in maha vidyalayas and madhya maha vidyalayas. Six test tubes, two Bunsen burners and an empty bench constitute a laboratory! So, the question of equipment is left out.

Then there is educational research. Well, I can understand that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if there is one matter that has steadily brought down the standard of education in our schools, if I may say so with some knowledge of the North and of other parts of the country, it has been this utterly unprincipled, utterly indefensible, utterly unscientific method of transfers of teachers without rhyme or reason, or without any policy laid down.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the Hon. Prime Minister will permit me to divulge this one fact, I said I was prepared to still my objections to the establishment of district councils if, as a trial, one subject, namely, education, which is pre-eminently suited for local government control, is left in the hands of local government bodies and made a district subject and teachers made members of a district service.

I have ample precedent for that submission. In the progressive advance of local government institutions, such as those in England and even in Russia, Germany, France and America, there has always been a tendency towards localization, towards bringing control and administration of educational institutions within the district rather than having remote centralized control.

I know how I have suffered, how our children have suffered, how parents have complained. I know the chaotic conditions in the educational institutions in this country. I was prepared to compromise even

கல் துறை:

on fundamental principles provided they transferred education completely as a district service. If I may say so, now talking as a Tamil, if education is transferred as a district service to the North, we can handle it far better than it is handled now or is likely to be handled in the future.

These are the exclusions. The inclusions are maintenance—maintenance would be what?—plastering, whitewashing—

செ. மனோகந்திரன்

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

Keep it going.

பொன்னம்பலம் ம. பொன்னம்பலம்

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

Then, medical inspection. What the district councils will do in regard to medical inspection, I do not know. Hold a candle? Then there is provision of milk and meals, facilities for recreation. Admirable! Then there is provision of transport facilities. I do not want to waste time. I shall advert to the implications of those matters which have been transferred for administration by the local bodies in a minute when I come to finance.

The point I am making is that the most unimportant aspects of education are transferred to local bodies while there is a concentration, a polarization, a crystallization, of the most important functions in the holy of holies, the Ministry of Education, which I say is absolutely undesirable and indefensible.

By contrast, may I refer to one other subject? The temptation is great, and I hope the fair lady, the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, who is seated close to me will not object. Among the very complicated matters under the subject of animal husbandry that the great and eternal leaders of the district councils will have to handle is cattle branding and castration.

தேவதாஸ் சண்முகம் பிள்ளை

செ. மனோகந்திரன்

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Family planning!

பொன்னம்பலம் ம. பொன்னம்பலம்

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

I hope I am forgiven. I could not resist the temptation.

Next, I wish to put a question to my Friend the Prime Minister. You have created this out of nothing and for nothing and, if I may venture to say so, for achieving nothing. You have been confronted, I must say, with very great and difficult problems. You have faced them boldly. You were faced with the reduction of the rice ration. You made a job of it. You justified it. I congratulate you. Devaluation was forced on you. I had my own views, but you made a job of it. Though it has been somewhat negatived and neutralized by the increase of allowances and the consequent rise in the cost of production of the primary products in this country, you have made a job of it. What are you trying to sell the people of this country by bringing these district councils? I asked my Friend this question some time back and I ask it now on the Floor of this House. What is it that you are commending to the people of this country? In my respectful submission you are really not achieving anything. I know a direct answer will come. Are you increasing the efficiency of the administrative machinery, central or local, in this country for the achievement of any national purpose? I know this is not a fair question to ask because I know the answer. If so, I ask the Prime Minister, will he be prepared to delegate to the district councils, if and when they are established, the whole of the food drive? I know the answer to it. That is why I hesitated for a moment and said that it was not a fair question. I am sure my Hon. Friend the Prime Minister will not relegate the food drive to the district councils for the

කල් තැබීම:

දිස්ත්‍රික් සහ පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

[පොත් නම්බලම් මය.]

reason that—[Interruption]—for a four or six it will go. The functioning of district councils will be dilatory, loquacious, and even inefficient, and if you are going to achieve something quite fast and directly, still the machinery of the Central Government will have to be utilized. My submission, therefore, on the one thing, on the one great subject that today concerns the people of this country, namely, the achievement of self-sufficiency in food and or in subsidiary foodstuff, is that the district councils will have to be left out because they can play a significant and important role only with proper and real popular participation. Let us see what happens.

I come to my next point, namely, the unequal and imbalanced development of various areas in this country under the proposed Bill. I shall merely, without going into detail, refer to two provisions. Incidentally, the functions of the proposed district councils fall under two broad categories—the formulation and recommendation of schemes of development to the central authority, the appropriate Minister, for his acceptance or rejection—purely advisory and persuasive and so on; and the other is the execution of the functions enumerated in the schedule of subjects to be transferred attached to the draft Bill. In regard to the first, nobody can cavil at it; somebody locally will address his mind and formulate some scheme and submit it to a Minister, and no harm can be done. Maybe some degree of enthusiasm and enlightened self-interest may make some distinct contribution in that regard. So, I shall not cavil at it. But the other one is the discharge of functions in respect of the fund. Now, what happens? Will there be uniform development?—I shall come to that. Will the functions and powers and responsibilities of these district councils be uniform? My hon. Friend the Member for Dambadeniya (Mr. R. G. Senanayake) goes about ferreting out most abstruse and trivial points in this Bill.

I do not know from where he gets them. I can understand why certain judgments were always upset. They are staring you in the face.

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් ජේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

That is his adviser.

පොත් නම්බලම් මය.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

You will find in every Bill reference to functions or something accruing from, emanating from some other written law. It is almost routine business. But, here, a Minister has the right under Clause 75 to withdraw a subject from a district council—to withdraw, not to increase—so that all district councils will not have the same subjects under their purview and control. That is not all. In regard to these subjects already transferred, the most important matters will be development schemes. And, Sir, in regard to development schemes there is a reserve fund under the Minister to (a) initiate development schemes and (b) transfer these development schemes to certain district councils and withhold them from others. “The Minister may transfer any development scheme relating to subjects in the schedule.” If anybody wants the reference I can give it.

So, here again—I hope I do not have a dirty mind, a mind dirtier than that of other persons—I say I apprehend the germ of discrimination in that district councils in various parts of the country will be prevented from enjoying, such as they are, the so-called rights, functions and responsibilities.

May I now refer to the most important subject which really is the key to the development of local government in any country in the world, namely, finance?

What is the position of finance? I would have liked it if there was, without giving details, some attempt

කල් නැමීම :

දිස්ත්‍රික් සහ පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

to lay down the broad principles which would govern the Central Government in the matter of making grants, making contributions, and so on. There is now a complete absence, a complete blank of any principles or policies underlying financial aid or financial powers for these district councils, except to say that these councils can levy taxes, rates and charges.

I suppose municipalities today levy taxes, rates and charges. Urban councils today levy taxes, rates, and charges. Where do you have the dividing line? There is no indication. Of course, one could legitimately say, "You are asking for details when this is only the broad principle of it." But I say, when you propose a departure from established local government principles, we must know the point of departure in the matter of finance.

Let us leave that point out. Now, what would happen in the matter of education? The poorer districts with poor resources, it is hardly necessary for me to say—it is obvious—will yield very little revenue. Now, then, are these great institutions which are being ushered in under such difficult conditions to be governed by the capacity of the local population to yield revenue? There is no indication in the White Paper or for that matter in the draft Bill showing the line of demarcation between central government sources of revenue and local government sources of revenue. There is a reference to grants and assistance by the Central Government. Here again, it is left nebulous, vague and obscure.

Then again, in India, in the Jilla parishad there is a permissive system of contributions by the Central Government towards the budget of local bodies. One hundred per cent in fact of the establishment charges and up to seventy-five per cent in regard to their activities are met by the Central Government. There is not a word said here in regard to that.

Then, I must not let this opportunity pass without referring to a very important advance in local government effected in 1959 by the Local Government Act in England wherein they have worked out an elaborate formula taking in youngsters below a certain age, taking in the whole population, considering the whole area and working out a formula by which the poorer districts will *pari passu* get a much greater contribution from the Central Government. Such a scheme is not mentioned and, as far as I can see, it is not contemplated. That is why I very much fear that in the operation of this law poor districts will become poorer and rich districts will become richer. There is no equalization of opportunity. In other words—hon. Members must excuse me and not argue that I have a bad mind.—I conceive of the provisions in respect of revenue and finance being made the instruments of discrimination under this Bill.

May I come back once again, just for a minute or two, to the so-called transferred subjects under these proposals? What are these transferred subjects? Again, without going into details, if I were to characterize them, if I were to categorize them, I would say they are largely of a routine, social service nature.

I shall give you one example—I think one of my juniors gave this to me—namely, milk and noon-day meal. This is today financed by the Central Government in respect of all schools, having regard to the number of children attending these schools. This is a subject transferred to the local authority or the district council in the future. What happens? In the matter of an adequate supply of milk and noon-day meals to these children, these authorities will be governed by their financial resources. In other words, you will have immediately inequality of treatment in respect of these social service functions that are now being transferred from the Central Government to the district councils. This is where you will have a greater inequality. If you

කල් තැබීම:

දිස්ත්‍රික් සහ පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

[පොත් නම්ලෙම් මය.]

want me to refer to the subjects, they are orphanages, playgrounds, homes for the aged, maintenance of roads and buildings. All these things will have to be maintained from local government revenue. If there is no direct assistance, and if they are to be met from local government revenue, the standards of maintenance will depend on the capacity and ability of that area to produce the money.

In spite of all this, at page 10, Clause 29 (4) lays down as a peremptory requirement that it shall be the duty of a district council to make reasonable provision within the district in respect of the subjects specified in the schedule and to execute or maintain works or development schemes in the district relating to any such subjects.

I want to know who supplies the grist to the mill. Where is the wherewithal to come from? You lay down a supreme function and leave it at that. You do not indicate how and from where the means are to come forth.

I have made observations up to now—I think hon. Members will agree—purely as a Ceylon citizen. Every one of the observations I have made is applicable *mutatis mutandis* to the whole of Ceylon.

May I now be permitted for a short while to refer to certain aspects which affect my people, the Tamils? It has been our misfortune—you ought to know as well as anyone of us—that the Tamils have had to rely, because they had inherited areas of infertile soil and inhospitable climate, on white collar employment in the public sector—mostly in the public sector—and somewhat in the private sector, still largely under government or semi-government institutions.

Now what happens here? I am thankful that the Hon. Prime Minister has succeeded in removing what was originally contemplated as a district service because that would have been, if I may use a colloquial expression, putting the thin lid on

all good things as far as we were concerned. Although district service has gone out today there is provision under Section 30 for the creation of posts and offices as may be deemed necessary, true enough, with the approval of the Minister of Finance.

Now, what does that mean? This is one of my fundamental objections to the whole concept of district councils, namely, that these bodies will naturally tend to get even the central government agency to recruit people with a local bias. In a way you cannot blame them. If you have local government institutions it is an inevitable corollary that in the matter of recruitment greater emphasis and greater proclivity would tend towards the recruitment of people of the locality. Though the district service and recruitment to it would have to be with the approval of the Minister of Finance, nevertheless it would mean greater and greater weightage towards the majority population, and my people, who have up to now in slightly diminishing numbers depended, through their education, for employment in government and governmental institutions for their living, will have to turn elsewhere, even, I say, with the possibility of this being used as an instrument of discrimination.

In this connection, may I be permitted to observe this: there has been such a lot of talk about communalism and so on. I say this to my hon. Friend from Dambadeniya (Mr. R. G. Senanayake). He and I have known each other for a long time. I felt very sorry for him yesterday. We remember his father and uncle. They were associated with the most eminent Tamils in this country on terms of complete equality and friendship.

Yesterday, when I listened to my hon. Friend from Dambadeniya, I honestly felt sorry for him. I know him in private life. Believe it or not, he is a most charming person. He exudes charm. His good lady at home will tell you that. But when he comes

කල් තැබීම :

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

here he seems to be a Mr. Hyde, while Dr. Jekyll remains at home. Why does he go on like this? Very soon he will be in a psychopathic condition. I say this with great personal concern.

Does he really think that we are monsters, that we are out to do something terrible to his country because he looks upon this as his country. Does he not think this is also our country? Yesterday my Friend gave me the impression that the only place he would relegate us to with safety is the Palk Straits and the Indian Ocean. He knows we have not yet turned amphibian. We have got to live in this country whether he likes it or not. Why does he start this hymn of hate?

Believe me, I followed his speech and it was painful. I feel sorry. I do not know whether to feel sorry for ourselves or for him. Such brains, such ability, much above the average, going to waste! Please, why does he not pull himself together? He has still a wonderful contribution to make. Why should he go on thinking in terms of shooting every illicit immigrant dumped unlawfully here, and saying he is an Indian, he is a *kallathoni*, and things like that? It does not do him justice; It does not do justice to his forbears. This is a very small country. We do not have many people of great ability. There were 4½ hours of utter drivel—I was almost going to say bilge—which I listened to. I wanted to see whether there was a germ of sense. I feel sorry. If he and his legal adviser had studied this Bill as I have studied it, without raising the communal cry, he could have raised a number of questions and criticized and opposed the Bill No. He leaves that alone, he goes like a horrible drain inspector looking for some obscure little hole somewhere—some stink hole—and then comes and breathes out in the open and criticizes.

May I also say this? I am talking quite seriously. If God forbid—he reflects the attitude of mind of the

majority of good Sinhalese people, for whom I have the greatest admiration—I still want to hold the light of unity bright—if, as I understand him, the Opposition are of the same way of thinking, and if the people of this country are going to increasingly adopt that line of thinking, then my good Friend, Member for Dambadeniya—I say this in all seriousness and in all sincerity—it will not be federalism, it will not be regional councils, it will not be district councils, but you and we will have to part. I am not saying this as an idle threat.

I am sorry the hon. Member who quoted me has run away. I did say in 1952, in opposing the federalists, and I say now, I do not believe in federalism, I do not believe in separatism, I do not believe in divisive politics; but if eventually, everything having being tried and having failed, a dissident movement of complete separation has got to be made, I shall not hesitate to lead it, and I repeatedly tell you here today, do not force us to it.

I repeated it in 1956 when the language Bill was introduced, by my amendment. I say, it is not something new. This is no idle threat. I said, a Bill that denies to a large section of the people of a country its fundamental language rights must include within its provisions the right to allow self-determination for the dissident minority. I am quoting from memory, and this is in HANSARD. Speaking on the Emergency in 1958 I repeatedly said it and you have forced me to say it today. So I have to repeat what I said in 1958, namely, that it will not be federalism, it will be separation.

I was dealing with the question of finance and taxation, revenue and so on. This is a matter about which I have spoken to those in authority. I say this. A district council will have power to levy taxes, will have power to issue licences, will have power to pass by-laws. What will happen if people increasingly adopt the way of thinking of the hon. Member for Dambadeniya (Mr. R. G. Senanayake) in the up-country areas, in the

කල් තැබීම:

දිස්ත්‍රික් සහ පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

[පොත්තම්බලම් මය.]

mid-country areas, where you have large Tamil populations with the predominant Sinhalese population, where you have bazaar areas, where you have areas with a number of boutiques and shops most of which today are owned—if not owned, run—by Tamils?

I hope I am not giving ideas to people when I say this but it must go on record. As much as you have introduced Ceylonization in regard to trade at the national level, so these local bodies can pass by-laws that permits and licences for trading and the keeping of shops shall be confined to people born and bred in that area. If you have these district councils you cannot prevent them from passing such by-laws. There is provision for by-laws. True, the by-laws have got to be approved by the Minister and they have to be tabled in the House. But what is fundamental is this. In our Constitution there is no Chapter of Fundamental Rights. In India there is a Chapter of Fundamental Rights. I do not want to waste the time of the House by referring to the relevant section in the Maharashtra Jilla Parishad Act which says that any by-law as will impinge on the section dealing with fundamental rights, where there can be no discrimination as between one subject and another on the basis of caste, race, religion or what have you, will be unconstitutional. There is no such provision here. I am merely pointing that out.

It may be that you are indirectly desiring it, and, if I may say so, the federalists may want to achieve it, if it is an achievement, namely, the progressive removal of the Tamils in the Sinhalese areas and their being concentrated and segregated in the Northern and Eastern Provinces.

Is that all? The establishment and maintenance of kanista vidyalayas in these various districts is going to be in the hands of district councils. Today, under the glorious dispensation of Pooh-Bah, the Lord High Executioner of the Education

Ministry, we know what we are going through. What is going to happen to Tamils living in these areas? Where are their children to be educated? Do you seriously think that a single district council in the Sinhalese areas will establish any kind of vidyalaya, kanista or what have you, for the Tamils in that area? I venture to think not.

I now come to loans. I think it was the hon. Member for Dambadeniya (Mr. R. G. Senanayake) who tried to father something on me. I am not saying who said this, but it certainly has been reported as being claimed to have been said by not one but two or three members of the Federal Party, why is Ponnambalam opposing this when we can live happily in our own land and raise a loan from Madras?

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

You cannot.

පොත්තම්බලම් මය.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

Of course, you cannot. But the point is that that passes muster, and the Member for Dambadeniya swallowed it hook, line and sinker. That lie has been nailed to the counter now. You can only raise a loan in Ceylon.

What I object to in regard to loans is that there is no delineation of policy or principle laid down with regard to the basis on which a loan shall be raised.

එම්. ඒ. ඩැනියෙල් මය. (හේවාහට)

(திரு. எம். ஏ. டனியல்—ஹேவாஹெற்ற)

(Mr. M. A. Daniel—Hewaheta)

I wish to point out that the hon. Member for Jaffna said at one time, "Fifty-fifty."

පොත්තම්බලම් මය.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

I am coming to that. Sir, may I now ask at this stage, for whose benefit is this White Paper and the draft

කල් නැතිම :

දිස්ත්‍රික් සහ පිහිටුවීමේ කොමිෂන්

Bill being brought? Echo answers, "No, Sir". Why is it being brought, Why is it being timed like this? I ask these questions, and I am hoping that those matters will also be considered by some of my Friends.

This Government has been steering on an even keel for the last few months, if I may say so, and it was gaining ground that appeared to have been lost. Sir, there are three fundamental questions that must engage and is engaging the attention of every man and woman in this country—unemployment, the food drive and the cost of living. Each one of these would be a full-time job for the energies of any government and I do not think this Government is more than super-equipped to tackle these problems. Do you realize that if all the energy and the thought and time that have been spent by this Government, this House and this country on this question had been diverted and directed to productive activity we would have taken this country several steps forward?

If this question is to go beyond the ambit of the White Paper, if it is to reach the proportions of a Bill, when will this Bill be ready, having regard to the promise made by the Prime Minister? When will we be able to harness and to canvas public opinion? Indeed, speaking for myself, although I have been concerned in these discussions with the Prime Minister and the leaders of parties from the beginning of this year for two and a half to three months, nevertheless, it took me time to study again this rather emasculated Bill and the White Paper that are before us. How much longer would it take, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for the country to understand its implications, having regard to the utterly unjustified propaganda that is being carried on? It is amazing. Do you know who the best friends of the Federal Party are? They are the Opposition, the Coalitionists, Mr. Basnayake, the the hon. Member for Dambadeniya, and the whole of that "Sun" group

of papers, namely, the Independent Newspapers of Ceylon. They are doing the finest propaganda and, obviously, the Tamils must be thinking: Surely, there must be something in this; otherwise would all these people go along and raise Cain?

As I said, if it is to reach the stage of a Bill, when will this Bill see the light of day? Can it see the light of day in less than nine months? And after the Bill sees the light of day when will we be able to make financial provision for instituting district councils? Will it be in this Budget? Obviously not. Financial provision can only be made in the next Budget, unless of course a special Budget is introduced for this purpose, which, I venture to think, will not happen. In other words, I do not see the remotest possibility of the actual establishment of district councils, of the functioning of district councils, within the next two years. Why, then, should we set ourselves by our ears? Why should the Government get upset? Why should there be this kind of turmoil and confusion over something which is to be abortive?

Talking of abortions, I am reminded of what I would have liked to call the district council. I should like to describe it as a hideous, hybrid monstrosity. It is not local government. It is not central government. There is nothing to which it can be equated in any institution in any country in the world.

Will it improve the quality of the work that is being turned out by the various government agencies? I do not mean government agents, but the agencies of government. Will it improve its quality or increase its expedition?

Sir, in this connection I may be permitted to make the irreverent remark that one of the progenitors of this Bill, the Minister of Local Government, made things so bad in this country that he has now begun to be called the Minister for dissolving local bodies. In Tamil it is a nice

word.

කල් තැබීම :

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

[පොත් නම්ලෙම් මයා.]

How many local bodies has he dissolved and why? All this has been done contemporaneously with the revolutionary advance into that no man's land between central and local government, namely, these district councils.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, those Tamils who had been nursed and nurtured with a distant mirage of a Tamil state and who had been made to take a more subdued stand and made to feel that it will not be an independent Tamil state, which incidentally is my interpretation of "Thamil Arasu Kadchi", then took a second possible view in the hope that there will be an autonomous linguistic Tamil state in a federal union. I hope I am doing justice to the terminology that has been adopted from time to time. The people who then had to resile from that position and think in terms of provincial councils, and subsequently resile from provincial councils, to regional councils, are today being offered district councils.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sure I will be challenged. I shall only say this, and I say it in all sincerity. The Tamil people by and large have been thoroughly frustrated and disabused. And may I say this? He laughs best who laughs last. Today they are disillusioned. They are embittered. They laugh without hope. They really thought they were going to get something worth-while. They have seen through it.

May I, with all respect, in all seriousness, ask my Friends why up to now not one speech has been made to commend the virtues of this White Paper and the draft Bill. Why has nobody made an attempt, however belaboured, however unsuccessful, to show what would be the advantages to the Tamils and to the country, if at all?

Yesterday, for one hour, in a speech which was not illumined but sullied by unholy untruth, there was not one

word, not one reference, not one attempt at analysis of one clause of this draft Bill.

The Tamils should be told on the Floor of this House, instead of half truths being peddled outside, the virtues of this Bill, which I have so far failed to discover.

I still say it is not late. Let my Friends of the Federal Party make use of the forum that is open to all of us, so that our Sinhalese brethren will also understand. Let them tell us, the unenlightened ones, the least informed people, the people whom they are going to beguile again, or attempt to beguile again, what it is that is behind this Bill that they are fighting for, asking for, supporting and advocating.

The tragedy is this. I was told—it was impertinence; I am sorry, I do not know whether I should be glad that this man is not here—that in 1947 or 1948 I abused the U. N. P. Fortunately there is still one man, the Prime Minister, who knows me as well as or better than most people. In 1947 I fought an election not against the U. N. P. but against, unfortunately, some of the revered men, persons whom I have personally the highest regard for—so please do not misunderstand me—like Sir Arunachalam Mahadeva, who is still alive, whom I had the very painful duty to contest once, a man for whom I have the greatest and utmost regard. We can differ politically. Believe me, I contested him in Jaffna leaving my—if I may be permitted to say so and you would not dispute it—family seat and coming from Vadamarachi to Jaffna to fight Sir Arunachalam Mahadeva. When I defeated him we were both in tears. There was no joy. I fought him on a principle because he supported the acceptance of the Soulbury Report.

I fought Mr. Nadesan, for whom I have the greatest personal regard. I fought him nominating the present hon. Member for Kankasanturai (Mr. Chelvanayakam), and the present hon. Member for Kankasanturai

கல் கவிதை:

defeated Mr. Nadesan by several thousands; and I am sorry to have to say that when the present Member for Kankasanturai thought it fit to leave the party which first brought him into politics, I re-nominated Mr. Nadesan and got him to beat Mr. Chelvanayakam by 7,000 to 8,000 votes—by the same majority. These are not subjects I would refer to, but somebody had the impertinence yesterday to refer to some of these things.

There is another painful subject. Naganathan and I had been the closest personal friends, if I may use his name. I fight him relentlessly. That is another matter. But we fight clean. I had to say that I would send him back to the obscurity of his suburban dispensary. I said that with pain; I said that in answer to a challenge, and did it. I do not gloat over it. And for this page-boy in buttons, this parvenu in politics, to tell me—

நிசேஷ கலாநாயகமே

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

I do not think it is fair to say that.

பேர்தலைவர் மஹோ.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

No. He should be here to take his medicine.

நிசேஷ கலாநாயகமே

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

I do not think it is fair to refer to an hon. Member of this House in that way.

பேர்தலைவர் மஹோ.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

You use the word “fair” in whose vocabulary?

நிசேஷ கலாநாயகமே

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

He is still a Member of this House.

தீபக் கவிதை மஹோ.

பேர்தலைவர் மஹோ.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

All right, Sir, in deference to what you say and to this House.

To talk of a microscopic party, does he know the meaning of the word? I am reminded of Winston Churchill who once said:

“One does not argue with a prophet, one disbelieves him.”

Mr. Amirthalingam, I disbelieve you, I disbelieve everything you would say, and the Jaffna man will give you the answer. I am speaking to an empty seat. A man who fights and runs away lives to fight another day!

தீபக் கவிதை மஹோ.

(பெர்தலைவர் மஹோ)

(திரு. எஸ். எம். இராசமாணிக்கம்—பட்டி ருப்பு)

(Mr. S. M. Rasamanickam—Paddiruppu)

He has not run away.

பேர்தலைவர் மஹோ.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

He has not run away? You are his custodian?

தீபக் கவிதை மஹோ.

(திரு. இராசமாணிக்கம்)

(Mr. Rasamanickam)

Yes.

பேர்தலைவர் மஹோ.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

We have a surety here.

I want to know this. He said that I abused the U.N.P.—[Interruption].

நிசேஷ கலாநாயகமே

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

I pulled up the hon. Member for Jaffna and called him to Order. The hon. Member for Paddiruppu must now keep Order.

கல் துறை:

தீர்மானம் பற்றி பித்திரிவினா யோசனை

ராசமணிகம் மஹா.

(திரு. இராசமாணிக்கம்)

(Mr. Rasamanickam)

It is easy to say anything and get away with it.

நியோஜன கலாநாயகர்

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

He did not say anything—

போன்றிவினா மஹா.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

I am regretting his absence. I would have liked it if he were here, if you understand English. I am very sorry he is not here.

I am supposed to have abused the U.N.P. The present Prime Minister knows me. His father, Mr. D. S. Senanayake, knew me. There is no question of abuse of the U. N. P. The abuse of the U. N. P. was the stock-in-trade of the Federal Party. From the year 1948, when we parted company, up till the 20th of March 1965—let Mr. Dudley Senanayake know it—the U.N.P. was characterized as the traditional enemy of the Tamils, and Ponnambalam and his party and his friends as their agents and their stooges. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I took it on my chin, and these people now come along and pretend friendship.

I do not abuse people behind their backs. Take that from me.

கி. சி. கன்னங்கரா மஹா. (தேனி யா)

(திரு. சி. என். கன்னங்கரா—தேனியாய)

(Mr. C. N. Kannangara—Deniyaya)

They are not realizing it.

போன்றிவினா மஹா.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

Today they have found friends. I was attacked, I repeat, till two days before the general elections. They told the voters that a vote cast for my party and for me would be a vote

cast for the U.N.P., the traditional enemy of the Tamils. That is how they got their seats. We stood for a united Ceylon and a unitary government as we felt that that was the best for the Tamils. I am very glad they won, and good luck to them, but let them not try to be funny and tell me that I, after having abused them, went for a portfolio.

I do not know whether my hon. Friend, the Member for Kankesanturai (Mr. Chelvanayakam), hears me I would very much like him to hear me because certain things have been mentioned and I must nail certain lies to the counter. When Mr. D. S. Senanayake invited the party—not merely me but the party as a party—to join the Cabinet, the first person I telephoned to and got down was the hon. Member for Kankesanturai.

I say here and now for the record that the hon. Member for Kankesanturai said, “Yes, certainly we must give our co-operation to this Government.” He agreed to join the Government. Two portfolios were offered and I said the hon. Member for Kankesanturai should have one. Sir, that matter was adopted by the Parliamentary Group, I believe, unanimously. If there was any difference. I must say in fairness, that difference came from my Friend, the present Member for Nallur (Dr. Naganathan) who was then a Senator. All the other elected Members agreed. The party executive agreed unanimously. The general council of the party agreed. Then all of us went before a public meeting in Jaffna and put forward a resolution which was reported in the press. I think that four men before a crowd of over 25,000 accepted the position that we join the Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this man has the effrontery to come here and tell me that having abused the U. N. P. in 1948 I went to them for a portfolio. There are two men alive today—if you want, I will give the names—who had been sent by the late

කල් තැබීම :

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

Mr. D. S. Senanayake to the Assize Court in Colombo thinking that I would probably slip out and not take my oaths as Minister. I do bow to a worthy man ; I will bow low but not in the sense that this man had the effrontery to allege. May I also say this in the hearing of the hon. Member for Kankasanturai. If there is one man in this House who knows these events either first-hand or second-hand, he is the Hon. Prime Minister himself. The late Mr. D. S. Senanayake, paying a tribute to the Tamils and referring to me at one of the biggest receptions ever given, said, "For 15 years the Member for Jaffna has fought with us relentlessly, and the only favour he asked us was to leave him out of the Cabinet and"—I say this with apologies for it was used as an expression—"to make a lean and hungry looking man the Minister." I say "with apologies" because I am merely quoting what he said. And I to be charged yesterday with having desired a portfolio ! The truth is—I hope the Hon. Prime Minister in his time and in his turn will bear me out—that I wanted to be left out of the Cabinet.

Sir, quite unnecessarily, reference has been made to my party and to its origin. I will say this : My party was formed to be the political forum of the Tamil-speaking people, and the doubtful honour of having split that party lies with these gentlemen.

Today, I was going to make a different speech but for the aberrations of the last speaker. I was coming here to make an appeal to my Friends. The time is not ripe for us to merely wash dirty linen here. Here is a community that is in dire straits. It requires all our energy, it requires all our strength, it requires all our capacity to come to their aid ; instead of which time is spent in concocting fallacies, creating illusions and generally misleading people.

Sir, I advocated balanced representation. With my last breath I will not deny it. This person who had the

effrontery to criticize me forgot that his political *guru* followed behind me in my demand, stood by me, helped me, if only with my books. Has there been no result of the representations made to the Soulbury Commission ? The Kodeswaran case is the answer—Section 29 of the Constitution. That was a result of our labours ; the only safeguard left for a national minority in this country under the present Constitution.

Sir, "barren", says he. What impertinence ! Barren ? We had bigger men than he, and better times have we seen.

Before the grant of independence, across the Floor of this House I asked the then Prime Minister, the late Mr. D. S. Senanayake, on the day of the declaration of the grant of Independence, "What about the Nandhi flag ?" He agreed, and the Nandhi flag flew—I think some of you know that—in Independence Hall that day. I have been belaboured in a whole election by this party, with the adventitious aid of a one-time and present Senator, that I had sold the Tamils by accepting some flag. I am not proud of the flag. A much better contraption could have been devised. But at least I fought and obtained a flag to show that this country is inhabited by Tamils and Muslims also. And to the Muslims I say, I gave them and I agreed to give them a width of green stripe equal to the orange stripe for the Tamils. That was the best I could do, and I had no other way. But I was lampooned, I was ridiculed, I was libelled, for the flag I accepted. We have lived to see another day. They stand and salute that very flag !

Then I come to language. I am proud to say that till 1956 and for so long as I was in the Cabinet, in spite of the resolution of 1944, introduced by my Hon. Friend the Minister of State and supported by the present Prime Minister—though not for communal reasons, I was assured and I know personally—in spite of that resolution, namely,

කල් තැබීම:

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

[පොත්තම්බලම් මය.]

that Sinhala should be only official language, with the amendment that was moved, and accepted by Mr. D. S. Senanayake; in spite of the Wijeyewardene Commission Report which stated that Sinhala should be the official language for all purposes, I am happy to say—if I may say so, I am proud to say—that I was able in the D. S. Senanayake Cabinet, of which the present Prime Minister was a Member, to prevent the implementation of any of these rather reactionary, rather harsh policies.

Came 1956. Came 1956 with the new prophets of doom, the Federal Party, and we know that since 19—. I do not know how long the period of Saturn lasts.—[Interruption]. The party was formed in 1948. In 1968 the period of Saturn is over for the Tamils.

In regard to employment, equality of opportunity was assured to the Tamils, the Muslims and other minorities all alike throughout the country, and there was no discrimination.

This man of yesterday asked me what the achievements were and he said, "Zero." Before I joined the Cabinet, and after 1956, has there been anything done in the fields of industrial and agricultural and fisheries development?

Colonization schemes: The raising of the Kilinochchi bund—[Interruption]. I do not think I will take more than ten minutes.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරඹ උද්ගිරි ජෙනරායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Shall we adjourn for tea?

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා

(උප සභාපාලකයාතුමා)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

It was agreed earlier that we will not adjourn for tea.

If the hon. Member is coming to a new point, the Deputy Chairman of Committees will now take the Chair.

අ. භා. 3.59

අනතුරුව නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා මූලාසනයෙන් ඉවත් වූයෙන්, කාරක සභා නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමා [ජී. ජේ. පාරිස් පෙරේරා මය.] මූලාසනාරූඪ විය.

அதன்பிறகு, உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள் அக்கிராசனத் துனின்று நீங்கவே, குழுக்களின் உப அக்கிராசனர் அவர்கள் [திரு. ஜி. ஜே. பாரிஸ் பெரேரா] தலைமை தாங்கினார்கள்.

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

පොත්තම්බලම් මය.

(තිரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

Everybody is wanting to go for tea, including the Gallery.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරඹ උද්ගිරි ජෙනරායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Why do you want the Gallery?

පොත්තම්බලම් මය.

(තිரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

Otherwise I cannot speak. I admit I like a gallery. I do not deny that.

I asked the question in passing a few minutes back as to why the Federal Party has not, through any one of its exponents or proponents or what have you, said one word in favour of the present proposals in the draft Bill and the White Paper. There was a somewhat belaboured attempt on the part of the last speaker to explain why in 1964 although the Throne Speech of Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike's Government contained a reference to the establishment of district councils, they opposed it. That question was asked by some hon. Member. I think it was my Friend the hon. Member for Vavuniya (Mr. T. Sivasithamparam). They said, "Oh, no. We were fully aware of the proposal for district councils. We

கடல் வலிமை:

wanted district councils, but we opposed the Throne Speech in spite of its reference to district councils for the very great reason—would you believe it?—that the liberty of the press was in danger.” Most laudable! Let us see whether it is also truthful. If in point of fact the reason for opposing it was that it contained a proposal involving the liberty of the press of this country—

ஈ. சீ. சேனநாயகம் இ.வ.

(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனநாயகம்)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

What was the year of the Throne Speech?

பொன்னம்பலம் இ.வ.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

Sir, I was a little disturbed. A point was made by the last speaker that they opposed the Throne Speech of Mrs. Bandaranaike in 1964 for the particular reason that there was an implication that the liberty of the press was being involved; otherwise they would have accepted the district councils. This was the answer that was given when the hon. Member for Vavuniya twitted them by saying, “You opposed the district councils then, but you are accepting them now.” Does that bear analysis? Does that bear examination?

Let us examine the position in 1956-57. Everybody else has forgotten that in 1956-57 it was the Mr. Bandaranaike's Government. Mr. Bandaranaike in 1956 itself, soon after the Choksy Report was published, referred to the fact that he would introduce institutions in the nature of regional councils to meet—I do not want to delay the House by quoting it—difficulties confronting the local government institutions. He said that. It is true that they did nothing at that time. I do not want to examine how they voted. But in 1957 what happened? In 1957—this is very, very interesting and I cannot resist

தேவதேவன் கனா பித்திரிமே வையாது

it; I am thankful to my young Friend who gave me the reference—this is what the Throne Speech said:

“In order to secure greater efficiency in the administration, a large measure of decentralization will be achieved by the establishment of Regional Councils.”—

By the establishment of regional councils!

—“A Bill for this purpose has been prepared and will be presented for your consideration.”

That was in the Throne Speech.

Then I refer to HANSARD of 17th June 1957; Column 110 of Volume 28. This is important for the record. Mr. Chelvanayakam, the Member for Kankasanturai, moved an amendment. This is very significant:

“that the proposed Regional Councils besides being subservient to the overriding power and authority of a Minister of State will also not be entitled to any control of autonomy over many subjects such as health, education, industry, land settlement, colonization, etc., and, therefore, bears no comparison with, but really is in complete contrast to the status and functions of an autonomous State or canton established under a Federal Constitution;”

Here was a proposal for the establishment of regional councils. Mr. Bandaranaike went so far as to extend the boundaries of a regional council throughout a province and more, but not the minor prophet of yesterday but the senior prophet of yesterday says, “No. Regional councils? No autonomy. Under the control of a Minister of State What is the use of that? This is not what we have been fighting for.”

He pooh-poohed the idea. I read out from his amendment. I will now read from his speech. In fairness to him, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am fully armed, all because of what happened yesterday. Otherwise I would have spoken off my cuff.

Column 125 of the same volume reads thus:

“Regional councils are glorified local bodies. They owe their existence not to the Constitution but to a piece of legislation.”—

[පොත්තම්බලම් මය.]

One would have thought it was a piece of dirt!

—“one Act or one statute of this Parliament, and a regional council is subordinate in function to the Government of the country.”

He wanted some kind of institution which is not subordinate to the Government of the country.

“We do not consider regional councils in any way an appropriate alternative to federalism.”

This was what Mr. Chelvanayakam said, speaking on the Throne Speech of June 1957.

Sir, this is the response to an offer of regional councils with all the powers adumbrated by Mr. Bandaranaike. They would not touch it. It is just a glorified local body. It is not an independent Constitution. It is dependent on the will of Parliament.

He was speaking of something very, very different. Yet these prophets of today accept what has been critically analysed by my Friend the Hon. Prime Minister as being the very shadow of some kind of regional council, a mere district council. He has analysed how fundamentally they differ.

Yet they are accepting it and I have no doubt they will extol it to whomever is left of the remnants of the gullible masses who were so misled as to follow them.

In 1956 what happened? They came fresh from an election. They had told the Tamil people, “The Tamil state in coming.” சிங்களம் வேண்டுமானால் பொன்னம்பலம் “If you want Sinhala, send Ponnambalam.” Do not laugh. It is a fact. Can anyone dare deny that? “If you want Sinhala, send Ponnambalam. If you want Tamil, send us.” And the people believed you, and the poor old women believed you.

බැ මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(කෙළරව අඟුකත්තවාර් ඉරුවාර්)

(An hon. Member)

What about the young women?

පොත්තම්බලම් මය.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

The young women know.

All these things come to this. You are not going to deceive all the people all the time.

I am very sorry, believe me, that my hon. Friend, the Member for Kankasanturai (Mr. Chelvanayakam) is physically somewhat low, but I wish he would at least read my contribution.—[Interruption]. Now it is relegated to prophecy, not to actuality.” Let us accept the district councils now. Later on the Sinhalese people, not we, will ask for more power to be put into this empty shell of a district council.” Then you quoted that expression “panoplied in power”. I am talking to an empty seat. This is all in the limbo of the future, a major prophecy.

බැ මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(කෙළරව අඟුකත්තවාර් ඉරුවාර්)

(An hon. Member)

It is too hard.

පොත්තම්බලම් මය.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

Why too hard? May I ask, what is the guarantee? This is the last bulwark of liberalism in this country, the last of the liberal forces. And if this is all this liberal force can give, and it is hailed as divisive, as separation, as truncation of the country on the other side, I ask you, what hope in hell have you to have greater powers in the future? I am supposed to have turned tables. Not on my life. In 1956, hot from the elections, where my party was reduced to one, myself, they came in. They marched to Trincomalee, they held a meeting, called it a convention, held out four demands, immutable, unchangeable, irrevocable: federal government, parity for Tamil, no colonization of the Northern and Eastern Provinces, full citizenship rights for the Indians. I would personally, if I am not exasperating the feelings of the Sinhalese subscribe to the last three. But

கல் வரிசை:

தீவிரத் தலைவரின் பதிலுக்கு எழுப்பல்

that is not the point. They said, "This or nothing else." They said in one year they will start direct action. That was the ultimatum in the March 1956 convention.

One year later, what happened? Where was this federalism? Where were the language rights of the Tamils? Where were the poor Indians' citizens rights? The hordes of Dravidastan, for no reason at all, surrendered and went to Horagolla, and at Horagolla was written that woeful document—a document of very questioned memory, unregretted memory—the Bandaranaike-Chelvanayakam Pact. The Tamil people had been beguiled and fooled into thinking nothing short of a Tamil state. And one year later what did Mr. Bandaranaike say on the Floor of this House and in published documents? He said, "Let it be clearly understood by my friends of the Federal Party, there will be no negotiation unless they accept the spirit and letter of the Sinhala only Act that Sinhala shall be the only official language in the whole of Ceylon and in the Northern and Eastern Provinces." And it was on that the negotiations went on. On the question of the Indians for whom they shed tears over the years, and abused me and reviled me, Mr. Bandaranaike said, "I told them that that is not their concern, that it would be a matter for discussion between me, the Prime Minister of this country, and the Indian Prime Minister."

For purposes of record I say that on the question of federalism he told them, "I shall not discuss federalism or regional autonomy" and yet negotiations went on that resulted in a pact of unhallowed memory.

Sir, I raised the banner of revolt, the banner of opposition, against that pact in the North and my Friend the Hon. Prime Minister did the same in the South. We were both lumped together as traitors. They said, "Why? Ponnambalam is just doing that at the behest of Dudley Senanayake.

Dudley Senanayake started opposing it in the South and G. G. Ponnambalam is echoing his master's voice." I never acknowledged any master and Mr. Dudley Senanayake knows it and this country knows it. I accept friends, and I co-operate with them, but I accept no master. We were dubbed as enemies of the Tamils.

The hands of the clock have done a complete turn. I opposed the regional councils and I oppose the district councils. The last speaker said that there is no difference between district councils and regional councils. Mr. Deputy Chairman, there is as much difference between them as there is between chalk and cheese. The district council is chalk and the regional council proposed by Mr. Bandaranaike was cheese. They voted against cheese and they are now chewing the chalk.

I am supposed to be sabotaging something that the Tamils are going to get. May I give this solemn assurance to this House and to my people outside—and the Hon. Prime Minister will tell you that it is so. I spent hours on end with him and some of my friends examining the draft Bill line by line and clause by clause, examining it with parallel legislation. To a certain extent a number of clauses which have been amended, if I may say so with respect, have been due to my intervention. I did my best to see whether I could possibly commend to my people anything good in it. I say there was nothing. Nevertheless, I only said I cannot support this Bill or the proposals in the White Paper.

Let me assure the Tamils that if there was any germ of good or benefit to them or to the country, I would not take up this position.

உப அக்கிராசனர் அவர்களே, எனது பேச்சை நான் முடிக்க முன், எனது தாய்ப் பாஷையிலும் பேச வேண்டிய கடமை எனக்கு இருக்கிறது. முதன் முதலாக சட்ட சபையில் எம் தமிழ்ப் பாஷையில் பேசியது நான்தான்.

கல் நுலி:

தீசுநித் ஸகா பிசுபிதே யோசனா

[பொன்னிலை மலர்.]

இம்முறையும் இந்த விவாதத்தில் நான் கொஞ்ச நேரம் தமிழில் பேச எனக்கு நீங்கள் இடந்தர வேண்டும்.

நான் என் மக்களுக்கும் ஜனங்களுக்கும் இச்சபை மூலமாகச் சொல்ல வேண்டியது என்னவென்றால் மாவட்ட சபைகள் காரணமாக தமிழ் இனத்திற்கோ தமிழ்ச் சாதிக்கோ தமிழ் மக்களுக்கோ 'நச்சநாமத்திற்கு' என்னவாகிலும் நயம் வருமாக இருந்தால் நான் அதற்குக் குறுக்கே இருக்க மாட்டேன். இவ்வளவு காலமும் தமிழனுக்கு என்னவாகிலும் வருவதைப் பொன்னம்பலம் கெடுத்தான் என்று சொன்னார்கள். நேற்றுப் பேசின ஒரு துரும்பு அதே மாதிரிப் பேசியது. நான் என்னவாகிலும் தமிழர்களது நயத்திற்குக் குறுக்கே நிற்கிறேன் என்று அது சொல்லியது. அது பொய். அப்படி நான் செய்ய மாட்டேன். ஆனால், நாம் இங்கே வாதிக்கும் விடயத்தினால் தமிழ் இனத்திற்கும் இலங்கைக்கும் கேடு வரும் என்பதை நல்லாக விளங்கியபடியினால் நான் இதை ஒருபோதும் ஏற்றுக் கொள்ள மாட்டேன் என்பதை நான் சொல்ல விரும்புகிறேன்.

இவ்வளவு காலமும் என்னை எதிர்த்தவர்களிடம் நான் கேட்கிறேன், இப்பொழுது தமிழ் அரசு எங்கே? சமஷ்டி எங்கே? பிராந்திய சபைகள் எங்கே? பிரதேச சபைகள் எங்கே? என்று. இப்பொழுது மாவட்ட சபைகள்! இது மாவட்ட சபை அல்ல, மகா வட்ட சபை யாகத்தான் வந்து முடியும் என்று சொல்லி எனது பேச்சை முடிக்கிறேன்.

May I, in conclusion, thank you and the House for having patiently listened to my speech.

அ. ஸா. 4.23

உ. தைந்நகைந் மலர். (நிகவரதிரை)  
(திரு. எம். தென்னக்கோன்—நிக்கவெரட்டிய)

(Mr. M. Tennakoon—Nikaweratiya)

ஓர் நியோசீத ஸகாபநிவாதி, அபேத்ரு யாபநயே ஓர் மன்துமலர் (சீ. சீ. பொன்னிலை மலர்.) விசின் பவந்வநலே தேமலே கலாவெந் பசு மெலே வுடனெந் ஓவலே பநிகாவ பிசுபிதே வலா கியுந்

கலா கரந்நவ மவந் அபஸ்பாவ லுநி லுந ம ஸந்நேச வெநலா. ஓர் அபமலி நுமாவந் ரசயவந் அப ஸ்நுநிவந்ந வெநலா, மெலே யோசனாவ ஓவலே பநிகாவந் லுநிவ மெ ஸகாவ ஓடிபெந் கிரிம லுந.

யுதிகிசு யோசனாவந் சநஸுமதய ருப ஸகவிசுவகவ ஸாசந கிரிம ப்ருசநந்நுலாடி க்ருமய யவநே வுடனெந் தேயந் வெநலா. உதெந் ஓவலே பநிகாவந் கருந்நு தேகந் ருதேஸ ஸகவிசு கரந்நவ அபஸ்பாவ நினெ லவ கிவயுநி. பூதே மஸசநநாவ ஸே நியோசீதயந் வந மன்துமலர்ந்நே அடகஸ ருடகஸ டுநலுநிமந் ஸீலா பரிக்ஷா கர லுநிமந் உம அடகஸ ருடகஸ யோசீத பநநவ அலுநெந் கிரிமந் உம காரண தேகந் உகந் லுநிவ ஸகந்நவ ப்ருபவநி. யுதிகிசு வுடனெந் பநநந் சநநாவ ஓடிபெந் விவெவநயவ ஸாசந வந அபஸ்பாவேடி, உம பநநே நினெ ஸயநககம பிசுபிதேவ மஸசநநாவ அநர ருடகஸேசந யந் கவகெந நினெ அபஸ்பாவேடி, மலுந் நுலே அநி வி நினெ கிரிம நுநி கர டுதேம ஸகா மெலுநி ஸகவிசுவந் கிரிம தேவந காரணய லுநிவ ஸகந்நவ ப்ருபவநி. ஓர் அபமலிநுமாவந் மெலே ரசயந் மெ ஓவலே பநிகாவ ஓடிபெந் கலே ம ஸகந்ந கலே தேவந அடகஸ ருப நோவெய கியா அப விஸ்பாஸ கரநலா. மெலி நினெ விசும நந்நவய பிசுபிதேவ சநநாவ அநர டுநலுநி நினெ கிரிம டுநலெந் உம கிரிம அலு கிரிமே அடகஸந் மெலே ஓவலே பநிகாவ மெ ஸகாவ ஓடிபெந் கலா நம உதெந் வந்நே சந ஸுமத வுடயவ விஸுல ஸாநிசந்ந யந்ந மநந் கர தேந்நவ மலு. உதே நுநுவ மஸசந நியோசீதயந் மலிந் மஸசநநாவந் அடகஸ டுநலெந், உம அடகஸ ஸுலகிசுலவ ஸாசந கலாவ ஸீ அநுவ, ருபே ஸுப கிசுபிதே பிசுபிசு, வஸவஸ்பா மலாவந் ஸகஸ கிரிமே அடகஸந் மெலே ஓவலே பநிகாவ ஸகவிசுவவ ஓடிபெந் கலா நம ஓர் அபமலிநுமாவந் ரசயவந் பநநந் லுநிவ மெய க்ருயந் மக நோகரந்நவ டுநவமந் கருந்நு உமவ லுநி நினெ லவ ம ப்ருகாஸ கரநலா. உதெந் அடி மெ ருபே பூதே மஸசநநாவ அநர நினெ விருட்பிநாவயந் மலிசேய கலேந்

කල් තැබීම :

ආණ්ඩුව පෙරළේවිය කියන හිතියට මන්ත්‍රිවරුන් භාජන කොට ඉන් ලැබෙන බලය තුළින්, රජයට තිබෙන වැඩි ඡන්ද බලය පාවිච්චි කොට, මේ භයානක ධවල පත්‍රිකාවට ඇතුළත් යෝජනා පනතක් හැටියට පරිවර්තනය කරන්නට හැකි වුණොත් එය ජාතියේ සමගියට වදින විශාල පහරක් වෙනවාක් මෙන්ම ජාතියේ දියුණුවටද ඉන් විශාල පහරක් වැදිය හැකි බවට කිසිදු සැකයක් ඇත්තේ නැහැ. එසේ හෙයින් මෙම ධවල පත්‍රිකාව ඉදිරිපත් කිරීම ගැන ගරු අගමැතිතුමාට ස්තූතිවන්ත වන අතරම මෙම ධවල පත්‍රිකාව මගින් මහජනතාවගේ ඇස්වලට වැලි ගැසීමක් නොකර, මේ සම්බන්ධයෙන් පැනනැගී ඇති පොදු මහජන විරෝධය දෙස බලා, පොදු මහජනතාවගේ අදහස් ක්‍රියාත්මක කිරීමක් වශයෙන්, මෙම ධවල පත්‍රිකාවෙන්ම මෙවැනි පනතක් ඉදිරිපත් කිරීමේ අදහස අහෝසි කර දමන ලෙසයි අප ගරු අගමැතිතුමාගෙන් කරුණාවෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටින්නේ.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමනි, අපේ ගරු අගමැතිතුමා ජනසම්මතවාදය ගැන කරුණු කිහිපයක් දැක්වූ බව තමුන් නාත්සේ දන්නවා. 1965 මාර්තු මාසයේදී පැවති මහා මැතිවරණයට පෙර තමන් විසින් ජනතාවට දෙන ලද අදහස් මොනවා දැයි ගරු අගමැතිතුමාට මතක ඇති. කොටින් කියතොත්, මේ රටේ සංවර්ධනය පිණිස, ජාතික සමගියක් ඇති කිරීම පිණිස, ජාතික විමුක්තියක් ඇති කිරීම පිණිස, එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ ආණ්ඩුවක් පිහිටුවනවාය කියන අදහසයි එතුමා රටට ප්‍රකාශ කෙළේ. 1965 මාර්තු මහා මැති වරණයට පෙර අවස්ථා කිහිපයකදීම පොදු මහජනතාව අතර එවැනි හැඟීමක් දී තිබෙනවා. තමන්ගේ ප්‍රධානත්වයෙන් තිබෙන එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂය ආණ්ඩුවක් පිහිටුවන බවයි කොටින්ම පොදු මහජනතාවට කියා සිටියේ. යම් පක්ෂයක් ආණ්ඩුවක් පිහිටුවනවාය කියනවා නම් එයින් අදහස් කරන්නේ තනි පක්ෂයේ ආණ්ඩුවක් ය කියායි සාමාන්‍යයෙන් පොදු මහජනතාව විශ්වාස කරන්නේ. සමහර විට ගරු අගමැතිතුමා ප්‍රශ්න කරන්නට පුළුවනි, “කොහේදීද එවැනි තත්ත්ව

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

කිවිවේ?” යනුවෙන්. පොදු මහජනතා යම් යම් දේවල් දැනගන්නේ පත්‍ර මාර්ග යෙනුයි. ගරු අගමැතිතුමා කථා කරද්දී පත්‍ර ගැනත් සඳහන් කළා. ඒ ගැන යමක් කියන්නට මා අදහස් කරන්නේ නැහැ. එහෙත් ගරු අගමැතිතුමා නොයෙක් නොයෙක් අවස්ථාවල නොයෙක් නොයෙක් රැස්වීම්වල කථා කරද්දී පොදු මහජනතාවට දුන් හැඟීම නම් එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂය බලයට පැමිණෙනවාය, “මම ආණ්ඩුවක් පිහිටුවනවා” ය යන්නයි. 1965 මාර්තු මාසයේ 20 වැනි සෙනසුරාදා “දිනමිණ” පත්‍රයේ 3 වැනි පිටුවේ එතුමා කළ ප්‍රකාශයක් සඳහන් වී තිබෙනවා. 1965 මාර්තු මාසයේ 17 වැනි බදාදා “දිනමිණ” පත්‍රයේ 3 වැනි පිටුවෙන් එවැනි ප්‍රකාශයක් තිබෙනවා. ඒ පුවත් පත් මගින් ජනතාවට දුන් අදහස මොකක්ද? “මම එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ ආණ්ඩුවක් පිහිටුවනවා” කියන එකයි එතුමා ඒ කාලයේ දුන් අදහස.

මොකද වුණේ? 1965 මාර්තු මාසයේ 24 වැනිදා වන විට එතුමාට යම් යම් උදවිය සමග සාකච්ඡා ඇති කරන්නට සිද්ධ වුණා. ඒ ගැන කසිටිස්හි ගරු මන්ත්‍රිතුමා (වි. නවරත්නම් මයා.) ප්‍රකාශ කළා. කසිටිස්හි ගරු මන්ත්‍රිතුමා ප්‍රකාශ කළ අන්දමට, හවුල් ආණ්ඩුවක් ඇති කිරීම සඳහා දේශපාලන පක්ෂයක් සමග හවුලක් ඇති කර ගන්නට එදා එතුමාට සිදු වුණා. ගරු අගමැතිතුමා දේශපාලන පක්ෂ කීපයක් සමග එකතු වී හවුල් ආණ්ඩුවක් පිහිටුවා ගත්තා. ඒ හවුල් ආණ්ඩුව පිහිටුවනු ලැබූ අවස්ථාවේදී, එතෙක් මේ රටේ ජනතාව එතුමා කෙරෙහි ඇති කරගෙන තිබුණු විශ්වාසය තරමක් දුර්වලත් බිඳ වැටුණේ නැද්දැයි මා අහනවා. මහා මැතිවරණය හා සම්බන්ධ වැඩ කටයුතු කරගෙන යද්දී තනියම ආණ්ඩුවක් ඇති කරන බවට ප්‍රකාශයක් කළේ නම්, මැතිවරණයෙන් පසු තවත් දේශපාලන පක්ෂයක් සමග—විශේෂයෙන් ජාතික සමගියක් ඇති කරන්නට උදව් උපකාර කරන්නට කිසිසේත් ලැස්ති නැති පක්ෂයක් සමග—හවුල් ආණ්ඩුවක් ඇති කර ගැනීම නිසා ජනසම්මතවාදය සම්බන්ධයෙන් එතුමා

කල් තැබීම :

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

[එම්. තෙන්නකෝන් මහ.]

කෙරෙහි මහජනයා තුළ තිබුණු විශ්වාසයට එතුමාම පහර ගසුවේ නැද්දැයි ගරු අගමැතිතුමාගෙන් අහන්නට කැමතියි.

ජනසම්මතවාදී ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදය රකින බවක් ගරු අගමැතිතුමා කීවා. 1965 මාර්තු මාසයේ 24 වැනිදා එතුමා යම් ආකාරයකට ක්‍රියා කළ නමුත්, එම ක්‍රියාවට පසුව, අදත් මේ රටේ මහජනයා අතර එක්තරා ප්‍රමාණයක විශ්වාසයක් තිබෙනවා, ඩිඩ්ලි සේනානායක අගමැතිතුමා වරක් මහජනයාගේ අදහසට විරුද්ධව වැඩ කෙළේ වී නමුත් ඉදිරියට වත් එසේ නොකරනු ඇතැයි කියා. ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදයේ සංකේතයක් හැටියට තිබෙන ප්‍රතිපත්ති සම්බන්ධයෙන් එතුමා පළමුවැනි වරද කළත් ජනතාව තවත් ඉවසිලිවන්න වුණා ; ඉදිරියේදීවත් එතුමා එවැන්නක් නොකරනු ඇතැයි සිතුවා. පැල්මඩුල්ලේ අතුරු මැතිවරණයෙන් පසු නැවතත් වරක් ජනසම්මතවාදයට පයින් ගහල, ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදයේ මූලික පදනමට හෙවත් මූලික ධර්මයට පයින් ගහල, එතුමා සිතා මොලමුරේ සෙනෙවිරත්න මැතිණිය උත්තර මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයට පත්කෙළේ නැද්ද? එය ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදයට එකඟ වූවක්දැයි ගරු අගමැතිතුමාගෙන් ඇසිය යුතුව තිබෙනවා. එයයි ප්‍රශ්නය. මහජනයා එතුමාගේ වචනය කොයි තරම් දුරට විශ්වාස කරයිද? වරක් එතුමා කළ ප්‍රකාශයක් කැඩුවා නම්, දෙවන වරටත් එතුමා කළ ප්‍රකාශයක් කැඩුවා නම්, දැන් රට සභාවලින් අපේ ජාතියට හානියක් වන්නේ නැත කියා එතුමා කරන ප්‍රකාශය රටේ පොදු මහජනතාව කොයි තරම් දුරට විශ්වාස කරයිද කියන එකයි ප්‍රශ්නය.

ගරු අගමැතිතුමා තුළ ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදී ලෙස, ජනසම්මත වාදය උඩ, නමා රට පාලනය කරමින් මේ කටයුතු කරනවාය යන හැඟීම තිබෙනවා. නමුත් එතුමා නොදැනුවත්වම එතුමා අතින් ජනසම්මත වාදයේ ප්‍රතිපත්ති කැඩෙන බවයි අපට මේ අවස්ථාවේදී කියන්නට තිබෙන්නේ. මේ ධවල පත්‍රිකාවෙන් යෝජනා කර තිබෙන දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමෙන් වන්නේ එයයි. මේ දිස්ත්‍රික් සභාවලට ගම් කාර්ය සභාවකට තරම්වත් බලයක් නැත කියා දැද එතුමා කියනවා. නමුත් එතුමා විශ්වාස කරනවා. මේ ධවල පත්‍රිකාව

සිද්ධ වන්නේ එතුමා ප්‍රකාශ කරන දේවල්ම පසුව එතුමා නොදැනුවත්වම කඩන්නටයි. ඒ අනුව තමයි එතුමා කොයි තරම් පිරිසිදු අදහසින් මේ යෝජිත පනත් කෙටුම්පත ගැන භයක් වන්නට එපාය කියා ජනතාවට ප්‍රකාශ කළත් එතුමා නොදැනුවත්වම ජාතියේ හානියට, ජාතියේ සමගිය හේද හින්නවීමට මේ ධවල පත්‍රිකාවෙන් යෝජිත පනත් කෙටුම්පත හේතු වෙනවාය කියා අප කියන්නේ. සමහර විට එවැනි භයානක තත්ත්වයකට අපට මුහුණපාන්නට සිදු නොවේය කියා සිතාගෙන මෙය කරනවා ඇති. මා මුලින් සඳහන් කළාක් මෙන්, පසුගිය මහා මැතිවරණ සමයේදී, ආණ්ඩුවක් පිහිටුවීමේදී මට මෙවැනි කොටසක් සම්බන්ධ කරගෙන මෙවැනි දේවලට මුහුණපාන්නට සිද්ධ වේය කියා ගරු අගමැතිතුමා තුළ අදහසක් තිබුණේ නැහැ. අද එතුමාට ධවල පත්‍රිකාවක් ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නට සිද්ධ වී තිබෙනවා. මේක එදා එතුමාට ගන්නට වූ පියවර තවත් ස්ථිර කරන දෙවැනි පියවරයි. මෙතැනින් තතර වෙන්නේ නැහැ. ඒ දෙවන පියවර ස්ථිර කරන්නට එතුමාට තවත් ඉදිරියට තුන් වන පියවර, සතර වන පියවර යනාදී වශයෙන් තව පියවර කීපයක් ගන්නටත් සිදු වේවි.

යෝජිත දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පනත් කෙටුම්පත භයානක නොවේය කියා අද එතුමා මේ ධවල පත්‍රිකාවෙන් කියනවා. ධවල පත්‍රිකාවක් ඉදිරිපත් කිරීමෙන් එතුමා ගත් පියවරට එතුමා නැති අවස්ථාවේදී මා ප්‍රශංසා කළා. දැන් එතුමා සිටින අවස්ථාවේදීත් ඒ ගැන මගේ ප්‍රශංසාව පළ කරන්නට සතුටුයි. ධවල පත්‍රිකාව ඉදිරිපත් කිරීම පිළිබඳව අදහස් දෙකක් මා ප්‍රකාශ කළා. ජනසම්මත වාදයට ගරු කිරීමක් වශයෙන් මහජන නියෝජිතයින්ගේ අදහස් විමසා බලන්නට සමහර විට මේක ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නට ඇති. එසේ නැත්නම් රටේ මහජනතාව අතර තිබෙන හිතියක්, භයක් සාකච්ඡාවට භාජන කර ඒ සාකච්ඡාව තුළින් මහජනතාවගේ ඇස් වලට වැලි ගසන්නට මේක ඉදිරිපත් කළා වෙන්නට ඇති. එයින් දෙවන අදහස අනුව මේක ඉදිරිපත් නොකළාය කියා මා පත්‍රිකාව

කල් තැබීම :

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

ඉදිරිපත් කිරීමේ අදහස මා දැන් ප්‍රකාශ කළ පළමුවැනි අදහසම වේවාය කියා මා ප්‍රාර්ථනා කරනවා. පළමුවන අදහස අනුව මේ ධවල පත්‍රිකාව ඉදිරිපත් කළා නම් මා ගරු අගමැතිතුමාගෙන් කාරුණික ඉල්ලීමක් කරනවා. මේ සාකච්ඡාව ආරම්භ කළ අවස්ථාවේ සිට මෙතෙක් කළ කටයුත්තන් ධවල පත්‍රිකාවේ ඇතුළත් අදහස් පනත් කෙටුම්පතක් හැටියට ඉදිරිපත් කිරීම සුදුසු නැති බව ඔප්පු වී තිබෙනවා. ගරු අගමැතිතුමා සිතට එකඟව, දේශපාලන වශයෙන් නොවෙයි, එතුමාගේ අවංක සිතට එකඟව ඒ කාරණය පිළිගෙන ජන සම්මත වාදයට ගරු කිරීමක් වශයෙන්—කඩවිම් ඇතිවී තිබෙනවා, නැවතත් එවැනි තත්ත්වයක් ඇති නොවන අන්දමට—ජනසම්මත වාදයට ගරු කිරීමක් වශයෙන් මේ ධවල පත්‍රිකාව පිළිබඳ සාකච්ඡාව මේ සාකච්ඡාවෙන්ම අවසාන කරන්නට එතුමාට සිතක් පහළ වේවායි මා ප්‍රාර්ථනා කරනවා. ධවල පත්‍රිකාවෙන් අදහස් කරන්නේ මොකක්ද? ධවල පත්‍රිකාවේ විස්තර වන දිස්ත්‍රික් සභාවලින් අදහස් කරන්නේ රටේ පාලනය ඒ පාලනය වන පිරිසටම භාර දීමයි. වෙනත් විධියකින් කියනව නම්, පළාත් පාලන ආයතනවලට වැඩිපුර බලතල දීමයි. ධවල පත්‍රිකාව සකස් කිරීමේදී එහි මූලික යොදා තිබෙනවා, එහි අදහස කුමක්ද කියා, පුරාණ රටසභා, පුරාණ ගම්සභා ආදිය මගින් තම තමන්ගේ කටයුතු පාලනය කර ගැනීමට අපේ මුතුන් මිත්තන්ට තිබුණු දක්ෂතාව ගැන සලකා, ගම් පාලනය ගමටම පැවරීමෙන් ගම් සංවර්ධනයක්, ගම් දියුණුවක් ඇති කළ හැකියි කියන මූලික සිද්ධාන්තයයි මේ දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමට පදනම වී තිබෙන්නේ.

දිවංගත බණ්ඩාරනායක අගමැතිතුමා කාලයක් පළාත් පාලන ඇමතිවරයා වශයෙන් සිටියදී ලැබූ අත්දැකීම්වලින් එතුමාට තේරුම් ගියා, රටේ මහත්වරු, කෝරළේ මහත්වරු, ගම්මුලාදැනින් සම්බන්ධ වී සිටින කවිචේරි ක්‍රමයෙන් පළාත්බද දියුණුවක් ඇති කිරීම ප්‍රමාද වන බව. ඒ මගින් පොදු මහජනයා සහභාගි වන, සම්බන්ධ වන පාලන

ක්‍රමයක් ක්‍රියාවේ නොයෙදෙන බව සහ වැඩ කටයුතු වේගවත්ව සිදු නොවන බවත් එතුමාට පෙනී ගියා.

අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන් කවිචේරි පිහිටුවා ඒ මගින් ආදායම් එකතු කරගෙන, ඒ ආදායමෙන් වැඩ කොටසක් ඔවුන්ගේ මව් රටේ යහපත පිණිස යොදවා ගන්න අතර, තම මව් රටට වාසිවන අන්දමින් ඒ ආදායමින් ඉතා සුළු කොටසක් මේ රටේ කෘෂිකර්මයටත් යොදවන්න පටන් ගත්ත. අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන් විසින් කවිචේරි ක්‍රමය මේ රටේ පාලනය සඳහා යොදා ගැනීමෙන් ඇති වුණු තත්ත්වය එයයි. ඒ මගින් ගම්වල කටයුතු ජනතාවගේ දියුණුව සඳහා ඉක්මනින් ඉටු නොවන බව පෙනී ගියා. එම නිසා මේ කටයුතුවල ප්‍රතිඵල භුක්ති විදින පොදු මහජනයා අතරින් සකස් වී ක්‍රියාත්මක වන ක්‍රමයක් මගින් මේ කටයුතු සිදු විය යුතුය කියන අදහස 1956 ටත් පෙර ඇති වුණු එකක්. එහෙත් මෙතැන එක කරුණක් තිබෙනවා. අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන් මේ රට ආණ්ඩු කරද්දී අපි දෙමළ සහ සිංහල වශයෙන් බෙදී සිටීමේ අදහස වැඩිපුර බල පෑවේ නැහැ. පෘතුගීසි, ඕලන්ද, යනාදි බලපෑම් ඇතිවෙලා ඩොනමෝර් ආණ්ඩු ක්‍රමය එන අවස්ථාවේදී සිංහල සහ දෙමළ ජාතීන් දෙකක් වශයෙන් සිටීමේ යුගය තරමක් දුරට අඩු වෙලා තිබුණා. ඊට පෙර නොයෙක් අවස්ථාවලදී ජාතීන් අතර සටන් තිබුණ. සිංහල-දෙමළ සටන් අපට අළුත් දෙයක් නොවෙයි. එහෙත් 1956 ට පෙර ඒ තත්ත්වය උග්‍ර වෙලා තිබුණේ නැහැ. මන්ද, අපි දෙගොල්ලම විදේශික බලපෑම් යටතේ කීකරු සේවකයන් බවට පත් වෙලයි හිටියේ. ඒ නිසා සිංහල හෝ දෙමළ හෝ අප දෙගොල්ලටම “මේක අපි දෙගොල්ලගේම රට; අපම මේ රට දියුණු කර ගත යුතුයි,” කියන හැඟීමකින් කටයුතු කිරීමේ අවශ්‍යතාවක් තිබුණේ නැහැ. ඒ සමගම, ඉංග්‍රීසි අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී ක්‍රමය යටතේ පාලනය සකස් වුනේ මධ්‍යම ආණ්ඩුවත් සමග සැම සම්බන්ධකමක්ම ඇති වන ආකාරයටයි. රටේ යම් පළාතක යම් කටයුත්තක් කෙරෙනවා නම් මධ්‍යම ආණ්ඩුව ඒ සැම කටයුත්තක්ම දැනගෙන සිටියා. එවකට සිටි ආණ්ඩුකාරතුමා, පේදුරු තුඩුවේ යම්

කල් තැබීම:

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

[එම්. තෙන්නකෝන් මයා.]

දෙයක් සිදු වුනත්, දෙවුන්දර තුඩුවේ යම් දෙයක් සිදු වුනත් ඒ සෑම දෙයක්ම දැන ගැනීමේ ශක්තියක් ඇතිව සිටියා. සෑම දෙයක්ම පාලනය වුනේ කොළඹිනුයි. එම නිසා සිංහල ජනතාවට හෝ වේවා, දෙමළ ජනතාවට හෝ වේවා දෙකට බෙදී හිතන්නට, ක්‍රියා කරන්නට අවස්ථාවක් ඇති වුනේ නැහැ. එමනිසා ඒ කාලයේදී ජාතික සමගියක් ඇති වී තිබුනා. ඒ ජාතික සමගිය සංවර්ධන කටයුතුවලදී ඒ තරම් ප්‍රයෝජනවත් නොවුවත් සාමකාමී හැඟීම් ඇති කර ගැනීමට එය ප්‍රයෝජනවත් වුනා. එවැනි තත්ත්වයකට අපේ රට සකස් කර ගන්නට ලැබුනේ බොහෝ කාලයකට පසුවයි.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමනි, අනුරාධ පුර යුගය අවසාන වුනේ කොහොමද? පොලොන්නරු යුගය ඇති වීමට හේතු මොනවාද? දඹදෙනි යුගය ඇති වීමට හේතු මොනවාද? මේ සිද්ධීන් ඇති වූයේ ද්විඛ-සිංහල හේදය උඩ බව ඉතිහාසය ගෙනහැර පෑමෙන් පෙන්නුම් කරන්නට පුළුවන්. එහෙත් අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන්ගේ පාලන ක්‍රමයේ තරක සියල්ලක් මැද එක ආණ්ඩුවක් ඇති වුනා. සිංහලය, ද්විඛය කියා අප ඒ තරම් වේගවත්ව හිතන්නේ නැති තැනට කරුණු යෙදුනා. එකට විද්‍යාල වල අධ්‍යාපනය ලැබුවා. එකට රටේ තොටේ කටයුතු කළා. උඹ දෙමළයා, මා සිංහලයා යන හැඟීම ඒ තරම් දුරට ඇති වුනේ නැහැ. සමහරවිට අදත් පාර්ලිමේන්තුවේදී යම් යම් අවස්ථාවලදී සිංහල, දෙමළ ප්‍රශ්නය උඩ යම් තරමක හේදයක් ඇති වුනත් ඒ හේදය මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්ගේ අභ්‍යන්තරයෙන් එන හේදයක් නොවෙයි. එය අභ්‍යන්තරයෙන් එන එකක් නොවන්නේ ලාංකිකයන් හැටියට එකට හිතන්නට, එකට කටයුතු කරන්නට අප කාලයක් තිස්සේ පුරුදු වුනු නිසයි. එම නිසා ජාතික සමගියක් ඇති වෙලා තිබුනා. 1956 න් පස්සෙ ඒ තත්ත්වය වෙනස් වුනා. වෙනස් වුනේ ඇයි? යාපනයේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාගේ (පොන්නම්බලම් මයා.) කථාවේ මුල් කොටසේදී එතුමා සඳහන් කළ එක් කරුණක් ගැන අප සතුටු වෙනවා. එතුමා පෙරිල් පක්ෂයට විරුද්ධ වන්නේ පෙරිල් පක්ෂය මේ රට

කොටස් කිරීමට අරමුණු කරගෙන සිටින නිසාය කියා එතුමා සඳහන් කළා. ඒ කොටස් කිරීමෙන් දෙමළ ජනතාවටත්, සිංහල ජනතාවටත් හානියක් මිස ප්‍රයෝජනයක් ඇති නොවන බවත් එතුමා ගේ කථාවේදී සඳහන් කළා. පෙරිල් පක්ෂය ආරම්භ කර තිබෙන්නේ, උතුරු, නැගෙනහිර පළාත්වලට ස්වාධීන පාලනයක් ඇති කර ගැනීම අවසාන පරමාර්ථය කරගෙනයි. ඒ තත්ත්වයෙන් ඒ පක්ෂය කොහොමවත් වෙනස් වී නැහැ. එම පක්ෂයේ ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක් තමයි, කයිට්ස්හි මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (වී. නවරත්නම් මයා.) එතුමා පක්ෂය ආරම්භයේ සිටම කටයුතු කළ කෙනෙක්. එතුමා හරි හෝ වේවා, වැරදි හෝ වේවා තමාගේ අදහස් වලට අවංකව සිටින මන්ත්‍රීවරයකු වශයෙන් මා එතුමා ගෞරවයෙන් සිහි පත් කරන්නට ඕනැ. 1956 අගෝස්තු මාසයේ 19 වැනිදා පැවැත්වුණු පෙරිල් පක්ෂයේ සම්මේලනයේදී සම්මත කර ගන්නා ලද යෝජනාවක් ගැන කයිට්ස්හි ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (වී. නවරත්නම් මයා.) පසුගිය 11 වැනිදා මෙම ගරු සභාවේදී සඳහන් කළා. එතුමා ඉංග්‍රීසි භාෂාවෙන් සඳහන් කර ඇති ඒ කාරණය මම ඒ විධියටම කියවන්නම්.

“Whereas the present Unitary System of Parliamentary Government has been imposed most irrationally and unfairly on a bilingual country like Ceylon. (OFFICIAL REPORT, 11th June 1968 ; Vol. 78, c 2769).

මෙහි අදහස ඒ අය කවදාවත් එකම පාලනයකට එකඟ වන්නේ නැති බවයි; එකම මධ්‍යම පාලනයක් යටතේ රට ආණ්ඩු කිරීමට ඒ අය කවදාවත් එකඟ වන්නේ නැති බවයි. දැන් පෙරිල් පක්ෂයේ ඒ පැත්තේ ඉන්නා ගරු මන්ත්‍රී වරුන් එකම පාලනයක් පවත්වාගෙන යෑමට සතුටු බව ප්‍රකාශ කරනවා නම් එක්කෝ ඒ අය කරන්නේ ආත්ම වංචා වක්; එසේ නැත්නම් සිය පක්ෂ ප්‍රති පත්ති ප්‍රතික්ෂේප කිරීමක්. දැන් ඒ අය කරන්නේ එයින් කොයි එකද? මේ වාගේ පනතක් ක්‍රියාත්මක කිරීමට පෙරිල් පක්ෂයේ උදවිය අගමැතිතුමාට බල කර නවා නම් ඔවුන් එසේ බල කරන්නේ ඔවුන්ගේ පක්ෂයේ මූලික පරමාර්ථ ඉෂ්ට කර ගැනීමට යයි විශ්වාස කරන්නට අපට සිදු වී තිබෙනවා. එහෙම නම්

කල් තැබීම :

මෙම ධවල පත්‍රිකාවෙන් යෝජනා කරන පනත ක්‍රියාත්මක වීමේදී ඒ අයගේ පරමාර්ථයන් මුදුන්පත් කර ගැනීමට කරුණු සම්පාදනය වන්නේ නැද්දැයි අසන්නට අපට සිදු වෙනවා.

ගරු අගමැතිතුමා මෙම ධවල පත්‍රිකාව සම්බන්ධයෙන් කරගෙන ගිය කටයුත්ත, ධවල පත්‍රිකාවත්, ධවල පත්‍රිකාවට යා කොට ඇති යෝජිත පනතේ යම් යම් යෝජනාත් සංසන්දනය කරන විට එකක් තව එකකට ගැටෙන අවස්ථා ගණනාවක් තිබෙන බව මතක් කරන්නට ඕනෑ. ධවල පත්‍රිකාවෙන් කියන්නේ කච්චේරි ක්‍රමය නිසා, නිලධාරි පාලන ක්‍රමය නිසා, සංවර්ධනය අඩපණ වී ඇති හෙයින්, මහජන අවශ්‍යතා සහ සංවර්ධන කටයුතු වේගවත්ව ඉෂ්ට කර ගැනීම පිණිස අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී ඒජන්ත ක්‍රමය වෙනුවට මහජනයා සහභාගි කර ගන්නා පාලන ක්‍රමයක් ඇති කිරීම අවශ්‍ය බවයි. ධවල පත්‍රිකාවට ඇදූ ඇති යෝජිත පනතෙන් කියන්නේ ඒජන්තවරයාගේ බලතල අඩු නොකරන බව හා ඒජන්තවරයා අලුත් සංවිධානයේ ප්‍රධාන නිලධාරියා බවයි. එහෙම නම් කච්චේරි ක්‍රමය තව දුරටත් පවතිනවා. ධවල පත්‍රිකාවෙන් කියවෙන දේට වෙනස් දෙයක් පනතෙන් කියවෙනවා. කච්චේරි ක්‍රමය නැති කරන්නේ වැදගත් හේතු වක් නිසයි. එය අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී ක්‍රමයක් නිසා, එය නිලධාරි පාලන ක්‍රමයක් නිසා, අපේ රටේ සංවර්ධනය ප්‍රමාද වී ඇති හෙයින් ඒ ප්‍රමාද වී ඇති සංවර්ධනය වඩාත් වේගවත්ව කරගෙන යෑම පිණිස ඒ ඒ ප්‍රදේශයේ කටයුතු ඒ ඒ ප්‍රදේශ වාසීන්ට භාර දීම සඳහා වෙනත් සංවිධානයක් ඇති කිරීම අවශ්‍යව ඇති බැවින් ඒ කච්චේරි ක්‍රමය නැති කරනවා. එහෙත් අගමැතිතුමාගේ කථාවෙන් ඒ අදහස වෙනස් වෙනවා. දිස්ත්‍රික් සභාවලට තිබෙන බලතල අනුව කච්චේරි ක්‍රමය නැති නොවන බව එතුමා කීවා. ඇයි, එහෙම නම් කච්චේරි ක්‍රමය අහෝසි කිරීම සඳහා මෙය සකස් කළාය කියන්නේ? ඒ අනුව බලන විට, ධවල පත්‍රිකාවෙන් යෝජනා කර ඇති පනත සකස් කිරීමේ පරමාර්ථය පැහැදිලි නැහැ. පරමාර්ථය පැහැදිලි වුණත්, ඒ පරමාර්ථය කරා යෑමට අවස්ථා ඇත්තේ නැහැ. ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම, “මේ රටේ සංවර්ධනය සඳහා, දියුණුව පිණිස,

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

විමුක්තිය උදෙසා පළාත්වාසී පොදු මහජනතාවට යම් යම් බලතල පවරා දෙන්න ඕනෑය, ඔවුන් ඒ බලතල පාවිච්චියට ගැනීම හේතුකොටගෙන ඒ ඒ කටයුතු දැනට වඩා වේගවත්ව කෙරේය” කියා අගමැතිතුමා තුළ හැඟීමක් තිබෙනවාද? එහෙත් යෝජිත පනතෙන් නම් එවැන් තක් කෙරෙන්නේ නැහැ. ඒ තබා, අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී ක්‍රමය අහෝසි වන්නෙත් නැහැ. කොටින්ම කියනවා නම්, බලාපොරොත්තු වන පරමාර්ථ ඉෂ්ට වන්නේ නැහැ.

එසේ නම්, මේ ධවල පත්‍රිකාව ඉදිරිපත් කිරීමෙන් සිදු වුණේ කුමක්ද? ජාතිය කැලඹීම පමණයි. එහෙත්, ද්‍රවිඩ ජනතාව ගෙන් කොටසක් කැලඹී සිටිනවා. මෙහෙත්, සිංහල ජනතාවගෙන් වැඩි කොටසක් කැලඹී සිටිනවා. එසේ නම්, මෙයින් ප්‍රයෝජනය ගන්නේ කවුද? මෙයින් ප්‍රයෝජනයක් ලබනවා නම් ලබන්නේ මේ රටේ ජාතික එකමුතුවට එකඟ නොවන ප්‍රතිපත්තියක් දරන පෙරළු පක්ෂයයි. ඒ අය සතුව කිරීම සඳහා ජාතිය හේද හින්න කිරීමට අගමැතිතුමා කැමතිද? එතුමා එවැන්තකට අකමැති නිසා, පොදු මහජන අදහස් විමසීම සඳහා මේ ධවල පත්‍රිකාව ඉදිරිපත් කළා නම්, ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදී සිද්ධාන්තයක් ක්‍රියාවේ යොදවන්නට දැන් අවස්ථාව එළඹ තිබෙනවා. මේ යෝජිත ක්‍රමයට වැඩි දෙනකු අකමැති නිසා මෙය ප්‍රතික්ෂේප කරන්න. වැඩි දෙනකුගේ මතයට එකඟ වෙනවාය යන හැඟීමක් පෙරළු පක්ෂය තුළ තිබෙනවා නම්, මේ ධවල පත්‍රිකාවෙන් යෝජිත පනත පැත්තකට කර, අපේ සංවර්ධන කටයුතු වෙනත් විධියකින් ක්‍රියාත්මක කිරීමට අගමැතිතුමාට ඉඩ දීම ඔවුන්ගේ යුතුකමක්.

පසුගිය කාලයේ අපේ සංවර්ධනයට බාධක වූ කරුණු රාශියක් අප නොයෙක් අවස්ථාවල ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙනවා. පාලනය විමධ්‍ය ගත නො කොට කේන්ද්‍ර ගතව තිබීමෙන් විශාල ප්‍රමාදයන් සිදු වෙනවා; විශාල අපතේ යෑම් වෙනවා. දිසාපති ක්‍රමය, ප්‍රාදේශීය ආදායම් නිලධාරි ක්‍රමය, අධ්‍යක්ෂ ක්‍රමය හේතුකොටගෙන වේගවත්ව කටයුතු නොකෙරෙන බව අප දන්නවා. ගමක සුළු වාරිමාගී කටයුත්තක්

ඉල් නැබීම.

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

[එම්. තෙන්නකෝන් මයා.]

සම්බන්ධයෙන් අනුමැතිය දෙන්න සමහර විට කොළඹ සිටින ගොවිජන සේවා කොමසාරිස්තුමාට සිදු වන අතර, ඒ පිළිබඳ අන්තිම තීරණය දෙන්න කොළඹ සිටින වාරිමාර්ග අධ්‍යක්ෂතුමාට සිදු වෙනවා. විශාල ප්‍රමාදයන් ඇති විට, එය ප්‍රධාන හේතුවක්. ගම්වැසි පොදු මහජනයාගේ යහපත පිණිස ගමේ යම් යම් අඩු පාඩුකම් සපුරා ගැනීම සඳහා කටයුතු කිරීමේ බලය, අද ඒ ගම්වලට ඇත්තේ නැහැ. අප නොයෙක් විට කියා තිබෙනවා, දෙපාර්තමේන්තු ප්‍රධානයන් සතුව තිබෙන යම් යම් බලතල බෙදා හරින්න කියා.

නිකවැරටිය ගමේ ඉඩම් කැබැල්ලක් තිබෙනවායයි අපි හිතමු. ඒ ඉඩම් කැබැල්ල තවත් කෙනකුට දීම සුදුසුද නැද්ද යන්න ගැන අන්තිම තීරණය ගැනීම සඳහා කොළඹ එන්න ඕනැ.

**ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක**

(කෙළරාභ උද්ග්‍රී ජේත්‍රනායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

ඒක හොඳ නැහැ.

**එම්. තෙන්නකෝන් මයා.**

(ති.රු. எம். தென்னக்கோன்)

(Mr. M. Tennakoon)

එය හොඳ නැත්නම් එය වෙනස් කිරීමද මෙයින් බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ?

**ගරු එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා (කෘෂිකර්ම හා ආහාර ඇමති)**

(කෙළරාභ எம். டி. பண்டா—விவசாய, உணவு அமைச்சர்)

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

ඒත් නැහැ.

**එම්. තෙන්නකෝන් මයා.**

(ති.රු. எம். தென்னக்கோன்)

(Mr. M. Tennakoon)

එහෙනම් මොකක්ද මෙහි තේරුම? ඒක වෙනස් වන්නේත් නැහැ. තිබෙන සමගියත් නැති වෙනවා. ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමනි, මට පෙනෙන්නේ කරන්න වුවමනා කරන්නේ මෙයයි: ඇත ගමක තිබෙන ඉඩම් කැබැල්ලක් පිළිබඳව අන්තිම

තීරණයක් සඳහා එය කොළඹ සිටින ඉඩම් කොමසාරිස්තුමා වෙතට එන්නට ඕනැ. එමෙන්ම පුංචි වාරිමාර්ග ක්‍රමයක කුඩා ඇලක් නැත්නම් චෙල්ලක් කැපීමටත් අවසාන තීරණය සඳහා කොළඹට එන්නට ඕනැ. අධ්‍යාපන දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවෙන් ප්‍රාදේශීය මට්ටම්වලට කොපමණ බලතල පවරා තිබුණත් පුංචි ගුරුවරයෙකුගේ මාරුවක් වුවත් කොළඹින් කෙරෙන්නට ඕනැ. මේ ක්‍රමය සංවර්ධනයට විශාල පාඩුවක් වී තිබෙනවා. එමෙන්ම මේ ක්‍රමය නිසා විශාල වශයෙන් මහජන මුදල් නාස්තිවන අතර මහජනයාගේ කාලයත් කාබාසිනියා වී යනවා. ඒ නිසා මේ ක්‍රමයෙහි යම් වෙනසක් කරන්නට ඕනැකම තිබෙනවා. එමෙන්ම එවැනි වෙනසක් කරන විට ඒ මගින් ජාතින් අතර හේදය කුත් ඇති නොවිය යුතුයි.

**ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක**

(කෙළරාභ උද්ග්‍රී ජේත්‍රනායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

මොකක්ද ක්‍රමය?

**එම්. තෙන්නකෝන් මයා.**

(ති.රු. எம். தென்னக்கோன்)

(Mr. M. Tennakoon)

ජාති දෙක අතර තිබෙන හේදය නැති කර එක්සත් කිරීමේ වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් ඇති කරන්නට ඕනැ. අපි යම් කාලයක තරමක් දුරටත් එක්සත්ව සිටියා නම්—අනුරාධපුර, දඹදෙනි කාලවල තිබුණු සිංහල ද්‍රවිඩ හේදය තරමක් දුරට අඩු වූ බව මා කලින් කීවා—එසේ එක්සත්ව සිටියේ සුදු මහත්වරුන්ගේ ඉංග්‍රීසි භාෂාව හා කච්චේරි ක්‍රමය යටතේ එක ධ්වජයක් යටතේ කටයුතු කරන්නට සූදානම්ව එකම භාෂාවක් පාවිච්චි කිරීම නිසා යම් බැම්මක් ඇති වී තිබුණු නිසයි. ගරු අග මැතිතුමා සෙන්ටි තෝමස් විද්‍යාලයේ ඉගෙන ගනිද්දී දෙමළ-සිංහල වශයෙන් කල්පනා කළාද?

**ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක**

(කෙළරාභ උද්ග්‍රී ජේත්‍රනායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

නැහැ. තමුත්තාත්සේ ඒකෙ හිටියේ නැද්ද? තමුත්තාත්සේ එහෙම හිතු වාද?

කල් තැබීම :

එම්. තෙන්නකෝන් මයා.

(திரு. எம். தென்னக்கோன்)

(Mr. M. Tennakoon)

මමත් එහි සිටියා. එමෙන්ම ඒ කාලයේ මාත් දෙමළ-සිංහල වශයෙන් හිතුවේ නැහැ. එමෙන්ම මරක්කර-සිංහල වශයෙන් හෝ බර්ගර්-සිංහල වශයෙන් හෝ හිතුවෙන් නැහැ. ඇයි එවැනි තත්ත්වයක් තිබුණේ? එක ධ්වජයක් යටතේ—එනම් ඉංග්‍රීසි ධ්වජය යටතේ—එකට සිටි නිසාත්, එකම භාෂාවක්—ඉංග්‍රීසි භාෂාව—පාවිච්චි කළ නිසාත් ඒ විධියට හිතුවේ නැහැ; වෙනසක් ඇතිවීමට අවස්ථාවක් ඇති වුණේ නැහැ; වේගයක් ඇති වුණේ නැහැ. එහෙත් ඒ නිසාම රටේ සංවර්ධනය හෙමින් හෙමින් තමයි ගමන් කළේ. ජාතික සමගියට අවශ්‍යවන කරුණුත් හෙමින් හෙමින් සම්පාදනය වුණා. ජාතිවාදීය කියා දේශපාලන වශයෙන් පෙඩරල් පක්ෂයට කොතරම් දෝෂාරෝපණය කළත් පෞද්ගලිකව සහෝදරයින් හැටියට කටයුතු සම්පාදනය කර ගන්නටත් කතාබහ කරන්නට හා ඉන්න හිටින්නටත් අද අපට පුළුවන් වී තිබෙන්නේ ඒ නිසා තමයි. අද අපේ ගම්වල එවැනි තත්ත්වයක් ඇති වී තිබෙනවා. අපේ ගම්වල ද්‍රවිඩ ජනතාව සිටිනවා. ද්‍රවිඩ ගම්වල සිංහල ජනතාව සිටිනවා. එහෙත් ජාති දෙකක් වශයෙන් සිතීමේ ගතිය අඩුයි. එයට හේතුව නම් අර අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී යුගයේදී අප දෙගොල්ලම යටත් විජිත වාදීන්ගේ වහළක් හැටියට දෙගොල්ලම සිතීම නිසා දෙගොල්ල අතර යම් එකමුතු කමක් ඇති වී තිබීමයි. අප හැම දෙනාම යටත්ව සිටි නිසා එක මට්ටමකින් සිතන්නට පුරුදුව සිටියා. දෙමළ වර්ගයාගේ අයිතිවාසිකම් යටපත් කරගෙන, සිංහල භාෂාව ඒ සඳහා බැම්මක් වශයෙන් ගෙන කටයුතු කරන්නට අප කිසි විටෙකත් කියන්නේ නැහැ.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

මොකක්ද කියන්නේ?

එම්. තෙන්නකෝන් මයා.

(திரு. எம். தென்னக்கோன்)

(Mr. M. Tennakoon)

දෙමළ වර්ගයාගේ අයිතිවාසිකම් ආරක්ෂා වන අන්දමට ජනසම්මත වාදය අනුව

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

කටයුතු කිරීම සඳහා වැඩි දෙනාගේ භාෂාව පාලන කටයුතුවලදී ප්‍රයෝජනයට ගන්නවා නම් ඒ තුළින් ජාතික සමගියක් ඇති කරන්නට පුළුවන් වෙනවා නේද? අප දෙගොල්ලගේ සමගිය නවදුරටත් වර්ධනය කර ගන්නට පුළුවන් වෙනවා නේද? 1956 දී බණ්ඩාරනායක අගමැතිතුමා සිංහල භාෂාව රාජ්‍ය භාෂාව වශයෙන් ක්‍රියාත්මක කිරීමේ පණත මෙම ගරු සභාවට ඉදිරිපත් කළාට පසු දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා රට සභා ආදිය ගැන එතුමා හිතුවේ ඉහත කී අදහස ඇතිව බව මේ අවස්ථාවේදී පැහැදිලි වම ප්‍රකාශ කළ යුතුව තිබෙනවා. 1956 දී සිංහල භාෂාව එකම රාජ්‍ය භාෂාව වශයෙන් පිළිගත් අතර එයින් දෙමළ භාෂාවට කිසිම හානියක් සිදු වන්නට ඉඩක් තැබුවේ නැහැ. දෙමළ වර්ගයාගේ භාෂාව අයිතිවාසිකම්, නිදහස යනාදිය යටපත් කරගෙන සිංහල අධිරාජ්‍යයක් මේ රටේ ඇති කර ගැනීමේ අදහසක් එදා තිබුණේ නැහැ. රටේ බහුතර ජනතාවගේ භාෂාව වන සිංහලය පාලන කටයුතු සඳහා යොදා ගන්නා අතර ද්‍රවිඩ ජනතාවගේ අයිතිවාසිකම්—ද්‍රවිඩ භාෂාව, ද්‍රවිඩ ජනතාවගේ සහායත්වය ශිෂ්ටාචාරය ආදී වූ සෑම දෙයක්ම—ආරක්ෂා වන අන්දමට කටයුතු කිරීමයි බණ්ඩාරනායක අගමැතිතුමාගේ අදහස වුණේ. එහෙත් පාලන කටයුතුවලදී පමණක් අප එකම වේදිකාවකට පැමිණිය යුතුයි. ඒ වේදිකාව සිංහල භාෂාව නම්, අප ජාති දෙකක් වශයෙන් සිතීමේ ගතිය ක්‍රමක්‍රමයෙන් අඩු වෙනවා නේද?

කයිට්ස් හි ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාගේ (වී. නවරත්නම් මය.) කථාවෙන් වැදගත් කරුණක් හෙළි වුණා. පසුගිය කාලයේදී රජයේ ද්‍රවිඩ සේවකයන් සිංහලය රාජ්‍ය භාෂාව වශයෙන් පිළිගෙන හිටියා. සිංහල භාෂා පණතේ නීති රීති සියල්ලක්ම ඒ අය පිළිගෙන හිටියා. සමහර ද්‍රවිඩ නිලධාරීන් සිංහලය ලියන්නටත් කියවන්නටත් ඉගෙන ගත්තා. එසේ ඉගෙනීමට යම් යම් නීතිරීති මගින් එක්තරා බල කිරීමක් ඇති වී තිබුණා. එම නිසා, 1965 වන විට මේ බැම්ම—ජාති හේද වාදයක් ඇති කිරීමේ හෝ ද්‍රවිඩ අයිතිවාසිකම් යටපත් කිරීමේ හෝ නොව, ජාතිය එකමුතු කිරීමේ බැම්ම—සැහෙන තරම් දුරට ශක්තිමත් වී තිබුණා. එහෙත්, 1965 දී ඔබතුමාගේ

කල් කැබිම :

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

[එම්. තෙන්නකෝන් මයා.]

ආණ්ඩුව බලයට පත් වුණු පසු ඇති වූ තත්ත්වය මොකක්ද? 1956 සිට 1965 දක්වා ඇති වේගෙන ආ ඒ තත්ත්වයේ විශාල වෙනසක් ඇති කොට, රජයේ සේවකයන්ටත් පෙඩරල් පක්ෂයේ ප්‍රති පත්ති අනුගමනය කරන අයටත් ඒ භාෂා ප්‍රතිපත්තියට පටහැනිව කටයුතු කරන්නට සැලැස්සුවේ නැද්ද? ඉන් පසු මොකද වුණේ? සිංහල ඉගෙන ගෙන සුළු කොටසක් වන අප එහි පාලනයට යටත් වන්නට වුවමනා තැන යනුවෙන් සමහර ද්‍රවිඩ රජයේ සේවකයන් දැරූ මතයට විරුද්ධව යමින් ජාතියේ එකමුතුව සඳහා අවශ්‍ය මේ සිංහල භාෂාව ඉගෙන ගත් කොටස් පවා ඒ ඉගෙනීම අතහැර දැමීම.

රජයේ සේවකයන්ගේ ප්‍රවීණතා විභාග යෙන් සමත් නොවීම නිසා ප්‍රතික්ෂේප කරන ලද උසස්වීම් ආදිය පවා 1965 න් පසු තාවත වරක් දන්නේ නැද්දැයි අහන්නට කැමතියි. එසේ දී, පෙඩරල් පක්ෂය අද වනතුරු කියා සිටියේ කුමක්ද? ඒ ගැන කයිට්ස්හි ගරු මන්ත්‍රී තුමා ඉතා පැහැදිලි ලෙස කැණ කියා තිබෙනවා. සිංහල භාෂාව ඉගෙන ගන්නට එපායයි දෙමළ නිලධාරීන්ට කිව්වා. ඒ අනුව, ටික දෙනෙක් ඒ වැඩේ නොකර සිටියා. එයින් සිදු වුණේ මොකක්ද? ඒ අයට ඒ කාලයේදී තමන්ගේ දක්ෂතාවන් අනුව ලැබෙන්නට ඕනෑ කරන තැන් තැනිව ගියා. රජයේ භාෂා ප්‍රතිපත්තියට අනුකූල නොවන සේ වැඩ කිරීම නිසා නිසි දඬුවම් ලබන්නට සිදු වුණා. මේ රට දෙකට බෙදන්නට ලැස්ති වුණු උදවියගේ හිතුවක්කාර පාලනය නිසාත්, අත්තනෝ මතික ක්‍රියාවන් නිසාත් සිදු වුණේ මොකක්ද? රජයේ ප්‍රතිපත්තියට හිස නැමූ රාජ්‍ය සේවකයන්ට ලැබිය යුතු තැන තැනිව ගියා. රජයේ ප්‍රතිපත්තියට එරෙහිව වැඩ කළ උදවියට තාවතත් උසස්වීම් දීම නිසා සිදු වුණේ මොකක්ද? මුලින් තිබුණු තර්ජනය නැති කර දැමීම. එය අයින් කර දැමීම. ප්‍රවීණතාව නැති නිලධාරීන්ට උසස්වීම් තව තවත් දෙන්නට පටන් ගත්තා. කයිට්ස්හි ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා කිව්වා වාගේ, ප්‍රවීණතාව නැති සමහර නිලධාරීන් යනවා, උත්තර මන්ත්‍රී ගරු තිරුවෙල්වම් පළාත් පාලන ආමතිතුමා සිටින එහිදී

තවත් ටිකක් හිටපල්ලාය කියනවාලු. ඔය විධියට ඒ අයට තව දුරටත් විනය විරෝධී ලෙස නිලතලවල උසස්වීම් ලැබෙනවා.

ඇයි මේ ආණ්ඩුව තව දුරටත් මෙවැනි දේවලට ඉඩ දෙන්නේ? යම් විධියක ප්‍රතිපත්තියක් තිබෙනවා නම් ඒ ප්‍රති පත්තිය ක්‍රියාත්මක කළ යුතුයි. මුලදී යම් විධියක බාධාවක් තිබුණ නම්, ක්‍රම ක්‍රම යෙන් ඒ බාධාව මගහැරීගෙන එන විට, අඩු වේගන එන විට, කටයුතු සම්පාදනය වේගන එන විට, හේද අඩුවේගන එන විට ඒවා නැවත අලුත්වැඩියා කරමින් හේද වැඩි වන විධියට ක්‍රියා කරන්නට යම් කොටසකට ඉඩ දෙන්නේ මොන හේතු වක් නිසාදැයි දන්නේ නැහැ. මෙසේ කරන්නේ සමහර විට සාමාන්‍ය ද්‍රවිඩ ජනතාවට තිබෙන ආදරය නිසා නොවෙයි. ආත්මාර්ථකාමීව, පාලන බලය අල්ලා ගැනීමට වුවමනාය යන ද්වේෂ අදහසින් පෙඩරල් පක්ෂය මෙහෙයවන නායකයන් වැඩ කරන්නේයයි සාමාන්‍ය මහජනයා කියනවා ඇති. සමහර විට ඔය ඇතැම් දෙමළ නායකයන්ගේ දූදරුවන් සිංහල ඉගෙන ගන්නවා. එහෙත් ඒ අය අනෙක් අයට කියන්නේ සිංහල ඉගෙන ගන්නට එපා කියයි. ඒ කියමන්වලටත් සමහර ද්‍රවිඩ සහෝදරවරුන් බිලිවෙනවා. පසුගිය කාලයේදීත් සමහර ද්‍රවිඩ සහෝදරවරුන් බිලි වුණා. තමන් මේ අන්දමට බිලි වූ බව ඒ අයටම ක්‍රම ක්‍රමයෙන් තේරුම් ගියා. තමන්ටම ඒ කාරණය පැහැදිලි වීමෙන් පසු තමන් ගෙන ගිය වැඩ පිළිවෙළ වැරදි බව වටහා ගත්තා. පෙඩරල් පක්ෂයෙහි නායකත්වය හදන්නේ අප බිල්ලට දී ඒ උදවියගේ දේශපාලන බලය සහ නායකත්වය තහවුරු කර ගන්නටය කියා ඔවුන් හිතා ගත්තා. 1965 වනතුරු ක්‍රම ක්‍රමයෙන් ද්‍රවිඩ සේවකයන් අතර මේ අවබෝධය වැඩි වෙමින් තිබුණා. ඒ නිසා තමයි ටිකින් ටික සිංහල භාෂාව ඉගෙන ගන්නා රාජ්‍ය සේවකයන්ගේ සංඛ්‍යාව වැඩි වන්නට පටන් ගත්තේ. 1965 වන තුරු ක්‍රමානුකූලව වැඩි වෙමින් තිබුණු ඒ තත්ත්වය 1968 වන තුරු එලෙසම තිබුණා නම් ජාතික සමගිය අවංකවම ඇති කර ගන්නට පුළුවන්කමක් මේ ආණ්ඩුවට ලැබෙන්නට තිබුණා. එහෙත් මේ ආණ්ඩුව ඒක කර තිබෙනවාද? නැහැ. මේ ආණ්ඩුවට තොයෙක් බලපෑම් ඇති වුණා. තොයෙක්

කල් තැබීම :

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

තර්ජන ඇති වුණා. ඒවාට ඉඩ දුන්නා. ඒ ඉඩදීමක් වශයෙන් තමයි අද මේ පනත සකස් කර තිබෙන්නේ. අපට මොකක් හෝ පනතක් දෙන්නායි ඉල්ලුවා.

මේ බවල පත්‍රිකාවෙන් යෝජනා කර තිබෙන රටසභා ක්‍රමය නොවෙයි ඊට වඩා විකක් අඩු එකක් වුවත් කමක් නැහැ, මොනවා හරි අපට දෙන්න. හිස් මුට්ටියක් වුවත් භාර ගන්නට අප ලැස්තියි. අපට අවශ්‍ය දේවල් පසුව සම්පාදනය කර ගන්නට පුළුවනි. ඔකයි මේ උදවියගේ තත්ත්වය. ඒ හැඟීම මේ පනත් කෙටුම්පතේ සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම තිබෙන බවයි අපට පෙනෙන්නේ. ඒ හැඟීම ප්‍රතික්ෂේප කරන්නට ලැස්ති නැහැ. ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙන මෙම රටසභා පනත හිස් රාමුවක් හැටියට අද පෙනෙන්නට පුළුවනි. ඒක ඒ විධියට තිබුණත් භාර ගන්නවා. සමහර විට අවුරුදු දහයක් පහළොවක් ගත වන විට අවශ්‍ය දේ ලැබෙනවා ඇතැයි මේ උදවිය කල්පනා කරනවා. අවුරුදු දහයක් පහළොවක් ගත වන විට මේ රටේ සිංහල දෙමළ ලේ හෙල් ලීමට මෙය උදව්වක් වන බව මා කියනවා. වුවමනාව එයයි. මේ පනතේ පරමාර්ථය එයයි. යම් අවස්ථාවක මේ පනත නියම විධියට ක්‍රියාත්මක වන විට සිංහල ද්‍රවිඩ හේදය උග්‍ර වී මේ රටේ සමගිය නැති වන යුගයක් අපට දකින්නට ලැබෙනු ඇති. අප ඒකට කොටස් කරුවන් වෙන්නට ලැස්ති නැහැ. ජාතික සමගිය ඇති කර පළාත් පාලනය සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම ඒ කොටස්වලට පවරන්නට ඕනෑ. ගම්වල පාලනය ගමේ මිනිසාට පවරන්නට ඕනෑය, ගමේ කටයුතු අපම පාලනය කරන්නට ඕනෑය යන උසස් හැඟීම ඒ පැත්තෙ ද්‍රවිඩ ජනතාව තුළත් තිබෙනවා; මේ පැත්තෙ සිංහල ජනතාව තුළත් තිබෙනවා. සෑම දෙනාටම එම අයිතිවාසිකම දුන් ජාතියක් අපේ ජාතිය. එමනිසා ගම් පාලනය කිරීමේ දක්ෂතාවය එහෙ ද්‍රවිඩ සහෝදරයන්ටත් තිබෙනවා; මෙහෙ සිංහල ජනතාවටත් තිබෙනවා. අන්න ඒ වැඩ පිළිවෙළ අපි ක්‍රියාත්මක කරමු. නමුත් එය ක්‍රියාත්මක විය යුත්තේ එක්සත් ලංකාවක් තුළයි. එහෙත් දඹදෙනියේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාත් (ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා.) කීවාක් මෙන් මේ යෝජිත පනත් කෙටුම්පත අනුව යන්නම් ඉරක් ගැහැව් වෙන් තව අවුරුදු දහයක් පහළොවක් වත් ගලා කරනවාද ?

ගත වන විට එකිනෙකා කඩුවෙන් පෙති ගසාගැනීමේ තත්ත්වයක් ඇති වන බවයි අපට කියන්නට තිබෙන්නේ. සමහර විට ද්‍රවිඩ අය සිංහලයන් පෙති ගසාහි; සිංහල අය ද්‍රවිඩයන් පෙති ගසාහි. දෙගොල්ලම හවුල් වෙන්නට පුළුවනි. ද්‍රවිඩ ජනතාවගේ කඩුවෙන් අපේ බෙලිවලට පහර වදින්නට පුළුවනි. ඒවාගේම ඔය දකුණු පළාතෙන් අනික් පළාත්වලත් ජීවත්වන සිංහල ජනතාවගෙන් ද්‍රවිඩ අයට පහර වදින්නට පුළුවනි. කාට වැදුණත් එය වැදීමක් හැටියට අප සලකන්නේ; ලේ හැළීමක් හැටියට අප සලකන්නේ. මේ රටේ ද්‍රවිඩ සිංහල හේදයක් ඇති කරන්නට අපට වුවමනා වක් නැහැ. අපේ බලාපොරොත්තුව ඒක නොවෙයි. නමුත් මේ යෝජිත පනත් කෙටුම්පත සම්මත කර ක්‍රියාත්මක කළොත් ඒ කැපුම්වලට කර්තෘ වරයා වර්තමාන අගමැතිතුමා බව රත් අකුරෙන් හරි කළ අකුරෙන් හරි යම් තැනක සඳහන් වෙනවා ඇති. අපට වුවමනා කරන්නේ නැහැ ජාති හේදයක්. අපට වුවමනා කරන්නේ ජාතික සමගියයි. අපේ පළාත්වල කටයුතු අපටම කර ගන්නට පුළුවන් වන්නේ ජාතික සමගියක් ඇති වුණාට පසුවයි. එවැනි තත්ත්වයක් ඇති වූ අවස්ථාවේදී සියළුම බලතල දෙන්න. එතකොට කවිවේරි ඕනෑත් නැහැ; අධ්‍යක්ෂවරුන් ඕනෑත් නැහැ; කඩදාසි කොළඹට එවන්නට ඕනෑත් නැහැ. තල්ලුර්හි කඩදාසියක් තීරණයක් ගන්නට කොළඹට එවන්නට ඕනෑ නැහැ. තල්ලුර්හිදීම ඒ තීරණය දුන්නාවේ. දඹදෙනියේ කඩදාසියක් තීරණයක් ගන්නට කොළඹට එවන්නට ඕනෑ නැහැ. දඹදෙනියේදීම ඒ තීරණය දුන්නාවේ. අන්න ඒ අදහස් අනුව අපේ පාලන ක්‍රමය සකස් කළාට කිසි වරදක් නැහැ. නමුත් ජාතික සමගිය තිබෙන්නට ඕනෑ. දඹදෙනියේ කෙනෙකුට තල්ලුර්හි සිටින්නටත් තල්ලුර්හි කෙනෙකුට දඹදෙනියේ සිටින්නටත් අවස්ථාව තිබෙන්නට ඕනෑ. අන්න ඒකයි අප මේ අවස්ථාවේදී කියන්නේ.

**කාරකසභා නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමා**  
(குழுக்களின் உப அங்கிராசனர் அவர்கள்)  
(Mr. Deputy Chairman of Committees)  
ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා තව කොපමණ වේලා

කල් තැබීම:

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

එම්. තෙන්නකෝන් මයා.

(திரு. எம். தென்னக்கோன்)

(Mr. M. Tennakoon)

තව විනාඩි 15 ක්.

කාරකසභා නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමා

(குழுக்களின் உப அக்கிராசனார் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Chairman of Committees)

තවත් ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් දස දෙනෙකු පමණ කලා කරන්නට සිටිනවා.

එම්. තෙන්නකෝන් මයා.

(திரு. எம். தென்னக்கோன்)

(Mr. M. Tennakoon)

මේ ධවල පත්‍රිකාවෙන් අදහස් කරන පනත දැනට භිෂ් දෙයක් වන්නට පුළුවනි. මූලික අදහසටත් විරුද්ධව මේවාට කවිවේ රියකට තිබෙන බලය නැත, දිසාපතිවරයාට බලයක් නැත, කියා ගරු අගමැතිතුමා පසු ගිය කාලයේ කීවිවා. නමුත් ඒ ඔක්කොම තිබෙනව මේකෙ.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

කොහේද තිබෙන්නේ?

එම්. තෙන්නකෝන් මයා.

(திரு. எம். தென்னக்கோன்)

(Mr. M. Tennakoon)

කලාවෙදින් කීව්වෙ, කවිවේරිවලට තිබෙන බලය අඩු වෙන්නේ නැහැ කියා.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

කවිවේරිවල බලය තිබෙනවා. කවිවේරි නැති වෙන්නේ නැහැ මෙයින්.

එම්. තෙන්නකෝන් මයා.

(திரு. எம். தென்னக்கோன்)

(Mr. M. Tennakoon)

ඒක තමයි මමත් කියන්නේ. කවිවේරි වල බලතල අඩු වෙන්නේ නැත කියන එක තමයි මමත් කියන්නේ. එතකොට මෙයින් පළාත් බදු සේවාවන් කරන්නට අවස්ථා වක් ලැබෙන්නේ නැහැ. මෙහි මූලික අදහස එය වුණට ඒකවත් ඉෂ්ට වෙන්නේ නැහැ. එහෙම නම් ගරු අගමැතිතුමා බලා

පොරොත්තු වන පරමාර්ථය ඉෂ්ට වන්නේ නැහැ. මෙයින් සිදුවන්නේ ජාතිභේදයට කරුණු සැලසීම පමණයි. එහෙම නම් මේ ගන්නා පියවරෙහි තේරුම කුමක්ද? අද අපේ පාලන ක්‍රමයෙහි යම් යම් අඩුපාඩු තිබෙනවා. රාජ්‍ය සේවයෙහි නියුක්ත රජයේ සේවකයන් තම රාජකාරි ඉෂ්ට කිරීමේදී කොයි තරම් අසතුටකින් ක්‍රියා කරනවාද කියා ඔබතුමා දන්නවා. විශේෂ යෙන්ම සිංහල භාෂාව උගත් රජයේ සේවකයන් තුළ අද විශාල අසතුටක් තිබෙනවා. ප්‍රවීණතාව උඩ, දක්ෂතාව උඩ අද ඔවුන්ට උසස්වීම් ලැබෙන්නේ නැහැ. ඒ විධියේ කනස්සල්ලකින් යුතුව සිටින රජයේ සේවකයකු තම යුතුකම් අවංකව ඉටු කරයි කියා ගරු අගමැතිතුමා විශ්වාස කරනවාද? රජයේ සේවයේ උසස් වීම් ගැන කල්පනා කර බලමු. උසස්වීම් දීමේ කිසිම ක්‍රමවත් පිළිවෙලක් නැහැ. සමහරවිට ඉතාම දක්ෂ සේවකයකුට වුණත් ඉදිරියට යාමේ අවස්ථාව නැහැ; පටන් ගත්ත නැතිත්මයි, අවසාන වෙන්නේ. කොපමණ දක්ෂතාවක් තිබුණත්, කොතරම් කායභී ශූර වුණත්, ජාතික නිෂ්පාදනයට, ජාතික සංවර්ධනයට කොතරම් දිරි දී වැඩ කළත්, ඉදිරියට යාමේ අවස්ථාව නැත්නම් රට ස්වයංපෝෂිත කිරීම සඳහා රජයේ සේවයෙන් සියයට සියයක ප්‍රතිඵල ලබා ගන්නේ කොහොමද?

අද රටේ ඉන්ජිනේරු හිඟයක් තිබෙනව. රටේ සංවර්ධන කටයුතු සඳහා අවශ්‍ය ඉන්ජිනේරුවන්ගේ හිඟයක් අද තිබෙන්නේ ප්‍රාදේශීය බල තල නැති නිසා ද? අධ්‍යාපනය සකස් වෙලා නැහැ. ඒ නිසා සංවර්ධනයට අවශ්‍ය නිලධාරීන් මිදි. ජාතික නිෂ්පාදනය අඩු වී තිබෙන්නේ ඒ නිසයි. රටේ ගමනාගමන පහසුකම් නැහැ. මේ රටේ ගමනාගමන පහසුකම් කොයි ආකාරයට සකස් විය යුතුද කියා විටින් විට මේ ගැන කරුණු සොයා බැලූ උදවිය යෝජනා ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙනව. මේ මා අතේ තිබෙන්නේ පරණ පොතක්. එහෙත් අද ඒ පොතේ විස්තර වන තත්ත්වය වෙනස් වී නැහැ. “පයනියර් පෙසන්ට් කොල නයි සේෂන් ඉන් සිලෝන්” තමැති මේ පොත ලියවී තිබෙන්නේ 1956 දීයි. ගමනා ගමනය පිළිබඳව ඊට පෙර පැවති තත්ත්වය ගැනත් ඒ පොත ලියූ පාමර් මහත්මයා විස්තර කර තිබෙනවා.

කල් තැබීම:

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

**කාරකසභා නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමා**(குழுக்களின் உப அக்கிராசனர் அவர்கள்)  
(Mr. Deputy Chairman of Committees)

මිය කරුණු බවල පත්‍රිකාවට කොහොම අදාළ වෙනවද මම දන්නේ නැහැ.

**එම්. තෙන්නකෝන් මයා.**(திரு. எம். தென்னக்கோன்)  
(Mr. M. Tennakoon)

ප්‍රාදේශීය සංවර්ධනය බවල පත්‍රිකාවට අදාළ නැද්ද?

**කාරකසභා නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමා**(குழுக்களின் உப அக்கிராசனர் அவர்கள்)  
(Mr. Deputy Chairman of Committees)

ගමනාගමනය මේකට අදාළ වෙනවා කියා මම හිතන්නේ නැහැ.

**එම්. තෙන්නකෝන් මයා.**(திரு. எம். தென்னக்கோன்)  
(Mr. M. Tennakoon)

ප්‍රාදේශීය සංවර්ධනයට අදාළ නැද්ද පාරවල්? මේ බවල පත්‍රිකාවේ ප්‍රධාන අරමුණ ප්‍රාදේශීය සංවර්ධනයයි. එහෙම නැත් නම් රට බෙදීමද?

**කාරකසභා නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමා**(குழுக்களின் உப அக்கிராசனர் அவர்கள்)  
(Mr. Deputy Chairman of Committees)

සාකච්ඡා කරන්නේ බවල පත්‍රිකාවට අඩංගු වෙලා තිබෙන කරුණුයි.

**එම්. තෙන්නකෝන් මයා.**(திரு. எம். தென்னக்கோன்)  
(Mr. M. Tennakoon)

මේ කරුණු බවල පත්‍රිකාවට අදාළයි. පාලන කටයුතු පළාත්වලට නොලැබෙන නිසා වැඩ කටයුතු ප්‍රමාද වෙනවා යයි අගමැතිතුමා කියනවා නම් එය වැරදි බව පෙන්වා දෙන්නටයි මට වුවමනා කරන්නේ. පාර්ලිමේන්තුවේ ගමනාගමන පහසුකම් ගැන එතුමාගේ පොතේ 68 වෙනි පිටුවේ සඳහන් කර තිබෙන්නේ මෙහෙමයි:

“One may not agree with the sweeping statement of the Kandyan Peasantry Commission that the most potent factor retarding the development of the Dry Zone is the absence of communications.”

වාරිමාලී පහසුකම් නොමැතිකම, ඉඩම් හිඟය, පාරවල් හිඟය වැනි දේවල් නිසා ගම්බද සංවර්ධනයට විශේෂයෙන් බාධා පැමිණ තිබෙනවා. අද තිබෙන පාලන ක්‍රමය යටතේ පනවන යම් යම් රෙගුලාසි හා නීති ඊනි මගින් මේ අඩුපාඩු වැඩි හරි යක් සකස් කර ගන්නට බැරිද? ඊට අවස්ථාව තිබෙනවා. එහෙත් මෙයින් අදහස් කර තිබෙන්නේ එය නොවෙයි. මේ රටේ පළමුව ප්‍රාදේශීය පාලනයක් ඇති කර ගෙන, ඊට පසුව දෙමළ රාජ්‍යයක් ඇති කර ගන්නට පෙරිල් පක්ෂය බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. ඒ අන්දමට දෙමළ රාජ්‍යය ඇති වුණදාට සිංහල රාජ්‍යයයි, දෙමළ රාජ්‍යයයි දෙක අතර සිටින කවදාවත් වළක්වන්න බැහැ. මීට පෙර එවැනි සිටින ඇති වි ජනතාව කොයිතරම් දුක් කම්කටොලුවලට මුහුණ දුන්නාද යන්න අපිට ඉතිහාසයෙන් පෙනී යනවා. ඒ නිසා අගමැතිතුමා බවල පත්‍රිකාවේ සඳහන් මේ යෝජනාවලට එකඟ වෙනවා නම් එකඟ වෙන්නේ ඒ පෙරිල් පක්ෂයේ ඉල්ලීමට ඉඩ දීමක් වශයෙන් මිස වෙනත් කිසිම අදහසක් උඩ නොවන බව අවංකව හිතන කෙනෙකුට සක්සුදක් සේ ඔප්පු වෙනවා.

පළාත් පාලන ආයතනවලින් අසා බලන්න ය කියන්නට යෙදුනා. ගරු අගමැතිතුමා ජනසම්මත වාදයට ගරු කරනවලු. ජනසම්මතවාදයට පයින් ගැසුවේ කොහොමද යන්න මා පෙන්වුම් කළා. ජනසම්මතවාදයට ගරු කරනවා නම් පළාත් පාලන ආයතන සියල්ලකින්ම මේ ගැන විමසා බලන්න. සිංහල ප්‍රදේශවලත්, දෙමළ ප්‍රදේශවලත් සෑම පළාත් පාලන ආයතනයකම කැමැත්ත විමසා බලන්න. වැඩි දෙනෙකු කැමැත්ත ප්‍රකාශ කරනවා නම් මේක ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්න. ඒ ගැන අපේ විරුද්ධත්වයක් නැහැ. හොඳයි, ස්වාධීනව අදහස් විමසීම සඳහා මේක බවල පත්‍රිකාවක් හැටියට ඉදිරිපත් කළා. මේ සම්බන්ධව තමුත්තාත්සේගේ ආණ්ඩු පක්ෂයේ මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්ගේ ම අදහස් මොනවාද යන්න ඔවුන් පෞද්ගලිකව හමු වී විමසා බලන්න. වැඩි දෙනා එකඟ නම් මේ බවල පත්‍රිකාවේ සඳහන් යෝජනා ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්න. හැබැයි, මේ පාර්ලිමේන්තුවේදී අදහස් විමසන්න එපා, පක්ෂ ආණ්ඩු ක්‍රමයක් තියෙද්දී

කල් තැබීම :

[එම්. තෙන්නකෝන් මය.]

හැම විටම ක්‍රියාත්මක වන්නේ ඇමති මණ්ඩලයේ ඒකාධිපති මතයයි. ස්වාධීන මතයක් පිළිගැනෙන්නේ නැහැ. ඒ සමගම මා කලින් කීවා වගේ පළාත් ආණ්ඩු සභාවලත් කැමැත්ත විමසා බලන්න. සංඝ සභාවල අදහස් විමසන්නාය කියා ඊයේ වැදගත් යෝජනාවක් ඉදිරිපත් කළා. පක්ෂ හැඟීමෙන් තොරව පළ කරන ස්වාධීන අදහස් තමයි, විමසිය යුත්තේ. ඒ නිසා අදහස් මොනවාද යන්න රහසෙන් අහන්න. පක්ෂවලට හානියක් වේය කියා එළිපිට ඇත්ත නොකියන්න පුළුවන්. මේ කාලකන්නි පක්ෂ ක්‍රමය තිබෙන තුරු මේ රටේ සංවර්ධනයක් ඇති කරන්නට බැහැ. හික්ෂුත් වහන්සේලාගේ අදහස්—සංඝ සභාවල අදහස්—පෞද්ගලිකව, රහසිගතව විමසා බලන්න. මේකට කැමතිද නැද්ද කියා විමසා බලා වැඩි දෙනා කැමති නම් ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්න. මෙයින් ජාතික නිෂ්පාදනයේ වැඩි විමක් ඇති වෙනවද? එසේ නම් ඇයි, රේපබ්ලික් මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් කීප දෙනෙකු පමණක් මේක ඉල්ලන්නේ?

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමනි , ද්‍රවිඩ ජනතාව, සිංහල ජනතාවගේ සේවකයන් බවට පත් වී සිටිනවාය කියා වඩිඩුක්කොඩෙයිනි ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (අමර්තලිංගම් මය.) විසින් එතුමාගේ කථාවේදී කියන්නට යෙදුනා. එසේ සිදු වී තිබෙන්නේ කොතැනදී ද, කොයි අවස්ථාවේදී ද කියා මා අහන්නට කැමතියි. ද්‍රවිඩ සහෝදරයන්ගේ සාධාරණ අයිතිවාසිකම්වලට සිංහල සහෝදරයන් පහර ගසා තිබෙන්නේ කොයි අවස්ථාවේදීද කියා අප අසන්නට කැමතියි. එහෙත් ත්‍රිකුණාමල ප්‍රදේශයේ ඉඩම් කොටසක් සිංහල සාමාජිකයන් සිටින සංගමයකට පැවරීමට තමන් විරුද්ධ වුණු බව එතුමා විසින්ම ඊයේ කියන්නට යෙදුනා. එසේ විරුද්ධ වීමට කරුණු මෙතැනදී කියන්නට පුළුවන්. එහෙත් ඒ අයගේ සිත් අවංකව පරීක්ෂා කර බැලුවොත් පෙනෙයි, ඒ අය ඊට විරුද්ධ වුනේ සිංහල අය ඒ ප්‍රදේශයේ පදිංචි වෙනවාට විරුද්ධ නිසා මිස වෙනත් කටයුතුවලට ඒ ඉඩම් අවශ්‍ය වී තිබෙන නිසා නොවන බව. ද්‍රවිඩ අය වයඹ පළාතේ කොයි තරම් ඉඩම් අරගෙන තිබෙනවද?

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

එයට විරුද්ධ වී තිබෙන සිංහල මහත් වරු කවද? සිංහල මන්ත්‍රීවරු කවද? ද්‍රවිඩ සාමාජිකයන් පමණක් සිටින සංවිධානවලට දෙනවාට අප විරුද්ධය කියා අප කවරුවත් විරුද්ධත්වයක් දක්වා තිබෙනවාද? අප විරුද්ධ නැහැ. අපට සහෝදරත්වයෙන් ජීවත් වන්නට ඕනෑ. ජාතික සමගිය අප බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා නම් කවදාවත් මේ යෝජනා ක්‍රියාත්මක කිරීමෙන් ඒ සමගිය ඇති කර ගන්නට බැහැ. මේක පළමු වැනි පියවර පමණයි. ගරු අගමැතිතුමා ආණ්ඩුව පිහිටුවීම සඳහා එක් පියවරක් ගත්තා. මේ දෙවැනි පියවරයි. තුන් වැනි පියවර වශයෙන් මේ පනතට සංශෝධන ඉදිරිපත් කරනවා ඇති. මුලදී ඉදිරිපත් කරනවා ඇත්තේ සුළු සුළු සංශෝධනයයි. ඊට පසුව මහ සංශෝධන ඒවි. ඒ සංශෝධන අද හෙට ඉදිරිපත් වෙතැයි මා කියන්නේ නැහැ. තවත් අවුරුදු 10 ක් ගත වන විට තත්ත්වය හුඟක් වෙනස් වේවි. ඔව්, තව අවුරුදු 10 ක් යන විට සිංහල දෙමළ සහෝදරත්වය නැති කිරීම සම්බන්ධයෙන් සම්පූර්ණයෙන් වගකිවයුත්තා ගරු අගමැතිතුමා වන බවට කිසිම සැකයක් නැහැ.

මෙම ධවල පත්‍රිකාව ඉදිරිපත් කෙළේ ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදී මූලධර්මවලට අනුකූලව මහජන නියෝජිතයන්ගේ අදහස් විමසීමට නම්, මහජන නියෝජිතයන් වැඩි දෙනෙකු මෙම යෝජනාවලට විරුද්ධ වෙතොත් මෙම යෝජනා ප්‍රතික්ෂේප කිරීමේ අදහසින් මෙය ඉදිරිපත් කළා නම්, පසුගිය 8 වැනිදා සිට මේ වනතුරු මේ සම්බන්ධයෙන් මෙම ගරු සභාවේදී ඒ ඒ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් විසින් කරන ලද කථා ඇසීමෙන් පසුව කළයුතු දේ කුමක්දැයි තීරණය කර ගැනීමට ගරු අගමැතිතුමාට පහසුවක් සැලසී ඇතැයි මා කල්පනා කරනවා. එහෙත් මේ ධවල පත්‍රිකාව ඉදිරිපත් කර ඇත්තේ මහජනයාගේ ඇස්වලට වැලි ගැසීමේ බලාපොරොත්තුවෙන් නම් ඒක වෙනම ප්‍රශ්නයක්. කොටි පඬියකු ඉස්සරහට එවා භය අඩු කරන්නටද මේ හදන්නේ? කොටියාට තිබෙන භය අඩු කිරීම සඳහා මුලදී කොටි පඬියකු සාදා එවීමේ චේතනාවෙන් මෙම ධවල පත්‍රිකාව ඉදිරිපත් කළා නම්, ජනතාවගේ ඇසට වැලි ගැසීම සඳහා මෙය ඉදිරිපත් කළා

කල් තැබීම:

නම්, ගරු අගමැතිතුමා ලොකු මුළුවක වැටී සිටින බව මතක් කරන්නට කැමතියි. කවදා හෝ නියම කොටියා ආ දවසට අප සියල්ලන්ම විනාශ කර දමාමි. කොටි පඬියා දක කොටියාට නිබෙන භය අඩු වූ විට නියම කොටියා අවුත් අප විනාශ කර දමාමි. ගරු අගමැතිතුමා මෙම ධවල පත්‍රිකාව ඉදිරිපත් කෙළේ ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම මහජන අදහස් විමසීමේ චේතනාවෙන් නම් එය පැසසිය යුතු කාරණයක්. මෙය ඉදිරිපත් කෙළේ ජනතාවගේ ඇසට වැලී ගැසීමේ චේතනාවෙන් නොවේවායි මා ප්‍රාර්ථනය කරනවා. මෙය ඉදිරිපත් කෙළේ අවාකව මහජන අදහස් දැන ගැනීම සඳහා නම් දැන් වැඩිදෙනා අනුමත කරන අදහස ගරු අගමැතිතුමාට පැහැදිලි වී ඇති හෙයින් ධවල පත්‍රිකාවට යා කොට ඇති යෝජිත පනත ක්‍රියාත්මක කිරීම අතහැර දැමීමට ක්‍රියා කරනවා ඇතැයි මා හිතනවා. අවංක හිත්වල වේදනාව ගරු අගමැතිතුමාට වැටහෙන්නට ඇති. එසේ හෙයින් ජනතාව මෙම ධවල පත්‍රිකාව හා පනත ගැන හිතන්නේ කෙසේදැයි මහජන නියෝජිතයන්ගේ මාර්ගයෙන් දැන ගන්නට ලැබුණු නිසා ජනසම්මත වාදයට ගරු කිරීමක් වශයෙන්—මීට පෙර නම් දෙවරක් ජනසම්මතවාදය කඩා දමා තිබෙනවා—රට සභා පනත ඉදිරිපත් නොකරන ලෙස බැහැපත්ව ඉල්ලමින් මගේ කථාව අවසන් කරනවා.

අ. හා. 5.32

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Mr. Deputy Chairman, when initiating this discussion on the White Paper. I had occasion to talk in Sinhala. This time I propose to speak in English because some hon. Members find it difficult to follow what one says—those who do not know Sinhala.

Although I am speaking at the present moment, I might assure hon. Members who wanted to speak on this Motion for Adjournment that this is not the final speech. Others

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

who wanted to speak have the opportunity to do so. I am speaking early because I have certain other engagements. As you know, Mr. Deputy Chairman, we did not set aside today for discussion of this White Paper. It was to be two days, and this is the third day, and since I have undertaken some other engagements I wish to speak now, but that will not be an impediment, as I said, to others who wish to speak thereafter.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, since in my earlier speech I dealt very comprehensively with most of the points that had arisen as regards this measure. I propose to confine my speech this time to some of the arguments adduced by hon. Members who have spoken up to now.

Most of them spoke very glibly about unity. "We want unity, we welcome unity, we will embrace unity with open arms." But if one had listened to some of those speeches and the thoughts underlying the utterances made, one would have realized that this talk of unity was a sham. I presume the unity that some want is the complete subjugation of all the others. That is all. I am reminded of the boast of peace that the British were wont to utter when they were ruling places like India and Ceylon. "We brought you peace", the British used to say. "You were fighting each other. We brought you peace. There is peace in India. There is peace in Ceylon." And what was the reply? "It is the peace of the graveyard."

The amity so glibly talked about is the amity of subjugation. Other cultures, other languages, other aspirations, all must be subject to one dominating force. Well, one had only to listen to the speech of the hon. Member for Dambadeniya (Mr. R. G. Senanayake) to realize that this talk of amity is the biggest sham perpetrated on this country.

ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා.

(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனநாயக்க)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

May I answer?—[Interruption].

கல் துணி:

தீர்மானம் கனம் பேரவைத் தலைவர்

செ. டி. டி. ஸேனானாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனானாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I am on my feet. Let him sit down. Let me not come out with his despicable past.

செ. டி. டி. ஸேனானாயக்க

(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனானாயக்க)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

The thought of amity strikes him only when he is Prime Minister !

செ. டி. டி. ஸேனானாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனானாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Yes, Yes ! Let me not come out with his past.

செ. டி. டி. ஸேனானாயக்க

(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனானாயக்க)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

Please do come out with that.

செ. டி. டி. ஸேனானாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனானாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Despicable past of the hon. Member for Dambadeniya.

செ. டி. டி. ஸேனானாயக்க

(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனானாயக்க)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

The last time too he said he would come out with my past. Why does he not come out with it ?

காரணம் நியோஜனம் கனம் பேரவைத் தலைவர்

(குழுக்களின் உப அக்கிராசனார் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Chairman of Committees)

Order, please !

செ. டி. டி. ஸேனானாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனானாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I shall come out with it in due time.

They speak of amity : We want amity ! We want to get together in brotherhood ! The brotherhood they

speak of is to shoot people.—[Interruption]. When he was speaking he wanted not to be disturbed. Will he please do that when I am speaking ? That is the sort of amity they talk of.

Now I shall deal with the points that have been raised in the chronological order in which they were raised.

I am very grateful to the hon. Member for Uva-Paranagama (Mrs. Rajaratna) who sincerely—I underline that—who sincerely had endeavoured to study the White Paper and the Bill and who raised some difficulties that were in her mind and wanted those matters elucidated. What were they ? The first important point raised by the hon. Member for Uva-Paranagama was the question of employment, namely that people will be shut off from employment in various areas by the establishment of district councils. I think she quoted a particular section which refers to the creation of posts by district councils with the consent of the Minister of Finance.

Creating posts and filling posts are two entirely different functions. As regards that matter, I want to point out to the hon. Member for Uva-Paranagama that there is no separate district council service, so that employment as it exists today will not be affected in any way. If there is a certain pattern of employment today, that pattern will prevail and continue, because it will be those in government service who will be seconded to man those posts in the district councils. In initiating the discussion, I did say that that is an added reason why, if and when the Central Government wants a direction carried out, there will be, not only the chief executive, who is the government agent and an employee of Government, but also others, who will be employees of the Government and not members of a separate district council service, to carry out the direction, unlike in the Local Government Service. The Local

කල් නැතිම :

Government Service employees are not employees of Government. That is a separate service. So, the fears visualized by the hon. Member for Uva-Paranagama do not arise.

Then again, the question was taken up about village expansion schemes, and much was made about the clause which deals with the vesting of land. This is a point that was raised by the hon. Member for Uva-Paranagama. A peculiar interpretation of the law was given by the hon. Member for Dambadeniya, perhaps on the advice of his legal adviser, once an eminent person.

And also I see the same idea in a letter I have received—I wish to deal with that too because it is a very highly respected priest, Rev. Madihe Pannaseeha, who has written to me—and the letter is also in the papers. I am replying to it. But I shall deal with some of the matters raised. The same matter is raised here, too.

This is what Clause 33 of the draft Bill says :

“33. There shall be vested in a District Council all such immovable property as may be situate within the district and may be made over, with the sanction of the Governor-General, to the Council by this Act or any other law.”

Now the great legal interpretation given was that under this all land in the district will be automatically vested in the district council. Imagine that kind of argument! I am not surprised that he passed the law and never practised.—[Interruption]. I will not say more that I know about his practice. However, according to his argument, immediately this Bill is passed all land will get automatically vested in the district council. As I quoted earlier Clause 33 reads :

“33. There shall be vested in a District Council all such immovable property as may be situate within the district and may be made over .....”

And he says there is a difference as regards the municipal councils. I shall now quote to you from the

දිස්ත්‍රික් සහ පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

Municipal Councils Ordinance. This is what Section 35 of the Municipal Councils Ordinance says :

“35. There shall be vested in the Municipal Council of each Municipality all such immovable property of the following classes, namely :—

- (a) waste lands ;
- (b) stones, gravel and cabook quarries ;
- (c) lakes, ponds, reservoirs, tanks, aqueducts and other water-works ;
- (d) Crown lands, whether with or without buildings,”

Now, according to the argument of the hon. Member for Dambadeniya, the moment the Municipal Councils Ordinance was passed, all Crown land got automatically vested in the council, and so now, according to that argument, there is no Crown land in Galle, there is no Crown land in Jaffna and there is no Crown land in Kandy! Why? Because after the passing of the Municipal Councils Ordinance all Crown land got vested in the municipal councils of those areas. Does the Member for Dambadeniya realize the absurdity of his argument? Was it not apt when the Member for Jaffna (Mr. Ponnambalam) said that listening to the arguments of the Member for Dambadeniya one would have thought that we were all lunatics? Surely the hon. Member for Dambadeniya has more brains than that. At least he was born with more brains. I do not know what has happened in the meantime.

Then, of course, we had the argument that village expansion schemes will come under the purview of district councils. Quite right, but that would be subject to the overriding provisions of Clauses 74 to 78 in the draft Bill, and, as I pointed out when I initiated this discussion, one does not expect the Minister to use the powers given by those provisions the whole time.

The hon. Member for Jaffna asked a very pertinent question. He asked, What do you propose to sell to the people by this? I will answer that.

කල් තැබීම :

[ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලි සේනානායක]

Before that I would like to say this. Land has first to be vested in the district councils and that vesting has to be done by the Minister of Land. A district council can deal with any property that has been vested in it in the same way that a municipal council can deal with any property vested in it. For example, the Central Government has vested certain lands in the Kandy Municipal Council, but that land did not automatically vest in the Kandy Municipal Council under the Municipal Councils Ordinance. It is the same with regard to district councils. Take for example forests. They come under the purview of the Conservator of Forests. There will be certain extents of land which in the opinion of the Minister of Land ought to be vested in the district councils. Then after they have been so vested the district councils can have their village expansion schemes. Building up on this in his own imagination, the Member for Dambadeniya argued that all land will be vested automatically in the district councils when this law is passed and, therefore, he argued, colonization schemes will come under the district councils. Why? Because according to him all land would have been vested in the district councils automatically with the passing of this Bill! Does the hon. Member at least now realize the absurdity of the argument he put forward?

ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා.

(තිரு. ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

Will the Prime Minister permit me to explain? What I wanted to make clear was this. When a land is vested in a district council, possession passes on to the district council, not the title. When the title is being divested the Governor-General's sanction is necessary because it is from the Governor-General that you get the title, but the actual possession of the property is under the control of the local body. I will give an example. Just outside my premises there is a crown property and there are a couple of shanties there. The municipal council

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

has accepted them and given them assessment numbers. My point is—not that it automatically comes into their possession—it comes under some sort of control, and that control, if used in the background of those who want to create a campaign for possession of land, a squatting campaign, will be very useful to them. It may not be so. If it is not so there is no point in insulting a person and asking him, “Where are your brains?”. One can see how this masterpiece, the result of a great brainwave of his, is being denounced by every single political party, every village committee, and every priest.

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උද්ගිරි සේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I will not ask where our brains are because there must be something to ask. Whatever it is, what is his explanation: people will come and squat. I will tell you that people are squatting on crown property even today. This does not make any difference. How absurd it is. The hon. Member himself knows that all over the countryside people are squatting on crown land. This is not going to make any difference. Separate action has to be taken by the Central Government with regard to squatting on crown land by people. If action has not been taken it is unfortunate. I do not know about people squatting opposite his house. I do not know what benefits he might be getting out of it, but certainly I will look into that matter.

ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා.

(තිරු. ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

I cited that as an example. It is not a complaint.

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උද්ගිරි සේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Please sit down—I am not giving way—for I have more important matters to reply to. Now, Sir, that is one of the big points he made.

කල් තැබීම :

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

The hon. fair Member for Uva-Paranagama (Mrs. Rajaratna) was perturbed about the fisheries aspect of this problem. We all know that people from our coastal areas go to the Eastern Province during the south-west monsoon—migratory fishermen—for fishing purposes. Now, she asked, what happens to them once the district councils are established? Nothing whatsoever happens to them because they can still go. District councils have no right or authority to hinder their going for seasonal fishing, and fishing as they are accustomed to.

This is the sort of thing that is put across to the people by various people. I do not mind if the truth is put before the country and the people reject it. That is a different matter.

But when utter falsehoods of this nature are perpetrated on the people, the people, not having an opportunity to hear the truth, will not only not know the truth but can also be misled. Let them hear the truth, let them object to the truth and let us see what they feel about it. I want them to know the truth, not half-baked facts.

Now, I do not know in that respect what the hon. Member for Jaffna (Mr. Ponnambalam) had in mind when he referred to our having these barricades when we are discussing this White Paper. Now, that is also referred to in this letter of the reverend priest. I do not say this respected priest had any such intentions, but I am aware of the fact that it was intended to prevent discussions here by various people coming and invading this place.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, we owe it as a duty to each and every Member, whether they be on that side of the House or on this side, to see that they have the opportunity, the privilege, of debating and discussing this matter without any hindrance from outside. That is a right which every Member is entitled to.

I did mention when I initiated this discussion—unfortunately those Members were not here; they were discussing this in Hyde Park—and I think hon. Members would agree with me, that when Mr. Bandaranaike introduced the Sinhala only Bill, those who advocated parity could not leave this House. They, the Sama Samajists and the Communists, were marooned here. They were marooned in this House and they had to appeal to Mr. Bandaranaike, the then Prime Minister, to give them police protection and transport to go to their homes.

Do you want this discussion to go on in that way? Is that the democracy that you want to have in this country, to find that the highest tribunal here, this Assembly, cannot freely and fairly and without outside pressures discuss the matter? And what is more? We are not coming to a decision now. I am glad the hon. Member for Nikaweratiya (Mr. M. Tennakoon) thanked me for having first introduced a White Paper for discussion. We are hiding nothing.

When we produce a draft of the proposed legislation with the White Paper, we are told we should have produced only the White Paper. If we produce only the White Paper, we are told, "This is a trick. We must see what is in the Bill." Now, there is no trick about this. There is a White Paper, there is draft legislation, and the draft legislation can be amended.

I remember—I want hon. Members to hear this—that during the discussion in our Government Parliamentary Group, some of the Muslim Members raised certain matters and we gave them an assurance that amendments would be made to meet their points of view.

So, we want to approach this question in the correct way. The hon. Member for Dambadeniya says, decentralization is good, but—if I followed him aright—not now. Decentralization is very good but not now. Considering the way he is behaving, could we ever have decentralization?

කල් තැබීම:

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

[ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක]

He says decentralization must come after there is amity among the communities. And you do everything in your power to prevent that amity. This is the hypocrisy of it all. In regard to the hon. fair Member for Uva-Paranagama (Mrs. Rajaratna), I do not say there was hypocrisy. She quite innocently and sincerely wanted certain things clarified. She said decentralization is a good thing. But how are we proposing to have this decentralization?

I was listening to the speech of the hon. Member for Dambadeniya (Mr. R. G. Senanayake). After admitting that he was for the Bandaranaike-Chelvanayakam Pact, after admitting that he said that because of the Bandaranaike-Chelvanayakam Pact the Hon. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike's name should be written in letters of gold in history, I do not know why he condemns this. Right throughout his speech of four hours odd, I did not hear one statement.—

ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා.

(තිரு. ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

May I give it to you now?

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරව උඩ්ලි සේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I am not going to allow even five minutes of further time—there was nothing. And practically every Member who spoke, and also the Rev. Madihe Pannaseeha, says that of course this does not give anything like the powers that were in the Bandaranaike-Chelvanayakam Pact, but this must not be done. Now the difference is this. As far as he is concerned, the difference is that I am bringing the proposal. That is the difference. And the reasons, I do not like to say.

ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා.

(තිரு. ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

What is the reason? Come out with the reason. This is a very strange situation. Last time he said

he is going to say what I did to his father, and now he speaks about my despicable past. I want to know it.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරව උඩ්ලි සේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

This is his despicable past that I referred to, his attitude on the Bandaranaike-Chelvanayakam Pact.

ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා.

(තිரு. ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

It will not take five minutes. I can give you the answer in five minutes.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරව උඩ්ලි සේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I have not given way.

ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා.

(තිரு. ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

Even those who signed the pact on the other side started saying that no amity was possible. We did not achieve amity by that pact and therefore the thing was torn up.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරව උඩ්ලි සේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Then another canard is that the Sinhala language and the language policies adopted by Governments of the past and this Government will be affected by this Bill. That, of course, is farthest from the truth. If you look at Clause 23, you will see that it reads:

“The business of a District Council shall be conducted in accordance with the language laws of Ceylon.”

Now, in the schedule we have stated what the language laws of Ceylon are. At page 34 of the White Paper the term “language laws” is defined as “the Official Language Act, No. 33 of 1956, read with the Tamil Language (Special Provisions) Act, No. 28 of 1958”. Both these Acts were passed by the Government of

කල් තැබීම :

දිස්ත්‍රික් සහ පිහිටුවීමේ සේවය

which the hon. Member for Dambadeniya was a member. It is true there are subsequent regulations. Now, what are these regulations?

I am reading from the regulations passed in 1966 under the Tamil Language (Special Provisions) Act :

"1. These regulations may be cited as the Tamil Language (Special Provisions) Regulation 1966.

2. Without prejudice to the operation of the Official Language Act, No. 33 of 1956, which declared the Sinhala language to be the one official language of Ceylon, the Tamil language shall also be used"—

It says, "without prejudice to the operation of the Official Language Act, No. 33 of 1956, which declared the Sinhala language to be the one official language of Ceylon, the Tamil language shall also be used."

—" (a) in the Northern and Eastern Provinces for the transaction of all Government and public business and the maintenance of public records, whether such business is conducted in or by a department or institution of the Government, a public corporation or a statutory institution."

What does this mean? Under the regulations framed, the transaction of all public business has to be in the Sinhala language in the first instance; Tamil shall also be used. This applies to statutory institutions too. District councils are institutions created by statute.

I read the priest's letter. There also the question has been raised about the language laws of the country. These points were also raised by the fair Member for Uva-Paranagama (Mrs. Rajaratna).

Next I come to the questions raised by the hon. Member for Dambadeniya (Mr. R. G. Senanayake), a good many of which I have dealt with already in the course of my remarks, namely, the questions as regards his welcoming the B-C Pact, as regards his saying that decentralization is good, and so on. Of course, as I said earlier, he said these must come later, after we have created conditions of amity.

Then he asks, how can we stop illicit immigration and smuggling? —[Interruption]. I am not laughing—he is laughing! He reads the draft Bill and asks, how are you going to stop illicit immigration and smuggling? I really must confess that the remark of the hon. Member for Jaffna (Mr. Ponnambalam) was quite apt. How does this Bill affect or encourage illicit immigration or smuggling? I do not know whether it was a common legal adviser who advised the priest who wrote me the letter as well as the hon. Member for Dambadeniya, because the priest also says the same thing. The priest brings out that argument in another way. Of the number of miles of shore around Ceylon, the Northern and Eastern Provinces embrace so many miles; therefore, illicit immigration will be rampant, he says.

The subjects of illicit immigration and smuggling and all such activities are completely under the purview of the Central Government and not affected one bit by this measure. These are the absurd arguments used in telling the people, "We do not want district councils." These are the arguments—distorted and far from the truth.

I have dealt with the legal interpretation he gave us about the vesting of land.

The next point he raised was about loans. The hon. Member for Jaffna dealt with this matter in the course of his speech. Clause 50 of the draft Bill reads thus :

"A District Council may, with the sanction of the Minister of Finance, borrow from the Government, or any bank, or other institution (whether corporate or unincorporate) in Ceylon such sums as may be required for any of the purposes of the Council."

Firstly, the borrowing can only be done with the sanction of the Minister of Finance, and any sum borrowed must be in Ceylon. The hon. Member for Dambadeniya says that they can borrow from Madras.

கரு. து. வி.:

தீர்மானம் பற்றி பதிலளித்தல்

அ. சீ. சேனநாயக்க மஹா.  
(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனநாயக்க)  
(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)  
I did not say that.—[Interruption].  
The sponsors of the Bill say that.

அ. சீ. சேனநாயக்க மஹா.  
(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனநாயக்க)  
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)  
Who?

அ. சீ. சேனநாயக்க மஹா.  
(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனநாயக்க)  
(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)  
The Federal Party.

அ. சீ. சேனநாயக்க மஹா.  
(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனநாயக்க)  
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)  
Now he is going on the advice of the Federal Party. He wants the advice of the Federal Party to interpret Clause 50!

அ. சீ. சேனநாயக்க மஹா.  
(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனநாயக்க)  
(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)  
It is as a result of pressure from the Federal Party that you are introducing this Bill. Nobody else wants this Bill. If it is the wish of the Federal Party that the Bill be placed before Parliament, surely their aims must be incorporated in it for them to support it. As admitted by the hon. Member for Jaffna these people plan to get money from Madras.

அ. சீ. சேனநாயக்க மஹா.  
(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)  
(Mr. Ponnambalam)  
Who told him that I admitted it? I repudiated it. He first fathered it on me. I said it came from other quarters and then pointed out the clause and said that all these loans can be raised in Ceylon and not outside.

அ. சீ. சேனநாயக்க மஹா.  
(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனநாயக்க)  
(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)  
That is not something that I am saying. The Federal Party feel that they can or they expect to get money from Madras.

அ. சீ. சேனநாயக்க மஹா.  
(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனநாயக்க)  
(The Hon. U. B. Wanninayake—Minister of Finance)  
That is not provided for in the Bill.—[Interruption].

அ. சீ. சேனநாயக்க மஹா.  
(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனநாயக்க)  
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)  
The hon. Member for Dambadeniya must please sit down. He has made a sufficient fool of himself. Let him not continue to do so.

How on earth—whether the Federal Party feels it or not—can they do so under Clause 50? That is my point. Probably, the hon. Member for Nallur (Dr. Naganathan) is having all kinds of dreams. I am only concerned with this draft Bill. How can you get loans from Madras under Clause 50?

அ. சீ. சேனநாயக்க மஹா.  
(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனநாயக்க)  
(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)  
I wish he would explain the Bill if there are any difficulties.—[Interruption].

அ. சீ. சேனநாயக்க மஹா.  
(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனநாயக்க)  
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)  
The hon. Member for Dambadeniya must please sit down. I am not giving way.

அ. சீ. சேனநாயக்க மஹா.  
(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனநாயக்க)  
(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)  
The point is this. He is having cheap jibes at me. Right through my speech, whatever I had to say on whatever doubts I had, I made no personal attack or personal jibes at the Hon. Prime Minister. If he wants that type of warfare he will get it next time.

அ. சீ. சேனநாயக்க மஹா.  
(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனநாயக்க)  
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)  
I am quite used to it.

கரு. து. செ. சே. சே. சே.

பே. து. செ. சே. சே. சே.

பே. து. செ. சே. சே. சே.

(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சே. சே. சே.)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

Up to now I have been very careful and given him the honour and credit due to a Prime Minister. But, every time I listened to him he has indulged in cheap jibes at me. I will let him have it when the time comes.

பே. து. செ. சே. சே. சே.

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சே. சே. சே.)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Does he think if I am afraid of him I will be here?

பே. து. செ. சே. சே. சே.

(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சே. சே. சே.)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

I am surprised that he is here. I thought would be in the bath room.

பே. து. செ. சே. சே. சே.

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சே. சே. சே.)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

The hon. Member must please sit down without wasting the time of the House. He has already taken 4½ hours.

பே. து. செ. சே. சே. சே.

(சுருக்கங்களின் உப அக்கிராசனர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Chairman of Committees)

The hon. Member is inviting me to send him out of the House. I do not like to do that.

பே. து. செ. சே. சே. சே.

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சே. சே. சே.)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Sir, when his arguments are exposed he cannot face it. In fact, he would have done better if he had walked out with the others.

Finally he asked, "Why do you not expand the powers of local bodies?" A very fine question. Why do you not, instead of having district councils, enlarge the powers of local bodies? That was the question he asked. Here, with all the powers of control and direction that would be retained by the Central Government, he thinks we are giving too much power to the district councils. He says that would be suitable only when amity

prevails. But I ask, once you give the local bodies power, where is the Central Government control? Which is the local body which has powers that are exercised under the direction and control of the Central Government? I like to ask that. Even a village committee, according to the powers that have been vested in it under the law, enjoys complete autonomy. That is why I said that, in certain respects, district councils have not got the powers of local bodies. What howl would have been raised if we expanded or enlarged the powers of local bodies!

Then I come to some of the points raised by the hon. Member for Point Pedro. I am sorry, I always keep making this mistake: I knew him first as the Member for Point Pedro, but of course he is now the Member for Jaffna (Mr. Ponnambalam).

He spoke of concurrent jurisdiction between local bodies and district councils.—[Interruption]. I would like to point out, and the hon. Member will agree with me, that even today there is concurrent jurisdiction between the Central Government and local bodies over certain subjects. For example, in respect of the opening of ayurvedic dispensaries and maternity and child welfare matters, there is today concurrent jurisdiction between the Central Government and local authorities. There is concurrent jurisdiction on a number of matters, and if the hon. Member wants I can give a list of those matters, although I gave a few examples earlier.

பே. து. செ. சே. சே. சே.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

The moment the Central Government starts one of these institutions it gets automatically vested in the local authority.

பே. து. செ. சே. சே. சே.

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சே. சே. சே.)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

No.

கல் துறை.

தீர்மானம் எடுக்கப்படுகிறது.

பேர்தலைவர் அவர்கள்.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

Correct me if I am wrong. I do not know of a single instance where an institution like a maternity home or a cottage hospital is established by the Central Government within the jurisdiction of a local authority and is then controlled by the Central Government. If established by the Central Government it normally vests in the local authority.

அ. டி. டி. டி. டி.

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

No. You can ask any member of a municipal council or urban council. It does not happen.

Then the hon. Member in the course of his speech said that he had no objection to expanding the powers of local government institutions.

பேர்தலைவர் அவர்கள்.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

According to your Throne Speech.

அ. டி. டி. டி. டி.

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

What would have been the response from the country, I am asking you?

பேர்தலைவர் அவர்கள்.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

Local bodies would have liked it.

அ. டி. டி. டி. டி.

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

But, in the circumstances, seeing what is happening around, do you think that step could have been contemplated? Perhaps the hon. Member for Dambadeniya (Mr. R. G. Senanayake) would have supported it.

அ. ம. தீர்மானம்

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

He would have opposed it.

அ. டி. டி. டி. டி.

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

The other point he made was that there is no popular participation as such by the step we are taking. It is true that there are no direct or indirect elections. That I grant to the hon. Member for Jaffna. Now we have parliamentary elections, village committee elections, municipal council elections and so on, and supposing we are to have district council elections also, can the country take all these numerous elections one after the other? That is the very strong reason that guided us in taking elected people. One cannot say that they are completely removed from contact with the people. Those who are *exofficio* members are, on the one hand, parliamentarians who have been elected by the people and therefore they are not divorced from the feelings and the aspirations of the people; on the other, the chairmen of the local bodies, also *exofficio* members, are in a similar group. So, avoiding the difficulties of having repeated elections, this is an endeavour to achieve indirectly a certain degree of participation of people who are in touch with popular aspirations.

Now, the hon. Member also posed a question about the food drive and said that he knows the answer. I do not know why he asked me that question, knowing the answer to it.

I would like now to deal with the subject of ministerial powers and general control. Clauses 74, 75, 76, 77 and 78 deal with those powers. Clause 74 says:

"Every District Council shall function under the general direction and control of the Government. The appropriate Minister may, from time to time, issue general or special directions to the Commissioner and it shall be the duty of the Commissioner to carry out such directions, and the Council shall be bound to adopt such

කලි තැබීම:

action as may be necessary to comply with such directions, notwithstanding anything in any other provisions of this Act."

### Clause 75 :

"Whenever the Minister considers it necessary in the public interest, he may, by Order published in the *Gazette*, amend the Schedule to this Act by the omission therefrom of any subject specified therein with the object of removing such subject from the purview and control of District Councils. Such Order shall come into force on the date of such publication, or on such later date as may be specified therein, and shall, on its so coming into force, be deemed to be as valid and effectual as though it were herein enacted, until such Order is rescinded."

Now, Mr. Deputy Chairman, even in the case of the limited powers that are transferred—the subjects are listed in the schedule—at any time the Minister can, in the public interest, take over any of those functions. We have a certain organizational set-up already for food production; we have people's participation today, almost at the lowest level, in food production. Thanks to the organization and the time spent by the Ministry and the Minister, we have got down to the village level in organizing food production through cultivation committees participating in the planning and through multi-purpose co-operatives. I do not want that disturbed at this moment. It is working at full speed and is delivering the goods. So, a transition there is not advisable, and I have said, and I say now, that anything to do with food production will, under Clause 75, be taken away from the purview of district councils.

Before I get on to the other points, I want to refer to a letter which has been written to me and which has appeared in the "Ceylon Daily News" of today. I intend sending a reply to it.

As an alternative to the proposed district councils, the Maha Nayake Thero, in his letter has suggested that "kachcheries be termed district council offices and that the government agents be designated presidents

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

of district councils." He also suggests that "the representatives to the district councils under the proposed legislation should be formed into advisory bodies which can assist the presidents of district councils."

A very good suggestion undoubtedly, but that is what we have today under the system of district co-ordinating committees. That is what the Venerable Priest, quite innocently and quite sincerely, has suggested we should do.

We have the district co-ordinating committee, of which the government agent is the chairman. We have the district agricultural committee, of which the government agent is the chairman. They are advisory bodies; they are advisory to the central government. Then, what this suggestion means is that we take no step at all!

He goes on to speak about the Sinhalese race and various things. And, of course, he says, in the letter that these bodies have ten times less power than the regional councils contemplated in the Bandaranaike-Chelvanayakam Pact. And then, in regard to correspondence he says:

"It must be clearly remembered that apart from the correspondence with the Central Government, the people in the North and East are legally entitled to do their business in Tamil."

Correspondence is governed by the Official Language Act. Correspondence with the Central Government must necessarily be in the Official Language. Of course, the records have to be kept in Sinhalese and also in Tamil. Those are the special language laws of the country.

Then the priest says that it is unfortunate that we have had to have these discussions with barricades. I have given the reason for it earlier. It is unfortunate that some people—not this priest of course—did not want a free discussion in this place. They want outside influence to prevail and to influence Members.

කල් තාවිම :

දිස්ත්‍රික් සහ පිහිටුවීමේ 'යෝජනා

[ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක]

Then he talks about the beaches of Lanka. I suppose he was suffering from the same misconception that the hon. Member for Dambadeniya suffers from. The Venerable Priest says :

"The beaches of Lanka are 800 miles in extent; out of which, 500 miles come within the DC's of the North and East. Traffic in illicit immigrants and contraband is predominant in these areas. Hence these areas will double their strength both in population and in the economic sphere. The fruits of a Federal State will then be clear to see."

In regard to the control of illicit immigration and contraband goods, district councils have no power whatsoever. The army is there now along the coast. District councils or no district councils, the army will continue to be there.

අ. හ. 6.30

කාරකසභා නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමා

(குழுக்களின் உப அக்கிராசனர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Chairman of Committees)

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

අනතුරුව කාරකසභා නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමා

இலங்கையின் துணை உறுப்பினர் நியோජ்‍ය கருவியாக  
இலங்கையின் துணை உறுப்பினர்.

அதன்பிறகு, குழுக்களின் உப அக்கிராசனர் அவர்கள் அக்கிராசனத்தினின்று நீங்கவே, உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள் தலைமை தாங்கினார்கள்.

Whereupon MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES left the Chair, and MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. Member for Jaffna (Mr. Ponnambalam) wanted to know why we want to have this in a hurry. There is no hurry. In fact, I am glad he used the word "hurry". I stressed this fact in my earlier speech. There is no hurry about a subject that is 40 years old. This started 40 years ago in 1928. Time and again it was taken up. In our case, as a Government we have mentioned this matter in three Throne Speeches—in 1965, 1966 and 1967—and, what is more, we

have brought a White Paper. We have brought draft legislation before you. There is no hurry. We have not tried to smuggle it in, nor are we in a desperate hurry about it. We have spent a lot of time over it. The hon. Member himself is aware of the number of hours I spent answering his questions at the conference. We went on till midnight practically every day.

As I stated, all along there was a feeling that a certain measure of decentralization was necessary. This feeling prevailed right along. It was recommended by the Donoughmore Commissioners; it was discussed in the State Council; the State Council accepted a motion by Mr. R. S. S. Gunawardena and Mr. Bandaranaike himself put forward the idea in 1947. Then we have the Choksy Report recommending the idea. Then, of course, there was the Bandaranaike-Chelvanayakam Pact which included regional councils.

That is the point I wish to stress. The fair Leader of the Opposition says, "Well, Mr. Bandaranaike brought a proposal to establish regional councils. It was opposed. He tore it up and now we have nothing more to do with it." That is not correct. That is absolutely and totally false, to say the least. They had it in two Throne Speeches—before the Coalition was formed in the 1963 Throne Speech, and in the 1964 Throne Speech after the Coalition was formed. And there it was not a question of district councils under the direction and control of the central government. There was nothing to that effect.

Then there was the Mahatantila Committee which was appointed when they were the Government. There was a report of that committee and also a draft Bill which gave much more powers than the proposed District Councils Bill, powers never contemplated in this Bill. There were

கல் வலிம:

minutes of meetings where the Minister handling the subject had deferred the discussions on the matter. So, the idea of decentralization was never given up. It was always there; it continued to be there, and practically every party was in favour of decentralization of power. At the moment the contention is that every party is against this idea. I do not know whether the hon. Member for Jaffna considers himself an exception to that.

பொன்னம்பலம் மலர்.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

I was opposed to regional councils.

சென்னை மலர்

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

He opposed regional councils but he was for decentralization.

பொன்னம்பலம் மலர்.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

I was for extension of local government—

சென்னை மலர்

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

And I gave my reply to it. That also is a form of decentralization.

பொன்னம்பலம் மலர்.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

That is another matter.

சென்னை மலர்

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

So, practically every party was for decentralization. There was an occasion when the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) asked the question, "When are you going to bring in the District Councils Bill?" When I asked him, "Are you for it" as late as 1966, he

சென்னை மலர்

said, "I am a hundred per cent for it. When are you going to replace the colonial kachcheri system?" So, what I contend is this: there is no party that was against decentralization. The U. L. F. Common Programme was quoted by the hon Member for Vaddukkoddai yesterday. You will see therefore that every party is for decentralization.

Various weapons have been used at various times to be labour the Government. They thought that with the rice cut the end had come. It had not. Like that, every opportunity was made use of. I am not surprised then that they could not face this Debate because of their past. They cannot reply about their past on this very subject.

I should say in fairness to the Federal Party that this is not what they want. This is nothing like what they want. The hon. Member for Jaffna himself will bear testimony.

பொன்னம்பலம் மலர்.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

I say, I do.

சென்னை மலர்

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Naturally they wanted very much more powers. There had to be a certain amount of compromise in the matter. That is how we arrived at this draft Bill ultimately. There must have been umpteen drafts at various times. I was rather amused that some sections of the press got hold of a draft and said, "This is the District Councils Bill" without realizing that within a couple of days that draft was amended. Since they said that that was a great secret they revealed, we have had about 25 drafts.

In a matter like this there was discussion between the Federal Party and myself; there was discussion between the leaders of parties that formed the National Government and myself along with some of my Ministers; there was discussion in the Cabinet. At all these stages various amendments were made. The

[ගරු ඩිච්ලි සේනානායක]

hon. Member for Nikaweratiya (Mr. M. Tennakoon) also welcomed decentralization. Is that correct? How does he want decentralization? Does he want local bodies to have more powers?

එම්. තෙනකෝන් මය.

(திரு. எம். தென்னக்கோன்)

(Mr. M. Tennakoon)

Bring about national unity.

ගරු ඩිච්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

First bring about national unity and then decentralize? And, in the meantime, everything is being done by certain people to stop the achievement of national unity.

එම්. තෙනකෝන් මය.

(திரு. எம். தென்னக்கோன்)

(Mr. M. Tennakoon)

I have not done that.

ගරු ඩිච්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I accept that. I am not making any charge against the hon. Member.

May this country be saved from those people who say, "First bring about national unity; then decentralization is good," and at the same time do everything possible to prevent unity.

That is all I wish to say with regard to that aspect. Their position is that we should bring about national unity first and then think of decentralization. Their whole argument is absurd.

They say that terrible powers are being given to the district councils, and if they suddenly take it into their heads to use the powers, they can do the most diabolical things, some of which were referred to. Fortunately, those things are not possible.

So the crux of the whole question is this. Are you for some measure of decentralization? If you are, there are various ways, I grant. You can do it by extending central government activities in this fashion. The hon. Member for Jaffna (Mr. Ponnambalam) calls this "hybrid abortion." Now the child, the genuine child he suggests is the extension of the powers of local government bodies.

As I said, there are different ways of decentralizing. One way of doing it is the method we have chosen, retaining the power to the central government not only to give general and special directions, but to dissolve these bodies when the need arises, and even to remove certain subjects that are delegated in the schedule. That is all.

Therefore, on the one hand, I would like hon. Members not to be taken in by these mischievous false prophets. Everybody here has intelligence. This is not a very intricate proposal, and the White Paper can be read in a matter of half an hour. I ask hon. Members to consider whether any of the points raised against this proposal can hold water. On the other hand, I would like them to consider seriously the question whether some measure of decentralization is desirable, and, in the circumstances of the country today, whether this is not the best compromise we can arrive at. I ask hon. Members to look at this proposal in that light, and I am confident that the doubts which some of them have will then be cleared.

අ. හ. 646

විමලා කන්නන්ගර මය. (සෞඛ්‍ය ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්)

(திருமதி விமலா கன்னங்கர—சுகாதார அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி)

(Mrs. Wimala Kannangara—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health)

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, දවස් කීපයක්ම විවාද වූ මේ බවල පත්‍රිකාවෙන් විස්තර කරන කාර්යයෙහි වටිනාකම හා ශ්‍රේෂ්ඨත්වය ගැන 1928 සිටම ඇති වූ

කල් කෑම:

නොයෙකුත් ආණ්ඩු හා දේශපාලන නායකයින් නොයෙක් අන්දමින් කරුණු ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙනවා. ඒ කරුණු දීර්ඝ වශයෙන් සඳහන් කිරීමට මා බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ නැහැ. එහෙත් සංකේෂ වශයෙන් දක්වන්නට අදහස් කරනවා. 1924 දී, එනම් යටත් විජිත පාලන යුගයේදී, ගම් සභා ක්‍රමය හා 1936 දී සුළු නගර සභා හා නගර සභා ක්‍රම ඇති කර අද දක්වාමත් ඒවා පවත්වාගෙන යනවා. 1928දී ඇති කළ ඩොනමෝර් කොමිෂන් සභාවෙන් ප්‍රාදේශීය බල මණ්ඩල ඇති කිරීමට නිර්දේශ කර තිබෙනවා. ඒ සම්බන්ධව 1940 දී රාජ්‍ය මන්ත්‍රණ සභාවේ යෝජනාවකුත් ගෙනා විත් තිබෙනවා. එහෙත් යුද්ධය ආදී යම් යම් හේතූන් නිසා එය ක්‍රියාවේ යෙදුණේ නැහැ. ඊට පසුව සර් ජෝන් කොතලාවල අගමැති වශයෙන් සිටියදී —1955 දී—දිසා සභා සම්බන්ධව වොක්ස් කොමිෂන් සභාව පත් කළා. ඒ කොමිෂම මගින් සෑම ගම් සභාවකටම ප්‍රශ්න මාලාවක් යවා අදහස් ලබාගෙන වාර්තාවක් සකස් කළා. ඒ කාලයේ කාගලු දිස්ත්‍රික්කයේ සිටි ගම් සභාවන්වරුන් 8 දෙනෙක්ම අද මේ ගරු සභාවේ මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් වශයෙන් සිටිනවා. මාවනැල්ලේ මන්ත්‍රීතුමාත් යටියන්තොට මන්ත්‍රීතුමාත් ගම්සභාපති කෙනෙක් වශයෙන් සිටින මමත් සමසමාජ පක්ෂයේ ගම් සභාපති කෙනෙක් වශයෙන් සිටි බස්නායක මහතාත් කතාබස් කර ඒ ගැන අපේ අදහස් අපි ඉදිරිපත් කළා පමණක් නොවෙයි, වොක්ස් කොමිෂන් සභාව ඉදිරියට ගොස් සාක්ෂිත් දුන්නා. දිවංගත එස්. ඩබ්ලිව්. ආර්. සී. බණ්ඩාරනායක අගමැතිතුමාත් දේශපාලන ජීවිතය ඇරඹුවේ ගම් සභාපති කෙනෙක් වශයෙන් අත්තන ගල්ලෙන්. නොයෙකුත් රටවලට ගොස් මොන මොන උපාධි ගත්තත් ගම්සභාපති කෙනෙක් වශයෙන් එතුමා ගම්බද අය ඇසුරට ගොස් ඔවුන්ගේ අදහස් උදහස් සිතූම් පැතුම් හොඳින් අවබෝධ කරගෙන කටයුතු කළ නිසා වොක්ස් කොමිෂන් සභාවේ නිර්දේශ අනුව කච්චේරි ක්‍රමය අහෝසි කොට ඒ වෙනුවට දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා හා ප්‍රාදේශීය බල මණ්ඩල ඇති කිරීමට ක්‍රියා කළා. එහෙත් ඊට ලඟුව දේශපාලන

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

නාය එයට ඇතුළු වී බණ්ඩාරනායක-වෙල්වනායගම් ගිවිසුම ඇති වී ඒ මගින් රටට යම් භානිකර පාවාදීමක් ඇති වන්නට ගිය අවස්ථාවේදී එම පාවාදීමට විරුද්ධව එක් සත් ජාතික පක්ෂය ගෙනගිය බලවේගය නිසාත් ගරුතර සංඝයාවහන්සේලා ගත් උත්සාහය නිසාත් රටට භානිදායක වූ ඒ රටසභා ක්‍රමය ඇතිකිරීම වළක්වන්නට යෙදුණා. ඒ අවස්ථාවේ බණ්ඩාරනායක-වෙල්වනායගම් ගිවිසුමට විරුද්ධ වූ කෙනෙක් වශයෙනුත්, ගම්සභාපති කෙනෙක් වශයෙනුත්, පළාත් පාලනයේ දියුණුව ගැන කටයුතු කරන කෙනෙක් වශයෙනුත්, ගරු අගමැතිතුමාගේ කථාවෙන් පසුව හෝ පළපුරුද්ද අනුව මේ ගැන කරුණු කීපයක් සඳහන් කරන්නට මා අදහස් කළා. එසේ වුවත් වැඩි කැලවේලාවක් ගැනීමට මා බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ නැහැ.

බණ්ඩාරනායක-වෙල්වනායගම් ගිවිසුම යටතේ රට සභා ඇති කිරීමට විරුද්ධව එදා ගෙනගිය ඒ ව්‍යාපාරය නිසා පළාත් පාලන ආයතන මගින් සතුව ප්‍රකාශ කරන ලද ඒ පනත අහෝසි වුණා. ඊට පසුවත් සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මැතිනියගේ ආණ්ඩුව කාලයේදීත් මේ අදහස මතු වුණා. ඒ අනුව එවකට පළාත් පාලන කොමසාරිස් වශයෙන් කටයුතු කළ මහතත්තිල මහතාගේ ප්‍රධානත්වයෙන් කොමිෂන් සභාවක් ඇති කර වාර්තාවක් ලබා ගත්තා. මහජන නියෝජිතයන් මගින් පාලනය වන ගම් සභා, සුළු නගර සභා, නගර සභා ඇතත්, අවුරුදු පහකට වරක් සර්වජන ඡන්ද බලයෙන් මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් පත් වෙතත්, මහජන උරුමයන් හරියාකාරව ලබා ගැනීමට නම්, මහජන මතය නියම විධියට ක්‍රියාත්මක වීමට නම්, වර්තමාන ආණ්ඩු ක්‍රමය යටතේ 40 අවුරුද්දක් තිස්සේ ක්‍රියාත්මක වෙමින් පවතින, අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී යුගයේ ලක්ෂණ විදහා පාන අන්තිම සංකේතය, යල් පැනපු කච්චේරි ක්‍රමය, අහෝසි කළ යුතු බව හැම ආණ්ඩුවක්ම පාහේ පිළිගෙන තිබෙන බව අපට හොඳින්ම පෙනෙනවා. වොක්ස් කොමිෂන් සභා වාර්තාවෙනුත්, මා ඉහත සඳහන් කළ මහතත්තිල වාර්තාවෙනුත් උපදෙස් දී ඇත්තේ, පළාත් පාලන ආයතනවලට මීට වඩා බලතල පවරන හැටියටයි. එදා ඇති කිරීමට බලාපො

කල් තැබීම:

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

[විමලා කන්නන්ගර මිය.]

රොත්තු වුණු දිසා සභාවල බලතල පිළිබඳව ධවල පත්‍රිකාවේ 5 වැනි පිටුවේ මෙසේ සඳහන් වෙනවා:

“ප්‍රදේශීය බල මණ්ඩල කෙරෙහි ඇතැම් පරිසාරන බලතල පාවිච්චි කිරීම හා ඒවා සම්බන්ධ යෙන් ඇමතිවරයා සතු බලතල පාවිච්චි කිරීම පිළිබඳව ඇමතිවරයාට උපදෙස් දීමද දිසා සභාව කට කළ හැකිව තිබිණි.”

ඒ කියන්නේ “සුප්‍රවේශය පවර්ස්” දීමයි.

මේ විධියට කවිචේරි ක්‍රමය මගින් අපේ සංවර්ධන වැඩ පිළිවෙළ වේගවත්ව කර ගෙන යන්නට බැරි නිසා ඒ සම්බන්ධ යෙන් යම් වෙනසක් ඇති කිරීම පිළිබඳවයි, ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක රජය මගින් මේ ධවලපත්‍රිකාව ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙන්නේ. යෝජිත දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා කෙටුම්පතක්ද මේ ධවල පත්‍රිකාවේ තිබෙනවා. එහි වගන්ති එකින් එක ගෙන බැලුවොත්, ඒවායේ වටිනාකම අවබෝධ වෙනවා ඇති. ඒ සමගම මතක් කරන්නට කැමතියි, ලොහොතකට කලින් කළා කළ අගමැතිතුමා, මහජන මතය අනුව මෙහි යම් යම් සංශෝධන කරන්නට වුණත් කැමති යයි ප්‍රකාශ කළ බව. මේ ධවල පත්‍රිකාව බලන අප කාටත් පැහැදිලි වෙනවා, යල් පැනපු කවිචේරි ක්‍රමය වෙනස් කොට ඒ වෙනුවට ඊට වඩා සුදුසු වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් ඇති කිරීම මෙහි මූලික පරමාර්ථය බව. ඒ වෙනුවෙන් 40 අවුරුද්දක් තුළ මහජන මන්ත්‍රණ සභා වන්නි සටන් ගෙන ගොස් තිබෙනවා. එහෙත් ඒ බව අමතක කොට, ජාති හේදයක් ඇදගෙන “පෙඩරල් පක්ෂයේ ඉල්ලීම උඩ දිසා සභා ගෙනනවා” යනුවෙන් බොරු විත්‍රයක් මවා පාමින් දේශපාලන වාසි තකා යම් පිරිසක් කටයුතු කරනවා නම්, එය මහජනයාටත් රටටත් කරන බලගතු අපරාධයක් බව කියන්න කැමතියි. ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම රජය කරන්නට යන්නේ, මහජන යහපත සැලසීමක්.

ඒ අය භාෂා ප්‍රශ්නය ගැනත් බොරුවට කැගෙනවා. එහෙත් දිසා සභාවල කටයුතු රටේ භාෂා නීතිවලට, එනම් 1956 එනම් 1956 අංක 33 දරන රාජ්‍ය භාෂා පනතට හා 1958 අංක 28 දරන දෙමළ භාෂා විශේෂ විධි විධාන පනතට අනුකූලව කරගෙන යාමටයි.

බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ. හොඳයි ගම් සභා ආඥා පනතේ 198 වැනි පරිච්ඡේදයේ, 35 වැනි අංකය බලමු:

“සෑම ගම් සභාවකම වැඩ කටයුතු හැකි තරම් දුරට කාර්ය සභාව පිහිටුවා තිබෙන ගම් ප්‍රදේශයේ ප්‍රචලිතව පවත්න භාෂාවෙන් කරගෙන යා යුතුයි”

ඒ කියන්නේ, යාපනේ ප්‍රදේශයේ ගම් සභාවක නම් කටයුතු කරගෙන යා යුත්තේ, ඒ ප්‍රදේශයේ ප්‍රචලිතව පවත්නා භාෂාව—වැඩි දෙනාගේ භාෂාව—වන දෙමළෙන් බවයි. උතුරු නැගෙනහිර පළාත් වල දෙමළෙන් වැඩ කළ හැකියි. මෙම ධවල පත්‍රිකාව මගින් පෙනෙන පරිදි රජයේ භාෂාවෙන් වාර්තා යනාදිය තබන්නට ඕනෑ. ඒවායේ පිටපත් දෙමළෙන් තැබිය යුතුයි. ඒ උදවියට කළා කිරීමේ නිදහස තිබෙනවා. මේ හේතුකොටගෙන සිංහල භාෂාවට නොයෙකුත් අන්දමේ හානි සිදු වෙනවායයි මින් පිටස්තර ස්ථානවලදී කැකෝ ගසන ඇතැම් ජනනායකයන් ගෙන් මා අහන්නට කැමතියි, මේ අනුව බලන විට එවැන්නක් සිදුවිය හැකිද කියා.

සිංහල ජනතාවට සහ මුස්ලිම් වැනි සුළු ජාතීන්ට උතුරේ සහ නැගෙනහිරේ ගොස් පදිංචි වන්නට ලැබේවිය කියා රේපබ්ලික් පක්ෂය සිටින තුරු කවදාවත් විශ්වාස කරන්නට බැරි බවත්, මෙම පනත නිසා ඒ අන්දමේ නොයෙකුත් හානි සිදු වේයයි සැක පහළ වන බවත් උච්ච-පරණගම ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමිය (කුසුමා රාජරත්න මිය.) ප්‍රකාශ කරන්නට යෙදුණා. එතුමිය මේ වචනම නොකිවත්, එවැනි අදහසක් දුන් බව අප දන්නවා. මා මේ පිළිබඳව කළා කරන්නට බලාපොරොත්තුවෙන් සිටියේ ගරු අගමැතිතුමා සභාවෙන් පිටත් වන්නට පුළුමයි. එතුමා දැන් මෙහි නැතත් වාර්තාගත වීම සඳහා මා එම කාරණය සඳහන් කරනවා.

ඉඩම් සංවර්ධන ආඥා පනත යටතේ ඒ ඒ ඡන්දදායක කොට්ඨාශවලට යම් යම් බලතල ලැබී තිබෙනවා. උච්ච-පරණගම ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමිය ගම් පුළුල් කිරීමේ ආඥා පනත යනුවෙන් එය සඳහන් කළේ වැරදි මකින් වන්නට ඇති. කෙසේ වෙතත්, ගම් පුළුල් කිරීමය කියන්නේ කුමක්ද යන්න මේ අවස්ථාවේදී හොඳින් පැහැදිලි කර දිය

කල් තැබීම :

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

යුතුව තිබෙනවා. පාවාදීමක් ගැන කියමින් අද කැගසන්නේ ඔය භාෂා ප්‍රශ්නයට සහ ඉඩම් බෙදා දීමේ ප්‍රශ්නයට විරුද්ධවයි. භාෂාව පිළිබඳව කැගසන දේවල් බොරු බව මා කලින් ඉදිරිපත් කළ අදහස්වලට අනුව පෙනී යනවා.

ගම් පුළුල් කිරීමය කියන්නේ කුමක්ද? මේ ක්‍රමය යටතේ බෙදා දෙන්නට ගලී ගමුව ආසනයේ යටිතල වත්තෙන් අක් කර සියයක් ගන්නවා. තවත් ස්ථානය කින් අක්කර 30 ක් ගන්නවා. එසේ කරන්නේ කුමන අරමුණක් මුල් කරගෙනද? අප දන්නවා අක්කර තුන හතරක පමණ බිම් ප්‍රමාණයක ගෙවල් සියයක් පමණ හදාගෙන මනුස්ස අයිතිවාසිකම් කිසිවක් නොලැබ ජීවත් වන උදවිය ගැන. මිනිස් අයිතිය යනුවෙන් අප හඳුන්වන්නේ කුමක්ද? උළු වහලක් සහිතව හොඳට කාමරයක් හදාගෙන උයාගෙන කන්නට හොඳ කුස්සියක් හදාගෙන ලිදක් හා වැසි කිළියක් ඇතුළු මනුස්සයින් වාගේ ජීවත් වන්නට අවස්ථාව ලබා ගැනීමයි අප එයින් සාමාන්‍ය අන්දමකට අදහස් කරන්නේ. එවැනි සාමාන්‍ය මිනිස් අයිතියක් පවා නැතුව දුක් විඳින අය ගැන අප දන්නවා. වැස්සට තෙමෙන දිරව්ව වහල සහිත වරිවිචි ගෙවලට වී වැසිකිළියක් පවා නැතුව ජීවත් වන උදවිය ගැන අප දන්නවා. කෙම්පැතිකාරයන්ට නැති නම් වෙනත් ධනවත් ඉඩම් හිමියන්ට අයිති අක්කර භාර පන්සියයේ ඉඩම්වලින් අක් කර පණහක් සියයක් දෙසියක් තරම් ලබා ගෙන එක් පවුලකට ඉන් අක්කර කාල බැගින් හෝ වෙන් කර ඒවායේ පදිංචියට ගෙවල් හා වැසිකිළි සකස්කොට දී පවුල් හතර පහකට හෝ එක ලිදක් බැගින්වත් තනා දී එවැනි උදවිය පදිංචි කරවීමට ක්‍රියා කිරීම වරදක් හැටියට සඳහන් කරන්නට අමාරුයි. ඔවුන්ට එසේ පදිංචි වන්නට ඉඩකඩ සලස්වා දීම ගැන කිසිවකු විරුද්ධ නොවෙනවා ඇති. මේ ආකාරයට මනුස්ස අයිතිවාසිකම් නැතුව ඒ මිනිසුන්ට ජීවත් වන්නට ඉඩ දෙන්නට අප බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ නැහැ. එම වැඩ පිළිවෙළ නීතිගත වී තිබෙන දෙයක්. ඊට විරුද්ධ වන්නට වුවමනාවක් ඇත්තේ නැහැ. මගේ අදහස ඒකයි.

එහෙත් දැන් තිබෙන ප්‍රශ්නය නම් ජනපද පිළිබඳවයි. ජනපද ප්‍රශ්නය තිබෙන්නේ ඉඩම් ඇමතිතුමා අතේයි. ජනපද ප්‍රශ්නය මෙම බවල පත්‍රයට හෝ යෝජිත දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පනතට හෝ ඇතුළත් වී නැහැ. උතුරේ සහ නැගෙනහිර පළාත්වල ඉඩම් බෙදා දෙන විට, එම පළාත්වල ජනපද ව්‍යාපාර ඇති කරන විට, රාජ්‍යාංගනය, අම්පාරේ, පදවිය, වැනි ස්ථානවල සිංහල සහ වෙනත් සුළු ජාතීන්ටත් ඊට අවස්ථාව ලබා දිය යුතුයි. අක්කර තුන හතර ලබා ගෙන ගම් පුළුල් කිරීමේ වැඩ පිළිවෙළ යටතේ අක්කර කාලේ බාගයේ ප්‍රමාණයන් වෙන් කර දෙන විට ලමුන් හත් අට දෙනා සිටින එවැනි පවුල්වල අයටත් ඉඩක් දිය යුතුයි. අපට විශේෂයෙන් දැන ගන්නට වුවමනා කරුණ එයයි. මුළු ලංකාවේම සිටින ජන ගහණය දස ලක්ෂ 12 යි. එයින් මා දන්නා හැටියට, ද්‍රවිඩ ආදී වූ සුළු ජනතාව දස ලක්ෂ 3 කට වඩා නැහැ. මේ අදහස වැරදි නම් යම් කෙනෙකුට එය නිවැරදි කරන්නට පුළුවනි. අප මහා ජාතිය වශයෙන් සුළු ජාතීන්ගේ අයිතිවාසිකම් ආරක්ෂා කරන ගමන්ම ගම් පුළුල් කිරීමේ ක්‍රමයේදී රටේ ඕනෑම තැනක ගොස් පදිංචි වීමේ අවසරය මහා ජාතියට තිබිය යුතුයි. උතුරු නැගෙනහිර පළාත්වල ද්‍රවිඩ ජනතාවගේ අයිතිවාසිකම් නැති වී, ඒ අය ජනපදවලට ගොස් පදිංචි වුණොත් ඉතිරි වන ඉඩම් ප්‍රමාණය අනෙක් ජනතාවට ඇද්ද? මගේ තර්කය අන්න ඒකයි. එපමණයි තිබෙන බය. මෙහි දැක්වෙන අනෙක් කරුණු ගැන බිය විමට කිසිම හේතුවක් නැහැ.

රාජ්‍ය භාෂාව වශයෙන් සිංහල භාෂාවට ලැබෙන බලතල මෙහි සඳහන් වී තිබෙනවා. දිස්ත්‍රික් සභාවල පාලන කටයුතු රාජ්‍ය භාෂාවෙන් කළ යුතු බව වාර්තාගත වී අවසානයයි. දැනට තිබෙන ගම්සභා ආඥා පණතෙන් දී තිබෙන බලතලවලටත් වැඩි බලතල මෙම බවල පත්‍රිකාව අනුව සිංහල භාෂාවට ලැබී තිබෙනවා. ජනපද ව්‍යාපාරය ගැන පැහැදිලි පිළිතුරක් ලැබුණොත්, මේ ගැන බිය විමට වෙන කිසිම හේතුවක් නැහැ. දස ලක්ෂ 3 ක් පමණ සුළු ජනතාව ඔවුන්ගේ අයිතිවාසිකම් අනුව ජීවත් වීම සඳහා එම අයිතිවාසිකම් ඉල්ලා සිටින අයිතිවාසිකම්, ඒවා දන්නොත් අප ඉවරයි.

[විමලා කන්නන්ගර මිය.]  
රටෙන් කැලලක් කඩාගෙන ඔවුන් සදහටම වෙනම රජයක් ඇති කර ගන්නවා, යනුවෙන් අද බොහෝ දෙනා කියන හැටියට බිය විමට හේතුවක් නැහැ. අවුරුදු 40 ක් තැස්සේ තිබෙන මේ ප්‍රශ්නය සම්බන්ධයෙන් සටන් කළ අයගෙන් බොහෝ දෙනෙක් අද ජීවතුන් අතරත් නැහැ. ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨය සමත් වුණු, උපාධි ලබා ගත් අපේ තරුණයන් ලිපිකරු සේවය වැනි රැකියාවලටම යැවීම සදහා ඇති කරන ලද මේ අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී පාලන ක්‍රමය වෙනස් කොට දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා මගින් පාලන ක්‍රමය විධිමත් කිරීමයි මෙයින් බලාපොරොත්තුවන්නේ. අද ලෝකයේ බොහෝ රටවල් පරමාණු යුගය පසු කොට දැන් අභ්‍යවකාශ යුගයටත් පැමිණ සිටිනවා. එංගලන්තයේ සිට ලංකාවට වරුවකින් ඒමට පුළුවන් තරම් වේගවත් ජෙට් යානා අද නිපදවා තිබෙනවා. එසේ තිබියදී අප තවමත් බර කරන්න යුගයේ සිට පැවත එන කඩිවේරි ක්‍රමය අලලාගෙන සිටිනවා. ඒ ක්‍රමය දැන් දිරාපත් වෙලා; ක්‍රියා විරහිත වෙලා; අඩ පණ වෙලා. ඒ ක්‍රමය අනුව රටේ සංවර්ධනයක් ඇති කරන්නට බැ; රැකිරක්ෂා ප්‍රශ්නය විසදන්නට බැ; රට දියුණුව කරා ගෙන යන්නට බැ. අප අවුරුද්දක් පාසා මෙම ගරු සභාවේදී අය වැය ලේඛනයෙන් මුදල් වෙන් කර ගන්නවා යම් යම් කටයුතු සදහා. එම කටයුතු කර ගන්නට අප කඩිවේරියකට ගිය විට, අපට දැනගන්නට ලැබෙන්නේ, ඒ පිළිබඳව සැලැස්මක් නැති තිසා එය කරන්නට බැ, යනාදී කරුණුයි. ඒ තිසා අපට සිදු වන්නේ, පිං පඩියක් හෝ වැසිකිළියක් හෝ කුඩා ඉඩම් කැබැල්ලක් හෝ වැනි සුළු දෙයක් වෙනුවෙන්, පොත්පත් කිහිල්ලේ ගසාගෙන කඩිවේරියක් ගානේ ඇවිදිමින් කාලය ගත කරන්නටයි. එවැනි කරදර සිදුවන්නේ, මේ දිරව්ව කඩිවේරි ක්‍රමයේ වරද තිසායි. තවදුරටත් අප මේ දිරව්ව ලණුව අල්ලා ගෙන නොසිට හැකි තරම් ඉක්මනින් එය අතහැර දමන්නට ඕනැ. අද ඒ කටයුත්ත කරන්නට බාර ගෙන සිටින්නේ අපට හොඳ හැටි විශ්වාසය තබන්නට පුළුවන් අගමැති කෙනෙකුයි.

1960 දී අප ජයග්‍රහණයක් කොට මෙම ගරු සභාවට පැමිණි නමුත් අපට ලැබුණේ ආසන 50 යි. ඊළඟ වාරයේදීත් එයම සිදු වුණු තිසා ආණ්ඩුවක් පිහිටුවා එය පවත්වාගෙන යාමට ශක්තියක් ලැබුණේ නැහැ. ඒ අවස්ථාවේදී අපට පෙබරල් පක්ෂයේ සහයෝගය අවශ්‍ය වුණු තිසා, පෙබරල් පක්ෂය යම් යම් ඉල්ලීම් අප වෙත ඉදිරිපත් කළා. සක්විති රජකම ලැබුණත් රට පාවා නොදෙන බවත් ආණ්ඩුව පවත්වාගෙන යන්නට බැරි නම් තව වරක් මහජනයා ඉදිරියට යන බවත් ගරු අගමැතිතුමා ප්‍රකාශ කෙළේ ඒ අවස්ථාවේදීයි. 1960 අප්‍රේල් මාසයේදී මේ ගරු සභාව තුළ මා කළ කථාව ගැන මට ආචම්බර වන්නට පුළුවනි. අපේ ලංකාව එකම ලංකාවක් මිස රටවල් දෙකක් හැටියට නොතිබිය යුතුයයි අප තරයේ විශ්වාස කරන තිසා එය දෙකක් කරන්නට කිසිසේත් ඉඩ නොදී, රට පාවා දීමට වඩා මේ තනතුර පරිත්‍යාග කරනවායයි කී කෙනෙකු හැටියට මා ගැන මට ආචම්බර වන්නට පුළුවනි.

මේ ආණ්ඩුව තවත් මාස 18ක් දිගටම පවත්වාගෙන යාමට පුළුවන් ආණ්ඩුවක්. ආණ්ඩුව දිගටම පවත්වාගෙන යාමට තිබෙන කැදරකමටවත්, මගේ ආසනයට මා තුළ තිබෙන කැදරකමටවත්, මා උසුලන පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම් ධුරය සම්බන්ධයෙන් ඇති කැදරකමටවත් මගේ ජාතික උරුමය මා පාවා දෙන්නේ නැහැ. මෙය හේතුකොටගෙන සිංහල ජාතියට යම් විපතක් සිදු වන්නට ඉඩ තිබෙනවා නම් මා කිසිසේත් මෙවැන්නකට එකඟ වන්නේ නැහැ. එහෙම දෙයක් මෙහි නොමැති බව නමුත්තාත්සේට පෙනී යනු ඇති. කරුණු සහිතව එය පෙන්වා දී තිබෙනවා. ධවල පත්‍රිකාවට යා කර තිබෙන මේ පනත් කෙටුම්පත කියවීමෙන් එය පැහැදිලි වෙනවා. විරුද්ධ විය හැකි දෙයක් නැති තිසයි මා පක්ෂ වන්නේ.

මා ලංකාවේ නොසිටි වේලාවක ගලිගමුව මැතිවරණ කොට්ඨාශය තුළ සිදු වූ දෙයක් ගැන කියන්නටත් දුකයි මට. මේ ආණ්ඩුව රටසභා පනතක් ඇති කරනවාය, ඒ මගින් රට පාවා දෙනවාය ඒ තිසා සිංහලයාට තැනක් තැනිව යනවාය යනාදී වශයෙන් විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයේ පිරිසක් ගලිගමුවේදී

කල් තැනීම :

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ ශේෂතා

කියා තිබෙනවා. මේ විධියේ ප්‍රකාශනයන් කළ රැස්වීමට විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයේ ගරු නායකතුමියන් ඇවිත්ගිටියාලු. ඊට සහභාගි වූ අනෙකුත් ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමන්ලාගේ නම් ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නට පුළුවනි. මගේ ආරංචියේ හැටියට කොළොන්නාවේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ඉලංගරත්න මයා.) මහර ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (සුරියාරච්චි මයා.) කාල ණියේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ආර්. එස්. පෙරේරා මයා.) කාගල්ලේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රී තුමා. (කඵගල්ල මයා.) ආදීන් සහභාගි වී තිබෙනවා. යෝජිත රටසභා ක්‍රමය නිසා සිංහලයට තැනක් නැති වෙනවාය ආදී වශ යෙන් කියා, එයින් තතරනොවී, ඒ නිසා යම් අම්මා කෙනෙක් අලියට කතිරය ගැහැව්වෙත් ඒ අම්මලා අපායේ යනවාය කියාත් කියා තිබෙනවා. ඔය විධියේ රැස් වීම් තබා තව තවත් මිනිසුන් මුද්‍රා කරන්නට යනවා. මේ උදවිය මේ විධියට ප්‍රකාශ කර තිබෙන්නේ මැයි මාසයේ 20 වැනිදා. එහෙත් මේ පනත් කෙටුම්පත මුද්‍රණය කරන ලද්දේ ජූනි මාසයේ 5 වැනිදායි. මා මෙය දුටුවේත් ජූනි 6 වැනිදායි.

ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම මෙවැනි කියමන් ගැන මා පුදුම වෙනවා. ළමයකු උපදින්නට පෙර හදහන් ලියන සිරිතකුත් තිබෙනවාද? නැහැ. ළමයා උපදින්නටත් ඉස්සර හදහන් නැත්තමිකේන්දර හදනවාය කියන කතාවක් තිබෙනවා. මෙතැනත් සිදු වී තිබෙන්නේ එවැනි දෙයක්. මේ පනත් කෙටුම්පත එළියට එන්නටත් ඉස්සරවෙලා—මාස ගණනකට ඉස්සර වෙලා—පෙබරල් පක්ෂයට මේ රට පාවා දෙන්නට යනවාය යනාදිවශයෙන් කියන්නට පටන් ගත්තේ මොන හේතුවක් නිසාද? එසේ කියන ගමන්ම අර 1960 මැතිවරණ කාලයේදී අප ඉදිරිපත් කළ ලංකාවේ සිතියමක් අරන් පෙන්වමින්, “ඔය සිතියම නොවෙයිද, 1960දී ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයට විරුද්ධව ඉදිරිපත් කළේ?” ආදී වශයෙන් කියන්නට පටන් ගෙන තිබෙනවා. 1960 ජූලි මැතිවරණයේදී ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂය අපට විරුද්ධව කරුණු ඉදිරිපත් කර අපේ බලය ආසන නිස් ගණනකට බස්සවා බලය ලබා ගත්තාය කියන්නට පුළුවනි. එදා ජනතාව මෙය පිළිගත්තේ නැහැ. අද පිළිගන්නේත් නැහැයි කියන්නට පුළුවනි. අපට පළ පුරුද්ද හොඳට තිබෙනවාය කියන්නට

පුළුවනි. ජාතිභේදවාදි කැරලි කෝලාහල ආදිය ඇති කොට දහස් ගණන් ජීවිත විනාශ කළා. අනුරාධපුරයේදීත්, පදවියේදීත් ගෙවල් ගිනි තබා විනාශ කළා. පානදුරේ කෝවිලක්ද කොහේදෝ පුලුස්සා දැමීමෙන් නොයෙක් කරදර ඇති වුණා. ඔය හැම දෙයකින්ම කරදර වුණා මිස දියුණුවක් ඇති වුණේ නැහැ.

මේ රටේ රැකිරක්ෂා ප්‍රශ්නය විසදීමටත්, අපේ දුදරුවන්ගේ අනාගත ශුභසිද්ධිය සහ සෞභාග්‍යය ඇති කිරීමටත් මේ යෝජිත පනත ඉතමාත් ඥානවන්තව කල්පනා කිරීමෙන් පසු අපේ ගරු අගමැතිතුමාගත් ශ්‍රේෂ්ඨ පියවරක් බව සඳහන් කරන්නට කැමතියි. මේ බවල පත්‍රිකාව මගින් දැන් ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙන්නේ එයයි. මගේ ආරංචියේ හැටියට මේ කෙටුම්පත් පනත ඉදිරියට එන අයවැය විවාදයෙන් පසුවයි ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නට ඉඩක් ලැබෙන්නේ. මා හිතන්නේ එහෙමයි. මේ ගැන මෙහි සිටින සමාජසේවා කටයුතු භාර ගරු ඇමතිතුමා මට වඩා හොඳින් දන්නවා ඇති. මේ ගැන ළඟදීම රට පුරා ප්‍රචාරක කටයුතු කරගෙන යන්නටත් බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. ප්‍රථම ප්‍රචාරක රැස්වීම මේ මාසයේ 17 වැනිදා ගලිගමුව ඡන්ද දායක කොට්ඨාශයේ කෙහෙල්වතුගොඩදී පවත්වන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. ජූනි මාසයේ 20 වැනිදා දැඩිගම් කොට්ඨාශයේ ඕපාතදී රැස්වීමක් පැවැත්වෙනවා. මහා සංඝයා වහන්සේලාගේත් ගම්කාරිය සභා ආදී නොයෙකුත් පළාත් පාලන ආයතනවලත් අදහස් උදහස් ලබාගෙන අවශ්‍ය සංශෝධන වෙනොත් ඒවත් ඇතුළත් කර යෝජිත පනත ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නටයි අදහස් කරන්නේ.

හතළිස් අවුරුද්දක පමණ කාලයේ සිට මේ දක්වාම නොයෙක් වාරවල කල් ගිය, යල් පැනපු කච්චේරි ක්‍රමය අහෝසි කර දැමීමගැන නොයෙක් දෙනා අදහස් ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙනවා. සමසමාජ පක්ෂයේ නායක ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා මහත්මයාත් නොයෙක් අවස්ථාවල කාගහලා කියලා තියෙන්නේ යල් පැනපු කච්චේරි ක්‍රමය වෙනස් කළ යතුය යන්නයි. කොමියුනිස්ට් පක්ෂයෙහුත් වෙනත් පක්ෂ වලින් ඒ අදහස නොයෙක් වර අනුමත කර තිබෙනවා. එහෙම කරලත්, මේ

කල් තැබීම :

[විමලා කන්නන්ගර මිය.]

අවසථාවේ පැනලා යන්නේ ඇයි ? ධවල පත්‍රිකාව මැති සබය තුළදීත් ඉන් පිටතදීත් පුද්‍රස්සා දමා—ගිනි තබා—තමන්ගේ අත පුද්‍රස්සා ගන්නේ නැතිව එහි අඩුපාඩු තිබෙනවායයි කල්පනා කරතොත් ඒවා සඳහන් කළ යුතුයි. රටට වටිනාකමක් ඇති පනතක් අඩංගු ධවල පත්‍රිකාවක් ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙන මේ අවස්ථාවේදී වග කීමක් ඇති අය මෙන් මේ ගරු සභාවට පැමිණ තමන්ගේ අදහස් උදහස් ඉදිරිපත් කර අවශ්‍ය සංශෝධන ගැන සඳහන් කර සේවයක් ලබා දිය යුතුයි. කවිචේරි ක්‍රමය අහෝසි වන්නේ නැහැ. මෙයින් කවිචේරි ක්‍රමයේ වෙනසක් විශාල වශයෙන් ඇති වන්නේත් නැහැ. ගම්කාරිය සභා සභාපති වරුන් සහ පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් ඇතුළත් වන මේ වැඩ පිළිවෙළ ක්‍රියාත්මක කිරීමේදී ඇති විය හැකි අඩුපාඩුකම් ආදිය සාකච්ඡා කර සංශෝධන ආදියක් අවශ්‍යයයි පෙනී ගියහොත් ඒවාත් පිළියෙල කර ගන්නට ඉඩ තිබෙනවා. නියම විධියට මෙය සකස් කර ගත්තාම සෞභාග්‍යයත් සමගියත් ලගා කරගෙන සමගි සම්පන්න, සමෘද්ධිමත් තත්ත්වයකට අපේ දිවයින පත් කරන්නට අපේ අසහාය නායක ගරු ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක අගමැතිතුමාගේ ප්‍රධානත්වයෙන් හැකි වේවායි මා ප්‍රාර්ථනා කරනවා. එයට සෑම දෙනාගේම සහයෝගය ලැබේවායිද ප්‍රාර්ථනා කරනවා. මේ පනත් කෙටුම්පත පන තවත් සංශෝධනය වෙනවා ඇති. මේ පනත් කෙටුම්පතට ඇතුළු කළ යුතු සංශෝධනයක් දෙකක් ගැන මමත් අගමැතිතුමාට දන්වා තිබෙනවා. ඒ සංශෝධනත් මේපනත් කෙටුම්පතට කළ යුතු වෙනත් සංශෝධනත් ගැන සලකා බලා මේ පනත් කෙටුම්පත තවත් සංශෝධනය කර මෙයින් රටට සෞභාග්‍යමත්, ආලෝකමත් වාසනාවත් යුගයක් උදා කරවීමට අවස්ථාවක් ලැබේවායි ප්‍රාර්ථනා කරමින් මගේ කථාව මෙයින් අවසාන කරනවා.

අ. භා. 7.10

පර්සි සමරවිර මයා. (වැලිමඩ)

(කිඊ. පෙරේරා—බෙලිමඩා)

(Mr. Percy Samaraweera—Welimada)

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, අද මේ ගරු සභාවේ සාකච්ඡා කරන ධවල පත්‍රිකාව පිළිබඳව ස්වාධීන මන්ත්‍රීවරයක

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

හැටියට වචනයක් දෙකක් ප්‍රකාශ කරන්නට පුල පුලා සිටි මට මේ සාකච්ඡාව අවසාන වේගන යන මොහොතේදීවත් අවසථාවක් ලැබීම ගැන මා සතුටු වෙනවා.

රටසභා පනත් කෙටුම්පතක් ගැන සඳහන් කරන විට 1965 සිට එහි ඉතිහාසය ගැනත්, රටසභා පාලන ක්‍රමයක් ඇති කරන්නට ගත් වැයම ගැනත්, ඒ වාගේම එවැනි පාලන ක්‍රමයක් ඇති කිරීම පිළිබඳව ගත් තීරණ ගැනත් විස්තර සහිතව මට කථා කරන්නට පුළුවනි. මේ ධවල පත්‍රිකාව ගැන අදහස් ප්‍රකාශ කළ යම් යම් ගරු මන්ත්‍රී වරුන්ට ගරු අගමැතිතුමා දුන් මොහොතකට ප්‍රථමයෙන් කථාවක් කරමින් පිළිතුරු සපයන්නට යෙදුණා. මේ ධවල පත්‍රිකාවට එහෙම නැත්නම් රටසභා ක්‍රමයකට විරුද්ධව අදහස් ප්‍රකාශ කළ ඒ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් පාලනය විමධ්‍යගත කිරීමට සතුටුය, නමුත් ඒකට මෙය අවස්ථාව නොවේය යන හැඟීමක් පළ කළාය කියා ගරු අගමැතිතුමා ප්‍රකාශ කරන්නට යෙදුණා. දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පනත් කෙටුම්පතක් මේ ගරු සභාවේ සම්මත කර එමගින් පාලනය කිරීමට නැත්නම් දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පාලනයක් මේ රටේ ඇති කිරීමට මෙය අවස්ථාව නොවන බව මමත් අවධාරණයෙන්ම ප්‍රකාශ කරන්නට සතුටුයි. මේ අවස්ථාවේදී එවැනි පනත් කෙටුම්පතක් ඉදිරිපත් කිරීම කාලෝචිත නැහැ. මා එසේ කියන්නේ හේතු ඇතිවයි.

1965 මාර්තු 23 වනදා මේ රටේ පාලනය ජාතික ආණ්ඩුව භාර ගත්තා. එදින සිට, මේ රට වැටී තිබෙන ආර්ථික ප්‍රපාතයෙන් ගොඩගැනීම සඳහා ගරු අගමැතිතුමාගේ ප්‍රධානත්වයෙන් කෘෂිකර්ම ව්‍යාපාරයක් ආරම්භ කර වැඩ කටයුතු කරගෙන යනවා. එම නිසා මේ අවස්ථාවේදී රටසභා පාලනයක් ඇති කර දැනට තිබෙන පාලන තන්ත්‍රය වෙනස් කළොත් රජය ගෙන යන ඒ කෘෂිකර්ම ව්‍යාපාරයට, ඒ ආර්ථික නිදහස් සටනට විශාල පහරක් වදින බවයි මා කියන්නට උත්සාහ කරන්නේ. ජාතික රජයේ නායක ගරු ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක අගමැතිතුමාට නූතන පරාක්‍රම බාහුය කියා ආමන්ත්‍රණය කිරීම නිවැරදිය කියා මා කල්පනා කරනවා. එදා පරාක්‍රම බාහු යුගයේදී මේ රට ස්වයම්පෝෂිත

කල් තැබීම :

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

කිරීමට කටයුතු කළාක් මෙන්ම වර්තමාන අගමැතිතුමාගේ නායකත්වයෙන් යුත් මේ ජාතික රජයත් අද රට ස්වයම් පෝෂිත කිරීම පිණිස විශාල කෘෂිකර්ම ව්‍යාපාරයක් ගෙන යනවා. ඉතාම වෙහෙස මහත්සියෙන් ගෙන යන මේ ආර්ථික නිදහස ලබා ගැනීමේ සටන නැත්නම් මේ රට ස්වයම්පෝෂිත කිරීමේ සටන මේ පනත් කෙටුම්පත ඉදිරිපත් කිරීමෙන් හෝ මෙවැනි පාලන තන්ත්‍රයක් අලුතෙන් ඇති කිරීමෙන් අඩපණ වෙනවා නොවේද යන ප්‍රශ්නයයි මා ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නේ. දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා නොවෙයි, රට සභාවලට විරුද්ධව සටන් කර හිර ගෙවල පවා ගිය උදවිය හැටියටයි, අපි අද මේ සභාවේ පෙනී සිටින්නේ.

දිවංගත බණ්ඩාරනායක අගමැතිතුමා විසින් 1957 දී රට සභා පාලන තන්ත්‍රයක් මේ රටේ ඇති කිරීම සඳහා ලංකාවේ ගම්කාර්ය සභාවලට යෝජිත රට සභා සහ ඒ සඳහා ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වුණු පනත පිළිබඳව සුළු විස්තරයක් ඇතුළත් වක්‍ර ලේඛයක් යවා ඒ පිළිබඳ අදහස් උදහස් විමසූ අවස්ථාවේදී ඇති වුණු තත්ත්වයක් මේ ගැන සභාවට මා මතක් කරන්නට ඕනෑ. 1957 දී අපි ජීවත්වන උච ප්‍රදේශයේ තිබුණ, ගම්කාර්ය සභා 32 ක්. ඒ ගම්කාර්ය සභා 32 ට පමණක් නොවෙයි, ලංකාවේ තිබෙන සෑම ගම්කාර්ය සභාවකටම මා සඳහන් කළ ඒ වක්‍ර ලේඛය නිකුත් කර තිබුණ. වක්‍ර ලේඛයෙන් ප්‍රශ්න කර තිබුණේ රට සභා පාලන ක්‍රමයක් මේ රටේ ඇති කිරීමට ඒ ගම්කාර්ය සභා සූදානම්ද කියායි. උචේ තිබුණු ගම්කාර්ය සභා 32න්, රට සභා පාලන ක්‍රමයක් මේ රටේ ඇති කිරීමට විරුද්ධත්වය ප්‍රකාශ කර එවු එකම එක ගම්කාර්ය සභාවක් තිබුණා. ඒ මා නියෝජිතයකු වශයෙන් සිටි කැප්පෙට් පොළ ගම්කාර්ය සභාවයි. උච ප්‍රදේශයේ තිබුණ ගම්කාර්ය සභා 32න් එක ගම්කාර්ය සභාවක් පමණයි, රට සභා පාලන ක්‍රමයක් මේ රටේ ඇති කරනවාට විරුද්ධ වුණේ.

ඊට අනතුරුව දිවංගත බණ්ඩාරනායක අගමැතිතුමා විසින් ගම්කාර්ය සභාපති වරුන්ගේ සම්මේලනයක් මාදම්පෙට් කඳෙව්ව. ඒ මාදම්පෙ සාකච්ඡාවේදී ඊට සහභාගි වූ ගම්කාර්ය සභා පාර්ශ්වය ගම්කාර්ය

කින් රට සභා පාලනයක් ඇති කරනවාට විරුද්ධත්වය ප්‍රකාශ කළේ යන්නම් ගම්කාර්ය සභා 19 ක් පමණයි. එදා තත්ත්වය එහෙමයි. අපි කරුණු ඉදිරිපත් කරල, මෙන්ම මේ මේ හේතු නිසා අපි රට සභා පාලන ක්‍රමයකට විරුද්ධ යයි පෙන්වා දුන් පසු වාසනාවකට මෙන් යෝජිත රට සභා ගැන සොයා බලා වාර්තා කිරීම සඳහා ඒක පුද්ගල කමිටුවක් පත් කළා. 1956 දේශපාලන විප්ලවයෙන් පසු, පෙරළියෙන් පසු මේ රටේ රට සභා පිහිටුවීමේ ප්‍රශ්නය පිළිබඳ ඉතිහාසය මේකයි.

ඊළඟට මොකද වුණේ? කමිටුවට පත් වුණු පුද්ගලයා මොන විධියේ වාර්තාවක් ඉදිරිපත් කළාදැයි අපි දන්නේ නැහැ. මොනයම් අන්දමකින් හෝ වේවා, 1960 ජූලි මැතිවරණයෙන් පසු 1963-1964 අවුරුදුවල පැවති ආණ්ඩුවලින් ඉදිරිපත් කරන ලද රාජාසන කථාවල රට සභා ගැන සඳහන් වී තිබුණ. එතකොට අප විසින් මේ ප්‍රශ්නය මතු කළ යුතුයි. අද රට සභා පාලන ක්‍රමයකට විරුද්ධ යයි කියන එදා මේ රට ආණ්ඩු කළ යම් පිරිසක් සිටිනවා නම්, ඒ උදවියගෙන් මා අහන්ට සතුටුයි, ඔවුන්ගේ රාජාසන කථාවල රට සභා ගැන සඳහන් කර තිබුණේ රට සභා පිහිටුවීමෙන් මේ රටේ ඇති විය හැකි තත්ත්වය පිළිබඳව කිසිවක් නොදැනද කියා. 1957 දී රට සභා පිළිබඳව ඉදිරිපත් වුණු යෝජනා පිළිබඳව මා විග්‍රහයක් කරන්නට වුවමනා නැහැ. ඇත්තෙන්ම මා රට සභා ප්‍රතිපත්තියට විරුද්ධ වුණත්, එදා ඉදිරිපත් කරන ලද රට සභා යෝජනාවලට වඩා අද ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙන යෝජනා හුඟක් ලිහිල් ඒවා බව මෙම ධ්වල පත්‍රිකාවෙන් හා ඒ සමඟ ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙන යෝජිත පනතෙන් පෙනී යනවා. කෙසේ වුවත් රට සභා පාලන ප්‍රතිපත්තියට අප විරුඬයි.

යම්කිසි පනතක් පිළිබඳව හෝ ධ්වල පත්‍රිකාවක් පිළිබඳව හෝ සාකච්ඡා කරන විට ඒවාට විරුද්ධ වන කොටසක් සිටිනවා. ප්‍රශ්නය තිබෙන්නේ මොනැයි. එක පාලන යුගයක පමණක්ද මෙවැනි ධ්වල පත්‍රිකාවක් හෝ පනතක් හෝ ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නට පුළුවන්කම තිබෙන්නේ? ධ්වල පත්‍රිකාව මොන විධියට සකස් වෙලා තිබුණත් රට සභා පාලනයක් ඇති කිරීමට

කල් තැබීම :

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

[සමරවිර මයා.]

අප විරුද්ධයි. සිංහලයන් සමඟ සහයෝගයෙන් කටයුතු කරන්නට සූදානම් බවට මේ රටසභා ඉල්ලන උදවියගෙන් අපට මෙතෙක් කිසිම ප්‍රතිඥාවක් ලැබී නැහැ. අපට තිබෙන භය එකයි. මේ රටේ ඒපබරල් ආණ්ඩු ක්‍රමයක් ඇති කරන්නට බලාපොරොත්තුවක් නැතැයිද, මේ රටේ රාජ්‍ය භාෂාව වශයෙන් සිංහලය පිළිගන්නට සූදානම් යයිද මෙම රටසභා ඉල්ලන අය මෙම ගරු සභාවේදී ප්‍රකාශ කරනවා නම්, සිංහලයාගේ භය නැති වනවාට සැකයක් නැහැ. එහෙත් තවම එවැනි ප්‍රතිඥාවක් ලැබී නැහැ. මෙම බවල පත්‍රිකාව ගැන දැන් දවස් කීපයක් තිස්සේ සාකච්ඡා වුණා. යෝජිත පනත ගැන අදහස් ප්‍රකාශ වුණා. එහෙත් දැන් මේ මොහොත වන තුරුම අර විධියේ ප්‍රකාශයක් කෙරී නැහැ. සිංහලයාට මේ පිළිබඳව භයක් ඇති වන්නේ අන්න ඒ නිසයි.

ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂය ප්‍රධාන කොට ඇති ලංකා සමසමාජ පක්ෂය හා කොමියුනිස්ට් පක්ෂය මෙම බවල පත්‍රිකාව ගැන සකාවා කරන්නට සූදානම් නැතැයි කියමින් මෙම ගරු සභාවෙන් පිට වී ගොස් පිටත දී බවල පත්‍රිකාව ප්‍රශ්න දැමූ බවට වාර්තා පහළ වී තිබුණා. දඹදෙණියේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා.) තවමත් ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයේ උප සභාපතිවරයකුදැයි මා දන්නේ නැහැ. ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂය අනාගතයේ දී කොන්දේසි සහිතව හෝ රහිතව ද්‍රවිඩ මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් සමඟ එකතු වී මොනම අන්දමේ හෝ රටසභා ක්‍රමයක් මොනම මුහුණුවරකින් හෝ ඉදිරිපත් නොකරන බවට ඒ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාට මෙම ගරු සභාවේදී ප්‍රකාශයක් කරන්නට පුළුවන්දැයි මා ප්‍රශ්න කරනවා. අනාගතයේ යම්කිසි දවසක ඒපබරල් පක්ෂයන් සමඟ හවුල් වී ආණ්ඩුවක් පිහිටුවීමට අවස්ථාවක් ලැබී එසේ කළායින් පසුව මොනම මුහුණුවරකින් හෝ රටසභා ක්‍රමයක් ඉදිරිපත් නොකරනවා යයි ප්‍රකාශ කරන්නට පුළුවන්ද?

දඹදෙණියේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයේ නායිකාවගෙන් පසුගිය දවස්වල ප්‍රශ්න 18 ක් අසා තිබුණා. ඒ

ප්‍රශ්නවලට පිළිතුරු ලැබුණාදැයි මා ඒ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා ගෙන් අහනවා. මේවයි දැනගන්නට ඕනෑ කරුණු. මේ දෙගොල්ල—ආණ්ඩු පක්ෂයන් විරුද්ධ පක්ෂයන්—නොයෙක් මත දරමින් මහජනතාව කුලප්පු කරන්නට මේ රටසභා පනත ගැන කථා කරනවා. මෙය ජාතික ප්‍රශ්නයක්. මෙය එක පිරිසකට පමණක් සීමා වූ එකක් නොවෙයි. මෙය ජාතික ප්‍රශ්නයක් නිසා මෙයට ඔය සියලු දෙනාම පිළිතුරු සපයන්නට ඕනෑ. මේ සම්බන්ධව මේ ගරු සභාවෙන් තීරණයක් ගන්නට පුළුවන් වන්නේ එසේ කළොත් පමණයි.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, කොටසක් හිතනවා ඇති මේ රටේ සිටින සුළු ජාතීන් කියන්නේ ඒපබරල් පක්ෂයට පමණක් කියා. එහෙත් මේ රටේ සිටින සුළු ජාතීන් හැටියට සලකන්නේ ඒපබරල් පක්ෂය පමණක් නොවේය කියා මා කියනවා. තවත් සුළු ජාතීන් මේ රටේ සිටිනවා මේ යෝජිත පනතින් ඒ අයගේ අයිතිය රැකෙන්නේ මොන ආකාරයටද කියා මා අහනවා. මේ පනතින් මුස්ලිම් ජනතාවගේ නැත්නම් මුස්ලිම් සහෝදරයින්ගේ අයිතිය රැකෙන්නේ මොන ආකාරයටද කියා මා අහනවා. ඒ නිසා මේ රටේ සුළු ජාතීන්ගේ අයිතිය ඒපබරල් පක්ෂයට පමණක් සීමා වී තිබෙනවාය කියා යම් යම් අය අතර නැත්නම් යම්කිසි පිරිසක් අතර යම් අදහසක් ඇති වී තිබෙනවා නම් එය වහාම අස් කර ගන්නය කියා මා කියනවා.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මේ සම්බන්ධව දීර්ඝ වශයෙන් අදහස් ප්‍රකාශ කිරීමට අපට අවස්ථාව තිබෙන්නට ඕනෑ. මා එසේ කියන්නේ මෙන්න මේ නිසයි : උඩරට ආසනයක් නියෝජනය කරන මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙකු වශයෙන් මගේ පෞද්ගලික දැනීමේ හැටියට මා අදහස් කරන්නේ මේ රටේ රටසභා ඇති කළොත් යම් කාලයක් යන විට උඩරට ප්‍රදේශයේ සිටින සිංහලයින්ට යම් යම් අතවරවලට මුහුණ පාන්නට සිදු වේය කියලයි. එයට හේතුව මෙයයි : සිරිමා-ශාස්ත්‍රී ගිවිසුම

කල් තැබීම :

අනුව ඉන්දියානුවන් තුන් ලක්ෂයකට මේ රටේ ලියාපදිංචිවීමට අවස්ථාව සැලසී තිබෙනවා.

ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

පුරවැසි භාවය පමණයි.

සමරවීර මයා.

(திரு. சமரவீர)

(Mr. Samaraweera)

පුරවැසි භාවය පමණක් වුවත් මේ රටේ පුරවැසියන් වශයෙන් ලියාපදිංචි වුවාට පසු යම් දවසක ඔවුන් සම්පූර්ණ අයිතිවාසිකම් ඉල්ලනවාට කිසිම සැකයක් නැහැ. මේ සිරිමා-ශාස්ත්‍රී ගිවිසුම අවුරුදු 15 ක් හෝ 25 ක් ඇතුළත ක්‍රියාත්මක කර අවසාන කිරීමටයි තීරණය වී තිබෙන්නේ. එහෙත් හෙට මේ රජයට කියන්නට පුළුවන් වුණෙත් “මේ පත් ලක්ෂය ඉන්දියාවට යවා තුන් ලක්ෂයට පුරවැසි භාවය දෙන්නට අපි සූදානම්; අපට විදේශ විනිමය තිබෙනවා” කියා, භයානක තත්ත්වය ඇති වන්නේ එවිටයි. එවැනි තත්ත්වයක් අද හෝ ලබන සමානයේ හෝ ඇති වන්නටත් පුළුවන්; අවුරුදු 25 කින් ඇති වන්නටත් පුළුවන්. ඒ අය මේ රටේ පුරවැසියන් වශයෙන් ලියාපදිංචි වුණාට පසු දැනට ඔවුන් ඡන්දය පාවිච්චි කරන අන්දමට මහ මැතිවරණයකදී පමණක් ඡන්දය පාවිච්චි කර සැඟමට පත් වී පළාත් පාලන බලමණ්ඩල සඳහා ඡන්ද බලය නොඉල්ලා සිටිවිය කියා කල්පනා කරනවාද? මේ රටේ ස්ථිරව ලියාපදිංචි වූ පුරවැසියන් හැටියට ඔවුන් ඒ අයිතිය ඉල්ලනවා නම් එය නොදී හරින්නට පුළුවන් කොයි ආණ්ඩුවකටද? කිසිම ආණ්ඩුවකට ඒ අයිතිය නොදී සිටින්නට පුළුවන් වේය කියා මා හිතන්නේ නැහැ. එවිට ඇති වන තත්ත්වය කුමක්ද? විශේෂයෙන්ම උඩරට මධ්‍ය ප්‍රදේශයේත්, උතුරු ප්‍රදේශයේ හා සබරගමුව ප්‍රදේශයේත් විහිදී සිටින ඒ තුන් ලක්ෂය ඡන්ද බලය ලබාගෙන ඡන්දය පාවිච්චි කරන්නට පටන් ගත්තොත් මා සඳහන් කළ ඒ පළාත් තුනේ ගම්සභාවල ඇති වන තත්ත්වය කුමක්ද කියා තමන්නාත්

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

සේ කල්පනා කර බලන්න. මේ පිළිබඳ වයි අප තුළ බිය පවතින්නේ. මේ කවිවේරි පිළිවෙළ අනුව කෙරෙන පාලන ක්‍රමය යම් කාලයකදී වෙනස් විය යුතුමයි. එසේ නමුදු ගරු අගමැතිතුමා කුමන ආකාරයකින් කරුණු කීවත් මා ස්ථිරවම කියනවා, රටසභා පනතක් ඉදිරිපත් කොට මෙම පාලන තන්ත්‍රය වෙනස් කරන්නට මේ අවස්ථාව නොවන බව. එසේ කියන්නේ මා මුලින් සඳහන් කරන ලද කරුණු දෙකට අදාළවයි. මේ රට ආහාර අතින් ස්වයම්පෝෂිත කිරීම සඳහා අප ගෙන යන්නාවූ කෘෂිකර්ම සටන මෙම කායඝීය නිසා අඩපණ වීම ඉන් එක් කාරණයක් හැටියට මා පෙන්නුම් කර දුන්නා. තුන් ලක්ෂයක් ඉන්දියානු ජාතිකයන් මේ රටේ පුරවැසි යන් වුවාට පසු උඩරට ප්‍රදේශයට ඇතැම් මට යම් අසාධාරණයක් සිදු වේවිය යන හැඟීම අප අතර තිබෙන බවත් මා ඊළඟ කාරණය වශයෙන් පැහැදිලි කළා.

මේ පිළිබඳව ඇතැමුන් කුමන අන්දමකට අදහස් ප්‍රකාශ කළත් මා එකක් කියන්නට කැමතියි. යම් යම් අවස්ථාවල මෙම ගරු සභාව තුළදී මේ පිළිබඳව විවිධ අදහස් දැක්වූ උදවිය අද මෙම කටයුත්තට සහභාගිවන්නේ කුමන අයුරකින්ද යන්න අපට පෙනෙනවා. විශේෂයෙන් සමසමාජ පක්ෂයේ සහ කොමියුනිස්ට් පක්ෂයේ වැඩ පිළිවෙළ ගැන මෙහිදී සඳහන් කළ යුතුයි. 1956 සිංහල පමණක් පනත පාර්ලිමේන්තුවට ඉදිරිපත් වූ අවස්ථාවේදී අද ඔය සිංහලට ලොකු තැනක් දිය යුතු බව කියමින් කැගහන සමසමාජ සහ කොමියුනිස්ට් පක්ෂවල උදවිය අනුගමනය කළ වැඩ පිළිවෙළ කුමක්ද? මේ රටේ සිටින සිංහලයන්ගේ—ඒ කියන්නේ මේ රටේ සිටින ප්‍රංචි රාළ ලාගේ, මේ රටේ සිටින උක්කු බණ්ඩලාගේ, මේ රටේ සිටින උක්කු මැණිකලාගේ, මේ රටේ සිටින පෙරේරාලාගේ, මේ රටේ සිටින සිල්වලාගේ සහ මේ රටේ සිටින කරෝලිස්ලාගේ—භාෂාව රජ බවට පත් කරන්නට යන විට ඒ අය කීවේ කුමක්ද? එසේ කරන්න බැරි බව කීව්වා. මේ රටේ සිටින කරුපයියලාටත් මේ රටේ සිටින සුප්පයියලාටත් අප තැනක් දිය යුතුය

[සමරවිර මයා.]

කිව්වා. එසේ කීවා පමණක් නොවෙයි, මේ රටේ සිංහල ජනතාවගේ මූලික අයිතිවාසිකම වශයෙන් ඇති ඔවුන්ගේ භාෂාව රජ කරවීම සඳහා පාර්ලිමේන්තුව ඉදිරියට පනතක් ඉදිරිපත් කළ අවස්ථාවේදී ඊට විරුද්ධව ඡන්දයන් පාවිච්චි කළේ ඔය සමසමාජ පක්ෂයන් කොමියුනිස්ට් පක්ෂයන් බව තමුන් තාන්සේට මතක් කරන්නට වුවමනා කරන්නේ නැහැ. එදා එසේ ක්‍රියා කළ උදවිය අද සිංහලයන්ගේ ලොකු ආරක්ෂකයන් වී සිටිනවා. ඒ අයම මේ රටේ ඇති කළ යුතු යම් කිසි පාලන තන්ත්‍රයක් ගැන පනතක් ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නට සූදනම් වුණාට මොකද එය බැරි වුණා. අනතුරුව මේ ආණ්ඩුව මගින් එවැනි නක් ඉදිරිපත් කළ විට “මේකට අපි විරුද්ධයි; අපි මේක ප්‍රච්චලා දමනවා මිසක් මේක ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්නට දෙන්නේ නැහැ” කියමින් සටනක් ගෙන යනවා.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මේක හැංගිමුත්තත් කෙළින් සටනක් නොවන බව මා කලින් කීවාක් මෙන් නැවත වරක් ප්‍රකාශ කරන්නට කැමතියි. හැංගිමුත්තත් කෙළලා කවදාවත් මේ ප්‍රශ්න විසඳන්නට බැහැ. මේ රටේ මහ ජාතිය වන සිංහලයන් සම්බන්ධ කරුණු පැහැදිලි වන ප්‍රශ්නයක් මේක. එසේ හෙයින් මෙම ගරු සභාව තුළදී පමණක් නොවෙයි මින් පිටස්තර රැස්වීම්වලදීත් වෙන වෙනත් සාකච්ඡාවලදීත් බොහොම අවංකව මේ ගැන අදහස් දක්වන්නට ඕනෑ. ඒකයි, අපේ ප්‍රාර්ථනය.

මේ සමාජය අද කුමන ආකාරයකට හැඩ ගැසීගෙන යනවාදැයි තව දුරටත් කරුණු ස්වල්පයකින් ප්‍රකාශ කොට මගේ කථාව අවසාන කරන්නටයි මා බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ. ඊයේ පෙරේදා මේ රටේ ඉතිහාස ගත වන සිද්ධියක් ඇති වුණා. එවැනි සිද්ධීන් මේ රටේ කවදාවත් ඇති වේය කියා අප කිසිවකු බලාපොරොත්තු වුණේ නැහැ. එක් ආගමක් අදහන්නන් කෙරෙහි තවත් ආගමක් අදහන්නන් තුළ නොයෙක් විධියේ විරුද්ධකම් සැවති යුගයක් මේ රටේ ඇති වී තිබුණා. රටේ නොයෙක් කටයුතු සම්බන්ධයෙන් කතෝ

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

ලික බලපෑම් ඇති වී තිබෙන බව මෙම ගරු සභාවෙහිදී පමණක් නොව දේශ පාලන වේදිකාවලදීත් ප්‍රකාශ කරන්නට පුළුවන් තත්ත්වයේ දේශපාලනඥයන් මේ රටේ සිටිනවා. එහෙත් අද ගරු ස්වාමීන් වහන්සේ නමක් අතින් පල්ලියක් විවාහ කරවන්නට පුළුවන් අන්දමේ සමගියක්, සම්බන්ධයක්, විවිධ ආගම් අතර ඇති වී තිබෙන බව මා මේ අවස්ථාවේදී ආඩම්බරයෙන් ප්‍රකාශ කරනවා. මේ සිද්ධිය අද අපේ සමාජයේ විශාල පිබිදීමකට තුඩු දී තිබෙනවා. මේ රටේ ඇති විවිධ ආගම් අතර සම්බන්ධයක් ඇති වී, විවිධ ආගමික පූජකයන් අතර සහයෝගතාවක් ඇති වී, රටට ආදර්ශයක් දෙන්නට පුළුවන් තත්ත්වයකට ඒ උදවිය පැමිණ සිටින අවස්ථාවකදීයි මේ ධවල පත්‍රිකාව මෙහි සාකච්ඡා කෙරෙන්නේ.

මගේ විශ්වාසයේ හැටියට නම්, මෙම ධවල පත්‍රිකාව සකස් කර තිබෙන්නේ එයින් ඉදිරිපත් කෙරෙන යෝජනා අනුව දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පණත සකස් කිරීම පිණිසයි. එම නිසා, මේ විවාදයේදී ඉදිරිපත් වුණු සෑම කරුණක්ම හොඳින් සලකා බලා, විශේෂයෙන්ම මෙම ගරු සභාවේ මුස්ලිම් මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්ගෙන් ප්‍රකාශ වුණු අදහස් සලකා බලා, පණත සකස් කළ යුතුයි. එපමණක් නොවෙයි, අප මේ පණතට සහ යෝග්‍ය දෙන්නේ, සිංහල භාෂාව මේ රටේ එකම රාජ්‍ය භාෂාව වශයෙන් පිළිගන්න බවත්, ඒපබරල් ආණ්ඩුවක් මේ රටේ ඇති කිරීමට සූදනම් නොවන බවත්, සිංහ කොඩිය මේ රටේ එකම ජාතික කොඩිය වශයෙන් පිළිගන්න බවත්, උතුරේත් නැගෙනහිරේත් තිබෙන ඉඩම් වල සිංහලයන්ට පදිංචි වීමට ඉඩ දෙන බවත් ඒපබරල් පක්ෂය විසින් මෙම විවාදයේදී ප්‍රකාශ කළොත් පමණයි. එවැනි ප්‍රකාශයක් නොකරතොත්, මා කලින් මතක් කළ තැනට නැවත වරක් යන්නට අප සූදනම් බව මතක් කරමින් මගේ කථාව අවසාන කරනවා.

කළු තැඹිලි :

දිසා ත්‍රිකා සහ පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

ඒ. ලන්ස් සිත්තලෙබෙ මයා. (මඩකල  
පුව දෙවන මන්ත්‍රී)

(ஐனாப் ஏ. லதீப் சின்னலெப்பை—மட்டக்  
களப்பு இரண்டாம் அங்கத்தவர்)

(Mr. A. Latiff Sinnalebbe—Second Batticaloa)

உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, நேற்று இம் மதிப்புக்குரிய அவையிலே நடந்த விவாதங்களை அவதானிக்கையில் உள்ளூர்க் குழப்பம் ஒன்று ஏற்பட்டதுபோல் எனக்குத் தென்பட்டது. இன்று நடைபெற்ற நிகழ்ச்சிகள் குடும்பக் குழப்பங்கள், கோளாறுகள் போல் காட்சி அளித்தன. முஸ்லிம் பிரதிநிதிகளில், இதுவரையில் நியமன அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவரும் தெரிவு செய்யப்பட்ட அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவரும் தான் இந்த விவாதத்தில் பேசி இருக்கிறார்கள். இந்த நேரத்திலே முஸ்லிம் மக்களால், பெரும் பான்மையான வாக்குகளால் தெரிந்தெடுக்கப்பட்ட ஒரு பிரதிநிதி என்ற ஹோதாவில் இச்சந்தர்ப்பத்திலே பேசுவதற்கு எனக்கொரு சந்தர்ப்பத்தை அளித்தமைக்கு நான் உங்களுக்கு முதலில் நன்றி கூறுகிறேன்.

நாம் அறிந்த மட்டில் ஆரம்பத்தில் 'கம்ச பாக்கள்' இந்த நாட்டு உள்ளூராட்சி அமைப்பில் இருந்தன. அதற்குப் பின்னர் கிராம சபைகள், பட்டண சபைகள், நகர சபைகள், மாநகர சபைகள் என்ற அமைப்புக்கள் உள்ளூராட்சி நிர்வாகத்தில் ஏற்படுத்தப்பட்டன. இதே வேளையில் கச்சேரியோடு அரசாங்க அலுவல்கள் நடைமுறையில் தொடர்ந்தும் இருந்து வந்தன. இதற்கிடையில் ஒரே ஒரு மாற்றம் மட்டும் ஏற்பட்டது. அதாவது 'ரட்ட மகாத் மையாக்கள்', 'வன்னியமுதலியார்', 'மணியக் காஸ்' என்றிருந்த நிர்வாகப்பதவிகள் மட்டும் அகற்றப்பட்டு மக்களுக்காகச் சேவை புரிவதற்கு, போதியளவு பயிற்சி அளித்து சோதனை வைத்து, தெரிந்தெடுக்கப்பட்டவர்களைக் கொண்ட D. R. O. system அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டுவரப்பட்டது நாம் அறிந்தவிடயமே. இதே வேளையில், ஜனநாயக அடிப்படையில் அரசாங்க அலுவல்கள் நடக்கும் முறையில், மக்களுக்கும் போதியளவு பொறுப்புக் கொடுக்கப்படவேண்டுமென்ற சூழ்நிலையில், பிரதேச சபைகள் கொண்டுவரப்பட வேண்டுமென்று 1957 ஆம் ஆண்டு வைகாசி மாதம் எஸ். டபிள்யூ. ஆர். டி. பண்டாரநாயக்க அவர்களின் ஆட்சியிலே திட்டமிடப்பட்டிருந்தது. அதன்பின்பு, 1957 ஆம் ஆண்டு ஆடி மாதம் நாம் எல்லோரும் அறிந்த பண்டாரநாயக்க—செல்ல

நாயகம் ஒப்பந்தம் கொண்டுவரப்பட்டது. அதற்கு ஏற்பட்ட கதி என்ன என்பது இந்நாட்டில் வாழக்கூடிய எல்லா மக்களும் அறிந்ததே.

இது இவ்வாறிருக்க, 1963 ஆம் ஆண்டு ஆடி மாதம் திருமதி ஸ்ரீமாவோ பண்டாரநாயக்க ஆட்சியிலே, அவரது சிம்மாசனப் பிரசங்கத் திலே, மாவட்ட சபைகள் அமைப்பதைப் பற்றிக் குறிப்பிடப்பட்டிருந்தது. அதைத் தொடர்ந்து, நாம் அறிந்த மகாதந்தில ஆணைக் குழு நியமிக்கப்பட்டு 1964 ஆம் ஆண்டு மாசி மாதம் அவர்கள் அறிக்கை வெளியிட்டிருந்தார்கள். அந்த அறிக்கையைத் தொடர்ந்து 1964 ஆம் ஆண்டு நிகழ்த்தப்பட்ட சிம்மாசனப் பிரசங்கத்திலே மாவட்ட சபைகள் நிறுவுவது பற்றி நடவடிக்கைகள் எடுப்பதாகவும் கூறப் பட்டிருந்தது. நேற்றுப் பேசிய கௌரவ வவுனியாப் பிரதிநிதி (திரு. ரீ. சிவசிதம் பரம்) மிக நல்ல முறையிலே இதுபற்றி எடுத்துக்காட்டினார். அவர் கூறினார், “அன்று அதை எதிர்த்தார்கள் தமிழரசுக்கட்சியினர்” என்று. ஆம்; இன்று கச்சேரியின் நடைமுறைத் திட்டத்திலே, அம்முறையை அழித்து, பொது மக்களுக்கும் மக்களால் தெரிவுசெய்யப்பட்ட பிரதிநிதிகளுக்கும் அதில் இடம் வேண்டுமென்று கேட்பதை நாம் மறுக்கவில்லை. அது நல்ல ஒரு திட்டமென்று எல்லோரும் வரவேற்கின்றார்கள். எல்லா மக்களும் அதை வரவேற்கின்றார்கள் என்று எங்களுடைய பிரதமர் அவர்கள் கூறினார்கள். அதே போன்று நாங்களும் அதை வரவேற்கின்றோம். இல்லை யென்று நாம் மறுக்கவில்லை.

தேசிய அரசாங்கம் வந்த பின்புதான் ஒற்றுமையேற்பட்டதென்று மிகவும் பெருந்தன்மையோடு, மிகச் சிறந்த முறையிலே நாம் எல்லோரும் கூறிக்கொண்டுதான் திரிகிறோம். ஆனால், இப்போதிருக்கக்கூடிய கச்சேரி நடைமுறைத் திட்டத்திலே இந்த உண்மையை நாம் காணக்கூடியதாக இருக்கின்றதா? எவ்வளவு தூரம் ஒரு இனம் இன்னொரு இனத்தைப் பாதிக்கின்றதென்பதை சற்று வேளையிலே நான் உங்களுக்குச் சுட்டிக்காட்டுவேன். இப்போது நமது மத்தியிலே இருக்கின்ற

கரீ வலி:

[சென்னை மன்றலே மன்றலே.]

மாவட்டசபை மசோதா வெள்ளை அறிக்கையிலே, ஏழாவது பக்கத்திலே கூறப்பட்டிருக்கின்றது—

### “Principles of Draft Bill—1968

The draft Bill approved by the Cabinet provides for Councils to be constituted in each district, meaning an Administrative District.

**Composition.**—The District Council will consist of *ex-officio* Councillors, namely (a) elected Members of Parliament for each electoral district which lies within such administrative district, (b) Appointed Members of the House of Representatives, (c) Mayors of Municipalities and Chairmen of Local Bodies within the administrative district. There will also be not more than three nominated Councillors.”

இதிலே கூறப்பட்டது போல, மாவட்ட சபைகளிலே அங்கம் வகிக்கக் கூடிய அங்கத்தவர்கள், நாடாளுமன்ற அங்கத்தினரும் மற்றும் உள்ளூர் ஆட்சி மன்றங்களிலுள்ள தலைவர்களுமாவர். மேலதிகமாக மூன்றுக்கு மேற்படாத கவுன்சிலர்களும் அங்கம்வகிப்பார்கள் எனக் கூறப்பட்டுள்ளது.

இந்த இடத்தில்தான், கிழக்கு மாகாணத்தைப் பொறுத்த மட்டில் உள்ள ஒரு மாபெரும் பிரச்சினையை இந்த அவையில் கூறிவைக்க விரும்புகிறேன். மட்டக்களப்பு மாவட்டத்திலே முஸ்லிம் மக்கள் வாழ்ந்திருந்தும் அங்கு வாழக்கூடிய அத்தனை முஸ்லிம் மக்களுக்கும் இருக்கக்கூடிய பிரதிநிதி நான் ஒருவன் மாத்திரம்தான் என்பதை நான் பெருமையாகக் கூறுகிறேன். இந்தச் சூழ்நிலையே அங்கு நிலவுகிறது. இவ்வாறு உள்ளூராட்சி மன்றங்களின் தலைவர்கள் மாவட்ட சபைகளிலே அங்கம் வகிப்பார்களாயிருந்தால் கிழக்கிலங்கையிலே ஐயாயிரம் பேர் சனத்தொகை உள்ளவர்களுக்கும் ஒரு கிராம சபை இருக்கிறது. இருபத்தையாயிரம் பேர் கொண்ட நகர சபைக்கும் ஒரு தலைவர் இருக்கிறார். பத்தாயிரம் பேர் கொண்ட சபைக்கும் அப்படித்தான். இதில் எங்கே இருக்கிறது பிரதிநிதித்துவம் என்று நான் இந்த அவையில் கேட்க விரும்புகிறேன்? இன்னும் நீட்டிக் கொண்டு சொல்ல வேண்டுமாயிருந்தால் இங்கு வீற்றிருக்கக்கூடிய நண்பர்களுக்கு வேதனையாக இருக்கலாம். ஆனால், உண்மையை மறுக்கவோ மறைக்கவோ முடியாது.

நான் இதற்கு முன்பும் சொன்னேன், இரண்டு மூன்று வருடங்களாக இந்தக்

தீர்மானம் என்னை மன்றலே மன்றலே

தேசிய அரசாங்கம் ஆட்சியிலிருந்த போதும் கூட, கிழக்கிலங்கையிலே உள்ளூராட்சி மன்றங்கள் எவ்வளவு தூரம் பிரிக்கப்பட்டு, பெருக்கப்பட்டு, அதிகரிக்கப்பட்டு வந்துள்ளன என்ற உண்மையைக் கூறிவைக்க விரும்புகிறேன். கௌரவ பொத்துவில் பாராளுமன்ற அங்கத்தவர் (ஜனாப் எம். ஏ. அப்துல் மஜீது) கூறுகிறார்கள், அங்குள்ள கிராம சபையைப் பிரிக்க வேண்டுமென்ற பிரச்சினை எழுந்து கொண்டிருப்பதாக; பிரித்துவிட்டார்களோ தெரியாது. அக்கரைப்பற்றிலே உள்ள கிராமசபையைப் பிரித்துவிட திட்டமிட்டு விட்டார்கள். கல்முனையிலுள்ள நகர சபையையும் பிரித்துவிட வேண்டுமென்று திட்டமிட்டிருக்கிறார்கள். இதே போன்று மட்டக்களப்பிலுள்ள ஆரைப்பத்தைக் கிராம சபையை இரண்டாகப் பிரிக்க வேண்டுமென்ற முயற்சிகள் எடுத்துவரப்படுகின்றன. இன்னும் வாழைச்சேனையிலுள்ள கிராம சபையை இரண்டாகப் பிரித்துவிட்டார்கள். ஓட்ட மாவடியை வேறொன்றாகவும் தமிழ்ப் பகுதியிலுள்ள வாழைச்சேனையை இன்னொன்றாகவும் பிரித்துவிட்டார்கள். இதிலே என்ன சூழ்ச்சி இருக்கிறது, என்ன சரி இருக்கிறது என்ற சந்தேகத்துடன் முஸ்லிம் சகோதரர்கள் சிந்திக்க வேண்டிய சூழ்நிலை இருந்துகொண்டிருக்கிறது.

உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இன்று இந்தப் பிரச்சினையிலே நான் அதிகம் சொல்ல வேண்டியதில்லை. ஏனென்றால் இது முஸ்லிம் மக்களை நோக்கிக் கொண்டிருக்கும் மாபெரும் பிரச்சினையாக இருக்கின்றது. அவர்கள் இந்த மாவட்ட சபையைச் சந்தேகக் குறியுடன் நோக்குகிறார்கள். அப்படி நோக்கும் பொழுது அவர்கள் மனத்திலே என்ன தோன்றும்? இப்படியெல்லாம் திட்டமிட்டுத்தான் இந்தக் கிராம சபைகளையும் நகர சபைகளையும் பிரித்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். இங்கே வந்துவிட்டது இந்தச் சரத்து. ஆகவே எம்மைச் சிறுபான்மையிலும் சிறுபான்மையாக ஆக்கத் திட்டமிட்டுவிட்டார்கள் தமிழரசுக் கட்சியினர் என்றுதான் அவர்கள் நினைக்கின்றார்கள். நாம் சில பகுதிகளில் சிறுபான்மையாக இருக்கிறோம். கல்முனைக்கு அப்பாற்பட்ட பகுதியில், அம்பாறை மாவட்டத்தில் பெரும்பான்மையாக முஸ்லிம் மக்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள். இப்படிப்

කල් නැඩීම :

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා සේවකයෝ

கிராம சபைகளையும் நகர சபைகளையும் பிரிக்  
கும் காரணத்தைக் கொண்டு எங்களைச் சிறு  
பான்மையாக ஆக்கி, மற்ற இடங்களில் உள்ள  
வர்களையும் சிறுபான்மையிலும் சிறுபான்மை  
யாக ஆக்க முயற்சிக்குகிறார்கள் என்றுதான்  
முஸ்லிம் மக்கள் குறைகூறுகிறார்கள். எதிர்க்  
கட்சியினர் இதை எடுத்துக் கொண்டு பல  
மாதிரி திட்டமிட்டுக் கொண்டு பல பிரச்சினை  
களை வளர்த்துக் கொண்டு வருகிறார்கள்.

ஆகவே, நான் இங்கு கேட்டுக் கொள்வது என்னவென்றால், முதலாவதாக இப்படித் திட்டமிட்டுப் பிரிக்கப்படும் கிராம சபைகளின் பிரிவுகள் உடனடியாக நிறுத்தப்பட வேண்டும். இரண்டாவதாக, முஸ்லிம்களின் சனத் தொகையைக் கொண்டு அந்த ரீதியிலே பிரதிநிதிகள் அங்கம் வகிக்கக்கூடிய ஏற்பாடுகளைச் செய்வதோடு அந்த விதத்தில் சரத்துக்கள் திருத்தப்பட வேண்டும்.

கௌரவ தம்பபெனிய பாராளுமன்ற அங்கத்தவர் (திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனாநாயக்க) நேற்றுப் பேசுகையில் முஸ்லிம்களும் சிங்கள மக்களும் அன்புடன் வாழ்கிறார்கள், ஒற்றுமையுடன் வாழ்கிறார்கள் என்று கூறினார். ஆம். இந்தச் சந்தர்ப்பத்திலே ஓர் உண்மையையும் கூறிவைக்க விரும்புகிறேன். சிங்களப் பிரதேசத்தில் வாழும் முஸ்லிம் மக்கள் எந்தவிதமான அசம்பாவிதங்களுக்கிடையோ எந்தவிதமான கவலையுடனோ வாழவில்லை. அவர்களுக்குப் போதிய அளவு பாதுகாப்பும் கௌரவமும் மதிப்பும் சிங்கள மக்கள் கொடுத்து வருகிறார்கள். கிழக்கிலங்கையிலே உதாரணத்துக்குச் சொல்வார்கள், முஸ்லிம் கிராமங்களும் முஸ்லிம் மக்களும் பிட்டிலே தேங்காய்ப் பூவும் மாவும் எப்படிக்கலந்து இருக்கிறதோ அதே போன்று கலந்து இருக்கின்றன என்று. தேங்காய்ப் பூ இல்லாவிட்டால் பிட்டுக்கு உருசி இல்லை. மா இல்லாமல் தனிய தேங்காய்ப்பூ இருந்தாலும் உருசி இல்லை. அப்படி இருந்தும் கூட, அறிந்த உண்மையை இவர்கள் உணர்ந்தும் கூட, ஏன் அசம்பாவிதமாக முஸ்லிம் மக்களை நடத்த எத்தனிக்கிறார்கள் என்று கேட்க விரும்புகிறேன்?. நேற்று கௌரவ வட்டுக்கோட்டைப் பிரதிநிதி பேசுகையில் ஒன்றைக் குறிப்பிட்டார். அது எனக்கு மிகுந்த வேதனையாக இருந்தது. கல்முனைத் தொகுதியிலே நடந்த இடைத் தேர்தலில் தமிழரசுக் கட்சி 4,000 மேலதிக வாக்குகளை ஈட்டியது என்று அறிவித்தார்.

ஞர். அந்த நாலாயிரம் மேலதிக வாக்குகளும் எங்களாலேதான் கிடைத்தனவே தவிர தமிழரசுக் கட்சியினால் கிடைக்கவில்லை என் பதை நான் இங்கு தெரிவிக்க ஆசைப்படு கிறேன்.

கல்முனைத் தொகுதியிலேயுள்ள, முஸ்லிம் மக்கள் பெருந்தொகையாக வாழும் சாய்ந்த மருதிலும் கல்முனைக்குடியிலும் நடந்த தேசிய அரசாங்கத்தின் தேர்தல் பிரசாரக் கூட்டங்களிலே தமிழரசுக் கட்சி உறுப்பினர்கள் மேடைக்கு வந்தார்களாக? வந்திருந்தாலும் கூட பேச எத்தனித்தார்களா என்று கேட்க விரும்புகிறேன்? ஏன் அங்கே பேச முன்வரவில்லை? பேசவே இல்லை. பெரும்பான்மையான முஸ்லிம்கள் வாழக்கூடிய பகுதியாகிய சாய்ந்தமருதில் நடந்த கூட்டத்தில், கல்முனைக் குடியில் நடந்த கூட்டத்தில் இவர்கள் தலைதாக்க முன்வரவில்லை. அப்படியிருந்தும் சொல்கிறார்கள் கல்முனை இடைத் தேர்தலிலே 4,000 மேலதிக வாக்குகள் தமிழரசுக் கட்சிக்குக் கிடைத்தது; அதனால் தமிழரசுக் கட்சியின் மதிப்பும் கௌரவமும் வளர்ந்து கொண்டு வருகிறது என்று. அவர்களுக்கு மீண்டும் மீண்டும் ஞாபகப்படுத்த விரும்புகிறேன், அத்தனை மேலதிக வாக்குகளும் எங்களால்தான் கிடைத்தன என்பதை மறந்து விடாதீர்கள் என்று.

உப சபாநாயகரவர்களே, சிங்களப் பகுதி களில் வாழக்கூடிய முஸ்லிம் மக்களைப் பற்றி ஆரம்பத்தில் கூறினேன். சிங்கள மக்கள் முஸ்லிம் மக்களை எவ்வளவு தூரம் கௌரவிக் கிறார்கள் என்பதற்கு ஒன்றை எடுத்துக்கூற விரும்புகிறேன். வெலிமடைத் தொகுதியி லுள்ள கிராம சபை ஒன்றிலே ஒரு முஸ்லிம் அங்கத்தவர் அக்கிராசனராக இருந்தார். அந் தச் சபையிலே அவர் தான் ஒரேயொரு முஸ் லிம் அங்கத்தவர். அவர் இறந்து விட்டார். அவர் இறந்தவுடன் உடனடியாகத் தேர்தல் நடந்தது. அந்த இடைத் தேர்தல் நடப்பதற் கிடையில் அந்தக் கிராமசபை அக்கிராசன ராக இன்னுமொருவரைத் தெரிந்தெடுத்து விட்டார்கள். அவர் ஒரு சிங்களவர். அந்த இடைத் தேர்தலில் காலஞ் சென்ற முன்னாள் அங்கத்தவருடைய மகன் போட்டியிட்டார். அவர் தேர்தலில் வெற்றியீட்டி அந்தக் கிராம சபையின் அங்கத்தவரானார். அப்படி அவர் தெரிந்தெடுக்கப்பட்டதும் அந்தச் சிங்கள மக் களுடைய பெருந்தன்மையைப் பாருங்கள்.

கலீ லலி:

கிஷ் திந் ஸலா பிசிபிவிதே ஸோசலா

[லீஃப் ஸிங்லெலெலெ லலா.]

அந்தக் கிராமசபையின் தலைவராகத் தேர்ந்தெடுக்கப்பட்டிருந்த சிங்களவர் உடனடியாகத் தமது தலைவர் பதவியை ராஜினாமா செய்துவிட்டு அந்த முஸ்லிம் இளைஞரை தலைவராக்கினார்கள். இந்தப் பெருந்தன்மை இன்று தமிழரசுக் கட்சியிடம் இருக்கிறதா என்று கேட்க விரும்புகிறேன்?

வி. டீலேன்ஸி லலா. (ஓடுவிடீ)

(திரு. வி. தர்மலிங்கம்—உடுவில்)

(Mr. V. Dharmalingam—Uduvil)

நீங்கள் டெபியுடி மேயராக வந்தது எப்படி?

லீஃப் ஸிங்லெலெலெ லலா.

(ஜனாப் லதீப் சின்னலெப்பை)

(Mr. Latiff Sinnalebbe)

அதற்கு நான் பதில் கூறுகிறேன். கொழும்பு மாநகரசபையை எடுத்துப் பாருங்கள். கொழும்பு மாநகர சபையில் நாற்பத்தெட்டு அங்கத்தவர்கள் இருந்த போதிலும் அச்சபையில் உள்ள முஸ்லிம் அங்கத்தவர்கள் எத்தனை பேர்? கொழும்பு மாநகர சபையில் பதினான்கு முஸ்லிம் அங்கத்தவர்கள் மாத்திரமே இருக்கிறார்கள். மூன்று தமிழ் அங்கத்தவர்களும் இருக்கிறார்கள். அப்படி இருந்தும் பெரும்பான்மைச் சமூகத்தினரின் பெருந்தன்மையை எடுத்துப் பாருங்கள்; கொழும்பு மாநகர சபையின் முதல்வர் உப முதல்வர் ஆகிய இரு பதவிகளையும் முஸ்லிம் சமூகத்திற்கே வழங்கி இருக்கிறார்கள். அப்படியான தன்மை இங்கே. ஆனால் கிழக்கு இலங்கையில் நான் உப மேயராக இருப்பதைப் பற்றிக் கூறுகிறார்கள். உண்மைதான். நாம் இல்லாவிட்டால் மேயர் பதவியே தமிழ் அரசுக் கட்சியினருக்கு வந்திருக்க முடியாதென்று இங்கே கூறி வைக்க விரும்புகிறேன். நான் இவைகளை எதற்காக இங்கு கூறுகிறேன் என்றால், நடைமுறையில் நமது மனநிலை, மனப்பான்மை மாற வேண்டும். அப்படியாக மனப்பான்மை மாறினால் ஒழிய முஸ்லிம் மக்கள், குறிப்பாகக் கிழக்கு இலங்கை எங்கும் பரந்து வாழும் முஸ்லிம்களுக்கு மாவட்டசபைகள் எந்தவிதமான பலனையும் அளிக்க முடியாது. அவர்கள் இந்த விஷயத்தை எதிர்க்கத்தான் செய்வார்கள் என்று கூறிவைக்க விரும்புகிறேன்.

கிழக்கிலங்கையைப் பொறுத்த மட்டில் முக்கியமான பிரச்சினை ஒன்று. மண்டரில் உள்ள பதின்மூன்றாம் குடியேற்றத் திட்டம் பட்டிருப்புத் தொகுதியில் இருக்கின்றது. இங்கு 152 முஸ்லிம் குடும்பங்கள் குடியேற்றப்பட்டு இருக்கிறார்கள். 1949 ஆம் ஆண்டு கல்லோயா அபிவிருத்திச் சபையினால் முஸ்லிம் மக்களுக்காக உருவாக்கப்பட்ட இக்குடியேற்றத்திட்டத்தில் கொண்டுபோய் 152 குடும்பங்களைக் குடியேற்றினார்கள். ஏறத்தாழ பத்தொன்பது ஆண்டுகள் கழிந்து விட்டன. இவ்விடத்தில் இன்னுமொரு முக்கியமான விடயத்தையும் கூறி வைக்க வேண்டும். இந்த மண்டர் குடியேற்றத் திட்டத்திலுள்ள 152 குடும்பங்களிலும் 52 குடும்பங்கள் எனது நண்பர் கௌரவ பொத்துவில் பிரதிநிதி (ஜனாப் எம். ஏ. அப்துல் மஜீத்) அவர்களது தொகுதியிலும் மிகுதி 100 குடும்பங்களும் பட்டிருப்புத் தொகுதியிலும் அமைந்து இருக்கின்றன. இன்று அங்கு என்ன நடந்திருக்கின்றது? இதையிட்டு பொத்துவில் பிரதிநிதி அவர்களும் நானும் அரசாங்க அதிபரிடம் எவ்வளவோ முறையிட்டோம். ஆனால், என்ன செய்வது, இங்கிருக்கக்கூடிய பாராளுமன்ற அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவரின் உறவினர் அங்கு Colonization Officer—அதாவது குடியேற்ற அதிகாரியாக இருக்கின்ற காரணத்தினால் நீதிக்கு இடமில்லாமல் போய்விட்டது. அந்தக் குடியேற்றத் திட்டத்தில் முஸ்லிம் மைய வாடிக்கு ஒதுக்கப்பட்ட இடத்திலே இன்று மக்களைக் குடியேற்றி வீடும் கட்டிவிட்டார்கள் என்று கௌரவ பொத்துவில் பிரதிநிதி கூறுகிறார். எனவே, இவ்வித மனப்பான்மைகள் இன்னும் மாறவில்லை. இந்த மனப்பான்மை மாறாத வரையில் நீங்கள் ஏன் கேட்கின்றீர்கள் மாவட்ட சபை? அதைக் கிழக்கு இலங்கையிலே எப்படி முஸ்லிம் மக்கள் ஆதரிக்க முடியும்?

இது தொடர்பாக இன்னுமொரு விடயத்தைக் கூற விரும்புகிறேன். 25 ஆம் யூனியரில் சிங்கள மக்களுக்காகக் கொடுக்கப்பட்ட குடியேற்றத்தில் அங்கு கொடுமை செய்கிறார்கள். இதுபற்றி Land Commissioner அவர்களுக்கு எடுத்துரைப்பதற்கென அங்கிருந்து மக்கள் நேற்று முன்தினம் கொழும்புக்கு வந்திருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்கள் அங்கு வாழ்வதற்கு இடம் அளிக்கிறார்கள் இல்லை. துரத்துகிறார்கள். இல்லாத வஞ்சனை எல்லாம் செய்கிறார்கள். இல்லாத வஞ்சனை எல்லாம் செய்கிறார்கள். இவ்விதம் கொடுக்கிறார்கள். சிங்

දිසෝ ත්‍රිකෝ සහා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

அதுமாத்திரமல்ல. இன்னுமொரு பிரச்சினை யையும் உங்களுக்குச் சொல்லிவைக்க விரும்புகிறேன். முஸ்லிம் மக்களுடைய நிலை என்ன சூழலிலேயிருக்கின்றதென்பதை மக்கள் அனைவரும் அறிய வேண்டுமென்பதற்காகத் தான் நான் இதைக் கூறுகின்றேன். என்னுடைய பேச்சின் முன்னுரையிலே நான் குறிப்பிட்டேன்; அதாவது, Chief Headmen

இன்னுமொரு முக்கிய பிரச்சினையை, சமீப காலத்திலே—இந்த அவையிலே நடந்த ஒரு பிரச்சினையை நான் உங்களுக்குக் கூறிவைக்க விரும்புகிறேன். தமிழ் பேசும் மக்கள் என்று கூறிக்கொள்கின்றார்கள். முஸ்லிம்களாகிய நாங்கள் தமிழ் பேசுகின்ற காரணத்தினாலே எங்களையும் தமிழ் பேசும் மக்கள் என்று கூறு கின்றீர்களே, இன்று, இந்த இடத்தில்தான் மறந்துவிட்டீர்கள் உங்களுடைய தமிழ் பேசும் நண்பர்களை ! அதாவது—இலங்கை வானொலி ஒலிபரப்புக் கூட்டுத்தாபனச் சபையிலே அங்கம் வகிப்பதற்காக முஸ்லிம் ஒருவரைக் கௌரவ பிரதமர் அவர்கள் நியமித்த பொழுது—Advocate ஹாஷிம் அவர்களை நியமித்த பொழுது—என்ன கூறினீர்கள் தமிழரசுக்கட்சித் தலைவர்களே ! அங்கு ஒரு தமிழ்ப் பிரதிநிதியைத் தாருங்கள் என்று கேட்டீர்கள். எங்கே உங்களுடைய “தமிழ் பேசும் மக்கள்” என்ற போர்வை? அந்த இடத்திலே உங்களுடைய “தமிழ் பேசும் மக் கள்” என்ற போர்வை இருக்கவில்லையா? அவர் தமிழ் பேசும்மகனில்லையா? உங்களு டைய தேவைக்கு, குழலுக்கு இணங்கத்தான் தமிழ் பேசும் மக்களா? நாங்கள் முஸ்லிம் களாகவே வாழ விரும்புகிறோம். நாங்கள் தமிழ் மொழி பேசுபவர்களாக இருந்தபோதி லும், “தமிழ் பேசும் மக்கள்” என்ற போர் வைப்பில் தமிழரசுக் கட்சியாருடன் சேர்க்கப்

Headmen, **അവതരിപ്പിക്കുക**

கல் வலி:

தீவிரக் கல்வியைக் கல்வியை

[தீவிரக் கல்வியைக் கல்வியை]

படுவதை எந்தச் சூழலிலும் நாங்கள் விரும்ப வில்லையென்றுதான் நான் கூறிவைக்க விரும்புகிறேன்.

பின்பு நடந்தது என்ன? தமிழரசுக் கட்சி என்று சொல்லுகின்ற பொழுது, அதை ஆங்கிலத்திலே Federal Party என்று சொல்லுகின்றார்கள். தமிழ் மக்களிடத்திலே செல்கின்ற பொழுது “தமிழரசுக் கட்சி” என்று சொல்லுகின்றார்கள். முஸ்லிம்களிடத்திலே போகின்றபொழுது “சமஸ்திக் கட்சி” என்று சொல்லுகின்றார்கள். இதற்கு மூன்று நாமங்கள் இருக்கின்றன.

வீரேந்திரன்.

(திரு. தர்மலிங்கம்)

(Mr. Dharmalingam)

அது உங்களுடைய கற்பனை.

[தீவிரக் கல்வியைக் கல்வியை]

(ஜனாப் லதிப் சின்னலெப்பை)

(Mr. Latiff Sinnalebbe)

முஸ்லிம் மக்கள் ஏன் பயமும் பீதியும் மடைந்துகொண்டிருக்கின்றார்கள்? அரசாங்கத்தின் மீதும், கௌரவ பிரதமர் அவர்கள் மீதும் அவர்கள் நம்பிக்கை வைத்துக்கொண்டிருந்தும் தங்களுக்கு என்ன நடக்கப்போகின்றதென்று தெரியாமல் அவர்கள் பீதியடைந்து, பயந்து, நொந்துபோயிருக்கின்றார்கள். அதற்கும் காரணம் காட்டுகின்றேன். மூதூர் பிரதிநிதி அவர்கள் தமிழிலே வாசித்துக் காட்டிய பத்திரிகைச் செய்தி. இன்று வெளியாகிய “Sun” பத்திரிகையிலே தலையங்கத்திலே காணப்படுகின்றது:

“Chelva favours even pruned Bill :

‘Even though the District Councils as envisaged in the White Paper will have only limited powers, the Federal Party feels it is politically advisable to accept them. It is merely a means to an end and we are certain we can obtain more powers as time goes on.’

This is what the Federal Party Chief, Mr. S. V. J. Chelvanayakam, says in the course of an interview published in the Federal Party weekly organ ‘Sutanti-ran’.”—

This is the English translation of his statement—

“....As far as the Federal Party is concerned, it is true that by the passage of this Bill we are not getting that amount of power which we were expecting to get.”—

The Hon. Prime Minister himself said this on the Floor of this House.

—“However, our party feels that it would be politically advisable to accept this Bill and establish these District Councils even though they are with limited powers. By and by we can obtain more power as time goes on. The District Councils in the Sinhala areas may at one time clamour for more powers, and the Government may be compelled to yield to such pressure. As a result, those powers will also be extended to the District Councils of Tamil areas as well.”

இதையிட்டுச் சாதாரண பொதுமகன் என்ன நினைக்கிறான்? அறிவுள்ளவர்கள், படித்தவர்கள் இதைப் பற்றி, இது அரசியல் தந்திரமா, அல்லது வேறேதுமா என்று நினைக்கலாம்; நினைக்காமலும் இருக்கலாம். ஆனால், கல்வி அறிவற்ற சாதாரண மகன், நடமாடிக் கொண்டு திரிபவன் இப்படிப்பட்ட காரணங்களை வாசிக்கும் பொழுது என்ன நினைக்கிறான்? ஆம். மற்றவர்கள் இதை எதிர்த்துக் கூறுவதில் என்னமோ உண்மை இருக்கிறது போலத் தோன்றுகிறதே. ஆகவே, இப்படிப்பட்ட பிரச்சினைகள் அகற்றப்பட வேண்டும். இந்த நிலை மாறவேண்டும்.

நேற்று நடந்த விவாதத்தில் கூட, நாம் சமஸ்திக் ஆட்சியை விரும்புகிறோம் என்று கௌரவ வட்டுக்கோட்டைப் பிரதிநிதி (திரு. ஏ. அமிர்தலிங்கம்) குறிப்பிட்டார். அதை அவர் மறுக்கவில்லை. உண்மையாகவே நான் கேட்கிறேன். அந்த நிலையை நீங்கள் கைவிட்டு விட்டீர்களா? அதை நீங்கள் கைவிட்டால் திட்டவாட்டமாக இந்த நாட்டிலே ஒற்றுமைக் கொடியின் கீழ், ஒரே கொடியின் கீழ் நாம் எல்லோரும் ஒன்று சேர்ந்து, இந்தத் தேசிய அரசாங்கத்தையும் பலப்படுத்திக்கொண்டு வாழலாம். அப்படியில்லாமல் நீங்கள் உங்கள் சமஸ்திக் கொள்கையை கடைப்பிடித்துக்கொண்டு இருப்பீர்களே யானால் கிழக்கிலங்கை வாழ் முஸ்லிம் மக்களும் ‘இஸ்லாமியத்தான்’ வேண்டுமென்று தான் கேட்பார்கள். அதைக் கேட்டுப் போராடுவார்கள். இதை மறந்துவிடவேண்டும். [இடையீடு]. நீங்கள் மறுக்காமல் இருந்தால் போதும்.

கௌரவ யாழ்ப்பாண அங்கத்தவர் (திரு. ஜி. ஜி. பொன்னம்பலம்) பேசிக்கொண்டிருக்கையில் இப்படிப்பட்ட மாவட்ட சபைகளால் மற்றப் பகுதிகளில் சிறுபான்மையினராக இருக்கக்கூடிய தமிழ் மக்களுக்கு என்ன அநீதி

கலீ வுலீ:

දිස්ත්‍රික් සහ පිහිටුවීමේ කේෂණ

கள், என்ன திங்குகள் விளைக்கப்படுமோ என்று அஞ்சுவதாகக் குறிப்பிட்டார். அதிலும் ஓரளவு உண்மை இருக்கத்தான் செய்கிறது. இது இப்படியிருக்க, நாம் இன்று இந்த அரசியல் அமைப்பிலே, சூழலிலே கண்ட ஒரு பெரும் உண்மை, 1956 ஆம் ஆண்டுக்குப் பின் அரசியல் கட்சிகள் அத்தனையும்—தமிழரசுக் கட்சியினரைத் தவிர— அவற்றின் கொள்கைகளை ஓரளவு மாற்றியமைத்திருக்கின்றன என்பது. எங்கள் ஐக்கிய தேசியக் கட்சியை எடுத்துப் பார்த்தாலும், நாம் எங்கள் கொள்கையை ஓரளவு திருத்தியமைத்திருப்பதை இன்று காணக்கூடியதாக இருக்கிறது. கௌரவ பிரதம அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் அவரது நேரம் பூராவையும் பொதுமக்களுடனும் கமக்காரர்களுடனும் கலந்துறவாடுவதில் கழிப்பதை நாம் காண்கிறோம். அன்று நாம் இதைக் காணவில்லை. எதற்காக இந்தக் கட்சிகள் தங்கள் கொள்கையை மாற்றின? ஸ்ரீ லங்கா சுதந்திரக் கட்சியினர் அவர்கள் கொள்கையை மாற்றினார்கள் வேறுவிதமாக. கம்யூனிஸ்ட் கட்சி, எல். எஸ். எஸ். பி. ஆகிய கட்சிகள் தங்கள் கொள்கையை மாற்றிக் கூட்டாட்சியில் சேர்ந்து, இப்பொழுது ஜனநாயகத்தைப் பற்றிப் பேச முன்வந்துவிட்டன. இந்தச் சூழ்நிலையிலே ஏன் தமிழரசுக் கட்சியினர் தங்கள் கொள்கையை மாற்றவில்லை? ஐக்கிய இலங்கையை உருவாக்க வேண்டும், ஐக்கிய இலங்கையிலே வாழவேண்டும் என்று பெருமிதம் பேசுவதில் எந்தவிதமான பிரயோசனமும் ஏற்படாது. நீங்களும் உங்களுடைய கொள்கையை மாற்றி எங்களுடைய பிரதமர் கொண்டுவரக்கூடிய நல்ல கருமங்களுக்கு உதவிபுரியுங்கள் என்று கேட்டுக் கொள்கிறேன்.

இலங்கையிலே இருக்கக் கூடிய சூழ்நிலை நல்லதாக இருக்கும் சந்தர்ப்பத்தைப் பார்த்து இதை அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டு வந்தால் எல்லாரும் வரவேற்பார்கள். ஆனால், இன்று ஏற்பட்டிருக்கக்கூடிய இந்தச் சூழ்நிலையில் மிகப் பெரிய எதிர்ப்புக்கள் இருந்து கொண்டிருக்கும் இந்த வேளையிலே இதை வற்புறுத்தாதீர்கள். பெருந்தன்மையாக நடவுங்கள் என்று கேட்டு, எனக்குப் பேசுவதற்குச் சந்தர்ப்பம் தந்தமைக்காக தங்களுக்கு நன்றிகூறி, எனது பேச்சை முடித்துக் கொள்கிறேன்.

අ. හා. 8.12

එම්. අබ්දුල් බකීර් මාර්කර් මහ. (බේරුවල)

(ஜனாப் எம். அப்துல் பாக்கீர் மார்கார்—வேருவலை)

(Mr. M. Abdul Bakeer Markar—Beruwala)

I am grieved to see the turn this Debate has taken. While the discussion on the White Paper proposals was going on various persons were appealing to the baser instincts of man through communalism thereby bringing about hatred among communities.

When the hon. Member for Dambadeniya (Mr. R. G. Senanayake) first started speaking I thought he was trying to be a friend of the Muslims. He tried to show us how grieved he was about the conditions of Muslims in Ceylon today. I thought we had at long last got someone who could champion our cause and see that justice was done to the Muslims. But when he went further and tried to create certain differences between the Muslims and the Tamils and spoke in derogatory terms, I felt that he was not a champion of peace nor a person who was prepared to bring about understanding between the communities, but one who would sow the seeds of discord and create enmity and hatred between the two communities. I wonder what his father would have said, had he been alive today, about the greatness of his son, trying to bring about national unity in this country!

I thought there was something behind the move of the hon. Member for Dambadeniya in trying to bring about dissension between the different communities, and when I listened to the hon. Second Member for Batticaloa (Mr. Latiff Sinnalebbe) I realized that the hon. Member for Dambadeniya had succeeded to some extent in trying to drive a wedge between the Muslims and the Tamils in this country.—[Interruption]. I am not speaking for the Batticaloa Muslims. I would ask the hon. Member to take a lesson from the manner in which the Muslims and the Sinhalese are living in the Sinhalese areas. We do not

කල් තැබීම:

දිස්ත්‍රික් සහ පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

[අබ්දුල් බකීර් මාකර් මයා.]

offer provocation to the Sinhalese, and there is much understanding between the Sinhalese and the Muslims living in Ceylon. We do not provoke them and we have no occasion to find fault with them. There is much understanding between the Sinhalese and the Muslims. As a result of that understanding we are prepared to do our best by the Sinhalese community and they in turn are prepared to help the Muslim community as an elder brother would help a younger brother.

At the time of the recent by-election I was in Kalmunai and I saw the manner in which the Tamils and the Muslims were conducting themselves towards one another. The misunderstanding and hatred that existed between the two communities is attributable to the Muslim leaders living in that area. The Tamil community in that area was not that provocative. They were prepared to give and take. If the manner in which some of the Muslims behaved at that time is to be considered as the general standard, I do not want to call myself a Muslim.

If there is misunderstanding between the Tamil community and the members of the Tamil community must take the blame. I do not say that the Muslim community alone is to blame. There are occasions when the members of the Tamil community as well have to be cautioned.

If you trace back the history of communalism in this country it goes back to the old days of "Fifty-fifty." We know how at a time when the majority community was anxious to bring about a united Ceylon and were prepared to go some distance to secure that ideal, we lost what we could have won as a result of the moves by the then Tamil leaders.

The hon. Member for Kayts (Mr. V. Navaratnam) mentioned how the late Mr. D. S. Senanayake was prepared to give recognition to the Tamil language and how things were moving in that direction, and then there was the move to see that both Sinhalese and Tamil were made the

official languages. Then one recalls how the then Prime Minister, Sir John Kotelawala, went to Jaffna and to Kayts and how he was crowned and garlanded. The Tamils then wanted parity of status for the Tamil language. What was the result? As a result of your own action a wave of emotion was created in the country and there was the demand: if you want parity of status we want Sinhala as the only language. That, of course, is history.

When you come to the recent past, the late Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike was one of the Ministers who was anxious to implement the proposal for the establishment of regional councils. Much has been said about that subject, but, anyway, you must also blame the Tamil leaders of that time for the fact that the regional councils did not see the light of day. If the proposal to have regional councils was implemented quite a lot of differences could have been straightened out and there might have been better understanding between the two communities. But what did the Tamil leaders at that time do? They were over—anxious, they wanted more and more, and then there was the B.-C. Past. What was the result? I think I need not reiterate the outcome of it because it has been referred to over and over again.

In the same way I find now, as a result of some unfortunate conduct on the part of certain leaders, that communalism in the minds of the majority people has been roused. I do not want to mention the details of it on this occasion.

While at the moment there are some leaders who are making every effort to bring about national unity, understanding and co-operation between the communities to have a united Ceylon, there are others among the Sinhalese community who are anxious, for political reasons, to win over the masses by appealing to the baser instincts of man. There are also at the same time some people who once spoke of Marxism,

කල්-තබීම:

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

of internationalism, of being cosmopolitical and, of course, who did not like that there should be any difference between an Indian and a Ceylon Tamil, but who have now changed their tune and are talking in terms of communalism because they think that that is the only way to gain political power in a country where democracy prevails, where the counting of heads matters.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, before I get on to the White Paper as such, there are one or two matters I wish to deal with.

The hon. First Member for Mutur (Mr. Mohamed Ali) mentioned a telegram sent to him by a person who has assumed the role of leader of the Muslims in this country. I am afraid, if this person has counted himself as a leader of the Muslims, that he is mistaken, for the simple reason that today Mr. Badiuddin Mahmud has no following among the Muslims. If he has succeeded in getting a few young men to rally round him, I might point out that these young men are those Muslims who went behind the Sama Samajist leaders, Dr. N. M. Perera and Dr. Colvin R. de Silva. These young men have come to the forefront under the leadership of Mr. Badiuddin Mahmud and are trying to infiltrate into the Muslim community and appear as their saviours. Besides that Mr. Badiuddin Mahmud is no leader, and he has no following among the Muslims. Of course, this is not the occasion for me to speak to you on the philosophy that Mr. Badiuddin Mahmud is following or on how empty are his Islamic ways.

Again, the hon. First Member for Mutur mentioned some paper publication and the views of Dr. Kaleel and leaders of the Muslim community. May I tell you that this question of district councils was taken up at a meeting of the All-Ceylon Muslim League Central Council which had its meeting at Beruwala about two or three months back and at that meeting a follower of Mr. Badiuddin

Mahmud started kite-flying? He wanted to move a resolution saying that the Muslims were against district councils. On that occasion a large number of Muslim Members of this House and Senators too were there. The Mayor of Colombo and a number of other representatives from the districts were present. We thrashed out this question, we discussed it, and finally that member who moved the resolution withdrew it because his seconder said, "For God's sake, withdraw it. None of us will be with you." That member was compelled to withdraw the resolution which he gave notice of and which was discussed. That was the manner in which the Muslims treated them.

Again, it was only the other day—the two Members who are on either side will bear witness—that the working committee discussed this question of the White Paper. We came to no decision. The meeting was presided over by Dr. M. C. M. Kaleel. One thing that was accepted was the suggestion made to decentralize governmental activities as it was a good suggestion and there was nothing in it that the Muslim community could go against. Of course, we want to go further and study the White Paper from all angles and see what effect it would have on the matter of representation, on membership and so on. As far as we are concerned, the central committee of the All-Ceylon Muslim League will meet and decide on the nature of the representations we should make to the Prime Minister, and after that, of course, we can see what the Muslim community has to say. Before that, I do not think it is correct to quote from some ancient paper or publication. We do not know what the papers are.

I should like to point out to you that I myself had been addressing a large number of my party branches within my electorate. Some of those meetings were held at the request of those branches because there is so much being said about district councils and how people are

කල් තැබීම:

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

[අඛණ්ඩව කතා කරමින්.]

rising against the district councils. At three meetings I had, almost no Muslims were present, but only members of the Sinhala community. I remember when I explained to them the purpose of the District Councils Bill, the manner in which kachcheri administration was going to be handed over to the people, and how people's representatives would be in a position to get their work done as much as they are getting it done at the village council level, there were at two of these meetings some village council members who proposed that they were in favour of district councils. One was at a meeting of the U.N.P. branch at Padagoda in my electorate and another at a meeting held at Magalkanda also in my electorate. I pointed out to my Sinhalese friends that they should never let themselves be misguided by the propaganda carried on by the newspapers.

It is very strange that none of these newspapers have mentioned any of the meetings we have held. I remember at one meeting when I said that if in the District Councils Bill there was any provision which would go against the general public, whether it be the Muslims or the Sinhalese, I would be the last person to support it, one newspaper reported me as saying that I was against the District Councils Bill.—[*Interruption*]. I would not mention the name of the paper. I can, if you want me to. Anyway, that is the manner in which some of these newspapers publish news.

I am also a chairman of a local authority. I think the hon. Member for Dambadeniya (Mr. R. G. Senanayake) asked if there was one urban council that wants district councils or is in favour of them. I might point out that in my council this question was brought up on a motion moved by a member and discussed and the only supporter of that resolution was the mover and it was defeated.

The papers are not reporting news that favours the Government.

various reasons we find that the English papers give one version, the Sinhala papers give another version and the Tamil papers give yet another version. From the point of view of circulation, I believe money matters, and so they are taking different attitudes at different levels. I would not find fault with them. I only warn the people not to be misled by the news that appears in the papers.

Now, we know there are certain difficulties which the Muslims in the Eastern Province are facing. We have the members of the All-Ceylon Muslim League and two Parliamentarians here to look into that question and we hold ourselves in readiness to study the position of the Muslims. I think the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Social Services mentioned certain difficulties. The Prime Minister himself said that he understood the position. He said, "That position has to be remedied and I am prepared to remedy that." Having got that assurance it would have been better and wiser for the hon. Second Member for Batticaloa (Mr. Latiff Sinnalebbe) not to have come out with a speech of the type he delivered today.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when we consider this question of district councils and the District Councils Bill, I might straightway point out that there is a lot of muddling and misconception at every level in regard to district councils and local authorities there has been a lot of misunderstanding. There is quite a deal of mixing up of the two ideas. I think when we talk of district councils we must go back to the report of the Soulbury Commission. And also, when you think in terms of local government you must consider the report of the Donoughmore Commission, which has described the two in such terms that I cannot but quote them.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

I think hon. Members have quoted passages from that report off and on.

කල් තැබීම:

අබ්දුල් බකීර් මාකර් මයා.

(ஜனாப் அப்துல் பாக்கீர் மாக்கார்)

(Mr. Abdul Bakeer Markar)

Sir, not from the Donoughmore Commission Report. Most hon. Members quoted from the White Paper.

This is what the Donoughmore Commission said with regard to provincial councils:

"One of the schemes which it is clearly necessary that they should explore and which to some students of the problem promises the best results is that for the creation of co-ordinating bodies to which certain administrative functions of the Central Government could be delegated. The argument in favour of the establishment of a Provincial Council in each Province is that such a scheme might result in a large part of the administrative work now carried out in the Legislative Council coming into the hands of persons permanently resident in the country districts and thus more directly in contact with their needs; in the relief of the departments of the Central Government of much detail work and in their being thereby set free to consider and advise on the larger affairs of the country; in the special views of the different races predominant in the different parts of the Island having effect in the administration of these parts; in members of the growing body of politically-minded persons in the country being placed in an honourable position to render real assistance in the administration; and in an increase in knowledge and capacity of the representatives of lesser local bodies who might be summoned to sit on the councils."

The purpose in establishing district councils or provincial councils as contemplated by the Donoughmore Commission was to set free the central government to consider and advise on the larger affairs of the country. That was the purpose behind it.

With regard to the proposals made by the then Prime Minister, the late Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike, I may point out that what he contemplated was not the decentralization of central government activities but the co-ordination of local government activities. That is quite different from the proposals of the Donoughmore

දිස්ත්‍රික් සහ පිහිටුවීමේ කොමිෂන්

Commission. This is what the late Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike said in 1947 as recorded in the White Paper:

"I do not think I shall be able to introduce the Bill relating to Provincial Councils before January next year. I propose to establish these Provincial Councils with a view to co-ordinating, supervising and controlling the work of local bodies in the districts or province concerned."

So, you find that the regional councils contemplated by the late Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike were not for the purpose of decentralizing central government activities but for the purpose of co-ordinating, supervising and controlling the work of local bodies.

Then there was some change brought about in the Choksy Commission Report. The Choksy Commission had to proceed within its terms of reference. The Choksy Commission was called upon to report only on matters connected with local government and not on central government activities. These are the terms of reference of the Choksy Commission:

- "(1) to examine the nature and scope of Local Government in the Island today;
- (2) to investigate whether any changes in such Government are needed and, if so, to determine the nature and extent of the changes; and
- (3) to report and to make such recommendations as may be considered necessary, with regard to the following matters:—
  - (a) the functions, powers, and duties that should be exercised by the various types of local authorities;
  - (b) the nature and extent of the supervision and control which the Central Government should have over local authorities;
  - (c) the ways and means of providing the revenue required by local authorities for the proper discharge of their functions;
  - (d) the appointment, conditions of service, transfer, dismissal and disciplinary control of employees of local authorities."

කල් තැබීම:

[අඩුප්‍රේ බකර් මාකර් මය.]

In making their suggestions the commissioners had to keep within the terms of reference, although they reported on certain matters which did not really fall within the scope of the terms of reference. Their suggestions were more towards a grouping together of the activities of local authorities.

Then in 1956 Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike, when he was Prime Minister, published the draft of a Bill to provide for the establishment of regional councils. He was concerned about the bringing together of local government bodies or central organization in respect of local bodies.

I might also read out the preamble to the draft Bill prepared by the Mahatantila Commission. It says:

"An Act to provide for the establishment of District Councils in the administrative districts of Ceylon for the decentralization of certain powers and functions of the Central Government and for the replacement of the Kachcheri system of administration by the said District Councils for the purpose of securing a greater measure of participation by the people in local and government affairs and in effecting necessary co-ordination in the planning and development of functions assigned to them and the local authorities and to provide for consequential amendments in other written law and matters incidental to or connected as aforesaid."

Even here you will find that the S. L. F. P. Government contemplated in their Bill the establishment of district councils, that there was to be a grouping together of local bodies.

When you consider the proposals in the White Paper and the preamble to the draft Bill attached to the White Paper, you will find that there is not going to be a grouping together of local authorities; it is a question of the people's participation in the activities of the Central Government.

The preamble to the present draft Bill reads:

"An Act to provide for the constitution of District Councils for the administrative districts of Ceylon with the object of securing a larger measure of participation by the people, under the direction

දිස්ත්‍රික් සහ පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

and control of the Government, in the administration of such districts, and for purposes connected therewith or thereto."

I am trying to emphasize this fact because there is so much misunderstanding about the purpose of district councils. When you group together the local authorities in a district, and when you know the local authorities are autonomous to some extent, and to the extent of their autonomy they are powerful and independent, then there is something in the fear that has been expressed. So, if, as contemplated by Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike's Government and Mrs. Bandaranaike's Government, there is to be a co-ordination or bringing together of local government bodies, then, of course, you could have the fear—quite reasonably too—that if these autonomous local bodies form themselves into a group they can wield some power. That is quite a legitimate fear although it is not substantial.

Under the draft Bill annexed to the White Paper it is definitely a matter of decentralizing central government activities. May I point out that before the Donoughmore Commission visited Ceylon, before the Soulbury Commission visited Ceylon, and before we were granted independence—just mark the period, Mr. Deputy Speaker—we were ruled by a colonial Governor and he had what was called a secretariat. He was in full control and in complete charge of both the legislative and executive activities of the Government. That was rule from the centre. In the provinces he had his representatives who were the government agents, and the government agents also had more or less their secretariat or what is called the kachcheries.

After we attained independence the structure at the centre changed and the power that was in the hands of the Governor passed to the Ministers. The power that was concentrated in the secretariat has now been decentralized and it is under the Ministers. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the structure at the centre

කල් කැබිම:

දිස්ත්‍රික් සහ පිහිටුවීමේ කොට්ඨාස

has changed and it has now become a democratic structure, but at the provincial level for which district councils are proposed the structure has not changed. There one man, a bureaucrat, is performing all the functions of all the Ministers put together. Today, the government agents perform the executive as well as all other functions of the Ministers at the provincial level.

I ask you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, should not that structure be changed, should not there be participation by the people in the executive functions of the Government? So, then, whatever motives the Opposition might impute, whatever the others might say, is this not one form of extending what we have been fighting for? Is this not the means to give the people the right to have a sort of executive government of their own at the district level? If you view it in that light you will no doubt agree that such a change in the district and provincial level is long overdue and that the Government is making every effort possible to see that such a democratic structure is found at the district level.

But, of course, we have to consider the question of the composition of these councils and their functions. I might say that if what is contemplated in the White Paper is to have certain functions carried on by the Central Government delegated to a body at the district level, then we must consider who should be the people who should constitute such bodies.

Now comes the question: are we right or correct in getting chairmen of local authorities to constitute such bodies? I know that when you come to the question of constituting these bodies with chairmen of local authorities you are going to make a blunder somewhere because you find there is no weightage at all given to proportionate representation. You will find a town council with a population of three thousand people and the Colombo Municipal Council, which has a population of seven hundred thousand people, having a represen-

tative each in the district councils. An urban council will have one representative in the district council, irrespective of whether its population is 20,000, 30,000 or 40,000.

A situation can occur where a few town councils and village councils will get together, although the population they represent may total only 30,000 or 40,000, and overwhelm and defeat the representatives of the urban councils and municipal councils. Therefore, by establishing district councils in this way, you will leave room for certain village councils to see that their areas and interests are looked after at the expense of the towns.

Then again, on the question of how a district council should be formed, there were earlier suggestions made that the members of such a body should be elected representatives. For instance, the Mahatantila Committee provided for elections in the draft Bill drawn up by them. I suppose the Hon. Prime Minister did not wish to have elections to district councils because there already are village council elections, urban council elections and parliamentary elections.

I am afraid, however, whatever might be said and done in a democracy such as that prevailing in this country, that the best way of allowing representation or allowing people's participation is by having elections to district councils. On this question of elections I have my own suggestion to make. I do not know whether my views will find favour, but all the same, for what it is worth, I might make the suggestion in this House for consideration by those in authority.

A fact to be remembered and to be kept in mind is that if it is a delegation of power from the Central Government to the district council, the party that has power at the centre must be able to wield that power at the district level too. A Government comes to power every five years and they will naturally want to pursue their policies and programmes. Therefore, what is expected at the district level is a group of

කල් තැබීම:

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

[අබ්දුල් බකීර් මාකර් මය.]

members who will be sympathetic or who will be prepared to implement those policies and programmes. Its only functions are executive functions. So, if you have one party at the centre, and another party at the district level opposed to those policies and programmes, a rebellious group, then to what extent will the district council idea succeed? Whatever programme you arrange at the centre will not be implemented at the district level, maybe for no reasons at all, maybe for political reasons.

Take the Kalutara District. Say, you have a district council formed there for the purposes suggested in the White Paper. Then, I am afraid, I will be the sole *ex officio* member, the only Member of Parliament who will, in addition to one or two others, be in sympathy with government policy, in that district council. All the others will be representatives of the Opposition.

What will be the position? The Central Government will arrange its programme of development and send it down to the district level for implementation. Are they going to implement that? No, they will obstruct the Government at every turn. They will obstruct the Government as well as its policies. So, at that level, we are not going to get their co-operation.

Of course, you have provision for the issue of general directions to the district councils. It will be confusion worse confounded, or you might fall from the frying pan into the fire. You cannot rule by fiat, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Ministers or the Prime Minister or the Governor-General cannot direct every time on every resolution. If they refuse to carry out directions, what will be the result? You will have to dissolve the district council and you will have to get the chief executive, the government agent, to carry on.

What will happen is, the very purpose for which you have district

councils will be defeated because the government agent, a bureaucrat, will be carrying out those functions which would have been carried out by the district council. He will now have complete power, almost the entire power the district council had. He will carry on. So the purpose of establishing district councils fails.

You must have some form of election. That is why I was about to suggest that for the period of five years it is very necessary that you must have at least a district council that will reflect the policy or the views of the party or the Government in power at the centre. If you are to do that, my only suggestion will be to see that simultaneous elections be held both for Parliament and for district councils. The process is simple. For each parliamentary electorate you will have to carve out two or three district council electorates. There you have got the proportion of representation, the weightage is given, population per area, and the same principle is followed. On the same day you have an election for Parliament. Using the same election machinery you can have the election for district councils. Quite possibly the same party machinery will work, the same propaganda will be carried on and the same candidates will be there. Only, when you go to vote there will be two ballot papers given to you, one to elect the district councillor and the other to elect the Member of Parliament. That is if you want the elective principles to be followed.

I have one more suggestion to make. Consistent with constitutional law and consistent with the democratic procedures we are following, this House elects a Senate. We elect a body which has almost equal legislative and executive powers. So if this House can elect such a body, why not entrust this House with similar power to elect a body for the district councils too? The details are immaterial; they have to be worked out. You are going to delegate power to a district council where at the district level you want your own policy

කල් තැබීම:

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

to be implemented and your own programme of work to be followed. If that is so is it not in keeping with our Constitution, is it not in keeping with constitutional law, if this House elects for each district a council of, say, 10, 15 or 20, whatever the number? You are following the elective principle. As representatives of the people you are going to elect a few to the district councils. Together with the Members of the House of Representatives, those elected by the House of Representatives and a few nominated by the Governor-General can form the district council. It is a delegation of power whereby you have a body which this House will control, and the policy or views of the party in power will be reflected at the district level too. I would therefore make that suggestion to those who are drawing this up and are interested in it, so that we might not have a revolutionary body at the district level which will at the end defeat the very purpose for which district councils are formed.

I am very grateful for the indulgence given to me. I have as far as possible attempted to point out what the White Paper contemplates and what procedure or principle we should follow in order to see that our intentions are carried out at all levels.

අ. හා. 8.56

එම්. ඒ. අබ්දුල් මජීඩ් මයා. (පොත්තුවිල්)

(ஜனாப் எம். ஏ. அப்துல் மஜீது—பொத்துவில்)

(Mr. M. A. Abdul Majeed—Pottuvil)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. Member for Jaffna (Mr. Ponnambalam) stated that these White Paper proposals and the eventual District Councils Bill will be bad for the country and the nation and worse for the Tamils. May I add that, as far as the Muslim community is concerned, it will be disastrous. Sir, we have no complaint against the component unit, the United National

Party. I am speaking very honestly. I do not normally take part in debates on the Floor of this House. I have been here as a Member of this House for about eight years, and so far I have spoken only three or four times. On this occasion the people in my area have demanded that I should speak on this matter. They said, "You normally do not take part in debates, but this time you shall voice our sentiments." That is the reason why I am here today. The Muslims who are in the Amparai, Batticaloa, and Trincomalee districts fear the Ilankai Tamil Arasu Kadchi not because of their acts of commission or omission in the distant past, but because of their acts after the National Government was formed.

My good Friend, the hon. Member for Beruwala (Mr. Abdul Bakeer Markar) gave us pontifical advice without even listening to our grievances, and said that the Muslims were at fault. I wish he would listen to what I have to say.

I should like to adumbrate a few instances of the treatment the Ilankai Tamil Arasu Kadchi have meted out to my community, having come to our areas stating that they are speaking for the Tamil-speaking nation inclusive of the Muslims. Sir, you and hon. Members of this House are well aware as to how the Ilankai Tamil Arasu Kadchi made strenuous efforts to prevent us from learning the Sinhala language. However, because of persistent agitation the three districts that I mentioned were able to get Sinhala teachers to the Muslim majority schools to teach our children the official language of this country. But today the Muslim children in Tamil majority schools—there are a good number of them—have no opportunity of studying the official language of this country. Hon. Members are well aware that we, the Muslims of this country, are almost 200 years behind the rest of the communities.

அ. ஸ. 9

நியோகித கலாநாயகருமே

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

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

அதற்கு நியோகித கலாநாயகருமே இலங்கையின் ஒன்றியமே, காரக வல நியோகித வலவகருமே இலங்கைக்கு விய.

அதன்பிறகு, உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள் அக்கிராசனத்தினின்று நீங்கவே, குழுக்களின் உப அக்கிராசனர் அவர்கள் தலைமை தாங்கினார்கள்.

Whereupon MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair, and MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES took the Chair.

உ. ம. அ. அப்துல் மஜீத் உமே.

(ஜனாப் எம். ஏ. அப்துல் மஜீத்)

(Mr. M. A. Abdul Majeed)

Sir, we the Muslim community in this country are far behind the other communities in every sphere. This is especially so in the educational sphere and it particularly applies to the Muslims in the Batticaloa and Amparai Districts who are very backward. Well, how can you legitimately say that we are at fault when we find the Ilankai Tamil Arasu Kadchi leaders who came as our saviours are trying to prevent us from having even a working knowledge of the official language of this country?

Hon. Members are well aware that in the Amparai District as well as in the Trincomalee District we have Sinhalese brethren who are settled in colonization schemes. The peasants and the workers will have to mix with them and work with them. Therefore, a knowledge of the official language is very necessary not only for the Muslims of Trincomalee or Amparai but also for the Tamils. What did our friends do? They said, "No, you shall not study Sinhala."

Secondly, when the Bill for the establishment of a Muslim Cultural University was introduced in this august Assembly, hon. Members are well aware of the performance of the members of the Ilankai Tamil

Arasu Kadchi, the people who speak for the Tamil-speaking nation. What did they do? They ran away from this House. They did not want to support it.

Then, again, hon. Members of this august Assembly are aware of how the Muslims had to fight to keep the Muslim schools as a separate entity. The Members of the Ilankai Tamil Arasu Kadchi did not want the Muslim schools to be a separate entity.

ராமானிகம் உமே.

(திரு. இராசமானிக்கம்)

(Mr. Rasamanickam)

When was it?

உ. ம. அ. அப்துல் மஜீத் உமே.

(ஜனாப் எம். ஏ. அப்துல் மஜீத்)

(Mr. M. A. Abdul Majeed)

Even recently when for Grade III principals about 25 Muslims were selected—this can be checked with the Hon. Minister of Education—there was a telegram from an Member of the Ilankai Tamil Arasu Kadchi objecting to the selection of 25 Muslims as Grade III principals.

The hon. Second Member for Batticaloa (Mr. Latiff Sinnalebbe) told this august Assembly what happened about a couple of months ago in Unit 13 village in Mandur in the left bank area of the Gal Oya Valley in which a Muslim community was settled by the G.O.D.B. This Muslim community was formerly in the Batticaloa District, which is now divided into two districts, namely, Batticaloa and Amparai. Only five village units are in the left bank area, and Unit 13 is one of them.

Some time back, you would recall, there were communal disturbances in Kalmunai, and Senator the Hon. Tiruchelvam, Minister of Local Government, and the Hon. M. H. Mohamed, Minister of Labour, came and held meetings. During those disturbances the colonists of Unit 13, who had been settled there in 1949 and who have been living in that unit

කල් තැම්ම :

දිස්ත්‍රික් සහ පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

for 16 to 17 years, had taken their wives, children and unmarried daughters to their respective *purana* villages, because they were surrounded by Tamils who were adopting a threatening attitude. What happened thereafter? All those cottages were forcibly occupied by the Tamils. I am sorry the hon. Member for Beruwala (Mr. Abdul Bakeer Markar) is not here. If such things happen what are we to do?

One-third of this unit is in my electorate—the Pottuvil Electorate. Those people whose houses have been forcibly occupied came to me and asked me to intercede on their behalf. I wrote letters and I sent telegrams to the government agent. Well, so far nothing has happened, and this incident has become a running sore. If the Muslims are not put back, I can assure you that there will be trouble. It is not fair to deprive them of that land. This is something that has been given to them. My people have been living there for more than 16 years. And now what is all this talk about a Tamil-speaking nation? Why do you blame us if we say we are frightened of our future under the D. C. dispensation. The Ilankai Tamil Arasu Kadchi had objected to even the implementation of the Paddy Lands Act. I will tell you why. Because the Muslims are the poor peasants.

Do not think for a moment that when I speak about the Ilankai Tamil Arasu Kadchi I am speaking against the Tamil community. Definitely not. Please do not equate the Tamil community with the Ilankai Tamil Arasu Kadchi.

We in the Batticaloa and Amparai Districts, the Tamils and the Muslims, live side by side. You will find a Muslim village, then a Tamil village, then again a Muslim village, and then again a Tamil village. Whether the Muslims of that area like it or not, whether the Tamils of that area like it or not, we will have to live together. The very fact that we have been living together for centuries shows that we have been living amicably. But I am sorry

say that after the advent of the Ilankai Tamil Arasu Kadchi that amity has been disrupted.

If the Ilankai Tamil Arasu Kadchi which stands and fights for the Tamil-speaking people, including the Muslims, had been a little tolerant towards us, we would have supported them over this Bill.

Take the case of the recent by-election at Kalmunai. They demanded their pound of flesh, and I know they forced the hand of the Prime Minister. They said, "Our man came second at the previous election. Give this seat to us." What happened? It incensed the Muslims. That is our capital for all the three seats, and the Muslims are in a very big majority. We pleaded with them, and if they had been a little tolerant we would have won that seat very comfortably. Now so many people are taking the credit for that. I will tell you the reason why the Muslims voted for the other candidate. It is because they did not want the country to know that the Muslims are with the Ilankai Tamil Arasu Kadchi. They did not want the Ilankai Tamil Arasu Kadchi flag to fly in Kalmunai. That is why the Muslims to a man voted for the Opposition candidate. Never in the history of Kalmunai have women turned out in their tens of thousands to vote; almost 99 per cent of the Muslim women voted at that election. They wanted to vindicate themselves.

How can you speak of a Tamil-speaking nation when you do these things? You are our big brother. We have been living there for hundreds of years. You say you are fighting for our rights. But when you do these things how can we have confidence in you?

I will give you an example of how we Muslims have supported our Tamil brethren. At the last election Mr. Devanayagam was returned to represent the Kalkudah Electorate with the support of the Muslims. The Muslims supported him in spite of the

[එම්. එ. අබ්දුල් මජීඩ් මයා.]

fact that there was a Muslim who contested that seat and said, "I am a Muslim. Vote for the Muslim." There are many such instances.

I have mentioned a few examples of the treatment meted out to us by the leaders who talk of the Tamil-speaking nation.

We, therefore, have a genuine fear that in the working of district councils in the Batticaloa, Amparai and Trincomalee Districts our legitimate interests will not be looked after.

Within the three years that the Minister of Local Government has been in office very many village councils have been created in our areas, but whereas our numbers are greater we are still in the same position or status.

I believe the earlier proposal of the Ilankai Tamil Arasu Kadchi was to have an electoral college and for every ward member to be in the electoral college, in which case even though in the Amparai District the Muslims are in a majority, their power would be less.

In Samanthurai East, we had a very large village council with a Muslim majority. There was a proposal to divide this village council. As Member of Parliament for the area my opinion was asked. I agreed to it because I wanted to show them that we are not against them and, further, because the Tamil villages are scattered. I agreed to two village councils although the Tamils were in a minority. They were potty little villages. If I had known that the District Councils Bill was coming in this form, that representation would be in this way, my attitude would have been quite different. Now I cannot face the Muslims there. They accuse me of having made a blunder.

I want to make it quite clear that we have nothing against the Tamil community, but I am sorry to see the treatment that is meted out to us by the Ilankai Tamil Arasu Kadchi.

I would have liked very much to support the Hon. Prime Minister. But after all, we, as representatives of the people, must abide by their decision, for they are our masters.

Why did the Ilankai Tamil Arasu Kadchi insist on the introduction of the District Councils Bill at this juncture? I think everybody will agree—and every hon. Member of the Opposition must agree if he is honest—that the Hon. Prime Minister, unlike any other Prime Minister, has taken upon his ample shoulders the task of seeing that we do not go to other countries year after year with the begging bowl in hand. Our country is almost like the Garden of Eden and it can produce all we want for our sustenance. That is why the Hon. Prime Minister has given top priority to the food drive. We must all give him credit for that. Instead of devoting all our efforts towards the attainment of self-sufficiency, if we dissipate our energy on this disastrous venture of establishing district councils, what would be the position?

We are a very small community; we cannot alter the history of this country; we are only saying that we want to be Ceylonese. We are not asking for majority rights because we know that the Tamils in our areas would not like to be under us, because the Sinhalese would not like it, and because there would be internecine warfare. We know what happened in the recent past at Akkaraipattu in the Kalmunai area, where a Muslim who did something to a Tamil would be knifed. In a situation like that how can we proceed to develop a country? We Muslims want to live in peace with everybody. Our history is different. We did not come into this country as forced labour or as conquerors; we probably came here as traders and petty functionaries of the then rulers of this Island. It is also recorded history that

දිසා ත්‍රිකා සහා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

අ. භා. 9.18

ରାଜପ୍ରାଧିକାରୀଙ୍କୁ ଭେଦ.

(திரு. இராசமாணிக்கம்)

(Mr. Rasamanickam)

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would have normally spoken in Tamil, but for the benefit of my good Friend the hon. Member for Dambadeniya (Mr. R. G. Senanayake) I wish to speak in English.

Hon. Members of the House from all sides have, very frankly and in a forthright manner, expressed their views. Some of them have very truthfully and accurately interpreted the White Paper and the draft Bill attached to it, while others have either inadvertently or purposely chosen to misinterpret it.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, we have had almost three different views expressed on this White Paper and the attached draft Bill. One view was: Let us not touch it. This is not the opportune time for district councils. Let us not discuss it. Let us just forget it. There was another group that expressed the opinion that the powers of local bodies be expanded rather than create new institutions in the nature of district councils. They argued against the creation of another body. They asked, 'Why create another body?'

කල් තැබීම:

දිස්ත්‍රික් සහ පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

[රාසමානික් කම් මයා.]

Why multiply the number of institutions in this country? Why create more elections? Let us give more powers to the local bodies and get them to function." There was a third opinion that was expressed, namely: the District Councils Bill does not contain enough powers; it is just a shoddy Bill, a Bill that does not contain even the modicum of powers that is contained in the Village Councils Ordinance; it is not worth it.

Every Member who spoke, even the Members who said that the District Councils Bill should not be introduced now, were of the opinion that decentralization of the administration of this country was necessary. Sir, we have had a few speeches which were very lucid, very clear, and very effective. The Hon. Prime Minister in his opening speech made a very clear and precise statement about what is proposed in the White Paper. I was not here to listen to the early part of the speech of the hon. Member for Jaffna (Mr. Ponnambalam) but I understand he made a very fine analysis, a studied speech, wherein he said that the District Councils Bill did not contain enough powers. I had the pleasure of listening to the speech of the hon. Member for Beruwala (Mr. Abdul Bakeer Markar) just a few minutes ago. He made a very clear and a very lucid speech giving certain clear indications of his mind. So everyone in this House agreed that decentralization of administration in this country was necessary.

During the colonial days it was explained how the Governor, the Government Agent, the Ratemahatmaya or the Maniyakkaran or the Vanniya Mudaliyar, and the Village Headman, in descending order, ruled the country; how the powers descended from one to the other; and how after the attainment of Independence power at the top has been decentralized and handed over to Ministers who are the elected representatives of the people. It has also been pointed out how the power lower

down has not been decentralized and the people of this country after twenty years of independence have not been able to participate in and associate themselves with the day to day administration of this country.

The crux of the problem is this. There were the days when the ordinary villager went to the Ratemahatmaya's office or the Maniyakkaran's office once a year, perhaps, to renew a land permit or a gun licence, or once a year to the kachcheri to ask for a permit to purchase a gun. But today the administration of the country has been so diversified and governmental activities have so multiplied that they affect the day to day life of every man in this country during every minute of his life. Even the sugar that you use in your tea every day is a thing, perhaps, for which you may have to get a permit. There are numerous items like that.

So, today, the ordinary man is unable to live his day to day life without contacting some government department or other. I think you yourself, Sir, must have the experience as a parliamentarian of more than half the number of people visiting your home complaining that they have not received a reply from one government department or another. Those are the stories we hear.

The burden at the top has become so heavy that decentralization of the administration has become very necessary and urgent. How can this decentralization be done? There can be two forms of decentralization. One form of decentralization can be bureaucratic decentralization, that is, a government department with a head of department in Colombo and assistants and deputies in the provinces to transact business. They are given certain powers. They are given certain provisions of money. They act immediately as a problem arises.

The next form of decentralization is what we are seeking to effect today—democratic decentralization. This is decentralization at district level where the ordinary man, through his elected representative,

කල් තැබීම:

participates in the day to day business. That is the only way of co-ordinating work and attaining efficiency in its execution.

The question is whether we are going to have a decentralized administration in this country, an administration that is streamlined and efficient in order to execute the work more quickly than is being done today, or whether we carry on with the machinery of government that is outmoded, rusty, not streamlined, not adapted to modern needs, and incapable of satisfying the people.

The question was asked why the Federal Party was very keen to have the District Councils Bill. No doubt the White Paper gives you the history of district councils since 1928. It is not a new thing. The proposal for decentralization is not a new thing. But the Federal Party requested a decentralized form of government from about 1957 when we, for the first time, entered into an agreement with the then Prime Minister of this country, the late Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, if you analyse the public expenditure incurred year in any year out in this country, you will see a very strange phenomenon. You will see that in certain urban areas politicians who are more powerful than the others get more money for development. In the matter of development the emphasis is on the urban and suburban areas. If it goes a little beyond that it would be on the initiative of a very powerful politician or perhaps a Minister. The rural areas represented by many Members of Parliament have been neglected for years together. That is the phenomenon that you will see if you analyse the expenditure figures in the budget of each year. In many cases funds do not reach the rural areas from the top. Rural areas do not get the same facilities or even half the facilities that the urban areas get. You will find that many rural constituencies do not have medical facilities, their educational facilities are meagre and

දිස්ත්‍රික් සහ පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

their social services are almost nil. Their roads are utterly bad and impassable. They have no bridges. Ferries are outmoded and are in the most primitive condition.

Why has the Government not been able to look after these places? The system of administration in this country and the disbursement and administration of funds are so clogged and choked by central control that it will never be possible to achieve efficiency. That is why we, the Members of the Federal Party, have discussed this problem in our deliberations. During the nine years we have been in the Opposition we have suffered the greatest loss as far as our electorates are concerned. We have suffered the greatest discrimination as far as our electorates are concerned.

The fact that we have not been able to get a proper form of administration of funds in this country has struck so forcibly not only us but even our brethren who are voiceless in other areas. They are suffering because of this fact. That is why we maintain that decentralization of administration and a body in the nature of a district council or a provincial council or a regional council will be the only solution to this problem. That is why we took an interest in this matter, not on a parochial level, not merely to develop Tamil areas, but to develop the entire country as a whole, on a national basis. My good Friend, the hon. Member for Dambadeniya (Mr. R. G. Senanayake) should remember that we have taken up this question on a national level.

ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මය.

(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனநாயக்க)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

Why do you call yourselves "Tamil Arasu"?

රසමානික්කම් මය.

(திரு. இராமானிக்கம்)

(Mr. Rasamanickam)

We want the entire country, including the rural areas, to be developed.

කල් තැබීම:

දිස්ත්‍රික් සහ පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

[රාසමානික් කම් මය.]

To give an example: In a village council today, if there is a breach on the road due to floods or heavy rains, it will be repaired in three days. I for one as a village council chairman know that the funds are there and will get it repaired in three days. But if a breach occurs on the main road it takes six months for the P. W. D. to get the estimate sanctioned by the head office and then have the breach repaired. That is the state of affairs that exists today.

I have already given the reasons why the Federal Party have taken an interest in this matter.

Members of the type of the hon. Member for Dambadeniya say that this is not the opportune time for a District Councils Bill to be presented in Parliament. They say that the unity of the country must be achieved first. I think I need not give any other reply than the one given by the Hon. Prime Minister. You can never achieve the unity you want so long as there are people like the hon. Member for Dambadeniya (Mr. R. G. Senanayake) in politics. They are the people who create dissension and disunity in this country. They are the people who are responsible for separatist movements in this country as was pointed out by the hon. Member for Jaffna (Mr. Ponnambalam). Every time the hon. Member for Dambadeniya speaks, every day he opens his mouth, he has something to say against the Tamil community, he has something to say against the Tamil language, he has something to say—

ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මය.

(තිரு. ආර්. ජී. ජෙලානායක)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

Not against the Tamil community or the Tamil language but against your "Arasu".

රාසමානික් කම් මය.

(තිரு. இராமானிக்கம்)

(Mr. Rasamanickam)

The hon. Member for Welimada (Mr. Samaraweera) is a very close companion of the hon. Member

for Dambadeniya, said that the Federal Party must accept three things before a Bill such as this is brought: that we must give up our demand for federation, that we must accept the national flag and that we must accept Sinhala only. He has failed to mention two other matters. He has failed to say that we should also accept the religion of the majority community, that is Buddhism, and that we should marry Sinhalese girls.—[Interruption].

Let me tell the hon. Member for Welimada that the Tamil community in this country will not go abegging to the Sinhalese community for anything, for our rights, at any cost. We demand our rights and we expect them to be given to us. We are not people who will go asking for our rights. It is for you to know what our rights are and to take steps to grant our rights. You develop that frame of mind. You will not be able to get us to submit to what you want done. Please keep that in mind.

ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මය.

(තිரு. ආර්. ජී. ජෙලානායක)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

What is it that you want?  
"Arasu"?

රාසමානික් කම් මය.

(තිரு. இராமானிக்கம்)

(Mr. Rasamanickam)

The unity of this country, the progress and development of this country, depend upon the good relations that exist between the majority community and the minority communities in this country, and it is up to the people of the majority community to realize that they have an obligation by the minority communities in this country.

කල තැබීම:

ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා.

(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனநாயக்க)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

What is it that you want?  
"Arasu"?

රසමානික්කම් මයා.

(திரு. இராசமாணிக்கம்)

(Mr. Rasamanickam)

There are many aspects to this question that I would like to discuss but since I have only just twenty minutes left I would deal with one or two salient points.

We were asked why we are asking for district councils. That is a question that has been asked not only by the Members of the Opposition but also by the hon. Member for Jaffna. (Mr. Ponnambalam). Now I will give the reason for it. We feel that under the Central Government's dispensation of funds and powers we are not able to get a fair deal in our day to day administration. That is why we say that we want a decentralization of the Central Government's administration so that not only the power that descends from the centre but also the funds that descend from the centre reach the ordinary man at the ordinary level.

I have an appeal to make to the hon. Member for Jaffna. In fact, I am sorry about a certain incident that occurred in this House and certain remarks that were made as a result of it in this House. Well, the hon. Member for Jaffna had many things to say about my party and the activities of my party, and I should like to reply him in the same strain, but I am refraining from doing so for very good reasons. Firstly, I do not want to create further recrimination in this House, and, secondly, we hope to reply him in adequate terms at the correct time and place.

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

In regard to some of the questions raised by the hon. Member I would like to tell him that his only grievance with regard to the District Councils Bill is that it does not contain adequate powers. Well, if the District Councils Bill does not provide adequate powers, I should like to mention the fact that no finality has been reached yet with regard to it. We have discussed it over and over again, the Government is still discussing it, and we have the right to make any suggestion or amendment that we want. Let us accept the District Councils Bill in some form and work it without merely saying: this does not provide enough powers and therefore we cannot accept it. Once again I say, let us accept the District Councils Bill and work it because we feel that it is through an institution like district councils that some co-ordinated development in this country can be carried out successfully.

I would tell my friends of the Left parties who are not in the House that they are trying to make the proposal for district councils a weapon in their hands to get over the unpopularity to which they have been subjected in the country during the last several months. They have no way of replying to the questions that are raised in this House over this matter and, I suppose, that may be one of the reasons why they decided to boycott this Debate. I wish to appeal to them and tell them that they should not make this an issue to deny to this country a democratic step forward that it well deserves after twenty years of independence.

Now I come to three of my Colleagues who made certain remarks right at the end of the Debate. The first was the Second Member for Batticaloa (Mr. Latiff Sinnalebbe) who made certain uncalled for remarks, quite unworthy of a man of his position. Not only is he the Second Member for Batticaloa, he is also Deputy Mayor of the Batticaloa Municipal

කල් තැබීම:

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ යෝජනා

[රාජමානික් කම් මයා.]

Council. I should have expected him to have spoken in the House with more decorum, decency and responsibility. Anyway I would like to reply to some of the questions he raised.

In regard to the Kalmunai by-election, the hon. Second Member for Batticaloa said that it was their victory. I do not know what he meant by that. The Kalmunai electoral district has 7,000 Tamil voters and 12,000 Muslim voters from Kalmunai-kudi and Sainthamaruthu and 3,000 Muslim voters from Marudamunai and Naippattimunai. The Federal Party candidate got 9,000 odd votes. The winning candidate, Mr. Ahamed, got 10,000 odd votes. If the hon. Member knows his arithmetic and if he applied a little commonsense, it would not have taken him a lot of time to realize how the voting went. Out of the 7,000 Tamil voters, about 400 voted for Mr. Manickam, and the balance voted for Mr. Moulana, and out of the 3,000 from Marudamunai and Naippattimunai, the majority voted for Mr. Moulana, and he was able to get about 9,000 votes. This was 4,000 more than what he got last time.

I am not making an argument of it. I merely want to tell the hon. Second Member for Batticaloa that these are controversial matters which should never have been brought up in this House because he would have understood the true position if he had done some simple arithmetic.

He made another allegation about the division of village councils and other local government institutions in the Eastern Province, by the Hon. Minister of Local Government. I know that every one of those divisions has been done at the request of Members of Parliament, so that I do not think the Hon. Minister has acted on his own or without advice. He has done it on the advice of Members of Parliament.

There was also an accusation by my good Friend the Member for Pottuvil (Mr. M. A. Abdul Majeed) and the hon. Second Member for Batticaloa in regard to the settlement of colonists in a colonization scheme partly in my electorate and partly in the Pottuvil Electorate. That was in reference to Unit 13. About 90 houses came within the Pottuvil Electorate and 62 come within the Paddirrippu Electorate. In 1956 when the communal riots took place in the Gal Oya Valley quite a large number of the Muslim allottees left their allotments and went away, and two years later when they came back they found that they were occupied by Tamil allottees. After three or four years of their occupation, the Muslim allottees came back and wanted to reclaim those allotments, but the G. A. and the authorities decided otherwise because the persons who subsequently occupied them had spent quite a lot of their money and energy in order to develop the allotments. The land was not given to them. It was due to no mistake or fault on the part of anybody that these people left the allotments and I do not think the hon. Member for Pottuvil or the hon. Second Member for Batticaloa could lay and accusations against anybody.

Recently in 1968 there was a communal clash between the Kalmunai Tamils and the Kalmunaikudi and Saintharamaruthu Muslims. I would remind the hon. Member for Pottuvil that in two puranic Tamil villages in Kalmunaikudi and Sainthamaruthu area the houses of about 500 Tamil families were looted. Their houses were burnt, the entire population was annihilated and they were chased out of their villages. Today those two villages are deserted villages. As a result there were isolated incidents all over the country, and one such incident was where the balance Muslim allottees in Unit 13, which is a predominantly Tamil area, sought to

කල තැබීම:

leave their allotments voluntarily, handed over their allotments to certain Tamil allottees and left them after getting certain payments in compensation. If the hon. Member for Pottuvil and the hon. Second Member for Batticaloa too had the courtesy to discuss the matter with me if any wrong had been done, I would have been only too happy to go to that spot and settle the matter. As far as I know and as far as information goes, these people voluntarily left the place, getting compensation for these allotments. Nobody could be blamed for it.

The hon. Member for Pottuvil very valiantly talked about oppression of the Muslims by the Tamils. It has become a national feature in this country, when a Sinhalese man and a Tamil man or a Sinhalese man and a Muslim man or a Muslim man and a Tamil man quarrel over private matters, to immediately make it a communal matter. It is made a Sinhalese-Tamil or a Sinhalese-Muslim or a Muslim-Tamil clash, and there are people who capitalize on it and prosper on it. They benefit from it and make capital out of it. There are such incidents all over the country, so that if one should characterize every incident that happens between a Muslim and a Tamil or between a Muslim and a Sinhalese as a communal clash, I think he is mistaken.

I would remind the hon. Member for Pottuvil (Mr. M. A. Abdul Majeed) of what happened in 1954 to an entire village, which is a part of his own village Samanthurai, a village called Veeramunai, one of the ancient Tamil villages with one of the most

දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා පිහිටුවීමේ ශේෂය

ancient temples in that area. The Samanthurai Muslim people attacked the Veeramunai people. They burnt their houses, looted their property and chased them out. Today they are living as refugees at Malwatte. The associates or the supporters of my Friend, who talked valiantly about communal clashes and Muslim oppression, were the people who were largely responsible for such atrocities. He was not able to prevent it. So people who live in glass houses should not throw stones at others.

I would tell the hon. Member for Pottuvil that he has of late taken the S. L. F. P. line. I do not know whether the hon. Member for Dambadeniya (Mr. R. G. Senanayake), who was whispering to him, was responsible for any mental or intellectual poisoning. Their grievance is with the Federal Party. I see that political parties have a grievance against the Federal Party. The newspapers have a grievance against the Federal Party. We do not seem to have any friends in this country. We seem to be an isolated unit with no friends at all. I do not know why. I would say that ours is one of the few political parties in this country which have been consistently honest in their political life. We have taken decisions at the expense of our popularity. We have taken uncomfortable decisions. We have taken decisions at times at great cost to ourselves. But ours is one party which no other party was able to buy over at any time for any price.

In 1960, when we defeated the U. N. P., the U. N. P. was in a position to give us portfolios, but we said, No. In 1965, when we joined this Government, we were in a position to get any

கல் நலிம:

[ரூபமாதிக் கம் மய.]

number of portfolios we wanted and any number of parliamentary secretaryships we wanted. But we declined because we wanted to vindicate our stand. Whatever our party has done has been done in our own way, honestly and sincerely.

Our Friends in the Opposition feel that if we had joined them they would be ruling this country today. They feel that we have let them down, and so they are angry with us. There are others who are angry with us because we are a group of persons who cannot be bought over because we are honest. It is not that I say that we make or unmake governments, but that we are people whom governments can trust, and that trust will be our dividend.

தீக் திக் கலா பிதிபிதே ஸேக்ஸ்

பிக்லி வேலாவு ஏ. கா. 8.30 பசுக்கர் திபிசென், காரக கலா தியேக்ஸ் கலாபதிதலா விசின் ப்ரெக்ஸ் தோவிசென் மன்த்ரி மனேவரெ கல் நலிம லே.

மன்த்ரி மனேவரெ பீவ் அதுகலே, ஏ. கா. 10 0, அடி தின கலாபதிமனே அதுவ, 1968 ப்ரதி 18 0ன அகலாவுடி, ஏ. கா. 2 0ன தோக் கல் ஸேக்ஸ்.

நேரம் பி.ப. 8.30 க்ருப் பிந்திவிட்டமையால் குழுக்களின் உப அக்கிராசனார் அவர்கள் வினாவின்றிச் சபையை ஒத்திவைத்தார்கள்.

இதன்படி பி.ப. 10 க்ரு, சபை அதனது இன்றைய தீர்மானத்திற்கிணங்க 1968 ஜூன் 18, செவ்வாய்க்கிழமை பி.ப. 2 மணிவரை ஒத்திவைக்கப்பட்டது.

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

*Adjourned accordingly at 10 P.M. until 2 P.M. on Tuesday, 18th June 1968, pursuant to the Resolution of the House this Day.*



දයක இடல் : இடல் வெைன டீனென் பஹு அரணென இயலே ஸிவ இய 12ன் கடிஸ  
 ரு. 32.00டி. (அஸெயிவ பிபென் கடிஸ நமீ ரு.35.00டி.) இய 6கெ ஸங்ஹுவென் அயகி.  
 பிபெனன் ஸை 30டி. நபுலென் ஸை 45டி. இடல், கைலி ஸபு இவடோர், இலலேகி  
 காரீயலயே ரக்யே புகான காரீயலயே அயகாரி வெை கடுன் பீலி ய்யுய.

சந்தா : பணம் கொடுத்த தேதியையடுத்துவரும் மாதம் தொடக்கம் 12 மாதத்துக்கு  
 ரூபா 32.00 (திருத்தப்படாத பிரதிகள் ரூபா 35.00) 6 மாதத்துக்கு அரைக்கட்டணம்.  
 தனிப்பிரதி 30 சதம், தபால்மூலம் 45 சதம், முற்பணமாக அரசாங்க வெளியீட்டு  
 அலுவலக அத்தியட்சரிடம் (த. பெ. 500, அரசாங்க கருமகம், கொழும்பு 1) செலுத்தலாம்.

Subscriptions : 12 months commencing from month following date of payment  
 Rs. 32.00 (uncorrected copies Rs. 35.00). Half rates for 6 months, each part  
 30 cents, by post 45 cents, payable in advance to the SUPERINTENDENT,  
 GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS BUREAU, P. O. Box 500, Colombo 1