



පාර්ලිමේන්තු විවාද

(හැන්සාඩ්)

නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ

නිල වාර්තාව

අත්තිකාරම් ප්‍රධාන කරුණු

අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරතුමාගෙන් ලන් සන්දේශ [නි. 3181]

ඔබ්බර් ජනරාල්ගේ වාර්තාව [නි. 3184]

ලංකා ව්‍යාපාරික ආරක්ෂක සංගමය පනත් කෙටුම්පත [නි. 3195] :

“ඒ” සභාව කාරක සභාවේ වාර්තාව ඉදිරිපත් කරන ලදී
තුන්වන වර කියවා සංශෝධනාකාරයෙන්, සම්මත කරන ලදී.

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල් (සංශෝධන) පනත්
කෙටුම්පත [නි. 3196] :

දෙවන වර සහ තුන්වන වර කියවා, සංශෝධනාකාරයෙන්, සම්මත
කරන ලදී.

ගිනිකුරු නිෂ්පාදනය (විධිමත් කිරීමේ) පනත : නියෝග
[නි. 3306]

All Ceylon Young Men's Muslim Association Conference (Incorporation)
Bill [Senate] [නි. 3321] :

දෙවන වර සහ තුන්වන වර කියවා, සම්මත කරන ලදී.

பாராளுமன்ற விவாதங்கள்

(ஹன்சாட்)

பிரதிநிதிகள் சபை

அதிகார அறிக்கை

பிரதான உள்ளடக்கம்

மகாதேசாதிபதியிடமிருந்து வந்த செய்திகள் [ப.3181]

கணக்குப் பரிசோதனை அதிபதியினது அறிக்கை [ப. 3184]

இலங்கை வனசீவராசிகள் பாதுகாப்புச் சங்க மசோதா [ப. 3195] :

நிலையற்குழு “ ஏ ” அறிக்கை பரிசீலிக்கப்பட்டு, மூன்றாம் முறை மதிப்பிடப்பட்டு, திருத்தப்பட்ட வாறு நிறைவேற்றப்பட்டது

இலங்கை அரசு ஈட்டு வங்கி நிதி (திருத்த) மசோதா [ப. 3196] :

இரண்டாம், மூன்றாம் மதிப்புகள் இடம்பெற்று, திருத்தப்பட்டவாறு நிறைவேற்றப்பட்டது.

தீப்பெட்டி உற்பத்தி (பிரமாணம்) சட்டம் ; பிரமாணங்கள் [ப. 3306]

All Ceylon Young Men's Muslim Association Conference (Incorporation) Bill
[செனெற்] : [ப.3321]

இரண்டாம், மூன்றாம் மதிப்புகள் இடம்பெற்று நிறைவேற்றப்பட்டது.

Volume 78

No. 18

Tuesday

18th June 1968

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OFFICIAL REPORT

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

MESSAGES FROM THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL [Col. 3181]

REPORT OF THE AUDITOR-GENERAL [Col. 3184]

WILDLIFE PROTECTION SOCIETY OF CEYLON BILL [Col. 3195] :

Report of Standing Committee “ A ” considered, read the Third time, and passed, as amended

CEYLON STATE MORTGAGE BANK AND FINANCE (AMENDMENT) BILL
[Col. 3196] :

Read a Second, and the Third time, and passed, as amended

MANUFACTURE OF MATCHES (REGULATION) ACT : REGULATIONS [Col. 3306] :

ALL CEYLON YOUNG MEN'S MUSLIM ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE
(INCORPORATION) BILL [Senate] [Col. 3321] :

Read a Second, and the Third time, and passed

අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරතුමාගෙන් ලන් සන්දේශ

නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය

பிரதிநிதிகள் சபை

House of Representatives

1968 ஜூன் 18 වන අඟහරුවාදා

செவ்வாய்க்கிழமை, 18 ஜூன் 1968

Tuesday, 18th June 1968

අ. හා. 2 ව මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය රැස් විය. නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා, [එම්. සිවසිත්ථම්පරම් මයා.] මූලාසනාරූප විය.

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

The House met at 2 P.M., MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER [MR. M. SIVASITHAMPARAM] in the Chair.

අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාර තුමාගෙන් ලන් සන්දේශ

மகா தேசாதிபதியிடமிருந்து வந்த செய்திகள்

MESSAGES FROM THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

I have received the following Messages from His Excellency the Governor-General :

I

“අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාර කාර්යාලය

රජ වාසල,

කොළඹ,

ශ්‍රී ලංකාව,

1968 ජූනි 17.

ගරු කථානායක,

1959 අංක 8 දරන පනතින් සංශෝධනය කරනු ලැබූ (40 වෙනි අධිකාරය වන) මහජන ආරක්ෂක ආඥාපනතේ 2 වෙනි වගන්තිය යටතේ 1968ක්වූ ජූනි 17 වැනි දිනමින් නිකුත් කරනු ලැබූ ප්‍රකාශනය මගින් ඉහත කී ආඥාපනතේ II වෙනි කොටසේ විධිවිධාන 1968 ජූනි 18 වැනි දින ක්‍රියාත්මක විය යුතු බව ම විසින් ප්‍රකාශ කරන ලදී.

අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරතුමාගෙන් ලන් සන්දේශ

ප්‍රකාශනය නිකුත් කිරීමට හේතුව මහජන සාමය ආරක්ෂා කිරීම හා ජනතාවගේ ජීවිතයට අත්‍යවශ්‍යවූ සැපයීම් හා සේවාවන් පවත්වාගෙන යාම සඳහා වූ බව නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය වෙත මම මෙයින් දැනුම් දෙමි.

ඩබ්ලිව්. ගොපල් ලව,

අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරවරයා.

නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ ගරු කථානායකතුමා.”

“மகா தேசாதிபதியின் கந்தோர்

இராணி மாளிகை,

கொழும்பு,

இலங்கை.

1968 யூன் 17.

கௌரவ சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே,

1959 ஆம் ஆண்டின் 8 ஆம் இலக்கச் சட்டத்தினால் திருத்தப்பட்டபடியான (40 ஆம் அத்தியாயமான) பொதுசனப் பாதுகாப்புக் கட்டளைச் சட்டத்தின் 2 ஆம் பிரிவின் கீழ், வெளியிடப்பட்ட 1968 யூன் 17 ஆம் திகதிப் பிரசித்தத்தின் மூலம் மேற்கூறப்பட்ட கட்டளைச் சட்டத்தின் II ஆம் பிரிவில் சொல்லப்பட்ட ஏற்பாடுகள் 1968 யூன் 18 ஆம் திகதி அமுலுக்கு வருமென்று நான் பிரகடனப்படுத்தியிருக்கிறேன்.

இப்பிரசித்தத்தை வெளியிட்டதற்கு நியாயம், பொது சன ஒழுங்கை நிலைநாட்டுவதற்கும் சமுதாயத்தின் சீவியத்திற்கு அத்தியாவசியமான வழங்குதல்களையும் சேவைகளையும் பாதுகாப்பதற்கு மென்பதை இத்தால் பிரதிநிதிகள் சபைக்கு வெளிப்படுத்துகிறேன்.

டபிள்யூ. கொபல்லவ,

மகாதேசாதிபதி.

கௌரவ பிரதிநிதிகள் சபைச் சபாநாயகர் அவர்கட்கு.”

“Governor-General's Office,

Queen's House, Colombo, Ceylon.
17th June 1968.

MR. SPEAKER,

BY PROCLAMATION dated 17th June, 1968, and issued under Section 2 of the Public Security Ordinance (Cap. 40), as amended by Act No. 8 of 1959, I have declared that the provisions of Part II of the aforesaid Ordinance shall come into operation on 18th June 1968.

I do hereby communicate to the House of Representatives that the reason for issuing the Proclamation is for the preservation of public order and for the maintenance of supplies and services essential to the life of the community.

W. GOPALLAWA,
Governor-General.

The Honourable the Speaker of the House of Representatives.”

செனேட் மன்றத் திணைக்களம் மன்றத் திணைக்களம்

இதே சேனாதிபதி திணைக்களம்

II

“அஞ்சலிபாசனம் கையாண்டு,
ரத் திணை,
இலங்கை.
1968 ஆம் ஆண்டு 16

மன்றத் திணைக்களம்,

1946 ஆம் ஆண்டு (அஞ்சலிபாசனம்) ருக்கியே 36 (2)
இந்த மன்றத்தின் பின்பு, பின்பு கையாண்டு அங்கு
கமி கமிக்க ருக்கியே கையாண்டு கையாண்டு கையாண்டு
ருக்கியே மன்றத்தின் இலங்கை மன்றத்தின் இலங்கை
அங்கு கமிக்க ருக்கியே கையாண்டு கையாண்டு கையாண்டு

‘An Act to amend the Customs Ordinance.’

‘An Act to provide for the establishment and regulation of a Printing and Publication Corporation in Ceylon.’

‘An Act to make more effective provisions for the proper conduct of public examinations, for the punishment of offences committed in connection with such public examinations, and for all matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.’

‘An Act to amend the Inland Revenue Act, No. 4 of 1963’.

மேலே,

இலங்கை கமிக்க ருக்கியே,

இலங்கை. கையாண்டு,
அங்கு கமிக்க ருக்கியே.

நியோஜித மன்றத் திணைக்களம்

இலங்கை கமிக்க ருக்கியே.

செனேட் மன்றத் திணைக்களம் மன்றத் திணைக்களம்
கமிக்க ருக்கியே

மூத்தவையிலிருந்து வந்த செய்தி
MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

நியோஜித கமிக்க ருக்கியே

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

A Message has been received from the Senate.

The Clerk of the House will now read it

மன்றத்தின் கமிக்க ருக்கியே மன்றத்தின் கமிக்க ருக்கியே

செயல்திகாரி பின்வரும் செய்தியை வாசித்தார் :

The Clerk read the following Message :

“மூத்தவையிலிருந்து வந்த செய்தி செனேட்
மன்றத் திணைக்களம் கமிக்க ருக்கியே கமிக்க ருக்கியே
கமிக்க ருக்கியே

Customs (Amendment)
State Printing Corporation
Inland Revenue (Amendment)
Public Examinations.”

இலங்கை கமிக்க ருக்கியே

கமிக்க ருக்கியே பரிசோதனை அறிக்கை
அறிக்கை

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT

நியோஜித கமிக்க ருக்கியே

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

I present the fifth instalment of the Report of the Auditor-General under Article 71 (2) of the Ceylon (Constitution and Independence) Orders in Council, 1946 and 1947, on the Appropriation Accounts of the Government of Ceylon for the financial year 1966-67 (Part II).

இலங்கை கமிக்க ருக்கியே (இலங்கை கமிக்க ருக்கியே)

(கையாண்டு மூ. பி. வன்னிநாயக்க—நிதி
அமைச்சர்)

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

I move,

“That the fifth instalment of the Report of the Auditor-General under Article 71 (2) of the Ceylon (Constitution and Independence) Orders in Council, 1946 and 1947, on the Appropriation Accounts of the Government of Ceylon for the financial year 1966-67 (Part II) be printed.”

புத்தகம் கமிக்க ருக்கியே கமிக்க ருக்கியே கமிக்க ருக்கியே.

வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

Question put and agreed to.

இலங்கை கமிக்க ருக்கியே கமிக்க ருக்கியே கமிக்க ருக்கியே

அறிக்கை அச்சிடப்படக் கட்டளையிடப்பட்டது.

Ordered that the Report be printed.

இலங்கை கமிக்க ருக்கியே கமிக்க ருக்கியே

சமர்ப்பிக்கப்பட்ட பத்திரங்கள்

PAPERS PRESENTED

Order made under Section 86 (1) (c) of the Higher Education Act, No. 20 of 1966.—[The Hon. Dahanayake on behalf of the Minister of Education and Cultural Affairs.]

கமிக்க ருக்கியே மன்றத்தின் கமிக்க ருக்கியே கமிக்க ருக்கியே

சபாபீடத்தில் இருக்க கட்டளையிடப்பட்டது.

Ordered to lie upon the Table.

மன்றத் தீர்மானம் கருத்து

கேள்விகள் இல்லை.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I wanted to know the position as we are still in the dark.

சுரு வந்திருக்கிறார்கள்

(கௌரவ வன்னினாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

We shall let you know the position in the course of the day.

புள்ளியை விவரம் கேள்வி கேள்வி கேள்வி.

வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

Question put, and agreed to.

மன்றத் தீர்மானம் கருத்து

சபை அலுவல்

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

சுரு வந்திருக்கிறார்கள்

(கௌரவ வன்னினாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

மா தீர்மானம் கேள்வி கேள்வி கேள்வி :

“நாளை உறுதியாகப் பரிசீலனை செய்யப்படும் ஏன 1
சன 2 உறுதியாகப் பரிசீலனை செய்யப்படும் ஏன 3 உறுதியாகப் பரிசீலனை செய்யப்படும்
மேலும் ஏன 8 உறுதியாகப் பரிசீலனை செய்யப்படும் ஏன 9 உறுதியாகப் பரிசீலனை செய்யப்படும்
விவரம் உறுதியாகப் பரிசீலனை செய்யப்படும் ஏன 10 உறுதியாகப் பரிசீலனை செய்யப்படும்.”

புள்ளியை விவரம் கேள்வி கேள்வி கேள்வி.

வினா எழுத்தியம்பப்பெற்றது.

Question proposed.

கேள்விகள் இல்லை.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

The Hon. Minister of Finance a moment ago asked for the co-operation of the Opposition, and I told him that when co-operation has been sought through the proper channels it has always been forthcoming in the conduct of Business. But now, in this matter the Government has chosen to adopt a most undesirable procedure. It certainly is not a unique procedure, and on every occasion they tried to adopt that procedure we have protested. Now it is the normal, routine arrangement in regard to the conduct of the Business of this

மன்றத் தீர்மானம் கருத்து

House—it is also an elementary courtesy to us of the Opposition—that, when the Government wants the House to suspend Standing Order No. 8 in order to dispose of a single item or several items of Public Business in a day's Sitting, prior discussion takes place. The Government, of course, is not bound to accept the opinion of the Opposition, but any Government that is wise knows that it cannot go on long conducting the Business of the House without the co-operation of the Opposition.

In this case, we are in a most unenviable position. When it came to the Debate on the White Paper, in which, as the Government knew very well, the Opposition was the least interested party, the Leader of the House went through all the formalities of consultation with great punctiliousness. Letters were written to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and the views of the Opposition were sought on that question. But when it comes to the Business of the last day of this Session, I might say, from the little that emanated from the Minister of Finance, two of the most important financial Bills, some of the provisions of which are going to have far-reaching consequences on the economic life of this country, are sought to be rushed through.

சுரு வந்திருக்கிறார்கள்

(கௌரவ வன்னினாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

They have been on the Order Paper for some time.

கேள்விகள் இல்லை.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Even though they have been on the Order Paper for some time, are they to be rushed through to a finish in a single day?

சுரு வந்திருக்கிறார்கள்

(கௌரவ வன்னினாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Not rushed through.

தென் தி. தென்மேல் கருத்து

கேனமன் மஹா.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I want, first of all, to say that we of the Opposition—and I speak with the authority of the Leader and the other Members of the Opposition—protest at the fact that Government should have adopted this procedure. It would have been elementary courtesy to consult the opposition.

Sir, if the Government wished to dispose of certain non-contentious business on the last day of the Session, we would have been more than glad to indicate what business could have been passed without much discussion or controversy. But the Government has selected two of the most controversial—

செ. வந்தியாசகரி

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

We had half moved this Bill.

கேனமன் மஹா.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I want to set the record straight because the Minister seems to be misleading himself.

With regard to the first matter, the Minister has made an introductory Second Reading speech.

செ. வந்தியாசகரி

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Half of it.

கேனமன் மஹா.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Half of it. He has not made his full speech. He had merely got up, and the Opposition was prepared to let him get up.

If the Hon. Minister wanted this particular Debate on item 1 finished today, the matter could have been discussed with the Opposition, and it is

தென் தி. தென்மேல் கருத்து

possible that on the basis of a discussion some mutually satisfactory arrangement could have been arrived at. I will not say that this is a non-contentious Bill. There are a number of matters in this Bill which are highly contentious and they will be revealed in the course of the Debate.

But I wish to protest most vehemently at item 2 being excluded from the operation of Standing Order No. 8. I can see no reason for this except that the Government now feels that, having placated the American-dominated International Monetary Fund in relation to a large number of demands it has made, it must, before the end of this Session, placate the British vested interests who are asking the Government to honour a promise given some time ago and remove the restrictions which the S. L. F. P. Government placed on the opening of new accounts in foreign private banks in this country.

That is one of the matters of acute controversy which will be debated for a long time when we come to debate the Finance (Amendment) Bill. And I ask my Hon. Friend whether he thinks it is fair that a highly contentious matter like this, a matter, after all, which is going to affect the economy of this country, should be rushed through today.

செ. வந்தியாசகரி

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

There is no proposal to curtail the Debate.

கேனமன் மஹா.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

We know that these matters have been on the Order Paper for a long time. There is an item which has been on the Order Paper for a long time. There is a Debate which went on even more extensively, namely, the Debate on the General and Technical Education Bill. The Minister of Education not only introduced that

මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ කටයුතු

[කෙනමත් මය.]

Bill but made his full speech, we had a very considerable discussion on the matter, and the whole matter suddenly got shelved because there were internal problems for the Government in passing that Bill.

Be that as it may, if it is going to be a completion of unfinished business, then let us finish at least that bit of unfinished business. It is at least three-fourths finished. But here we have not even come to first base ; we have got only to half base.

We are ready to go on with the Debate on the State Mortgage Bank and Finance (Amendment) Bill but we want a longer consideration of the Finance (Amendment) Bill, which is a matter on which many hon. Members wish to speak. We have got a long history of actions by the Government annulling progressively decisions taken by the previous Government—the case of the oil companies, and now the case of banks, and so on and so forth. All these are matters which must be fully discussed, and it is not correct to do that in the wee hours of the morning. I anticipate that the Ceylon State Mortgage Bank and Finance (Amendment) Bill will take some time. How can we, after that, go through and complete the Debate on the Finance (Amendment) Bill ?

I wish to say this. If the Government wants, let us conclude what we have started ; that is, the Second Reading Debate on the Ceylon State Mortgage Bank and Finance (Amendment) Bill, and through the usual channels let us see whether we can agree on a fixed time to conclude the discussion on that Bill. If there is time available, we can take up non-contentious items on the Order Paper, but let item No. 2 and other contentious items go over for the next Session. I think this is a very fair offer to the Government and I hope the Government will seriously consider it. If not, we will have to protest very strongly in every way against this attempt to try and pass these two pieces of legislation today.

මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ කටයුතු

අ. භා. 2.15

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා. (හබරාදුව)

(ශ්‍රී ල. ප්‍රිතින්ස් ඉරිසේකරා—හබරාදුව)

(Mr. Prins Gunasekera—Habaraduwa)

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා ගරු සභානායකතුමා සමඟ සාකච්ඡා කරන්නේ විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයේ විරෝධයට ඇහුම්කන් දී විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයේ ඉල්ලීමට ඉඩ දෙන්නට නම් මම එකවරම වාඩි වෙන්නම්. ඒ තීරණය ගන්න තෙක් විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වය වෙනුවෙන් අපේ විරුද්ධත්වය දක්වන්නට අවසර දෙන්න.

ත්‍යාය පත්‍රයේ අංක 1 සහ අංක 2 යටතේ තිබෙන්නේ මේ රටේ ආර්ථික ක්‍රමය කෙරෙහි බොහෝ දුරට බලපාන වැදගත් පනත් දෙකක් බැවින් ඒවා සියුම් ලෙස විග්‍රහ කර, ඒවා පිළිබඳව දිගින් දිගට විවාද කිරීමට විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වය බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. පසුගිය සතියේ ආණ්ඩු පක්ෂය විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයට දොස් කිව්වේ මේ ගරු සභාවේ විවාදවලට සහභාගි වන්නේ නැත කියායි. විවාදවලට සහභාගි වන්නට අප බොහොම කැමැත්තෙන් ඉන්නවා. ඇයි එහෙම නම් මේ පනත් කෙටුම්පත් ඉක්මනින් සම්මත කර ගන්නට උත්සාහ කරන්නේ ? ස්ථාවර නියෝග සාමාන්‍ය විධියට අනුගමනය කර කෙටුම්පත් පනත් සාමාන්‍ය විධියට විවාද කර, මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්ගේ අදහස් දැනගෙන, ඒවා අනුව කෙටුම්පත් පනත් සංශෝධනය කර නීතිගත කරන්නට බැරි ඇයි ? පසුගිය සතියේ ආණ්ඩුව පැත්තේ පමණක් ඇති වූ විවාදයේදී—විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයේත් තුන් හතර දෙනෙකු ඒ විවාදයට සහභාගි වුණු බව ඇත්තයි—පැහැදිලි වුණු එක කාරණයක් නම් වැදගත් ජාතික ප්‍රශ්න පිළිබඳව මේ ගරු සභාවේ විවාද කිරීම සඳහා ලැබෙන කාලය කිසිසේත් ප්‍රමාණවත් නොවන බවයි.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා

(උප සභාපාලක ආචාර්ය)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

May I know from the Hon. Leader of the House whether the Government is prepared to omit item No. 2 ?

මන'ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ කටයුතු

අත්හැරීමට යෝජනා කළ වචන ප්‍රශ්නයේ
කොටසක් හැරියට තිබිය යුතුය යන ප්‍රශ්නය
විමසන ලදින්, නිෂ්පාදන විය.

விடப்பட வேண்டுமென பிரேரிக்கப்பட்ட சொற்கள் வினாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமெனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு நிராகரிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question, put, and negatived.

එම වචන එතැනට එකතු කළ යුතුය, යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදීන්' සහසම්මත විය.

குறித்த சொற்கள் சேர்க்கப்படவேண்டுமெனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

Question, that those words be there inserted, put, and agreed to.

මුල් ප්‍රශ්නය, සංශෝධිතාකාරයෙන්, විමසන
ලදින්, සහසම්මත විය.

மூலவினா, திருத்தப்பெற்றவாறு விடுக்கப்பட்டு நிறைவேற்றப்பட்டது.

Original Question, as amended, put and agreed to.

මහත් මනසලසේ කටයුතු

சபை அலுவல்

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

ගුරු කි. පි. ද සිල්වා

ගරු සි. පී. ද සිල්වා

(கௌரவ சீ. பி. டி சில்வா)

(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

I move,

“That the following provisions shall have effect with respect to the Business of this Day’s sitting :

‘That if the report of Standing Committee ‘A’ on Wildlife Protection Society of Ceylon Bill be presented to the House this day, the report be considered forthwith and the Bill be read a Third time this day.’”

ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදීත්, සභාසම්මත විය.

வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

Question put, and agreed to.

(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

In regard to my Motion, I move,

"to leave out 'items 1 and 2' and insert
tem 1."

“item 1.””

பிழைவன டே வர்ண

பிழைவன டே வர்ண

சமர்ப்பிக்கப்பட்ட அறிக்கைகள்

REPORTS PRESENTED

வன ஸர்வரக்ஷக சங்கேத பதன் கேடுமேத

இலங்கை வன சீவராசிகள் பாதுகாப்புச் சங்க
மசோதா

THE WILDLIFE PROTECTION SOCIETY OF
CEYLON BILL

சீ. ஜே. பாரிஸ் பெரேரா மைய. (யா.ஜே.)
(காரகஸக நியோஜீத ஸகபதி ஸக “அ”
ஸகவர காரக ஸகவே ஸகபதி)

(திரு. ஜீ. ஜே. பாரிஸ் பெரேரா—ஜா-எல—
குழுக்களின் உப அக்கிராசனரும், நிலையற்குழு
'ஏ' இன் தலைவரும்)

(Mr. G. J. Paris Perera—Ja-Ela—
Deputy Chairman of Committees and
Chairman, Standing Committee “A”).

I present the Report of Standing
Committee “A” on the Wildlife
Protection Society of Ceylon Bill to-
gether with the Minutes of Pro-
ceedings.

REPORT

The Committee considered the Wildlife
Protection Society of Ceylon Bill and have
agreed to it as amended.

பதன் கேடுமேத “அ” ஸகவர காரக ஸகவே
பிதன் வர்ண கரக டே பரீத ஸககை லகே டே.

மசோதா, நிலையற்குழு “ஏ” இனால் அறிக்கை
[செய்யப்பட்டவாறு பரிசீலிக்கப்பட்டது.

Bill, as reported by Standing Com-
mittee “A”, considered.

லகே பரீத ஸககை ஸககைமேத விச:

பின்வரும் பிரேரணை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது:
Resolved.

“That this House doth agree with the
amendments made by the Standing
Committee.”—[லகே ஸககை]

லகே சி. பி. ஸககை (லகே லகே ருசக
லகே)

(கெளரவ டி. பி. அத்தபத்து—பதில் இரா
ஜாங்க அமைச்சர்)

(The Hon. D. P. Atapattu—Acting
Minister of State)

I move,

“That the Bill, as amended, be now
read the Third Time”.

லகே ருசக ருசக லகே லகே
[ஸககை] பதன் கேடுமேத

புளிய விசேத டேன், ஸககைமேத விச.

கேடுமேத பதன் ருசக ஸககை ஸககை
கிசல ஸககைமேத ஸககை கரக டே.

விசு விடுக்கப்பட்டு, ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

அதன்படி, மசோதா மூன்றாம் முறையாக மதிப்
பிடப்பெற்று திருத்தப்பட்டவாறு நிறைவேற்றப்பெற்
றது.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read the Third time,
and passed, as amended.

லகே ருசக ருசக லகே லகே [ஸககை] பதன் கேடுமேத

இலங்கை அரசு ஸககை, நிதி (திருத்த)
மசோதா

CEYLON STATE MORTGAGE BANK AND FINANCE (AMENDMENT) BILL

ஸககை [புதி 7] பிழை கல் நகை டே
பிழை நகை டேன் பதன் லகே பிழை நியோஜீத
கிசல டே.

“கேடுமேத பதன் டேன் டேன் வர கிசல
புது.”—[லகே வந்நியாகை]

ஜூன் 7 ஆம் தேதிய பிரேரணை மீதான விவாதம்
மீள ஆரம்பிப்பதற்கான கட்டளை வாசிக்கப்பட்டது.

“மசோதா இப்பொழுது இரண்டாம் முறை மதிப்
பிக்கப்படுமா.”—[கெளரவ வன்னிநாயக்க]

Order read for resuming Adjourned
Debate on Motion—[7th June.]

“That the Bill be now read a Second
time.”—[Hon. Wanninayake.]

டி. லா. 2.20

லகே வந்நியாகை

(கெளரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Section 103 of the State Mortgage
Bank Ordinance provides for the
recovery of penalty interest for the
non-payment of loan instalments on
the due dates. There is at present no
provision for the waiver of penalty
interest. Section 45 of the Amending
Bill is designed to introduce an ele-
ment of flexibility into the system of
penalty interest and also provide for
waiver.

As I stated in my last Budget
Speech the Government has decided
to transfer the debt redemption

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්

[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

scheme from the People's Bank to the State Mortgage Bank as recommended by the People's Bank Commission. Chapter VA of the Bill seeks to give effect to this decision.

One of the biggest complaints against the present debt redemption scheme is that it is not applicable to debts incurred prior to 1956. In my Budget Speech of 1965 I mentioned that the Government proposed to amend the legislation so as to bring within the scope of the scheme debts incurred from the beginning of 1952 as well. Section 70 B (1) of Chapter VA of the Bill seeks to make the operative date of the scheme the first day of January, 1952 thus bridging the gap between the period covered by the Land Redemption Ordinance, No. 61 of 1942, which was repealed in 1954 and the operative date of the debt redemption scheme as provided for in the Finance Act, No. 11 of 1963. This would enable the bank to offer relief to a large number of persons whose properties have been sold in the execution of a mortgage decree or transferred to any person or persons whose properties have been sold in the execution of a mortgage decree or transferred to any person or persons in the satisfaction of a debt during the period 1952-1956.

In the course of the operation of the debt redemption scheme, the People's Bank has come across a large number of difficulties which prevent the public from obtaining the full benefit of the debt redemption scheme. Amendments are being introduced in this Bill to overcome these defects.

අ. භා. 2.23

වී. බී. ඉලංගරත්න මයා. (කොලොන්නාව)

(ති.රු. ඒ. ඩී. ඉලංගරත්න—කොලොන්නාව)

(Mr. T. B. Ilangaratne—Kolonnewa)

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මෙම පනත ඉදිරිපත් කරමින් ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා සැහෙන විස්තරයක් නොදීම ගැන මූලින්ම කනගාටුව ප්‍රකාශ කළ යුතුව තිබෙනවා. මෙම සංශෝධන පනත ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නට හේතුව අපට පැහැදිලි කර දුන්නේ නැහැ.

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

ගරු වන්නිනායක

(කෙළරාච වැන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

පසුගිය වතාවේ හොඳ විස්තරයක් කර තිබෙනවා. ඒක කියෙව්වාද?

ඉලංගරත්න මයා.

(ති.රු. ඉලංගරත්න)

(Mr. Ilangaratne)

ඒක කියෙව්වා.

ගරු වන්නිනායක

(කෙළරාච වැන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

ඒ දවසෙ තමුන්නාන්සේ මෙහි හිටියේ නැ.

ඉලංගරත්න මයා.

(ති.රු. ඉලංගරත්න)

(Mr. Ilangaratne)

හිටියේ නැතුවාට හැන්සාඩ් වාර්තාව කියෙව්වා. සැහෙන විස්තරයක් දී ඇති බවක් පෙනුණේ නැහැ. මෙම සංශෝධන පනත ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නට හේතු වූයේ මොන කාරණාදැයි පැහැදිලි නොකිරීම ගැන කනගාටු වෙනවා. මෙය ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙන්නේ කාරණා කීපයක් ඉෂ්ට කර ගැනීමට බව කියා ඇතත් හරි පැහැදිලි විස්තරයක් දී නැහැ.

ඉඩම් නිරවුල් කිරීමේ කටයුතු රජයේ උකස් බැංකුවට යා කරන්නැයි මහජන බැංකු කොමිෂන් වාර්තාවෙන් නිර්දේශ කර ඇති බව ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා විසින් ප්‍රකාශ කරන්නට යෙදුණා. එහෙත් ඒ වාර්තාවේ එවැනි දෙයක් සඳහන් වී තිබෙන බවක් මට නම් පේන්නේ නැහැ. රජයේ උකස් බැංකුවට ඉඩම් නිරවුල් කිරීමේ කාර්යය භාර දෙන්නැයි මහජන බැංකු කොමිෂන් වාර්තාව නිර්දේශ කළාලු. එහෙම දෙයක් තියෙන්නේ කොහේද?

ගරු වන්නිනායක

(කෙළරාච වැන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

ඒ වාර්තාව කියෙව්වාද?

ඉලංගරත්න මයා.

(ති.රු. ඉලංගරත්න)

(Mr. Ilangaratne)

මේ කථා කරන්නේ ඒවා කියවලා තමයි. අප මොව්ටයත් වාගේ කථා කරනවා යයි

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්

[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

[ඉලංගරත්න මයා.]

ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා කල්පනා කරන වාද? ඒක කියවා නැත්තේ මුදල් ඇමති තුමයි.

ගරු වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

මම හුඟක් දේවල් කියවා තිබෙනවා.

ඉලංගරත්න මයා.

(திரு. இலங்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Ilangaratne)

තමුන්නාන්සේ එය නොකියවා ඇති නිසා මා ඒ අදාළ කොටස කියවා පෙන් වන්නට කැමතියි. මා මේ කියවන්නේ 1966 වර්ෂයේ 7 වන සැසි වාර්තාවේ 130 වන පිටුවේ 200 වන වගන්තියයි.

“The General Manager has expressed to us his expectations that Government will make some special funds available to the Bank to finance land redemption.”

මෙහි අදහස මෙයයි: මේ කාරණය සඳහා ආණ්ඩුවෙන් සැහෙන මුදලක් වෙන් කර දෙනැයි සාමාන්‍යාධිකාරීතුමා බලාපොරොත්තු වුණා. එහෙත් සාමාන්‍යාධිකාරී තුමාගේ ඒ බලාපොරොත්තුව සුන් වුණා. මුදල් ලැබුණේ නැහැ. ඒ නිසා මේ අය රෙකමදරුවක් කරනවා. ඒ මොකක්ද?

“While we appreciate that the intention of the Government is to assist debtors to redeem their lost immovable property and rehabilitate themselves, we cannot commend their use of the funds of the Bank for this purpose. We are not aware of the reasons that have impelled the Government to invoke the authority of the Minister in charge of the People's Bank, or the Bank's resources for this purpose, when a Land Commissioner's Department with knowledge and experience of land acquisition and redemption procedure has been in existence for long and could, it seems, have been entrusted with the task with funds directly provided by Parliament for the purpose.”

මේක විතරයි, කියා තිබෙන්නේ. මහජන බැංකුවේ සාමාන්‍යාධිකාරීතුමා ඉඩම් නිරවුල් කිරීමේ කටයුතු සම්බන්ධයෙන් ආණ්ඩුවෙන් සැහෙන මුදලක් බලාපොරොත්තු වෙන් සිටියත් ඒක ඉෂ්ට නොවුණු බව බැංකු කොමිසම කියා තිබෙනවා. ඒ නිසා අර කාරණය ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්නට බැරි වුණාලු. එසේ හෙයින් වෙන යමක් කරන්නැයි ඒ අය රෙකමදරු කරනවා. කළ

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

යුත්තේ අසුවල් දෙය යයි නම් කර නැහැ. ඉඩම් දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවේ එක්තරා අංශයක් තිබෙද්දීම ඒ කාලයේ සිටි මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා ඉඩම් නිරවුල් කිරීමේ කටයුත්ත මහජන බැංකුවට යා කෙළේ මන්දැයි ඒ අයට තේරෙන්නේ නැතිලු. මේ කොමසාරිස්වරුන්ට අප කළ හුඟක් දේවල් ගැන හිතන්නට බැහැ. අප ඒ ගැන පුදුම වන්නේ නැහැ. ඉඩම් දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවේ ඉඩම් නිරවුල් කිරීමේ අංශයටත් සැහෙන මුදලක් වෙන් කර නැති බව අපට පෙනී ගියා. ඒ වාගේම මේ ප්‍රශ්නය විසඳන්නට ඒ අයට වැඩි වුවමනාවක් තිබුණේත් නැහැ. අප මේ පිළිබඳව මහජන බැංකුවේ අංශයක් විවෘත කෙළේ ඒ නිසයි. හුඟක් කාලයක් තිස්සේ මේ රටේ බැංකු තිබුණා. මුලින්ම තිබුණේ විදේශ බැංකුයි. ඒ විදේශ බැංකුවලින් විදේශීය ව්‍යාපාරික යන්ට විශාල සේවයක් වුණා. ඒ වාගේම කර්මාන්තකාරයන්ට විශාල සේවයක් වුණා. නමුත් ඒවායින් ලාංකිකයන්ට සැහෙන සේවයක් සිදු වුණේ නැහැ. එම නිසා තමයි, 1939 දී ලංකා බැංකුව ඇති කළේ. ලංකා බැංකුව ඇති කර සැහෙන සේවයක් කරන්නට පටන් ගත් නමුත්, ඒ ලංකා බැංකුවෙන්වත් විශේෂයෙන් සාමාන්‍ය පොදු මහජනතාවටත්, සමුපකාර සංගම්වලටත්, සුළු ව්‍යාපාරිකයන්ට සහ නොයෙකුත් කර්මාන්තවල හා ව්‍යාපාරවල යෙදී සිටින සංවිධානවලටත් සැහෙන ආධාරයක් නොලැබුණු නිසායි, මහජන බැංකුව ඇති කළේ.

මහජන බැංකුව ඇති කළත්, එයින් අංග සම්පූර්ණ සේවාවක් කරන්නට අපට පුළුවන්කමක් තිබුණේ නැහැ. හුඟ කාලයක් තිස්සේම ඉඩම් නිරවුල් කිරීමේ දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව ඉඩම් දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවට යා කර තිබුණු බව මා දන්නවා. එහෙත් එය ක්‍රියාත්මක වුණේ නැහැ. 1956 දී අප ආණ්ඩු බලය අතට ගන්නා විට, ඒ දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව වසා දමා තිබුණා. එම නිසා එය නැවතත් විවෘත කරන හැටියට සැහෙන මහජන උද්ඝෝෂණයක්—විශේෂයෙන් කඳුකර පළාත්වල අයගෙන්—තිබුණා. ඔවුන්ට මුදල් අමාරුකම් ඇති වී, මුදල් ලබා ගැනීම සඳහා සිය ඉඩම් උකස් කළ විට, ඒවා උකස් ගත්තවුන්ට ඉබේම සිත්ත

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්
[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

වෙනවා. එසේ සිත්ත වුණු ඉඩම් ආපසු ගැනීමට ක්‍රමයක් නැති නිසා මහ මහට පවා බසින්තට ඔවුන්ට සිදු වෙනවා. එම නිසායි, ඒ ආණ්ඩුව අර හොඳ වැඩය කරන්නට පටන් ගත්තේ. එහෙත් හොඳ වැඩ වුණත් හුඟක් කල් කරන්නට බැරි වෙනවා, ධනපති ක්‍රමයට, බලපෑම් වලට හිස පාත් කරන්නට සිදු වන නිසා. එම නිසා 1956 දී මේ ප්‍රශ්නය වේගවත් ආකාරයකින් මතු වුණා.

මේ කාර්යය ඉෂ්ට කිරීම සඳහායි, ඒ වෙනුවෙන් 1961 දී මහජන බැංකුවේ අංශයක් විවෘත කළේ. මා කලින් සඳහන් කළ දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව මගින් එම කාර්යය ඉෂ්ට කරන හැටියට ඉල්ලමින්, අපේ කාලයේදී ඉඩම් ඇමතිතුමා වෙත නොයෙක් වර සංදේශ ඉදිරිපත් කළා; නියෝජිත පිරිස් ගිහින් කරුණු කියා හිටියා. එහෙත් ඒ ඉල්ලීම ඉෂ්ට වුණේ නැහැ. ඒ අන්දමට එය හරියාකාරව ඉෂ්ට නොවුණු නිසා තමයි, ඒ වෙනුවෙන් මහජන බැංකුවේ අංශයක් විවෘත කළේ. ඒ කාලයේදී යටියන්තොට ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා) කීවා, මෙය වැඩි බරක් වන්නට පුළුවන් කියා. ඒ බව අපත් පිළිගත්තා. බර වැඩි වුණත් ඒ කාර්යය කෙසේ හෝ කළ යුතු නිසා, පුළුවන් තරම් සේවකයන් බඳවාගෙන හෝ එය ඉෂ්ට කරන්නට අප කටයුතු කළා. ඒ වැඩය සැහෙන ප්‍රමාණයකට කෙරීගෙන ගියා.

එසේ සැහෙන තරම් දුරට කෙරීගෙන ගිය ඒ කාර්යය තමයි, මේ උකස් බැංකු වට පවරන හැටියට තමුන්නාන්සේලා යෝජනා කර තිබෙන්නේ. එහෙත් මා කලින් කියවූ සැසි වාර්තාවෙන් එවැනි රෙකමදාරුවක් කර නැහැ. මගේ කල් පතාවේ හැටියට නම්, මෙහි යටි අදහසක් තිබෙනවා. “මේ වෙනුවෙන් වෙන් කළ යුත්තේ අසවල් ප්‍රමාණයක මුදලය” යනුවෙන් ආණ්ඩුවෙන් මහජන බැංකුවට නියම කරනවා. එම නිසා ඒ ඒ කාලවල ඉල්ලීම අනුව මුදල් පරිහරණය කරවීමට ආණ්ඩුවට පුළුවන්කම තිබෙනවා. තමුන් නාන්සේලාගේ පාලනය යටතේ මේ මුදල් විසඳුම් කර ඇති අතර, දුන් මුදල් ආපසු අය කර ගැනීමට බැරි තැනට දුන් කටයුතු යෙදී තිබෙනවා. මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා

නම් හිස වනනවා. කෘෂිකාර්මික කටයුතු වෙනුවෙන් රුපියල් ලක්ෂ 850 ක් දී තිබෙනවා, නොයෙක් සමුපකාර මණ්ඩලවලට. පසුගිය අප්‍රේල් මාසය වන විට ඒ රුපියල් ලක්ෂ 850 ආපසු අය කර ගත යුතුව තිබුණා. එහෙත් ඒ මුදලින් මෙතෙක් ලැබී තිබෙන්නේ රුපියල් ලක්ෂ 150 ක් පමණයි. ලක්ෂ 850 ක් ණයට දුන් තමුත් ආපසු ලැබී තිබෙන්නේ ලක්ෂ 150 යි. ඒ අතර මේ කන්නයටත් මුදල් ණයට දෙන්නට සිදු වී තිබෙනවා. තමුත් නාන්සේලා ගණන් හදා බලා කියන්න. මා ඉදිරිපත් කළ ගණන් හිලව් වැරදි නම් පිළිගන්නම්. මාත් මේ ගැන හොඳට හොයා බලුවා. මට ලැබී තිබෙන ආරංචි අනුව නම් තත්ත්වය, ඒකයි.

ඊට හේතුව මොකක්ද? තමුත්නාන්සේලා මුදල් ණයට දී ඇති මේ සංගම් වැඩි ගණනක සහාපතිකම් දරන්නේ එක් කෝ මන්ත්‍රීවරු නැත්නම් ආණ්ඩු පක්ෂයේ බලවත් අය. මා ඊට දොස් කියන්නේ නැහැ. අපේ කාලයේත් ඒ විධියට තනතුරු දරුවා. ඒ විධියේ පුද්ගලයන් තනතුරු භාර ගැනීම හොඳ නැතැයි මා කියන්නේ නැහැ. මන්ත්‍රීවරු හෝ තමුත් නාන්සේලාගේ පක්ෂයේ බලවත් අය හෝ ඒ තනතුරු දැරීමේ වරදක් නැහැ. එහෙත් එවැනි පුද්ගලයන් ඒ තනතුරු දැරීම නිසා, ලබා ගත් මුදල් ආපසු ගෙවන හැටියට බල කරන්නට බැංකුවට පුළුවන් කමක් නැහැ.

ගරු වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

නැ.

ඉලංගරත්න මයා.

(திரு. இலங்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Ilangaratne)

තමුත්නාන්සේලා නැතැයි කීවත්, හොඳට සොයා බලුවොත් පෙනේවි, කොයි තරම් කුණු කන්දල් මේකෙ තිබෙනවාද කියා. තමුත්නාන්සේලාගේ සමහර මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් ගත් ණය තවමත් ආපසු ගෙවා නැහැ. බැංකුවල පවතින සම්ප්‍රදායක්

ලංකා රජයේ උගස් බැංකුව හා මුදල්
[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ඉලංගරත්න මයා.]

අනුව, අසුවල් අය මෙපමණ මුදලක් ණයට ගත් නමුත් තවමත් ගෙවා නැතැයි කියන්නට බැහැ. එහෙත් අප බලයේ සිටිද්දී ඒ සම්ප්‍රදායය කැඩුවා. අපෙන් ඇහුවාම අපි ඒ විස්තර ඇතුළත් සම්පූර්ණ ලැයිස්තුවක් ඒ කාලයේදී දුන්නා. සමහර මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් ගත් ණය මුදල් ආපසු ගෙවා නැහැ. දෙන්නට බැරි තත්ත්වයකට බැහැලා ඉන්න බව මා දන්නවා. තමුන්නාන්සේලා කොමිටියක් පත් කළා. පත් කරන ලද ඒ කොමිටිය නිර්දේශ වශයක් ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙනවා. තමුන්නාන්සේලාට දැනගන්නට වුවමනා කළේ මහජන බැංකුව, එය පිහිටුවීමේ පරමාර්ථයන් ඒ ආකාරයටම ඉෂ්ට කර තිබෙනවාද යන්නත්, එසේ නැත්නම් කොයි තරම් දුරට එයින් පිට පැන කටයුතු කර තිබෙනවාද යන්නත් බව පෙනෙනවා. ඉදිරි පත් කරන ලද වාර්තාවේ හැටියට මහජන බැංකුව කරුණු දෙක තුනක් සම්බන්ධයෙන් පිට පැන ගොස් තිබෙන බව පෙනෙනවා. ඒ කොයි හැටි වෙතත්, ඒ අය කියන්නේ හොඳ ඇප එහෙම ඇතිව මුදල් ණයට දී තිබෙනවාය කියයි. ඒ කාලයේදී ඒ ආකාරයට මුදල් ණයට දී තිබෙන්නේ විශේෂ අවස්ථාවක් තිබුණු නිසයි. ඒ විශේෂ අවස්ථාව මොකක්ද? මහජන බැංකුව හැර සෙසු බැංකු වැඩ වර්ජනයක යෙදී සිටියා. ඒ නිසා විශාල මුදලක් තිබුණා. ගෙවා පිරිමහන්නට බැරි තරම් විශාල මුදලක් තිබුණු නිසා, නීතිරීති ආදිය තරමක් දුරට ලිහිල් කර, හොඳ ඇප ඇතිව, කර්මාන්තවලට දෙන්නැයි කීව්වා. ඒක තාවකාලික වැඩක් පමණයි. ඒක වෙනම එකක්. දැනට තිබෙන තත්ත්වයයි මා සඳහන් කෙළේ. මුලින්ම ආණ්ඩුවේ මුදල් මේ බැංකුවට පවරන්නට මැලි කම නිසයි රජයේ උගස් බැංකුවට මෙය පවරන්නේ.

ලංකා රජයේ උගස් බැංකුවට මුදල් ලබා ගන්නේ සෘණපත්‍ර විකුණා, ණය ඔප්පු මගින්, මහජනයාගෙනුයි. එහෙත් මහජන බැංකුවට මුදල් ලැබෙන්නේ ඒ ආකාරයට නොවෙයි. එහි වැඩවලට ආණ්ඩුවෙන් මුදලක් වෙන් කරන්නට ඕනෑ. තමුන්නාන්සේලා මුදලක් වෙන් කරන්නට සතුටු නැහැ. ඒ නිසා “ඩිබෙන්ටර්ස්” විකුණා

මහජනයාගෙන් ණයකර ඔප්පුවලට මුදල් අරන් උගස් බැංකුවට පවරා එයින් තමයි නැවත වරක් මෙය කරන්නට යන්නේ. මෙන්න මේකයි අපට විකක් දැනගන්නට වුවමනා කරන්නේ. ලංකා බැංකුවත්, මහජන බැංකුවත් තිබෙන බව තමුන්නාන්සේලා දන්නවා. ඇයි මේ ආයතන දෙකට ඒවා ගන්නට බැරි? මුදල් නැති නිසාය, යන්නයි මෙහි වාර්තා කර තිබෙන්නේ. අධ්‍යක්ෂවරයාට මේ වැඩ කොටස කරන්නට බැරි වී තිබෙන්නේ මුදල් නැති නිසයි. ඒ හැර තවත් හේතුවක් දක්වන්නට තිබුණා. මොකක්ද ඒ? සේවකයන් මදි. සේවකයන් මදි නම් තවත් සේවකයන් බඳවා ගන්නට පුළුවනි. ලංකා රජයේ උගස් බැංකුව තව තවත් පුළුල් කරන විට තව තවත් සේවකයන් බඳවා ගන්නට සිද්ධ වෙනවා. එක් කෙනකු, දෙන්නකු නොවෙයි විශාල සංඛ්‍යාවක් බඳවා ගන්නට සිදු වෙනවා ඇති. සාමාන්‍යාධිකාරීවරයකු පත් කළාට මදි. ජෙනරල් මැනේජර් කෙනකු මෙන්ම උප ජෙනරල් මැනේජර් කෙනකුත් වුවමනා කරාවි. ඔය ආදී වශයෙන් විශාල සංඛ්‍යාවක් වුවමනා කරනු ඇති. තමුන්නාන්සේලා ඒ විධියට කරන්නට අදහස් කරනවා. ඇයි, මහජන බැංකුවෙන් මෙය කළාම මොකද වෙන්නේ? ඒ ප්‍රශ්නය අහන්නට කැමතියි.

ලංකා රජයේ උගස් බැංකුව දීර්ඝ කාලයක් තිස්සේ පැවති ආයතනයක්. එහෙම නිසියදී තමයි මහජන බැංකුව ඇති කෙළේ. එසේ කෙළේ මක්නිසාද? උගස් බැංකුවෙන් කරන ලද්දේ සීමිත සේවයක් පමණක් නිසයි. එය වරදකැයි කියන්නේ නැහැ. එය තවත් විකක් පළල් කළාට අප විරුඩ වන්නේ නැහැ. එහෙත් අප අහන්නේ මෙසේ කරන්නේ මක්නිසාද යන්නයි. ඊට දිය හැකි එකම හේතුව ආණ්ඩුවේ මුදල් වෙන් කරන්නට කැමති නැහැ යන්නයි. ඒ නිසා, ණයකර ඔප්පු මගින් “ඩිබෙන්ටර්ස්” විකුණා මහජනයාගෙන් ඒ වුවමනා කරන මුදල් ලබා ගන්නටයි. දැන් ඔය තමුන්නාන්සේලා අදහස් කරන්නේ. වෙන කිසිම හේතුවක් පෙන්වන්නට බැහැ. ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාට එක් කාරණයක් කියන්නට මා කැමතියි. ආණ්ඩුවේ මෙය ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්නට අප පටන්

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්
[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

ගත්තේ 1956 සිටයි. 1956 සිට ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්නට පටන්ගත්තේ කාරණා දෙකක් උඩයි. 1956දී එක්තරා යුගයක් පටන් ගත්තා. එයම නොවෙයි, කාරණය. විකිත් වික පටන් අරන් තවත් විකක් දුරට යන් නටයි අදහස් කෙළේ. 1952 සිට පටන් ගත්තාය කිම ගැන සන්තෝෂයි. එහෙත් අප තුළ එක්තරා බියක් තිබෙනවා, ක්‍රියාව ගැන. විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයේ මත් ත්‍රිත් හැටියට අප තුළ බියක් තිබෙනවාය කියන්නට ඉඩ තිබෙන නිසාම නොවෙයි මෙසේ කියන්නේ. තමුත්තාත්සේලා මේ ආණ්ඩුව ගත්තාට පස්සේ සම්පූර්ණ යෙන්ම ඒ අංශය වැහිලයි තියෙන්නේ. තමුත්තාත්සේ මිට පෙරත් ඔය විධියට ඔළුව වැනුවා. ඒ අනුව මිනිසුන් යවා සෝ දිසි කෙරෙව්වා.

තුඩුගල්ල කියන මහත්මයා ඉන් තවා. ඒ මහත්මයා ගරු රාජ්‍ය ඇමති තුමාගේත් නැදැයෙක්. ඒ වාගේම කොළොන්නාවේ හිටපු සභාපතිවරයෙක්. තිබෙන නීතිය යටතේ මහජන බැංකුවෙන් ඒ විධියේ ආධාරයක් ගන්නට කෙළවරක් නැතිව ලියුම් යවා තිබෙනවා. තමුත්තාත්සේලාටත් ලියුම් යවා තිබෙනවා. එය ක්‍රියා විරහිත වී තිබෙනවා. දැන් මහජන බැංකුවේ මේ අංශය සම්පූර්ණ යෙන්ම වසා දමා තිබෙනවා. ඒ අංශයෙන් කිසිම ප්‍රයෝජනයක් නැහැ. නීතිඥ මහත් මයෙකු වැනි යම්කිසි බලයක් තිබෙන මහත්මයෙකුටත් මෙවැනි දෙයක් කර ගන්න බැරි නම් සාමාන්‍ය මහජනතාව සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම එය කෙරෙහි තැබූ බලා පොරොත්තු සුන් කරගෙන සිටින බව අපට වටහා ගන්න පුළුවනි. මේ සංශෝධන ආඥාපනත නම් අද සම්මත වෙයි. එසේ සම්මත වුණත් මේ පසුගිය ඒවා ගැන විකක් සොයා බලන්න. එය මහජන බැංකු වට හාර කරනවා නම් එය ඉක්මණින් ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්න. එයට උච්චස්ථාන යක් දී එම ප්‍රශ්නය විසඳා, මහජනයා හුඟක් ආශාවෙන් බලා සිටින කරුණක් ඉටු කර දෙන්න. ඒ සම්බන්ධ යම්කිසි සහනයක් ලබා දෙන ලෙස මා මේ අවස්ථා වේදී ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මේ ඉදිරි පත් කර තිබෙන සංශෝධන ආඥාපනත් ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙන්නේ කරුණු කිහිපයක් පිණිසයි. එයින් එක් කාරණයක් නම් මෙයයි :

“ලංකාවෙහි ආර්ථික සංවර්ධනයෙහි, විශේෂයෙන් කෘෂිකර්ම ක්ෂේත්‍රයෙහි, වඩා අත්‍යවශ්‍ය හා ක්‍රියා ශීලී වැඩ කොටසක් බැංකුව විසින් ඉටු කළ හැකි වන පරිදි බැංකුවෙහි බලතල සහ විෂය ප්‍රමාණය වැඩි කිරීම.”

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, අපි මෙයට විරුද්ධ නැහැ. තමුත් අපි විරුද්ධ වන්නේ මෙන්න මේ කරුණටයි. අපේ චෝදනාව මෙයයි. මහජන බැංකුවෙන් මහ බැංකුවෙන් මේ සේවාව කෙරෙනවා නම් ඉතාමත් අමාරුවෙන් සේවයක් කර ගන්න සිදු වී තිබෙන උගස් බැංකුවටත් ඇයි මෙය පවරන්නේ? අන්න එයටයි අපි විරුද්ධ. අපි කවුරුත් දන්නවා, සමහර විට මේ බැංකුවෙන් ණයක් ලබා ගැනීමට අවුරුදු 6 ක් පමණ බලා සිටින්න සිදු වෙන බව. මා මෙහි සිටින සේවකයන්ට දෙස් කියන්නේ නැහැ. තමුත් ඒ බැංකුවේ තිබෙන ක්‍රියා මාර්ගයේ හැටියට කඩදාසි එහාට මෙහාට දමනවා මිසක් ණය මුදලක් දීමට ඉක්මණින් කටයුතු කරන්නේ නැහැ. මා නම් එතනින් ණය ලබා ගන්න ගොස් නැහැ. තමුත් පැමිණිලි රාශියක්ම ලැබී තිබෙනවා, ඒ ස්ථානයෙන් ණය ගැනීම හුඟක් අමාරු බවට. අනික් බැංකු වල එවැනි තත්ත්වයක් ඇත්තේ නැහැ. එවැනි තත්ත්වයක් මේ බැංකුවට තිබියදී ඇයි මේ දෙයත් එයට පවරන්නේ. මොකක්ද එයට තිබෙන හේතුව? යම්කිසි අන්දමකින් එහි සේවකයන් පිරිසට වැඩ මදිය කියා සිතන බැවින් එහෙම කරනවා නම් අපි එයට විරුද්ධ වන්නේ නැහැ. එහෙම තැත්නම් එහි තිබෙන මුදල් ප්‍රමාණය වැය කිරීමට ක්‍රමයක් නැති නිසා එයට යම්කිසි පිළිවෙලක් යෙදිය යුතුය කියා මෙවැනි දෙයක් කරනවා නම් ඊටත් අපි විරුද්ධ වන්නේ නැහැ. තමුත් මේ සඳහා මුදල් උපයන්න හදන්නේ කොයි විධියටද? ණයකර විකිණීමෙනුයි. මා තමුත්තාත්සේලා ගෙන් මේ අවස්ථාවේදී අහන්න කැමතියි, දැන් විදේශ ආධාර, විදේශ ණය කොයි තරම් ඉහළ ගොස් තිබෙනවාද

லங்கா ரජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්

[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

[ඉලංගරත්න මයා.]

කියා. ප්‍රාදේශීය ණය ප්‍රමාණය කොයි තරම් ඉහළ ගොස් තිබෙනවාද? භාණ්ඩාගාර බිල් පත් මගින් ගන්නා ණය මුදල කොයි තරම් ඉහළ ගොස් තිබෙනවාද? රක්ෂණ සංස්ථාවෙන් කොයි තරම් මුදලක් ලබා ගෙන තිබෙනවාද? පැවරල් සංස්ථාවෙන් කොයි තරම් මුදලක් ලබා ගෙන තිබෙනවාද? සේවක අර්ථ සාධක අරමුදලෙන් කොයි තරම් මුදල් ප්‍රමාණයක් ලබා ගෙන තිබෙනවාද? තමුන්නාන්සේලා දැන් දේශීය හා විදේශීය වශයෙන් ගන්නා පුළුවන් ණය මුදල් හැම එකක්ම වාගේ ලබා ගෙන හමාරයි.

ගරු වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

සංවර්ධන කටයුතු සඳහායි.

ඉලංගරත්න මයා.

(திரு. இலங்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Ilangaratne)

සංවර්ධන කටයුතු සඳහායි කියා තමුන්නාන්සේලා කියනවා. තමුත් කෝ ඒවායේ ප්‍රතිඵල. රුපියලේ වටිනාකම සියයට 20 කින් අඩු කළේ සංවර්ධන කටයුතු වැඩි වී තිබෙන නිසාද? ඊට පසු විදේශ විනිමය සහතික ක්‍රමය අනුව සියයට 45 කින් නැවත වැඩි කර තිබෙන්නේ සංවර්ධන කටයුතු දියුණු වුණ නිසාද? කිසිම දෙයකින් සැහීමකට පත් වන්නා පුළුවන් කමක් නැහැ. පත්‍රවලින් නම් නොයෙක් දේ කියනවා. වී වගාව බොහෝ දුරට දියුණු කියා “ඩේලි නිවුස්” පත්‍රයෙන් හැමදාම කියනවා. තමුත් තමුත් නාන්සේලාට හිතවත් ඡෙල් කොමිෂනර් වාර්තාවෙන් කියන්නේ මොනවාද? ඒ අය කියනවා මේ හැම එකක්ම බොරුය කියා.

ගරු වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

කවිද කියන්නේ?

ඉලංගරත්න මයා.

(திரு. இலங்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Ilangaratne)

ඡෙල් කොමිෂනර් කාරයින්. මම දන්නේ නැහැ, ඒ අයත් දැන් ආණ්ඩුවට යටි උගල් අදිනවාද කියා. ඒ නිසා තමුන්නාන්සේලා විකක් ඒ ගැන සොයා බලන්න.

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

ගරු වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

ඔය කොමිෂනර් සමග අපේ කිසිම සම්බන්ධයක් නැහැ.

ඉලංගරත්න මයා.

(திரு. இலங்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Ilangaratne)

අහන්නන් බොහොම සන්නේෂයි. ලක්ෂ 550 ක් පමණ දී ඒ අයගේ සිත් සතුටු කළාට පසු ඒ අය සමග කිසිම සම්බන්ධයක් නැහැයි කියනවා නම් අපි පිළි ගන්නම්. එය අහන්නන් සතුටුයි. අවුරුද්දට ලක්ෂ 500 ක පමණ ආදායම් බදු වශයෙන් ගන්නා මුදල් ආපසු ඒ අයගේ සාක්කුවලටම දමා ගන්නා ඉඩ දුන්නා. එහෙම කළාට පසුවත් සම්බන්ධ කමක් නැහැයි කියනවා නම් එය බොහොම වටිනා කියමනක්. අන්න ඒ නිසා අපි තමුන්නාන්සේලාට චෝදනා කරන්නේ මෙසේ නැවතත් රටට ණය වී “ඩිබෙන්-චර්ස්” විකුණා ණය කර ඔප්පු මගින් මුදල් අරගෙන තමුන්නාන්සේලා ක්‍රියාත්මක කිරීමට යන මේ උපක්‍රමය ගැනයි. මධ්‍යම ආණ්ඩුවෙන් ඒ ඒ ආයතන වලට මුදල් වෙන් කර ඒවා ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්නට තමුන්නාන්සේලාට මුදල් නැති නිසා මේ විධියට කරන බවයි අපට හැඟී යන්නේ.

මේ විධියේ අණපනත් ඇති කිරීමෙන් මොකක්ද සිද්ධ වන්නේ? දැනටත් හුඟක් දුරට ක්‍රියාශීලී නොවී තිබෙන ආයතනයකට තව තවත් බර පැවරීමෙන් සිදු වන්නේ එම ආයතනවලින් විශේෂයෙන්ම සාමාන්‍ය මහජනතාව බලාපොරොත්තු වන සේවය සිදු නොවීමයි, මහජන බැංකුව අඩපණ කිරීමයි; ලංකා බැංකුව අඩපණ කිරීමයි. ඒ වාගේම තමුන්නාන්සේලා ඊළඟට ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වන යෝජනාවෙන් අදහස් කර තිබෙන්නේ විදේශ බැංකු සමග මෙතෙක් අත් සිටුවා තිබූ ගනුදෙනු යළිත් ආරම්භ කිරීමටයි. එයින් සිද්ධ වන්නේ මොකක්ද? ලංකා බැංකුව, මහජන බැංකුව, ණය කර බැංකු ආදී බැංකුවලට පාඩු සිදුවීමයි. ඒ නිසා අපි තමුන්නාන්සේලාගේ මේ යෝජනාවට

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

විශේෂයෙන් විරුද්ධ වෙනවා. මහජන
බැංකුවෙන් කරන සේවාව අඩපණ කර,
ලංකා බැංකුවෙන් කරන සේවාව අඩපණ
කර, මහජන මුදල් ඒවාට යොදවන්නට
ඉඩ නොතබා ; මහජනයාගෙන් ණයකර
ඔප්පු පිට මුදල් අරගෙන මේ වැඩ
කටයුතු කරන්නට යාමෙන් තමුන්
නාන්සේලාගේ ආණ්ඩුව තව තවත්
රටට ණය විමෙන් ජාතියක් වශයෙන්
අපට විශාල අහාගන්‍යයකට මුහුණ පාත්
නට සිද්ධ වන නිසයි අප මේ ලෙස
වෝදනා කරන්නේ.

number of years follows a conservative policy. As far as assistance to the unfortunate persons who had mortgaged their lands and had lost their lands in consequence are concerned, they receive very little assistance from the State Mortgage Bank.

The State Mortgage Bank acting as a lending institution for the purpose of helping people to build houses made a practice of demanding clear title in respect of land—clear title going back several generations. They forgot the simple fact that if as a result of any failure on the part of the debtor they had to seize the land which had been offered as security, the very fact that it was a state institution that was acquiring this land would have cleared all problems with regard to title. That aspect of the matter was forgotten by the State Mortgage Bank. They used to demand from persons who went to them for loans to build houses, clear title going back to several generations.

I know, the present management of the bank wants to do away with all these requirements which impeded the benefits that could have been conferred upon the public, and I know that from their point of view they regard this Bill as an instrument of liberalization of policy. That is as far as the valuable side of this Bill is concerned. When we say this much we have said all that can be said in favour of this Bill.

ගරු චන්‍ද්‍රිකායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

That is saying a lot !

බරිතාඩි සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

For the rest of it there are a number of other objections that we have, and I would like to see how the Hon. Minister of Finance intends to meet them.

This Bill cannot be considered apart from the general policy of this Government in regard to credit. We

බද්ධතාව පොසිසි මය. (දකුණු කොළඹ)

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா—கொழும்பு

தெற்கு)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa—Colombo South)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Hon. Minister was very brief in his introduction in which he explained the objects he had in mind in bringing this Bill before Parliament. This Bill *prima facie* appears to be full of good intentions.

We can detect the intention of certain officers of this bank, their intention to do good, but all these do-gooders of the London School of Economics—

ഒരു ഉത്പന്നം

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Who are they ?

බිරිතාචි සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

They are now in the Central Bank.

Sir, when we examine this Bill in some detail we find we are up against a difficulty. First I will deal with the good intentions.

I know that the present management of the State Mortgage Bank, the recently installed General Manager in particular—all these people—have liberal ideas. The State Mortgage Bank which has functioned in this country over a

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්

[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

[බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මය.]

have a number of credit institutions. We have the commercial banks and in that sector there is the Bank of Ceylon, the People's Bank, the Ceylon Savings Bank and the State Mortgage Bank. Then you have other institutions like the Agricultural and Industrial Credit Corporation, the Loan Board and the Development Finance Corporation.

It was the intention of the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera), when he was Minister of Finance, to bring some kind of order and method in regard to the granting of credit. Whether it be credit for consumption purposes, credit for investment, or for development purposes in industry or agriculture, it was his intention to rationalize the processes governing credit in this country. He had no time to put his intentions into practice.

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක

(කෙළරව වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Good intentions.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මය.

(තිரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Ms. Bernard Soysa)

All those who are now handling the affairs of this Government got together and brought down that Government of 1964.

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක

(කෙළරව වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

The people.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මය.

(තිரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Yes, it is always the people.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාභිති என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

The people will bring you down also next time.

සිරිමාවෝ ආර්. ඩී. බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.

(අත්තනලේල)

(திருமதி சிறிமாவோ ஆர். டி. பண்டாரநாயக்க —அத்தனகல்ல)

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

Are you ready for it ?

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක

(කෙළරව වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Always ready.

සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.

(திருமதி சிறிமாவோ பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)

Not some of your other Ministers.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මය.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

These hon. Members who are now the Governemnt of the day brought down the Government of 1964 and they inherited these problems in regard to credit.

What has the present Hon. Minister done ? He also announced in his first Budget Speech that it was his intention to bring some kind of co-ordination among the institutions that grant credit in this country, and what has he been doing since then ? Since then we find that he has not been able to make up his mind. He has been motivated by one set of intentions, namely, finding credit for development purposes in industry and agriculture, particularly for the Ceylonese sector of our economy. He has been motived by that desire and also by a desire to curb consumption borrowing and that too at the behest of the World Bank.

As requested by the World Bank, the Hon. Minister and the Hon. Prime Minister have announced to this honourable House more than once that they applied a credit squeeze. That is the word used by the Hon. Prime Minister—a credit squeeze. They were afraid that these loans that were taken for housing purposes, the various loans

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්
[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

that had been given through the People's Bank to help needy students—a measure that was introduced by the hon. Member for Yatiyantota—that all these moneys in the hands of people were used for consumption expenditure and that it produced no valuable results. So they decided upon a credit squeeze.

You follow this dual policy of trying to encourage loans granted for development on the one side and on the other you apply your credit squeeze. At a certain point you have one policy working against the other. You are involved in a contradiction because the Hon. Minister of Finance knows, and the Hon. Minister of Industries and Fisheries will grant, that there are a number of persons who come to his Ministry or who came to his Ministry in the past until the Foreign Exchange Entitlement Certificates Scheme came into existence and demanded allocations and with the best of intentions allocations were given and thereafter one never knew what happened to these moneys. Often they were misused. If you read the "Weekend Observer" yesterday, the front page carried a story which at least is true in parts. But even the parts that are true are a terrible indictment against the present practices governing the control of foreign exchange resources. The Minister of Finance knows very well that there are large assets being built up by some of our Ceylonese in banks in Hong Kong, in banks in Switzerland, in banks in the United Kingdom, and his Exchange Control Department, the Treasury, knows nothing of these transactions.

In the same way, persons who took loans from these institutions for the purpose of development, spent this money in various ways; some used it as dowries for their daughters who were getting married, some used it on conspicuous spending, on the purchase of luxuries, and so on. That is known. So at a certain point, his clamp on credit for consumption purposes began to work in a contrary

direction by being used for consumption purposes. It was very difficult for him to sort the sheep from the goats and to find out exactly who would put his money into development purposes, and who would not.

The Hon. Minister of Finance, functioning with this internal contradiction in policies, did not know what to do with these various organizations that he had, and in this situation he was faced with another problem.

This Government has been relying very closely on the International Monetary Fund. There is a kind of embrace of the International Monetary Fund which has almost become indissoluble. Of course they can dissolve it and get away just as an old rake can get off the embrace of a girl that has become embarrassing to him and cast her off at any moment. —[*Interruption*].

The Government was relying on the International Monetary Fund and this newly-formed organization, the Aid Ceylon Club, this consortium that has as its principal purpose the grant of assistance to poor little Ceylon.—[*Interruption*.]

The hon. Member for Yatiyantota saw written over the entrance to the conference hall, "Abandon all hope, ye who enter here."

The Hon. Minister of Finance has had to rely very hopefully on the International Monetary Fund. This goes back to the roots of financial policy of this Government. They decided to give tax concessions to companies, local and foreign, to individuals who had amassed wealth in this country in various ways. They granted another amnesty over and above the amnesty that was granted in 1964: an amnesty to hoarders, an amnesty to those who failed to declare their income tax.—[*Interruption*.]—They granted all these. They paid the petroleum companies more than had been assessed as the actual value of the assets taken over.

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්

[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.]

Now, with your devaluation, your rupee commitment in respect of what you are going to pay them is much larger, because one of the terms of the contract into which you have entered is that despite any devaluation the amount that has to be paid in dollars or in sterling will remain the same. So your rupee commitment is much larger. It was originally estimated at Rs. 55 million and the Hon. Minister has not given us the revised estimate. The commitment will be over Rs. 65 million.—[Interruption.] Yes, it is free from tax. Having done all this the Hon. Minister turns round and complains that he has no money in the Treasury for development. Naturally, it should be so, and he had to lean very heavily on the I. B. R. D., I. D. A. and the I. M. F. and all those other organizations, and as though they were not enough he had also to lean on this newly formed consortium, the Aid Ceylon Club.

The Hon. Prime Minister went round the world seeking goodwill for Ceylon, and partly as a result of his endeavours and partly as a result of the endeavours of the present Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Planning and his negotiations round the table at the International Monetary Fund this Aid Ceylon Club was formed.

Now, these bodies do not give the loans without something in return. If it is only interest that is chargeable that could be understood, but when you have the creditor-debtor relationship and they presume to give us advice on what we should do in order to improve our credit—worthiness that advice becomes a command. The Hon. Minister of Finance loses his temper, equable man though he is, when we tell him that he does something at the behest of the I. M. F., that the rice ration was cut because the World Bank wanted it, the expenditure on social services was cut because they wanted it, and that the rupee was devalued because they wanted it. In fact, they wanted

a further devaluation in order to meet them half way and though you did not like this particular scheme you have now embarked upon the Foreign Exchange Entitlement Certificate Scheme. When we tell him these things he does not like to hear us. When you do things at the behest of somebody, the advice they give becomes a command. Is the Hon. Minister of Finance so naive as not to believe that where a person in the position of debtor vis-a-vis creditor gives advice that it tantamounts to a command? That is what has happened to this Government.

I notice from the Order Paper that we are due to discuss an amendment to the Finance Act of 1963, but that the Government has consented to take up this particular Bill during the next Session of Parliament. The Bill we are discussing now is also intimately connected with the other one—[Interruption.] Against your better judgment you have been persuaded to have a prorogation in between. I am not going to discuss it. We shall wait till it comes. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries and Fisheries excites himself quite unnecessarily.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

He is always excited.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

He is always in good spirits.

සිරිමාවෝ බන්දාරනායක මිය.

(திருமதி சிறிமாவோ பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)

More so in the evenings.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Sir, the Hon. Minister of Finance does not like us when we tell him that he is doing all these at the behest of the various international

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්
[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

organizations. This particular Bill falls in line with the various fiscal measures of this Government since 1965; in line with the policy indicated to them by the World Bank and the I. M. F. That is our case against you and that is why this Bill is not as innocent as it looks. And, despite the good intentions of those who sponsor it from among the present executives of the State Mortgage Bank, we must be forgiven if we see something far more sinister in this.

The Hon. Minister knows very well that the 1963 Finance Act provided for the establishment, within the Central Bank, of a Medium and Long Term Credit Fund for the grant of loans through the commercial banks for development. Last week the Hon. Minister had a Bill passed through all its stages in this House in order to amend the Monetary Law Act for the purpose of bringing in monies from any foreign fund or foreign agency into this Medium and Long Term Credit Fund.

Now, that is a means of obtaining monies from the I. D. A., I. M. F. or any other organ of the Asian Development Bank. You bring the money into the Central Bank, into your Medium and Long Term Credit Fund, from there you pass over to the commercial banks and through them the loans are processed. They are given to companies or private individuals for various development projects. The Hon. Minister has his Development Finance Corporation. The Development Finance Corporation Act was also amended a few months ago for the identical purpose of obtaining monies from the I. M. F. direct into the Development Finance Corporation—

ඩී. சேல்டன் ஜயசிங்க மஹா. (கர்மனா
හා ඩිවර් ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්)

(திரு. டி. ஷெல்டர் ஜயசிங்க—கைத்
தொழில், கடற்றொழில் அமைச்சரின் பாராளு
மன்றக் காரியதரிசி)

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

Not only the I.M.F.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මහා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Maybe any other agency.

—with, of course, the consent and knowledge of the Hon. Minister of Finance and his Central Bank. You obtain these monies and, through the Development Finance Corporation, give these monies out for development projects to the private sector.

Now, these are two matters which were intended to provide a channel for monies borrowed from the International Monetary Fund, the Asian Development Bank, the I. D. A. or any other agency or, maybe, your consortium and maybe private agencies—of course with the consent of your consortium—to get those monies into the private sector here either through the Central Bank, the long and medium term loans or direct through the Development Finance Corporation. As though that is not enough, the Hon. Minister is amending the State Mortgage Bank Act also for the same purpose. If you look at Clause 17 which amends Section 51 of the principal enactment, the new Section 51(1) (u) on page 10, you will find that one of the objects is:

“to negotiate and obtain with the approval of the Minister or the Monetary Board of the Central Bank loans from any international agency.”

Loans from any international agency. Now, the Hon. Minister is going to amend this; instead of “the approval of the Minister or the Monetary Board of the Central Bank,” he is going to include an amendment which would say “with the approval of the Minister and the Monetary Board of the Central Bank”, which is the same thing. It is a distinction without a difference. But still, in so far as the Hon. Minister is supposed to have a conscience independent of the coffers of the Central Bank—he has a conscience which is separate to that extent—we presume that this dual consent needs some change. But

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්

[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

[බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.]

that is not the point I am discussing at the moment. The question which concerns me is that, having amended your Monetary Law Act for the purpose of getting monies from international agencies through medium and long-term loans on the funds of the Central Bank into the private sector through the commercial banks—you amended the Development Finance Corporation Act for the same purpose of getting moneys from international agencies into the private sector—you are now proposing to amend the Ceylon State Mortgage Bank Ordinance for the same purpose.

Why is there this multiplicity of channels? I have no doubt the Hon. Minister will also bring a Bill to amend the Savings Bank Act. I suppose that will have the same provisions as this. Why do you want a multiplicity of channels for the purpose of bringing in these moneys of international agencies into the private sector in Ceylon?

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීන්

(කෙළරව වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

There is an amendment circulated today.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(තිரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Yes, and it is a distinction without a difference. The sub-clause as it stands now requires the consent of the Minister—

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීන්

(කෙළරව වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

That clause is being amended.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Where? It is not in the amendments tabled.

කෙනමත් මයා.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

That is the one he has got up his sleeve.

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීන්

(කෙළරව වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

The amendment I have tabled today meets the hon. Member's objections.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Where does it say that? What are you substituting?

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීන්

(කෙළරව වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

We are not substituting anything. We have considered all your objections. We are thinking about these problems the whole time.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

We are now discussing your Bill. We can discuss the amendments at the Committee stage.

This is how the sub-clause reads as it stands now :

“(u) to negotiate and obtain, with the approval of the Minister or the Monetary Board of the Central Bank, loans from any international agency ;”

and this is the amendment :

“(1) in lines 2, 3 and 4, leave out ‘or the Monetary Board of the Central Bank’, and insert ‘and with the concurrence of the Minister of Finance given in consultation with the Monetary Board of the Central Bank,’ . . .”

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීන්

(කෙළරව වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

There is a new amendment.

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්
[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(තිரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

This is the amendment that was circulated to us.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

He has tabled another amendment today.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

He has given notice of another amendment today, has he?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You are sending amendments at the last moment.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Your new amendment says:

“Clause 17, page 10—

(1) leave out lines 1 to 5; and

(2) in line 18, leave out ‘skill’
and insert ‘skills’.

You have just tabled this.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

And you are asking us to discuss this now.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

The amendments which were circulated last week did not have this amendment.

ලේ. වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

This was circulated today.

කේනමන් මයා.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

You do not know your own mind.

ලේ. වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

This is the change you are seeking, and now that it is made you say, “You do not know your own mind.” If you do not like this amendment we can go back to the original clause.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

I had the pleasure of discussing this matter. I am glad the Hon. Minister has decided to remove sub-clause (u) of this clause.

ලේ. වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

You can have nothing more to say about it.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

I have a lot more to say about it.

Despite the fact that sub-clause (u) goes out of this Bill, the Minister, through the links with the Central Bank on the basis of deposits and borrowed moneys, through the issue of debentures, has the same basic object served in another way.

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්

[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

[බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.]

The Central Bank operating on the new section which governs the Medium and Long Term Credits Fund can pump the same amount of money from any of these agencies into the State Mortgage Bank.

One of the consequences of which I was afraid, namely, the direct link-up of this bank with the I.M.F. and these other institutions, is removed. One danger is removed. I grant that.

The Minister knows very well what I mean. When he was discussing or defending the Foreign Exchange Entitlement Certificates Bill, I asked him why he did not draft regulations for the purpose of giving effect to the provisions of that Bill. The Minister said that there was information which he did not want to give out.

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීතුමා

(කෙළරා වැන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

There may be some information.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(ශ්‍රී. බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

There are vast state secrets which have to be hidden, which have to be kept away, from the public. Now the Minister, who is so keen on keeping all these things under cover, knows very well that the managers of all his banks, the Bank of Ceylon, the People's Bank and the Central Bank, are very reluctant to give any information when they come before the Public Accounts Committee. I have had various bankers from these institutions coming before the Public Accounts Committee. When asked to show their fixed assets they fall back on the danger of revealing secret reserves.

What are the secret reserves of the Central Bank? That massive building they have put up in the Fort? Is that a secret reserve? When you

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

ask them to state the value in the books of the bank, they state that secret reserves are involved. When asked to state the value of their sticks of furniture for the purpose of accounting, they say they dare not declare that because they would be revealing their secret reserves! It is the same with the People's Bank and the Bank of Ceylon.

The Minister, when he was asked to draft regulations to give effect to the Foreign Exchange Entitlement Certificates Bill, said that such regulations would reveal information—

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීතුමා

(කෙළරා වැන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

May reveal.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(ශ්‍රී. බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

—may reveal information which they do not want to reveal. The fact remains that these various international agencies, to the extent to which they give these funds for the purpose of being pumped into the private sector, will not give one shilling, one cent, unless they are satisfied in regard to your creditworthiness, and at every point at which you try to negotiate a fresh loan you will be faced with the same difficulty. That is the danger I anticipate.

You will have no secrets left. You keep your "secrets" from us, from Parliament, from the public of this country, but the International Monetary Fund, the International Development Association and the Asian Development Bank will know, down to the last cent, what is the credit position in the country, the extent of loans given and what stake they have in the development projects of the private sector in this country.

You have two developments as a result of this. One is that there will be no secret reserves. There will be

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්
[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

no secrecy regarding your reserves. Despite what the Minister and his bankers say, there will be no secret reserves. We have no secrets left. We have only some squalid intrigues. That is the position to which we have come.

The other is that your entire credit structure is going to be bound up in such an intimate and intricate way with these funds—the Asian Development Bank, International Monetary Fund, I.D.A. and so on ; and not merely your credit structure but through the operation of the credit structure an important sector of private investment in this country will also be tied up.

Who will be ruling this country—I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Finance—with such a large sector of the economy under their control, with your credit institutions so completely under their control, with a Government that accepts advice so readily? We are constrained to say, it is not advice but a command that has been given. I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Finance and the Members of this Government, what has happened to our independence. What has happened to the sovereignty of the State. Are these not imperilled?

The Hon. Minister is not worried at all. He has done these things piecemeal since 1965 and he is still unable to face up to the reality of the cumulative effect of what has been done and what is being done. That is the tragedy.

However, Sir, he has now agreed to make this small amendment by removing sub-clause (u). The Hon. Minister wants this bank to function as another development bank. I have to ask the Hon. Minister of Finance, what is your policy governing these various institutions—the State Mortgage Bank, the Savings Bank, the

Loan Board, the Agricultural and Industrial Credit Corporation, the People's Bank, and the Bank of Ceylon?

The Bank of Ceylon Act is to be amended. There has been a considerable degree of dissatisfaction in regard to the grant of loans to Ceylonese for business purposes. There is a commission that is sitting on the matter and it is anticipated that the Bank of Ceylon Act will be amended in order to introduce a greater degree of flexibility in regard to the grant of credit in this sector, particularly the industrial sector.

Then you have the People's Bank. The People's Bank has been very generous. It has been very generous to the Members of the Government by accommodating them in regard to the repayment of loans, for instance to Hon. Ministers. Do not deny it and compel me to come out with things which will be uncomfortable for you. Please do not deny it. I want to know whether the People's Bank examined each of these projects for which the loans were taken, with the same care as that with which you propose to examine the loans that you are going to grant through the State Mortgage Bank.

You have here some earnest of your good intentions at least. This is what Section 22 of the Ordinance says:

“22. The board may, from time to time, appoint any duly qualified person or persons to act as legal, economic, financial or technical adviser to the bank, and any such person shall be remunerated in accordance with such scale of fees as may be prescribed.”

This is obviously to advise you in regard to these projects. By new Section 17 you propose to replace Section 51, sub-section (x) :

“(x) to train selected personnel of the bank and other persons in accountancy, banking and valuation, project and credit appraisal, and engineering and scientific skill ;”

This is for the purpose of evaluation in regard to the various projects for which loans will be granted. I

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

[බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.]

presume it is the purpose. But I would like to ask the Hon. Minister, does the People's Bank do that in regard to the large loans which involve several lakhs? Do they examine those projects for which the money is being required? You claim to have put on a credit squeeze. How do you know what happened to that money? And the Hon. Minister does not know what happened to that money. What happened to your credit squeeze? Does he know what has happened to that money? I know some of the things that have happened to that money even if the Hon. Minister does not know.

You have all these institutions for granting loans for development. What is your policy governing these loans? Have you allocated different sectors of the economy to each institution? No. How do you prevent a person or an institution from getting a multiplicity of loans from each of these different institutions? The same person will get a loan from the People's Bank; another loan from the Bank of Ceylon; another from the Development Finance Corporation; and another from the Agricultural and Industrial Credit Corporation.

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.

(තිரு. செல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்க)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

He could have multiple projects in agriculture, industry and so on.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(තිරු. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary, I am sorry to say, has given up the good intentions he had once upon a time fighting the growth of monopoly. He now says a multiplicity of projects may be had by a single person. Apparently good intentions change when you change from one side of this House to the other.—[Interruption]. I beg your pardon; the Hon. Minister of Industries quoted the old Latin tag, "*Omnia mutantur*"—

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

(கௌரவ ம. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன—கைத் தொழில், கடற்செறழில் அமைச்சர்)

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

"*Omnia mutantur, nos et mutamur.*"

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary has undergone a change of views, a change of perspectives. I ask the Hon. Minister of Finance, how do you prevent this? Have you got any machinery for preventing this? In regard to all these fiscal measures have your financial advisers given you a scheme which would harness credit institutions in this country in a proper and rational way? Have you given your mind to that? Instead, you keep on making these piecemeal amendments to the various Acts governing these institutions. And there is only one principal motivation, and that is to bring these in line with the requirements that have been made by your Consortium, by your I. M. F., by your World Bank. We do not see any other pattern.

This Bill represents an act of indecision on the part of the Hon. Minister. He took over from the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) a scheme for bringing some degree of rationality into the field of credit, and a Bill was drafted, which I do not think he saw, for the purpose of amending the Savings Bank Act. The Savings Bank was to be converted into a major development bank. All that had been done. He has now transferred the major provisions of that draft amending Bill to the State Mortgage Bank Act. That is all that has happened, and Mr. Minister, that is how you get this peculiar mixture of good intentions and bad.

The Hon. Minister of Finance must remember that the first thing that is incumbent upon this Government

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්
[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

even at this late stage is to introduce some method and some order into this field of credit for granting credit for development. You have made a certain emphasis here on agriculture; that is, presuming that the other institutions are principally concerned with industrial development. Is that so? No.

Your major tax concessions given recently are in regard to agriculture. This is part of the food drive, I suppose, of the Government. Has the Hon. Minister thought for one moment of checking up on any of these ventures that have already taken loans for agricultural purposes? What has happened to the moneys taken for the purchase of motor vehicles, tractors, jeeps? How much of that money has helped agriculture in this country?

ශ්‍රී ලන්කායක

(කෙළරව වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Wait a little and see.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාතිඨි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

We have been waiting for three years.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(තිල. පෙරේරා සොයිසා)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

The Hon. Minister had a domestic difficulty—the Government had a domestic difficulty.

ශ්‍රී ලන්කායක

(කෙළරව වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Everybody has.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(තිල. පෙරේරා සොයිසා)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Two sections, both of persons who had backed this Government at the last elections, had a quarrel about the Inland Revenue Act on the question of a five-year tax holiday or a six

year tax holiday—the question of setting off losses against income, whether it should be restricted to the income from the particular project or income from other sources.

Now, how was that resolved? You resolved it on the basis of a compromise between the two groups. The compromise was that, instead of taking the year of assessment as the starting point for the tax holiday, you took the year of commencement of business. The Hon. Minister of Finance admitted that when he moved the Inland Revenue (Amendment) Bill.

One reason he had for the amendment was that there were racketeers operating in this sector. Industrialists who had put up large factories in Dematagoda and other places made huge profits which were tax-free because of the tax holiday, and for the purpose of obtaining further tax concessions these persons had invested small sums of money allegedly in agricultural projects—to grow beans in their backyards—and claimed losses on that and wanted those losses set off against the profits which now became taxable. The Hon. Minister admitted that on the Floor of this House and said that he had to bring the amending Bill for the purpose of preventing these racketeers from profiting in that way. That is what the Hon. Minister said.

I ask the Hon. Minister, has he made a survey to see how far these loans already given for agricultural development have been used by these racketeers operating in this sector whom he himself exposed? We know what happened with regard to the special leases. The Hon. Minister himself admitted the lease of 3,000 acres to one person, 2,000 acres to another, and thousands of acres to various companies. Some of them sold the timber, and some of them have been gemming on the land.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාතිඨි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Now they have saw mills also.

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්
[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීනායක

(කෙළරඹ වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

We got royalty for the timber.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(තිரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

These are the people who have already got credit.

I mention all these things because I want to bring home to the Hon. Minister one simple point. This Government changed its agricultural policy in a basic way from dependence upon the peasantry—the rural population of this country—for the production of food. This Government shifted its emphasis to a dependence on the *entrepreneur*, the capitalist—

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීනායක

(කෙළරඹ වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

One was not replaced by the other.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(තිரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

To whom are you giving your aid? Who has benefited from your jeeps and tractors? Your Satyawadi Mudalali, who hires out the tractors which are obtained on loans and allocations from this Government, at exorbitant rates to the peasants. Is that how you changed the emphasis?

Sir, the Hon. Minister and his Government want to rely upon the private sector, the *entrepreneur*, for agricultural development in a big way. They benefited from tax concessions and special leases, allocations in regard to jeeps and tractors, and loans, whereas the poor peasant who was getting his loan from the People's Bank is compelled to pay a higher interest. How dare the Hon. Minister say he did not change his emphasis?

Then you started your system of giving loans to the big capitalists operating in this sector and at the same time you increased the rate of interest that the poor peasant has to pay on the loans he gets from the People's Bank. If you take these two things together, is there no change of emphasis? This is pursuing the same line of action.

In regard to your State Mortgage Bank, the principal emphasis here is to give loans to the private sector for agricultural development. That is here in the new Section 51 that is brought in by Clause 17 of this Bill. That is not a policy we can agree to. We of the Opposition here do not believe that the solution of the food problem of this country or development in the agricultural sector can come about in the way that this Government anticipates.

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීනායක

(කෙළරඹ වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

You must take it to the State.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(තිரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

It is not so simple as all that. Our answer is a much richer one than that. There will be a certain sector that will have to be taken over to the State. That is right. That is one of the basic objections we have to this Bill. This is the same twist in regard to agriculture that the Government started introducing in 1965. Of course, they are deceived by their own reports. The Report of the Central Bank has become a pernicious political document. It is almost like a U. N. P. pamphlet.

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීනායක

(කෙළරඹ වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Getting ready for the Budget Debate.

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්
[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(තිரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

You will hear more during the Budget Debate, Mr. Minister.

You have in the Central Bank a number of experts. I do not deny the fact that they are very able men. I am not denying that for a moment.

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

What are you denying then?

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

I deny the value of their collective researches.

When they go round the country, they go to a peasant in the paddy field and examine the best patch in rice paddy. They measure that and estimate a crop return for the whole area on that basis, and you get a story written thereafter in the newspapers of the Maha crop bringing in a terrific yield. This, of course, comforts the Minister of Finance, the Prime Minister, the Minister of Agriculture and so on. This same myth is spread throughout the country.

I am glad that at least the Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Agriculture had the courage to say in his recent seminar in which the C. B. C. tried to wake the people up—the C. B. C. decided that the people in our country are asleep and require to be awakened; it is a very good endeavour on the part of the C. B. C., a new departure in broadcasting—that there is no national awakening in agriculture; that there has only been an upsurge in production. Even to that extent he was erroneous. There has been no great upsurge in production. There has been a conspiracy to deceive the public in regard to this matter.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Fudge the books.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

There has been a conspiracy to deceive the public. The Hon. Minister must not over-estimate the operation of various factors in this particular field.

When the Hon. Minister and his Government decided to cut the rice ration, to give one measure free and let the other measure be bought at a price that would operate according to free market operations, they thought they were giving the producer a larger benefit and that, therefore, this financial stimulus, this price stimulus, would increase production. The Hon. Minister must not overestimate that. The first is that his market arrangements do not permit the settling down of a price from the point of view of the consumer at any reasonable level. Apart from that, despite all these statistics in regard to the increased paddy that is being produced, you still cannot buy a measure of rice in Colombo at less than Re. 1 or Re. 1.10—it may be more—and that despite your bumper crops, these never-before-seen harvests that you have collected. There will be time enough to discuss some of these things when the next Budget is presented, if it is presented.

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

You have doubts about that also.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

The Hon. Minister must not over-estimate the operation of this price factor because it is a self-liquidating factor. Surely, the Hon. Minister

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්
[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මය.]

must realize that if as a result of that he is able to produce, and he is able to induce the peasant to produce, more rice, there should be a price drop and at the same point the stimulus to produce should disappear. It is a self-liquidating factor, and too much reliance on that can only result in the Hon. Minister deceiving himself.

What else is there? Your fertilizer, the increased application of fertilizer and the use of new seed. I will not comment on this question of the use of new seed. There will be time enough to do so later. But on the question of fertilizer I hope the Hon. Minister took my advice in the matters which we mentioned during the Debate on the Foreign Exchange Entitlement Certificates Bill. He has put fertilizer on the Open General Licence and the Fertilizer Corporation is buying from the private sector which buys its fertilizer on the entitlement certificates, and has therefore paid a premium.

Therefore, from the point of view of the rural population, the farmer will have to get his fertilizer at a higher price. Is this how you are stimulating production in agriculture? Mr. Minister, your Foreign Exchange Entitlement Certificate Scheme has already increased the price of fertilizer to the cultivator. That is what is happening. If you examine the position your foreign exchange allocation for this particular sector is expected to come down while the Agriculture Department has plans for increasing the use of fertilizer. So, you find that the foreign exchange component is coming down while the fertilizer application is supposed to increase. I do not know how these two things can be reconciled. This is a mysterious process, and they have the hardihood to announce it at a time when, by their Foreign Exchange Entitlement Certificates Scheme they put the price up further for the cultivator. Now you are caught up in a contradiction, and at least there is an

obligation cast upon you to seek to resolve it in an honest way. But to seek to hide it with some figures—that is not worthy of a government. That is not worthy of the Hon. Minister of Finance. The emphasis in this Bill is on the development of agriculture.

With all these defects that are pointed out, namely the failure to utilize the loans that have already been granted through the existing credit institutions to this sector, to add one more to encourage the racketeer is not something that the Opposition can welcome.

This Bill seeks to take over some of the functions that have been given to the People's Bank. In fact there is relief from mortgages, but it also proposes to give extra housing loans, and apart from agriculture, the Hon. Minister has left himself a safety clause. They can also finance prescribed projects. The Hon. Minister does not explain to us what these prescribed projects are. Could the Hon. Minister state what they are? What are these prescribed projects other than agriculture that you intend to assist?

In his opening speech the Hon. Minister could not tell us what they are. What are these prescribed projects? Are they industrial projects? Are they commercial ventures? What are they?

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මය.

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I will state in my reply.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මය.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

The Hon. Minister states very little when he introduces a Bill, and when we make criticisms he says he will give us the answers in his reply. But when it comes to his turn to reply, he either says, "I have no time", or "The matter has been sufficiently discussed and it is not necessary for

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්

[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

me now to take the time of the House", or "We shall discuss this in the Committee stage or in the Third Reading". So he gets away with a laconic statement in his opening speech and another laconic statement which is even less informative in his reply.—[*Interruption.*]

Yes, Sir, the Hon. Minister's humour, of course, is always appreciated by us on both sides of the House. But humour is no answer to an argument.

When the Hon. Minister was asked about his Budget, he regaled this House with an account of the blind men and the various anatomical explorations of the blind men in respect of the elephant. Now, this was no answer to the arguments that we put forward.

I have to ask him once again, what is going to happen to your Agricultural and Industrial Credit Corporation? Is it proposed that the Development Finance Corporation will not finance agricultural projects? Otherwise why is there this heavy emphasis on agricultural projects in regard to this bank?

What is your policy? Have you made a demarcation of areas that are to be financed either geographically or according to their needs? Is there any such proposal in hand? We do not know where we stand in this matter. Why this emphasis on agriculture here?

බැ. වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Do you want each bank to engage in only one kind of loan?

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

There are various ways in which you can reorganize your credit structure. That is one of the ways. That

is just one way. It may be open to certain objections. I am prepared to grant that. My complaint is that you have not even examined the question of how you are going to bring some degree of co-ordination into these various institutions that you have. How are you employing them?

Sir, credit is essential for development whether it is private sector development or public sector development, and here, at the heart of this matter, we have this confusion, confusion in regard to the intentions of this Government, confusion in the mind of the Hon. Minister. He does not know what he wants to do.

The stated principal object of the Bill is the take-over from the People's Bank of the function of granting relief to persons who forfeit their property through mortgages—the acquisition of mortgaged land or property. The question that troubles us is this. We appreciate the Hon. Minister's intention, if he has one, of liberalizing the practice of the State Mortgage Bank in this matter. I certainly appreciate the attitude of the present officers handling this matter in the State Mortgage Bank—I must state that—but why do you want to take away this function from the People's Bank completely? Why are you repealing that section of the People's Bank Act—or rather, not repealing, but staying its operation in the future?

Let us look at this particular clause, Clause 70B (2) of new Chapter V A as proposed by Clause 30:

"No premises shall be acquired under sub-section (1)—

(a) if an application in that behalf had earlier been made to the Debt Conciliation Board by the original owner, and a settlement arrived at between the parties; or

(b) if an application in that behalf had earlier been made to the People's Bank under Part VIII of the Finance Act, No. 11 of 1963, and such Bank had determined that such premises should not be acquired;"

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

[බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මය.]

In that event you will give no relief through this provision. Now, let us read that together with the amendment to the Finance Act, No. 11 of 1963, new Clause 98A, which is sought to be inserted by Clause 51 of this Bill.

“Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in any other provision of this Part of this Act, no application under Section 71 (2) of this Part of this Act shall be made to or entertained by the Bank on or after such date as may be fixed in that behalf by the Minister by Order published in the Gazette.”

In other words, the Hon. Minister is suspending the operation of the provision in the Finance Act, No. 11 of 1963, which enables the People's Bank to step in and acquire properties for the purpose of re-conveying them to those who have lost them through mortgages. He wants to stop the operation of the People's Bank because of his new bank, refurbished to undertake that operation. Why are you transferring this completely away from the People's Bank to this bank? Why can both these institutions not function in the same field?

ශ්‍රී මන්නිකයක

(කෙළරව වන්නිநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Two banks to engage in the same field of work?

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මය.

(ශ්‍රී. පෙරිනාට්. සොය්සා)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

They cannot acquire the same land.

ශ්‍රී මන්නිකයක

(කෙළරව වන්නිநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Two banks would not give loans for the same purpose to one person.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මය.

(ශ්‍රී. පෙරිනාට්. සොය්සා)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

If a person has lost premises No. 168, Galle Road, through a mortgage and he goes to the People's

Bank for relief, acting under—[Interruption]. I beg your pardon.

ශ්‍රී මන්නිකයක

(කෙළරව වන්නිநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

You gave the answer earlier. You said that they may take it from both banks.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මය.

(ශ්‍රී. පෙරිනාට්. සොය්සා)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

No, I was talking about loans. I am not talking about relief from mortgages. If a person goes to the People's Bank in order to have re-conveyed to him premises No. 168, Galle Road—I do not know to whom it belongs—which he has lost through a mortgage, and the People's Bank proposes to acquire and re-convey it, he cannot go to the State Mortgage Bank for the same purpose. Two institutions are not going to acquire the same property. I do not see how a situation like that can arise in which you get both banks functioning in respect of the same premises. It cannot just happen. There cannot be a conflict between the two. I shall give the Hon. Minister the opportunity of consulting his advisers during the suspension of Sittings for tea so that he will be able to give us a reply.

ශ්‍රී මන්නිකයක

(කෙළරව වන්නිநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

In regard to the re-transfer to the People's Bank?

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මය.

(ශ්‍රී. පෙරිනාට්. සොය්සා)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

No. Let both function. We have no objection to the State Mortgage Bank functioning in this way. But why stop the People's Bank functioning in this way too?

You have one difference. The People's Bank will not take on a case where the owner of the property has

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්
[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

had an income of over Rs. 10,000 in three years of assessment. You have no such limitation here. So there is a difference in the field of operations. So why do you want to remove this? Why do you want to stop the People's Bank operating in this way?

යම්විම ඊට අනුකූලව තාවකාලිකව අත්හිටුවන ලදීන්
අ. හා. 4.30 නැවත පවත්වන ලදී.

அதன்படி அமர்வு இடைநிறுத்தப்பட்டு மீண்டும் பி.ப.
4.30 மணிக்கு ஆரம்பமாயிற்று.

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

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.

(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்க)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

What is your suggestion?

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Just delete all the words in lines 24 to 35 in Part II. That is all that is required. There can be no clash between the two institutions because you cannot have two institutions acquiring the same property for the purpose of reconveying it to the same man. I just do not see how that can happen.

If you want a safety clause you can have one before this clause to say that no person can apply to both institutions for relief in respect of the same property. You can introduce a new clause if you like, but I do not see the need for it because it is physically impossible for a situation like that to arise. You cannot have two institutions clashing in the matter.

This is a sector, Sir, in which the greatest amount of relief is necessary today. So, why not allow both institutions to operate? There will be less of a strain on the liquidity of the People's Bank as well as on the liquidity of the new State Mortgage Bank if you allow both of them to function in this sphere. It will be a relief to both institutions if you allow them to exist.

May I continue after tea?

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

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

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was on this question of the People's Bank. I asked the Minister why it was necessary to take away all these functions from the People's Bank that were given to it by the Finance Act, No. 11 of 1963. I asked why it would not be possible for the Ceylon State Mortgage Bank to function along with the People's Bank in regard to the same matter. The Minister was afraid that that work would be duplicated. But there could be no danger like that for the reason that the same property cannot be acquired by both these institutions.

I understand from the officers concerned that there is a question of personnel. I do not see any reason why there should be any such difficulty in this matter. But it would appear that the People's Bank, having performed these functions from 1963, is now anxious to get rid of them, and that, as far as the State Mortgage Bank is concerned, in administering this entire Chapter VA, the new clauses 70A and 70B, the People's Bank would be drawn into the structure of granting relief. I do not know whether there is any such machinery proposed in this Bill—I do not see any evidence of it—but if the Minister is prepared to give an assurance to this House that the branches of the People's Bank outside Colombo would be enabled to function as agencies of the Ceylon Stage Mortgage Bank for the purpose—

ලෝ වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Yes, they will be enabled to do so.

ரேகா ரசயே ரகஃ லுங்கு னா மூரே
[கண்ணென] பதந் கெடுபென

—தேவன வர கியவீத

செல்டன் ஜயசிங்ஹ மஹா.

(திரு. செல்பற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

That can be done administratively.

பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா மஹா.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

To that extent, there will be some relief.

செல்டன் ஜயசிங்ஹ மஹா.

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

If it becomes necessary.

பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா மஹா.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

I do not like these second thoughts of the Minister, these modifications that are brought in. The Minister always regrets his generosity.

காலவாஸி காலேவின் டாக்டர். டி. சில்வா (அலகலவத்தை)

(கலாநிதி கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா—அகலவத்தை)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva—Agalawatta)

He is always running away from himself.

பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா மஹா.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

There are certain other amendments which I want to suggest. In regard to new Clause 70B (1) I want to suggest an amendment. As it stands at present it reads:

“Subject to the provisions of sub-section 2, the bank is hereby authorized to acquire the whole or any part of any agricultural, residential or business premises, if the bank is satisfied that those premises were, at any time, not earlier than the first day of January 1952....”

My amendment is to add the words “or share” after the word “part” and before the word “of” in line 19.

செல்டன் ஜயசிங்ஹ மஹா.

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Accepted.

பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா மஹா.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

The reason for that amendment is that as the clause now stands the Bill does not enable relief to be given in respect of undivided land—

செல்டன் ஜயசிங்ஹ மஹா.

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I have accepted that amendment.

பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா மஹா.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

As the Hon. Minister knows, most agricultural holdings are held on the basis of undivided shares. In regard to the consequences of the *thattu maru* system, I know one instance where a person is able to get his share of the produce after 132 years. There are so many persons entitled to that same land. If the land is physically divided he will probably get a few square inches. It is in regard to persons of this sort that I want this relief given, and I am glad that the Minister is prepared to accept my amendment.

The next is an amendment in regard to Clause 70B (2) (a). I propose the deletion of that part. This is what Clause 70B (2) (a) says:

“(2) No premises shall be acquired under sub-section (1)—

(a) if an application in that behalf had earlier been made to the Debt Conciliation Board by original owner, and a settlement arrived at between the parties;....”

I see no reason why the relief should not be given in such instances too. It will benefit both the creditor and the debtor. If it involved merely a breach of contract on the part of

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්

[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

the debtor to the disadvantage of the creditor I might have even understood anyone opposing it. But this is going to benefit both parties. There is no reason why this relief should not be given. I am glad that the Hon. Minister is accepting that amendment too.

In regard to the administrative structure that he proposes for this I want a definite assurance from the Hon. Minister that whatever sympathy was shown by the People's Bank in handling these cases will not dry up in the arid conservatism that has so far informed the Ceylon State Mortgage Bank. Since I want that assurance I shall also move an amendment which, of course, I know the Hon. Minister will not accept, namely, the deletion of Part II of his Bill—Clause 51. But I should be satisfied with the assurance, if the Hon. Minister is able to give it, without the qualification that he will subsequently introduce an amendment, as an afterthought.

These are the observations I want to make about this Bill. As I said I am in principle opposed to the first part, namely, this addition to the credit structure from the point of view of an alleged encouragement of private sector agricultural development. I say that it is against the position taken up by the Opposition in regard to the development of agriculture in this country; it is against the basic interests of the rural peoples of this country.

The experience that this country has had since 1965, of all efforts of the Government in this sector, has only revealed that we have rackets piled upon rackets and that every effort to give more facilities such as tax reliefs, extra credit, exchange allocations and the like will only multiply these outlaws who have been operating in this particular field.

The Hon. Minister has removed one of the gravest fears that I had by consenting to the removal of sub-clause (u). He still does not remove the tie-up of this institution through

the Central Bank with the I.M.F. and such other organizations. He does not remove that. But at least he has removed the direct dealing position which existed in the Bill as presented to us, and that at least is some little grace.

I do not want to take up any more time of the House. Since the principal question of agricultural policy is involved, we are constrained to express our opposition in regard to that matter, but I am glad that the Hon. Minister has consented to these other amendments. In regard to the good intentions that have been announced by the present management of the State Mortgage Bank, I trust that they will bear fruit from the point of view of the small people of this country who have suffered in regard to their mortgaged lands. While commending the greatest possible sympathy in that matter, I would like to appeal to the Hon. Minister of Finance to make available the necessary monies that this bank will require in order to give effect to that policy. While doing so, as I said, they are involved in the principal question in the matter of these development loans, particularly in regard to agriculture, in regard to which a definite emphasis is made in this Bill, and for that reason I find I do not happen to be in sympathy with the Hon. Minister in regard to that sector. It is, therefore, with regret that, as far as that matter is concerned, we have to declare our opposition.

මෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මහා.

(திரு. ஷெல்டன் ஜயசிங்ஹா)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should like to have your permission to participate in this Debate, particularly in view of what has been said by the hon. Member for Colombo South. The hon. Member, may I say, spoke of a multitude of contradictions, intent of purpose, duplication, and so on. He said there were a host of contradictions. The hon. Member's speech itself was a contradiction *in toto*. He started off by saying that he agrees with the first part and disagrees with the second part. He said he is in sympathy with the first part—

කො රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්

--දෙවන වර කියවීම

[සංයෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා

(කලාநிති කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

No !

පෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.

(තිரு. ශෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

Or he said he was in agreement with the second part and in disagreement with the first part.

ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා

(කලාநிති කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

Whatever it is, he is in disagreement with you !

පෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.

(තිரு. ශෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

Should I be complimented, I wonder ! He said this Bill is good in parts and bad in parts. Which weighed more heavily with him I do not know ! But I think the hon. Member for Colombo South, who often speaks with a lot of facts and figures and conviction from the innermost soul, today did not sound so very convincing because I find that this is a Bill that has been advocated particularly by hon. Members of the L.S.S.P. for quite some time.

The hon. Member for Yatiyantota, for instance, I well remember, when speaking about finance and industrialization, often asked, "How do you expect to implement your policy of industrialization ? Are you going to Ceylonize industry ? How are you going to promote development ? Is it going to be done by the people of this country ?" He used to blandly tell this House, "This will not be done because the people of this country do not have the necessary finance."

What is the root cause of this ? Where does the difficulty lie ? The hon. Member for Yatiyantota will accept that the majority of our people have their assets in immovables ; and a certain portion of them, the more

affluent people, have negotiable security. The vast majority of them have land and immovable property. How are we going to make the bulk of the people viable ? That is the crux of the problem. How can the Government step in and harness the people of this country in its policy of industrialization and development ?

I do not say that this is a complete answer, that this Bill, when it becomes an Act, will forever remove the difficulties of investment by the people of this country, that they will automatically find the wherewithal to come into industry and agriculture and development. No. But to some extent, and I think to a large extent, this may be the answer.

I have to make an appeal to the Government in this instance, and I think hon. Members like the hon. Member for Agalawatta and the hon. Member for Yatiyantota will support me ; that is to say, this must be the incentive and the prod, if necessary, to the Hon. Minister of Justice to bring a Bill for the settlement of land titles in this country, to consolidate all holdings and settle land. It is absolutely necessary. We see in this Debate the problems we are faced with. These problems will live with us until we settle this matter. The problem of indebtedness, the problem of finding finance for our people, will be with us until we settle this matter of title. And I sincerely make this appeal to Government that soon the Hon. Minister of Justice should deem it fit to place before this House a Bill for the settlement of title to land. We have an umpteen number of cases where people who have had their land for half a century or more in some instances, wanting to raise money for an industrial venture, to develop a project which is already in existence, or to make an effort in agriculture, cannot do so. They are turned down by the Bank of Ceylon, by the People's Bank, or whichever bank it may be, because the collateral they put up, the bank says, is not sufficient or is vulnerable. I hope, therefore, that the Hon. Minister of Justice and the Hon. Minister of

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්
[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

Finance will prevail upon their Colleagues to arrive at an early settlement of this problem.

The hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa) spoke of investment of foreign funds. I was watching the face of the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) at that time. He was not very happy about that.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාநிති என். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)

No.

පෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.

(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

About the reference to investment of foreign funds. The hon. Member for Colombo South spoke as if this is a completely new departure for the first time. Here is money got from the I. M. F., the I. B. R. D., the U. N. Special Agencies, the World Bank Special Agencies.—[Interruption]. I know the hon. Member for Yatiyantota will be the first person to repudiate this. Your Colleague who was seated just behind you—

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා,

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You did not understand him.

පෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.

(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

My understanding of the hon. Member for Colombo South cannot be as good as that of the hon. Member for Yatiyantota. I accept that. But I am only stating how the House understood him and not how the hon. Member for Yatiyantota understood or chooses to understand.

ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා,

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

You are not the House.

පෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.

(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

As long as I am on my feet I represent the House; I am the voice of the House.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා,

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)

That is a wrong presumption.

පෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.

(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

Well, Sir, the hon. Member for Colombo South said it is not correct to get I. M. F. aid or any such foreign aid to be invested in the private sector. There are umpteen number of cases now. Look at China aid for replanting; unless I am wrong this goes to the small man, to the middle-class owner, to large estate owners. All, as one, are serviced by this money. The Development Finance Corporation is another agency which handles such money.

What is the grouse about this? Is this mere opposition to everything coming from us?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා,

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)

The Hon. Minister has accepted an amendment.

පෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.

(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

Fair enough. Your Friend spoke for 11½ hours on it, and will you give me five minutes to reply to it? It does not take five minutes to reply to such an argument. So, you will see, one should not oppose measures for the benefit of the country just because they are brought by the Government or vice versa. Whatever is good for our country must have the approval of every sincere politician.

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

[පෙල්වන් ජයසිංහ මයා.]

The grouse of the Opposition is that most sums of money going into new agricultural schemes of the Government—to put it as such—means denying the farmer assistance and pride of place and pinning our hopes on the new gentleman-farmers, so to say.

What did the hon. Member for Kolonnawa (Mr. T. B. Ilangaratne) say in the opening bars of his speech? He said Rs. 850 lakhs has gone out as rural credit and we have collected only Rs. 150 lakhs. This is a contradiction between—

ඉලංගරත්න මයා.

(திரு. இலங்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Ilangaratne)

Agricultural projects.

පෙල්වන් ජයසිංහ මයා.

(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

Yes, agricultural projects. This money has been expended on agricultural ventures—farmer plus anybody else who has taken part in agriculture.

I personally do not wish to tell the hon. Member for Kolonnawa (Mr. Ilangaratne) that he was wrong, but I have my grave doubts about the correctness of those figures. I will at the earliest opportunity attempt to check those figures so that I could, if necessary, give the correct answer to the hon. Member for Kolonnawa.

The intended purposes of this Bill are to be found at page 5 :

“51. (1) Subject to the provisions of this Ordinance, the bank is authorized to carry on and transact the several kinds of business hereinafter specified, namely :

(a) to grant loans, subject to interest, to any person for the purpose of—

(i) the purchase or lease, or the cultivation, development or improvement of any land used, or to be used, for any purpose of agriculture ;”—

You choose only to take one sub-clause, eliminating the second sub-clause which is there in vivid characters. The second sub-clause reads :—

—“(ii) the purchase or lease, or the construction, repair or renewal, of any building, factory, mill, mine, machinery or equipment used, or to be used, in connection with any agricultural or other prescribed undertaking not inconsistent with the objects of the bank ;”

It is specified here that development funds, or funds for development, for industry, for house-building are available from this source. It is not purely an agricultural bank. The idea is to broadbase or diversify this attempt to feed or pump money into the local entrepreneur, to give him a chance of coming into industry, agriculture and development.

We have seen how applications for development funds have been tied up in knots on various occasions on the most frivolous of arguments. This Bill seeks to eliminate most of those difficulties.

I agree with the hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa) that we should not have left out or taken away the existing functions of lending for redemption of debts on property, by the People's Bank. But the Minister of Finance has agreed, and he says he will give an assurance to the House, that the branches of the People's Bank in the outstations will function as agents of the Ceylon State Mortgage Bank. That solves the problem for us as far as we are concerned.

The hon. Member for Colombo South, as I said, found it very difficult to speak convincingly in this Debate because here is a Bill that is liberalizing credit, making credit available to the people of this country. Here is a progressive party. I do not know in which way they are progressing these days. Here is a party of progressives opposed to it! Why do they choose to oppose it? They say at once it finances agriculture. Which is more progressive, mending and fending for one's own needs or begging and borrowing? If the hon. Members of the Lanka Sama Samaja Party say

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්

[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—தேவன வர கியதீத

it is better to beg and borrow than to grow and produce for one's own self, then, of course, that is an argument which I not only do not agree with but oppose. I cannot see how you can oppose a Bill that liberalizes credit. The hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) asked for this a thousand and one times on the Floor of this House. He said, "Make credit broadbased, remove the restrictions, let the credit be freely available to the people, let all sections come into the development of this country, do not limit it only to the few more affluent people in this country." The hon. Member for Colombo South also wanted to stress on certain things. He took the opportunity to wake this Debate almost a prelude to a budget debate. He took a couple of hours of the time of the House. He asked questions of the Minister of Finance. He asked: What have you done with the sums you have borrowed? Is your FEEC scheme a success? Is it not putting up prices? Are you not, by your new monetary scheme, giving partial treatment to some and denying assistance to the rest of the people? I do not know how he got all these arguments into a simple Bill that seeks to liberalize credit. This is the most wonderful situation that we are faced with. If I were to reply to that the House would be embroiled in a first class pre-budget discussion. He had to almost touch on it because the amendment to the Finance Act would still be here and he would speak afresh on the subject. Of course all those things have nothing to do with this. He tried to make out by bringing all extraneous arguments into the Debate that our purpose is to oppose the liberalization of credit to the people. That is the point that I wish to take up.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා, මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

You raised the rate of interest on People's Bank loans.

சேல்டன் ஜயசிங்க மயா.

(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

I am coming to that. I would not run away from that argument. As I said, he raised the question about the FEEC scheme, foreign credits, loan funds, all of which have nothing to do with this matter. One of the points that he raised was about the granting of assistance to agriculture, assistance to the new type of farmer and the permanent fixture in agriculture. He wanted to know what we had done to the resident farmer or the farmer we had known for years. He said, "You have raised his interest rate." That is not correct. We have raised the rate of interest on loans of money over a certain limit. It is not an overall rise in the rate of interest. It is operated through the co-operatives and where there has been a default there has been a rise.

மேதிரிபால சேனநாயக்க மயா. (மீட வச்சி)

(திரு. மைத்திரிபால சேனநாயக்க—மதவாச்சி)

(Mr. Maithripala Senanayeke—Meda-wachchiya)

No. You have taken his rice ration books.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා,

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You have taken the rice ration books of the whole family, not only of the cultivator.

சேல்டன் ஜயசிங்க மயா.

(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

Do you say that the Government has taken over lock stock and barrel? What a good godfather this Government is!

மேதிரிபால சேனநாயக்க மயா.

(திரு. மைத்திரிபால சேனநாயக்க)

(Mr. Maithripala Senanayeke)

We shall tell you how good you are at the next election.

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.

(තිரு. ශෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

As for this difference in the rate of interest, it has been done more to remind the farmer of his obligation ; it has been done more to remind the farmer that these loans must be repaid. The hon. Member who had once been Finance Minister knows that this scheme of rural credit can operate only if you keep it in a state of liquidity. The scheme must be operated in that fashion in order to get the fullest benefit. The hon. Member for Yatiyantota will accept that, and that should serve as an incentive or a reminder to the farmer that he must pay back the loan he has taken. The Government was mindful of that. The farmer must not forget that although he would have to carry an additional burden, we have raised the price of rice under the guaranteed price scheme.

මොතිපාල සේනානායක මයා.

(තිரு. මොතිපාල සේනානායක)

(Mr. Maithripala Senanayeke)

That was not after devaluation. That was much earlier.

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.

(තිரு. ශෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

Sir, if he wants to participate in this Debate, he is perfectly entitled to do, so, but he should not interrupt.

මොතිපාල සේනානායක මයා.

(තිரு. මොතිපාල සේනානායක)

(Mr. Maithripala Senanayeke)

Talk something sensible. Do not utter falsehoods here.

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.

(තිரு. ශෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

He can get up on his hind legs and speak of the benefits that have been given to the farmer by this Bill. I am amused at his remarks. But why should he want to interrupt me in this manner ?

The hon. Member for Colombo South said, "You have raised the interest rate." But he did not mention the added benefits that had been given to the farmer—[Interruption]. I am coming to fertilizer. The farmer has been given a new strain of paddy. No, Sir, we want the agricultural benefits that accrue in this country to be first visited on the farmer. The farmer, the cultivator, who toils in the field, must be the first to get the benefits of this scheme. We have given him a better price for his paddy. We have given him a finer line of seed which will give him better production. We have given him more government assistance by taking the officers who formerly worked in the kachcheri to the field level. We have provided the farmers with all the implements for farming.

I well remember the time when a farmer in this country could not find a mammoty. I remember the time when you talked about the boost to agriculture. If you take the statistics you will find how many tractors the previous Government imported. I ask the hon. Member for Medawachchiya, how many tractors did they import in 1964 ?

He can very well say the tractors are now being imported by somebody else. I am not contesting that here. Whatever has been imported by way of agricultural implements has gone to the farmer. That is my argument. Whether some firm has made a deal on it or somebody has earned some money, that is another matter. I do not think a service like that will be rendered *gratis*.—[Interruption]. I do not think the hon. Member for Yatiyantota is so naive as to think that tractors will be imported into Ceylon by a firm just for sake of service.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාතිථි භූ. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Why cannot the Government do that ?

ஓங்கா ரச்சையே ருணவ் வுங்கு வா இடரே
[சுனேஷ்வர] பதவ் கெடுமபத

—தேவன வர கியதே

செல்டன் ஜயசிங்ஹ மஹா.

(திரு. ஷெல்டன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

That is a matter you should take up on another score. But do not bring that question into this argument. What has that got to do with the present Debate? You are bringing into this Debate aspects of agriculture, finance, and all sorts of things, because you find you do not have sufficient grounds to oppose this Bill..

Let it be written down very clearly that you of the Lanka Sama Samaja Party, you who understand this Bill—I could have understood the hon. Member for Kolonnawa arguing about the loans given and the amounts recovered and stating that he could not support this Bill—you who say you are the champions of the workers, the heroes of the down-trodden, now rebels without a cause, have now got up here to oppose a Bill that liberalizes credit. I do not know what your opposition to this could be.

ஃபார்க்ஸ் கொல்டன் ஃபார்க். டி. சில்வா

(கலாநிதி கொல்டன் ஃபார்க். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

You are a conformist without a church.

செல்டன் ஜயசிங்ஹ மஹா.

(திரு. ஷெல்டன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

What is a conformist without a church to a man who has no religion? Let us say we are both non-conformists.

I find that the Lanka Sama Samaja Party who swear by the gods they do not believe in—now serves the feudal aristocracy in this country forgetting their Internationale. The champions of the down-trodden now vote against the liberalization of credit. Strange things happen! These are very hard and unpalatable facts.

I want to say this because I want it to be written down in HANSARD. I had no intention to intervene in this Debate because the Bill could have been perfectly understood by any-

body. It did not require any clarification, other than the amendment that was suggested and readily accepted by the Hon. Minister of Finance. More than that is not required. Let it be said that the Lanka Sama Samaja Party has raised its voice in defiance of and opposition to a measure whereby we wish to liberalize credit to the people of this country, whereby we want to further the Ceylonization of trade and industry, whereby we want to make the farmer a respected citizen of this country, whereby we want to make available to him the wherewithal to make him independent. It is the Lanka Sama Samaja Party which has opposed this most progressive step.

ஃபார்க்ஸ் கொல்டன் ஃபார்க். டி. சில்வா

(கலாநிதி கொல்டன் ஃபார்க். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I stayed here entirely because the hon. Parliamentary Secretary who last spoke made an appeal to his own Minister of Justice to bring legislation that would consolidate holdings and, I think, also render secure and stable title to land.

Sir, that is a matter that concerns the State Mortgage Bank because the people who go to the State Mortgage Bank have to go there primarily with land as security.

In Ceylon, land ownership, or rather the reform of land ownership, has a very long history. It is a history of well-meaning measures making confusion worse confounded. I happen also, among other things, to have been a historical research worker, and I am not unaware of the history of this country especially under the British.

I remember how the very first Governor of this country, and even the very first British administrators prior to the Governor being appointed here, had tried with the best of intentions to bring about land reform.

Everyone who has come to Ceylon from abroad is convinced, for instance, that the system of co-ownership of land, which we have inherited along with the Roman Dutch Law primarily from the Dutch

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්

[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා]

colonialists, has been the curse of our country from the point of view of agricultural development. There is very little doubt that that is a true and correct point of view. Co-ownership has meant in Ceylon regressive agriculture in consequence; therefore, we require some land system which, from the point of view that we are now discussing at this moment of those who go to the State Mortgage Bank, would enable both the bank and the constituent to come to quick agreement on the basis of title to a known piece of land, which title is secure and unchallenged.

You will never get that under the present system of land ownership in Ceylon. I say so deliberately; I say so after having spent a considerable part of my lifetime having thought over this problem with knowledge of it which comes from historical research, from legal research and from social research.

The present system of land ownership in Ceylon is one which in its functioning simply cannot produce secure title. In more recent years in the last half century or so, the rulers of this country turned to another device, the device of partition laws. Now, those who entered upon that enterprise in legislation and what amounted to an attempt at social reform, entered upon it on a misconception, namely, that in English land ownership the system of primogeniture prevailed. In fact, since the year 1925, the system of primogeniture has been statutorily abolished in England. There is a myth and the belief that if you introduce a system of land ownership in Ceylon which was based primarily on the alleged British principle that lands should descend to and be inherited by the eldest son of the family, you would in some way or other render secure title and stabilize the size of holding.

Now, Sir, the Partition Ordinance turned out to be a new curse to this country, a curse which is best understood by those who like me come from the southern seaboard. I will not mention names, for names do not de-

serve to be mentioned when what has to be referred to is contemptible, but there is many a fortune which was built up by proctor, in this Island out of these partition laws which were manipulated in such a manner that the costs of partition were far, far greater than the value of the land, where the true plaintiff bringing the partition action was only the nominee of the proctor for the plaintiff, and where, at the end, the bill of costs presented turned out to be so outrageous and technically so accurate that ultimately at a certain state the Supreme Court itself, stung in its social conscience, came in using its own inherent powers to limit and place a ceiling upon the costs.

All that happened was that the humble-co-owner lost his land to the rich village owner and to the rising proctor. Then, Sir, they turned to the limitation of costs. In fact, this Partition Ordinance is such that the moment somebody writes an authoritative book on it, by the time it is published it is out of date because life has compelled so many amendments. You, Sir, know it as well as I do.

In the midst of all this we have had a system of land registration. Now, it is very essential to note that what we have in Ceylon is a system of land registration which really does not help very much to clear title. I shall give you one or two examples to show what I mean. You register your deed of title in relation to a parcel of land which is described, as they say in England, by metes and bounds, or, as we call it, by the boundaries.

The first thing is that he who has a parcel of land, when he wishes to describe its boundaries, is compelled to do so by mentioning the parcels of land which are adjacent to his own parcel of land, to the north, south, east and west and various other directions of the compass.

Now, Sir, the parcels of land which are adjacent are themselves of uncertain identity. So you describe one uncertainty with another group of uncertainties and imagine that you

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්
[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

have created a certainly. You so imagine until somebody goes to the courts. Then everybody turns round and says, "There in the courts they split hairs"—they often do—; "they make refined distinctions"—I hope they do so—; "they introduce concepts from which they come to interpretation"—there is no other known system of interpretation in any system of law in the world—; "but what happens in the end is that I who acquired land *in bona fide* belief in a whole chain of title find myself displaced by another title in relation, presumably to the same parcel of land but which had been differently registered."

Then we enter into a long discussion of who registered first and which is the correct land and ten million other things, and at the end some infortunate judge carefully analyses it all and comes to a decision. Then there is an appeal from his decision to the Supreme Court and sometimes the district judge is told he did not understand what he decided; and then somebody who is rich enough appeals from the Supreme Court judgment to the Privy Council, and the Privy Council says, "Why, the only man who understood it all is the humble district judge who heard the matter first."

Sir, every effort at land reform or every effort towards the so-called object of stabilizing holdings and titles has only multiplied litigation without ever bringing the certainty that is aimed at.

Now, my good Friend the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries and Fisheries called upon his Minister of Justice to bring a Bill that will end it all. I should be glad if he brings a Bill. But indeed, if he is hoping to bring a Bill to end it all, well, Sir, with great respect to all concerned, I wish to say this.

We all got together and accepted and passed a Paddy Lands Act to end it all only in the realm of land tenure in the *ande* system. The latest discovery I have made, representing as I

do now a constituency in which this question is constant and frequent, is that when you have gone through the appropriate machinery and institutions set up under the Paddy Lands Act, for an *ande* cultivator to get back his right to cultivate the land which he had been traditionally cultivating and from which he had been expelled, you are told by the appropriate Agrarian Services Department authorities: "We are very sorry. Although the man you are talking about has succeeded in proving his right at every level, we have not the power given to us under the law to put him back into possession."

In fact it is well known that there are a number of cases pending in the courts, and if in my lifetime I see the end of those cases I may be able to die with a reasonable amount of happiness in regard to that question. But the fact of the matter is this. Let us face it. My good Friend, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries and Fisheries is very worried about our meandering from our old moorings. After all he is very interested in the moorings and he seems to think that we are only interested in the meanderings.

I should like to say this. I hold personally—I think my party does too—the belief that the land system of this country is incapable of this kind of piece by piece reform, that it undoubtedly requires the revolutionary seizure of the land, its final redistribution and the consolidation of that redistribution in law. I do not say that that can be done tomorrow or anything like that. But within the system as it stands let us think in terms of some action that could be taken to bring about some reform.

We are discussing this short problem. We are not discussing the ordinary cultivator. The ordinary cultivator does not go to the State Mortgage Bank. You know it and we all know it. It is no use talking about liberalization of credit through the State Mortgage Bank to the ordinary cultivator, the little man who is really tilling the little field with little

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්
[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා]
results which can be added up to magnificent figures in the bloated imaginations of administrators. That is by the way. We are talking really of the kind of people who go to the State Mortgage Bank. They are men of reasonably sized property.

Now, when you come to the bigger properties in this land it is possible to have an appropriate legislation by which some kind of stabilization of the holding, some kind of identification of the holding and some kind of certainty of the title, can be achieved. There are in Ceylon only two points of departure from which you can start clean and with a title that is unchallengeable. One is a partition decree. The other—it is not so well-known—happens to be if you can effect a sale of the land through one of the processes of the local government bodies, especially like the municipal council. If they sell any land the title comes clear of everything. Now that is clear in title, but that does not dispose of the matter. There is the additional question. We cannot ask people to go and default on their taxes, lest that fact will hold against them, in the hope that they will be able to buy the land back for a song. So both these methods of getting a start for securing your title are rather too unsatisfactory. And I know that the late Mr. M. W. H. de Silva who was much concerned with this question was thinking of a method of sending a commissioner on to the land, on to the spot, who would make some kind of summary inquiry at the place and say, “Well, that plot is yours, this is the other person’s”, do a partition on the spot and go away.

There is still a difficulty. You may start with a clean title to a separate block of land. But if you want that block of land to remain intact you must take care to die without children and without leaving a widow because otherwise the Roman-Dutch Law comes in and divides the property. So, where are you? In one generation through a partition action

or some other process you clear up title, you separate your holdings, you sell amongst the parties and you say, Lot “A” is for the first person, Lot “B” is for the second and Lot “C” is for the third person, and there is a beautiful plan. Then in the next generation lot “A” has the entire progeny plus the widow’s folk or the other spouses, as the case may be, fighting it over and over again. It is like sweeping back the waves of the sea. You cannot go on like this. So, if my good Friend the hon. Parliamentary Secretary is, in fact, prodding—and prodding is a correct word in respect of a party whose symbol is the elephant—the Hon. Minister of Justice to bring an appropriate bit of law, he should be prodding through his neighbour who is after all the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice. He has a separate system of law which he carries with him and that creates more complications than the Roman-Dutch Law; and nowadays we do not know from where to study the authority on that question. Ours is a happy country. We have several systems of law—the Kandyan system, the Roman-Dutch system, the Muslim system, several Muslim systems and so on. Into this is introduced the Hindu Joint Family System, and, for my part, my ignorance of that subject is so complete that I do not dare to make even a remark about it.

What kind of land title can you create? That is what I am trying to say. A State Mortgage Bank which is going to accept land as security must, as a starting point, dare to take some substantial risks if it is to be of any use. That is the point I am coming to. The expenses involved in getting a loan, not to mention the delays involved in getting it after satisfying the proctors behind the scenes, renders the loan itself well-nigh worthless by the time you get it.

The greatest advantage of the State Mortgage Bank, I am aware—not having ever taken advantage of its existence, unfortunately—

ஒரு ரகசிய ரகசிய லுக்கு என் இடில்
[சுனெய்மன] பனன் கெடுதலு

—தேவன் வர கியதில்

செ. வந்தியாயக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

You do not need it!

சுலாபீசு கெல்வின் சார். டி. சில்வா

(கலாநிதி கொல்லின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

I require it but I follow a rather conservative attitude to benefiting from government institutions.

செ. வந்தியாயக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Not sufficiently pressed!

சுலாபீசு கெல்வின் சார். டி. சில்வா

(கலாநிதி கொல்லின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

No, no, I have been often pressed but it is wiser to steer clear of something lest those documents be flung at you in some wrong context in the course of a Debate here.

The only advantage of the State Mortgage Bank, as far as I am aware, is that it gives convenient instalments over long periods. I believe, you can get instalments over a 20-year period. Of course, it is a little forgotten by many that if the State Mortgage Bank forecloses by resolution of its own committee, then the land goes absolutely to the State Mortgage Bank, and the man to whom they sell receives title. This may be a good device of clearing title for the bank but it is a very expensive device for the man who goes to the bank for a loan.

I say that the State Mortgage Bank as an institution requires to be radically reformed from the point of view of making it an institution which, firstly, is easily accessible even for those who have the property to go to it and, secondly, to make it more accessible to the smaller landowner. I say that eternally we are thinking in terms of how the big fellow can be tided over his difficulties but not of the little man who is constantly falling in and out of difficulties and need a little assistance.

It has been suggested that the State Mortgage Bank should work together with the People's Bank. May I be permitted—though we are not on the People's Bank now—just to make one remark, to mention one little episode, because it might be of some use to the Hon. Minister of Finance in liberalizing certain regulations. Nowadays, Sir, because of the free education system, a considerable number of people in this country of the poorer or humble strata succeed in the examination for admission to the universities of our country. In the past there was the H. S. C. examination, but now it is the G. C. E. (Advanced Level) Examination by which they enter the universities. I want to say, and I say this very humbly but very earnestly and with much pity in my heart, that a number of parents have come to me over and over saying, "My child has obtained admission to the university. If I could obtain a loan, I may be able to finance the child through the university." Then, in the simpleness of my heart, I tell them, "The People's Bank, I am told by the Government, will give a loan." They go to the People's Bank.

Now, only last week a lady came to me, a humble person whose daughter had secured admission to the university. In order to put this child through the university she wanted Rs. 3,000 from the People's Bank and the People's Bank sent her the standard form to produce a guarantor who is an income tax payer, etcetera, etcetera. You know, the person has to be one earning over Rs. 600 a month.

Precisely because she is a humble person in humble circumstances she cannot find such a guarantor or guarantors. So, she thinks of the only thing that she can think of. There is believed to be a universal father of all, the Member of Parliament of the area. When these people come to their Members of Parliament and when they are told, this is not a thing that can be done by Members of Parliament in that way—

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්
[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා]
perhaps some of them may go up to a certain point—they look bewildered etcetera, etcetera.

Now, this is a terrible situation. We talk of liberalization of credit. Is this not the true place for a little genuine liberalization of credit? If you are lending to a humble person because that person can get a big guarantor, you are lending not to the person but to the guarantor. We all understand that. So, why pretend? Cannot we do something about it? My humble Friend on my right in his time did something in this respect and I earnestly urge that you get back to that.

Now, I want to say one thing more on the same matter. There are many families, in the rural areas in particular, whose children get admitted to the universities in that way, who have a little block of land, and who, from an appropriate institution which was not looking always to title going back to a hundred years at least or starting with something that never existed, might be able to get that money on the security of their little piece of land. Cannot the State Mortgage Bank or the People's Bank be instructed that in that type of case they accept what you will call a reasonable title instead of looking into perfect title? I could understand a bank saying, "if you come to us to borrow a million rupees we want perfect title." There, there is a million rupees involved, but the truth of the matter is that the person to whom a bank is willing to lend a million rupees often does not need either land or title but only credit and respectability.

I am sorry, Sir, I did not intend to speak so long but land reform is a subject which is interminable and it has been a subject of special interest to me personally and therefore it is that I took the cue from my good Friend the Parliamentary Secretary and permitted myself these remarks.

I say with respect that if the State Mortgage Bank today is to be truly

of a liberal character and is to serve the people, it must find ways and means of taking bigger risks by making itself more available particularly to the little man in his little needs.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

That is precisely what this Bill does not do. When the hon. Parliamentary Secretary waxed eloquent about the farmer and cultivator and so on, he forgot that the Bill does not touch that category of persons. Still the minimum amount lent is Rs. 2,000. So, where are you?—[Interruption]. Well, you are presenting a Bill. Now you are talking of an amendment. You are not going to move an amendment? The Hon. Minister will not amend the Bill in that way. Will the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries and Fisheries move an amendment?

මේල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා,

(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

I shall support it.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

But you are interested. So, why do you not move the amendment? I would request you to move the amendment.

මේල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා,

(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

I shall second it.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You are asking us to move the amendment? They are always prepared to get us to pull the chest-nuts out of the fire for them.

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්
[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

What are we at ? What is this Bill about ? The Bill apparently contemplates the amendment of the State Mortgage Bank Ordinance. The words "State Mortgage" means mortgaging of what ? Of property. It has existed from 1931. It has accumulated a whole, shall I say, body of experience over these years of doing what ? Of mortgaging property only in this country. That is the experience, that is the expert knowledge, it has got. That is what the people are trained for in the State Mortgage Bank.

But what are you doing now here ? You are doing something else. You are giving it the colouring of a development bank. You are asking them actually to take over properties and run the properties, run businesses. If you want to have a development bank set-up on its own, I would be the first to support you. But why are you going and amending the State Mortgage Bank Ordinance ? They are two separate things.

What are the difficulties today of the State Mortgage Bank ? You get hundreds of village people who are not being served by the State Mortgage Bank. Where are the credit institutions for the villagers ? There are no credit institutions for them. He still has to go to the village *mudalali* to get his credit. That is the truth about it. The paddy cultivator gets some sort of credit now for which he has to mortgage his coupon book also. He does get some credit. What about the ande-cultivator who has no property of his own ? I can understand if the Hon. Minister seriously amended this Ordinance to provide for loans to be given on, say, 50 years' clear ownership.

செல்டன் ஜயசிங்க மஹா.

(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

Why fifty ?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Even less, so much the better. I would like it to be no more than one generation. If you want reasonable satisfaction, let it be one generation, 20 to 25 years. I think that is very reasonable.

What is the present position ? The State Mortgage Bank has its own proctors scattered throughout the Island who have to be cajoled, sometimes feted, by the poor man in order to get his title passed. Sometimes it takes six months to get the title cleared by these local proctors. For months and months you have to be at his doorstep in order to get it done. He will say he is overworked, he has got so much work and he will do it sometime or other. That is what is happening today in the State Mortgage Bank.

I sent for the recent report of the State Mortgage Bank from the Library. There is no report. We do not know what is happening in the State Mortgage Bank. To whom are the loans given ? They do not send a report even. Have they analysed the statistics relating to loans, the status of the individual who has got the loan and so on ? We do not know. There has been no analysis of the lending operations of the State Mortgage Bank. That would have been feasible. That would have been the best thing to do. Honestly I have been trying to get the report in order to see whom we have been helping in the past. We have been helping some of the big pepole in the past.

We are not opposed to liberalizing credit. Hon. Members will remember what I said in my Budget Speech. I was very glad to be reminded of it. I said :

"As a first step in this direction, the State Mortgage Bank and the Agricultural and Industrial Credit Corporation will be amalgamated into a new long-term credit institution entitled the National Development Bank."—
[OFFICIAL REPORT, 30th July 1964 ; Vol. 56, c. 1689].

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

[ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා]

Now four years have passed and nothing has happened. You are doing something else which is quite alien to the State Mortgage Bank. If you said "I am transforming the Agricultural and Industrial Credit Corporation" I can understand that. They are better equipped than the State Mortgage Bank to do this business.

Let us see what you are going to do. Look at your new Section 51. What are you trying to do in Section 51? It is not enough to introduce a Bill here. Please read what you are going to do under this Bill. Apart from giving loans and so on, according to new Section 51 (1) (a) you seek "to grant loans, subject to interest" for various purposes. I do not mind that. But take new Section 51 (1) (b) onwards:

"(b) to grant loans of money, subject to interest, to any person for the purpose of conducting any agricultural business, or for the settlement of debts incurred under any mortgage provided such mortgage has been to secure a loan raised for a purpose falling within the purview of the bank;

(c) to finance, and to participate in, the share capital of corporations established or maintained with capital wholly or partly provided by the Government and engaged in agriculture."

Have you got the people to do this?

ශ්‍රී ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන

(කෙළරාචල ම. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන)

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

These are all things you learn in the Loganathan School of Banking.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලානිති ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Then (d) says:

"to grant loans of money to any person for the purpose of carrying out any scheme approved by the Minister of Finance for the development of agriculture;"

What is the competence of the Hon. Minister of Finance to give instructions about schemes? Do you think

your Treasury officials are competent enough to do this job? Look at it again. It is clear. It says:

"to grant loans of money to any person for the purpose of carrying out any scheme approved by the Minister of Finance for the development of agriculture;"

How does the Hon. Minister of Finance come into the picture? What does he know about agriculture? His Treasury officials are the least competent to discuss agriculture. I am telling you this through experience, after having worked with these people. What do they know about agriculture?

ශ්‍රී ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන

(කෙළරාචල ම. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන)

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

So are all the Ministers of Finance, both past and present.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලානිති ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

That may be true.

"(e) to carry on the business of hire-purchase in agricultural machinery, and equipment used in agriculture;"

You will have to set up another Sathiyawadi establishment under this State Mortgage Bank where you have somebody competent enough to discuss the various uses of agricultural implements and so on.

Then (f) says:

"to manage, supervise or control, with or without remuneration, or to participate in the management, supervision or control, with or without remuneration, of any agricultural or other prescribed undertaking of any client of the bank where such management, supervision or control, or such participation therein appears to the board to be necessary in order to protect the interests of the bank in any loan granted by the bank;"

It means that you must have the competence to run a whole establishment. It may be a tea estate, a rubber estate or whatever other estate. Has the State Mortgage Bank the

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්

[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

competence to do this ? May I tell you what the State Mortgage Bank does? It has some valuers of property, and those valuers are very much in tow with the people in the State Mortgage Bank. They carry on valuations in order to fill their own pockets. That is what is happening in the A.I.C.C. and in the State Mortgage Bank. There is not one person in either of them competent to do any of these jobs. You are just producing Bills which will become useless, which can never be implemented.

Then (g) says:

“to act, with or without remuneration, as the technical adviser of any client of the bank, on any matter relating to any agricultural or other prescribed undertaking of such client;”

What technical advisers do you have in the State Mortgage Bank? What kind of madness is this? You are just producing a Bill for the sake of producing it.

Then (h) says:

“to set up the necessary organization for selling or marketing any product of any agricultural or other prescribed undertaking;”

In other words, they want to have a marketing board. What has the State Mortgage Bank to do with a marketing board? Is it to buy Sathiyawadi tractors?

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Why Sathiyawadis?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා,

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Why, your tractor people. That is what you are going to do, to carry on the business of hire-purchase and management. That is the work done by Sathiyawadis. You will have to get the competence and the tractors from him.

Then (i) says:

“to act as the agent of any client of the bank, or any other person, for the purpose of the purchase of any machinery or equipment or of any material of any description, required for the purpose of any agricultural or other prescribed undertaking of such client, or other person, as the case may be;”

You are going to give expert advice to purchase machinery to clients. What is this body you are setting up? You are also talking about credit expansion. This is not credit expansion. No, Sir, this is a misconception of functions. You are thinking of something else. You want an entirely different institution for this purpose.

Mr. Minister, we would be in favour of this if you had seriously thought about consolidating the credit institutions. We would then be with you. We would therefore ask that you make these credit institutions fairly large credit institutions which can be capable of providing liberal credit facilities to a large number of poor people who want credit. If you provide them with easy credit by saying, as the Hon. Minister of Industries and Fisheries said, that if it is landed property, twenty to twenty-five years ownership would be sufficient for the purpose of getting a reasonable loan, then that would be liberalization, particularly in respect of the rural areas. A large number of poor people want temporary assistance in various forms to tide over their various difficulties, which are of one type or another. That is what you want to do and that is what is meant by liberalization. But under the guise of liberalizing credit, you want to set up a monster institution which is not competent to do any of the jobs which you have got.

From 1931 to 1968, during these last 37 years, they have built up an entirely different type of experience. They have not got the competence to do all these big things that you have in mind unless you completely transform that institution. The people who have been accustomed to running this

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්

[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා]

institution have never been accustomed to granting money on real property. I think, Hon. Minister, you have not thought about this Bill. You have just presented this Bill.

This is what the Bill says :

“to acquire and undertake the whole or any part of any business carried on in Ceylon by any person, being a business which the bank is authorized to carry on ;”

We are not satisfied that there is any purpose in this. This is going to be a dead letter. This will never function. Moreover, you have missed the purpose of what you want to do.

By the way, what is the major trouble with the State Mortgage Bank ? It has no money. I see you are providing Rs. 5 million by way of a grant. Then you are also asking the Central Bank to provide a little more money. Why does not the hon. Parliamentary Secretary for Industries and Fisheries not raise the most important question, namely, that of the agency houses being allowed to swallow all the credit that we have ? Where is the credit for the local people ? That is an important point.

පෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.

(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

I raised that in the Budget Debate.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා,

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

That was the main theme of his last Budget Speech. That is relevant here.

There is a limit placed here. I do not see how your limit is going to be carried out. The Bill says :

“.... does not exceed the maximum limit imposed by the Minister, with the concurrence of the Minister of Finance ;”

What is the maximum limit you are going to impose ? At the present moment they can issue only debentures from time to time with the

consent of the Minister of Finance, and that is limited. So, the amount of actual help which the State Mortgage Bank can get is limited. The quantum of debentures is limited. It is not possible for the bank to issue unlimited debentures. You have not changed any of these things. Without these changes, where is the credit coming from ? What are the “deposits from the Government, or the Central Bank, or other such institutions as are approved for the purpose by the Monetary Board of the Central Bank” ? Where are the limits drawn ? What is not clear here is that the Central Bank will not be giving unlimited credit to the State Mortgage Bank. What are the limits within which you are going to operate ? What are the conditions under which money will be lent by the Central Bank to the State Mortgage Bank ? None of these things were made clear by the Hon. Minister in his speech.

The Hon. Minister referred, in passing as it were, to the increased activity of the State Mortgage Bank that is contemplated. But he never really tried to analyse the implications thereof—from where the experts are going to come, from where the technical know-how is going to come, to the State Mortgage Bank. None of these matters were brought to light by the Hon. Minister in his speech. Just gaily passing Bills will not help this country. By that you are only fooling the people outside that you have made a big contribution to the process of liberalizing credit in this country. You are doing nothing of the kind ; you are just producing a Bill to amend the State Mortgage Bank Ordinance which means nothing in the end. It will be a dead letter up to the end of 1970.

Certainly, as far as we of the Opposition are concerned , we do not intend to carry out this. We would certainly like to consolidate credit facilities and we stand by the statement that I made in 1964 namely that we must provide more and more sources of credit, liberalize credit by

ලංකා උපයෝජක සේවක බැංකු හා මුදල්

[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

all means and bring all these credit institutions into one organization so as to make it possible to get easy credit on reasonable terms. That is what you have to do. Do not ask the State Mortgage Bank to do a thing that a specialized institution should do, where you have the technical men, the agronomists, the agricultural men and so on, who can give the necessary advice to run estates and so on. That is a different job; that is entirely a different job from what the State Mortgage Bank can do.

I do not want to speak at length but I do think that this is wrongly conceived. Therefore, I would appeal to the Hon. Minister to please withdraw this Bill and bring in an amending Bill to provide easier credit, more money to the State Mortgage Bank, so that the rural people can get easy credit through property, to make it possible for them to get on marketable securities any reasonable sum of money, and for the purpose of bringing down the minimum to at least Rs. 1,000, if not less.—
[Interruption].

පෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.

(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

The minimum is Rs. 2,000.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I do not see it here. If you say so I will accept it. Here you have increased the maximum to Rs. 25,000. According to Section 16 of the State Mortgage Bank Ordinance when only three directors are present no loan exceeding ten thousand rupees can be sanctioned. I think you should have an amendment to alter that position and to leave it to the directors to make any necessary change.

செரு வந்தியாயக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

We have removed it.

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

That is what is wanted; the other things are meaningless.

I agree with the hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa) on the question that these two institutions should be permitted to do this work. The People's Bank for the last few years has gathered sufficient experience with regard to debt redemption work and if it wants to continue to do that work I do not see why we should not permit it. Now you have earmarked certain years and so on, differentiation has taken place, and you might ask both these institutions to do debt redemption work. I have a feeling that debt redemption work was done in the past by the Agriculture Department; previous to that it was done by the Department of the Land Commissioner. I think it had something to do with the Government. Now that you are handing over this work to the State Mortgage Bank I have no objection, but I do not see why you should freeze the other source. If the People's Bank is prepared to do that work let them continue to do so, because then a person will have two places to go to. If one place is congested, if there is too much of work, the other place will be available to the person concerned.

We are opposed to this because it is a meaningless Bill and I do not think it will serve the purpose the Hon. Minister has in mind.

செரு வந்தியாயக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

It has been asked why this debt redemption scheme is being transferred from the People's Bank to the State Mortgage Bank. The hon. Member for Kolonnawa (Mr. T. B. Ilangaratne) said that the People's Bank Commission Report does not advocate that. The report at page 136 states:

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

[ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක]

"207. It is inadvisable to cast new burdens on the Bank such as Land Redemption and Loans to University Students (Paras. 200 and 201)."

And they definitely advocate the removal of the function from the People's Bank. They may not have said that it should be transferred to the State Mortgage Bank, but they did want the function removed from the People's Bank. So, it is not quite correct to say that the People's Bank Commission did not express any view on this matter.

The hon. Member for Kolonnawa (Mr. Ilangaratne) raised the question that when the scheme was functioning under the People's Bank the Government made available to it a certain sum of money to work the scheme and that, as a result of the transfer of this function from the People's Bank to the State Mortgage Bank, that money will not be available to the State Mortgage Bank, which will then have to depend on the loans they can raise.

Now, that is not correct. Whatever money was available to the People's Bank to work this scheme will be made available to the State Mortgage Bank also. So, that criticism too is not justified.

The following are a few of the reasons why this debt redemption scheme is being transferred from the People's Bank to the State Mortgage Bank :

A debt redemption scheme involves long-term credit in which the State Mortgage Bank generally specializes. The People's Bank would be allowed to concentrate on short and medium-term credit, particularly to the co-operative and rural spheres. The State Mortgage Bank will use the services of the People's Bank—for example, its outstation branches—to operate the scheme.

The question was raised whether we would make use of the branches of the People's Bank in the working

of this scheme. Well, the intention is to do that, namely, make use of those branches.

The operation of this scheme will bring about a more rational distribution of functions as between the People's Bank and the State Mortgage Bank.

The question was raised by the hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa) that we have no principle or basis on which these various credit institutions function. There is a scheme behind it, Sir.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මය.

(திரு. பொருட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

A scheme or a conspiracy ?

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க).

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

A conspiracy is also a scheme.

The State Mortgage Bank specializes in agricultural and mortgage credit. The Agricultural and Industrial Credit Corporation—amendments are under consideration to that Act—will concentrate on industrial financing and small-scale tourist projects. The Development Finance Corporation, as we know, will cater to the private sector. The Post Office Savings Bank and the Ceylon Savings Bank will be amalgamated and form the National Savings Bank. Legislation for this purpose is now under preparation. The Bank of Ceylon, the People's Bank and the private commercial banks will concentrate on the co-operative and rural sectors.

One of the criticisms levelled against this Bill was that its provisions are too liberal to the private sector. That was the chief argument of the hon. Member for Colombo South.

We can understand that criticism. It is so. We are making capital and loans available to the private sector.

ලංකා රජයේ ලකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්
[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

To the big man.

ලෝ වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Not necessarily to the big man.
Even the Rs. 2,000 limit has been removed in this Bill.

I can understand that those who do not believe in the private sector will naturally oppose this. But there is no secret about it. The purpose of the amendment is to make finance available to the private sector to engage in development activities. There is no hiding that fact.

Section 52 (1) of the original Act fixed that the minimum loan shall be Rs. 2000. That has been removed.

Then, Sir, the Report of the State Mortgage Bank for 1965 has been published.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

It is not available in the Library.

ලෙස්ලි ගුනවර්ධන මයා. (පානදුර)

(திரு. லெஸ்லி குணவர்தன—பாணநதுறை)

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene—Panadura)

Ask the Minister of Posts.

ලෝ වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

In the past only security of immovable property was accepted by the State Mortgage Bank. With the proposed amendments, loans can be given on the security of movable property also. Hire-purchase on equipment will also be allowed.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

But only agricultural machinery?

ලෝ වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Yes.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Not cars.

ලෝ වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I must say that I agree with the criticism of the hon. Member for Yatiyantota that we have still a long way to go to realize the objectives for which the bank was set up. The bank is not yet fully equipped in respect of personnel and technical skills. But we must make a start somewhere, and if as a result of this Bill we achieve as many of the objectives as possible that would be something. In the light of the experience gained we can bring in further amendments.

The hon. Member for Kalonnawa raised another point. It is hardly relevant to this Debate. He said that the loans given by the People's Bank are not being repaid. It is too early to say that. I understand that some persons are going about in certain areas asking the people not to repay loans. In spite of that, I am told, people are going in certain areas in procession and repaying the loans.

ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන දේන්, සහසම්මත විය.

කෙටුම්පත් පනත ඊට අනුකූලව දෙවනවර කියවන ලදී.

வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு, ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

அதன்படி, மசோதா இரண்டாம் முறையாக மதிப்பிடப்பெற்றது.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a Second time.

லேகா ரசயே ரகசு லேகா ஹ மூடல்
[சுண்டென] பதன் கெடுதலு

"In page 2, line 37, to leave out "carry out" and insert "carry on".

அதற்குரிய சேர்ச்சா கல் வலன் வலன்நியை
கோவசன் ஹுயிசு நிநிய ஹுயிசு ஹுயிசு
விவசன லேன், நியைபுல வி.

அதன் வலன் பதன் பதன் கல் ஹுயிசு, ஹுயிசு
புலநிய விவசன லேன், ஹுயிசுமல வி.

வலன்நிய சுண்டெனகாரசென் கெடுதலு
பதனேன் கோவசன் ஹுயிசு நிநிய ஹுயிசு, ஹுயிசு
புலநிய விவசன லேன், ஹுயிசுமல வி.

5 வலன் வலன்நிய, சுண்டெனகாரசென் கெடுதலு
பதன் பதனேன் கோவசன் ஹுயிசு நிநிய ஹுயிசு
நியைபுல கர்ன லே.

விடப்பட வேண்டுமென பிரேரிக்கப்பட்ட சொற்கள்
வாசகத்தின் பகுதியாக இருக்கவேண்டுமெனும் வினா
விடுக்கப்பட்டு நிராகரிக்கப்பட்டது.

அந்தச் சொற்கள், இங்கே சேர்க்கப்பட வேண்டும்
எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

வாசகம், திருத்தப் பெற்றவாறு மசோதாவின்
பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமெனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு
ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

5 ஆம் வாசகம், திருத்தப்பெற்றவாறு மசோதாவின்
பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமென ஆணையிடப்பட்டது.

Question, that the words proposed to
be left out stand part of the Clause, put,
and negatived.

Question, that those words be there
inserted, put, and agreed to.

Question, that the Clause, as amended,
stand part of the Bill, put, and agreed to.

Clause 5, as amended, ordered to stand
part of the Bill.

6 வலன் வலன்நியை ஸி 16 வலன் வலன்நியை
நேன் கெடுதலு பதனேன் கோவசன் ஹுயிசு
நியைபுல ஹுயிசு நியைபுல கர்ன லே.

6 ஆம் வாசகத்திலிருந்து 16 ஆம் வாசகம் வரை
மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமென ஆணை
யிடப்பட்டது.

Clauses 6 to 16 ordered to stand part
of the Bill.

CLAUSE 17.—(Replacement of section
51 of the principal enactment)

அலாபீசு பதன். பி. பி. பி. பி.

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Sir, I have not worked out an
amendment to this clause myself, but
I would like the Hon. Minister to

—காரக ஹுயிசு

consider making it possible to have
marketable securities instead of
insisting on Crown title and creating
various complications. Can we not
put in an amendment somewhere?

அலாபீசு பதன். பி. பி. பி. பி.

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Let us wait for the time being.
Later on we can bring in some
amendment if necessary.

அலாபீசு பதன். பி. பி. பி. பி.

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Then the whole purpose of the
State Mortgage Bank will be lost.

அலாபீசு பதன். பி. பி. பி. பி.

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Let us pass it as it is. Otherwise,
there will be trouble later on.

அலாபீசு பதன். பி. பி. பி. பி.

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

The point is this. When the State
Mortgage Bank is offered certain
property on which a loan has been
applied for, they can go into whether
that loan should be given or not on
the basis of the marketable value of
the property. There are properties
today which can be sold in the market
but on which you cannot get a loan.
That is what is happening. So, the
whole purpose of your State Mort-
gage Bank is lost. They will take
months and months in order to
clarify the titles. Therefore, I would
like at some stage or other to intro-
duce a small amendment which will
meet this difficulty.

அலாபீசு பி. பி. பி. பி.

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

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

We amended it some time ago. It
is only marketable title, not Crown
or partition title as in the early
days.

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්
[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—කාරක සභාව

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Unless you bring it in here they will not be able to apply it.

ශ්‍රී ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන

(கௌரவ டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

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

At present the State Mortgage Bank accepts marketable title.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

No.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(දොම්පේ)

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

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike—Dompe)

The State Mortgage Bank accepts marketable title but it requires 80 years' proof of possession. It may be that "marketable title" requires re-definition. A marketable title of 20 or 25 years may be accepted.

ශ්‍රී ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන

(கௌரவ டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

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

The Hon. Minister can define "marketable title" to mean 25 years' possession.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

The Hon. Minister could give a general direction to the bank in these terms, "Please accept title with 25 years' possession."

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

May I refer to Section 53 of the principal enactment as amended by Act No. 17 of 1958 ? It states :

"No loan shall be granted unless—

(i) the title of the borrower to the property offered as security is, in the opinion of the Board, satisfactory ;".

"Property" here is intended to cover something more than what was granted earlier. What exactly is covered here by "satisfactory property" ?

ශ්‍රී ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන

(கௌரவ டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

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

Marketable title. Earlier you needed clear title of 100 years.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Can you not reduce it now to 25 years ?

සභාපති

(அக்கிராசனர்)

(The Chairman)

Any amendment on those lines will not come under Clause 17.

අ. භා. 6.15

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

If the Hon. Minister is willing he can amend sub-clause (b) or (d).

In page 6, lines 25 onwards, the new sub-clause (b) reads: "to grant loans of money, subject to interest," and so on. If the Hon. Minister wants he can specify the nature of the security required in that sub-clause or any of the other sub-clauses (c) or (d).

සභාපති

(அக்கிராசனர்)

(The Chairman)

This clause really enumerates the type of business the bank can undertake.

—කාරක සහාය

‘19. Section 53 of the principal enactment, as amended by Act No. 17 of 1958, is hereby further amended as follows :

(1) by the substitution, for the words 'shall be granted unless', of the words 'shall be granted on the mortgage of property unless'; and

(2) in paragraph (c) of that section, by the substitution, for the word 'valid', of the word 'satisfactory'."

අත්හැරීමට යෝජනා කළ වචන වගන්තියේ
කොටසක් හැටියට තිබිය යුතුය යන ප්‍රශ්නය
මමසන ලදිත්, නිෂ්ප්පහ විය.

අතික් වචන එතැනට එකතු කළ යුතුය, යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදින්, සහායමිමත විය.

වගන්තිය සංශෝධිතාකාරයෙන්, කෙටුම්පත් පණතෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට නිව්ය යුතුය, යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදින්, සභාසම්මත විය.

19 වන වගන්තිය, සංශෝධිතාකාරයෙන් කෙටුම්පත් පණතෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට නිව්ය යුතුයයි නිශේශ කරන ලදී.

விடப்பட வேண்டுமென பிரேரிக்கப்பட்ட சொற்கள் வாசகத்தின் பகுதியாக இருக்கவேண்டுமெனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு நிராகரிக்கப்பட்டது.

அந்தச் சொற்கள் இங்கே சேர்க்கப்பட வேண்டும் எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

வாசகம், திருத்தப் பெற்றவாறு மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமெனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

19 ஆம் வாசகம், திருத்தப்பெற்றவாறு மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமென ஆணையிடப்பட்டது.

(The Chairman)

Question, that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause, put, and negatived.

Question that those words be there inserted, put, and agreed to.

Question, that the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill, put, and agreed to.

Clause 19, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

20 වන වගන්තියේ සිට 23 වන වගන්තිය
තෙක් කෙටුම්පත් පණතෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට
නිව්ය සුත්‍රයක් නියෝග කරන ලදී.

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

20 ஆம் வாசகத்திலிருந்து 23 ஆம் வாசகம் வரை மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமென ஆணை விடப்பட்டது.

Clauses 20 to 23 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්
[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—කාරක සභාව

CLAUSE 24.—(Amendment of section 62 of the principal enactment.)

ගරු වන්නිநாயக்க

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I move,

“In page 16, line 5, to leave out ‘double interest’, and insert ‘other interest payable under the proviso to section 103.’”

අත්හැරීමට යෝජනා කළ වචන වගන්තියේ කොටසක් හැටියට තිබිය යුතුය යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදී, නිෂ්ප්‍රභ විය.

අනික් වචන එතැනට එකතු කළ යුතුය, යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදී, සහසම්මත විය.

වගන්තිය සංශෝධිතාකාරයෙන්, කෙටුම්පත් පණතෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට තිබිය යුතුය, යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදී, සහසම්මත විය.

24 වන වගන්තිය සංශෝධිතාකාරයෙන් කෙටුම්පත් පණතෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට තිබිය යුතුයයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.

விடப்பட வேண்டுமென பிரேரிக்கப்பட்ட சொற்கள் வாசகத்தின் பகுதியாக இருக்கவேண்டுமெனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு நிராகரிக்கப்பட்டது.

அந்தச் சொற்கள் இங்கே சேர்க்கப்பட வேண்டும் எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

வாசகம், திருத்தப் பெற்றவாறு மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமெனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

24 ஆம் வாசகம், திருத்தப்பெற்றவாறு மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமென ஆணையிடப்பட்டது.

Question, that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause, put, and negatived.

Question, that those words be there inserted, put, and agreed to.

Question, that the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill, put, and agreed to.

Clause 24, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

25 වන වගන්තියේ සිට 29 වන වගන්තිය තෙක් කෙටුම්පත් පණතෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට තිබිය යුතුයයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.

25 ஆம் வாசகத்திலிருந்து 29 ஆம் வாசகம் வரை மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமென ஆணையிடப்பட்டது.

Clauses 25 to 29 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

CLAUSE 30.—(Insertion of new Chapter VVA in the principal enactment.)

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

I move,

“In page 18, line 19, after ‘part’ to insert ‘or share’”.

සභාපති

(அக்கிராசனார்)

(The Chairman)

Does the Hon. Minister accept that amendment?

ගරු වන්නිநாயக்க

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I accept that amendment.

එම වචන එතැනට එකතු කළ යුතුය, යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදී, සහසම්මත විය.

குறித்த சொற்கள் சேர்க்கப்படவேண்டுமெனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

Question, that those words be there inserted, put, and agreed to.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

I move,

“In page 10, to leave out all words in lines 26 to 31.”

ගරු වන්නிநாயக்க

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I am accepting that amendment.

අත්හැරීමට යෝජනා කළ වචන වගන්තියේ කොටසක් හැටියට තිබිය යුතුය යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදී, නිෂ්ප්‍රභ විය.

වගන්තිය සංශෝධිතාකාරයෙන්, කෙටුම්පත් පණතෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට තිබිය යුතුය, යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදී, සහසම්මත විය.

30 වන වගන්තිය, සංශෝධිතාකාරයෙන් කෙටුම්පත් පණතෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට තිබිය යුතුයයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.

ஒரு ரகசிய உத்தரவு அல்லது
[சுமேந்திர] பதன் கையெழுத்தான

—காரண கையெழுத்து

விடப்பட வேண்டுமென பிரேரிக்கப்பட்ட சொற்கள் வாசகத்தின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமெனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு நிராகரிக்கப்பட்டது.

வாசகம், திருத்தப்பெற்றவாறு மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமெனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

30 ஆம் வாசகம், திருத்தப்பெற்றவாறு மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்கவேண்டுமென ஆணையிடப்பட்டது.

Question, that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause, put, and negatived.

Question, that the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill, put, and agreed to.

Clause 30, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

31 வது உத்தரவு 40 வது உத்தரவுகளைக் கையெழுத்தான பதனைக் கொடுக்கக் கூடியவைகளாக இருக்க வேண்டுமெனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு நிராகரிக்கப்பட்டது.

31 ஆம் வாசகத்திலிருந்து 40 ஆம் வாசகம் வரை மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமென ஆணையிடப்பட்டது.

Clauses 31 to 40 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

CLAUSE 41.—(Amendment of section 94 of the principal enactment)

ஓர் உத்தரவு

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I move,

“In page 40, leave out all words in lines 23 to 37, and insert the following :

* Amendment of section 94 of the principal enactment.

41. Section 94 of the principal enactment is hereby amended in sub-section (1) of that section as follows :—

- (1) by the substitution, in paragraph (d) (ii) of that sub-section, for the words and figures “and the additional purposes for which loans may be made under section 51 ;”, of the words and figures “and the matters stated or required to be prescribed under section 51 ;”;
- (2) by the substitution, in paragraph (f) of that sub-section, for the words “on such loans.”, of the words “on such loans ;”; and
- (3) by the insertion, at the end of that sub-section, of the following new paragraph :—

“(g) for carrying out or giving effect to the principles and provisions of Chapter VA, and for regulating any matter regarding the assessment and payment of any compensation, or any matter stated or required to be prescribed, under Chapter VA ”.”

அந்த உத்தரவு மசோதா கையெழுத்தான பதனைக் கொடுக்கக் கூடியவைகளாக இருக்க வேண்டுமெனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு நிராகரிக்கப்பட்டது.

அந்த உத்தரவு மசோதா கையெழுத்தான பதனைக் கொடுக்கக் கூடியவைகளாக இருக்க வேண்டுமெனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

வாசகம், திருத்தப் பெற்றவாறு மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமெனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

41 வது உத்தரவு, மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமெனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

வாசகம், திருத்தப் பெற்றவாறு மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமெனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

வாசகம், திருத்தப் பெற்றவாறு மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமெனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

வாசகம், திருத்தப் பெற்றவாறு மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமெனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

41 ஆம் வாசகம், திருத்தப்பெற்றவாறு மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமெனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්
[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—කාරක සභාව

Question, that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill, put, and negatived.

Question, that those words be there inserted, put, and agreed to.

Question, that the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill, put, and agreed to.

Clause 41, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

42 වන වගන්තියේ සිට 44 වන වගන්තිය තෙක් කෙටුම්පත් පනතෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට නිතිச යුතුයයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.

42 ஆம் வாசகத்திலிருந்து 44 ஆம் வாசகம் வரை மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமென ஆணை யிடப்பட்டது.

Clauses 42 to 44 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

CLAUSE 45.—(Amendment of section 103 of the principal enactment)

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I move,

“In page 41, to leave out all words in lines 15 to 30, and insert :

* Amendment of section 103 of the principal enactment.

45. Section 103 of the principal enactment is hereby amended as follows :—

- (1) by the substitution, for the words “Any mortgage bond”, of the words “Any instrument”;
- (2) by the substitution, for the words “equated payment,”, of the words “equated or other payment,”;
- (3) by the substitution, for the words “loan in respect of the half-year for which default has been made”, of the word “loan” ; and
- (4) by the insertion, at the end of that section, of the following proviso :—

“Provided, however, that the board may, in its absolute discretion, waive the payment of interest at the prescribed rate referred to in the preceding provisions of this section, and may, in lieu thereof, determine that interest up to double the agreed rate shall be payable on the instalment in default for the period commencing on the date on which the instalment was due and ending on the date on which the instalment was paid.”.

අත්හැරීමට යෝජනා කළ වචන කෙටුම්පත් පනතේ කොටසක් හැටියට නිතිස යුතුය යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදීත්, නිෂ්ප්‍රභ විය.

விடப்படவேண்டுமென பிரேரிக்கப்பட்ட சொற்கள் மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்கவேண்டுமெனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு நிராகரிக்கப்பட்டது.

අනික් වචන එතැනට එකතු කළ යුතුය, යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදීත්, සහසම්මත විය.

அந்தச் சொற்கள் இங்கே சேர்க்கப்பட வேண்டும் எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

වගන්තිය සංශෝධිතාකාරයෙන් කෙටුම්පත් පනතෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට නිතිස යුතුය, යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදීත්, සහසම්මත විය.

வாசகம், திருத்தப் பெற்றவாறு மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமெனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

45 වන වගන්තිය, සංශෝධිතාකාරයෙන් කෙටුම්පත් පනතෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට නිතිස යුතුයයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.

45 ஆம் வாசகம், திருத்தப்பெற்றவாறு மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமென ஆணையிடப்

கேள்வியைக் குறித்து வந்தது அல்லது
[சுருக்கமாக] அதன் கருத்து

—கூடுதல் கருத்து

Question, that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill, put, and negatived.

Question, that those words be there inserted, put, and agreed to.

Question, that the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill, put and agreed to.

Clause 45, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

46 வது பிரேரணைக் கிடைக்க 50 வது பிரேரணைக் கிடைக்கப் பட்டதென்பதைக் கவனத்தில் கொண்டு அதை நிராகரிக்க வேண்டும்.

46 ஆம் வாசகத்திலிருந்து 50 ஆம் வாசகம் வரை மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமென ஆணை யிடப்பட்டது.

Clauses 46 to 50 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

CLAUSE 51.—(Insertion of new section 98A in Act No. 11 of 1963

பெர்னாட் சாய்ஸா.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சாய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

I move,

"In page 43, to leave out all words in lines 24 to 35."

I am moving to delete the whole of Part II. The reason is this. This is the clause by means of which the Hon. Minister is staying the operation of the parallel provision of the Finance Act which applies to the People's Bank. We make the request that the Hon. Minister should allow both banks to continue to function. He should allow the People's Bank to continue doing this work and also allow this bank to do this work.

பெர்னாட் சாய்ஸா

(கேள்வியை வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

The commission does not recommend that.

பெர்னாட் சாய்ஸா.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சாய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

The People's Bank Act has provision for the Minister to give special

and general directions to the bank, but it would appear that this has been reversed now and the bank is giving special and general directions to the Minister.

பெர்னாட் சாய்ஸா

(கேள்வியை வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

No. It was recommended by the commission.

பெர்னாட் சாய்ஸா.

(கேள்வியை ம. பி. ரு. குணவர்தன)

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

The People's Bank is to act in the outstations.

பெர்னாட் சாய்ஸா.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சாய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Let us know what the Hon. Minister has to say on the subject. Let him get up and say it. Let that go down on record so that we shall know what he has said. I have moved the amendment. Let us hear what he has to say.

பெர்னாட் சாய்ஸா

(கேள்வியை வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I said that we shall make use of the People's Bank branches.

சபாபதி

(அக்கிராசனார்)

(The Chairman)

Does the Hon. Minister accept the amendment?

பெர்னாட் சாய்ஸா

(கேள்வியை வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

No.

பெர்னாட் சாய்ஸா.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சாய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

The Hon. Minister says he is prepared to give certain assurances in regard to this matter. I do not want those assurances given sotto voce. Let him get up and say it.

கேள்விகள், பதில்கள், வினாக்கள்
[செனதா] பதில்கள்

—கனக சபை

செனதா

(கேள்விகள் வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I said that we shall make use of the People's Bank branches in the working of this scheme if and when it becomes necessary.

செனதா

(கனகசபை என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

"If and when it becomes necessary" means that they will never be used.

செனதா

(கேள்விகள் வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

No. If it becomes necessary we shall use them. If it is not necessary, then why use them? Surely, we must have the discretion? Whether it is necessary or not, you want us to use them. There is no point in that.

செனதா

(கனகசபை என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

It only means this, that you must be prepared to use the branches. "If and when necessary" may mean that even if the necessity arises you may not use them. This provision will give you the discretion to use or not to use the People's Bank branches in the matter of debt redemption. There are properties in various parts of the country. If the People's Bank branch in a particular area is competent to do that job, why do you not use it for the purpose instead of getting the people to come all the way to the State Mortgage Bank here?

செனதா

(கேள்விகள் வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

That is the intention. So, you must not go half way and say, "You must do it and this is the only way you can do it and in no other way."

செனதா

(கனகசபை என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

When you say "if and when necessary", it gives too wide a discretion. Whenever the occasion arises you must use it. That is what is wanted.

செனதா

(கேள்விகள் வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

All right.

செனதா

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

If the Hon. Minister will state that a person in any part of the Island who has got this problem and who wants debt redemption relief will be entitled to go to the nearest People's Bank branch and transact his business with the People's Bank branch in relation to the operation of this Act, that is all we want.

செனதா

(கேள்விகள் என். பி. ஜார். குணவர்தன)

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

There is nothing to prevent the State Mortgage Bank from opening branches in the outstations.

செனதா

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

If they have a branch which operates on the spot, then there is nothing to be said.

செனதா

(கேள்விகள் வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

We are trying to make it as convenient as possible.

செனதா

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

The question is whose convenience.

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්

—කාරක සභාව

[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

It must be the customer's convenience, not the bank's convenience.

සභාපති

(அக்கிராசனார்)

(The Chairman)

Is the Hon. Minister prepared to accept the amendment?

ගරු වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

No.

අත්හැරීමට යෝජනා කළ වචන වගන්තියේ කොටසක් හැටියට තිබිය යුතුය යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදී, සහසම්මත විය.

NEW CLAUSE 17.—(Amendment of section 35 of the principal enactment)

'Amendment of section 35 of the principal enactment.

17. Section 35 of the principal enactment is hereby amended, in paragraph (a) of that section, by the substitution, for the words "the bank upon the security of mortgates", of the words "the bank."

ඉදිරිපත් කරන ලදී, පළමුවන වර කියවන ලදී.

கொண்டுவரப்பட்டு முதன் முறை மதிப்பிடப்பட்டது.

Brought up, and read the First time.

ගරු වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I move,

"That the clause be read a Second time."

වගන්තිය දෙවන වර කියවිය යුතුය, යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදී, සහසම්මත විය.

වගන්තිය කෙටුම්පත් පණතට එකතු කළ යුතුය, යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදී, සහසම්මත විය.

17 වන අළුත් වගන්තිය කෙටුම්පත් පනතෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට තිබිය යුතුයයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.

வாசகம் இரண்டாம் முறையாக மதிப்பிடப்படவேண்டுமெனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

வாசகம் மசோதாவில் சேர்க்கப்பட வேண்டுமெனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக் கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

17 ஆம் புதிய வாசகம் மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமென ஆணையிடப்பட்டது.

Question, that the Clause be read a Second time, put, and agreed to.

Question, that the Clause be added to the Bill, put, and agreed to.

New Clause 17 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

ලංකා රජයේ උකස් බැංකු හා මුදල්
[සංශෝධන] පනත් කෙටුම්පත
—කාරක සභාව

ගිනිකුරු නිෂ්පාදන නියෝග

NEW CLAUSE 42.—(Amendment of
section 98 of the principal enact-
ment)

'Amendment of
section 98
of the
principal
enactment.

42. Section 98 of the principal enactment is hereby amended
as follows:—

(1) in sub-section (1) of that section, by the substitution,
for the words "A director or a member of a branch
board", of the words "A director"; and

(2) in the marginal note to that section, by the substitution,
for the words "directors, members of branch boards,"
of the word "directors".

ද්විதීපත් කරන ලදින්, පළමුවන වර කියවන
ලදී.

கொண்டு வரப்பட்டு முதன்முறை மதிப்பிடப்பட்டது.
Brought up, and read the First time.

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I move,

"That the clause be read a Second
time."

වගන්තිය දෙවන වර කියවිය යුතුය, යන
ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදින්, සභාසම්මත විය.

වගන්තිය කෙටුම්පත් පනතට එකතු කළ
යුතුය, යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදින්, සභාසම්මත
විය.

42 වන අළුත් වගන්තිය කෙටුම්පත් පනතෙහි
කොටසක් හැටියට තිබිය යුතුයයි නියෝග කරන
ලදී.

வாசகம் இரண்டாம் முறையாக மதிப்பிடப்படவேண்டு
மெனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

வாசகம் மசோதாவில் சேர்க்கப்பட வேண்டுமெனும்
வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக் கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

42 ஆம் புதிய வாசகம் மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக
இருக்க வேண்டுமென ஆணையிடப்பட்டது.

Question, that the Clause be read a
Second time, put, and agreed to.

Question, that the Clause be added to
the Bill, put, and agreed to.

New Clause 42 ordered to stand part
of the Bill.

ප්‍රඥප්ති වගන්තිය සහ නාමය කෙටුම්පත්
පනතෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට තිබිය යුතුයයි
නියෝග කරන ලදී.

කෙටුම්පත් පනත, සංශෝධන සහිතව, වර්තමා
කරන ලදී.

சட்டமாக வாசகமும் தலைப்பும் மசோதாவின் பகுதி
யாக இருக்க வேண்டுமென ஆணையிடப்பட்டது.

மசோதா திருத்தங்களுடன் ஏற்றுக் கொள்ளப்பட
டதாக அறிவிக்கப்பட்டது.

Enacting Clause and Title ordered to
stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported with Amendments.

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I move,

"That the Bill, as amended, be now
read the Third time."

ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදින්, සභාසම්මත විය.

කෙටුම්පත් පනත ඊට අනුකූලව සංශෝධිත
කාරයෙන්, තුන්වනවර කියවා සම්මත කරන ලදී.

வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு, ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது. அதன்
படி மசோதா திருத்தப்பட்டவாறு மூன்றாம் முறையாக
மதிப்பிடப்பெற்று நிறைவேற்றப் பெற்றது.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill, as amended, accordingly read the
Third time, and passed.

ගිනිකුරු නිෂ්පාදන නියෝග

தீப்பெட்டி உற்பத்திப் பிரமாணங்கள்

MANUFACTURE OF MATCHES
REGULATIONS

අ. හා. 6.30

ශ්‍රී ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන

(கௌரவ டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)
(The Hon. D. P. R. Gunawardena)

I move,

"That the regulations made by the
Minister of Industries and Fisheries
under Section 9 of the Manufacture of

ගිනිකුරු නිෂ්පාදන නියෝග

ගිනිකුරු නිෂ්පාදන නියෝග

[ශ්‍රී ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන]

Matches (Regulation) Act, No. 6 of 1963, and published in Ceylon Government Gazette No. 14,778 of 8th December, 1967, which were presented on 12th January, 1968, be approved."

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Shall we discuss Items 14 and 15 together?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

No. Let us get through Item 14, which deals with the quantum of output.

ශ්‍රී ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන

(கௌரவ டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

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

At present there is a limit on the amount of matches that a particular firm can produce. It is 17,000 cases. We want to raise it from 17,000 to 20,000 cases.

The regulations made under the Manufacture of Matches (Regulation) Act, No. 6 of 1963, and published in the Ceylon Government Gazette No. 13,826 of November 22, 1963, provided that no manufacturer shall, during any period of twelve months, produce a quantity of matches (a) in excess of 17,000 cases of matches, and (b) less than 600 cases of matches.

There is a lower limit as well as an upper limit. It is now proposed to amend this regulation to increase the upper limit to 20,000 cases because sometimes we find that we have to import from other countries in order to make up the deficit.

The average annual demand for matches in this country has been estimated at 36,000 cases. I think that too is an under-estimate. This of course means that 36,000 cases would be the average number of cases of matches of good quality that would be required. It has however been found that quite a large percentage of the safety matches that are now available to the consumer are of doubtful quality. If we assume that 30 per cent of the annual demand—this would be a very conservative estimate—consists of matches of inferior quality, this would mean that the demand for matches would be 46,800 cases. We would expect 36,000 cases of good quality matches out of an overall production of 46,800 cases of all qualities.

To fix an upper limit of 20,000 cases would therefore not confer any monopolistic advantage to a single firm as this would be even less than fifty per cent of the total estimated demand, and any one of the firms would be free to come up to this prescribed ceiling limit.

The installed capacity of the existing match firms is as follows :

		First shift No. of cases	Second shift No. of cases
Ceylon Match Company Limited 18,000	.. 11,000
Lanka Light 8,000	.. No second shift
Nugaduwa Match Works 1,500	.. 1,500
Sinha Industries Limited 2,000	.. No second shift
National Match Works 2,500	.. 1,986
Thambakarana Sons & Co. 2,160	.. No second shift
United Industries 7,200	.. 4,800
Total : 41,760	.. 19,280

ගිනිකුරු නිෂ්පාදන නියෝග

ගිනිකුරු නිෂ්පාදන නියෝග

[ලේස්ලි ගුණවර්ධන මයා.]

යට මා සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම එකඟ වන බව පළමුවෙන්ම කියන්නට කැමතියි. ගිනි පෙට්ටි “කෝස්ස්” 36,000 ක් ප්‍රමාණවත් වෙතැයි කමිත්ත අමාත්‍යාංශයෙන් ඇස්තමේන්තු කර ඇති බව දැනගන්නට ලැබුණා. “කෝස්ස්” එකක ගිනි පෙට්ටි 7,200 ක් තිබෙනවා. ඒ අනුව බලන කොට එක්කෝටි විසිලක්ෂයක් තරම් ඇතැයි කියා සිතන්නට පුළුවන්. වර්තමාන ජනගහනය ගැන සලකන විට එක් තැනැත්තකුට එක් මාසයක් තුළදී පාවිච්චි කරන්නට පුළුවන් වන්නේ ගිනි පෙට්ටි දෙකක් පමණයි. මෙය කිසි සේත්ම ප්‍රමාණවත් වන්නේ නැහැ. මේ “එක් තැනැත්තා” සලකා තිබෙන්නේ ලමයි නූත් ගණන් ගැනීමෙනුයි. නමුත් ඒක වුණත් ප්‍රමාණවත් නැත කියා මා කියනවා. හේතු කීපයක් තිබෙනවා. එක් හේතුවක් නම් සමහර ගිනිකුරු පත්තු නොවීමයි. සමහර ගිනිකුරු පත්තු කරන විට බෝම්බ වාගේය කියා දොම්පේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාර නායක මයා.) කීව්වා; නමුත් සමහර ගිනිකුරු පත්තු වෙන්නේ නැහැ.

ගරු ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන

(கௌரவ டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)
(The Hon. D. P. R. Gunawardena)

ඒව “සේෆ්ටි මැටස්!” [බාබා කිරීමක්]

ලේස්ලි ගුණවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. லெஸ்லி குணவர்தன)
(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

තවත් හේතුවක් තිබෙනවා. එම හේතුව ඉදිරිපත් කිරීම ගැන තමුන්තාත්සේ මා සමග අමනාප නොවිය යුතුයි. අපේ බොහෝ දෙනා මේ යාපනේ සුරුවිටි බොනවා. යාපනේ සුරුවුවක් පත්තු කරන්නට අඩු වශයෙන් ගිනිකුරු හතරක් වත් පත්තු කරන්නට සිද්ධ වන බව තමුන්තාත්සේලා දන්නවා ඇති. ඒකත්

එක්තරා හේතුවක්. මෙවැනි හේතූන් කීපයක් කරණකොටගෙන කර්මාන්ත අමාත්‍යාංශය ලංකාවට වර්ෂයකට වුවමනා සම්පූර්ණ ගිනි පෙට්ටි ප්‍රමාණය කෝස්ස් 36,000 ක් කියා කර තිබෙන තක්සේරු ව කිසිසේත්ම ප්‍රමාණවත් නොවන බව මා පෙන්වා දෙන්නට සතුටුයි. ගරු ඇමති තුමා ඒ කාරණය පිළිගැනීම ගැන මා සතුටු වෙනවා.

ගරු ඇමතිතුමා තේරුම් අරගෙන නැති තවත් කාරණයක් මෙතැන තිබෙනවා. ඒ කාරණය මේකයි. මහජනතාවට වුවමනා ප්‍රමාණයට වඩා අඩුවෙන් ගිනි පෙට්ටි නිෂ්පාදනය කිරීම හේතුකොටගෙන ඇති වි තිබෙන ගිනි පෙට්ටි හිඟයේ තේරුමක් නැත කියා සිතීම වැරදියි. ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම එහි තේරුමක් තිබෙනවා. මොකක්ද එය? අද නානාප්‍රකාර කුඩා ගිනි පෙට්ටි කර්මාන්ත ශාලා තිබෙනවා. පත්තු නොවන ගිනිකුරු සාදන, එහෙම නැත්නම් වුවමනාවට වඩා පත්තු වන ගිනිකුරු සාදන, බොහොම අදක්ෂ විධියට ගිනිකුරු සාදන නොයෙක් කමිත්ත ශාලා තිබෙනවා. මේවායේ සාදන ගිනි පෙට්ටි විකිණීම බොහොම අමාරුයි. මක්නිසද, මහජනතාව ඒවා මිල දී නොගන්න නිසයි. මහජනතාව ඒවා මිල දී ගන්නට කැමති නැහැ. අර කැලණියේ “අලියා” ගිනි පෙට්ටිවලට නම් කවුරුත් කැමතියි. ඒකට හේතුව “අලියෙක්” සිටින නිසා නොවෙයි, පත්තු වන නිසයි. තවත් නොයෙක් ලකුණු දරන ගිනි පෙට්ටි තිබෙනවා. මහජනතාව ඒවා මිලයට ගන්නට කැමති නැහැ. හොඳ තත්ත්වයේ ගිනි පෙට්ටිවල හිඟයක් නොතිබුණොත් කවදාවත් අර තරක ගිනි පෙට්ටි විකුණා ගන්නට පුළුවන් වන්නේ නැහැ. හොඳ ගිනි පෙට්ටිවල හිඟයක් තිබුණාම තමයි ඒ පත්තු නොවන, නැත්නම් වුවමනාවට වඩා පත්තු වන, තරක ගිනිකුරු සහිත ගිනි පෙට්ටි මහජනතාවට මිල දී ගන්නට සිද්ධ වෙන්නේ. කඩේකට ගියා ම හොඳ වගීයක ගිනි පෙට්ටි නැත්නම් තිබෙන ගිනි පෙට්ටියක්, පත්තු නොවන එහෙම නැත්නම් වුවමනාවට වඩා පත්තු වන, පිපිරෙන ගිනිකුරු සහිත ගිනි පෙට්ටි යක් ගන්නට සිද්ධ වෙනවා.

ගිනිකුරු නිෂ්පාදන නියෝග

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

“ කාක්ක ” ගිනි පෙට්ටි ගන්නෙ නැහැ.

ලෙස්ලි ගුණවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. லெஸ்லி குணவர்தன)

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

එම නිසා මේ ගිනි පෙට්ටි හිඟය අද රියේ සිට තිබෙන එකක් නොවන බව මා ගරු ඇමතිතුමාට මුලින්ම මතක් කරන්නට සතුටුයි. මේක අවුරුදු ගණනාවක් තිස්සේම තිබෙන තත්ත්වයක්. මෙවැනි තත්ත්වයක් තිබීමේ අහිරහසක්, තේරුමක්, අරමුණක් තිබෙනවා. හොඳ ගිනි පෙට්ටිවල හිඟයක් තිබීමේ අහිරහස, තේරුම නැත්නම් අරමුණ අත් කිසිවක් නොවෙයි මහජනතාවට අර නරක ගිනි පෙට්ටි මිල දී ගන්නට බල කිරීමයි. හොඳ තත්ත්වයක ගිනි පෙට්ටි වුවමනා ප්‍රමාණයට මේ රටේ තිබෙනවා නම් මහජනතාව කවදාවත් ඒ නරක ගිනි පෙට්ටි මිල දී ගන්නෙ නැහැ. ඒ නරක ගිනි පෙට්ටි මහජනතාවට බලහත්කාරයෙන් විකිණීමට තිබෙන එකම ක්‍රමය තමයි හොඳ තත්ත්වයේ ගිනි පෙට්ටිවල හිඟයක් ඇති කිරීම. ඒ කාරණය අප මතක තබා ගත යුතුයි.

දෙවැනි කාරණය මේකයි. ගිනි පෙට්ටි නිෂ්පාදනය පිළිබඳව අද මේ රටේ ක්වෝටා ක්‍රමයක් නැත්නම් කොටස් පංගු ක්‍රමයක් තිබෙනවා. ඒ ඒ ගිනි පෙට්ටි කර්මාන්තශාලාවලට යම්කිසි ප්‍රමාණයක් ගිනි පෙට්ටි නිෂ්පාදනය කළ යුතුය කියා නියම කර තිබෙනවා. මේ කොටස් පංගු ක්‍රමය මුලින්ම ඇති වුයේ 1938 වර්ෂයේදීය කියා මා කල්පනා කරනවා. එවකට සිටි ඩී. එස්. සේනානායක මහත්මයා තමයි මේ කොටස් පංගු ක්‍රමය ඇති කළේ. එහි අරමුණ වුයේ ගිනි පෙට්ටි සාදන ලාංකික කාර්මිකයන්ට ආධාරයක් කිරීමයි. ඒ කාලයේදී එය ස්වදේශීය කර්මාන්තයක් දියුණු කිරීමට රුකුලක්, මාර්ගයක් වන්නට ඉඩ තිබුණු නමුදු අද එය වෙනත් ස්වරූපයක් අරන් තිබෙන බව අපට පිළිගන්නට සිදු වී තිබෙනවා. “ ක්වෝටා ” ක්‍රමයට ගිනිපෙට්ටි නිෂ්පාදනය කිරීමේ ප්‍රතිඵලයක් වශයෙන් එහි වන්දිය, පාඩුව දරන්නට සිදු වී තිබෙන්නේ මහජනතාවටයි. ඒ නිසා මේ

ගිනිකුරු නිෂ්පාදන නියෝග

ක්‍රමය තව දුරටත් ගෙන යනවාද නැද්ද යන්න ගැන ගරු ඇමතිතුමා තීරණයක් ගත යුතුව තිබෙනවා. එය, එම බැන්ඩ රෝල් ප්‍රමාණයම දහහත, විස්සකට වැඩි කිරීමෙන් පමණක් විසඳන්නට පුළුවන් ප්‍රශ්නයක් නොවෙයි. එයින් ඇති වන යහපත කුමක්ද? එයින් ඇති වන්නේ හිසේ කැක්කුමට කොට්ටය මාරු කිරීමක් වැනි දෙයක් මිස වෙන කිසිම වෙනසක් නොවෙයි. ඒ නිසා මිට වඩා ගම්හිර ලෙස කල්පනා කර බලා, මහජනයාගේ පොදු යහපතට හේතු වන ආකාරයට ප්‍රයෝජනයක් ලබා දීම සඳහා කොයි ආකාරයක ප්‍රතිසංස්කරණයක් කරන්නට ඕනෑදැයි සොයා බලා, ගනු ලබන පියවරකින් විය යුතුයි, මෙය විසඳන්නට පුළුවන් වන්නේ.

ගිනිපෙට්ටියක් මුල් කාලයේ දී ශතය බැගින්ම විකුණන ලද්දේ. දැන් එය ශත පහකටත් ඉහල නැගලා. අමුතුවෙන් කල්පනා කර, මේ ප්‍රශ්නය සතුටුදායක ලෙස විසඳන්නට ඕනෑය යන හැඟීම ඇති ව හොඳ වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් ඇති කළොත් ඒ විධියට ඉහල මිලකට විකුණන්නට කිසිම වුවමනාවක් නැහැ. ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම ශත පහකට නොව, ඊට වඩා අඩුවට ගිනි පෙට්ටියක් මහජනයා අතට පැමිණවීමට ඉඩ තිබෙනවා. විශේෂයෙන්ම බැරෑරුම් ප්‍රශ්නයක්ව පවතින ජීවන වියදම—ජීවන අංකය වැඩි වෙගන යන නිසා මෙවැනි වර්තමාන ආණ්ඩුවට හිසරදයක්ව පවතින කාලයක අඩු වශයෙන් ගිනිපෙට්ටියක මිලවත් අඩු කරන්නට පුළුවන් නම් ඒ සුළු ප්‍රමාණයටවත් ජීවන අංකය පහල දැමීමය කියන්නට පුළුවන් වෙනවා. එවැනි තත්ත්වයක් ඇති වුණොත් එහි ශෝරවය ගරු කර්මාන්ත ඇමතිතුමාට හිමි වන ආකාරයට වුවත් මේ ප්‍රශ්නය විසඳන්නට ක්‍රියා කරනවා නම් හොඳයි කියා මා කල්පනා කරනවා.

ක්වෝටා ක්‍රමය ගැන වචනයක් කියන්නට කැමතියි. මේ ක්‍රමයෙන් වැඩක් නැහැ. බැන්ඩරෝල් ක්‍රමය 17 සිට 20 දක්වා වැඩි කරනවාය යයි ගරු ඇමතිතුමා කියනවා. එයින් වාසියක් තිබෙනවා යයිද එතුමා කියනවා. කොයි තරම් වාසියක් තිබෙනවා ය කිව්වත් එයින් වැඩක් වන්නේ නැහැ. කොයි තරම් වැඩිපුර නිෂ්පාදනය කරන්නට අවසරය දුන්නත්, නිෂ්පාදකයින්—

ගිනිකුරු නිෂ්පාදන නියෝග

[ලෙස්ලි ගුණවර්ධන මයා.]

කර්මාන්තකාරයින්—ඒ වැඩි කළ ප්‍රමාණය අනුව නිෂ්පාදනය කරන්නේ නැහැ. ක්වෝටා එක දීලා ඇති. එහෙත්, දෙන ලද ඒ ක්වෝටා එක අනුව හදන්නේ නැහැ. ඒක තමයි දැන් මෙතැන වෙලා තියෙන්නේ. අද ක්වෝටා දී තිබෙන ප්‍රමාණයට එකම කාර්මිකයෙක්වත් නිෂ්පාදනය කරන්නේ නැහැ. ඒ නිසා තමයි වෂීයක් වෂීයක් පාසා ගිනිපෙට්ටි හිඟයක් තිබෙනවාය කියමින් පිටරටවලින් මේ රටට ගිනිපෙට්ටි ගෙන්වා ගන්නට අපට සිඬ වෙලා තියෙන්නේ. වෂීයක් වෂීයක් පාසා පිටරටවලින් වැඩි වැඩියෙන් ගිනි පෙට්ටි ආනයනය කරන්නට රජයට සිඬ වෙනවා. ගිනිපෙට්ටි හිඟයක් ඇතැයි කියමින් රජය අවුරුදු පතා ගිනිපෙට්ටි ගෙන් බීම ගැන කමින්න ඇමතිතුමාගේ ගරු පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමා නම් ටිකක් දන්නවා. ගිය වර්ෂයේදී, නැත්නම් මේ වර්ෂයේ මුල් කාලයේදී, පිටරටවලින් ගිනි පෙට්ටි ගෙන්වා ගැනීමට රජයට සිද්ධ වුණේ “අලියා” කොම්පැනියේ ගිය වර්ෂයේදී සිදු වූ වැඩ වර්ජනය නිසායයි කියන්නට එපා. එය එක් හේතුවකැයි පිළිගන්නට පුළුවනි. එහෙත් ඊට වඩා හේතු තිබෙනවා. ඒ හැම එකක්ම කියන්නට ගියොත් වැඩ වරදින්නට පුළුවනි. වැඩ වර්ජන නො තිබුණු වෂීවලත් පිටරටවලින් ගිනිපෙට්ටි ආනයනය කරන්නට රජයට සිද්ධවෙලා තියෙනවා. මේ රටේ නිෂ්පාදනය කරනු ලබන ගිනිපෙට්ටි ප්‍රමාණය, අවශ්‍යතාවත් සමග සසඳන විට ප්‍රමාණවත් නොවන නිසා ඇති වූ හිඟය හේතු කොට ගෙනයි එවැත්තක් සිදු වුණේ.

එමනිසා, පිළිතුරු දෙන අවස්ථාවේදී මේ සියල්ලටම හේතුව ගිය අවුරුද්දේ තිබුණු වැඩ වර්ජනය කියන කාරණය ඉදිරිපත් කොට බේරෙන්න උත්සාහ නොගන්නා ලෙස පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමාට මතක් කරන්න කැමතියි. ගිය අවුරුද්දේ වැඩ වර්ජනයක් තිබුණු බවත්, එයින් සැහෙන ප්‍රමාණයකට නිෂ්පාදනයෙහි අඩුවක් වුණු බවත්, අප පිළිගන්නවා. නමුත් ඒක නොවෙයි මූලික හේතුව. ඊට වඩා වැදගත් හේතුවක් තිබුණු බව මතක් කර දෙන්න කැමතියි. ගිය අවුරුද්දේ පමණක් නොවෙයි මෙයට පෙර අවස්ථාවලදීත් ගිනි පෙට්ටි හිඟ

ගිනිකුරු නිෂ්පාදන නියෝග

විම් ඇති වී පිටරටින් ආනයන කරන්න සිද්ධ වුණු බව අප දන්නවා. එම නිසා ගිය වර්ෂයේ ඇති වුණු හිඟයට හේතුව ගැන සඳහන් කරන විට වැඩ වර්ජනය ගැන සඳහන් කර නියම හේතුව වසන් කිරීමට උත්සාහ නොගන්නා ලෙස ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා. මෙතෙක් පවත්වා ගෙන ආ ක්වෝටා ක්‍රමය නැති කර දැමීමේ කාලය දැන් පැමිණ තිබෙනවා. ක්වෝටා ක්‍රමයෙන් ඩී. එස්. සේනානායක මහත්මයා ගෙ කාලයේදී යම් කිසි ප්‍රයෝජනයක් සැලසුණත් දැන් නම් මෙම කර්මාන්තයට සැලසෙන ප්‍රයෝජනයක් නැති බව පිළිගන්න සිද්ධ වී තිබෙනවා. එසේ වුණත් වර්තමාන ආණ්ඩුව, බලයට පත් වූවාට පසුව තමන් ගෙ කීප දෙනකුට අලුතෙන් ක්වෝටා දී තිබෙනවා.

ගරු ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන

(கௌரவ டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

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

කාටවත් දී නැහැ, එය සම්පූර්ණ අසත්‍යයක්.

ලෙස්ලි ගුණවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. லெஸ்லி குணவர்தன)

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

මෙයට පිළිතුරු දෙන අවස්ථාවේදී, වතී මාන ආණ්ඩුව යටතේ කොපමණ දෙනකුට අලුතෙන් ඉඩ දී තිබෙනවාද, දැනට කී දෙනකු ලබා තිබෙනවාද, ආදී කාරණා ගැන පැහැදිලි විස්තරයක් කරන මෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා. නමුත් මට ලැබී ඇති ආරංචිවල හැටියට, මෙම අලුත් ආණ්ඩුව බලයට පත් වුණාට පසුව තම පක්ෂයේ අනුගාමිකයන්ට, හිතවතුන්ට, අවස්ථා සලසා දී තිබෙනවා. දේශපාලන වශයෙන් වාසි ලබාගැනීමේ අදහසින් ක්වෝටා එකේ ප්‍රමාණය වැඩි කර තිබෙනවා, අලුතෙන් ක්වෝටා දී තිබෙනවා.

මෙම ප්‍රශ්නයේදී විශේෂයෙන්ම සිහි පත් කළ යුතු කාරණය නම් මෙයයි. එනම්, අද විශාල විදේශික සමාගම් දෙකක් මෙම ගිනිපෙට්ටි කමින්නයට සම්බන්ධ වී ඇති බවයි. මට දැනගන්න ලැබී ඇති හැටියට, අලියා ගිනි පෙට්ටි සමාගම ස්විඩන් රටේ සමාගමක් සම්බන්ධ කර ගෙනයි ගිනිපෙට්ටි නිපදවන්නේ. මෙම ආරංචිය වැරදියි කියනවා නම් ඒ ගැන කරුණු පැහැදිලි කරනවා ඇතැයි මා බලාපොරොත්තු

ගිනිකුරු නිෂ්පාදන නියෝග

වෙනවා. එම සමාගමේ කොටස්වලින් සිය යට 58ක් විදේශීය සමාගමකටත්, සියයට 42ක් ලාංකිකයන්ටත් අයත් බව මට දැනගන්න ලැබී තිබෙනවා. මේ අනුව ලාංකිකයන්ට කොටස් ප්‍රමාණයක් තිබුණත් වැඩි බලය ඇත්තේ ස්විඩන් රටේ කොම්පැනි කාර්මිකයන්ට බව පෙනී යනවා. මේ අන්දමට විදේශික සමාගමකට කොටස් අයිති තවත් ගිනි පෙට්ටි නිපදවන සමාගමක් තිබෙනවා. මට ලැබී ඇති ආරංචිවල හැටියට ‘කාකා’ ගිනි පෙට්ටි සමාගම අයිති නාඩාර්ලා වගේකටයි. එපමණක් නොවෙයි මේ නාඩාර්ලා විදේශිකයෝ. යම් විධියකින් ගරු ඇමතිතුමා කියනවා නම් ඒ අය විදේශිකයෝ නොවෙයි, එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ ආණ්ඩුව යටතේ පුරවැසිභාවය ලැබූ, වරප්‍රසාද ලත් පුරවැසියන් පිරිසක් කියා, එහෙම නම් මම එය පිළිගන්න සූදානම්. නමුත් මට දැනගන්න ලැබී තිබෙන්නේ ඒ අය පුරවැසි භාවයවත් නොලත් විදේශිකයන් පිරිසක් බවයි. අඩු වශයෙන් වරප්‍රසාද ලත් පුරවැසියන්වත් නොවන පිරිසක් බවයි.

මේ ප්‍රශ්නය හරිහැටි තේරුම් ගත්තම් නම් තවත් එක කාරණයක් කියන්න ඕනෑ. අලියා ගිනිපෙට්ටි සමාගම තිබෙන්නේ ස්විඩන් රටෙයි. ඒ කොම්පැනිය තමන්ගේ ලංකාවේ ඒජන්තවරුන් වශයෙන් ලාංකික සමාගමක් පත් කරගෙන සිටිනවා. ඒ ලාංකික සමාගම දෙත් කරෝලිස් සහ පුත්‍ර සමාගමයි.

ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(කෙළරාව අරුත්තවාර් ඉරුවාර්)
(An hon. Member)
කවුද, ඒ ?

ලෙස්ලි ගුනවර්ධන මයා.

(තිරු. ලෙස්ලි ගුනවාර්තන)
(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

කවුද ඒ කියන එක ඇමතිතුමාගෙන් අහන්න. ඇමතිතුමා හොඳට දන්නවා.

ගරු ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුනවර්ධන

(කෙළරාව ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුනවාර්තන)
(The Hon. D. P. R. Gunawardena)

නැහැ. තමුත්තාත්සෙන් ඒ වගේම දන්නවා. තමුත්තාත්සේගෙන් තැයෙනේ.

ගිනිකුරු නිෂ්පාදන නියෝග

ලෙස්ලි ගුනවර්ධන මයා.

(තිරු. ලෙස්ලි ගුනවාර්තන)
(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

නැකම ගැන මම කලා කරන්නේ නැහැ. ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කලානායකතුමනි, යම්කිසි ප්‍රශ්නයක් ගැන කලා කරන විට කර්මාන්ත ඇමතිතුමාට නිතරම මතක් වෙන්නේ නැකම ගැනයි. එහෙත් දේශපාලන පක්ෂපාතීත්වය අනුව කල්පනා කරනවා නම් මේ දෙත් කරෝලිස් කොම්පැනිය මොකක්ද කියන එක ගැන මට වඩා හොඳට ඇමතිතුමා දැන ගත්ත ඕනෑ බවයි මම කියන්නේ.

ස්විඩන් රටේ සමාගමකට වැඩි කොටස් අයිතිව තිබෙන අලියා ගිනිපෙට්ටි සමාගමේ මේ රටේ නියෝජිතයන් වශයෙන් ක්‍රියා කරන්නේ දෙත් කරෝලිස් සහ පුත්‍ර සමාගමයි.

ගරු ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුනවර්ධන

(කෙළරාව ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුනවාර්තන)
(The Hon. D. P. R. Gunawardena)
7 වෙන තුරු ජේත කියනවා වගෙයි.

ලෙස්ලි ගුනවර්ධන මයා.

(තිරු. ලෙස්ලි ගුනවාර්තන)
(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

ඇමතිතුමාට ටිකක් රත්වේගන එන බව තමි පෙනෙන්නට තිබෙනවා.

ගරු ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුනවර්ධන

(කෙළරාව ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුනවාර්තන)
(The Hon. D. P. R. Gunawardena)
“ සේප්පි මැව් ” රත් වෙන්නේ නැහැ.

ලෙස්ලි ගුනවර්ධන මයා.

(තිරු. ලෙස්ලි ගුනවාර්තන)
(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කලානායකතුමනි, රත් වෙන්නේ මොකද කියන එක මා දැන් කියන්න යන කාරණයෙන් තමුත්තාත්සේට අවබෝධ වෙනවා ඇති. නැකමක් තැනි වුණත්, මේ දෙත් කරෝලිස් සහ පුත්‍ර සමාගම සමග ඇමතිතුමාගේ දේශපාලන නැකම තිබෙනවා. ඒ නිසා තමයි, කියන්නටත් ඉස්සර රත් වීගෙන එන්නේ.

கிநிகுரு நிதீபாடன நியோன

ஸர் டி. பி. ஃபார். குனவர்டன

(கௌரவ டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

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

தமிழ்நாந்ஃசெனெ டேனபாடன நுகுமீ
நியெந்நெ மெவலெநுந்நந் தீக்.க.

லெஸ்டி குனவர்டன மியா.

(திரு. லெஸ்லி குணவர்தன)

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

ரந் வந லவ நமீ தம்திந்நாந்ஃசெ
ஃனெடவ நேரெநவ. டுந் பிபிரெந்
கிபிபுமி.

செல்டன் ஜயசிங்ஹ மியா.

(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

லிய வெந் வ பபா அபி மெநுந ஓந்நவ.

லெஸ்டி குனவர்டன மியா.

(திரு. லெஸ்லி குணவர்தன)

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

மம ஃய வெந்நெ நுகு. அமநிநும
ஓந்நெ ம ஃன நோவெமி; பார்டிமேந்
லேகமீநும ஃனநெ.

செல்டன் ஜயசிங்ஹ மியா.

(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

பீவ அபி லெ ஃந்நமீ.

லெஸ்டி குனவர்டன மியா.

(திரு. லெஸ்லி குணவர்தன)

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

பிபிரெ விபி ப்ரணேந் அஃவ, கநவ ஃ
வெநந் நுகுமீவ ஃந் வடிந்நெ பார்டி
மேந்நு லேகமீநுமஃனெமி.

செல்டன் ஜயசிங்ஹ மியா.

(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

பீக அபி லெ ஃந்நமீ.

லெஸ்டி குனவர்டன மியா.

(திரு. லெஸ்லி குணவர்தன)

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

வெந்நெ மோநவடி கியா அபி மே
புந்நெ ஓடெனெ லெ ஓந்நமீ.

கிநிகுரு நிதீபாடன நியோன

செல்டன் ஜயசிங்ஹ மியா.

(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

டூந் ஓநிந் 7 வெநகமீ கபா கெரு
கெருவெநெ.

லெஸ்டி குனவர்டன மியா.

(திரு. லெஸ்லி குணவர்தன)

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

7 நோவெமி, 12 வெந நுரு கபா கரந்
பூவநி. மே ஃந ப்ரணக் டேவலே கியந்
நிலெநவ. அசே அமநிநும நேருமீ
நோஃந் டேவலே அமநிநுமவ அவலெமி
கரவந் கிய ப்ரவ நிலெநவ. பார்டி
மேந்நு லேகமீநுமவ மேவ நேருமீ
கரல வஃக நுகு. பஃந் கரீமாத்ந
அமநிநுமவ நேருமீ கர டூந்நோந்
பரண அநிநயவந் மநக் கரஃநெ யமக்
கரந் ஓவ நிலெந லவ கிநாஃநெமி
மம மே கருணு ஃந ஃடஃந் கரந்நெ.

ஸர் நியோஜீத கபாநாயகநுமநி. ம
கலிந் மநக் கலாக் மேந், பிபிரெந
கிணீபெபிபி ஃந பந்நு நோவந கிநிகுரு
ஃடந பூவ கிணீபெபிபி கரீமாத்நஃன
கிபயக் மே ரபெ நிலெநவ. பீ டுபிய
நமந்ஃந் கிணீபெபிபி விநுணு ஃந்
பூவந்நகமக் நுகு. பஃந் பீ ஃமஃநி
கிணீபெபிபி விநுணு ஃந்நெ கபுருந்
மாரீஃயெந்? டேந் கரோலிஃ ஃந ப்ர
ஃமஃநி மாரீஃயெநுமி. டேந் கரோலிஃ
ஃமஃநி அலிய கிணீபெபிபி காரமிந்
நியோஜீதயந் வஃயெந் கிய கரநவ
பமணக் நோவ, ம கலிந் ஃடஃந் கப
விநுணு ஃந் லூரி கிணீபெபிபி நிதீப
டநய கரந டுபிய ஃமஃந் பீகநு வெ
கிபிநவ.

நியோஜீத கபாநாயகநும

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Order, please! Does the hon.
Member intend to take much more
time?

லெஸ்டி குனவர்டன மியா.

(திரு. லெஸ்லி குணவர்தன)

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

I shall take another half an hour or
so.

All-Ceylon Young Men's Muslim Association
Conference (Incorporation) Bill
[Senate]

நிஸேத் கபாநாயகர்

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

There are two Private Members' Bills which have been sent here from the Senate. In these few minutes before the Adjournment is moved they can be taken up if the House agrees. Does the House agree?

ஓர் உத்தரவு

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர்கள்)

(Hon. Members)

Aye!

நிஸேத் கபாநாயகர்

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Will the Hon. Minister move that the Debate be now adjourned.

ஓர் உத்தரவு

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I move,

"That the Debate be now adjourned."

புனிய விசேஷ டேன், சபாநாயகர்.

வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு, ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

Question put, and agreed to.

ஓர் உத்தரவு விசேஷ டேன்.

உத்தரவு விசேஷ 1968 ஜூன் 4 வது உத்தரவு
பதின்ம பதின்ம ரூபி.

இதன்படி விவாதம் ஒத்திவைக்கப்பட்டது.

விவாதம் 1968 ஜூலை 4 வியாழக்கிழமை மீளத் தொடங்கும்.

The Debate stood adjourned accordingly.

Debate to be resumed on Thursday, 4th July 1968.

ALL-CEYLON YOUNG MEN'S MUSLIM
ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE
(INCORPORATION) BILL
[SENATE]

தேவன வர் கியவீதே நிஸேத் கியவன டே.

இரண்டாம் மதிப்பிற்கான கட்டளை வாசிக்கப்பட்டது

Order for Second Reading read.

ஓர் உத்தரவு

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I move,

—தேவன வர் கியவீதே

"That the Bill be now read a Second time."

புனிய விசேஷ டேன், சபாநாயகர்.

கேபிளர் பதின்ம ஓர் உத்தரவு தேவன வர் கியவன டே.

வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

அதன்படி, மசோதா இரண்டாம் முறையாக மதிப்பிடப்பட்டது.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a Second time.

உத்தரவு விசேஷ டேன், சபாநாயகர்.

"கேபிளர் பதின்ம ஓர் உத்தரவு தேவன வர் கியவன டே."—[ஓர் உத்தரவு]

பின்வரும் பிரேரணை ஏற்றுக் கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

"மசோதா முழுச்சபைக் குழுவுக்குச் சாட்டப்படுமா."

[கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க]

Resolved:

"That the Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House."—[The Hon. Wanninayake.]

காரக சபாவைக் கீழ்க்கொண்டு டே.

[நிஸேத் கபாநாயகர் இலங்கை விசேஷ]

முழுச் சபைக் குழுவில் ஆராயப் பெற்றது.

[உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள் தலைமை தாங்கினார்கள்]

Considered in Committee.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair.]

1 வது உத்தரவு விசேஷ 11 வது உத்தரவு
தேன் கேபிளர் பதின்ம கையெழுத்து
நினைவு டே.

1 ஆம் வாசகத்திலிருந்து 11 ஆம் வாசகம் வரை
மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமென ஆணை
யிடப்பட்டது.

Clauses 1 to 11 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

உத்தரவு பதின்ம கேபிளர் கையெழுத்து
கையெழுத்து நினைவு டே.

அட்டவணை மசோதாவின் பகுதியாயிருக்க ஆணை
யிடப்பட்டது.

Schedule ordered to stand part of the Bill.

புனிய விசேஷ டேன், சபாநாயகர்
கையெழுத்து நினைவு டே.

முன்னுரை மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமென ஆணையிடப்பட்டது.

Preamble ordered to stand part of the Bill.

புனிய விசேஷ டேன், சபாநாயகர்
தேன் கேபிளர் கையெழுத்து
கையெழுத்து நினைவு டே.

All-Ceylon Young Men's Association
Conference (Incorporation) Bill
[Senate]

—கூரக ஸ்தாவ

கேபிளென் பன்ன, ஸ.ஸேவன ரகிதவ, வரீகா
கரன டீ.

சட்டமாக வாசகமும் தலைப்பும் மசோதாவின் பகுதி
யாக இருக்க வேண்டுமென ஆணையிடப்பட்டது.

மசோதா திருத்தமின்றி ஏற்றுக் கொள்ளப்பட்டதாக
அறிவிக்கப்பட்டது.

Enacting Clause and Title ordered to
stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported without Amendment.

செ. வந்தினாயக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I move,

"That the Bill be now read the Third
time."

புனிய விசை டீன், ஸ்கைலித வி.

கேபிளென் பன்ன ரீவ அனுகூலவ, துனவனவர
கியவ ஸ்கைலித கரன டீ.

வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு, ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

அதன்படி, மசோதா மூன்றாம் முறையாக மதிப்
பிடப்பெற்று நிறைவேற்றப் பெற்றது.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read the Third time,
and passed.

CEYLON NATIONAL CHAMBER OF
INDUSTRIES BILL
[SENATE]

செ. வந்தினாயக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Are we taking up this Bill ?

அலாபீச லீன். லி. பீ. பீ.

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Explain.

செ. மன்றியேவரேன்

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

Is this Mr. R. E. Jayatilaka's Bill ?

அலாபீச லீன். லி. பீ. பீ.

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

That is why I want somebody to
explain.—[Interruption]. And may I
say this. I have just come from

Madras ; I have heard about the
doings of the gentleman in Madras.
It is a disgrace to the whole country.
I think the Hon. Minister of Indus-
tries was there at the time and he
knows how this gentleman has dis-
graced this country. We do not want
to have anything to do with this Bill
if it is being sponsored at his in-
stance. That is why I want somebody
who is introducing this Bill to
explain.

நியோஜித கலாநாயகமூல

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Who is introducing this Bill ?

செ. வந்தினாயக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

This is a Bill brought from the
Senate, Sir, and they have gone into
it thoroughly.

அலாபீச லீன். லி. பீ. பீ.

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Who has gone into it ?

செ. வந்தினாயக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

The Senate.

அலாபீச லீன். லி. பீ. பீ.

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

That will not do. Please explain.
You are the sponsor in this House.

செ. வந்தினாயக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

We shall take it up on another
date.

நியோஜித கலாநாயகமூல

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

The Item will stand down.

கல் நூலிடு

கல் நூலிடு

ஒத்திவைப்பு

ADJOURNMENT

சுரு வந்தினாசக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I move,

"That the House do now adjourn."

புனிய விசேஷ டேன், ஸபாசமீதே விச.

வினா விடுக்கப்பெற்று ஏற்றுக் கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

Question put, and agreed to.

கல் நூலிடு

தேதி உண்டியல் 20 அனுக்கு
 ஈ. ஸ. 7.030 ஈடி டீன ஸபா சமீதே
 அது, 1968 ஜூன் 4 வன குஹ் பகித் ஈ
 ஈ. ஸ. 2 வன தைக் கல் கிசே ஸ.

அதன்படி. பி. ப. 7.03 மணிக்கு, சபை
 இன்றைய அதனது தீர்மானத்திற்கிணங்க,
 1968 ஜூலை 4, பி. ப. 2. மணிவரை
 ஒத்திவைக்கப்பெற்றது.

Adjourned accordingly at
 7.03 p.m. until 2 p.m. on
 Thursday, 4th July 1968, pur-
 suant to the Resolution of the
 House this Day.

பரிந்துரை

லோகாவே ஸா ஸபாசிய வேதன் விசேஷன்தி ஸா ஸபன் பூதேஸன்தி
 மஹ ராசேஸிய பூடி, பூடி ராசு மஹேஸியே அபிபதிதிய பூடி,
 தேவேதி பிசேஸனென் மஹ ராசேந்நதியேன் நாமசேதி.

புலகாசனிய

ஸ்ரீ லோகாதிபேசியே ஸா நதிய ஸபன் தேஸன்தி அபூஷ்விஹார் ஸா
 ஸேநாமிநாசக பூரின, விநாநாச அபிபாசியே அநி டிந்நம
 பபிபாபியேதி ஸாபாசியக பூ விசேஸி ஸோபலே டி
 டிநுமஹன் வஹ்ஸே விசிதி.

உதா

விசேஸி. ஸோபலே டி

1946 லோகா (ஈஷ்வி ஹு) ராசேஸா ஈஷுவே 15 வன வஹ்நியேன் மஹ வேத
 பவரது லூவி லேதலே பூஹார், அபூஷ்விஹார் விசேஸி ஸோபலே டி வன மஹ விசித். தே
 பூஹாசனியேன், 1968 ஜூன் மஹ விசேஸி டீன மஹ ராசியே பபன்
 பாரீலேதேன்நு வ கல் நலா, டீலா பாரீலேதேன்நு வாரியேதி ஈரமீதக டீன வஸியேன்
 1968 ஜூன் மஹ ஸன் வன டீன நியம கர்ந லிவ டீன ஸுது.

வசீ பன்டிஹ் நவசிய ஸபாபன் பூ ஜூன் மஹ விசேஸி டீன பூ தேடீன கோலூடி டீ
 தேன டீ.

டிநுமஹன் வஹ்ஸேனே அந பரிடி,

பி. வி. ஈல்கிபுவே,

அபூஷ்விஹார்நுமஹே லேகமீ.

அநுபந்தம்

இலங்கையினதும் மற்றும் அவரது ஏனைய இராச்சியங்கள்,
 ஆள்புலன்களினதும் அரசியும், பொதுநலவரசுத்
 தலைவியுமான, மாட்சிமைமிக்க இரண்டாவது
 எலிசபெத் மகாராணியாரின் பெயரால்

பிரகடனம்

இலங்கைத் தீவினதும் அதனைச் சார்ந்த நாடுகளினதும்
 மகாதேசாதிபதியும் முதற்பெரும்படைத் தலைவரும்
 பிரித்தானியப் பேரரசின் அதியுத்தம வரிசை
 உறுப்பினருமான அதிஉத்தமராம் விலியம்
 கொபல்லவ அவர்களால்

முத்திரை

டபிள்யூ. கொபல்லவ

உய்க இடல் : இடல் ஸென் டீனென் பஹு அரணென் ஸென் ஸென் 12ன் ஸென்
 ரு. 32.00ஹு. (அனென் ஸென் ஸென் ஸென் 35.00ஹு.) ஸென் 6ஹு ஸென் ஸென்
 ஸென் ஸென் 30ஹு. ஸென் ஸென் 45ஹு. இடல், ஸென் ஸென் ஸென் ஸென்
 ஸென் ஸென் ஸென் ஸென் ஸென் ஸென் ஸென் ஸென் ஸென் ஸென் ஸென்

ஸென் : ஸென் ஸென் ஸென் ஸென் ஸென் ஸென் ஸென் ஸென் ஸென் ஸென்
 ஸென் 32.00 (ஸென் ஸென் ஸென் ஸென் 35.00) 6 ஸென் ஸென் ஸென்
 ஸென் ஸென் 30 ஸென், ஸென் ஸென் 45 ஸென், ஸென் ஸென் ஸென் ஸென்
 ஸென் ஸென் ஸென் ஸென் (ஸென். ஸென். 500, ஸென் ஸென் ஸென், ஸென் ஸென் 1) ஸென் ஸென்.

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