



පාර්ලිමේන්තු විවාද

(හැන්සාඩ්)

නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ

නිල වාර්තාව

අත්තිකාරම ප්‍රධාන කරුණු

ප්‍රශ්නවලට වාචික පිළිතුරු [නි. 1726]

පළමුවන වර කියවන ලද පනත් කෙටුම්පත් [නි. 1731] :

අනුරාධපුර සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩල (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

ප්‍රසිද්ධ රැහුම් දැක්වීම් (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68 [අවම වෙන් කළ දිනය]
[නි. 1733] :

දෙවන වර කියවීම—විවාදය අවසන් කරන ලදී.

කෙටුම්පත් පනත පූර්ණ මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩල කාරක සභාවකට පවරන ලදී.

ප්‍රශ්නයට ලිඛිත පිළිතුරු [නි. 1961]

பாராளுமன்ற விவாதங்கள்

(ஹன்சார்ட்)

பிரதிநிதிகள் சபை

அதிகார அறிக்கை

பிரதான உள்ளடக்கம்

வினாக்களுக்கு வாய்மூல விடைகள் [ப. 1726]

முதன்முறை மதிப்பிடப்பெற்ற மசோதாக்கள் [ப. 1731] :

அனுராதபுரம் பாதுகாப்புச் சபை (திருத்த) மசோதா
பொது வரங்காட்டுகள் (திருத்த) மசோதா

ஒதுக்கீட்டு மசோதா, 1967-68 [ஒதுக்கப்பட்ட எட்டாம் நாள்] [ப. 1733] :

இரண்டாம் மதிப்பு—விவாதம் முடிவுற்றது
மசோதா குழுச்சபைக் குழுவுக்குக் காட்டப்பட்டது.

வினாக்களுக்கு எழுத்துமூல விடைகள் [ப. 1961]

Volume 73
No. 9

Monday
14th August 1967

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OFFICIAL REPORT

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 1726]

BILLS READ THE FIRST TIME [Col. 1731]:

Anuradhapura Preservation Board (Amendment) Bill
Public Performances (Amendment) Bill

APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967-68 (Eight Allotted Day) [Col. 1733] :

Second Reading—Debate concluded
Bill committed to Committee of Whole House

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 1961]

ලිපි ලේඛනාදිය පිළිගැන්වීම

වාචික පිළිතුරු

නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය

பிரதிநிதிகள் சபை

House of Representatives

1967 අගෝස්තු 14 වන සඳුදා

திங்கட்கிழமை, 14 ஆகஸ்ட் 1967

Monday, 14th August 1967

ප්‍ර. හා. 10 ව මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය රැස් විය.
නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා [එස්. සී. ෂර්ලි කොරියා
මහතා] මූලාසනයාද විය.

சபை, மு.ப. 10 மணிக்குக் கூடியது. உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள் [திரு. எஸ். சி. ஷேரலி கொறியா]. தலைமை தாங்கினார்கள்.

The House met at 10 A.M., MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER [MR. S. C. SHIRLEY COREA] in the chair.

ලිපි ලේඛනාදිය පිළිගැන්වීම

சமர்ப்பிக்கப்பட்ட பத்திரங்கள்

PAPERS PRESENTED

Supplementary Estimate No. 32 of 1966-67.—[සමුදේශ කටයුතු ඇමති වෙනුවට
ගරු වෙලගෙදර]

සහමේසය මත තිබිය යුතුයයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.

சபாபீடத்தில் இருக்க கட்டளையிடப்பட்டது.

Ordered to lie upon the Table.

(1) Food Control Order No. 257 made by the Minister of Agriculture and Food under section 4 (1) (i) of the Food Control Act (Cap. 171) and published in Gazette No. 14,754/8 of 28.6.67.

(2) The Audited Accounts of the Rubber Control Fund for the year 1966.

(3) Food Control Order No. 252 made by the Minister of Agriculture and Food under section 4 (1) (vi) of the Food Control Act (Cap. 171) and published in Gazette No. 14,738/2 of 2.3.67.—[කෘෂිකර්ම හා ආහාර ඇමති වෙනුවට ගරු වෙලගෙදර]

සහමේසය මත තිබිය යුතුයයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.

சபாபீடத்தில் இருக்க கட்டளையிடப்பட்டது.

Ordered to lie upon the Table.

2—එව 6072—793 (67/8)

Regulations made by the Minister of Labour, Employment and Housing under section 63 of the Wages Boards Ordinance (Cap. 136).— [කම්කරු රැකියා සහ නිවාස ඇමති වෙනුවට ගරු වෙලගෙදර]

සහමේසය මත තිබිය යුතුයයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.

சபாபீடத்தில் இருக்க கட்டளையிடப்பட்டது.

Ordered to lie upon the Table.

(1) Regulation made by the Minister of Communications under sections 166 (2) and 237 of the Motor Traffic Act (Cap. 203) relating to area comprised within the administrative limits of the Eravur Town Council.

(2) Supplementary Estimate No. 31 of 1966-67.—[ප්‍රවාහණ ඇමති වෙනුවට ගරු වෙලගෙදර]

සහමේසය මත තිබිය යුතුයයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.

சபாபீடத்தில் இருக்க கட்டளையிடப்பட்டது.

Ordered to lie upon the Table.

(1) By-law made by the Kandy Municipal Council under sections 267 and 272 of the Municipal Councils Ordinance (Cap. 252) relating to the Kandy Fire Brigade and approved by the Minister of Local Government and Housing.

(2) By-laws made by the Dehiwala-Mt. Lavinia Municipal Council under sections 267 and 272 of the Municipal Councils Ordinance (Cap. 252) relating to registration of Mortgages and approved by the Minister of Local Government.— [පළාත් පාලන ඇමතිගේ සහ ප්‍රමාණි හා ගුවන් විදුලි ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම් වෙනුවට ගරු වෙලගෙදර]

සහමේසය මත තිබිය යුතුයයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.

சபாபீடத்தில் இருக்க கட்டளையிடப்பட்டது.

Ordered to lie upon the Table.

ප්‍රශ්නවලට වාචික පිළිතුරු

வினாக்களுக்கு வாய்மூல விடைகள்

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Question No. 1.—[Pause].—The hon. Member is not here. Question No. 2.—[Pause].—The hon. Member

වෘත්ති විලිඳුරු

திரு. பி. டபிள்யு. ஜி. அபயரத்தன, இஹலபன்னல,
குப்பல்குழவ

MR. P. W. G. ABEYRATNE, IHALAPANNALA,
KUMBALGAMUWA

5. ද සොසිසා සිරිවර්ධන මයා. (වි. බි. එම්. හෙරත් මයා.—වලපතේ—වෙනුවට)

(திரு. டி. சொய்சா சிறிவர்தன—மினுவாங்
கோட—திரு. ரி. பி. எம். ஹேரத்—வலப்பனை
—சார்பாக)

(Mr. de Zoysa Siriwardena—on behalf
of Mr. T. B. M. Herath—Walapane)

අධ්‍යාපන හා සංස්කෘතික කටයුතු ඇමති
ගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය : (අ) 1967 දී ශිෂ්‍ය
ගුරුවරුන් පත් කිරීමේදී එක් එක් ආස
නයකින් කී දෙනා බැගින් පත්කරන
ලදද? (ආ) වලපනේ ආසනයෙන් පත්
කරන ලද සංඛ්‍යාව කෙතෙක්ද? (ඉ) ශිෂ්‍ය
ගුරු විභාග අංක පී 717 යටතේ සමර්ථව
සම්මුඛ පරීක්ෂණයට කැඳවන ලද, කුඹුල්
ගමුව, ඉහළ පන්තල පී. ඩබ්. ජී. අබේ
රත්න මහතාට පත්වීමක් නොදෙන ලද්
දේ මන්ද? (ඊ) වලපනේ ආසනයේ
ශිෂ්‍යගුරු පත්වීම් දී ඇත්තේ සාමාන්‍ය
සංඛ්‍යාවට අඩුවෙන් නිසා මොහුට පත්වී
මක් දීමට එතුමා ක්‍රියා කරනවාද? (උ)
නොඑසේ නම්, ඒ මන්ද?

கல்வி, கலாசார விவகார அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா : (அ) 1967 இல் மாணவ ஆசிரியர்கள் நியமிக்கப்பட்ட சமயத்தில் ஒவ்வொரு தொகுதியிலிருந்தும் எத்தனைபேர் விகிதம் நியமிக்கப்பட்டார்கள்? (ஆ) வலப்பனை தொகுதியில் இருந்து எத்தனைபேர் நியமிக்கப்பட்டார்கள்? (இ) மாணவ ஆசிரியர் பரீட்சை இலக்கம் P. 717 என்னும் கட்டிலக் கத்துடன் தேர்ச்சியடைந்து நேர்முகப் பரீட்சைக்கு அழைக்கப்பட்டிருந்த, கும்பல்கமுவ, இஹலபன்னல திரு. பீ. டப்ளியூ. ஜி. அபயரத்ன என்பவருக்கு ஏன் நியமனம் வழங்கப்படவில்லை? (ஈ) வலப்பனை தொகுதிக்கு மாணவ ஆசிரிய நியமனங்கள் தேர்தல் தொகுதிகளின் சராசரி எண்ணிக்கைக்குக் குறைவாக வழங்கப்பட்டிருப்பதனால் இவருக்கு நியமனம் வழங்க அவர் நடவடிக்கை எடுப்பாரா? (உ) அன்றேல் ஏன்?

asked the Minister of Education and Cultural Affairs: (a) How many persons were selected from each electorate in recruiting pupil teachers in 1967? (b) How many pupil teachers were recruited from the Walapane electorate? (c) Why was Mr. P. W. G. Abeyratne, of Ihalapannala, Kumbalgamuwa, whose index number at the pupil teachers' examination was P 717, and who being successful at the examination was called for interview, not appointed? (d) In view of the fact that the number of pupil teachers recruited from the Walapane electorate is less than the average number for electorates, will he take action to appoint him? (e) If not, why?

ගරු චෙලගෙදර (අධ්‍යාපන හා සංස්කෘතික කටයුතු ඇමති වෙහෙවර)

(கௌரவ வெலகெதர—கல்வி, கலாசார
விவகார அமைச்சர் சார்பாக)

(The Hon. Welagedera—on behalf of the Minister of Education and Cultural Affairs)

(අ) මෙම තොරතුරු 1967.6.3 වැනිදා අසන ලද ප්‍රශ්නයකට පිළිතුරු වශයෙන් එදින සභාගත කර ඇත. (ආ) 19. (දෙවැනි සම්මුඛ පරීක්ෂණයට පැමිණි සියළුම දෙනාට පත්වීම් දී ඇත.) (ඉ) ශිෂ්‍ය ගුරු විභාගය සඳහා අයදුම් පත්‍ර කැඳවමින් පළ කරන ලද ගැසට් නිවේදනයේ දන්වා තිබුණේ 1965.1.5 වැනි දිනට අයදුම්කරු වන්නේ වයස අවුරුදු 18 ට වඩා අඩු නොවිය යුතු බව ය. පී. ඩබ්ලිව්. ජී. අබේරත්න මහතාගේ වයස, උප්පැන්න සහතිකය අනුව එදිනට අවුරුදු 18 ට අඩුය. (ඊ) නැත. (උ) ගැසට් නිවේදනයේ සඳහන් කර තිබූ පරිදි 1965.1.5 වැනි දිනට ඔහුගේ වයස අවුරුදු 18 ට අඩු වූ බැවින්.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Question No. 6.

දී සොයා ගන්නා මග.

(திரு. டி. சொய்ஸா சிறிவர்தன)

(Mr. de Zoysa Siriwardena)

I ask that Question on behalf of the hon. Member for Divulapitiya (Mr. Jayakody).

விசேஷப் பேரவைக் கூட்டம், 1967-68

—தேவன் வர கிடைத்த

கேள்விகள் மூலம்.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

If the Prime Minister looks at the schedule sent up by the Office of the Leader of the House he will find that the Government is only asking for 4 hours.

நியோஜன கமிட்டியினர்

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

According to your Whip, you want only 3 hours and 55 minutes. You are getting that.

சென்னைப் பேரவை

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

All right.

நியோஜன கமிட்டியினர்

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Then, I take it, it is agreed that we should not do away with the lunch interval but only do away with the tea interval.

சென்னைப் பேரவை

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I want my lunch interval.

நியோஜன கமிட்டியினர்

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

I want it more than you because there is nobody to relieve me today.

பி. ஓ. 10.10

பி. ராஜதேவன் மூலம். (மேல்கூட்டம் பற்றியும்)

(திரு. சி. இராஜதேவன்—மட்டக்களப்பு முதலாம் அங்கத்தவர்)

(Mr. C. Rajadurai—First Batticaloa)

கௌரவ உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்த வரவு செலவுத் திட்ட விவாதத்திலே எனக்குப் பேசுவதற்கு இடம் கிடைக்குமோ என்ற கம்பிக்கையினம் உடையவனாக இருக்கிறேன்.

இருப்பினும் சென்ற வாரம் இந்தச் சபையில் எனக்குப்பேசக் கிடைத்த சில நிமிடங்கள் காரணமாகத் தொடர்ந்து எனது பேச்சை நிகழ்த்தக் கூடிய வாய்ப்புக் கிடைத்திருக்கின்றது. ஆனால், அதற்கும் நீங்கள் காலவரையறை, கட்டுப்பாடு விதித்திருக்கின்றீர்கள். நான் இந்த நாட்டிலே உள்ள பழம்பெரும் அரசியல் வாதிகளுடைய பல அரசியற் கருத்துக்களை எடுத்துக் கூறுவதற்கு நினைத்திருந்தேன். இலங்கை அழகும் சுபீட்சமும் பஞ்ச சீலத்தில் நம்பிக்கையும் கீழைத் தேச நாகரிக, கலாசாரத் துறைகளில் முன்னேற்ற முழுடைய ஒரு நாடு. ஆட்சி முறையைக் கைப்பற்ற வேண்டும், அரசியல் அதிகாரத்தைக் கைப்பற்ற வேண்டும் என்ற நோக்கத்துடன் உழைக்கின்ற அரசியல் வாதிகளினால் இந்த நாட்டின் சௌஜன்யமான உறவும் இந்த நாட்டின் சமாதானமும் இந்த நாட்டின் சீரும் இந்த நாட்டின் பொருளாதார உயர்வும் மீண்டும் சீர்குலைக்கக் கூடிய அபாய கரமான நிலை மறைமுகமாகவும் வெளிப்படையாகவும் நடைபெறுவது ஒரு துக்ககரமான நிகழ்ச்சியாகும்.

இந்த நாட்டின் அரசியல் வாதிகள் அகில உலகத்துக்கும் சென்று வருகிறார்கள். அமெரிக்காவுக்குச் செல்கிறார்கள்; கனடாவுக்குச் செல்கிறார்கள்; யூகோசலோவியாவுக்குச் செல்கிறார்கள்; சுவிட்சர்லாந்துக்குச் செல்கிறார்கள்; சோவியத் ரஷ்யா, சீனா போன்ற நாடுகளுக்கெல்லாம் செல்கிறார்கள். அந் நாடுகளில் எல்லாம் நடக்கின்ற அரசியல் அமைப்பு முறைகளை நன்கு படித்திருக்கின்றார்கள்; தெரிந்தும் இருக்கின்றார்கள். இன்று அந் நாடுகளுக்கு நேரடியாகச் செல்கின்ற பொழுது அந் நாட்டு மக்கள் மகிழ்வோடும் உற்சாகத்தோடும் தம் தேசங்களின் முன்னேற்றத்துக்கு உழைக்கின்ற காட்சியைக் காண்கின்றார்கள். ஆனால், திரும்பி தமது தேசத்துக்கு வந்ததற்குப் பின் அவர்கள் இந்த நாட்டுப் பொது மக்களை, நல்லெண்ணும் நல்ல சிந்தனையும் நல்ல அறிவும் உடைய பொது மக்களை அரசியற் பாதையில் தவறான வழியில் வழிநடத்திச் செல்கின்றார்கள்.

இப்பொழுது இந்தச் சபையில் நடைபெறும் வரவு செலவுத் திட்ட விவாதத்தில் அரசாங்கத்தின் மாவட்டச் சபைகளைப் பற்றிப் பலமான கண்டனங்கள் தெரிவிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. மாவட்ட சபை என்பது

விசேஷ உணர்வு கைபிசை, 1967-68

—தேவன வர கியபிசை

தேசிய அரசாங்கத்தினுடைய ஒரு குழந்தையல்ல. இந்த மாவட்ட சபை முறையானது உலகத்தின் பல நாடுகளில் இயங்கிக் கொண்டிருக்கக்கூடிய ஒரு முறையாகும். அது மட்டுமல்ல. இவர்கள் எந்த நாட்டின் தலைவர்களைப் பின்பற்றுகின்றார்களோ நாம் அறியோம். ஸ்டாலினைப் பின்பற்றுகிறார்களா, அல்லது குருஷோவைப் பின்பற்றுகின்றார்களா, மாசேதுங்கைப் பின்பற்றுகின்றார்களா, அல்லது மார்ஷல் டிட்டோவைப் பின்பற்றுகிறார்களா என்பது நமக்குத் தெரியாது. இந்த நாட்டின் காலஞ்சென்ற பிரதமருடைய கொள்கையைப் பின்பற்றுவதாக இவர்கள் சொல்கிறார்கள். காலஞ்சென்ற பிரதமர் கௌரவ பண்டாரநாயக்க அவர்கள் கடந்த காலங்களில் ஆற்றிய கருத்து மிக்க உரைகளை இவர்கள் கவனித்துப் பார்க்கவேண்டும். அவற்றையெல்லாம் நான் இங்கு வாசித்துக் காட்டுவதற்காக வந்தேன். ஆனால் எனக்குக் கிடைத்திருக்கின்ற நேரம் அதற்குப் போதவே போதாது. ஓரிடத்திலே காலஞ்சென்ற பிரதமர் பண்டாரநாயக்க அவர்கள் குறிப்பிட்டுள்ளதை நான் இங்கு வாசிக்கிறேன்.

“ஆம், சுதந்திரம் சிங்கள மக்களுக்கு மாத்திரம் கிடைத்ததல்ல. இந்தநாட்டுப்பிரஜைகளான தமிழர், முஸ்லிம்கள், மலாயர், பறங்கியர் யாவருக்கும் பொதுவானதே இந்தச் சுதந்திரம்.”

இதைவிட உயர்ந்த வார்த்தைகளைச் சொல்லக்கூடிய ஒரு பிரதமர் இருக்க முடியுமா? ஆனால், அவரைப் பின்பற்றுகிறோம் என்று சொல்லும் சில அரசியல் வாதிகள் இன்று என்ன செய்கிறார்கள்? மாவட்ட சபைகள் இந்நாட்டைத் துண்டுபோட முனைகின்றன; தமிழரசுக் கட்சிக்குக் கொடுக்கப்படுகின்ற சன்மானமே அவை என்றெல்லாம் வர்ணிக்கப்படுகின்றன. மாவட்ட சபைகள் வடக்கு, கிழக்கு மாகாணங்களுக்கு மட்டும் கொடுக்கப்படும் அரசியல் அமைப்பல்ல. இந்த நாட்டின் நிர்வாக இயந்திரங்களைச் சீர் செய்யவும் பரவலாக்கவும் இந்த நாட்டிலே கொண்டு வரப்படுகின்ற ஓர் அரசியலமைப்பே அது. இந்த நாட்டுக்கு டொனமூர் அரசியல் கமிஷனர்கள் வந்தபொழுது அவர்கள் முன்னிலையில் இந்நாட்டுக்கு மாவட்ட சபைகள் வேண்டும், பிரதேச சபைகள் வேண்டுமென்று வாக்குமூலம்

அளித்திருக்கிறார்கள் அன்றைய தலைவர்கள். இது சம்பந்தமாக காலஞ்சென்ற பிரதமர் பண்டாரநாயக்க அவர்கள் 1957 ஆம் ஆண்டு ஓகஸ்ட் மாதம் வானொலி மூலமாக விடுத்த அறிக்கையின் ஒரு பகுதியை நான் இங்கு வாசிக்கின்றேன் :

“இனி நான் பிரதேச சபைகளின் விஷயத்துக்கு வருகிறேன். டொனமூர் கமிஷனர்கள் கூட இப்படிப்பட்ட ஸ்தாபனங்களை ஏற்படுத்தும்படி சிபாரிசு செய்திருந்தார்கள். டொனமூர் அரசியல் திட்டத்தின்கீழ் யான் ஸ்தல ஸ்தாபன அமைச்சராக இருந்தபோது ஸ்தல ஸ்தாபன நிர்வாகக்குழு இப் பிரச்சினையைப் பரிசீலனை செய்தபின் இவ்விஷயம்பற்றி ஒரு விரிவான அறிக்கையை அரசாங்கத்திற்குச் சமர்ப்பித்தது. இந்த அறிக்கை ஏகமனதாக ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது. புதிய பாராளுமன்றம் தேர்ந்து எடுக்கப்பட்டபோது மந்திரிசபையும் கூட இந்தக் கருத்தை அங்கீகரித்தது.”

டொனமூர் அரசியல் கமிஷனர்கள் இந்த நாட்டிற்கு வருகை தந்தபோது ஸ்தல ஸ்தாபன அமைச்சராக இருந்த காலஞ்சென்ற பண்டாரநாயக்க அவர்கள் வெளியிட்ட இக்கருத்தை நான் இச்சபையின் கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டு வருகிறேன். அது மட்டுமல்ல; இந்த நாட்டின் கிராம சபைகளைப் பார்க்கிறோம். கிராம சபைகளுக்கு அடுத்ததாகப் பட்டின சபைகளைப் பார்க்கிறோம். பட்டின சபைகளுக்கு அடுத்ததாக நகர சபைகளைப் பார்க்கிறோம். நகர சபைகளுக்கு அடுத்ததாக மாநகர சபைகளைப் பார்க்கிறோம். மாநகர சபைகளுக்கு அடுத்ததாக மாவட்ட சபைகளைப் பார்க்கிறோம். இதற்கு அடுக்கப் பிரதேச சபைகள். இது ஒரு நாட்டின் ஐக்கியத்தையும் சமாதானத்தையும் வளர்த்து நாட்டின் நிர்வாகத்தை இலகுவடித்தக்கூடிய ஒரு திட்டமே ஒழிய தேசத்தைக் கூறு போடும் ஒரு திட்டமன்று. அகில உலகிலும் சோசலிச நாடுகளாக இருந்தாலும் சரி, கம்யூனிச நாடுகளாக இருந்தாலும் சரி, முதலாளித்துவ நாடுகளாக இருந்தாலும் சரி, அல்லது முதலாளித்துவத்திற்கும் சோசலிசத்திற்கும் இடைப்பட்ட நாடுகளாக இருந்தாலும் சரி ஒன்றுக்கு மேற்பட்ட தேசிய இனங்கள் வாழ்கின்ற எல்லா நாடுகளிலும் அந் நாடுகளின் சுபிட்சமும் சமாதானமும் பொருளாதார உயர்ச்சியும் அந்நாடுகளில் வாழும் சிறுபான்மை மக்களைக் கட்டி அணைத்து அவர்களுடைய உரிமைகளை வழங்குவதில்தான் தங்கி இருக்கின்ற நாடு சிறுபான்மை மக்க

விசேஷன பனன் ஹெலெபன, 1967-68

—தேவன வர கியலிவ

[கி. ருபேரேயி லே.]

ஞடைய உரிமைகளைக் கொடுக்க மறுத்ததோ அந்த நாடு அரசியலிலும் சரி, நாகரிகத்திலும் சரி, பொருளாதாரத்திலும் சரி நொந்து போய் இருக்கின்றது என்பதற்கு நான் பல உதாரணங்களைக் காட்ட முடியும். ஸ்பெயின், பிரான்ஸ், ஜெர்மனி ஆகிய நாடுகளில் எல்லாம் சிறுபான்மை இனத்தை ஒழிக்க முற்பட்டவர்கள் ஈற்றில் தாங்களே அழிந்து போன சரித்திரத்தை நான் உங்களுக்கு எடுத்துக்காட்ட முடியும்.

இன்று இந்த நாட்டில் மாவட்ட சபைகள் ஒரு பூச்சாண்டியாகக் கிளப்பப்படுகின்றது. ஆனால், மாவட்ட சபைகளுக்கு மேற்பட்ட பிரதேச சபைகளையே தருவதற்குக் காலஞ் சென்ற பிரதமர் பண்டாரநாயக்கா அவர்கள் எங்களுடன் ஒத்துப்போய் இருந்தார், ஒப்புக் கொண்டிருந்தார்; பிரதேச சபைகளைத் தருவதற்கு அவர் முன்வந்திருந்தார். ஆகவே, இன்று யாருடைய கொள்கையைப் பின்பற்றுகிறீர்கள் நீங்கள்? ஸ்ராவினைப் பின்பற்றுகிறீர்களா? குருஷேவைப் பின்பற்றுகிறீர்களா? மார்ஷல் டிட்டோவைப் பின்பற்றுகிறீர்களா? அல்லது உங்களுடைய மாபெரும் தலைவர் என்று நீங்கள் கருதுகின்ற காலஞ் சென்ற பிரதமர் திரு. எஸ். டபிள்யூ. ஆர். டி. பண்டாரநாயக்க அவர்களைப் பின்பற்றுகிறீர்களா? நீங்கள் இவர்களில் யாருடைய கொள்கையைப் பின்பற்றுகிறீர்கள் என்று தெரியவில்லை. நீங்கள் இந்த நாட்டை மீண்டும் குழப்பப் பார்க்கின்றீர்கள். தேசிய ஒற்றுமையின்பால் இந்த நாடு முன்னேற்ற மடைய வேண்டுமென்று உங்களுடைய அரசாங்கம் விழப்போகின்ற கடைசி நேரத்திற்கூட அபயக்குரல் எழுப்பினீர்கள். இந்த நாட்டின் முன்னேற்றமும் பொருளாதாரமும் தேசிய ஒற்றுமையில் தங்கி இருக்கின்றது என்று அன்று அவலக்குரல் எழுப்பினீர்கள். எங்கள் நாட்டில் சொல்லுவார்கள் இதைச் 'சுடலை ஞானம்' என்று. உங்களுடைய அரசாங்கம் தோற்றுப் போன நேரத்தில் உங்களுக்குச் சுடலை ஞானம் பிறந்தது. ஆனால், இப்போதோ எதிர்க் கட்சியினராகிய உங்களில் பலருக்கு அந்தச் சுடலை ஞானம் இருப்பதாகத் தெரியவில்லை.

கிழக்கு மாகாண மக்களுக்குப் பல ஆண்டுகளாக அரசாங்கத்தில் ஒரு அவநம்பிக்கை ஏற்பட்டு வந்திருக்கின்றது. அந்த அவநம்பிக்கை இன்னும் தொடர்ந்து வருகின்றது. காரணம்

யார்? அரசாங்கங்களா அல்லது அரசாங்க நிர்வாக இயந்திரங்களை இயக்கும் உத்தியோகத்தார்களா என்பது கவனத்திற்கு எடுக்கப்பட வேண்டியதொன்றாகும். கடந்த சில மாதங்களுக்கு முன்னர் தேசிய அரசாங்கத்தின் பிரதமர் கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க கிழக்கு மாகாணத்திற்கு விஜயஞ் செய்திருந்தார். 1942 ஆம் ஆண்டில் இரண்டாவது உலக மகா யுத்தத்தின் போது இந்த நாட்டின் அரிசிப் பஞ்சத்தைத் தீர்த்த நாடு கிழக்கிலங்கை என்பது உங்களில் பலருக்கு நன்கு தெரியும். இந்த நாட்டின் பொது மக்களுடைய அரிசித் தேவையில் பெரும் பாலான பகுதியை அள்ளிக் கொடுத்த பிரதேசம் கிழக்கு மாகாணமாகும். ஆனால் அத்தகைய ஒரு பிரதேசம் கடந்த பன்னிரண்டு ஆண்டுகளாக இந்த நாட்டில் புறக்கணிக்கப்பட்டுக் கொண்டு வந்திருக்கின்றது. இது யாருடைய நட்பம்? யாருடைய நட்பம் இது? இது இந்தத் தேசத்தின் நட்பமாக உங்களுக்குத் தெரியவில்லையா? தேசத்தின் நட்பமாக நீங்கள் இதைக் கருதவில்லையா? வடக்கே தென்னமரவாடி முதல் தெற்கே பாணமைப்பற்று வரை இருக்கின்ற வளம்கொழிக்கும் ஆயிரக்கணக்கான ஏக்கர் வயல் பிரதேசங்கள் அழிந்துபோக வேண்டுமென்று நீங்கள் கருதுகின்றீர்களா? அல்லது இந்த நாட்டை ஊடறுத்துச் செல்லும் வற்றாத ஜீவநதிகளைத் தடுத்து நீர்ப்பாசன வசதிகளைச் செய்து இந்த நாட்டை வளம் கொழிக்கச் செய்ய வேண்டுமென்கின்ற நோக்கம் உங்கள் அரசாங்கத்திற்கோ அல்லது அரசாங்க உத்தியோகத்தார்களுக்கோ இல்லையா என்று நான் மிக மனவருத்தத்தோடு கேட்க விரும்புகிறேன்.

இங்கினியாகலைத் திட்டம் உருவாக்கப்பட்ட நேரத்தில் அதைப் பற்றி வானளாவப் புகழப்பட்டது. அந்தத் திட்டம் கிழக்கு மாகாண மக்களின் வாழ்க்கைத் தரத்தை உயர்த்தும், கமச்செய்கையை அதிகரிக்கச் செய்யும், அதிகப்படியான நெல்லை விளைவிக்கும் என்று சொன்னார்கள். இந்தத் திட்ட இடதுபுற வாய்க்கால் அபிவிருத்தி வேலைகள் ஏன் நிறுத்தப்பட்டன? இடதுபுற வாய்க்கால் விஸ்தரிப்பு வேலைகள் ஏன் தாமதிக்கப்பட்டன? அல்லது ஏன் முற்றாகக் கைவிடப்பட்டன என்று கேட்கவிரும்புகிறேன். அந்த இடதுபுற வாய்க்காலை அடைச்சல் குளம், புளிகுளம், கண்டியன் குளம் ஆகியவற்றோடு

விசேஷ உணர்வு வெளிப்பாடு, 1967-68

—தேவன 20 கி.மீ.

தொடர்புபடுத்தி உன்னிச்சைக் குளத்தோடு இணைக்கப்படுமாறால் ஏறக்குறைய 50,000 ஏக்கர் பிரதேசம் இன்று நீர்ப்பாசன வசதியைப் பெறும் என்று எந்த நீர்ப்பாசன அதிகாரிக்கும் சவால்விட நாம் ஆயத்தமாக இருக்கிறோம். இது அரசாங்கத்தின் நீர்ப்பாசன இலாகாவைச் சேர்ந்த உத்தியோகத்தார்கள் கவனிக்க வேண்டிய ஒன்றாகும். இந்த நாட்டின் வருவாயைக் கூட்டுவதற்குக் காரணமாக இருக்கின்ற நெல் உற்பத்தியை நாம் பெருக்க வேண்டும். இன்று அரிசி அளவை வெட்ட வேண்டியிருக்கின்றது. இதைப்பற்றி நாடு பூராவும் பிரச்சாரம் செய்யப்படுகின்றது. நேற்று மட்டக்களப்பு மைதானத்திலே அரிசி வெட்டைக் கண்டித்துக் கூட்டம் கூடினார்கள். அரிசி வெட்டினால் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கின்ற 170 கோடி ரூபாயைத் தவிர்த்து கொண்டு தூர்ந்துபோன குளங்களைத் திருத்த வேண்டும்; அரிசி உற்பத்தியைப் பெருக்க வேண்டும் என்று சொல்லிவைக்க விரும்புகிறேன்.

ஒரு தடவை நான் இங்கே பேசுகின்ற பொழுது சங்கத் தமிழ் இலக்கியமாகிய பட்டினப் பாலையிலே ஒரு பாடலை உங்களுக்கு ஞாபகப்படுத்தினேன். இலங்கை இந்தியாவுக்கு அரிசி ஏற்றுமதி செய்ததாக அந்தப் பாடலிலே கூறப்பட்டிருக்கின்றது. இலங்கை இந்திய நாட்டுக்கு அரிசி ஏற்றுமதி செய்திருக்கிறது. அவ்வளவு அரிசியை உற்பத்தி செய்த நம் நாடு இன்றைக்கு தாய்லாந்து, கம்போடியா, பர்மா போன்ற நாடுகளிலிருந்து அரிசிக் கப்பலை எதிர்பார்த்துக்கொண்டிருக்கின்ற நிலைமை ஏற்பட்டுள்ளது. புறக்கணிப்பு, பாரபட்சம், வகுப்புவாத மனப்பான்மை ஆகியவற்றால்தான் இந்நிலைமை ஏற்பட்டதென்பதை நான் சுட்டிக்காட்ட விரும்புகிறேன்.

கிழக்கு மாகாணத்தை நெற்களஞ்சியமாக்க அங்குள்ள தூர்ந்துபோன குளங்கள் திருத்தப்பட வேண்டும்; வாய்க்கால்கள் திருத்தப்பட வேண்டும். கடந்த 12 வருட காலமாக உன்னிச்சை இடதுகரை வாய்க்காலைப் பற்றி நான் பேசி வருகின்றேன். 3,783 ஏக்கர் நிலத்துக்கு நீர்ப்பாசன வசதி செய்வதற்கு இந்த அரசாங்கத்துக்கு 12 வருடங்கள் எடுத்திருக்கின்றது. இன்னும் அது முடியவில்லை. என்ன வெட்கக் கேடு? எப்போது நீர் தருவோ

மென்ற உத்தரவாதத்தை அளிப்பதற்கு நீர்ப்பாசன அதிகாரிகளுக்கு முடியாத நிலை! இந்நிலையிலே கௌரவ பிரதம அமைச்சரவர்கள் எடுத்துக்கொண்ட உணவு விவசாயத் திட்ட அதிகரிப்பு வேலைகள் எப்படி நடக்கப்போகின்றதென நாம் அறியோம். ஆகவே அரசாங்கம் விவசாயத்துறையில் சிறந்த கவனம் செலுத்த வேண்டும். விவசாயிகளுக்கு நல்ல போக்குவரத்து வசதிகள் அளிக்க வேண்டும். சிறந்த போக்குவரத்து வசதிகளை விவசாயிகளுக்கு அளித்தால்தான் விதை நெல்லைக் கொண்டுசெல்லவோ, முட்கம்பிகளைக் கொண்டு செல்லவோ, பசுவைக் கொண்டு செல்லவோ, விளைந்த நெல்லை மீண்டும் சங்கங்கள் உள்ள இடங்களுக்குக் கொண்டுசெல்லவோ, அவர்களுக்கு போதிய வசதியாக விருக்கும்.

ஒரு முக்கியமான போக்குவரத்துப் பாதையைப் பற்றி நான் இங்கே குறிப்பிடவிரும்புகிறேன். வலையிறவு, வவுணதீவு, ஆகிய இரண்டு துறைகளுக்கும் இடையில் ஒரு போக்குவரத்துப் பாதை அமைக்கப்பட வேண்டும். மட்டக்களப்பு இரண்டு பகுதிகளாகப் பிரிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. 25 மைல் நீளமான வாவியினுடே அது பிரிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. ஒன்று எழுவான்கரை. மற்றது படுவான்கரை. எழுவான்கரை முழுவதும் கடற்பிரதேசம். எங்களுடைய கௌரவ கற்குடா பிரதிநிதி அவர்களின் பகுதியான கதிரவெளி, பால்சேனையிலிருந்து கல்முனை போகவசையுள்ள எழுவான்கரைப் பிரதேசம் அத்தனையும் கடற்பிரதேசம். தென்னையை விட வேறு ஒன்றும் அங்கு விளையாது. ஆனால், படுவான்கரைக்கு மறுபுறமுள்ள பகுதி அத்தனையும் விவசாய நிலம். அந்த விவசாய நிலங்களைத் திருத்துவதற்கு அவசியமாகவுள்ள வலைக் கட்டிறவு-வவுணதீவுத் தாம்போதியைப் பற்றி, கௌரவ மராமத்து அமைச்சர் மட்டக்களப்புக்கு வந்தபோது, அவருக்கு நாம் அளித்த வரவேற்பிலே ஆயிரக்கணக்கான விவசாயிகள் கேட்டார்கள். அந்த நேரத்திலே பட்டிருப்புத்தொகுதியின் பிரதிநிதி (திரு. இராசமாணிக்கம்) அவர்கள் இந்தத் தலைமுறையிலே இந்தத் தாம்போதி சரிசெய்யப்படுமா என்று கேட்டார்கள். அதற்கு மராமத்து அமைச்சர் அளித்த பதில் என்ன? இத்தேசிய அரசாங்கத்தின்

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

අන්දමට කරගෙන යාමට උත්සාහ කළ බව සඳහන් කරන අතරම, ගරු ඇමති වරුන් දෙදෙනකු පමණක් එයට වෙනස්ව කළා කිරීම ගැන මගේ කනගාටුව පළ කරන්නට සිදු වී තිබෙනවා. මා ඒ ගැන විශේෂයෙන් සඳහන් කරන්නේ ඒ ගැන පිළිතුරු නොදී බැරි නිසයි. කර්මාන්ත ඇමති තුමාත් කළ කළා ගැනයි මා සඳහන් කළේ. ඒ කළා ගැන හැකිතාක් ලුහුඬින් යමක් කියන්නට කැමතියි.

කර්මාන්ත හා ධීවර කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ගරු ඇමතිතුමා, මා ගැන සඳහන් කරන හැම අවස්ථාවකදීම වාගේ පාවිච්චි කරන්නේ “Feudal lady from Mahawalatenne” යන වචනමාලාවයි. මගේ පරපුර ගැන සඳහන් කරමින් ඒ ගරු ඇමතිතුමා කවදත් කළා කරන්නේ ඔන්න ඔය ආකාරයටයි. මගේ පරපුර ගැන ලජ්ජා වන්නට කාරණයක් මට ඇත්තේ නැහැ. කොයි විධියට එතුමා විස්තර කළත් මගේ පරපුර ගැන මා ලජ්ජා වන්නේ නැති බව පැහැදිලි ලෙස ප්‍රකාශ කරන්නට කැමතියි.

ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා
(අගලවත්ත)

(கலாநிதி கொல்வின ஆர். டி. சில்வா—
அகலவத்த)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva—Agalawatta)

He is a broken down feudalism from Boralugoda—do you not know it?

සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.

(திருமதி சிறிமாவோ பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)

අපි කාගේවත් දේවල් මංකොල්ල කාලා නැහැ. අපි කවදාවත් මිනීමරා නැහැ; හරක් හොරකම් කර නැහැ. අපේ පරපුර ඉතාමත් වැදගත් අන්දමට ජීවත් වුණු පරපුරක් හැටියට මේ අවස්ථාවේ මට කියන්නට පුළුවනි. කර්මාන්ත ඇමතිතුමා කළ කළාවේදී එතුමා පාවිච්චි කළ භාෂාව පාවිච්චි කරන්නට මා කැමති නැහැ. කර්මාන්ත ඇමතිතුමා පාවිච්චි කළ භාෂාව පාවිච්චි කර මට පුරුද්දක් නැහැ. කෙනකුගේ වැදගත්කම මනින්නේ කෙනකුගේ පරපුරින් නොවන බවත්, තම තමන්ගේ හැසිරීම අනුවම ලෝකයා කෙන

කුගේ වැදගත්කම මනින බවත් තමන් ගේ ක්‍රියාවේනුත් යමකුගේ වැදගත්කම මනින බවත් කියන්නට කැමතියි. මා ඒ කතාව ගැන ඉතාමත් කනගාටු වෙනවා. එතුමා පාවිච්චි කළ භාෂාව පාවිච්චි තරමින් එතුමට පිළිතුරු දෙන්නට මා කැමති නැති බව කියන්නට කැමතියි. එහෙත් කොටින් එක් කරුණක් පමණක් අහන්නට කැමතියි. ඔය විධියට මා ගැන තීරණය වාගේ Feudal lady from Mahawalatenne යනුවෙන් සඳහන් කරන ඔය ගරු ඇමතිතුමාත් එක් කාලයක් ඒ Feudal lady from Mahawalatenne යටතේ අමාත්‍යාංශයක් දරන්නට ඉඩක් ලබා ගන්නට කැමැත්තෙන් ඊට සූදානම් වී හිටියේ නැද්ද? එසේ සූදානම් වී සිටියේ වී නමුත් ඊට ඉඩ නොලැබුණු කාරණයත් එතුමා දන්නවා ඇති. මගේ ඇමති මණ්ඩලයට එන්නට එතුමාට ඉඩක් නොලැබුණේ එවකට මගේ කැබිනට් මණ්ඩලයේ හිටපු ගරු ඇමතිවරුන් දෙදෙනකු නිසයි. හිටපු කර්මාන්ත ඇමති තුමා සහ හිටපු ඉඩම් ඇමතිතුමාත් නිසයි එතුමාට මගේ ආණ්ඩුවේ ඇමති ධුරයක් ගන්නට බැරි වුණේ. වර්තමාන ඉඩම් ඇමති සී. පී. ද සිල්වා මහත්මයාත්, දැනට මැදවච්චියේ අසුන නියෝජනය කරන මෙත්‍රිපාල සේනානායක මහත්මයාත් මගේ කැබිනට් මණ්ඩලයේ ඉන්නතුරු—ඒ දෙදෙනා ප්‍රතිගාමීන් හැටියටයි එදා එතුමා රටට හඳුන්වා දුන්නේ—එන්නට බැරි බවක් එදා එතුමා ප්‍රකාශ කළ බව තමුත්තාත්සේට මතක ඇති. අද තත්ත්වය කොහොමදැයි අහන්නට කැමතියි. අද නම් එතුමා ඉඩම් ඇමතිතුමා සමග බොහෝම හොඳ යාලුවන් හැටියටයි—අඹ යාලුවන් වාගේයි—ඉන්නේ. ඒ අස්ථාවේදී බැහැ කිව්වා. අද අඹයාලුවන් වාගේ එකට වැඩ කරගෙන යනවා. ඒ දෙන්නා නිසා තමයි එදා එතුමාට එන්නට බැරි වුණේ. එහෙම තත්ත්වයක් තිබුණේ නැත්නම්, ඔය හැටියට විස්තර කලත්, අප යටතේ වැඩ කරන්නටයි එදා සූදානම්වෙලා හිටියේ. එපමණයි කර්මාන්ත ඇමතිතුමාට පිළිතුරු වශයෙන් දෙන්නේ.

සමාජසේවා ඇමතිතුමාගේ කළාවෙන් කියා තිබෙන්නේ බණ්ඩාරනායක ආණ්ඩු දෙකකින්ම අවුරුදු තවයක් තිස්සේ මේ රට දියුණු කිරීමට කිසිම දෙයක් කර නැහැ

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[සිව්මාවේ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.]

කියන අදහසයි. ඒ ගරු ඇමතිතුමාට පසු ගිය කාලයේදී සිදු වූ දේ අමතකවෙලාදැයි දන්නේ නැහැ. ඒ තරම් ඉක්මණින් අතීතය අමතක වෙතැයි මට නම් විශ්වාස කරන්නටත් අමාරුයි. 1956 සිටම සමාජ සේවා ඇමතිතුමා අප ආණ්ඩුවලට සම්බන්ධ වී සිටියා. දිවංගත බණ්ඩාරනායක අගමැති තුමා විසින් 1956දී පළමුවැනි වරට පත් කරන ලද මන්ත්‍රීවරයකු වශයෙන් මේ ගරු සභාවට ආ සැටි සමාජසේවා ඇමති වරයාට අමතක වෙතැයි මා කල්පනා කළේ නැහැ. ඒ අණ්ඩුව අවසන් වනතුරුම ඒ ආණ්ඩුවේ මන්ත්‍රීවරයකු හැටියට හිටියා නොවෙයිද? එදා ඒ විධියට පැමිණීමට හේතුවත් දන්නවා. කෙසේ හෝ වේවා ඒ ආණ්ඩුවෙන් බොහෝ කල් හිටියා. ඊට පස්සේ 1960 මහා මැතිවරණයේදීත් තරඟ කළේ ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයේ ධජය යටතේ බව අපට මතකයි. එසේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ආසනයක් දිනාගෙන පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම් ධුරයකුත්—උප ඇමති කමකුත්—දැරුවා. අවුරුදු තුනහමාරක් තරම් කාලයක් හිටියා. ඒ නිසා ඒ ඇමති තුමා ගැන අප පමණක් නොව, මේ ගරු සභාව පමණක් නොව, මුළු රටම දන්නවා. අපෙන් මේ රටට යම්කිසි දෙයක් ඉටු වී නැත්නම්, අපේ විශේෂ දුර්වලකම් තිබුණා නම්, තවත් විධියකින් කියතොත් ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයේ ආණ්ඩුවෙන් මේ රටට වැඩක් කෙරුණේ නැත්නම් සමාජසේවා ඇමතිවර අශෝක කරුණාරත්න මහත් මයාට කළ හැකි දේවල් තිබුණු බව මතක් කරන්නට කැමතියි. ඒ කිසිවක් නොකර මේ අවසථාවේදී මේ විවාදයේදී අපට දොස් කියා පමණක් බේරෙන්නට හැදුවාට මදි. ඒ තරම් දීර්ඝ කාලයක් ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයේ ආණ්ඩුවලට එකතු වී සිටියේ ඇයි? අවුරුදු හයකටත් වැඩි කාලයක් සිටියේ නැද්ද? ඊට කලින් අස්වෙන්නට ඉඩ තිබුණේ නැද්ද? සමාජසේවා ඇමති වරයා මගේ ආණ්ඩුවෙන්—අපේ පක්ෂයෙන්—අස්වෙලා ගියේ ඇමති දුරයක් නුදුන් නිසයි. ඒ බව නොකියා වෙනත් දේවල් කීමෙන් ප්‍රයෝජනයක් තිබෙන වාද? අස්වෙලා ගියේ ඒ නිසා බව ඔප්පු කළොත් ආසනයෙන් අස්වන බවට සමාජ සේවා ඇමතිතුමා අභියෝගයක් කර තිබෙනවා. මේ ගැන අපේ එක්තරා ගරු මන්ත්‍රී

වරයකු සඳහන් කළ අවසථාවේදී විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයේ ගරු නායකතුමිය මෙය කියනවා නම් අස්වෙනවාය කිව්වාලු. මම ලැස් නිසි එය කියන්නට. ඔන්න ඔය කාරණය නිසයි එවකට දරමින් සිටි අධිකරණ ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම් ධුරයෙන්—උප ඇමති ධුරයෙන්—අස්වුණේ. ඒ නිසා මා අහන්නේ මෙයයි: සමාජසේවා ඇමතිතුමා අවුරුදු ගණනාවක් අපේ ආණ්ඩුවේ හිටියා. අප යම්කිසි දෙයක් කළේ නැත්නම් එයටත්, එකට වැඩ කට යුතු කළ කෙනෙකු හැටියට, රඹුක්කන මන්ත්‍රීතුමා වරද හාර ගන්නට ඕනැ.

Of the Budget speeches made by the Hon. Minister of Finance during the last three years, this year's Budget speech has required the least amount of effort and, probably, the least amount of thinking. His speech was entirely a summary of the Annual Report of the Central Bank for this year. The extent of plagiarism can be seen in that he has taken portions of the Central Bank Report without even attempting to change the phraseology. The entire content of his speech was a pathetic statement of the economic situation of 1966. This was quite unnecessary because the Central Bank reports deals with it comprehensively.

The Budget speech of the Finance Minister of a country which is attempting to achieve a fast rate of economic growth should not merely seek to paint a gloomy picture of the past and attribute it all to factors beyond the control of the Government. The approach of a progressive budgetary policy should be to show the current problems of the country and problems of the immediate future, and to find ways and means of solving those problems.

What has the Hon. Minister of Finance done? He has tried to muster the present problems by painting a gloomy picture of the past, particularly of 1966. The Hon. Minister of Finance does not highlight the main problems of the country which are not only financial and economic, but **social too.**

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

From the economic standpoint Ceylon would require a properly worked-out plan with the necessary machinery to achieve this plan. A promise was made in the earlier speeches to do this. Obviously the Government has not been able to do this. If in a period of two and a half years the Government has not been able to take the initial steps for preparing a plan, there is no hope of their doing it in the balance period of their term of office. You cannot fool the people all the time.

They keep on saying that we have ruined the country. This has been the theme of the speeches made by hon. Members on the Government side. They say we left them an empty Treasury, that we handed over an empty Treasury to this Government. If we grant this—not that we grant it but for argument's sake if we do—we should point out that we handed over to them very valuable assets which should have brought in substantial income. If these assets had been properly and efficiently managed, they would have been very valuable and would have provided a substantial income to this country. I mean the Ceylon Transport Board, the Ceylon Insurance Corporation, the Ceylon Petroleum Corporation and so on. We are not so sure that these assets are being efficiently handled and properly managed. Judging from the reports already published, some of them are already running at a loss, particularly the Ceylon Transport Board. We understand the profits are coming down.

ශ්‍රී ඩී. ඩී. වන්නිනායක (මුදල් ඇමති)
(கௌரவ பூ. பி. வன்னிநாயக்க—நிதி அமைச்சர்)

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

No.

සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.

(திருமதி சிறிமாவோ பண்டாரநாயக்க)
(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)

You can say, "no". These are the reports. These institutions are being used to solve the unemployment problem of the stooges of this

Government at the expense of the country. It is no wonder, therefore, that these institutions are losing today or that their profits are coming down.

Two of the major problems which confront the country today and which will continue to plague the economy for a long time to come are the rising cost of living and the consequences of the fall in real income. From the point of view of budgetary and economic policy, these are the major issues which have not been considered. After all, the Budget is the greatest welfare instrument in the hands of the Government. And welfare means the well-being of the people, and, therefore, the first consideration of any Government should be the welfare of the people. This could be achieved only if the people have access to goods, particularly the essential goods, which should be available in plenty for long periods. Unless this is ensured there is no guarantee that we are promoting the welfare of the people. There is no use making excuses and saying that this could not be achieved due to factors beyond the control of the Government.

The argument that has been brought forward by the Government is that the cost-of-living index came down in 1966. Is this actually so? The cost-of-living index which is used to show the influence on prices, has many shortcomings. It is not representative of all sections of the people. It is prepared for the working class only. It excludes the upper middle class, the lower middle class and the rural people. In any case, the present index covered only a few items. For instance, since the rice ration was reduced by half, has the cost of the extra measure of rice which the people have to buy in the black-market been reflected, in the index? We are not sure that it has been. If it has been reflected the cost-of-living index could not have come down in 1966. Not only rice, several other major items of food, essential items of food, have gone up in price. When there are shortages people have

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.]

to buy in the blackmarket. Have all these things been reflected in the cost-of-living index? We are not sure that they have been. If all those things had been reflected in the index, I am sure the cost of living would have gone up by at least 20 per cent.

The present budgetary proposals do not give us any indication that the cost of living will be reduced this year too. On the other hand, there is every indication that it is going to rise considerably. The question of the cost of living has been dealt with by other Members on this side of the House, and therefore, I do not intend dealing with it in detail because the time allotted to me is short. I presume other Members on this side who are to follow me also will deal with that question.

I shall now go on to the question of tourism, something from which this Government is expecting to make a lot of foreign exchange. They have loudly proclaimed that they are hoping to replace tea with tourism as a foreign exchange earner. The Hon. Minister of State, in his speech the other day—I was not here to listen to it; but I read it—was full of hopes of success for tourism. All those are dreams. I would like to quote here the relevant figures from the report of the Central Bank to show what we have earned from tourism since 1961. In 1961 we earned Rs. 7.6 million; 1962 Rs. 5.6 million; 1963—Rs. 5.9 million; 1964—Rs. 5.5 million; 1965—Rs. 5.7 million; 1966—Rs. 6.5 million. In short in 1966 Ceylon has earned Rs. 1.1 million less than in 1961. And in 1961, after we came into power—this was the time when it was said that foreigners will not come into this country, that they will run away from Ceylon, that they were afraid to come here because of our Government—we had earned Rs. 1.1 million more than you have earned in 1966 during the period of your Government. The statistics of the tourist arrangements are no more hopeful. I would like to quote to you for your information from the “Analysis of Tourist Arrangements

in 1965 and Foreign Exchange earned from Tourism” printed by the Department of Census and Statistics.

In 1961, 17,325 tourists came to Ceylon, exclusive of Indians and Pakistanis who bring very little foreign exchange. In 1962 there were 15,740 tourists; 1963, 14,753; 1964, 15,593; and 1965, 14,628. We have not got the figures for 1966 but I understand that the figure is the same as that for 1965. Here again, you will see that there is a decrease in 1965 compared to the previous years.

In view of these figures, the question is whether tourism in Ceylon, since this Government came into power, is on the decline or on the up-grade. Plans to build hotels and the declaration of the International Tourist Year are no indication of a tourist boom. What is important is, how much have we earned or how much foreign exchange are we going to earn from tourism? This is the only index of the progress of tourism and the tourist contribution to the national economy.

There is not the slightest doubt that this Government does not expect to earn more than Rs. 8 million this year. This is stated in the Foreign Exchange Budget of the Hon. Minister of Finance at page 13. According to his estimate, we would earn about Rs. 7 million in 1967. In any case, even if we accept these figures, in view of the fact that there is a leakage of about 75 per cent of foreign exchange into the blackmarket, can we have much hope of earning foreign exchange from tourism?

What this Government should do is to adopt every possible means to prevent foreign exchange from leaking into the blackmarket. Why do they not have the courage to implement the amendment to the Exchange Control Act which we tabled in the last two months of our Government, which unfortunately could not be discussed owing to the fall of our Government? That legislation was designed to make the unauthorized possession of foreign currency an offence, restrict money-changing

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

to commercial banks and leading hotels and to provide for other administrative measures for the implementation of that Act. Why does this Government not bring forward that amending legislation and try and prevent the leakage of foreign exchange into the blackmarket? Unless these steps are taken to retain the foreign exchange earnings from tourism, in this country, there is no point in trying to, or hoping to, replace tea with tourism. That is only a dream which will never be realized.

The lavish quotas of foreign exchange that are being granted to hotels, and for the purchase of transport equipment and so on, will only benefit a few individuals. Such quotas will not help to increase tourist earnings.

The Hon. Minister of State had talked of hotels that are being built or going to be built. He had talked of resthouses that are being handed over to private individuals for management. Those are resthouses on which the Government had spent a considerable amount of money by way of extensions and improvements and which were showing profits. If the private companies were prepared to invest in resthouses why did you not hand over to them resthouses which were in a rather bad condition, and let them invest in and improve them and make profits? Why did you hand over the best resthouses on which the Government had spent a considerable amount of money?

The Hon. Minister of State had said in the course of his speech that I had made a remark that I could not afford to go to the Hikkaduwa Resthouse because the rates there were too high I did say so. It is not only I who has said that the rates at the Hikkaduwa Resthouse are for too high but several others, including diplomats. These are diplomats who are making use of this resthouse for spending week-ends, for sea-bathing, etc. They have said that they cannot do this too often because the rates are too high.

The Hon. Minister of State said in the course of his speech, "The Leader of the Opposition can go and spend through her nose and stay in hotels in Yugoslavia." I would like to inform the Hon. Minister that I did not have occasion to stay in a hotel in Yugoslavia. On two occasions I went there on the invitation of the Government of Yugoslavia and I was the guest of that Government. On the third occasion I went for medical treatment.

I can tell him that the rates at hotels there are very reasonable. For the information of the Hon. Minister of State I should like to say that I have got some statistics which show that the rates at hotels in Yugoslavia are not as high as the Hon. Minister thinks. The costliest hotel in Yugoslavia, which is in Sveti Stefan on the Adriatic coast, charges only 18 dollars per day for a double room with attached bath and all conveniences. This is a hotel that is up to international standard. So, the highest hotel charge in Yugoslavia is 18 dollars per day. The Hon. Minister can have this book, which gives all the rates, if he wants it.

Can we compare our country with countries like Yugoslavia and the U. S. S. R.? Those are countries which have a very high standard of living compared to ours.

Are our resthouses run for the benefit of foreign tourists only? Do we not have the right to use them, to go to them to have a meal whenever we are in that locality? We are prevented from using the Hikkaduwa resthouse—not only we but also middle-class people who would like to go there and spend a few days—because the rates charged are too high. That was what I said, and I maintain it. That has been said not only by me but by several others too.

We cannot compare our hotels with those in the Eastern European countries. The hotels there are up to international standard. Therefore, to compare our resthouses with the hotels in Yugoslavia is to mislead the

public.

[සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.]

The Hon. Minister of State talked about luxury hotels and super-luxury hotels that are going to be built. He is hoping to earn Rs. 200 million per annum from tourism. I do not know how he has calculated these figures. He has said that he is expecting 150,000 tourists to come to Ceylon per year, and he is hoping that those tourists will give the country Rs. 200 million. Even if a tourist does spend roughly Rs. 100 for accommodation, will he be prepared to spend another Rs. 200 per day on the purchase of goods or on amusements in order to enjoy his stay in Ceylon? The Hon. Minister is expecting the tourist to spend at least Rs. 300 per day. I do not know whether even the American tourist is prepared to spend such an amount. The American tourist is certainly not prepared to spend 60 dollars per day. Excepting a few American millionaires, I do not think the average American tourist is prepared to spend or can spend such an amount. Many of the tourists who come to Ceylon are from average middle-class families. They save their life's earnings to spend a holiday abroad. They are not going to come to Ceylon and spend Rs. 300 or 60 dollars per day in order to satisfy us. They would like to stretch that money to the utmost in order to enjoy the holiday for which they have longed.

Therefore, your hope of earning Rs. 200 million a year, your hope of replacing tea with tourism, are but dreams. We understand that the green light has been given for building four super-luxury hotels: one Hilton Hotel, one Intercontinental Hotel, one Reef Hotel, and we understand there is to be another hotel to be built by U. T. A.

The Hilton Hotel is estimated to cost Rs. 30 million, of which the foreign exchange component would be Rs. 23 million, and this is to be in foreign loans. Already, a fantastic price of Rs. 3½ million has been paid for a block of land in Colpetty to put

up the hotel. I understand that the contractors and the architects are foreigners. As fees, the architects are to get 2½ per cent on the total cost of the hotel. Hiltons will only come in to do the management of the hotel. I understand they have reserved the right to employ a large number of foreigners, personnel to manage the hotel, and they have not given any undertaking to train local people to take their place subsequently.

Due to the high rates there is no guarantee that these hotels are going to be occupied fully right through the year. Irrespective of the prospects, the country is committed annually to make repayment on the foreign loans at 12 per cent and commission at 15 per cent to Hiltons for management. Therefore, what do we hope to make from tourism? Whatever we make will go out by way of repayment of loans and commission to the management of Hilton Hotels.

I understand, the other three projects are also similar. I would request the Hon. Minister of State to table in this House those agreements that he has drawn up with these four companies that are going to put up the hotels. I think the country has a right to know what it is going to be committed to in building these hotels. Are these secret agreements? Has the public not got a right to know what these agreements are and what they are committed to for generations? It is nice to have super-luxury hotels, but are we going to get the tourists to come and live in these hotels? These hotels are beyond the reach of many people in Ceylon. Very few people in Ceylon can afford to go to these hotels at these rates. Therefore we will have to depend on tourists. And we do not get tourists right through the year, but only during certain times of the year. During the rest of the year, the hotels will be white elephants. Therefore, these boasts of hoping to replace tea with tourism, as I said before, are only dreams.

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I dwelt on tourism because I see that many of the other speakers had not touched on this matter. I particularly want to point out to the Hon. Minister of State because his speech was entirely on tourism and what he is hoping to make of tourism—I wish to warn him—that by allowing these four super-luxury hotels to be built, for which I understand there are arrangements—I am subject to correction—he is committing this country for generations to something which it cannot bear. Therefore, I would request him and the Government to think twice before we are committed to this.

I do not intend to deal with some of the major problems such as employment which was dealt with by many speakers on this side of the House, or industries because I think our former Minister of Industries is going to deal with that problem. Therefore I shall leave that subject to him; also, because my time is limited. I do not intend to lengthen my speech because I would like other Members on this side of the House also to speak.

I would like to point out once again to the Hon. Minister of Finance and this Government that their Budget proposals are in no way going to help bring down the cost of living or solve the economic problems that face this country today.

I thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for your indulgence. I should like to give way to other speakers as the time available is limited.

ප්‍ර. හ. 10.58

එස්. තොන්ඩමන් මහ. (පත් කරන ලද මන්ත්‍රී)

(திரு. எஸ். தொண்டமான்—நியமன அங்கத்தவர்)

(Mr. S. Thondaman—Appointed Member)

The Opposition, as usual, has tried to paint a grim picture of the Budget. However, the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) in the course of his speech told this

House that the purchasing power of our people is not so low, that if you go to any village these days you find that there is hardly a house without a radio, and if you go to the village fair you see that the people are better dressed than before. In spite of the critical financial situation—in the last year our foreign exchange earnings have dwindled to alarming proportions, and the prospects even for this year are not very encouraging—the fact that the Government has been able to maintain the present high standard, as admitted by the hon. Member for Yatiyantota, is to the credit of this Government.

In the course of his speech the hon. Member for Agalawatta (Dr. Colvin R. de Silva) said that the policy of the late Mr. D. S. Senanayake in regard to paddy cultivation, which this Government should follow, was to leave it to small-holders and peasant cultivators to grow paddy. In the same breath the hon. Member for Agalawatta said “I for a moment do not comment on the merits or demerits of that proposition”. If he is not defending that policy as being right, why is he changing from his good policy? I do not know what purpose he had in bringing up that matter in this House. However, if he is anxious that this Government should follow the policy of the late Mr. D. S. Senanayake, I do not see why the hon. Member has failed to express concern over the attitude of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, who is also the leader of the S. L. F. P., who claims that she is in politics to follow the policies of the late Mr. Bandaranaike. On every occasion she has, while claiming to follow the policy of the late Mr. Bandaranaike, acted contrary to such policy.

Leaving aside the leader of the S. L. F. P., I come to the L. S. S. P., the party to which my good friend the hon. Member for Agalawatta belongs. What about his own self? Has he not changed his own policy on the status of plantation workers and the Tamil language? Does he mean that changing or deviating from old poli-

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[තොන්ඩමන් මයා.]

cies is the exclusive right of the S. L. F. P., the L. S. S. P. and himself?

Coming back to the question of food production, the emphasis should be laid on development, and there should be a programme of development for any developing country. There can be no two words about it. You must have all round development and not lopsided or one-sided development. At the same time the question is whether that all round development should be only in relation to this little Island of ours or in the context of regional states and of the world situation. For instance, today most of the developing countries are placing the accent on agricultural development. As a result of the increase in population all the countries that were once exporting food have now come to depend increasingly on the import of food grains. I do not think that anybody can be blamed if in a small country like ours the accent is placed on increased food production. In fact, it is very unfortunate that the previous Government did not place due emphasis on the growing of rice and subsidiary foodstuffs. They can be grown in this country and we shall then be in a position to conserve our foreign exchange and use it for industrial development. Instead of doing that the previous Government collected all the available foreign exchange and ran to China, Burma and Thailand and bought whatever rice was available in those countries. Then they rushed to India and Japan to buy our requirements of textiles and they just managed their affairs.

The result is, today this Government has no alternative but to take to food production in a big way and encourage the growth of rice and other subsidiary foodstuffs and meet the shortage of essential foods in this country. It is true that every day the prices paid for our exports are dwindling. When we had comparatively better prices for our exports,

the previous Government had the advantage of laying great stress on agricultural development instead of spending that money for other purposes. If they did so, today we would have had all round development.

Take a recent instance. If the Arab-Israel War had developed into a full-scale war, what would have been our plight? There would have been no British Navy to bring our food in convoys of ships. Now people fear war for this reason. If we have sufficient food produced in our country we need have no cause for fear.

The Hon. Prime Minister and this Government should be congratulated for the bold and correct step they have taken to produce more food in this country and divert the foreign exchange spent on the purchase of food grains for industrial development. In fact the people of the country have rallied dynamically round the Prime Minister in his move for increased production. If one goes round the country one will see that lands that were once lying idle and abandoned have been turned into fertile paddy fields. People in all corners of the Island have opened up land and are producing food. This is sufficient testimony that the people have endorsed the correctness of the policy of this Government and are determined to extend their full support for the food production drive. At the present moment the situation is the same all over the world. If we were to serve our people their barest necessities, then it is absolutely necessary to increase our food production.

Take India, for instance, where everything is done on a planned basis. What is the use of all their planning when today they are finding it extremely difficult to feed their teeming millions? Even we had to divert a food ship to Kerala in order to overcome starvation there. So, to avert such a situation in our country we must do everything possible to make this country self-sufficient in food.

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

I am also glad that our youth have been made use of in these campaigns. They are to be made the means of food production and this will also provide employment to the unemployed youth in this country. It is a very good proposal. At the same time I would like to impress upon the Government that in this matter there are so many situations to which the youths will have to get accustomed in regard to their new environment, new conditions of work and so on, and therefore the co-ordination of the vital services is necessary. In these youth camps human problems as well as social problems do arise. You should not ignore them and lay emphasis only on food production and on the question of finding employment. The solution of the human and social problems that arise is vital to the success of these schemes.

In fact, in the course of my speech at the I. L. O. I asked whether the I. L. O. could not have a pilot project of this nature, study the problems themselves and advise the Government on the matter. Such a project would not have cost the Government a single cent, but the experience and knowledge gained from it would have been very useful to the Government.

In my opinion during the last two and a half years the conditions of the workers of this country have taken a turn for the better. Thousands of workers in the mercantile and banking sectors were given salary increases by their employers, not out of tax concessions or any relief granted to them by the Government, but out of the profits that they have been making so far. In their demand for increases in salary, the Government has given every possible assistance.

The tea price has remained at about two rupees a pound from 1956, and although there was supposed to have been a socialist and progressive Government from that time up to 1965, not a single cent by

way of an increase in salary was given to the workers in the plantations. But, this Government, in spite of the fact that the price of a pound of tea has come down to about Rs. 1.50, was able to persuade the estate owners to give an increase to these workers.

The two previous Governments had followed a "wage freeze" policy in respect of the public sector, but this Government has been able to change it and give an increase of Rs. 20 per month to those government servants whose basic salary is less than Rs. 100 and Rs. 10 to those government servants whose salary is above Rs. 100 but less than Rs. 300 per month.

A few days before the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) assumed the office of Minister of Finance in the last Government he presided at the meeting of the workers agitating for the 21 demands, but when he became the Minister of Finance of that Government he was able to give only Rs. 1.50 to the workers. The present Government in its Budget for the year 1967-68 has conceded straightway an increase of Rs. 20 and Rs. 10 respectively to these workers. The first of the 21 demands was for an increase of Rs. 30, and this Government was able to concede almost two-thirds of that demand to the workers in the public sector, whereas a trade union leader who was the Finance Minister was hesitant to do so.

With regard to the declining prices for our commodities in the world market, I know that this Government has taken steps. In fact, I myself at the I.L.O., both at the plenary sessions and elsewhere, urged that a fair price must be paid for exports from the developing countries. I feel that the Government must take more positive and meaningful steps in this direction instead of taking an attitude of despondency. We must do everything possible both at the international and local levels to see that

[නොන් ඩමන් මො.]

something is done. In fact, the other day, the hon. Member for Wattala (Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe) gave us some revealing facts and figures. I must tell you that today our market is being depressed by various forces, sometimes by our own actions. For instance, I read in this morning's papers that tea is being sold by the C.W.E. at Rs. 1.25 a pound. They are claiming that they are giving cheap tea to the consumer and preventing the traders from making big profits. But does the C.W.E. know that they are doing a big disservice to the tea industry? If the C.W.E. is interested in giving the consumer cheap tea, it can do so by other methods without depressing the tea prices. If you go to certain plantations in Talawakelle or Hatton or Nuwara Eliya you can get the best tea. How? Stolen tea is sold cheap!

We should not do anything that will depress the prices. If better prices are paid it will help the producer and the country will earn more foreign exchange. For example, during the Dimbulla season Russia comes into the market for two weeks and immediately the prices go up by 25 or 30 cents. The quality is the same but because there is one more buyer the price goes up. Teas that were selling three weeks back at Re. 1.40, Re. 1.50 and Re. 1.80 are today selling at Re. 1.80, Rs. 2 and Rs. 2.20. Why? The quality has not changed but there is no quantity in the market. When the amount put up at the auction was 9 million pounds the price was depressed at Re. 1.40. Today when the amount at the auction is 6 million pounds, everybody is buying. When tea is bought at Re. 1.25, what happens? The producer gets the subsidy. What should be done? When the price goes below Re. 1.75 the C.W.E. should buy a million pounds at that price. Then it will benefit the producer and the plantation worker.

What is happening in the estates today? They are giving the workers only two or three days work. More than the tea industry itself it is the workers who are suffering. They are being given only a few days work in the month and they are unable to make ends meet.

I ask the Government to have a well thought out policy in regard to this matter instead of leaving it to officials some of whom are adopting rackets. The matter should not be left to officials. It should be discussed and decided at Cabinet level.

If it were not for the free measure of rice given to these workers, they would today be dying of starvation. I would strongly urge the Government to take steps to see that these workers on the plantations do not go out of employment. Estates should not be abandoned or neglected. If necessary the State Plantations Corporation should be asked to take over such estates and run them.

The hon. Member for Wattala (Mr. Jayasinghe) referred to the sterling companies being given overdrafts by the foreign banks here. What do the Ceylonese proprietary interests get? Nothing. Formerly they could get the money from the Chettiers. When the prices are good the banks are prepared to help; when the prices go down they are not prepared to help.

In a developing country when the Government cannot balance its budget it gets temporary accommodation from international institutions. Why cannot you see that Ceylonese planting interests also get relief when it is required? They require relief temporarily or due to drought. They must be given financial assistance not because we are merely speaking in terms of financing individual proprietors that is a small thing—but because so many thousands of people will be thrown out of employment. Therefore I urge the Government to do something positive in this direction.

I also want to say that the 10 per cent increase in the import licence fee is not a serious thing, but that increase should not be passed on to the consumer. What will happen is that a lot of people will be making a lot of money if this increase is not absorbed by the importers but passed on to the real consumers. Take, for instance, the import licence fee on tea chests. This is going to put up the cost of production. Also the licence fee on the import of fertilizer.

The other matter I want to refer to is the tax holiday on a new industries. We find that fantastic dividends are benignly declared by these industries so that when the tax holiday period is over they might abandon the industries. Therefore, it might be necessary that they be made to plough back their profits into the industry. These industries should be made to work for the benefit of the consumer. Now the industrialists get the benefit of high prices and at the same time capital formation does not take place. This is not in the interest of the country and steps must be taken to prevent this.

I am glad that there is provision in the Budget for the implementation of the Indo-Ceylon Pact. It is also gratifying to note that the Government of India too is taking all steps necessary for the speedier implementation of the pact. I know there are forces both in the Opposition as well as on the Government side that do not want the problem solved. They want this problem to stay so that they can rise politically.

So far as I am concerned, and so far as my organization is concerned, statelessness should end early and I shall extend my full co-operation towards that end. It is also my determination to use all influence to see that not one single person of Indian origin is sent as a refugee. I want them to go as citizens with full confidence in their future and not simply bundled off to India and put in a

camp. I want them to go as free citizens with a feeling of confidence in their future. It is possible to do this.

The period stipulated in the agreement is 15 years. I should rather like everyone to be given sufficient time to make arrangements to go, and that they be told that they could go in two years, or three years or four years, voluntarily on their own initiative. Each year a sufficient number of people can go. Renewing their residence permits every year or every two years is not desirable. Once they opt for India they must know exactly how long they have to stay here, so that they can make the necessary arrangements to leave. I will always use my influence to get them to leave the country at the earliest, and I hope the Government will take the necessary steps to expedite matters. There may be difficulties in regard to obtaining exchange permits and so on, but I hope that all such matters will be worked out in such a way as to assist them, so that when they go to India they can lead useful lives.

Now, with regard to those who will become citizens of Ceylon, at the moment their housing is looked after by the employers. Once they become citizens of this country, it is undesirable that they should continue to depend on their employers for their housing, because, in a generation or two, if those occupying estate houses do anything wrong, it is very likely that they would not only be thrown out of their employment but out of their houses too. Therefore, the Government should think of starting housing schemes for them.

Then there is the problem of education of the estate children. True, it is a big problem. It has been neglected for many years although, in theory, the policy from as far back as 1947 has been that their education would form part of the national education. Although a number of schools have been taken over, yet no progress of a nature that would give

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[තොන්ඩමන් මයා.]

satisfaction in the matter has been made. And I would urge that some serious attention be given to that matter too so that those persons of Indian origin who will be accepted as Ceylon citizens will, in every respect, have full rights, equal rights, with the rest of the population.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ
(අකුරුස්ස)

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹு—

அக்குறஸ்ஸ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe—Akuressa)

තැගී සිටියේය.

rose. . .

නියෝජ්‍ය කළානායකතුමා

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

I would like to remind the hon. Member that he should try not to exceed the 45 minutes allotted to him.

ප්‍ර. හා. 11.25

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ
(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹு)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කළානායකතුමනි, මගේ කථාව මෙම අයවැය විවාදයේ අන්තිමටම වාගේ කරන්නට මා බලාපොරොත්තු වූයේ, විශේෂ කාරණයක් නිසයි. 1965 සිට අද වන තුරු ඉදිරිපත් කළ හැම අයවැය ලේඛනයකින්ම ගහන ශබ්ද වාහිනී නැටිය තමයි, “ලංකාවේ අතීතය රැදී පැවතියාක් මෙන්ම වර්තමානය හා අනාගතය රඳා පවත්නේත් කෘෂිකර්මය දියුණු කිරීම මතයි” යන්න. ඒ නිසා ආහාර හා කෘෂිකම් ඇමතිතුමාගේ කථාවෙන් ඒ පිළිබඳ විස්තර දැන ගැනීමට අප බලාපොරොත්තු වුණා. එහෙත් එතුමාගේ කථාවක් නියා එතුමාවත් මේ ගරු සභාවේ නැහැ. ඉබ්ම, වාරිමාර්ග හා විදුලි බල ඇමතිතුමාගේ කථාව අනුව නම් පෙනී යන්නේ; ඒ පරණ තැටියම ගහමින්, පරණ කථාවම

කියමින්, පරණ ක්‍රමයම ඉදිරියටත් ගෙන යන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වන බවයි. ඒ පරණ සෞභාවම ඉදිරියටත් කරන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වන බව එතුමාගේ කථාවෙන් පැහැදිලිව පෙනුණා.

මේ රට ආහාරයෙන් ස්වයංපෝෂිත වනු වෙනුවට ආහාර අතින් උග්‍ර හිඟයක් ඇති වුණේ, ඩී. එස්. සේනානායක මහත් මයාගේ කාලයේ සිට අද වනතුරුත් ගෙන යන, ආර්ථික අතින් විනාශකාරී වූ, විද්‍යාත්මක නොවූ කෘෂිකර්මික ව්‍යාපාරය නිසා බව පැහැදිලි වශයෙන්ම පෙනී යනවා. ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් වාර්තාවක් දෙකක් ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නට මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. ඒ පිළිබඳව තර්ක-විතර්ක කිරීමට නම් වේලාවක් නැහැ. වැඩිදුර තර්ක-විතර්ක කිරීමට වේලාව නැති බැවින් කථාව සීමා කරන හැටියට, මගේ කථාව ආරම්භයේදී ම නියෝජ්‍ය කළානායකතුමා අවවාද කළා. මා ඒ අවවාදය කිකරුකමින් යුක්තව පිළිගන්නවා.

නියෝජ්‍ය කළානායකතුමා

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

බොහොම ස්තූතියි.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ
(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹு)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

එම නිසා මේ පිළිබඳව දීර්ඝ වශයෙන් විවේචනය කරන්නට පුළුවන්කමක් නැහැ. ඒ නිසාම ලොකු අමාරුවකුත් ඇති වෙනවා.

මගේ කථාව රාජ්‍ය භාෂාවෙන් කරන්නටයි, මා ලැස්ති වුණේ. මගේ කථාවේදී උපුටා දැක්වීම සඳහා ගෙන ආ වාර්තා කීපයකුත් මා ළඟ තිබෙනවා. එහෙත් සමහර සිංහල වාර්තා ඉංග්‍රීසි වාර්තාවට පරස්පර විරෝධීයි. මා ඒ බව හිසවර අයවැය විවාදයේදීත් ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාට පෙන්නා දුන්නා. එතුමාගේ අමාත්‍යාංශයෙන් ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙන සිංහල හා ඉංග්‍රීසි වාර්තා එකිනෙකට වෙනස්. මෙය ඉබේ සිදු වුණු වැරද්දක් නොවෙයි. මෙය මහජනයා නොමග යැවීම සඳහා හිතාමතා යෙදූ උපක්‍රමයක් හැටියට මා පෙන්නා දෙන්නට කැමතියි.

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා ඉංග්‍රීසියෙන් කළ අයවැය කථාවේ මෙසේ සඳහන් වෙනවා :

“The per capita real domestic product therefore declined by 0.4 per cent and the per capita real product by 0.7 per cent.”

එහෙත් එතුමාගේ අයවැය කථාවේ සිංහල පිටපතේ එය සඳහන් වන්නේ කොහොමද ?

“එබැවින්, ප්‍රතිශීර්ෂ තුර්ත දේශීය නිෂ්පාදිතය සියයට 0.4 කින් වැඩිවුණු අතර ප්‍රතිශීර්ෂ මූර්ත නිෂ්පාදිතය සියයට 0.7 කින් වැඩි වුණා.”

ඉංග්‍රීසියෙන් අඩු වෙනවා. සිංහලයෙන්—රාජ්‍ය භාෂාවෙන්—වැඩි වෙනවා. මෙය ඉබේ සිදු වුණු, නොදැනුවත්කමින් සිදු වුණු වරදක් නොවෙයි. අඩු, වැඩි කියන දෙකේ වෙනස ඉගෙන ගන්න ලොකු පණිවිත ඥානයක් වුවමනා කරන්නේ නැහැ. පොදු මහජනතාවත්, විශ්ව විද්‍යාලවල ඉගෙන ගන්නා ශිෂ්‍යයන්ගත් බලන්නේ, මේ සිංහල පිටපතයි. ඒ නිසා මෙය ඔවුන් නොමග යැවීමට හිතාමතා කළ වාංචනික ක්‍රියාවක් හැටියට මා චෝදනා කරනවා. මේ ගැන සොයා බලන ලෙස ගරු අගමැතිතුමාගෙන් මා ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා.

එපමණක් නොවෙයි, 1966-67 වර්ෂය සඳහා වූ, එක්සත් ජාතීන්ගේ වාර්තාවක්—සංවර්ධන වැඩ සටහනක්—ලංකාවේ ආර්ථික හා ක්‍රම සම්පාදන අමාත්‍යාංශය මගින් 1966 ජූලි මාසයේදී නිකුත් කර තිබෙනවා.

“The Development Programme 1966-67” issued by the Ministry of Planning and Economic Affairs, Ceylon, in July 1966.

ඉංග්‍රීසි වාර්තාවේ තිබෙනවා,—“යුත් සෙට්ල්මන්ට්” ගැන—තරුණයන් පදිංචි කරවීමට ඇති කරන අළුත් ජනපද සම්බන්ධව. එහි මෙසේ සඳහන් වෙනවා :

“Youth settlement schemes have been started in various parts of the country for the development of new land for cultivation of subsidiary food crops, tea, coconut, paddy and livestock farming. These schemes are as yet at an experimental stage and the new patterns of farming, holdings, etc., have not been finally evolved.”

ඒ ගැන මොකක්ද කරන්නේ කියා ස්ථිර වශයෙන් තවමත් කියා නැහැ. එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයට සම්බන්ධ උදවිය එළිමහනේම තෝරා ගන්නවාය කියන එක නැතැයි කියන්න අගමැතිතුමාට බැහැ. දේශපාලන ආයුධයක් වශයෙනුයි කෘෂිකම් හට හමුදාව ඇති කර තිබෙන්නේ. එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ නියෝජිතවරුන් මගින් ඒ හමුදාවට තරුණයන් තෝරන්නේ. ඒ මාගියෙන් තෝරා ගන්නා උදවිය ගෙන ගොස් පදිංචි කරවන ජනපදවල ප්‍රතිපත්තිය කුමක්ද කියා තවමත් ස්ථිර වශයෙන් තීරණය කර නැත කියනවා. ඒ පිළිබඳව රාජ්‍ය භාෂාවෙන් නොහොත් සිංහල භාෂාවෙන් තිබෙන වාර්තාවේ සඳහන් වී තිබෙන්නේ කෙසේද කියා මා බලුවා. ඒ කොටස සිංහල වාර්තාවේ නැහැ. ඒ තරුණයන්ට අස්ථිර තත්ත්වයක් තිබෙන්නේ කියන එක සිංහල වාර්තාවේ නැහැ. ඇයි, කොහොමද සිංහලෙන් එය සඳහන් කරන්නේ. ඒ උදවියට පොරොන්දු දී තිබෙන්නේ, මහා ධනවතුන් කරනවාය, විශාල වශයෙන් පදිංචි කරවනවාය ආදිය කියායි.

ලොකු ධනවතුන්ට දුන් ඉඩම් පිළිබඳව නම් යම් තීරණයක් කර තිබෙනවා. ඒ පිළිවෙලටයි ඒවා බදු දී තිබෙන්නේ. ඒවායින් යම් අලාභයක් වුණොත් කොළඹ තිබෙන ඔවුන්ගේ ජාවාරම්වලින් ව්‍යාපාරවලින් ආදායමෙන් ලැබෙන ලාභයෙන් ඒ පාඩු අඩු කරගන්නවා ඇති. එහෙත් තරුණයන්ගේ ව්‍යාපාරය සම්බන්ධ තවම ස්ථිර තීරණයක් ආණ්ඩුවට ගන්න බැරි වී තිබෙනවා.

මේ රටේ සෑම තැනම තරුණ කණ්ඩායම් ඇති කර කුඩාරම්වල නවත්වා වැඩ ගන්නා ව්‍යාපාරයක් තිබෙන බව අප දන්නවා. එහෙත් ඒ උදවිය කරන්නේ මොනවාද, වගා කරන්නේ මොනවාද, ආදී ප්‍රශ්න පිළිබඳව අස්ථිර තත්ත්වයක් තිබෙනවා. ඒ බව තමුත්තාන්සේලා ඉංගිරිසි වාර්තාවේ සඳහන් කරනවා. ඉංගිරිසියෙන් ප්‍රකාශ නොකර බැහැ, මේ කටයුතුවලට ලෝක බැංකුව සම්බන්ධ නිසා. එසේ නැත් නම් ඒ උදවිය සිතාගනිවි, මේ ආණ්ඩුවත් සමග සිටින නිලධාරී පිරිස බොරුකාරයන්ය වංචාකාරයන්ය කියා; අපේ මුදල් විනාශ කිරීමට කටයුතු කරනවාය කියා. ඒ නිසා

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ]

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

The "Time" magazine, Asia Edition, of 28th July 1967. I quote :

ඒ උදවියට ඇත්ත ප්‍රකාශ කරනවා. වැඩි ජනතාවට තේරෙන, වැඩි ජනයාට අවබෝධ වන භාෂාවෙන් නොහොත් සිංහලෙන්—මා දන්නේ නැහැ දෙමළෙන් මෙය පළ කර තිබෙනවාද කියා, තිබුණත් මේ විධියටම වෙන්ත ඇති—සිංහලෙන් පළ කරනවා, වෙන විධියකට, ඒ නිසා අප මේ වෝදනාව අගමැතිතුමා වෙත එල්ල කරනවා. ඇත්ත ප්‍රකාශ නොකර මහ ජනයා නොමග යවන වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් මෙහි තිබෙන නිසා එසේ වෝදනා කිරීමට සිදු වී තිබෙනවා.

"Now that the Soviet Union has rebuilt the cities that were devastated by the German army in World War II, and now that the Cold War tension of the Stalinist era has eased, Russia is becoming an increasingly popular target for tourists. In 1956, fewer than 500,000 foreigners were adventurous enough to travel through the U. S. S. R.—one-eighth the number that visited France the same year—and about three-quarters of them were from the Communist countries of Eastern Europe. This year, which marks the 50th anniversary of the Revolution, Russia expects more than 1,500,000 tourists."

They have now satisfied the needs of the people in housing.

සංචාරක අංශය පිළිබඳව විරුද්ධ පක්ෂයේ නායිකාව සැහෙන විස්තරයක් කළ නිසා ඒ ගැන නැවතත් සඳහන් කිරීමට මා බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ නැහැ. එක් කාරණාවක් ගැන මතක් කරන්න කැමතියි. එනම් විදේශ සංචාරකයන් පිළිබඳව සෝවියට් දේශයේ කෙරෙන කටයුතු සම්බන්ධයෙන් රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා කළ ප්‍රකාශය ගැනයි. එතුමා ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් ඇමෙරිකන් සඟරාවකින් කරුණු ඉදිරිපත් කළා. එම ඇමෙරිකන් සඟරාවේ තිබෙන වැදගත් කොටසක් මා දැන් තමුත්තාත් සේලාට පෙන්වා දෙනවා. මේ ආණ්ඩුව වශ කිය යුතු ආණ්ඩුවක් නම්, තමන්ගේ හෘදය තුළ එක පුළුන් රොදක පමණවත් දේශප්‍රේමී අවබෝධයක් තිබෙනවා නම්, විදේශිකයන් සඳහා ඔය සකස් කරන්නට යන මාගී සකස් කිරීමට ප්‍රථමයෙන්, සෝවියට් දේශයේ එවැනි කටයුතු ගැන මෙම සඟරාවේ සඳහන් වන මේ කොටස පිළිබඳව සැලකිල්ල යොමු විය යුතුයි.

සෝවියට් දේශය විදේශ සංචාරකයින් තම රටට ඇතුළත් කර ගන්නේ රටේ ජාතික අවශ්‍යතාවලට බාධාවක් නොවන ආකාරයටයි. ලංකාවේ වගේ නොවෙයි, දෙවෙනි ලෝක මහා යුද්ධ සමයේදී සෝවියට් දේශයේ ගෙවල් ලක්ෂ ගණනක් විනාශ වී ලක්ෂ ගණනක් ජනතාව උග්‍ර නිවාස ප්‍රශ්නයකට මුහුණ දුන්නා. ඒ ප්‍රශ්නය විසඳන තුරු 1945 සිට 1956 දක්වා ඒ රටට දේශ සංචාරකයින් කැඳවාගෙන තිබෙන්නේ ඉතාම අඩු ප්‍රමාණයක්. ඒ රට ගැන කරුණු පරීක්ෂා කරන්නට ආණ්ඩුව මගින් කැඳවන්නට යෙදුණු උදවිය පමණයි, ඒ කාලයේ සාමාන්‍යයෙන් සෝවියට් දේශයට සංචාරකයින් ලෙස පැමිණ තිබෙන්නේ. ඒ කාලයේ සංචාරකයින්ට ඉතාම පහසු ජීවිතයක් ගත කරන්නට හෝටල් සේවා ක්‍රමයක් සෝවියට් දේශය සකස් කර තිබුණේ නැහැ. එහෙත් මාසයෙන්-මාසය, අවුරුද් දෙන්න-අවුරුද්ද ලක්ෂ ගණන් ගෙවල් සෑදීමට ක්‍රියා කළා. ලංකාවේ තත්ත්වය කොහොමද? හෝටල් හදන්නට වියදම් කරන ගණන්වල විස්තර දැන් ප්‍රකාශ වුණු නිසා මා ඒවා නැවත කියන්නට යන්නේ නැහැ. ආණ්ඩුව මේ විධියට හෝටල් හදන්නට විශාල මුදලක් වියදම් කරන අතර, සහතික අයෝජ්‍ය 12 වැනිද, සෙනසුරාද

"Now that the Soviet Union has rebuilt the cities that were devastated by the German army in World War II—"

ඩී. ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා. (කර්මාන්ත හා ඩිවර ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්)

(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்க—கைத்தொழில், கடற்றொழில் அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி)

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

What is the name of the magazine?

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

“ඩේලි නිවුස්” පත්‍රයේ ලොකු අකුරින් මේ විධියේ ප්‍රවෘත්තියක් පළ කර තිබුණා : “190 M. Housing Plan suspended.” “Await better times”, says Wanninayake.

ඒ වාර්තාවේම කියන හැටියට, වන්නියේ නායකයා වන අපේ මුදල් ඇමති තුමා ප්‍රකාශ කරනවා, කොළඹ නගරයේ ජීවත් වන වැසියන්ගෙන් 3/4 ක් ම ජීවත් වෙන්නේ මනුෂ්‍ය වාසයට සුදුසු නැති ගෙවල්වල බව. ඒ තරම් භයානක උග්‍ර ගෙවල් හිඟයක් කොළඹ පවතිනවා. මේ ප්‍රශ්නය විසඳීමේ බලාපොරොත්තු වෙත් තවට ගෙවල් 5,000 ක් සෑදීමට වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් සකස් කර තිබුණා. දැන් ඒ වැඩ පිළිවෙල හමස්පෙට්ටියට දමා තිබෙනවා. කාරණය මොකක්ද? මුදල් හිඟයයි. මේ රටේ ගෙවල් සෑදීමට තිබෙන රුපියල් කෝටි ගණනක මුදලක් වැය කරන්නට යන්නේ විදේශ සංචාරකයින්ට සුබෝපබෝගි ජීවිතයක් ගත කිරීමේ පහසුකම් සැලසීමටයි.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මේ අවස්ථාවේ මා අගමැතිතුමාට එක කාරණයක් මතක් කරන්නට ඕනෑ. වගකීමක් ඇතිව මා චෝදනා කරනවා, මේ හෝටල් හදන්නේ සංචාරකයින් සඳහා නොවෙයි කියා. මට ආරංචි වී තිබෙන අන්දමට මේ වැඩ පිළිවෙලේ යට තිබෙනවා, ඉතා භයානක විශාල දූෂිත කුමන්ත්‍රණයක්. ඒ ගැන මතක් කරන්නට කලින්, හෝටල් පාලනය සම්බන්ධයෙන් හොඳ පළ පුරුද්දක් ඇති, දැනට තිබෙන හෝටල් පාලනය කරන සමාගමේ සභාපති වන සී. එක්ස්. මාර්ටින් මහත්මයාගේ වාර්තාවකින් කොටසක් කියවන්නට මම අදහස් කරනවා. මෙන්න ඒ කොටස :

“We do accept the fact that new hotels are necessary both for prestige and trade purposes, but we should be cautious in embarking upon so many projects. I make this statement in view of what has already happened in neighbouring countries where tourism is said to be flourishing. I wish to read to you an extract from the ‘Bangkok Post’ of Thursday, May 4th, this year.

‘City Hotels Face Many Problems :

The majority of hotels in Bangkok will have to find new formula if they want to survive, a Bangkok spokesman warned yesterday.

The estimated drop in the average occupancy rate from the previous 80 per cent to 50 per cent may well indicate the magnitude of this problem, the spokesman said.”

As my time is limited I shall not read the whole extract. I shall quote this portion, which is the most relevant :

“Some hotels, finding themselves in this predicament, have found a way out by leasing themselves out to US military personnel stationed in Bangkok.

Five hotels have been completely leased out on contracts, the spokesman said, and no less than five others have been partially leased out on a similar basis.”

බැංකොක්වල හෝටල්, හමුදාවට දුන්නේ බිස්නස් නැති වුණු නිසා නොවෙයි. ඇමරිකන් ව්‍යාපාරිකයින් යොදවා ඒවා තැනුවේ බොඩ විශ්විනාමය, බොඩ ලාවෝසය, බොඩ කාම්බෝජය ආදී ආසියාතික රටවලට පහර ගැසීමට හා බෝම්බ දැමීමට එන ඇමරිකන් උසස් නිලධාරීන්ට නැවතී සිටීමට නිවාස අවශ්‍ය නිසයි. ඒ නිසයි හෝටල් හදන මුවාවෙන් බැංකොක් නගරයේ කාමර 5,000 ක් පමණ හදන්නට යෙදුණේ. අද ඒ නිලධාරීන් ජීවත් වෙන්නේ ඒ කාමරවලයි. බැංකොක් නගරයේ තිබුණු ධනපති ආණ්ඩුවත් ඇමරිකන් ධනවතුනුත් එකතු වෙලයි මේ හෝටල් හැදුවේ. ඒවාට යෙදවූ මුදල්වලට විශාල පොළියක් ගෙවන්නට සිද්ධ වී තිබෙනවා. අද එහි තිබෙන්නේ මිලිටරි ආණ්ඩුවක්. ව්‍යවස්ථාදායක ආණ්ඩුවක් නැහැ. දැනට අවුරුදු දහයකට පමණ ප්‍රථමයෙන් එහි තිබුණු ව්‍යවස්ථාදායක ආණ්ඩුව විසුරුවා හැරියා. අද එහි තිබෙන්නේ සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම මිලිටරි ආණ්ඩුවක්. අද අපේ රටේ තිබෙන ආණ්ඩුවත් හදිසි නීතිය පනවා ව්‍යවස්ථාදායක ක්‍රමය තාවකාලික වශයෙන් අත්හිටුවා තිබෙනවා. ව්‍යවස්ථාදායක ක්‍රමය තවම නැති කර නැහැ. ඒ ගැන මා අගමැතිතුමාට කතාකළා වෙනවා. ලංකාව තවම බැංකොක් තත්ත්වයට ආවේ නැහැ.

1966 ජනවාරි 8 වැනිදා සිට මේ රටේ හදිසි තත්ත්වය පනවා තිබෙනවා. බැංකොක් නගරයේ ඒ කටයුතු කළ අන්දමටම දැන් ලංකාවෙන් හෝටල් සාදන්නට යනවා. “Hard-headed businessman Rockefeller” කියා රාජ්‍ය

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

[වෛද්‍යවාරිය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ]

ඇමතිතුමා කියනවා. ඒ විධියෙ කට්ට සුර මොළ නිබෙන වෙලද ව්‍යාපාරිකයන් ලාහ උපදවා ගන්නට බැරි නම්, ආදායම් උපයා ගන්නට බැරි නම් මේ විධියට මුදල් යොදවයිද? මේ ආණ්ඩුව මාර්ගයෙන් ලංකාවත් ඇමරිකන් අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන්ගේ යුද්ධ භූමියක් කර ගැනීමට බලාපොරොත්තු වනවා. ප්‍රමාණයට වඩා විශාල වශයෙන් ඔවුන් මේ රටේ මුදල් යොදවන්නට කටයුතු කරනවා. අද අප රටේ හෝටල්වල ඇඳන් ගණන දෙදහසකින් වැඩි කරන්නට යනවා. විශාල හෝටල් දහයක් පමණ පිහිටුවන්නට කටයුතු කරගෙන යනවා. අළුත්ගම අක්කර 80 ක පමණ බිම් ප්‍රදේශයක් අරගෙන දැනට එහි තිබෙන තානායම් සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම කඩා දමා විශාල ගොඩනැගිල්ලක් සාදන්නට කටයුතු කරගෙන යනවා. විදේශ සංචාරකයන්ට වඩා හොඳ මාලිගා ඕනෑය කියා දැනට තිබෙන හොඳ ගොඩනැගිලි සියල්ලම කඩා ගෙන යනවා. නමුත් අපේ රටේ ජනතාවට ඉඩම් තැහැ; ගෙවල් දෙරවල් තැහැ. අපේ රටේ, ජනතාව පැල්පත්වලයි ජීවත් වෙන්නේ. අද කෙනෙකුට නිවාසයක් සාදා ගැනීමටත් වුවමනා කරන ද්‍රව්‍ය තැහැ. නිවාසයක් තැනීම සඳහා ජාතික නිවාස දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවෙන් ණය මුදලක් ඉල්ලා තිබෙන තැනැත්තකු මට හමුවුණා. මූලික කටයුතුවලට රුපියල් 600 ක් පමණ වැය කර මා ණය මුදලක් ලබා ගන්නට ජාතික නිවාස දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවට ණය ඉල්ලුම් පත්‍රයක් ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙනවාය, දැන් භය මාසයක් ගතවී තිබෙනවාය, තවම කිසිම උත්තරයක් ලැබී නැත කියා ඔහු මට ප්‍රකාශ කළා. අද මේ රටේ කෙනෙකුට ගෙයක් සාදා ගන්නට ණය මුදලක්වත්, නිකම් දෙන මුදලක් නොවෙයි ණය මුදලක්වත් ලබා ගැනීමට ක්‍රමයක් තැහැ. නමුත් බෙන්තොට තිබෙන හොඳ ගොඩනැගිලි කඩා දමා බිමට මට්ටම් කර විශාල මාලිගා වැනි ගොඩනැගිලි සාදාගෙන යනවා. ඒ අවට පදිංචි ජනතාව ඉවත් කර අක්කර 80 ක් පවරා ගෙන තිබෙනවා.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කළාතායකතුමනි, ඒ සමගම රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා කියනවා, යුරෝපා රටවල මෙන් ලංකාවේ දූෂණ නැත කියා. නමුත් මේ ඊයෙ පෙරේදා ඉතාලි

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

තානායමේ ඇතිවූ සිද්ධිය බලන්න. ධනපතියන්, එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ ඇමතිවරුන්ගේ සහාය ඇතිව, මා නම් කියන්නේ නැහැ—

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

තැහැ, තැහැ, නම් කියන්න.

වෛද්‍යවාරිය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

නඩුවක් පවරන්නට තවමත් පරීක්ෂා කරගෙන යන නිසා මා නම් කියන්නේ නැහැ.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

එහෙම නම් බොරු කියන්නට එපා.

වෛද්‍යවාරිය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

ගාල්ලේ නගර සභාවේ නියෝජිත යෙක්—

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ ඇමතිවරුන්ගේ සහාය ඇතිව කිව්වේ? නම් කියන්න.

වෛද්‍යවාරිය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

තානායමේ සිටි අය පොලීසිය අල්ලා ගත් අවසාවේදී මේ ආණ්ඩුවේ ඇමතිවරයකුත් පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්වරයකුත් ඒ අය පොලීසියෙන් නිදහස් කර ගැනීමට බලපාමින් කටයුතු කළාය යන චෝදනාව මා එල්ල කරනවා. ඒ තරම් නින්දිත, පාහර ක්‍රියාවක් කළ පුද්ගලයකු සම්බන්ධ—

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

කඩදාසි හෙම කටයුතු කළේ?

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

නගර සභාවේ නියෝජිතයකු වෙන්න
ඇති.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

කවුද මේ ඇමතිවරයා?

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

මා නම් කියන්නේ නැහැ.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

ඇයි නම් කියන්නෙ නැත්තෙ?

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

පොලිසියෙන් අහන්න. එතකොට
ඇමතිවරයාගෙ නම දැනගන්නට පුළුවනි.
මා වුවමනා නැති ආරංචි දෙන්නෙ නැහැ.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

එහෙම නම් ඇයි කිව්වෙ?

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

කිව්වෙ සොයන්න වුවමනා නිසා.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

නිකම් මඩ ගහන්න.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

සොයා බලන්න.

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, රාජ්‍ය
ඇමතිවරයා “නයිට් ක්ලබ්ස්” ගැනත්
සඳහන් කළා. ලුනාවේ “ඩේ ක්ලබ්”
එකේයි මේ තරම් දූෂණ ක්‍රියා කළේ. ඩේ
ක්ලබ්ස්වල දවල් ක්ලබ්ස්වල, නයිට්
ක්ලබ්ස්වල නොහොත් රූ ක්ලබ්ස්වල
කෙරෙන දේවල් ගැන මේ ගරු සභාවේ
නොවෙයි වෙන කොයි තැනකදිවත් විස්තර
කරන්නට බැහැ. අද ඒ තරම් දූෂණ
කෙරෙනවා. මේ අන්දමින් සලකා බලන
විට ලංකාවේ ධනපතියනුත් විදේශවල
ධනපතියනුත් එකතු වී කරන්නට යන මේ
වැඩ පිළිවෙළ හරිගියොත් අපේ සදාචාරය
ඉවරයි; අපේ සංස්කෘතිය ඉවරයි;
අපේ ජාතික මමත්වය ඉවරයි;
අපේ ජාතියේ ගරුත්වය ඉවරයි.
බැංකොක් නගරයේ සිදු වුණු
දේවල් ගැන අපි දන්නවා. මැනිලා නගර
යේ සිදු වන දේවල් ගැන අපි දන්නවා.
තායිවාන්වල සිදු වන දේවල් ගැන අපි
දන්නවා. මේ රට “මරිජුවානා ක්ලබ්ස්”
වලට පාවා දීමට ඉඩ දෙන්න බැහැ. ඔවුනි
කටයුතු සඳහා හදන්නට යන හෝටල්
සංස්ථා ගොඩනැගිලි යනාදිය කවදා හෝ
රාජසන්නක වන බව අමෙරිකන් කොමි
පැනිකාරයන්ට මා මතක් කර සිටිනවා. මේ
රටේ ජාතික ගරුත්වය රුක ගන්නට පුළු
වන්නම තිබෙන ආණ්ඩුවක් මෙම ආණ්ඩුව
තල්ලු කර දමා බලයට පත් වූ විට එය සිදු
වෙනවා ඇති. සංචාරක කටයුතු පිළිබඳව මා
කතා කරන්නේ එපමණයි. හෝටල් වැඩ
සම්බන්ධයෙන් මා ඉහතදී කළ චෝදනාව
තුවනත් කරනවා. උසස් අමෙරිකන්
යුද්ධ නිලධාරීන්ට මේ රටේ පදිංචි වෙලා
කටයුතු කරන්නට ඉඩ දීම වැරදියි. අද
අග්නිදිග ආසියාව තුළ අමෙරිකන්
ආක්‍රමණය පවත්වාගෙන යන පිළිවෙළ
අප දන්නවා. ලංකාව ප්‍රධානකොට ඉන්දී
යන් සාගරයේ පිහිටි රටවල් යුද කඳවුරු
වශයෙන් යෙදවීම සඳහා ගෙන යන
කුමන්ත්‍රණයට ආධාර දීම සඳහා අමෙරි
කන් කොමිපැනිකාරයන් යොදන කුට
ව්‍යාපාරය පිළිබඳව රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා නො
දැන නොවෙයි, මේ අන්දමට ක්‍රියාකරන්
නේ. මා ඒ ගැන එතුමාට චෝදනා
කරනවා. එසේ නැතෙයි කියනවා නම්
“මෙතන සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම ඇත්තක්
නැත” කියන ප්‍රකාශය කරන හැටියට මා
ගරු ඇමතිතුමාගෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා.

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ]

මේ අන්දමේ උපක්‍රම ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්නට බැරි බවට එය එක්තරා අන්දමකින් සහතිකයක් වෙනවා ඇති.

ගරු කර්මාන්ත ඇමතිතුමා හොඳ සුද්ධ චරිතයක් තිබෙන, කිසිදු දූෂණ ක්‍රියාවක් නොකරන, රඳල ක්‍රමයට නොගැවුණු, දූෂණ ක්‍රියාවන්ගෙන් තොර කෙනෙකු වශයෙන් කතා කරමින් අගලවන්න ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා), “prince of parasites” යයි කිව්වා. කාල වේලාව නොමැති හෙයින් මා ඒ පිළිබඳව වැඩි දුර කතා කරන්නේ නැහැ. එහෙත් එකක් කියන්නට ඕනෑ. ගරු කර්මාන්ත ඇමතිවරයාට ඒ අන්දමට නම්බු නාමයක් දෙනවා නම් “king of betrayers” යයි කියන්නට පුළුවනි. අද සිටින තැනේ හැටියට සලකා බලන විට “පාවා දීමේ රජුරුවන්” යැයි එතුමාට නම් කරන්නට පුළුවනි.

පුද්ගලික අංශයට දුන් කර්මාන්ත පිළිබඳව 1967 අප්‍රේල් 7 වන දින හැන්සාඩ් වාර්තාවෙහි සඳහන් වී තිබෙනවා. ඇලුමිනි

යම් පැහැලි තහඩු සහ වටරවුම් නිෂ්පාදනය පුද්ගලික අංශයට භාර දී ඇති බව එහි සඳහන් වෙනවා.

ගරු ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන

(කෙළරාභ ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන)

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

ඇලුමිනියම් කියල නැහැ, හොඳට කියවා බලන්න.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(ඩොක්ටර් ආර්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

ඇලුමිනියම් කියන්නේ මොනවාද?

ගරු ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන

(කෙළරාභ ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන)

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

ගැල්වනයිස් කියන්නේ ඇලුමිනියම්ද?

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(ඩොක්ටර් ආර්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

ටිකක් ඉන්න කියන තුරු.

එදින හැන්සාඩ් වාර්තාවේ 2767 වන සඳහන් වෙනවා:

නිෂ්පාදකයාගේ නම

- | | |
|------------------------------------|-----|
| 10. ඇලුමිනියම් නිෂ්පාදන සමාගම | ... |
| 14. ලංකා ගැල්වනයිස් කර්මාන්ත සමාගම | ... |
| 15. ගිම්ප්ස් (ලංකා) සමාගම | ... |

මට ආරංචි, රොබට් සේනානායක මහතාටත් කොටස් වගයක් තිබෙනවාය කියා. [බාධා කිරීමක්] එම කොමිෂනි සමග මේ රටේ ජාචාරම් කරන අයටත් අයිතිය දී තිබෙනවා. කර්මාන්ත ඇමතිතුමා කලබල වන්නේ, ඊළඟට මා කියන දේ ගැන දන්නා නිසා වෙන්නට ඇති.

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

(කෙළරාභ ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන—කෘත්‍ය ධූරාය, කළුරුගුණිල්ල අමාත්‍යාංශය)

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

දන්නේ නැහැ, කියන්න.

පිටුවේ එතුමා දී තිබෙන පිළිතුරක මෙසේ

කර්මාන්තය පිළිබඳ විස්තර

ඇලුමිනියම් පැහැලි සහ වටරවුම්
ගැල්වනයිස් යකඩ තහඩු
ගැල්වනයිස් යකඩ තහඩු.”

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(ඩොක්ටර් ආර්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

වෑනේ කර්මාන්ත ශාලාව සම්බන්ධයෙන් 1966 දී නල්ලුර්ගි ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය නාගනාතන්) සහ ඇමතිතුමා මොනවාද කිව්වේ? මේකේ අභිනාලම බහිනවාය කිව්වා; යටින් ගංගා ගලා යනවාය කිව්වා; මෙතන කටයුතු සඳහා යටියනින් ගඩොල් ගෙනෙන්නට අමතර වියදමක් ගොස් තිබෙනවාය කිව්වා; මෙහි මහ බැරෑරුම් තත්ත්වයක් තිබෙනවාය කිව්වා. මේ අන්දමට ටිකක්වත් සත්‍යයක් නැති, නින්දිත බොරු වෑනේ කර්මාන්ත ශාලාව සම්බන්ධ

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

යෙන් මෙතැනදී ප්‍රකාශ කළා ඊට පෙර සිටි ඇමතිවරයා සම්පූර්ණයෙන් ම මෙය නැති හංග කර දමන්න වැඩ පිළි වෙළ යෙදූ බවට කළ ප්‍රකාශයක් හැත්සාඩ් වාර්තාගත වී තිබෙනවා. ඇමතිවරයා කළ මේ අන්දමේ ප්‍රකාශයන් මේ අවස්ථාවේදී මා කියවන්න යන්නෙ නැහැ.

ශ්‍රී ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන

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

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය ඩී. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(ඩොක්ටර් ආර්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ)
(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

I am not going to give way to the Hon. Minister.—[Interruption].

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා

(උප සභාපාලකතුමා)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

It is not a case of giving way. You have used the words “නින්දිත බොරු”. It is not fair to use those words.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය ඩී. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(ඩොක්ටර් ආර්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ)
(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

On his own showing, they are proved to be untrue. ඇමතිවරයා කියන මේ ප්‍රකාශවල ඇත්තක් තිබෙනවාද? වානේ කර්මාන්තශාලාවේ අඩිතාලම බැස තිබෙනවාද? අද විශාල වශයෙන් කර්මාන්ත ශාලාවේ වැඩ කටයුතු කරගෙන යනවා; බලාපොරොත්තු වුණු නිෂ්පාදන සියයට සියයකින්ම කර ගෙන යනව නොවේද? අද ඒ කර්මාන්තය ගැනත් පුරසාරම් දොඩනවා.

ශ්‍රී ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන

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

බැස තිබුණු ඒවාට කළ ප්‍රතිකර්ම ගැන මා කීවා. අඩිතාලම බැස තිබුණා.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය ඩී. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(ඩොක්ටර් ආර්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ)
(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

නිකම් ඉන්නවා.

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

ශ්‍රී ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන

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

තමුත්තාන්සෙට වැඩිය මා දන්නවා.
[බාධාකිරීම්]

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය ඩී. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(ඩොක්ටර් ආර්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ)
(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

මා තමුත්තාන්සෙගෙ හැටි කියන්න දන්නවා.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා

(උප සභාපාලකතුමා)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

What is the use of this personal attack? Please carry on with the Debate.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය ඩී. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(ඩොක්ටර් ආර්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ)
(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

තමුත්තාන්සෙගෙ ජීවිතය ගැන අහගන්න ඔබ්බ නම් මට කියන්න පුළුවන් කම තිබෙනවා. දූෂණවලට, උපක්‍රමවලට, මහන්සි ගත් හැටි මට කියන්න පුළුවන්. නිකම් කලබල වෙන්න ඔබ්බ කරන්නෙ නැහැ.

ශ්‍රී ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන

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

දූෂණ ක්‍රියා කිරීමට ඔහෙන් එවා සිටි මිනිසුන් ගැනත් මා දන්නවා.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය ඩී. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(ඩොක්ටර් ආර්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ)
(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

වානේ සංස්ථාව පිහිටුවනු ලැබූ අවස්ථාවේදී, 1961 සැප්තැම්බර් 30 වනදා ගැසට් පත්‍රයෙහි නීතිගත කිරීම පිළිබඳ ප්‍රකාශනය—පළ වී තිබුණේ මේ අන්දමටයි. ඇමතිවරයාට ඇති බලතල අනුව මෙහි කෙරෙන වැඩ කටයුතු ගැන, කිරීමට භාර ගත් වැඩ කටයුතු ගැන, වගකීම ගැන, සංස්ථාව පිළියෙළ කිරීම ගැන ඔය ආදී කාරණා ගැන මෙහි උපලේඛනයෙහි සඳහන් කර තිබෙනවා. මෙහි එක් තැනෙක තිබෙනවා—

“Manufacture of finished products from iron and steel and alloys of iron and steel including enameling, lathering, galvanizing, plating, polishing, blacksmithing and welding.”

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[වෛද්‍යවෘත්තීය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ]

7 වන උපලේඛනයෙහි—

“Importation, sale, distribution and export of iron and steel and all products of iron and steel, tools, implements, etc. The construction, operation and management of all processes or activities subsidiary or connected with or required for the aforesaid processes.”

එතකොට, ගැල්වනයිස් ෂීට්ස් සෑදීමත් රූපියල් කෝටි ගණනක් ණය මුදල් ගෙන වියදම් කර පිහිටුවනු ලැබූ මේ වානේ කර්මාන්ත ශාලාවට භාර දුන් කාර්යයක්. දැන් එය පෞද්ගලික කොමිෂනර්වලට භාර දීමට යනවා, නමුත් නීතියෙන්ම භාර දුන්නේ වානේ සංස්ථාවටයි. මේ අන්දමට පෞද්ගලික අංශයට භාර දීමේ තේරුම මොකක්ද? ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මෙවැනි කාරණා ගැන දිගින් දිගට මා තර්ක කරන්න යන්නේ නැහැ. සමහර විට මේ අමතරවරයා, සෝවියට් විශේෂඥයින් ගැන විශ්වාසයක් නැතුව වෙන්ත ඔනෑ. තමන්ට පඩි ගෙවන භාමුලා සතුවු කරන්න වෙන්ත ඔනෑ, එංගලන්තයෙන් ඇවිකිත්සන් කියන—

ගරු ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන

(கௌரவ டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

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

තමවත් කියන්න දන්නේ නැහැ, නිකම් බොරු දොඩවනවා.

වෛද්‍යවෘත්තීය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

රන් පවුම් හතලිස් පන් දහසක් වියදම් කර උපදේශකයකු පත් කර වාර්තාවක් ලබාගන්නා. නමුත් ඒ වාර්තාවත් පාර්ලිමේන්තුවට ඉදිරිපත් කරන්න ඇමතිට බැරිකමක් තිබෙනවා.

ගරු ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන

(கௌரவ டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

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

මොකද ඉදිරිපත් කරන්න බැරි?

වෛද්‍යවෘත්තීය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

එක කියෙව්වොත් ඇමතිවරයා කළ ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මට දූෂණ ඵලි වෙන නිසා, වානේ සංස්ථාව තමාගේ පමණ වෙලාව නියෙනවාද?

සම්බන්ධයෙන් කළ බොරු ප්‍රකාශ ඔක්කොම ඔප්පු වෙන නිසා, එය ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නේ නැහැ. එය ඉදිරිපත් කළොත් අඩිතාලම බැස නැති බව එම වාර්තාව අනුව ඔප්පු වෙනවා. අද වන තුරු පාර්ලිමේන්තුවට වාර්තාව ඉදිරිපත් කළේ නැහැ. නිකම් බොරු සිංහයකු වාගේ කෑ ගහන්නේ නැතුව, වාර්තාව පාර්ලිමේන්තුවට ඉදිරිපත් කරන්න.

තවදුරටත් මෙසේ පළකර තිබෙනවා:

“The selection of the products, on an economic and technical feasibility basis, is dealt with in Article 13 but it is convenient to list these products here together with the anticipated sales for each up to the year 1980.”

වේලාව මිදි නිසා මා එය තවදුරටත් කිය වන්නට අදහස් කරන්නේ නැහැ. අවශ්‍යම කොටස මෙයයි:

“But at least one enterprise in the private sector plans to instal sheet galvanizing plant which could detract from the Corporation’s profitability. We have assumed for the present purposes therefore that this private sector proposal will not be given permission to proceed and that the market requirement for galvanized sheet will be met by the Steel Corporation.”

මේ විධියේ වාර්තාවක් නැද්දැයි මා අහනවා. දැන් කෝ කතා? ගැල්වනයිස් තහඩු සෑදීමේ සම්පූර්ණ බලය, ආණ්ඩුවෙන් ඇති කරන ලද වානේ කර්මාන්ත ශාලාවට දෙන්නට ඔනෑ බව මේ ඇමතිවරයා විසින් පත් කළ විශේෂඥයකු වන එටිකිත්ස් මහතා කියා තිබියදීත් අද මේ ඇමතිවරයා කටයුතු කරන්නේ, මේ රටේ ජනසතු ව්‍යාපාර දියුණු කිරීමටත් ධන පති ව්‍යපාරය දුර්වල කොට සමාජවාදය කරා මේ රට ගමන් කරවීමට වත් නොව, මිට පෙර තිබුණු ආණ්ඩුව විසින් ඇති කරන ලද කර්මාන්ත සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම දේශීය හා විදේශීය ධනපතින්ට අත්පත් කර දීමට බව මෙයින් ඔප්පු වන බව මා මේ අවස්ථාවේදී තමුන්නාන්සේට මතක් කරනවා.

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

තව මිනිත්තු 15 ක් තියෙනවා.

පෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.

(திரு. ஷெல்ஹன் ஜயசிங்க)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

මොකද ඔව්වර හදිස්සි? හෙමින් කථා කරන්න. කලබල වෙන්න එපා.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

ජාති දෝෂීන් දේශ ප්‍රේමීන් වෙන්න හදන විට ඉවසීමක් ඇතිව කථා කරන්නට පුළුවන්ද? දෝෂීන් දෝෂීන් හැටියට ඉන්නව නම් කමක් නෑ.

ගරු ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන

(கௌரவ டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

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

දැන් හෝදා පාළුවට බහින්න.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

නමුසෙ වාගෙ හෝදාපාළුවෙක් තවත් ඉන්නවයැ?

ඊළඟට ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, කිරි මණ්ඩලය සම්බන්ධ වාර්තාවක මෙසේ සඳහන් වී තිබෙනවා :

“It is proposed to make up this shortfall by expanding the existing dairy production in the coconut plantations. An incidental advantage is that because the plantations are on the whole better located in relation to Colombo than the present milk producing areas, there will be savings on transport and distribution costs.”

ලංකාවෙහි පොල් වතු අක්කර 12 ලක්ෂයක් තිබෙන බවත් අක්කර තුනක එකා බැගින් ඒවායෙහි හරකුන් යෙදවීමෙන් කිරි පට්ටි තුන් ලක්ෂයක් පමණ ඇති කරන්නට පුළුවන් බවත් මෙහි කියා තිබෙනවා. මේ සම්බන්ධව කරුණු කියන්නට එම විශේෂඥයන්ට ආණ්ඩුව නියම කර තැනත් පසුව කළ යුතු දෙයක් වශයෙන්

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

එය මතක් කරන බවයි කියා තිබෙන්නේ. ඊළඟට මේ වාර්තාවෙහි මෙසේ සඳහන් වෙනවා :

“The Mission believes that in the context of its terms of reference, these two projects should have relatively low priority.”

පොල් වතුවල කිරි පට්ටි ඇති කළොත් උඩ රටින් කිරි ගෙන්වීමට යන වියදම අඩු කර ගැනීමෙන් විශාල ප්‍රයෝජනයක් ලබන්නට පුළුවන් බවයි මෙහි කියා වෙන්නේ. පොල් වතුවල කිරි පට්ටි ඇති කිරීම ලංකාවේ වැඩි වැඩියෙන් කිරි නිපදවන්නට පුළුවන් ක්‍රමයක් වුවත් ඊට අනුමැතිය ලැබී නැති නිසාත් මේ පිළිබඳව වාර්තා කරන උදවියට ලැබී තිබෙන බලයේ හැටියටත් ප්‍රමුඛත්වයදී වැඩිදුර වාර්තා කරන්නට බැරියයි කියා තිබෙනවා. එයින් තව විකක් මම කියවන්නම්.

.....“third, the coconut plantations of which there are some 1.1 million acres capable of a stocking rate of 1 animal to 3 acres.”

මේ වාර්තාවේ තවත් හුඟක් කරුණු සඳහන් වෙනවා. ඒ වුණත් ඒවා කියවන්නට වෙලාවක් නැහැ. මේ ආණ්ඩුව දැනට පවත්වාගෙන යන්නේත් ඩී. එස්. සේනානායක යුගයේ තිබුණු ප්‍රතිපත්තිමයි.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, කිරි පට්ටි ඇති කිරීම සම්බන්ධයෙන් 1934 දී —පළමුවැනි රාජ්‍ය මන්ත්‍රණ සභා කාලයේ දී—මා කියා ඇති දෙයක් අදද මතක් කර දෙන්නට කැමතියි. පොල් වතුවල කිරි පට්ටි ඇති කිරීමේ වැදගත්කම ගැන මා එදා අදහස් කළත්, ඩී. එස්. සේනානායක ඇමතිවරයාට ඒ මා කී කරුණුවල වැදගත්කම අවබෝධ කර ගන්නට බැරි වුණා. කිරි පට්ටි ඇති කොට කොළඹ ප්‍රදේශයේ සිටින ලමයින්ට තොම්ලයේ කිරි සපයන ලෙස මා ඉල්ලා සිටි අවස්ථාවේදී ඩී. එස්. සේනානායක මහතා ඒ අදහස හෙළා දැක්කා. මා මේ කියවන්නේ 1934 ජූප් තැම්බර් මාසයේ 9 වැනිදා හැන්සාඩ් වාර්තාවකිනුයි.

(ඩී. ඇස්. සේනානායක) කෘෂිකර්ම හා ඉඩම් සංවර්ධන ඇමති :

“I am sorry, Sir, that I did not make the position clear in the course of my speech at the Second Reading stage. I

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[වෛද්‍යවෘත්තීය ඒ. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ]

quite realize that milk is a very valuable article of food. But I am not making an attempt to supply milk to children. It is very desirable to do that, and I hope someone will do it. If the mothers are not able to supply milk to the children, then someone else should do so."

දරුවන්ට කිරි දීම තමාගේ වැඩක් නොව අම්මලාගේ වැඩකැයි එදා ඒ ඇමතිවරයා කීවා. ආණ්ඩුවේ ප්‍රධාන ඇමති

වරයා, කිරි පට්ටිවලට රුපියල් ලක්ෂ ගණන් වියදම් කිරීමට වැඩ කළ ඇමති වරයා එදා කීවේ එහෙමයි. දැනුත් ගෙන යන්නේ එදා ගෙන ගිය ප්‍රතිපත්තියමයි. කිරි පට්ටි ඇති කිරීම සම්බන්ධයෙන් වාසිදායක තත්ත්වයක් තිබෙන බව විශේෂඥයන් වාර්තා කර තිබෙනවා. ලංකාවේ කිරි පාවිච්චිය සම්බන්ධයෙන් කියා තිබෙන්නේ එහෙමයි.

MILK CONSUMPTION IN CEYLON

"The rate of milk consumption in Ceylon is very low, particularly when compared with the respective consumption rates of the developed countries."

Ceylon	2 oz. per person per day
India	6 oz. per person per day
Japan	12 oz. per person per day
Australia	45 oz. per person per day
United Kingdom	40 oz. per person per day
Denmark	40 oz. per person per day

මේ සංඛ්‍යාලේඛන අනුව මේ රටේ කෙනෙකුට දිනකට ලැබෙන්නේ කිරි අවුන්ස දෙකයි. උඩරට වතුවල වැඩියෙන් කිරි නිෂ්පාදන කටයුතු කිරීම සඳහා රුපියල් කෝටි ගණන් වියදම් කරන්නට ක්‍රියා කළා. ඒ වෙනුවට පොල් වතුවල විශාල කිරි පට්ටි ඇති කර මේ රටේ ජනතාවට පහසුවෙන් කිරි සපයන්නට පුළුවන් කම තිබුණා; තිබෙනවා. අද කිරි මිළ ගත දහයකින් වැඩි කරලා. ජනතාවට පහසු මිලට කිරි සපයා දීම අද සමාජවාදී ලෝකයේ හැම තැනම සිදු වෙනවා. ඒ නිසා අන්න ඒ කටයුත්ත ඉෂ්ට කරන හැටියට අප මෙම ආණ්ඩුවෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා.

තව එක කරුණක් ගැන, තවත් හෝදාපාඨවක් ගැන කියන්නට ඕනෑ. ගල්ඔය ව්‍යාපාරයේ කෙරෙන කටයුතු සම්බන්ධයෙන් විශේෂ කොමිෂන් සභාවක් ලවා පරීක්ෂණයක් කරවන ලෙස මා 1965 කාලයේදී ගරු ඉඩම් ඇමතිතුමාට බල කළා. එවැනි පරීක්ෂණයක් පවත්වන බවට එදා එතුමා පොරොන්දු වුණා. එහෙත් ප්‍රසිද්ධ පරීක්ෂණයක් නම් පැවැත්තුවේ නැහැ. එහෙම නම් අපටත් ඒවා ඉදිරියට ගොස් යම් යම් කරුණු ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නට තිබුණා. කෙසේ වෙතත්, විශේෂඥයන් කණ්ඩායමක් යොදවා පසු ගිය කාලයේදී ගල්ඔය ව්‍යාපාරයේ

යුතු සම්බන්ධයෙන් පරීක්ෂණයක් පැවැත් වූ බව අප දන්නවා. ගල්ඔය ව්‍යාපාරයේ මොනතරම් සමාජද්‍රෝහී, මොන තරම් දේශද්‍රෝහී කටයුතු සිදු වෙනවාදැයි මා හැම අයවැය ලේඛන විවාදයකදීම වාගේ පෙන්වා දී තිබෙනවා. හොදාපාඨවල තත්ත්වය පෙන්වා දී තිබෙනවා. ගරු ඉඩම් ඇමතිතුමා ගල්ඔය ව්‍යාපාරය පිළිබඳව සොයා බැලීමට පත් කරන ලද කොමිටියේ වාර්තාව මෙම ගරු සභාවට ඉදිරිපත් කරනවා ඇතැයි අප බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. ඒ වාර්තාවෙන් දූෂණවල තත්ත්වය බලා ගන්නට පුළුවන් වෙනැයි මා කල්පනා කරනවා.

ආහාර වගාව සම්බන්ධයෙන් මෙම ආණ්ඩුව එදා ගෙන ගිය ප්‍රතිපත්තියයි, අදත් ගෙන යන්නේ. ඒ පිළිබඳව කියවන්නට නම් වාර්තා කීපයක්ම තිබෙනවා. එහෙත් ඒවා කියවන්නට දැන් වේලාවක් නැහැ. එසේ වුවද එකක් පමණක් කියවන්නට ඕනෑ. මා මේ කියවන්නට හදන්නේ 1935 දී රාජ්‍ය මන්ත්‍රණ සභාවේදී මා කළ ප්‍රකාශයකුයි. හෝදාපාඨ ගැන මා අද පමණක් නොව එදත් කියා තිබෙනවා. මා මේ කියවන්නේ 1935 අගෝස්තු මස 13 වැනි දින හැන්සාඩ් වාර්තාවකිනි.

"I would also remind the Minister that we have taken it as a settled fact, as an established fact, that the only way of regenerating agriculture and of tackling the

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

problem of the landless and the unemployed is by giving him patches of land on a hill slope, or to divide the available land into uneconomic blocks of 2 acres, 3 acres, or even 5 acres, and put the man on that piece of land. There is going to be an additional scheme to give these people some relief, and it is going to cost us a few hundred thousand rupees. I would seriously ask the House to consider whether that is going to solve our problem of the landless peasant, or our problem of unemployment.

I would only ask the House to consider this fact: If a private individual, with the incentive of private profit for himself, is able to conduct a big estate on borrowed capital, without receiving any state subsidy, if he successfully manages a thousand acres of tea, draws big profits from the plantation, I would ask the Board of Ministers seriously to consider the matter—of introducing some system into these colonies as the system employed in estates. Of course, in the case of these colonies run according to the economic plan of estates by the State, the incentive should be not private profit but extending the maximum advantage to the man who produces wealth in the colony."

ඒ 1935 දී: අවුරුදු 30 කට කලින්.

"I submit that we should adopt a scientific system instead of the present policy.....

Why should it be that all economic propositions should be left to private enterprise and all the unprofitable, impossible schemes should be given over to the State? I do not think this House will consider it unsafe to absorb these landless villagers and peasants into a colonization scheme carried on according to a scientific system."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, State Council, 13th August 1935; Vol. II, c. 2133-4.]

I am living in eternal hope.

ඒ ජනපද ක්‍රම සම්බන්ධව ලෝක බැංකුවේ විශේෂඥයන් විසින් අදත් පළ කර තිබෙන වාර්තා ඉදිරිපත් කිරීමට මට කාලයක් නැහැ. අවස්ථාවක් ලදොත් පසුව ඉදිරිපත් කරනවා. අක්කර දෙක තුන බැගින් ගම්මුත්තට බෙදා දී තමන්ගේ භාමන නිවා ගෙන යම්තම් ජීවත් වීමට ඉඩ සලස්වා තිබෙන කෘෂිකර්ම ක්‍රමය අලුත් ව්‍යාපාරවලට යෙදවීමෙන් ඇති වන විනාශදායක වැඩ පිළිවෙළ සම්බන්ධව වාර්තා ගණනාවක්ම තිබෙනවා. එහෙත් ඒවා යටපත් කර දමා තිබෙනවා. ඒවා යෙහි තිබෙන කරුණු ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නේ නැහැ. ඒ වාර්තාවලින් පෙන්වා දී ඇති

කරුණු එකක්වත් ඉඩම් ඇමතිතුමාගෙන් ප්‍රකාශ වුණා ද? එකක් නම් ප්‍රකාශ කළා. ගල්ඔයට සිදු වී තිබෙන විනාශය මෙන්ම උඩවලවේ මුඩුබිම් විනාශ කරන්නට යන බව සඳහන් කළා. ගල්ඔය තුනෙන් පංගුවක් පමණ ප්‍රදේශය කිසිම දෙයක් වටන් න බැරි විධියට නිසරු ප්‍රදේශයක් වී තිබෙනවා සෝදාපාළුව නිසා. දේශපාලන සෝදාපාළුව නිසා නොවෙයි; විද්‍යාත්මක ලෙස ඒ වැවිලි කටයුතු නොකළ නිසා. ඉක්මනින්ම එක මෝසමක් ගොවිතැන් කරන්න ඕනෑ නිසා යන්නු සුත්‍ර දමා ට්‍රැක්ටර් මගින් එළිපෙහෙළි කොට වගා කළාය, ඒ විධියට පළමුවෙනි අවුරුද්දේ විශාල අස්වැන්නක් ලබා ගත්තාය, නමුත් ඊළඟ අවුරුද්දේ වැස්ස වැටුණ විට අර බුරුල් වී තිබූ පස සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම සෝදා ගියා. වලවේ ව්‍යාපාරයේත් ඒ විනාශ කාරී ව්‍යාපාරයම ගෙන යන බව ඇමති වරයා මේ සභාවේදී ප්‍රකාශ කළා. ඒ නිසා ඇමතිවරයාගේ ඒ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය අනුව ඇමතිවරයාට කිසිම දෙයක් අමතක වන්නේ නැහැ, කිසිම දෙයක් ඉගෙනගත්තත් බැහැ. ඉංගිරිසියෙන් කියමනක් තිබෙනවා: The Bourbons forget nothing and learn nothing. ඒ විධියටයි මේ ඇමතිවරයා ක්‍රියා කරන්නේ.

එපමණක් නොවෙයි, මහවැලි ගඟ ව්‍යාපාරය ගැන අන්තර් වාර්තාවක්—interim report—ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙනවා. ඒ සියල්ලක්ම ගැන විවේචනය කරන්න වෙලාව නැහැ. මේ රටේ අනාගතය සම්පූර්ණයෙන් රැදී තිබෙන්නේ ආහාර වගාව උඩය කියන මතය මත පිහිටා අද මේ ආණ්ඩුව කර්මාන්ත අංශය වික වික පොද්ගලික අංශයට වාසි වන අන්දමට හැඩගස්වාගෙන යනවා. ආහාර වගාව කියන විට, වී වගාව පමණක් නොවෙයි, අනෙක් අමතර අතිරේක වගාවනුත් ඊට අයිතියි. විදේශ විනිමය ප්‍රශ්නයන් ජීවන තත්ත්වය උසස් කිරීමත් ප්‍රධානම කරුණු හැටියට සලකා කර්මාන්ත පිළිබඳ වැඩ පිළිවෙළ දැන් විකක් පැත්තකට තල්ලු කර දමා තිබෙනවා. දැනට කරගෙන යන විධියටම ආහාර වගාව කරගෙන ගියොත් සාර්ථක නොවන බවට විශේෂඥයන් ගෙන් වාර්තා පිට වාර්තා ලැබී තිබෙනවා. ඒ සඳහා නවීන ක්‍රම යොදවන්නට වුව

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය ඒස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ]

මනා යැයි එම වාර්තාවල සඳහන් වෙනවා. මේ ආණ්ඩුව එක නවීන ක්‍රමයක් නම් යොදා තිබෙනවා. පෞද්ගලික ව්‍යාපාරිකයන්ට ධනපති ක්‍රමය අනුව අක්කර දහස් ගණනක් දී තිබෙනවා. එහෙත් සමාජවාදී රටවල මේ ප්‍රශ්නය විසඳා ඇති ආකාරයට රජයේ ගොවිපොළවල් හෝ සමූහ ගොවි පොළවල් හෝ පිහිටුවා මේ ප්‍රශ්නය ලෙහෙසියෙන් විසඳන්නට මේ රජයට බැරි ඇයි? “පරණ විධියට නම් මේ ප්‍රශ්නය විසඳන්නට බැරිය, අළුත් විධියක් අනුගමනය කරන්නට වුවමනාය” කියා විශේෂඥ වාර්තාවල කොතෙකුත් සඳහන් වී තිබෙනවා. ලොකු වතු ක්‍රමයට—තේ වතු ක්‍රමයට, රබර් වතු ක්‍රමයට—රජයේ ඉඩම් ධනපතියන්ට දී, ගොවි ජනතාව සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම වහලුන් බවත් පත් කර, කම්කරුවන් කුලීකරුවන් හැටියට යොදවා, දේශීය හා විදේශීය ධනපතියන්ට මේ රට සුරා කෑමට ඉඩ දීමයි, මේ රජයේ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය වී තිබෙන්නේ.

ලංකාවේ වියළි කලාපය, අක්කර 15,00,000 ක් පමණ වූ ප්‍රදේශයක්. එහෙත් ලංකාවේ ජනගහණයෙන් 3/4 ක් පමණ ඉන්නේ, තෙත් කලාපයේයි. ලංකාවේ භූමි ප්‍රමාණයෙන් 1/4 ක් පමණක් තෙත් කලාපයට අයත් වුණත්, ජනගහණයෙන් 3/4 ක්ම ඒ ප්‍රදේශයේ ඉන්නා බව අප අමතක කරන්නට හොඳ නැහැ. නිල්වලා, කඳු, කළුණේ යන ගංගාවලින් වන හෝදාපාළුව ගැන, අවුරුදුපතා වන ජල ගැලීම්වලින් ගාලු, කළුතර, කොළඹ ආදී දිස්ත්‍රික්කවලට—කොළඹ නගරයට පවා—සිදු වන හානිය ගැන ඒවා වැළැක්විය යුතු ආකාරය ගැන ලංකා කොමිෂනරිස්ට් පක්ෂය අවුරුදු 30 ක පමණ සිට තියනවා. සිදු වන ඒ හානි වැළැක්වීම සම්බන්ධයෙන් පිළියෙළ වුණු විශේෂඥ වාර්තා පවා තිබෙනවා. එහෙත් ඒ වාර්තා ගැන මේ ආණ්ඩුව සලකා බලන්නේ නැහැ.

මේ ආණ්ඩුව කල්පනා කරන්නේ මොනවා ගැන ද? මන්තාරමට ගිහිත් පොළොව යටින් වතුර පොම්ප කරන්නයි, මේ ආණ්ඩුව කල්පනා කරන්නේ. පොළොව යට වතුර තිබෙනවා ද නැද්දැයි පරීක්ෂා කරන්නට කලින්, දෙවියන් වහන්සේ දී තිබෙන පොළොව මතුපිට තිබෙන වතුර වික ප්‍රවේශම් කර ගන්නට

කටයුතු කරන්නට ඕනෑ තේද? සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම සෝවියට් ආධාර ඇතිව කරන්නට ගිය මල්වතු ඔය ව්‍යාපාරය සම්බන්ධයෙන් සැලැස්මවල් පවා ඉදිරිපත් කළාට පස්සෙ, එය හමස් පෙට්ටියට දැමීමා. එය හමස් පෙට්ටියට දමා, ඊශ්‍රායලයෙන් විශේෂඥයන් ගෙන්වාගෙන දැන් ආණ්ඩුව මහ ලොකුවට කෑ ගහනවා. මැද පෙරදිග අරාබි රටවලට විරුද්ධව කටයුතු කරන ඊශ්‍රායලයට තැනක් දෙන්නට—ප්‍රචාරයක් ලබා දෙන්නට—වුවමනා නිසා, පොළොව යටින් පොම්ප කරන වතුර ගැන දැන් ආණ්ඩුව බොහොම ලොකුවට කපා කරනවා.

මහවැලි ගඟ ව්‍යාපාරය සහ උතුරු හා උතුරු මැද පළාත්වල තිබෙන භූ ජල සම්පත්තිය සම්බන්ධව කටයුතු කිරීම තමන් භාරගෙන තිබෙන බව, එක්සත් ජාතීන්ගේ විශේෂඥයන්ගේ වාර්තාවල සඳහන් වී තිබෙනවා. පොළොව යට තිබෙන වතුර හිඳෙන්නේ තැනිතලා තබා ගැනීම සඳහා පොළොව මතුපිට තිබෙන වතුර ඒ පොළොව යටට යැවීමට වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් යෙදීමත්, පොළොව යටින් උඩට වතුර පොම්ප කිරීම වාගේම වුවමනා යැයි ඒ වාර්තාවල සඳහන් වෙනවා. එසේ තැනිතලා පොළොව යට තිබෙන වතුර උඩට පොම්ප කරන්නට පටන් ගත්තොත්, වුවමනා තරම් වතුර පොළොව යට ගබඩා වන්නේ—තැන්පත් වන්නේ—තැනි නිසා, කාලයක් යන විට ඒ ප්‍රදේශය සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම විනාශ වී යන්නට ඉඩ තිබෙනවා. එක්සත් ජාතීන්ගේ විශේෂඥ වාර්තාවලට පවා විරුද්ධව කටයුතු කරමින්, මහ ජනයා නොමග යවන විධියේ ප්‍රචාර හා ව්‍යාපාර පමණක් මේ ආණ්ඩුව විසින් කරගෙන යාම ගැන අප විරුද්ධ වන්නේ, ඒ ව්‍යාපාර මේ රටේ දියුණුවට ඉතාමත් අහිතකර නිසයි.

මගේ නියමිත වේලාවට වඩා මිනිත්තු කීපයක් දීම ගැන නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායක තුමාට මගේ කෘතඥතාවය පළ කරමින්, මගේ කථාව මෙයින් අවසාන කරනවා.

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

අ. භා. 12.15

මෛත්‍රිපාල සේනානායක මයා. (මැද වටිවිය)

(திரு. மைத்திரிபால சேனநாயக்க—மதவாச்சி)

(Mr. Maithripala Senanayeke—Meda-wachchiya)

නියෝජ්‍ය කළානායකතුමනි, මේ අයවැය විවාදය අවසාන වන දිනයේදී ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් වචන ස්වල්පයක් කළා කරන්නට අවස්ථාව ලැබීම ගැන මා සන්තෝෂ වෙතවා. විශේෂයෙන් කර්මාන්ත අමාත්‍යාංශය ගැන වචන කීපයක් ප්‍රකාශ කරන්නට මත්තෙන් මා කියන්නට සතුටුයි; මේ ගරු සභාවේ සිටින මන්ත්‍රී වරුන් වන අප පමණක් නොව මුළු රටේම මහජනතාව, අවුරුදු 2 1/2ක ආයුෂ් කාලයක් ගෙවා තිබෙන මේ ආණ්ඩුවේ තුන් වැනි අයවැය ලේඛනය ගැන ඉතා මත් ඕනෑකමින් බලා සිටිය බව. එය විශේෂයෙන් සඳහන් කළ යුතු දෙයක් නොවෙයි. පළමු වැනි අවුරුද්දේ හදිසියෙන් අයවැය ලේඛනයක් ඉදිරිපත් කර, දෙවැනි අවුරුද්දේ යම් විධියක අභිනාල මක් දමා, තුන් වැනි අවුරුද්දේ අයවැය ලේඛනයෙන් ඉදිරි අවුරුදු 2 1/2 තුළ මේ ආණ්ඩුව ගමන් කරන මාර්ගය ගැන සංශ්‍ය වක් දේවි යැයි පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්, සෙසු මුළු මහත් ජනතාවත් බලාපොරොත්තු වන නිසයි, මා එසේ කියන්නෙ. එහෙත් කතාශ්‍රවකට මෙන් මේ රටේ මහජනතාවට අද ඉතාමත්ම අසාර්ථක අයවැයකට මුහුණපාන්න සිදු වී තිබෙනව. 1965 මාර්තු මාසයේ මේ ආණ්ඩුව බලයට පත් කරන්නට ඡන්දය දුන් මහජනතාව ලොකු බලාපොරොත්තුවකින් හිටිය, පළමුවෙනි අවුරුද්දේ බැරි වුණත්, දෙවෙනි අවුරුද්දේ බැරි වුණත් තුන්වෙනි අවුරුද්දේ ඉඳලත් යම් යම් බලාපොරොත්තු සහිතව ජීවත්වන්නට පුළුවන් වෙයි කියා; දවසින් දවස නැගී ගෙන එන ජීවන වියදම් ප්‍රශ්නය සම්බන්ධයෙන් යම් විධියක සහනයක් මේ ආණ්ඩුවෙන් ඇති කර ගන්නට පුළුවන් වෙයි කියා. ඒ බලාපොරොත්තු අද සම්පූර්ණයෙන් අහෝසි වී ගිහිත්. මේ රටේ පොදු මහජනතාව අද ඉතාමත්ම අමාරු තත්ත්වයකට පත් වෙලා ඉන්නෙ.

මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාගේ අයවැය කළාව කියාගෙන යද්දි විපක්ෂයේ සිටි අපට, විශේෂයෙන්ම පසු ගිය ආණ්ඩුවේ වගකීම් දරාගෙන සිටි අපට පෙනී ගියේ මොකක්ද? කර්මාන්ත අංශය දෙස බලන විට මට පෙනී ගියේ මොකක්ද? ඒ කාලයේ අපි පටන් ගත්ත කර්මාන්ත ඉදිරියට ගෙන යාම විනා, අපි පටන් ගත්ත වැඩ පිළිවෙල ඉදිරියට ගෙන යාම විනා, ඉදිරි වර්ෂයේදී අපුත් වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් මහජනතාව ඉදිරියේ තැබීමට මේ ආණ්ඩුව ලැහැස්ති නැති බවයි, අපට මේ කළාවෙන් වැටහී ගියේ. කර්මාන්ත අතින් මේ ආණ්ඩුව කරන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වෙන්නෙ මොකක්ද? කාල වේලා සීමා වී තිබෙන නිසා මා විස්තරාත්මක කළාවක් කරන්නට යන්නෙ නැහැ. 1956 මේ රටේ ඇති වුණු ඒ සාමකාමී විප්ලවයෙන් පසුව කර්මාන්ත දියුණු කිරීමට යම් විධියක අභිනාලමක් දැමීමට ක්‍රියා කරන්නට අපට සිද්ධ වුණා. ඊට පසුව 1960 දී ඒ තැබූ අභිනාලම උඩ යම් විධියක වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් මගින් මේ රටේ කර්මාන්ත යුගයක් බිහි කිරීමේ අවස්ථාව, වරප්‍රසාදය මට ලැබුණ. කර්මාන්ත අරඹා මේ රටේ රක්ෂා නොමැතිව සිටි අයට සහනයක් සලසන්නත්, මේ රටේ නිෂ්පාදනය කරන්න පුළුවන් දේවල් නිෂ්පාදනය කරන්නටත් අප ක්‍රියා කළා.

මේ ඇමතිතුමා කර්මාන්ත ඇමති ධුරයට පත් වී දැන් අවුරුදු 2 1/2ක් ගත වී තිබෙනව. මේ විවාදයේදී එතුමා කළ කළාවෙන් ප්‍රකාශ වී තිබෙනව, කර්මාන්ත 100 ක් ඇති කරන්නට යනවාය කියා. අවුරුදු 2 1/2 කින් පසුව එදා කියා තිබෙනව, කර්මාන්ත 100 ක් අනුමත කර තිබෙනවාය කියා. ඒ ප්‍රකාශයෙන් වුණත් අපට පැහැදිලි වෙන්නෙ අවුරුදු 2 1/2 ක් ගත වන තුරුත් එතුමාට යමක් කරන්නට බැරි වූ බවයි.

විශේෂයෙන්ම යම් යම් අවශ්‍ය කර්මාන්ත රජය මගින් කරගෙන යන අතර මේ රටේ මුදල් තිබෙන පොද්ගලික අංශයේ අයටත් යම් යම් කර්මාන්ත කිරීමට අවස්ථාව සලසා දී—ඉංග්‍රීසියෙන් කියනව නම්: “to create a climate”—මේ රටේ කර්මාන්ත යුගයක් බිහි කරන්නට අපට පුළුවන් වුණ බව ඇමති

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[මෙමුහුණ සේනානායක මයා.]

තුමා කොපමණ කැ ගැහුවත් මහජනතාව පිළිගන්නවා ඇති. ඒ නිසාම අපට යම් යම් ප්‍රශ්නවලට මුහුණපාන්න සිද්ධ වුණා. මහජනයාට වුවමනා කරන යම් යම් පාරිභෝගික ද්‍රව්‍ය ගෙන්වීම සීමා කරන්නට අපට සිදු වුණා. ඒ නිසාම යම් යම් කම්කරුවන්ට මහජනයාට මුහුණ පාන්න සිදු වුණා. එසේ ඉතිරි කරගත් විදේශ විනිමය මේ රටේ කර්මාන්ත සංවර්ධනය සඳහා යෙද වූ බව අපට නිර්භයව කියන්නට පුළුවනි. අපේ පරාජය ඒ නිසාම සිදු වුණා නම්, ඒ පරාජය අත්විම ගැන අප කතාගාටු වෙන්නේ නැහැ. මක්නිසාද? අපි යම්කිසි අභිනාලමක් දමා තිබෙන නිසයි. ඒ නිසා තමයි අද මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාටත්, කර්මාන්ත ඇමතිතුමාටත් භාර කාරයන් වශයෙන් පමණක් ඒ කටයුතු කරගෙන යන්නට සිද්ධ වී තිබෙන්නේ. කර්මාන්ත ඇමතිතුමා කොපමණ කැ ගැහුවත් ඒ මහත්මියා කරන්නේ භාරකාරකම හෙවත් සුපර් වයිසර්කම පමණක් බව නිර්භයව අද අපට කියන්නට පුළුවනි කම තිබෙනවා.

අද ඝාමාන්‍ය තත්ත්වය දෙස බලන්න. අද ලක්ෂ 5 ක් පමණ රක්ෂා නොමැති උදවිය සිටිනවා. රජයේ රැකිරීම් කාර්යාලවල ලියාපදිංචිවී සිටින රැකිරීම් නොමැති උදවියගේ ගණන්වලින්ම අපට පැහැදිලි වෙනවා, මේ ආණ්ඩුව පසුගිය අවුරුදු 2 1/2 තුළ ගෙන ගිය වැඩ පිළිවෙළ සාර්ථක වී නැති බව. මේ ආණ්ඩුව බලයට පත් වූවාට පසුව රැකිරීම් හිඟය උග්‍ර වී තිබෙනවා. 1964/65 වර්ෂයේ රැකිරීම් නැතිව සිටි සංඛ්‍යාව අද පත් ලක්ෂය දක්වා වැඩි වී තිබෙනවා. මේ ආණ්ඩුවේ අසාර්ථක ප්‍රතිපත්ති නිසාත්, අසාර්ථක වැඩ පිළිවෙළ වල් නිසාත් එවැනි තත්ත්වයක් ඇති වී තිබෙන බව අපට පැහැදිලිවම ප්‍රකාශ කරන්නට පුළුවනි. මේ ආණ්ඩුව යම් පිරිසකට රක්ෂාවල් සපයා දී තිබෙනවා නම්, විශේෂයෙන්ම අතුරු මැතිවරණ කාලවලදී යම් පිරිසකට රක්ෂාවල් සපයා දී තිබෙනවා නම් එසේ රක්ෂා සපයා දී තිබෙන්නේ අප ආරම්භ කළ කමිත්තවලින් හා අප ඇති කළ ජනසතු සේවාවලින් බවත් මා නිර්භයවම ප්‍රකාශ කරනවා. කමිත්ත ඇමතිතුමා ඔහු කොපමණ පුරුද්දකින් දෙක

වත් ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම තත්ත්වය කුමක්ද කියා අපි බලමු. කමිත්ත සියයක් සඳහා අනුමැතිය දී තිබෙනවා කියා එතුමා කියනවා. ඒවා මොන විධියේ කර්මාන්තද, ඒ කමිත්ත ආරම්භ කරන්නට අනුමැතිය දී තිබෙන්නේ කාටද කියා අප ප්‍රශ්න කරනවා. ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කපානායක තුමනි, මේ අවස්ථාවේදී මා දීර්ඝ වශයෙන් විස්තර සහිතව කතා කරන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ නැහැ. කමිත්ත පිළිබඳව අප මුල් වරට බලයට පත් වන විට මේ රටේ තිබුණු තත්ත්වය කුමක්ද? 1956 තිබුණු කමිත්ත මොනවාද? එවකට මේ රටේ තිබුණු කමිත්ත මොනවාද? එවකට තිබුණේ, ලංකා සම්භාණ්ඩ සංස්ථාව, තුනී ලැලි කමිත්ත සංස්ථාව, ලංකා පිහන් බඩු කමිත්ත සංස්ථාව, නැගෙනහිර කඩදසි කමිත්ත සංස්ථාව, ලංකා බණිජ වැලි සංස්ථාව, කුඩා කමිත්ත සංස්ථාව ආදී—

ගරු බඩුලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

සිමෙන්ති.

මෙමුහුණ සේනානායක මයා.

(திரு. மைத்திரிபால சேனநாயக்க)

(Mr. Maithripala Senanayake)

සිමෙන්ති කමිත්ත සංස්ථාව, පරන්තන් රසායනික ද්‍රව්‍ය කමිත්ත සංස්ථාව ආදී කමිත්ත සංස්ථා කීපයක් පමණයි. එහෙත් 1956 වර්ෂයෙන් පසුව,

“Industrial Estates Corporation, Ceylon Steel Corporation, Petroleum Corporation, Tyre Corporation, State Hardware Corporation, Fisheries Corporation, Flour Mills Corporation, Fertilizer Corporation.”

ආදී වශයෙන් රාජ්‍ය අංශයෙන් අප කමිත්ත රාශියක් ආරම්භ කළා. ඊළඟට පෞද්ගලික අංශය දෙස බලමු. අර මා කලින් ප්‍රකාශ කළ අන්දමට සුදුසු වාතාවරණයක් ඇති කිරීමෙන් පසුව 1960 සිට 1963 දක්වා වූ කාලය තුළදී පමණක් මේ රටේ කමිත්ත ආරම්භ කරන්නට ඉදිරිපත් වූ පෞද්ගලික අංශයේ ඉල්ලුම්කරුවන් දෙදහසකින් විශාල ලෙස, ඝාමාන්‍ය වශයෙන් හා මධ්‍යම ප්‍රමාණයෙන් කමිත්ත 407 කුත් සුළු වශයෙන් කමිත්ත

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

892 කුත් ආරම්භ කරන්නට පුළුවන් වුණි. සාමාන්‍යයෙන් බලන විට ඒ කමිත්ත වලට පෞද්ගලික අංශයෙන් රුපියල් කෝටි 37½ ක පමණ මුදලක් යොදවා තිබෙනවා.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, අප ආරම්භ කළ කමිත්ත පිරිසිදු කරන්නට මේ ආණ්ඩුවේ කමිත්ත ඇමතිතුමාට සිඬ වී තිබෙනවාය කියා මහ ලොකුටට සැම අවස්ථාවකදීම ප්‍රකාශ කරනවා. මේ ඇමති තුමා කමිත්ත පිරිසිදු කරන හැටි මා කියන්නම්. මේ අවස්ථාවේදී එක සංස්ථාවක් ගැන පමණයි මා සඳහන් කරන්නේ. ලංකා සම්භාණ්ඩ සංයුක්ත මණ්ඩලය ගනිමු. අද මොකක්ද ඒ සංයුක්ත මණ්ඩලයේ තත්ත්වය? අද ඇත්ත වශයෙන් ම සේවකයන්ට පඩිනඩි ගෙවන්නටවත් බැරි තත්ත්වයකට ඒ සංයුක්ත මණ්ඩලය වැටී තිබෙනවා. මහජන බැංකුවෙන් ණය මුදල් පවා අරගෙන තිබෙනවා. මා නොකී වාට ගරු ඇමතිතුමාම නියම තත්ත්වය දන්නවා ඇති. ඒ සංයුක්ත මණ්ඩලයේ සහාපති තනතුරට වර්තමාන කමිත්ත ඇමතිතුමා ලීනස් සිල්වා මහත්මයා පත් කළාට පසුව අද තිබෙන තත්ත්වය කුමක්ද? මා එක් කරුණක් මේ අවස්ථාවේදී මතක් කළයුතුව තිබෙනවා. රොබින් රත්නම් කියන මහත්මයාට මේ සංයුක්ත මණ්ඩලය භාරව තිබුණු කාලයේදී, ඒ මහත්මයා සේවකයින්ගේත් නිලධාරීන්ගේත් සහාය ඇතිව සැම අවස්ථාවකදීම සංස්ථාවේ දියුණුවටම කටයුතු කළා විනා සංස්ථාවේ පාඩුවට, සංස්ථාව නැති වන තැනට කටයුතු කළේ නැහැ. එහෙත් අද තිබෙන තත්ත්වය කුමක් ද? 1966 න් පසුව භාණ්ඩාගාරයෙන් ණය වශයෙන් ලක්ෂ 11 ක් ගෙන තිබෙනවා. ලඬකා බැංකුවෙන් මහජන බැංකුවට දීලා ඒ මගින් ලක්ෂ 3ක් අරගෙන තිබෙනවා, overdraft වශයෙන්. මේ සියලු දේම අරගෙන කියන්නේ මොනවාද? රුසියාවට සපත්තු යැව්වාය කියනවා. රුසියාවට යැව්වේ, සපත්තු කුට්ටම් 2,000 යි. එය මහ ලොකු දෙයක් වශයෙන් කියනවා. ඒවා යවන්න ලොරි 5 ක් භාරසූවා. සංස්ථාවේ සිට වරාය දක්වා ගෙන යාමටයි ඒවා යෙදුවේ. කුලිය රුපියල් 1,000 යි. මේ සපත්තු අනුරන්තපුර ප්‍රකිස්

පෙට්ටි සෑදුවේ කොහේද? දොන් කරෝලිස් සාප්පුවෙයි. ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, එතුමාගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමා දැන් පැමිණිනා. එතුමා මේ ගැන හොඳට දන්නවා ඇති. අපේ තවත් පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම් තුමකුට සම්බන්ධකම් තිබෙන දොන් කරෝලිස් සාප්පුවෙහි, ප්‍රකිස් පෙට්ටි සෑදුවේ. [බාබා කිරීමක්] මා එතුමාට චෝදනා කරනවා නොවෙයි.

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.

(තිரு. ශෙල්ටන් ඉයාසිඞ්ග)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

පටන් ගන්න එපාය.

මේත්‍රිපාල සේනානායක මයා.

(තිரு. මාමත්තිරිපාල සේනානායක)

(Mr. Maithripala Senanayake)

පටන් ගත් පිළිවෙළ තමයි, මේ කියන්නේ. ලස්සනට පටන් ගෙන තිබෙන බව පෙනෙනවා. සපත්තු කුට්ටම් 2,000 යි, යවා තිබෙන්නේ. [බාබා කිරීමක්] සපත්තු කුට්ටමක් රුපියල් 12 ගණනේයි, රුසියාවට පටවන්නේ. ඒ සපත්තු කුට්ටම ලංකාවේ විකුණන්නේ රුපියල් තිස් ගණනකටයි. සපත්තු කුට්ටම් 2,000 ක් රුසියාවට පටවන්න ලොරි පහක් යෙදුවා. ඒවා ඇහිරීම සඳහා පෙට්ටි සෑදුවේ දොන් කරෝලිස් සාප්පුවයි. [බාබා කිරීම]

ගාමනි ජයසූරිය මයා. (අධ්‍යාපන හා සංස්කෘතික කටයුතු ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්)

(තිரு. ගාමනි ඉයාසූරිය—කල්බි, කලාසාරා ඛිඛකාරා අමෙස්සරින් පාරාලාමන්තක් කාරියාතිරි)

(Mr. Gamani Jayasuriya—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education and Cultural Affairs)

හොඳ බඩු.

මේත්‍රිපාල සේනානායක මයා.

(තිரு. මාමත්තිරිපාල සේනානායක)

(Mr. Maithripala Senanayake)

බොහොම හරි. සල්ලි තියෙනවා නම් නොගන්නෙ කවුද?

මේ පිළිබඳව කලින් පැවති තත්ත්වය කුමක්ද? මේ රටේ හම්වලින්මයි, මේ සපත්තු යනාදිය නිෂ්පාදනය කළේ.

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[මෛත්‍රිපාල සේනානායක මයා.]

fප්‍රවිබෝලී යනාදිය පවා සෑදුවේ මේ රටේ හම්මලින්මයි. ලීනස් සිල්වා මහතා පැමිණියාව පසු තත්ත්වය වෙනස් වුණා. රොබින් රත්නම් මහත්මයා සහාපති වශයෙන් සිටි කාලයේදී යම් විධියකින් හදිසි වුවමනාවක් ඇති වුවහොත් ගැනීම පිණිස රුපියල් 75,000 ක පමණ හම් පිට රටින් ගෙනවිත් තිබුණා. වර්ග අඩි 20,000 යි ගෙන්නුවේ.

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.

(ශ්‍රී. ශෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

හැම අවුරුද්දේම ගෙන්නුවා.

මෛත්‍රිපාල සේනානායක මයා.

(ශ්‍රී. මායිත්‍රිපාල සේනානායක)

(Mr. Maithripala Senanayake)

වර්ග අඩි 20,000 යි ගෙන්වා තිබෙන්නේ. අද තත්ත්වය කුමක්ද? 1966 දී ලක්ෂ හයක හම් පිටරටින් ගෙන්නුවා. 1967 දී ලක්ෂ 10ක ගෙන්වා තිබෙනවා. කාලය නොමැති හෙයින් මා සඳහන් කරන්නේ එක සංඝාතයක් පිළිබඳ තත්ත්වය ගැනයි. අපේ මේ දක්ෂ ඇමති තුමාගේ පාලන කටයුතු පිළිබඳව මහ ලොකුවට පුරසාරම් දොඩවන නිසයි, මා ඒ ගැන කියන්න කල්පනා කළේ. එතුමා පාලනය කරන අනෙකුත් සංඝාතය ඔය විධියටයි, පවත්වා ගෙන යන්නේ. ඒ බව මා නිර්භයව ප්‍රකාශ කරනවා. එම සංඝාතයේ හිටපු නිලධාරීන් දැන් කෝ? ඇයි ඒ උදවිය අස් වී යන්නේ? මනුකුලසූරිය මැනෙන්නර් මහත්මයා දැන් කෝ? වීර සේන මහත්මයා—Purchasing Sales Officer—දැන් කෝ? කහදූව මහත්මයා—Personnel Officer—දැන් කෝ? ඩොරන් අබේවික්‍රම මහත්මිය දැන් කෝ? හේරත් ගුණරත්න මහත්මයා දැන් කෝ? චේලාරත්න මහත්මයා—Chartered Accountant—දැන් කෝ? ඇයි, එම උදවිය අස් වෙලා යන්නේ? ඒ උදවියට ලීනස් සිල්වා මහතාත් සමග වැඩ කරන්න බැහැ. කිසිම මැෂිමක් සංඝාත තුළට වැඩිපුර ගන්නේ නැතුව, කිසිම අංශයකින් පරීක්ෂා කර බලන්නේ නැතුව, වගකීමෙන් තොරව සේවකයන් බඳවා ගන්නවා. මේ සංඝාතය පිළිබඳව සභානායක ගන්නවා.

විශේෂයෙන් සොයා බලන ලෙස ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාගෙන් මා ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා. අද තමුත්තාත්තේ දෙන මුදල්වලින් මෙම සංඝාත තුළ කෙරෙන්නේ, සේවකයන්ට පඩි ගෙවීම පමණකැයි කිව හැකියි.

ඊළඟට පොහොර සංඝාත බලමු. තෙල් පිරිසිදු කිරීමේ සංඝාතයේ අංශයක් වශයෙනුයි, මෙම සංඝාතය පවත්වාගෙන යන්නේ. එවකට කෘෂිකර්ම ඇමතිවරයා වශයෙන් සිටි දොම්පෙ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.) පොහොර මිශ්‍ර කිරීමේ සංඝාතයට කොමර්ෂල් කොමිෂනරියේ ගොඩනැගිලි ලබා ගැනීම සඳහා නිලධාරීන් සමග කතා බස් කර ක්‍රියා කරගෙන ගියා. මගේ කල්පනාවේ හැටියට, ඒ පිළිබඳ තක්සේරුව රුපියල් ලක්ෂ 5කටද කොහේද ගණන් බලා තිබුණා. මේ ස්ථානයේම පෝර කර්මාන්තශාලාව සෑදීමට ඉඩම් අක්කර ගණනක් අත්පත් කර ගන්නටත් වැඩ පිළිවෙළ සකස් කර තිබුණා. සපුගස්කන්දේ තෙල් පිරිසිදු කරන කර්මාන්ත ශාලාවේ සිට පෝර සෑදීමට වුවමනා කරන බනිස් ද්‍රව්‍ය පරිපූරක මාර්ගයෙන් පහසුවෙන් මේ ස්ථානයට ගෙන එන්නටත් පුළුවනි. අතත ඇත්තේ උස් බිමක් නිසා ඒ ද්‍රව්‍ය මෙතැනට ගෙන ඒම පහසුයි. අමුතුවෙන් පොම්ප කරන්නට වුවමනාවක් නැහැ. ඒ අතර මෙතැන දුම්පිය මාර්ගයන් තිබෙනවා. කොමර්ෂල් කොමිෂනරියේ ගොඩනැගිලි තිබෙනවා. ඒ ගොඩනැගිලි පවරාගෙන ඒ කටයුතු කර ගෙන යන්නටයි, පසුගිය රජය සාකච්ඡා කර තිබුණේ. ස්ථිර තීරණයක් අරගෙන නොතිබුණු බව නම් ඇත්තයි. එහෙත් ඇමතිතුමාගේ අනුදානම ඇතිව ඒ විධියට සාකච්ඡා කර තිබුණා. එහෙත් අද සිදු වී ගෙන යන්නේ මොකක්ද? අද කොමර්ෂල් කොමිෂනරියේ ඉඩම්වල ඒ කටයුතු කිරීම සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම අත්හැර දමා තිබෙනවා.

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.

(ශ්‍රී. ශෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

අපේ ගරු කෘෂිකර්ම ඇමතිතුමා එතුමාගේ පෝර මිශ්‍ර කිරීමේ කටයුතු සඳහා ඒ ස්ථානය ගන්නවා.

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

මොත්‍රිපාල සේනානායක මයා.
(திரு. மைத்திரிபால சேனநாயக்க)
(Mr. Maithripala Senanayeke)

මා කියන එක ගරු පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම් තුමාට තේරුණේ නැහැ. විදේශික කොමිෂනරියන්ට තවමත් මේ විධියට ඉඩ දීම ගැනයි, මා කියන්නේ. කර්මාන්ත ඇමතිවරයා ගෙන යන ප්‍රතිපත්තිය ගැන අකුරැස්සේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (වෛද්‍යා චාරිය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ) පැහැදිලි කළා. එතුමා එදා නම් ලොකු සමාජවාදියෙක්. එහෙත් අද ඔහු විදේශික කොමිෂනරියන්ට, අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන්ට මේ රටේ මුල් බැස ගන්නට ඉඩ සලසනවා. කොමර්ෂල් කොමිෂනරියේ ගොඩනැගිලි ගත්තාම වන්නේ මොකක්ද? පෝර සංස්ථාවත් අපේ නම්, පෝර බෙදා හැරීම කරන්නේත් අප නම්, කොමර්ෂල් කොමිෂනරියට තවත් ඉඩ දෙන්නේ මොකටද? කොමර්ෂල් කොමිෂනරියේ ඉඩම ගත්තවා වන්නට පුළුවනි. එහෙත් ගොඩනැගිලි ගත්තේ නැහැ. ගම්බද දුප්පත් ජනයා පදිංචි අක්කර 135 ක බිමකින් ඒ දුප්පත් මහජනයා තල්ලු කර දමා පෝර කර්මාන්ත ශාලාව සෑදීමටයි, මේ ආණ්ඩුව කල්පනා කරන්නේ. තෙල් පිරිසිදු කරන ස්ථානය ලඟ ඇති ඉඩම් ගෙන පෝර කර්මාන්ත ශාලාව හදන්නට යනවා. ඉතින් ඉදිරියට කොමර්ෂල් කොමිෂනරියට මෙහි නැවතී සිටින්නට වුවමනාවක් නැහැ. ඉදිරියට පෝර මිශ්‍ර කර බෙදා දෙන්නට ඒ අය වුවමනා නැහැ. එසේ හෙයින් කොමර්ෂල් කොමිෂනරියේ ගොඩනැගිලි ගෙන මේ කටයුතු කරගෙන යන්න. අර දුප්පත් මිනිසුන් පදිංචි වී සිටින ඉඩම් නොගෙන ඒ විධියට වැඩ කරගෙන යන්න.

මා මුලින් කීවා සේ මේ ආණ්ඩුවේ කර්මාන්ත ඇමතිතුමාගේ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය අකුරැස්සේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා පැහැදිලි කළා. විදේශිකයන්ගේත් සම්බන්ධය ඇතිව මේ රටේ කර්මාන්ත පවත්වාගෙන යන්නටයි, අද මේ රජය ක්‍රියා කරන්නේ. එහෙත් එදා අප ක්‍රියා කෙළේ මේ රටේ පෞද්ගලික අංශයට මුදල් හා දැනුම නැත්නම් පමණක් විදේශිකයන් සම්බන්ධ කරගෙන කටයුතු කරගෙන යෑමයි. යම් යම් කර්මාන්ත සඳහා අපේ පෞද්ගලික අංශයට මැදිහත් වී ක්‍රියා කරගෙන යන්නට

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

අපහසු අවස්ථාවලදී විදේශිකයන් ගෙන්වා ඒ කර්මාන්ත සඳහා සම්බන්ධ කර ගන්නට එදා අප ඉඩ දුන්නා. නමුත් නමුත් තාත්සේලා මේ කටයුත්ත කරන්න යන්නේ, විදේශිකයන්ට කොටස් දීමේ අදහසින්. නමුත් තාත්සේලාගේ ප්‍රතිපත්තියක් වශයෙන් සෑම කටයුත්තකදීම දැන් ක්‍රියා කර ගෙන යන්නේ ඒ ආකාරයටයි. අන්න ඒකයි, නමුත් තාත්සේලා ගෙන් අපෙන් ප්‍රතිපත්තිවල ඇති මූලික වෙනස.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, ගරු ඇමතිතුමා කියනව, දහස් ගණනකට රක්ෂාවල් දෙන්න යනවාය කියා. රක්ෂා දෙන පිළිවෙළ අප දන්නවා. ලංගමයේ, එක බස් රථයකට දොළොස් දෙනා බැගින් වන ලෙස රක්ෂාවල් දී තිබෙනවා. නමුත් එදා මා දුටුවා, ලංගමයට අයත් බස් රථයක රෝදයක් ගැළ වී යනවා. දෙසියනේ ඔය පිළිවෙළටද ලංගමය තබන්න කරන්නේ? බස් රථයක් පාලනය කරන්න දොළොස් දෙනා බැගින් සිටිනවා නම්, පාරේ ගමන් කරන බස් රථවල රෝද ගැළ වී යන තත්ත්වයක් ඇති වී තිබෙන්නේ මොකද? ඔය විධියට සංස්ථාවල වැඩ කටයුතු ගෙන යනවා නම්, අනාගතයේදී කර්මාන්ත දියුණුවක් ඇති වෙනවාද කියායි අපට අහන්න සිද්ධ වී තිබෙන්නේ.

ඊළඟට, අද ඇති කර්මාන්තවලට අමුද්‍රව්‍ය ගෙන්වා ගැනීම පිණිස අවශ්‍ය තරම් විදේශ විනිමය අනුමත කරන්නේ නැතුව, තව තවත් කර්මාන්ත ආරම්භ කිරීම අනුමත කරනවා.

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.
(திரு. ஷெல்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

නමුත් තාත්සේලා දුන්නාට වඩා තුන් ගුණයකින් අපි වැඩි කර තිබෙනවා.

මොත්‍රිපාල සේනානායක මයා.
(திரு. மைத்திரிபால சேனநாயக்க)
(Mr. Maithripala Senanayeke)

අපේ කාලයේදී අවුරුද්ද දෙකට බෙදා, හය මාසයෙන් හය මාසයට දුන් අමු ද්‍රව්‍ය, ඒ අනුව ස්ථිර වශයෙන් ඒ අයට දිගටම

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[මෙමුසාල සේනානායක මයා.]

ලැබෙන්නේ නැහැ. එසේ තිබෙද්දී නමුත් නාන්සේලා තව තවත් කර්මාන්ත අනුමත කරනවා. මේ නිසා කලින් තිබුණු කර්මාන්ත පවත්වා ගෙන යන්න අසීරු තත්ත්වයක් ඇති වී තිබෙනවා. ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, අපේ කාලයෙදී යම් යම් කර්මාන්ත සීමා කර තිබුණා, “සැට්ටර්ෂන් පොයින්ට්” එකට පැමිණීම නිසා. ඒ අනුව යම් යම් කර්මාන්ත දියුණු කිරීම පිණිස, ඇති තරම් ප්‍රමාණයක් නිෂ්පාදනයෙහි යෙදී සිටිනවා නම් අලුතෙන් කර්මාන්ත ආරම්භ කිරීමට අවකාශ දෙන්නේ නැහැ. නමුත් අද සිදු වී තිබෙන්නේ මොකක් ද? ඒ කර්මාන්ත ලැයිස්තුව එහෙම පිටින්ම පැත්තකට දමා අලුතෙන් කර්මාන්ත ශාලා ආරම්භ කිරීමට පොද්ගලික අංශයට—

මෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.

(තිரு. ශෙල්ටන් ඉයාසිංහ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

මොනවා ද? කාට ද?

මෙමුසාල සේනානායක මයා.

(තිரு. මායිත්‍රිපාල සේනානායක)

(Mr. Maithripala Senanayake)

කාරක සභා අවස්ථාවේදී මම විස්තර කර දෙන්නම්. ගරු උප ඇමතිතුමා විස්තර අහනවා නම් එක් කාරණයක් ගැන පමණක් සඳහන් කරන්නම්. කවිචේරිය ලග පදික වේදිකාවේ සිටි පකිස්ථාන් කාරයකුටත් කණ්ණාඩි රාමු හඳුන්වා අවසර දී තිබෙනවා. මම ඒ සියල්ලක් ගැන විස්තර ලෙස කාරක සභා අවස්ථාවේදී කියන්නම්.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, ලෝභ භාණ්ඩ සංයුක්ත මණ්ඩලය පවත්වා ගත් අවස්ථාවේදී, පෝලන්ත ආණ්ඩුවෙන් ආධාර වශයෙන් කෝටි 3.8 ක ණය මුදලක් ලැබුණා, ආර්ථික ආධාර ගිවිසුම යටතේ. නමුත් මෙතරම් විශාල මුදලකින් අප ප්‍රයෝජනයට ගෙන ඇත්තේ දසම 6 ක් පමණයි. කෝටි 3.8 ක් ලැබුණු ණය මුදලෙන් අප ප්‍රයෝජනයට ගෙන ඇත්තේ දසම 6 යි. මට මතකයි, ට්‍රැක්ටර් ලංකාවේම සෑදීමට ඒ අය යෝජනා කර තිබුණු බව. පළමුවෙන් ට්‍රැක්ටර් කොටස් ගෙන්වා ලංකාවේදී සවි කිරීමටත් දෙවන

පියවර වශයෙන් ලෝභ භාණ්ඩ සංයුක්ත මණ්ඩලයේ වෙනම අංශයක් වශයෙන්, ට්‍රැක්ටර් කොටස් මෙහිදීම නිෂ්පාදනය කර ට්‍රැක්ටර් සෑදීමටත් යෝජනා කර තිබුණා. නමුත් සිදු වී තිබෙන්නේ මොකක් ද? මේ රජයට විදේශ විනිමය සොයා ගැනීම අද ලොකු ප්‍රශ්නයක් වී තිබෙනවා. නමුත් විදේශ විනිමයට සිදු වී තිබෙන්නේ මොකක් ද? ට්‍රැක්ටර් ආදිය ගෙන්වීමට අවසර දීමෙන්, අපේ විදේශ විනිමය පොද්ගලික අංශයට යනවා. මේ සම්බන්ධයෙන් කලින් පැවැති සාකච්ඡාවේදී, තීන්දුවක් ගෙන නැහැ; අදහස් ප්‍රකාශ කර තිබුණා පමණයි. පෝලන්තයෙන් දුන්, ආර්ථික ආධාර ගිවිසුම උඩ පෝලන්ත රජයෙන් ආධාර ලබාගෙන මේ රටට අවශ්‍ය, අපේ පසට සුදුසු, අපේ දේශගුණයට, අපේ පොළවට, අපේ කඳුකර ප්‍රදේශවලට සුදුසු ට්‍රැක්ටර් මෙහිම නිපදවන්න යෝජනා කළ නමුත් අද සිදු වී තිබෙන්නේ මොකක් ද? අද ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් ගෙන ඇති පියවර කුමක් ද? ඇයි ඒ මුදල් පාවිච්චි කරන්නේ නැත්තේ? ඔය අන්දමට සමාජවාදී රටවල් කීපයකින් ලැබුණු ආධාර හරියා කාර පාවිච්චි කර නැහැ. දෙමිපෙ පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාගේ කොටසාශයෙහි ඉදි කරන්න ගිය රෙදි කර්මාන්ත ශාලාව—

මෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.

(තිரு. ශෙල්ටන් ඉයාසිංහ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

වතුරු වැසියි.

මෙමුසාල සේනානායක මයා.

(තිரு. මායිත්‍රිපාල සේනානායක)

(Mr. Maithripala Senanayake)

නමුත් නාන්සේලා ගියාම වතුර වැසි වෙනවා.

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(දොම්පෙ)

(තිரு. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක—

දොම්පෙ)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike—Dompe)

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

මොත්‍රිපාල සේනානායක මයා.

(திரு. மைத்திரிபால சேனநாயக்க)

(Mr. Maithripala Senanayake)

සමහර විට තමුන් තාත්සෙලා වතුර ඇති කරනවා වෙන් න ඇති. වතුර වැඩියි කියා ලජ්ජා නැතුව මෙම ගරු සභාවෙදි ප්‍රකාශ කරනවා. අවුරුද්දක පමණ කාලයක් පස සම්බන්ධයෙන්, පොළොව සම්පූර්ණයෙන් පරීක්ෂණ කර රටට අවශ්‍ය රෙදිපිළි නිෂ්පාදනය කිරීමට, චින ආණ්ඩුවෙන් පරිත්‍යාගයක් වශයෙන් ලංකාවට ලැබුණු මෙම රෙදි කම්හල පිහිටුවීමට කටයුතු කළා. අද නම් ඇස්තමේන්තුවල තිබෙනවා. අම්බලං ගොඩට ගෙන යනවාය කියනවා. අම්බලං ගොඩ වතුර අඩුදැයි අහන්නට කැමතියි. මුහුදුකර අම්බලංගොඩ තිබෙන්නේ උණු වතුර නොවෙයිද? දොම්පේ ප්‍රදේශයේ පිරිසිදු වතුර නොවෙයිද තිබෙන්නේ? රෙදි කර්මාන්තයට පිරිසිදු වතුර අවශ්‍යයි. සමහර විට කර්මාන්ත ඇමතිතුමාගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමා මේ ගැන දන්නේ නැතිවා වෙන් නට ඇති. ඔන්න ඔය විධියටයි කර්මාන්ත ඇමතිතුමාගේ වැඩ පිළිවෙළ පවතින්නේ. පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමා ඒවාට කොපමණ දුරට සම්බන්ධදැයි කියන්නට මා දන්නේ නැහැ. ඒ නිසා එතුමා ගැන යමක් කියන්නට යන්නේ නැහැ. එහෙත් ඔන්න ඔය විධියටයි වැඩ නම් කරගෙන යන්නේ. ඊට වැඩි යමක් කර්මාන්ත ගැන කියන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ නැහැ.

ඉඩම් අමාත්‍යාංශය ගැන කරුණු දෙකක් තුනක් කියන්නට සිද්ධ වෙලා තියෙනවා. මේ රටේ ආහාර නිෂ්පාදනය සම්බන්ධව අපේ ගරු අගමැතිතුමා බොහොම මහත්සි ගන්නවා. ආහාර නිෂ්පාදනය දේශපාලන ප්‍රශ්නයක් ලෙස විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයේ අප නොසලකන බවත්, ආහාර වශාව ඉදිරියට ගෙන යාම සම්බන්ධයෙන් හැකි හැම දෙයක්ම විශේෂ උනන්දුවකින් කරන්නටත් අප සූදානම් බව ප්‍රසිද්ධ වේදිකාවල දීත් අප කියා තිබෙනවා. අපට දෙන්නට පුළුවන් සෑම ධෛර්යයක්ම දීමට අප ලැස්ති බවත්, සෑම වේලාවේදීම අප ඊට ලැස්ති බවත් මා ප්‍රකාශ කරනවා. එහෙත් වාරිමාර්ග දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් දක්වන සැලකිල්ල කුමක්දැයි අප විසින් සොයා බැලිය යුතුව තිබෙනවා. වාරි මාර්ග දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවෙන්

යන්නේ මොකක්දැයි සොයා බලන්නට ඕනැ.

ගිය අවුරුද්දේ ඇති වූ විශාල ජල ගැල්මෙන් උතුරු-මධ්‍යම පළාතේ වැව් රාශියක් කැඩුණා. ගරු ඇමතිතුමා වහාම පැමිණ පරීක්ෂා කර බැලුවා. ඒ වාගේම ට්‍රැක්ටර් යොදා මහත්සි අරන් හැදුවා. ඒ ඒ ප්‍රදේශ වලට ට්‍රැක්ටර් ගෙන්වා ගත්තා. අනෙක් තැන්වල මොකක්ද සිද්ධවෙලා තියෙන්නේ? කැඩුණු වැව් බැඳ තිබෙනවා. එහෙත් ඒ වැව් කැඩුණේ මොන කරුණු නිසාදැයි සොයා බැලුවේවත්, ඒවාට අවශ්‍ය වාන පිළියෙල කිරීම අවශ්‍යදැයි බැලුවේවත් නැහැ. තවම ඒ ගැන සොයා බැලුවේ නැහැ. බැඳපු වැව් පවා කැඩීගොස් තිබෙනවා. අලුත්හල් මිල්ලාව වැවේ වරක් කැඩුණු තැනින්ම තුන් වරක් කැඩී තිබෙනවා. මේ විධියට වරක් කැඩුණු බැම්ම බැත්තාගෙන් පසු නැවතත් කීප වරක් කැඩෙන්නේ මොන හේතුවක් නිසාදැයි සොයා බලන්නට ඕනැ. යම් තැනක බැම්මක් කැඩුණොත් එය කැඩුණු හේතුව සොයා දැනගන්නට විශේෂඥයන් වුවමනා කරන්නේ නැහැ. වැවක් තුළට ගලා එන වතුර ප්‍රමාණය නවත්වාගෙන වැඩිපුර එන ජලය ආරක්ෂා සහිතව පිට කිරීමට ක්‍රියා කරන්නට ඕනැ. හරියාකාර එය ශුද්ධ කරන්නේ නැතිව බැහැ. ශුද්ධ කළ යුතු තැන් ශුද්ධ නොකර ට්‍රැක්ටර් අරන් ගිහිල්ලා බැත්තන් අනෙක් වාරයේ වර්ෂාව ආවාම නැවතත් එතැනින්ම කැඩී යනවා.

මුංඇටගම කිරිගොල්ලාව වැව තිබෙනවා. ඒ වැව කැඩී ගියා. දැන් එය දෙවැනි වරටත් කැඩීගොස් තිබෙනවා එක වාන කින් පමණයි දැන් ජලය යන්නේ. වාරි මාගී දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවේ ප්‍රාදේශීය නිලධාරියාගෙන් මේ ගැන ප්‍රශ්න කළාම ඒ නිලධාරියා කියනවා එය කොන්ත්‍රාත් දී තිබෙනවාය කියා. ඔක්තෝබර් 15 වැනිදා තරම වන විට උතුරු-මධ්‍යම පළාතට වම්බ ඇති වෙනවා. එතකොට, කොන්ත්‍රාත් දීමෙන් ඇති ප්‍රයෝජනය මොකක්ද? ඊට පෙර මේ කාර්යය කෙරෙන්නේ තැන් නම් ප්‍රයෝජනයක් තිබෙනවාද? ලක්ෂ ගණන් වියදම් කර ට්‍රැක්ටර් යොදා තැනු මේ වැව නැවත වරක් කැඩුණාම ඒ ගැන සොයා බලා හරියාකාර වැඩ පිළියෙල කරන්නට මේ ඇමතිතුමාටත් බැරි වී තිබෙන බව සඳහන් කරන්නට සිද්ධ වෙලා තියෙනවා.

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[මෙහිපාල සේනානායක මහ.]

මේ වාගේ සුළු දේවල් ගැන නොසලකා හැරියොත් වැඩ කරගෙන යන්නේ කොහොමද? කවිවේරියේ ප්‍රමුඛත්ව ලයිස්තු—construction priority list—නිබෙනවා. කවිවේරියේ නිබෙන ප්‍රමුඛත්ව ලයිස්තුවල නම් ලියා තැබීමෙන් පමණක් ප්‍රයෝජනයක් ලැබෙනවාද? වැඩවල නම් පමණක් ප්‍රමුඛත්ව ලයිස්තුවේ තිබීම මදි. ඒ වැඩ ටික ඉක්මනින් කර ගැනීමයි අවශ්‍ය. වැඩ බැඳීමේ කටයුත්ත පොද්ගලික කොමිෂනරියකට බාර දෙන්නට යන බව මාස දෙකකට පමණ උඩදි කවිවේරි රැස් වීමට පැමිණි අවස්ථාවේදී ගරු ඇමතිතුමා ප්‍රකාශ කළ බව මට මතකයි. එහෙත් තවම ඒ වැඩේ පටන් ගෙන නැහැ. දැන් අගෝස්තු මාසයේ මැද හරිය පැමිණ තිබෙනවා. මේ මාසය ඇතුළත මේ වැඩ ප්‍රතිසංස්කරණය කිරීමේ කටයුතු පටන් ගත්තේ නැත්නම්, ගරු අගමැතිතුමා ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්නට මහත්සි ගන්නා වැඩ පිළිවෙළ කවදා සාර්ථක වේදැයි ප්‍රශ්න කරන්නට අපට සිදුවී තිබෙනවා. එම නිසා මේ ගැන විශේෂ සැලකිල්ලක් දැක්විය යුතු බව මා මතක් කරනවා.

මගේ කථාව අවසාන කරන්නට පෙර සඳහන් කළ යුතු තව එක කරුණක් තිබෙනවා. දුම්රිය දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව ඩීසල් එන්ජින් ගැනීමට ටෙන්ඩර් කැඳවීම ගැන විරුද්ධ පක්ෂ නායිකාව විශේෂ ප්‍රශ්නයක් නැඟ අවස්ථාවේදී ඊට පිළිතුරු දුන් ගරු හුරුල්ලේ ඇමතිතුමා ඊට මගේ නමත් සම්බන්ධකර කිසියම් ප්‍රකාශයක් කර තිබෙනවා. මාත් යම් දවසක ගමනාගමන ඇමති ධුරය දැරූ නිසා “මැදවච්චියේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාත් මේ ගැන දන්නවා” යනුවෙන් එතුමා කියා තිබෙනවා. මේ සම්බන්ධයෙන් ගරු ඇමතිතුමාට මා එකක් කීව යුතුයි. නිලධාරීන් දෙන කරුණු මෙහි ගෙනවිත් ගිරවකු මෙන් කියවන්නට එපා යයි මා ඇමතිතුමාට කියනවා. මා ගමනාගමන ඇමතිව සිටියදීත් මේ ප්‍රශ්නය මතු වුණා. එහෙත් මා එදා හොරාගේ අම්මාගෙන් පේන් අහන්නට ගියේ නැහැ. “Diesel electric engine සහ diesel hydraulic engine සම්බන්ධයෙන් රම්පාල මහත්මයා එක් අදහසක් දැරූ අතර Chief Mechanical Engineer” යන අදහසක් දැරුවා. මේ පරාමර්ශය මාගෙන් නැහැ. ගොවිතැන් සඳහා අක්

විරෝධී අදහස් ගැන මා එදා හොරාගේ අම්මාගෙන් පේන් අහන්නේ නැතිව, නියම තත්ත්වය දැන ගැනීම පිණිස ලංකාවේ සිටි ඉංජිනේරු මහත්වරුන් තුන් දෙනකු පත් කළා. මෙන්න ඒ තුන් දෙනා: Prof. E. O. E. Pereira, D. B. Ratnatunga, Deputy Mechanical Engineer, Deputy Director of Agriculture; C. P. Siriwardene, Ministry of Development, Secretary. මා එදා කෙළේ ඒකයි. ගරු හුරුල්ලේ ඇමතිතුමා අර විධියේ අදහසක් ප්‍රකාශ කළේ, දැන් එතුමා කරන්නේත් එදා ගමනාගමන ඇමතිව සිටි මැදවච්චියේ මන්ත්‍රීතුමා කළ දේමය යන අදහස මේ ගරු සභාවට දීමට වෙන්න පුළුවනි. එය සහමුලින්ම බොරුවක්. මා කළේ, ලංකා විශ්ව විද්‍යාලයේ ඉංජිනේරු අංශයේ කපි කාචාර්යතුමා ඇතුළු තවත් දක්ෂ ඉංජිනේරු මහත්වරුන් දෙදෙනෙකුගෙන් යුත් පිටස්තර කොමිටියක් පත් කිරීමයි. දුම්රිය සාමාන්‍යාධිකාරී මහත්මයාත්, “විෆ් මිකැනිකල් ඉන්ජිනර්” මහත්මයාත් පරස්පර විරෝධී අදහස් දැරූ නිසායි මා එසේ දෙපාර්තමේන්තු කොමිටියක් පත් නොකර පිටස්තර කොමිටියක් පත් කළේ. එහෙත් අද ඇමතිතුමා කර තිබෙන්නේ දෙපාර්තමේන්තු නිලධාරීන්ගෙන් යුත් කොමිටියක් පත් කර ජෙනරල් මැනෙෂ්ට් මහත්මයාගේ අදහස් අනුව කටයුතු කිරීමයි. එම නිසා, ගරු ඇමතිතුමා අර විධියේ ප්‍රකාශයත් කිරීම මා හෙළා දකින අතර, මා සම්බන්ධ කොට එදා කරන ලද ප්‍රකාශය සම්බන්ධයෙන් පැහැදිලි අදහසක් මෙම ගරු සභාවට ඉදිරිපත් කරන ලෙස මම එතුමාගෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා.

අයවැය විවාදය සම්බන්ධයෙන් මට කියන්නට තිබෙන්නේ මෙපමණයි. මේ රට නිදහස ලබා තිබුණත් ආර්ථික අතින් ඒ නිදහස සම්පූර්ණ කර ගන්නා තෙක් අපගේ නිදහසේ වටිනාකමක් නැති බව අප කවුරුත් පිළිගන්නවා. කවර පක්ෂයක් බලයට පත් වී සිටියත් මේ රටේ අනාගත දියුණුව සඳහා කෘෂිකර්මය දියුණු කළ යුතු අතරම ඒ හා අත්වැල් බැඳගෙන කර්මාන්ත අංශයත් දියුණු කිරීම ඉතාම අවශ්‍ය බව මෙහිදී විස්තර කර දීම අවශ්‍ය බවත් අදහසක් දැරුවා. ගොවිතැන් සඳහා අක්

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

කර 57,000 ක් බනපති කොමිෂනර් කාරි සිත්ට දී ඔවුන්ට විරුද්ධව ආදී යන්ත්‍ර සූත්‍රත් ලබාදී මේ ආණ්ඩුව ගෙනයන ප්‍රතිපත්තිය නිසා අපේ ගම්බද ගොවිජන තාවට ඒ අතින් පසු බසින්නට සිදු වෙනවා. අක්කර දෙක තුන වැඩ කරන දුප්පත් ගොවි ජනතාවට ඒ තරගයේදී පසු බැසීමට සිද්ධ වෙනවා. ඒ නිසා එසේ පසු බසින්නට සිදු වන ඒ ගම්බද ජනතාවට රක්ෂාවල සපයා දීම පිණිස විශේෂ යෙන්ම කර්මාන්ත දියුණුව ඉතාමත්ම අවශ්‍යයි. ඒ නිසයි අප කියන්නේ ආහාර වශාවත් සමගම අත්වැල් බැඳගෙන කර්මාන්ත අංශයන් ඉදිරියට ගමන්ගත යුතුය කියා. බණ්ඩාරනායක ආණ්ඩු දෙකම, එස්. ඩබ්ලිව්. ආර්. ඩී. බණ්ඩාර නායක ආණ්ඩුවත්, සිරිමා බණ්ඩාර නායක ආණ්ඩුවත් යන ආණ්ඩු දෙකම, ඒ අතින් පසු ගිය අවුරුදු ගණන තුළදී ක්‍රියා කළ බව ආඩම්බරයෙන් කියන්නට අපට සිදු වී තිබෙනවා. කෘෂිකම් දියුණුව ඇති කරමින් ආහාර වශාව දියුණු කිරීමට එක පැත්තකින් පියවර ගත් අතර, අතින් අතින් කර්මාන්ත දියුණුව සඳහාත් යම් අඩිතාලමක් අප විසින් දැමුවා. ඒ නිසාම අද මේ රටේ බලයේ පවතින ආණ්ඩුවේ පණ ගැට ගැසී තිබෙන බව ප්‍රකාශ කරන්න සිද්ධ වී තිබෙනවා. අද රටේ තිබෙන ඕනෑම වෙළඳ පොළකට, කඩයකට, සාප් පුවකට ගියොත් මේ රටේ නිෂ්පාදනය ආර්ථිකය බඩු භාණ්ඩ පාරිභෝගිකයාට ලබා ගැනීමට පුළුවන් බව මම ආඩම්බරයෙන් සඳහන් කරන්න කැමතියි. ඒ ආඩම්බරය ලැබීමේ වරප්‍රසාදය මා පෞද්ගලිකව ලබා ගැනීමට බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ නැහැ. 1956න් පටන්ගත් ඒ සමාජවාදී වැඩ පිළි වෙළ අනුව, මේ රටේ සාමාන්‍ය මනුෂ්‍යයාට වුවමනා කරන භාණ්ඩ රටේ ඕනෑම වෙළඳ පොළකින් ලබාගැනීමට පුළුවන්කම ලැබී ඇත්තේ අපේ ඒ වැඩ පිළිවෙළ නිසාම බව මා නිර්භයවම ප්‍රකාශ කරන්න කැමතියි.

කර්මාන්ත ඇමතිතුමා වරප්‍රසාද යටතේ මොනවා කිව්වත්, කොපමණ සෝෂා කළත්, අතික් අයට windbag කියා කිව්වත්, සමාජවාදයේ පියා යයි කියාගෙන, අද බනවාදී ක්‍රමය ආරක්ෂා කරන බොරළු ගොඩ බොරු සිංහයා අප එදා ආරම්භ කර පවත්වාගෙන ආ කර්මාන්තවල මුරකරුවා

වශයෙන් අද ක්‍රියා කරන බව ප්‍රකාශ කර මින් මගේ වචන ස්වල්පය අවසන් කරනවා.

අ. හා. 12.54

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය ඊ. එම්. වි. නාගනාතන්
(නල්ලූර්)

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

(Dr. E. M. V. Naganathan—Nallur)

In the few minutes I have before the lunch interval, I think I should be able to dispose of the points raised by the three Members of the Opposition who have been speaking today.

First of all, I have to answer a few questions raised by the very charming hon. Leader of the Opposition. She accused the Minister of Finance of painting a very gloomy picture. I do not know ; our Minister of Finance has told us the truth. He has told the country where we are and he has given a medicine to get rid of this disease which is now affecting the country. The Leader of the Opposition said that the previous Government had left "fallen reserves"—it had no doubt left reserves at a very low level—but it had left very valuable assets: the C. T. B., the Petroleum Corporation, the Insurance Corporation and so on. I do not know whether the C. T. B. ever paid a dividend during her time.

කෙනමත් මයා.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Yes, last year.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය නාගනාතන්

(டொக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

I do not think they have ever paid income tax. Last year they may have paid. I am talking of your period. Do not contradict me because I have got the facts and figures.

කෙනමත් මයා.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

They made a big profit.—[Interruption].

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

நித்யேசம் கலாநாயகநாமா

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

You can reply to him. Please do not disturb him.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය නාගනානන්

(டொக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

The so-called Rs. 13 million is covered up by various purchases of buses, tyres and so on which really come under maintenance. They go under "maintenance." There are no profits or dividends that they have given to the Government.

The next point is about the Insurance Corporation. My good Friends think that all moneys that come into the Insurance Corporation are profits or dividends. One has to realize that an insurance company has to put its money in as reserves to meet its liabilities. All the policies written in its books are its liabilities. It must meet those liabilities one day or another. An insurance company is judged by what is called its policy fund or reserve fund, that is, how much funds has it got in its reserves sufficient to pay off the policies? Supposing, to take a problematic question that never arises, all the insured die and all the insurance policies have got to be met immediately, what percentage can you pay? If you can pay 20 per cent you are a solid company; if you can pay 30 per cent you are a very very good company.

Our Insurance Corporation, being a new one, naturally cannot have its reserves. All its capital funds, all its policy funds, cannot be more than 5 or 10 per cent because a new company has a large proportion of new policies. The new policies cost money and perhaps the whole of the first year's premia go into servicing the new policies. Sometimes it is even more. Therefore, it is only the second, third, fourth and the following years' policies that are really slightly profitable, allowing for the small cost of keeping those policies going. Therefore, a new company cannot be a profit-bringing company. What happens is

that all its insurance premia are paid into the general fund and there is confusion. It is time that we have a proper five-year examination, a quinquennial examination, of its working to know where it stands. They do not have a proper actuary. A young Civil Servant is made the General Manager. He may be a very sharp man in the service, but he knows nothing about insurance. If you say that those are assets, then they must be questionable assets.

I do not say that we should not have the C. T. B. Today the C. T. B. is working much better than before because of the various improvements that have taken place.

நித்யேந்திர கிருஷ்ணகிருஷ்ண

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

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

රැස්වීම ඊට අනුකූලව නාවකාලිකව අත් ශිව්‍රවන ලදින් පස්වරු 2 ව නැවත පවත්වන ලදී.

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

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

භෙද්‍යාඩ්ඪය නානානන්

(டொக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

As I was saying just before we adjourned for lunch, the assets which the fair Leader of the Opposition stated had been left to us by their Government, namely, the C. T. B., the Petroleum and the Insurance Corporations, are not the gold mines that they think they have given us. They have a poor comprehension of what is income and what is not. For instance, I explained that the Insurance Corporation gets a large amount of money by way of premia. Those moneys are not profits. These have to be kept carefully to pay off the liabilities if and when they arise. In any case, when a policy matures, the sum assured has to be paid back plus the profits. So the monies accumulated really are not profits but belong to the shareholders or policy

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

You can judge the strength of an insurance company by its life fund. That is the fund in which they have accumulated reserves. Supposing the impossibilities happen and all the liabilities have to be met at once, then what percentage can that insurance company pay? That is the standard by which you judge the stability or worth of the company.

As I said earlier, in the first years of an insurance company, the premia received on each policy will not be enough for the writing of that policy. So, it is only in the second, third, fourth and subsequent years that the insurance company has to make good its profits. Therefore, for a young company, where the proportion of new policies is high compared to the old policies, the expenses ratio too will be high; the results will be low, the profits will be low and the company has to take care of its management and build up the life fund.

Insurance funds are supposed to be the backbone of any State. That money must be invested purely and only on the basis of a long-term development policy, not on any kind of subsidy or social service to the people in Ceylon. Unfortunately, the funds of the Insurance Corporation of Ceylon have not been kept separately. They must be kept separately. A certain portion of it must go every year, after calculation, to the life fund. The balance will have to be utilized for the expense ratio and any sum left from the premia.

The next matter, on which both the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. Member for Akuressa (Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe) waxed eloquent, is the question of tourism. The burden of their song was that this Government was preparing to spend huge sums of money and to saddle future generations with a heavy burden.

Their fears are groundless because the whole tourist industry in Ceylon is going to be financed by private enterprise, both local and foreign. A big proportion of the foreign exchange component is to be brought

in by foreign shareholders or their partners in this enterprise. So even if the tourist business fails, the Government and the people of this country are not going to suffer any loss; but if the tourist industry flourishes, we stand to profit by it. In fact, we have nothing to lose and everything to gain in this tourist business. Therefore, the fears expressed by the Opposition on the score of too much money being spent and too many hotels being built are groundless and should not be taken much notice of.

I do not want to go into details in regard to tourists going to Bangkok.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.
(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)
Thailand.

වෛද්‍යවරයා නාගනාතන්
(டொக்டர் நாகநாதன்)
(Dr. Naganathan)

Thailand, Yugoslavia, etc., for to do that I do not have the time, but I do want to mention one fact, and that is, that tourism is expected to bring Rs. 200 million to this country, especially through foreign investors.

We have been told that the question of bringing down the cost of living has been neglected by this Government and that we should try to do something about it. The Government is doing everything possible to bring down the cost of living. You will find that the prices of textiles, fuel and oil have come down. Then there is the free measure of rice that is being given. All that is really more than what this Government can do today with the resources at its command.

As you know, we have had an adverse trade balance of over Rs. 500 million last year. This country lives on what is called an export-import economy. Unfortunately, that is not the best type of economy, and we cannot get over the difficulties arising out of it overnight. There have been causes beyond our control. For instance, the prices of our export

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය නාගනාතන්]

commodities are coming down rapidly. Now, can we be blamed for that? I am sorry the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) is not here so that I may ask him the question, who is responsible for the prices of our exports coming down rapidly? Then, for the last two years we have had incessant rain and alternating floods, and, as such, we have not been able to export the same volume of products as we have been doing in previous years. I hope the situation will improve very soon. All that is in the lap of the gods.

Now, the prices of our exports have been coming down by 5 per cent on an average, while import prices have increased by 9 per cent on an average, and thus we are left with a trade deficit of Rs. 504 million. What are we to do? We admit that we are in a very grave financial position. The fair Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike) said in her speech that the Minister of Finance had painted a very gloomy picture. That is so. The financial situation is bad and we are facing up to it. We are facing a very severe crisis in our economic history.

Sir, the ship of state is in troubled waters. The captain of the ship cannot be blamed if we have encountered stormy weather. What is the remedy?

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.
(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Scuttle the ship!

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය නාගනාතන්
(டொக்டர் நாகநாதன்)
(Dr. Naganathan)

That is what you want. That is what you are trying to do.—[Inter-
ruption.]

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා
(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Do not lose your temper. Carry on.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය නාගනාතන්
(டொக்டர் நாகநாதன்)
(Dr. Naganathan)

What are we doing now? We are calling all hands on deck. Everybody must come to the rescue. If the ship of state goes down we all go down with it. We must all help and see that we get out of this stormy weather. But what are our hon. Friends on the other side doing? They are trying to scuttle the ship. They are calling meetings all over the country and reminding the people of the 1953 hartal and trying to get unwilling government servants—they will not do it—to strike. They are trying to make it more difficult for this Government. They are making it more difficult not only for the Government but for the State.

As I said, the prices of our primary products are coming down and the prices of our necessary imports are going up and we have a deficit. We have to have recourse to loans and to aid to make good that deficit, so much so that the public debt has gone up.

There is another danger to this country and that is the rapid increase in the population at the rate of 2.5 per cent a year. Those who know simple arithmetic will know that the figure will double itself in 25 to 30 years and that by 1990 or 1995 the population of Ceylon, which is now 12 million, would have doubled itself to 24 million. And ours is a small country. What is the future of our country?

A big academic question has been raised by hon. Members on the other side as to what must come first, agriculture or industry. Everybody naturally thinks there must be a balanced development of agriculture and industry. But today we are in a very difficult position. There is a very urgent need to first develop agriculture to satisfy our own needs. The F.A.O. and other important organizations have stated that by 1970 the world food situation will be critical. We will not be able to buy

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

our food. Therefore, today, food production is our primary concern. It is imperative that we do something now about the future world shortage of food. There is no one to look after us. We have to look after ourselves. For instance, last year, just before the rice cut was imposed, there was a sudden world shortage of rice. Why? A hundred thousand tons of rice which we had ordered three months earlier on a contract entered into between Ceylon and Burma was sent to Pakistan. Burma broke the contract and sent the rice to Pakistan. China intervened and said, "It does not matter if you do not send the rice to Ceylon but send it to Pakistan." Therefore, Pakistan got the 100,000 tons of rice and we had no option but to cut the rice ration at that time.

The hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) came to this House at that time, during the Debate on the question of the cut in the rice ration, and said, "I can get you rice from Pakistan." This is the way these men—the double doctor, the knowing one—bluff the people of this country, when really Pakistan was the cause of our failure to get rice. That very night I heard President Ayub Khan appealing to the people of Pakistan over the radio to tighten their belts as there was no rice in the world market and asking them to grow more food. But the hon. Member for Yatiyantota comes here and says that he could have got the rice for us from Pakistan!

Pakistan did offer some rice. But that was special buriyani rice at £69 per ton, and only 10,000 tons were available. That buriyani rice has to be specially cooked. First it has to be fried in ghee or butter and then boiled with just sufficient water till it is cooked. There should not be any excess water left to strain. Our people have not got the money to buy this rice at £69 per ton and they do not know how to cook it either. It would have been an absolute waste of money to buy that rice from Pakistan. Of course, the rich and

the Giridara mill owner, might be able to buy that rice but not the poor people whom we represent.

That reminds me, Sir, of the story of Marie Antoinette, who, when she heard a hungry crowd shouting for food, asked, "What do the people want?" When she was told that they were asking for food, she said, "Why don't you give them bread?" "There is no bread," she was told. "If there is no bread, give them cake," was her reply. Now, Sir, my hon. Friend, the Member for Yatiyantota, says, "If there is no rice available give them buriyani rice at £ 69." That is what our great theoretician and great expert from the other side said.

I do claim that to keep pace with our population explosion the G. N. P. should rise 8 per cent in real terms in the next decade. It has declined to 7 per cent. We own it. The public debt has gone up. We face a very grave situation. But what is the remedy? We have trained our people to depend on a welfare state. Everything is subsidized. From where are we to get the money? The first remedy is to make Ceylon completely self-sufficient in food and thereby save a further Rs. 8½ million. That is the first thing to be done. Let us not talk about industry or agriculture. We must be first self-sufficient in food. I would have been very happy if the Hon. Minister of Finance had openly said, "We are going to have a planned programme. By 1970 not a grain of food will be imported into this country." We must either produce more food or be prepared to starve. As the Chinese and the Russians did, we have got to face hardships.

Though we say that we want to reduce our dependence on foreign countries for our food and though we have reduced the rice ration by half and saved Rs. 150 million, what are we doing with the money that is saved? Flour, which is a substitute for rice, has gone up in price, and a good part of the money saved is spent

பிஸ்கித பதந் கெடுபத, 1967-68

—தேவந வர கியபித

[வேத்யபாபீய கானானந்]

on flour. So, we have not gained much, and we must try our best in the coming year to see that we do really reduce our dependence on foreign countries for our food.

Then, we have been getting loans and foreign aid from foreign countries, and, in my opinion, we have misused those loans and aid. We have used them for the purchase of various commodities and to subsidize our people in various ways. We must utilize those loans—I am sorry we have to depend on them at the moment; there is no option—for developmental purposes, and, by tightening our belts, if necessary, see to it that we build up our economy and build up capital formation.—[Interruption]. My good Friend is laughing, but in Russia that is exactly what they did. How did they build up capital formation in Russia? Not with foreign aid, but by hard work and starvation. In Russia trade unions were not allowed. People had to work for 16 hours a day. Here we are a democratic country, and within the limits of democracy we appeal to the people—

பிபி. ஃபி. டியஸ் கிளாந்தானை மூ.
(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Starve like democrats !

வேத்யபாபீய கானானந்
(டொக்டர் நாகநாதன்)
(Dr. Naganathan)

—to help the Government, to help the State, to overcome these difficulties by hard work and by being prepared to go without certain things for a short time, so that we can make this country a better place for our children. My hon. Friends across want to scuttle the ship of State.

பிபி. ஃபி. டியஸ் கிளாந்தானை மூ.
(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

You want to do it.

வேத்யபாபீய கானானந்

(டொக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

Now I come to the food drive. All these years our food production has been on the basis of peasant farming. The Government gives the land and does all the head-work. A colonist is given three to five acres of land and he is given money to build a cottage for himself and his family. All this is done at tremendous expense to Government.

This was a slow process. Today we cannot afford to adopt this slow and long process, and the Government has not got the money to start large schemes of colonization. Therefore, the Government has, very wisely, thought of a plan by which it gets the private sector to invest money in agriculture. The land is given on a 25-year lease, and the Government gives them every help it can, such as permits to import what they require for the purpose. And they have got, within a certain time, to build up and improve our economy and increase our food production.

We have no doubt that by June next year there will be a tremendous improvement and quite a different story for us to tell you. There has been some delay because the machinery and other agricultural implements did not come in time. But there was no other alternative to a Government which has no money nor the time to invest in peasant cultivation, development and food production.

My Friends in the Opposition have been criticizing this Government in a very ignorant way. They say: "The Government is providing tractors for the rich and not for the poor people." The rich people are buying their own tractors. Poor people who own two to three acres cannot utilize tractors, but the Government is having tractor pools which make available tractors at Rs. 55 per acre. In the case of the very poor people the Government

விசேஷ உதவி கெடுப்பத, 1967-68

—தேவன் வர கியமீத

has thought it fit to charge very cheap rates and in some cases to give tractor services free of charge. The point is this : you cannot expect the Government to give the poor peasant free tractors. But you come here and complain that we are giving tractors to the rich. Those rich people are buying tractors with their own money. We got to give them the foreign exchange to do so.

We are not going behind-hand in the matter of industrial development. It will come very soon. First and foremost we have got to see that not one grain, not one pound or measure of subsidiary foodstuffs come to this country from outside. Our country is a very rich and very fertile country. We have got the manpower with us. We must have the energy and the drive to make the country self-sufficient in food in no time. I can promise that it can be done in my area within a year if I am given the opportunity to do so. Nallur produces more than half the potatoes that the country needs and they are the best potatoes produced in Ceylon. Next year we expect to produce three times that amount. That is just by the way.—[*Interruption.*]

ஃப். ஃர். டியஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க

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

Why did you not bring some ?

தேவநாதன்

(டாக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

The next problem is this. What about our export and import prices ? Can we do something about it. I think it is beyond our control.

In 1947 I was a delegate to the Asian Relations Conference along with the late Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike. There I read a paper on

“Regional Grouping of Political Freedom and Security and Economic Freedom and Advancement.” Sir, what I said in 1947 at that regional conference of nations of South and South-East Asia seems to be now drawing on the minds of the people. What Naganathan thinks today the world thinks tomorrow ! That paper which I read at the Asian Relations Conference was printed and published by the conference. The fair Leader of the Opposition may be having a copy of this among the documents of her late husband, Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike, whom we greatly revered. It is high time that we consider whether we cannot as a group co-operate with each other and see to it that our primary products, mainly tea, rubber and coconuts, and oils like soya bean oil get their due and fair prices in the world market without competition. We are now pitted one against the other and are being squeezed and exploited.

In this connexion I will say something about my good Friend the hon. Member for Yatiyantota. He made a number of points which require reply. He said, “I have advocated certain measures to break the stranglehold of sterling companies and remove their exploitation : differential income tax and a moratorium on dividends which were frozen indefinitely.” His measures were a very good idea but I think they have rebounded on him. We must assure the investor, whoever he is, whether he be black or white, that he will not get exploited here. If you tell him or if he finds that he will be exploited, then he will not come here and invest. While the cow eats we also milk it. Similarly, we could have continued to milk this cow, the foreign investor,

[වෛද්‍යවරයා නැගෙනහන්]

or call him exploiter, for the benefit of this country. He is a wily fellow, maybe also unscrupulous. He had all the cards in his hand; he was not only the investor but the exploiter of tea in this country. He was also the exporter, the buyer, the distributor and also the consumer. He controlled the tea industry in all its aspects, and we should have known that before we tried to play ducks and drakes with him. They have now formed themselves into a combine, no doubt an unscrupulous combine. They all work and fight together; so they are able to knock us down and draw away from us the profits that should come to us. The price of tea in England has not come down. A packet of a quarter pound of tea in New York is 1 dollar and 29 cents. While the price abroad remains the same, the price we, the producer, receive has gone down. They are exploiting us now. Why? Because they thought we were going to drive them away.

You talked of nationalizing and expropriating their estates. So they thought the game was up, and they say, "We will teach you fellows a lesson". What have they done now? They have opened up tea plantations in Kenya and other places and they have already reached the same standards that we have done after so many years of blood, sweat and toil. They are in a position to make profits on tea in those places despite the fact that prices are low, because labour charges are low, income and other tax rates are low. So they make profits and hit us back. When the Government says that we are not responsible for the low prices prevailing in the world market, that it is a matter beyond our control, I point the finger of

guilt at the hon. Member for Yatiyantota for that state of affairs; I say he is to blame for it. It is the hon. Member for Yatiyantota, the hon. Member for Kolonnawa and other big-mouthed people who talked too soon, too loud and too foolishly, who are responsible for it.

My hon. Friends referred to the academic question of industrialization as against agricultural development. Whatever be the theoretical objection or theoretical standpoint, we are today faced with a world shortage of rice and other food crops. There is nobody to come to our rescue. We must look after ourselves. We must make this country self-sufficient before 1970. Not one grain of rice, not one pound or measure of other foodstuffs, should come into this country from outside. That must be our motto.

My hon. Friends opposite say that they have brought into being a number of industries. Let us consider those industries. They started a sugar factory—a huge factory, which may be the biggest in the East or the biggest in the world I do not care, but I know it is the biggest white elephant we have. They are a load and a burden on us and our country.

Then, of course, with regard to beer, there is U. K. Edmund's beer, the biggest scandal and the biggest blunder that has been perpetrated.

Hon. Members opposite were speaking of Rs. 375 million being invested during their time. I ask them, can they give us an account of the Rs. 375 million that was supposed to have been invested, of the machinery and the equipment that was brought into this country? You will find a large amount of that

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

money, Sir, in the Swiss banks, sent there by overloaded invoices. Some of the Ministers are responsible as much as these industrialists themselves.

Now, with regard to biscuits manufactured by Malibans Ltd.—Some of them are good friends of mine. You cannot have better Ceylonese people than they. I have nothing to say about them. Let us examine the economics of their industry. They make some of the best biscuits in the world, but what are the economics of it? The flour has to be bought from outside, not the flour that we import, but a special kind of flour at special rates. The sugar is not the sugar we import; they get a special sugar from Tate and Lyle. Every bit of essence, and even the colouring matter, they import from outside. Then, of the packing, 95 per cent is imported, the tins are imported, the printing and the paper are imported. Is it a national industry? Less revenue will go out of the country if you were to import your biscuits than by starting this kind of *boru* factories in this country. I have nothing against the Maliban Company. Their daughters and their sons-in-law are very fine persons. I have nothing to say against them. God bless them!

But what is the economic value of the industry, of any industry that these people opposite have brought into this country? I can list them one by one, but I have not the time. They started their hair-pin industry, their nail industry, and so on.

There is one more thing I want to say on the matter raised by the hon. Member for Akuressa. He said that I mentioned something on an earlier occasion about the steel factory. I did

say that the steel factory cannot be an economic proposition unless we have the real iron ore smelting department in this country.

For instance I applauded the opening of the tyre factory. We have got the rubber. We have the raw material for it. This reminds me to ask you why we should not grow more cotton. There is good black soil suitable for cotton growing. In one year we can grow all the cotton we need.

To come back to the subject of steel. We now import steel ingot, and unless we import it we cannot manufacture steel products. And unless we really make steel in a big way the country will not be able to buy it. They must have the money. As the Hon. Prime Minister said, unless people have more money to build houses, to build more roads, to build more bridges, railways, and so on where is the iron to be used? I said that we have to choose what industries are necessary in the immediate future. What are the national industries that we can build up? What are the pseudo-national industries that we can build up?

We have been told that we do not require raw material to build up our industries. They say that England without producing one ounce of cotton built up the biggest cotton industry in the world. Quite right, But England had an empire. She could grow cotton in her empire. We do not have that privilege, that opportunity, that advantage. We have in fact got certain disadvantages.

We must frame our industrial build-up according to our needs. Wherever possible, we shall try and utilize our own home produce. Those must be given first preference. I do not say you must not build other industries. Let us have them also, but let us give first preference to industries we could start with the raw material that is locally obtainable. We must think and plan out local industries.

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[වෛද්‍යමාලීය නානොතන්]

The hon. Member for Nintavur (Mr. Mustapha) said that a Minister or town councillor from North Korea was wearing a suit which was of a very beautiful fibre and that it was made out of sandstone or something like that. We have got an institution, the C.I.S.I.R. I think it must be given particular directions to find out how it can utilize local raw produce for our industries; and those industries must be given first preference.

The hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) spoke of Yugoslavia.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

I am getting rather alarmed when you produce that long piece of paper because your time is up. I can give you another five or ten minutes if you like. Please try and finish up within that time.

වෛද්‍යමාලීය නානොතන්

(டொக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

He said the hotels in Yugoslavia are not expensive. It is only a half-truth. In Yugoslavia they have different types of hotels. There is one type for pedestrians and others who come on cycles from surrounding countries. There is another type for those who come on motor cycles. They have different types of hotels and motels. Some are very expensive and some are cheap. I do not know where the hon. Member for Yatiyantota went and stayed. To say that they are all cheap is only a half-truth.

He found fault with the Prime Minister about the question of chillies. He said that the Prime Minister had stated that they were giving 3 ounces on the ration but more could be bought off ration at a higher price. We are now trying to become self-sufficient in chillies and the villagers and others are now

growing chillies. The Government purchases the chillies just as it purchases the rice. I think it is purchased by the Government at a fairly high price but for the sake of the people it gives a certain quota on the ration, after subsidizing it, at a lower price through the C.W.E., the co-operatives and so on. In the outside market you have to pay a higher price because we want to encourage the farmer to get more money. That is the only incentive to grow more food.

My hon. Friend told me that he used to buy potatoes at six cents a pound when he was young but now it is sold at Rs. 1.20. He does not want us to become self-sufficient. He wants us to import potatoes. He wants us to import chillies. And yet he calls himself a patriot!

There was a time when we were importing eggs. We banned the import of eggs. Eggs went up in price. Today we are producing more eggs than are necessary and they are coming down in price. Any lover of this country should be prepared to endure for a short period a certain amount of trouble in the interests of the people, in the interests of the country and in the interests of the farmers.

The hon. Member spoke of capital formation. He said that capital formation was mainly in the form of transport. There is no harm in having transport because, after all, transport is a very essential part of development, of what is called "developmental overheads". Without transport, without roads, you cannot have development. In view of the fact that we have been starved of transport, it is very necessary that we should now have more transport, which means more jeeps, more lorries, tractors and so on. It is part of our capital formation.

I wish to refer to Table II (A) 7 of the Central Bank Report for 1966 dealing with capital formation: In respect of plant and machinery the capital formation for 1966 over 1965

விசேஷப் பணக் கெடுபிண, 1967-68

—தேவன் வர கியவீதே

is 28 per cent; transport 56 per cent; imported goods 83 per cent. What is wrong with that? He made fun of it by saying that that is only transport. That shows how very superficial is his study of the question of capital formation.

One great need of the country is capital formation. With our growing population unless we have increased capital formation we have no hope for this country. Even if we choose to undergo sufferings in various ways we would still have no hope.

The last two years have been a very trying period for us. The gap between import and export is Rs. 500 odd million. In spite of that, we have spent money on machinery, transport and other materials necessary for our capital build-up. Plant and machinery, transport, and capital goods are the major items. The biggest item, of course, is machinery.

I come next to the question of the cost-of-living index. The hon. Member for Yatiyantota said that the extra measure of rice the people have to buy today was not taken into account in computing the living index. I tried to find out the truth of this statement, and I was assured that they did make allowance for the cost of an extra measure of rice, which people have to buy in the open market. For the sake of argument let us say that they did not take it into account. Yet, what does that mean? Where you paid 50 cents for two measures earlier, you are now paying 85 cents for one measure of rice and getting the other measure free.

சோமரத்ன சேனரத் இலா. (அம்பாரை)
(திரு. சோமரத்ன சேனரத்—அம்பாரை)
(Mr. Somaratne Senerath—Amparai)

Where can you buy rice at 85 cents a measure?

நிர்ணேயக் கமிஷனருக்கு

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

You can take him around some time later. Please allow the hon. Member to go on with his speech.

வேலையாட்சி மானாணன்

(டொக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

I can take him along to 100 shops if he wants to go. I too want to go with him. It may be that he does not know how to buy.

சேனரத் இலா.

(திரு. சேனரத்)

(Mr. Senarath)

Who cannot buy? I will buy you!

வேலையாட்சி மானாணன்

(டொக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

Taking it for granted that you have to spend an extra 35 cents, can that take the cost-of-living index from 112 to 124.6—12 points more? My good Friend, the double doctor, cannot tell us how the addition of 35 cents is going to raise the cost-of-living index from 112 to 124.6. He has added a point. In his case it is easy. When you are bluffing if you but add a point it would sound more probable.

I come to the next matter. Earlier the general complaint by manufacturers was that there were not enough raw materials. Some even closed down for want of raw materials. But this year, I notice from the estimates that too much has been allocated for the import of raw materials. I spoke to some of the manufacturers and they told me that they have got enough money allocated to them, and it would be sufficient for them to go on till about next March or May. I hope the Hon. Minister will look into this matter and see that more money than is necessary is not given to certain trades. Some probably do require it. Manufacturers themselves told me that some of them do not require such large allocations.

I think I have more or less touched on all the points—[Interruption].

விசேஷண பதன் கெடுபிதன், 1967-68

—தேவன வர கிவலி

ஃபி. ஃபி. டியஸ் டிசைந்தரநாயக்க மெ.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

He has reached the point of no return.

வேதநாடாரசை நானைநன்

(டொக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

On the question of the money supply, my hon. Friend the Member for Yatiyantota said that the Central Bank was trying to play some tricks about the money supply position. He said that there are other factors that should be taken into consideration. Now, the Central Bank has given a comparative statement of the money supply. It has taken the very same factors from 1953—even in 1966—into consideration in computing the money supply. So it has not played any tricks in this particular year to please the Minister or the party in power; it has not gone out of its way to fudge figures.

The hon. Member for Yatiyantota mentioned one point which is very, very important. He said that there is money which is hoarded. Nobody can make a computation of how much money is hoarded. Hoarded money does not come into the money supply; it is being salted away like the fixed deposits, the Post Office Savings Bank deposits. Hoarded money is not readily available. Therefore these figures are correct; and to take into consideration hoarded money is, I think, wrong. The double-doctor in Economics should not have made that mistake because hoarded money is money that is salted away and therefore it cannot be taken into consideration in computing the money supply. What I want to say is that if there is hoarded money nobody can compute how much of it is there; and if the Central Bank is to take that money into account, it should have done so in the previous years also. The point that I make is that the same factors and facts that were taken into consideration all these years have been

taken into account this year too in computing what the money supply is.

There is one other point that I want to touch upon before I conclude and I need about five minutes more.

நிசேஷண கிவநாயக்கமெ

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

How many five minutes' does the hon. Member want?

வேதநாடாரசை நானைநன்

(டொக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

Whatever it is, this is final.

My hon. Friend from Kilinochchi (Mr. Ratnam) brought out a point which I think needs a little elucidation. He said very clearly, and I support it, that we as a party do still maintain that it is under a federal form of constitution that the best form of government for Ceylon, the Sinhalese people, the Tamil people, could be had. At the same time it must be said, while we have not given up our faith in it and our aims, that it is not practicable is Ceylon today because as far as a federal union is concerned, the Sinhalese people and the rest of the people in this country must accept it; they must become members of that union. Until all become members you cannot have such a union; they must become partners of it. Therefore, till such time as they accept it—I hope they will accept it soon—we cannot put forward that as a practical solution. Nonetheless, we still say that it is the best possible solution, and that it can provide the best possible constitution for Ceylon, for the Sinhalese, Tamils, Muslims, and even the Moors if they are near about. We feel that under a federal set-up you can have a real democratic constitution for this country.

Unfortunately, some people try to draw a parallel between the D. M. K. in India and us of the Federal Party. It would appear that the D. M. K. have openly stated that they have withdrawn their demand for a

விசேஷப் பதவி கெடுப்பதற்கு, 1967-68

—தேவன் வர கியவீ

secession. The demand for a secession is really something which is almost like treason. If they want a separate state it can be done unilaterally. If the D. M. K. and South India want it they can fight for it and have it unilaterally; they do not want the support of North India. If we want a federal union we cannot have it separately by ourselves—it is something like a man being unable to marry without a woman. We cannot have a federal union without the Sinhalese people or until such time as we are able to teach them better, until such time as this ugly and foolish propaganda is removed out of their minds by our young people. Our young people are learning Sinhala to convince the Sinhalese people of the need for a federal union and they are doing so only for that purpose, and we hope very soon to have the Federal Party not only for the North and the East but for the whole of Ceylon. That is the only way we can get the best form of government for Ceylon, a truly democratic government and truly free country.

டி. ஸா. 2.54

கேனமன் இஸ்.

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think I shall need even three minutes to deal with the speech of the hon. Member for Nallur (Dr. Naganathan). I must confess that I was fascinated by his performance today. I have never seen him play so many roles in one performance. We had him as the research worker in history digging out the utterances of Marie Antoinette. We saw him as a cooking expert telling us how best to prepare buriyani from Pakistan rice. We had him as the helmsman assisting the captain of the ship of State to steer a safe course through troubled waters. Most amazing of all, we had him in the role of elder statesman. Of course, there were lapses when he revealed his true self. But may I say that he was most lovable when he forgot himself and relapsed to his usual role of overgrown juvenile delinquent.

தேவன் வர கியவீ

(டாக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

O.K. boy!

கேனமன் இஸ்.

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

He said that what Naganathan says today, the world accepts tomorrow. May I say that what Naganathan says today, this House forgets the next moment and the country ignores the next morning.

தேவன் வர கியவீ

(டாக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

Ignores to their regret.

கேனமன் இஸ்.

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

We have come to the last day of a long and rather listless Debate on the third Budget of the present Government.

Let me begin by offering my congratulations to the person who has to be most congratulated, and that is yourself. I congratulate you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on your endurance in sitting out this Debate.

Some hard things have been said about my Friend, the Hon. Minister of Finance. The fair Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike) gave him a few hard knocks. The Minister is an accomplished politician and a man of the world. He is used to knocks from fair ladies and I do not suppose that he is unduly worried. But I must say I thought he did rather well, considering the situation in which he was placed. I have watched him for the last three years in the post of Minister of Finance and I must say that he has become, economically speaking, an accomplished card-sharper. He can deal from different places in the pack with great skill and aplomb.

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[කෙනමත් මය.]

and on this occasion he excelled himself. With nothing to say, he said it rather well.

I am only sorry that he did not receive the support that he deserved from his Colleagues. My Friend, the Minister of Finance, was in a somewhat embarrassing position. Apparently his back-benchers are getting somewhat restive and even his Colleagues on the Front Bench did not see eye to eye with my Hon. Friend. We had the spectacle of different reactions from within the Government itself to the Hon. Minister's main proposal, namely, the increase in the import licence fee to 10 per cent.

Incidentally, I must congratulate the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries and Fisheries, the Member for Wattala (Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe) on his speech. It was an excellent one.

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීවරු

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர்கள்)

(Hon. Members)

Hear ! hear !

කෙනමත් මය.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

He repeated some of the things that I have been saying for the past twenty years.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

That is why it was excellent.

කෙනමත් මය.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

That was his particular excellence, and I am glad that after so long my ideas are getting accepted.

To return to my hon. Friend from Wattala, he told the Hon. Minister that he should be careful about his proposal. Even his Colleague, the

Hon. Minister for Health, told the Minister that he would have imposed this levy in a different way if he was the Minister of Finance. The Hon. Minister of State, of course, made a totally different Budget speech. He ignored my poor old Friend, the Minister of Finance, and went on to say how he intends to save the economic fortunes of this country by investing Rs. 50 million now in tourism and after 10 years getting a return of Rs. 200 million, quite forgetting what the Hon. Minister of Finance had told us, namely that Rs. 300 million escapes every year in smuggled gem transactions, about which this Government does nothing.

Nevertheless, the Minister of Finance was the recipient of congratulations as well from hon. Members from his side of the House. I was rather struck by the fact that he was congratulated not so much on his Budget but on the fact that he had lasted so long in his portfolio; hon. Members opposite made a point of congratulating him on his durability. I do not want to deny my Hon. Friend this modicum of pleasure or praise. If he has lasted long in this position, it is so much more to his credit.

Of course, he has a special advantage. He has the one job which nobody else on his side wants. That, I imagine, is a big help under the present circumstances. The important fact is that hon. Members on the Government side, who are today obsessed with the idea and haunted by the spectre of political survival, should be so struck by my Hon. Friend's capacity to survive in this difficult post.

The only other matter on which there seems to be agreement on both sides of the House is that this year's Debate has been the duller in living memory. There does not seem to be much interest shown by either side or indeed by the public in the proposals and estimates of the Hon. Minister of Finance. Speaking as one who has listened to 20 Budget speeches and taken part in 20

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

Budget debates, I must say that I cannot blame hon. Members on either side of the House very much if they have this reaction, for after all even my hon. Friends opposite, the back-benchers, have come to accept that, under this Government, budgets have become, to put it politely, fictions, or, to put it very accurately, frauds.

Both the Hon. Minister of Finance and his Parliamentary Secretary spoke of the fact that there has been a continuity in all the three Budgets which the Minister of Finance has presented. Yes, there has been a certain continuity, a continuity over and above the fact that they have been presented by the same Minister.

If you examine what has happened in the economic field in this country over the last two budgetary periods, there are certain salient facts which all of us have to accept.

The first fact is that the Budget that we debate here is never the Budget that finally gets implemented. To put it more precisely, the Budget Estimates which the Minister of Finance presents to this House at the beginning of each financial year and which are solemnly and seriously debated and accepted, have not been the Budgets that were actually put into practice.

The second fact is that the real authors of the Budgets are not so much the Minister and the Government, but the World Bank missions, the various international agencies from whom this Government borrows money and the various imperialist countries which are described as our "donor friends."

I shall show—and my Hon. Friend himself admits a part of it—that a number of decisions that have been taken, including the decision to change the Budgets that had been accepted by this House, were taken on the recommendation of these real "Ministers of Finance" of this country.

The third fact is that all the main and really important financial decisions of this Government are not

included in the Budget proposals. They are taken in between the Budgets and implemented without the prior consent of this House being sought for their implementation.

These facts are rather important. I do not accuse the Government of any breach of the law; they are still acting within the law and the Constitution. But what they are doing is, in my opinion, tantamount to a contempt of this House. If that is the situation and if, in fact, the Budget Estimates that are placed before us are unreal and are chopped and changed beyond recognition, and this is done behind the back of Parliament and without consulting the Parliament that adopted those estimates, then can you blame hon. Members if they do not take much interest in the Debate? After all, who wants to debate a fiction, unless you want to hear the sound of your own voice? It would be far better to debate reality than a self-confessed fiction.

Look at what happened to the last Budget, that is to say, the Estimates which my Hon. Friend, the Minister of Finance, prepared for 1966-67 and placed before this House in July 1966, and which were approved by this House in August 1966. What has happened to it? We do not have to go any further than my Hon. Friend's own speech to see that, at the end of this financial year, we shall be left with a Budget that is completely different from the one we debated and accepted last year. I can understand it if there are some small variations in the Budget in the course of a financial year. But in practically every fundamental respect we are left with something quite different from what we debated and accepted.

In my speech I shall mainly deal with two questions, namely, the structure of the Budget and the Government's so-called strategy of economic development. So, I shall examine that question from those points of view.

It is quite clear from the Hon. Minister's speech that nearly all the assumptions on which the Budget of

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[කෙතමන් මස.]

1966-67 was constructed have either not materialized or else proved to be false.

Look at the facts given by my Hon. Friend himself. He admits to the widest variations. First of all, he admits that expenditure will be Rs. 108 million less than he estimated. That is not a small sum. Revenue will be Rs. 158 million less than he estimated. Capital expenditure will be Rs. 34 million less than he estimated. Recurrent expenditure will be Rs. 64 million less than he estimated. The surplus on current account will not be Rs. 109 million as he announced but Rs. 15 million only. The limit on local loans to bridge the budget gap which the Hon. Minister of Finance told us would be Rs. 325 million has been arbitrarily increased by a further Rs. 73 million to Rs. 398 million.

Only Rs. 221 million of the Rs. 422 million foreign aid promised by the Anglo-American consortium for 1965 and 1966 actually arrived by June 1967, and only Rs. 136 million—much less than what was expected—arrived in 1966. These are all figures which my Hon. Friend himself has given us in his speech.

You will see that the very basis on which he constructed his Budget—on which he asked this House to accept that Budget and on which that Budget was accepted by a majority of this House—has disappeared. Thus what we will be left with at the end of the financial year will be something vastly different from what was presented to us at the beginning of the financial year.

What have my hon. Friends done about this situation? I have drawn attention to the fact that important financial decisions have been taken, not in the Budget but administratively. The most important one was the decision that was taken on the 17th December 1966, namely, the decision to cut the rice ration by half. Maybe my hon. Friends have not realized all that they expected

from this measure. I understand that the saving in foreign exchange, as far as rice is concerned, will only be Rs. 23 million. My hon. Friend the Member for Nallur (Dr. E. M. V. Naganathan) told us that the saving on both flour and rice as far as foreign exchange is concerned will be only about Rs. 30 million. But the Hon. Minister of Finance himself told us that, as a result of this calculated action by the Government, Rs. 150 million was sliced off the food subsidy. That is quite a large slice. It is quite a big change from what this House was presented with and on the basis of which the last Budget was accepted, and it is a change that was taken administratively by the Government.

The second matter to which I wish to draw your attention is this. This Government has also arbitrarily changed the Foreign Exchange Budget and that too in a major way. As you are aware, early in 1967 import quotas agreed to in the Foreign Exchange Budget were drastically revised by administrative decisions, on the recommendation of the World Bank Mission. The import programme for 1967 was cut back administratively by a further sum of Rs. 173 million on items other than rice and flour.

Let me give you some of the details. Rs. 313 million had been allocated for the import of subsidiary foodstuffs. This was reduced to Rs. 292 million, that is, by Rs. 21 million. When my hon. Friends opposite find that subsidiary foodstuffs are in short supply let them remember that their own Government, behind the back of Parliament, reduced even the meagre allocation that it had told Parliament about in the last Budget.

Textile quotas were reduced from Rs. 85 million to Rs. 60 million, that is by Rs. 25 million. Petroleum allocations were reduced by Rs. 5 million, cement allocations by Rs. 4 million, drug allocations by Rs. 5 million, and direct user items by Rs. 15 million. Allocations to non-industrial corporations were cut down by Rs. 25 million.

விசேஷப் பதவி கெடுப்பத, 1967-68

—தேவன் வர கிவிலி

That is how they help corporations ! They talk about how they help the private sector, but the allocations to private sector industries were cut by Rs. 105 million. Trade quotas other than above were cut by Rs. 25 million.

So, you see, Sir, here were important economic decisions being taken and put into operation without bringing them before this House. Of course, my hon. Friends had legal cover. They also have legal power to continue an Emergency when there is no need for it. But if they have any respect for this House, they would at least have come here and told us what the real position is when they decided to revise the Budget.

The hon. Member for Nallur said that the Hon. Minister of Finance was an honest man and that he was prepared to tell us the position frankly. Well, he was not prepared to tell us this position frankly. And may I point out that the economic situation is far more serious than my hon. Friend was prepared to admit.

The two actions that I just referred to did not end the Government's practice of making administratively changes that are normally included in the budgetary proposals each year. I shall give another example. Today import duties on raw material and on machinery and equipment used by approved industries are revised by notices in the Gazette. Notices appeared in the Gazette on the 11th, 12th and 27th May 1967, revising these import duties.

You also know that approved industries are now granted tax relief—not through budgetary decisions but by a so-called Income Tax Committee which has been set up, of course by law, but administratively. What relief has been granted I do not know.

தேவன் வர கிவிலி.

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

That is according to the Act

தேவன் வர கிவிலி.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

It is quite wrong. What is happening is that decisions that should be taken on the Floor of the House, in the full light of publicity, are now being taken administratively, even though my hon. Friends are covered by law. The net result is that this House, whenever a Budget is placed before it, is asked to debate something which is unreal, something which is a fiction and not a fact.

I do not know where the habit ends. We have been told that the Government has taken a decision to legalize bookies. I read an editorial in the "Daily Mirror", which I now quote :

"A full turn out of Cabinet Ministers decided on 2nd July that the business of bookmakers who take bets on horse racing be made legal."

We have also been told that this will give the Government an additional Rs. 10 million in revenue. If that is so—and no Government Member has denied it ; therefore it should be so—why are not such matters included in the Budget ? If the Government has decided to get another ten million rupees or whatever the sum by legalizing bookies, why is it not shown in the Budget ? Surely the Budget is the appropriate time to tell us of this intention. That is why I should like to say that it is very difficult for us to work up enthusiasm about matters which are not facts but fiction. Even the Government does not pretend it to be other than fiction.

Can we take the Estimates for 1967-68, the present Estimates, any more seriously than we can take the last Estimates ? I do not think so. Just look at the flippancy—I use the word advisedly—with which my Hon. Friend the Minister of Finance and the Government treat their own Budget proposals.

First of all, my Hon. Friend the Minister produces a Budget with a record deficit of Rs. 995 million. Then what does he do ? With one stroke

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[කෙතමන් මය.]

of the pen he reduces the deficit from Rs. 995 million to Rs. 889 million, by blandly announcing that he does not intend to spend Rs. 107 million. This is not budgeting. This is confidence trickery! Mr. Minister, if you do not intend to spend this Rs. 107 million, why do you include it in the Estimates?

I can understand the Minister of Finance at the end of the year telling us, "Well, we thought we would be able to spend this money but in fact, for various reasons, we were unable to do so." Many Governments and many Ministers have come before this House with that story. But that is after the financial year is over.

But my Hon. Friend tells us, at the start of the financial year: "We have no intention to spend Rs. 107 million"—it is not such a small sum—"which we have included in the Budget Estimates".

Mr. Minister, whom are you trying to fool? Are you trying to keep some of your more rumbustious Ministers quiet when they shout for bigger allocations for their departments? Are you trying to fool the hon. Members behind you who have promised their constituents various social services and amenities? Is that why you have included this amount in the Budget without the slightest intention of spending that money? When a Government and a Minister treat their Budget proposals in such a light-hearted manner, do you expect us of the Opposition to take their Budget seriously?

What next? The Hon. Minister of Finance—mind you, with a completely straight face—says that he expects to finance Rs. 275 million of this deficit from foreign aid. Now, he himself has told us that for the last 2½ years all the foreign aid he had got was Rs. 221 million. He told us that, last year, he received Rs. 136 million only. He told us that even in July 1967, they had not yet finalized all the matters relating to aid for this

year following the consortium meeting in Tokyo early in 1967. Yet he has told us, with a perfectly straight face, "I am going to finance Rs. 275 million from foreign aid." Hey presto! On what basis other than blind faith or confidence trickery can the Hon. Minister treat the House in this way?

Sir, my Hon. Friend knows very well—I do not have to give him lectures on this; he is an experienced man—that in a developing country like Ceylon, budgets have a special role to play. A budget has to be something more than a national accounting every year. Budgets have to be a mechanism for stimulating and developing the economy. That is why most budgets in countries like ours consist of three sets of measures. There are fiscal measures, that is to say, measures which are introduced by the Minister of Finance and the Treasury, mostly dealing with taxation. There are monetary measures—those introduced by the Central Bank and the banking mechanism of this country. There are also development planning measures. The striking feature of the last two budgets of my hon. Friend the Minister of Finance—this is the real continuity of his budgetary policy—is that both these budgets have been innocent of all three measures. The Minister of Finance has succeeded in producing budgets which, when you look at them closely, dodge these major matters.

I do not think I should go into the question of taxation because one of the main features of this Budget is that there are no new taxes. In fact, my Hon. Friend the Minister of Finance and his Government have been bending backwards to avoid having to finance the deficit by taxing the rich people of this country. That is the one source of revenue that you never think of. You are prepared, Mr. Minister, deliberately to put up prices by Rs. 80 million by increasing licence fees. You stop housing schemes, while you allow luxury hotels to be built. But you are not

பிசுபீசன பதன் கெடுதலுடன், 1967-68

—தேவன் வர கியவீத

prepared to consider increasing taxes on the rich or even taking back part of the tax concessions you gave them in your first Budget. I have no time to go into details. I have a lot of details here. The rich people have not been doing badly in the past two years. Some of the foreign and local companies have been doing quite well even though the country and the people have been doing badly.

My hon. Friend the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries and Fisheries, in his excellent speech, repeating, as I said, what I had said earlier, gave us a good deal of very valuable information on how the sterling companies exploit this country. Every word he said was true. I congratulate him on the courage he displayed, in standing up here and telling the truth. But having said what he did, why did he not follow it up by asking the Minister of Finance what he intends to do to put a stop to such robbery.

அரு மன் துவிர்சென்

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

No guts.

கௌரவ மன்.

(திரு. கௌரவன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

My hon. Friend states a problem but is not prepared to ask the Minister of Finance what he is going to do about it. I ask the Minister: what are you going to do about this robbery and exploitation of Ceylon by the sterling companies? Why do you not even tax them more? You were prepared to take part of the profits of the state enterprises to finance your budgetary deficit. I do not think it is wrong. In fact, I advocated such a policy myself earlier. You are prepared to take Rs. 25 million out of the profits of the corporations which the previous Government started and which your party opposed and said would never be run at a profit! Well and good! You are prepared to take the money from state corporations but

you are not prepared to touch the foreign capitalists, or even the big local capitalists.

It is no secret that some of the new industrialists are making profits of between 200 and 300 per cent. They have been given a tax holiday. On top of that, they are allowed unrestricted profits and the right to produce shoddy materials by the renegade socialist Minister of Industries. You do not think of touching them, Mr. Minister.

I have here a case of a company engaged in the manufacture of toilet-ry. It has a capital of Rs. 2 million, and it has, just last week, declared a profit of Rs. 5 lakhs. You find that happening all over. They are making 200 to 300 per cent profit. I am prepared to establish that. Nothing however is being done about it. You are not prepared to touch them.

My hon. Friend the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries and Fisheries told you how the sterling companies exploit the country. You are not prepared to touch them. On the other hand, you are prepared to help them to exploit the people of this country.

In 1965-66 the Hon. Minister of Finance lifted the moratorium imposed by the previous Government on the export of the profits and dividends of foreign companies, to the extent of Rs. 67.4 million. I have a document here. It has not been published yet. It has been prepared by the I. B. R. D. Mission. It is entitled "Note on recent developments and the exchange and growth outlook, 1967-71, of Ceylon" and is dated March 24, 1967. It was prepared by my Hon. Friend's I. B. R. D. advisers to be sent to the Tokyo meeting of the donor countries. If you want me to table it I shall do so. My Hon. Friend probably knows its contents. This is what it says at page 11:

"It has been assumed that the moratorium on remittances of dividends and profits will be lifted from 1968 onwards and that the accumulated backlog will be released over 10 years."

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[කෙනමත් මය.]

That is what the I. B. R. D. Mission has told the donor countries. But you have not told us that, nor have you told the country. I ask the Hon. Prime Minister, is that correct? Have you given such an assurance to the donor countries? Have you given such an assurance to the I. B. R. D.? If that is so, why is this country not being told? Why is Parliament not being told? How many secret agreements do you have? Are you not satisfied with your secret agreement with the Federal Party?

My Hon. Friend had the possibility to finance his budget deficit by taxing these exploiters, but he deliberately did not use that opportunity.

My hon. Friends opposite seem to imagine that allocations for expenditure on development are the same as promoting development. They have boasted that the amounts they have allocated in their budgets for economic development—the last one and this one—have been progressively the largest on record. I do not know about the last one, but it is probably correct in regard to this one.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Both.

කෙනමත් මය.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

This one, I think, is correct. Very well, I accept the Hon. Prime Minister's assurance on that. It is a simple matter of fact. You had the biggest budgetary allocation for economic development but, in practice, as the Central Bank has told us, in spite of this allocation, in spite of all this money being set aside, the per capita G. N. P. declined in both years, 1965 and 1966. Therefore, allocation by itself is not the guarantee of performance. It is not enough merely to blame it on the weather. This year we have had good weather, at

least so far as the Maha crop is concerned. But My Hon. Friend and his own advisers will admit—and I shall quote from the document if necessary—that there is not going to be any spectacular rise in the G. N. P. per capita in 1967 either.

If you look at the proposals of my Hon. Friend you will see that the main ways in which he intends to finance his deficit will be by increasing Ceylon's dependence on foreign capital and by making the Ceylonese consumer pay higher prices than before. These are the two basic lines of providing money for financing his deficit.

I do not want to go into the question of the promises of aid made to this Government by the Anglo-American combination of countries. The hon. Members of the Government themselves admit that the promises given by these friends of theirs have not been kept more than up to 50 per cent. In certain cases some of the countries have not even kept their promises up to 50 per cent. But in the totality they have not got even 50 per cent of the foreign aid they were promised by their consortium friends.

What is interesting is that the Government has now a new conception of the role that foreign aid is to play. The hon. Member for Nallur (Dr. E. M. V. Naganathan), you will remember, said that we should not waste foreign aid and that we should spend foreign aid on development work alone. I do not blame the hon. Member for Nallur, but he should really listen more carefully to the speeches of the Hon. Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance. Both these Hon. Ministers told us that last year their economic position had been saved largely as a result of the foreign aid that they had received. You will remember that the Prime Minister made a statement to that effect in his reply in the Throne Speech Debate and my good Friend the Minister of Finance repeated it in this Debate.

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

In other words, what they were trying to tell us is that the Government was able to tide over the drop of Rs. 235 million in our export earnings in 1966 as a result of the meagre commodity aid that they got from their imperialist friends, coupled with their many short-term borrowings from the International Monetary Fund and other international agencies.

Important points arise from these statements of my hon. Friends. The first is that the Government now looks upon foreign aid not as a means to develop the country but as a means to off-set the drop in the export earnings each year—in other words, as a way to keep your economic head above water. That is the way in which my hon. Friends now think and talk about foreign aid.

The Hon. Minister of State, the hon. Member for Wattala (Mr. D. Shelton Jayasinghe), and even the single doctor from Nallur, all told us how these very imperialist friends of the Government in Britain, America, and certain West European countries have deliberately depressed our export prices for tea. They told us this is really the cause of the drop of Rs. 235 million in our export earnings. In 1966 and over a long period earlier. Thus your imperialist friends depress our export prices to the tune of Rs. 235 million a year, and then give us Rs. 136 million a year as aid. We lose on the swings, and we lose on the roundabouts as well, but there is no remedy for that position in any of the proposals of my Hon. Friend presented in this Budget.

What does it mean? It means that your idea that we need foreign aid to keep your head above water inevitably leads you to the desperate position in which the Government goes on making one political concession after another to the imperialist powers in order to get the aid they promised, but which is only given in dribblets depending on whether the Government behave like good boys or not. We have had many examples of this—the over-generous compensation paid to the Anglo-American oil companies, the promise

to lift the moratorium on the export of profits, dividends and interest, the special tax reliefs given to the big foreign and local capitalists in the first and second budgets, the new concessions to be given to a certain class of capitalists in the form of foreign exchange allocations in this Budget.

I read in the newspapers that attempts are now being made to get Ceylon to join the so-called Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) that is being launched by Thailand, Philippines, Malaysia, Singapore and Indonesia. We have not had an official confirmation of this by the Government, but there are many indications that the reports are true. In the "Observer" of 11th August 1967, I read a statement by the Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Defence and External Affairs, Mr. G. V. P. Samarasinghe, that "Ceylon was keen on joining ASEAN" and was studying the declaration. Malaysia's Prime Minister, Tunku Abdul Rahman, in an interview to the "Sun" on 6th August 1967, stated that Ceylon had already taken "meaningful steps" in that direction. In the "Observer" of 1-th August 1967, there is a statement by the Indonesian Foreign Minister, Adam Malik, that Ceylon was on the brink of joining that association.

I do not know what the intention of the Government is in regard to this matter. I hope the Hon. Prime Minister will enlighten us on this question. But I must say that we categorically condemn and oppose any attempt by this Government to join ASEAN. This is not an attempt to strengthen Asian economic solidarity and co-operation. On the contrary the Government is seeking to pervert these sentiments in order to take Ceylon into SEATO by the backdoor and to scuttle the non-alignment policy that this country has followed since 1956. I shall speak more about this in the Committee stage when we discuss the Prime Minister's Votes. But there can be no economic or other benefit in our joining this grouping of states.

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[කෙනමන් මය.]

We all know that the British Government has decided to withdraw its bases and troops east of Suez. The United States feels that there is a "power vacuum" for imperialism in this area and, therefore, seeks to put together a so-called "association" consisting of two members of SEATO, Thailand and Philippines, two governments which have defence pacts with Britain, Malaysia and Singapore, and the right-wing Government of Indonesia. Our Friends on the other side are now on the brink of joining them.

Like attracts like. I was rather disturbed when I read some of the statements made by the Hon. Prime Minister in his communique after he returned from his visit to Japan. If this Government contemplates joining ASEAN, we wish to tell them that any such step will be strongly opposed—

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

What is it that you are objecting to in the communique?

කෙනමන් මය.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Your reference to the discussions you had for regional solidarity—your sudden interest in and reference to these matters, particularly at this moment.

My Hon. Friend the Minister of Finance intends to borrow money locally and internationally. He tells us that he intends to borrow Rs. 650 million in the course of this year in order to finance the budget deficit. He tells us he intends to borrow but he does not tell us how he intends to repay what he has borrowed or what he intends to borrow. Does he want to leave this for the next Government to decide? Or does he want to mortgage the country's vital interests in the process?—[Interruption.] My

hon. Friends will soon find out what the real position is. The Hon. Minister should have told us at least what his advisers of the IBRD think about the outcome of his present borrowing policy.

I refer again to the Note. The repayments of loans already contracted, that is, especially this Government's emergency short-term borrowings from the IMF, will increase threefold between 1967 and 1971. The repayment position is broken down as follows:

1967—Rs. 95 million

1968—Rs. 91 million

1969—Rs. 191 million

1970—Rs. 239 million

1971—Rs. 274 million

And this is what the Mission says. I quote:

"This is partly the result of Ceylon having to repay to the I. M. F. the drawings made earlier to cope with the immediate exchange problems in 1965-1967..."

That is your period.

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මය.

(திரு. ஷெல்தன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

This year we paid back.

කෙනමන් මය.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

You paid back only the Anglo-American creditors. You did not repay your commitments to anyone else. Before you borrow, please consider how you are going to repay.

What else does this Note tell us? My Hon. Friend has not given us the full picture. Not only will we have to repay Rs. 274 million in 1971, mostly to repay short-term borrowings of this Minister and his Government, but also our export earnings will decline by Rs. 1,000 million in the same period. I quote:

"It is now estimated over the period 1967-1971 Ceylon will lose, from declines in export prices below the 1965 level,

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

about Rs. 1,000 million in export earnings roughly equivalent to two-thirds of all aid now assumed to be provided by the Group."

Who says that? Your I.B.R.D. advisers!

At page 11, we are also told that payments for services, that is, remittances of dividends, profits, interest, etc., after the withdrawal of the moratorium "are expected to increase from Rs. 23 million in 1961 to Rs. 149 million in 1971." Why does not my Hon. Friend tell us that that is the position, as explained to him by his advisers?

In fact, there are a number of urgent questions about which the Hon. Minister of Finance makes no reference whatsoever in his speech. There is the position arising out of the closure of the Suez Canal. We are paying a freight surcharge of 17½ per cent over and above what we paid earlier. My Hon. Friend does not think it worthwhile to mention this, although it will obviously mean that imports will be less and much more expensive in the course of this year. Why are you not actively seeking the assistance of other powers to continue and step up the campaign to see that Israel withdraws her forces to her pre-aggression positions? That is the only way in which conditions to open the Suez Canal can be created. You have dropped this matter like a hot brick. You took up a position at the United Nations and you have done nothing to follow it up. Even what you can do diplomatically, you are not doing.

My Hon. Friend does not inform this House about another matter. He pretends that such a situation does not exist. My Hon. Friend knows that the British Government is standing on its head to enter the E.C.M. If Britain does enter the European Common Market it will obviously have adverse effects on our export market. Are you preparing for such an eventuality? Do you even have such an eventuality in mind? We do not find a single bit

of foresight in appraisal of the realities of the contemporary situation in the speech of my Hon. Friend.

I have given you some of the salient facts about what sort of future faces us. This is one point on which I agree with the hon. Member for Nallur (Dr. Naganathan). The outlook is much more gloomy than the Minister of Finance has foretold. It is not at all a happy situation. In fact, this is what my Hon. Friend's advisers say at page 16 of their Note.

I quote:

"In essence, it is difficult to see how Ceylon's economy can reach and maintain an adequate rate of growth, say 4 to 5 per cent. a year, within the limits of import capacity as now assumed. There would probably still be an initial spurt in 1967-68,"—

You had better have an election before that, Mr. Prime Minister!

—"but thereafter the rate of growth would rapidly decline. Present indications are that towards the end of the 1960's it may well fall back to a level barely adequate to maintain per capita incomes, as gross investments decline, probably below the inadequate amount of 1966."

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Middle of nineteen what?

කේනමන් මය.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Towards the end of the nineteen sixties.

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

From where are you quoting?

කේනමන් මය.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I am quoting from the Note sent to the donor countries, a note prepared by the I.B.R.D. Mission here—[Interruption]. Have you not seen it? I am prepared to table it.

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[කෙතමන් මය.]

I turn to the last point I want to make.

What is the economic strategy that the Government intends to pursue in order to cope with the problem of how to re-orient the economy and promote an adequate rate of growth against the background of a declining capacity to import?

The Budget Speech of the Hon. Minister of Finance and the speeches of other Ministers in charge of development departments who have spoken so far in this Debate, make it clear that the Government does not have a single overall economic strategy. Instead, we have a number of partial and sometimes contradictory strategies, proclaimed and pursued by different Ministers and groups of Ministers, and all operating at the same time.

Of course, there are certain matters on which they all agree. The most obvious is the fundamental strategic consideration that the political survival of the Government takes precedence over the economic welfare of the country and its people. They also agree on such matters as reliance of foreign aid to offset the fall in export earnings, and the need to reduce real incomes and keep consumption in check.

You will recall that, even though it may not have succeeded in many respects, the basic economic strategy of the past Government was based on two main premises. The first premise was that the goal of economic development should be pursued while at the same time maintaining standards of income and consumption and carrying out measures of social welfare and re-distribution of income. That was the first premise. The second premise was that in economic development priority should be given to the development of industry and to the development of the public sector.

These were the two basic premises of the economic strategy of the last Government. I admit that they did

not succeed in giving flesh and blood to all this, but that was the basic economic orientation, their perspective, however faulty their actual steps may have been. My hon. Friends opposite have changed this whole strategy, particularly since the last Budget was introduced in this House, and more particularly since they took the turning point decision on the 17th of December 1967, to cut the rice ration. We have now a whole number of strategies.

We have the strategy of the Hon. Minister of State. He made, as I said earlier, a separate budget speech which has nothing to do with the Budget Speech of the Hon. Minister of Finance. His strategy was a simple one and it is this: externally, we should make up the Rs. 250 million, which we expect to lose every year on export earnings, from tourism; and internally, we should hand over the task of economic development to the private sector and liquidate all public sector development that took place under the former Government. Several hon. Members have already referred to that strategy. The Hon. Minister of State follows his strategy wherever he can, especially in regard to the C. W. E. and the best-paying resthouses and other departments under his control.

Then there is the strategy—I do not know whether it could be called strategy—of the Hon. Leader of the House, who is also the Minister of Land, Irrigation and Power. He has so many strategies that it is difficult to keep count of them. One day it is going to be cadju, the next day it is going to be deep-water drilling, that is going to save the country. My Hon. Friend was in charge of irrigation for several years before he realized—and he told this House quite frankly about it—that water could also be passed through a turbine to generate electricity, and not only to irrigate fields.

This year he told us that our salvation lies in IR 8. Down with H4, up with IR8! That is his current slogan.

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

I notice that both the F.A.O. and the Minister of Agriculture, who has a different strategy, have issued scientific objections to the "Daily News" today saying that we will be ruined if we place our faith in IR 8 and ignore an old friend, H 4. As I said there are contradictory strategies being put forward and followed.

Then there is the strategy of the Hon. Minister of Industries and Fisheries. His strategy is simple. From time to time he comes out of his stupor and makes a public speech attacking someone. He attacks the World Bank; he attacks the traders; or he attacks some industrialists. Immediately they all get together and complain to the Prime Minister, the Hon. Minister of Industries subsidizes. That we all know. That is all that happens. This time he has attacked some Members of the Opposition because he knows that we will not complain to the Prime Minister! He is on safe ground.

We should however be most concerned with two strategies. One is the Hon. Finance Minister's strategy, and that is, to go on borrowing money at home and abroad until the aid that has been promised by his imperialist friends arrives or until something else turns up. Like Micawber, he hopes something will turn up. The most serious thing is that he has, in addition, now adopted a new strategy, a strategy in which it does not matter what happens to questions like those of unemployment, high prices, and so on. He has deliberately increased prices in his proposals this year.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

May I know how much longer the hon. Member will take? We want to have a break. Can he finish in about ten minutes?

කෙනමන් මයා.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I shall try to finish in ten minutes.

The other proposal of the Hon. Minister of Finance is to give a special living allowance of Rs. 20 and Rs. 10 to certain categories of public employees. It is well known that the trade unions, particularly those trade unions associated with the Joint Committee of Trade Union Organizations, have for some time demanded an additional Rs. 30 a month or Re. 1 per day as a special living allowance to meet the cost of living, especially after the cut in the rice ration. If my Hon. Friend is under the impression that he can disrupt the trade union movement that was building up against his economic policies by this meagre concession to some, I think what happened at the conference of trade unions at the Town Hall yesterday should make him change his mind. At this conference, the trade unions in the private and public sector have categorically said, first, that they want a special living allowance of Rs. 30 applicable to everybody. My hon. Friends opposite say, "Well, Mr. Bandaranaike gave only Rs. 17.50. We are giving Rs. 20." May I say this. Mr. Bandaranaike gave Rs. 17.50 to everybody and he gave it to everybody at a time when people were getting two measures of rice for 50 cents.

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Now you get rice free!

කෙනමන් මයා.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

That is not the position today. Nor have you given Rs. 20 to everybody. You have given Rs. 20 to some, Rs. 10 to a few and *hulang* to most of the workers. And you have to pay Rs. 1.10 for two measures of rice.

The second point is this. If the Government, that is to say the Hon. Minister of Finance and the Hon. Prime Minister, admit that this special living allowance is to be granted in order to compensate for

தீவிரமான பணம் கெடுப்பை, 1967-68

—தேவன் வர் கியதி

[கேள்விகள் மீ.]

the hardship brought about by the cutting of the rice ration, then you must pay this allowance with arrears from the date the ration was cut, namely, 17th December 1966. It seems to me a just demand.

செல்வன் சிவசுந்தரம் மீ.

(திரு. செல்வன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

What logic?

கேள்விகள் மீ.

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

What is your logic? You say you want to compensate these people; then start compensating them from the time you perpetrated this cut in the ration.

செல்வன் சிவசுந்தரம் மீ.

(திரு. செல்வன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

You could not give Rs. 1.50!

பாண்டிசன். சி. பி. பெரேரா (யதியன் தொடு)

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா—யட்டியாந் தோட்டை)

(Dr. N. M. Perera—Yatinyantota)

I was there only for six months.

சென் மன்றத்தினர்

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

What about the twenty-one demands?

பாண்டிசன். சி. பி. பெரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You are getting them soon.

நியோகித கமிஷனர்கள்

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Order, please! Let the hon. Member continue with his speech.

கேள்விகள் மீ.

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I want to deal with that economic strategy of the Government which certainly deserves the greatest respect, because it is the commanding strategy of the Hon. Prime Minister. May I put it in a simple way? The Hon. Prime Minister's economic strategy seems to be that no economic victories can be secured by a multi-front offensive and therefore it would be better and more advantageous to concentrate all your efforts on one front and hope within a reasonable period of time to score an economic breakthrough on that front. He has selected the food production front, and therefore the food drive has become the main economic strategy of the Government. I dealt with the food drive in my speech in the Throne Speech Debate, so I do not want to repeat what I said then.

To judge from some of the public speeches that have been made by the Hon. Prime Minister which have been quoted in the press, he seems to have developed hallucinations about his strategy. If the report in the "Daily News" is correct, he is thinking not only of self-sufficiency by 1970 but even exporting rice—

சென் மன்றத்தினர்

(கௌரவ டட்ளி செனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

No. I stressed that by 1970—

கேள்விகள் மீ.

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

If my Hon. Friend says he did not make that statement I will accept it. But the Hon. Minister of Local Government apparently does not know what is happening for he says that in ten years the country will be able to export rice, that rice will become an exchange earner for this country. It is true that even now we export, though illegally, a bit of rice to India. But if the Hon. Minister of Local Government thinks that in ten

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[කෙනමන් මය.]

the staff officer level. Surely the increase must be at the field officer level and the overseer level. But, judging by the Estimates, my Friends opposite want to have additional assistant government agents and even government agents, rather than increase the staff at the field level, which is the level at which you can actually reach and help the peasant.

My hon. Friend, the Member for Anuradhapura, and I were the day before yesterday at Vavuniya. I am sorry the hon. Member for Vavuniya was not there, but he knows all about it. We learned at Vavuniya that two staff officers have to share one clerk.

Take the number of other questions that were raised by hon. Members about the peasantry. Why do you still charge them 12 per cent interest on agricultural loans? Why does the Government allow exploitation of the peasants in regard to the hiring of tractors? If it wants to help the food drive, why does not the Government take over the import of tractors and sell them at a reasonable price to the peasantry and the co-operatives?

The c.i.f. price of a tractor is between Rs. 6,500 and Rs. 7,500, and they are sold at Rs. 18,000, and some even at Rs. 24,000. Anyway, the importers of tractors make more than one hundred per cent profit. If you want to help the food drive and the cultivator, why do you not import tractors through your C. W. E. or some other organization and sell them at a minimal profit? You cannot do so because you would hurt your Senator N. M. Appuhamy. Are you running the food drive for the benefit of N. M. Appuhamy or for the benefit of the *goviyas*? That is what we would like to know. In fact, your main strategy seems to be that the food drive should take place without the principal producers of our food, namely, the peasantry, being involved.

My Hon. Friend, the Prime Minister, when he cut the rice ration, told us that he expected the enthusiastic participation of the peasantry from the fact that the price of a bushel of paddy in the free market would rise far above the guaranteed price of Rs. 12. If that were so—it was so for a very short time—the peasantry may have taken a keener interest because they would have got more money, but my Hon. Friend knows that today the price of a bushel of paddy is roundabout Rs. 12.

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් ජේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Why?

කෙනමන් මය.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Why? The reason is because most of your millers have formed rings and are hoarding. They are rigging the market and forcing down prices and you are not prepared to take action.

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් ජේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

If they are hoarding it will go still higher.

කෙනමන් මය.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

No, Sir. Not "hoarding". I am sorry I used the wrong word. They are forcing down the price.—[Interruption].

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් ජේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

If they are hoarding it will rise up higher.—[Interruption].

කෙනමන් මය.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

They are forcing down the price at which they buy paddy from the

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

peasant. The people who benefit are the millers and middlemen.—[*Interruption*]. Why is the price of paddy low and the price of rice so high?

Much has been said about my Hon. Friend's strategy of giving special leases of state land to the big capitalists. I am not going to deal with that. I have spoken on that. What is really new is the new injection into food production of organized labour in two forms. One is the *shramadana* of school children and the other is the so-called Land Army. I am not going into the politics of this question. But I want to ask my Hon. Friend, have you had a study of the economics of this question? Are you not merely increasing the cost of production of a bushel of paddy? Would it be cheaper to use paid labour for this purpose? Have you ever examined this matter? Has anyone looked into how much it costs to take all these children into the fields and to bring them back? If you want to inject organized labour in the form of a Land Army into food production, you must also have sufficient planning so that your machinery and the other things you need will be at the right place at the right time. In other words, you need a much greater and efficient organization than you have at the moment.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා

(උප සභානායක ජනරාල්)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Can the hon. Member stop at 4.15 P.M.—[*Interruption*]. Order, please! Please do not disturb the hon. Member. He is finishing.

කෙනමන් මයා.

(තිரு. කෙනමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I should like to deal with this matter further, but I do not want to trespass upon your indulgence. I raised this question because this strategy needs much more careful consideration. I do not agree with

my Hon. Friend's strategy of concentrating everything on one front. I do not think he has even seriously considered the real economics of his strategy.

Are you satisfied with the performance reports you get in regard to food production? Are you satisfied with the method of random sampling? You do not even sample on the basis of a whole acre, you sample on patches.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරව උද්ග්‍රී ජේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Then you do not know what random sampling is. You have to choose a number of patches.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාතිථි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

No. Random sampling can be on a whole acre also.

කෙනමන් මයා.

(තිරු. කෙනමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

The sample can be a whole acre. Why can you not do random sampling on the basis of a whole acre, and not merely on the basis of patches?

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරව උද්ග්‍රී ජේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

That is not random sampling.

කෙනමන් මයා.

(තිරු. කෙනමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

If you want to have a proper strategy for development you must have changes in your export-import trade. If you want to have a proper strategy you have to have a complete change in your trading policy, a change in your public sector policy, changes in the place to be given in the economy to industry, to agriculture and so on. All these matters need change. It is impossible for this Government to

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[කෙනමත් මයෝ.]

make these changes within the orbit of its class outlook and class interest. That is why the first item in a real strategy for an economic breakthrough in this country is the removal of this Government.

නිලයෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

The Sitting is suspended till 4.30 p.m. The Hon. Prime Minister will speak next.

රැස්වීම ඊට අනුකූලව තාවකාලිකව අත්සිටුවන ලදින් අ. හා. 4.30 ට නැවත පවත්වන ලදී.

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

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

ගරු ඩබ්ලි ටෙස්^{ප්} නානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central (Mr. Keuneman) started his speech, following the hon. Member for Nallur (Dr. Naganathan), he said that he would deal with the latter's speech in ten minutes. I do not want to be so discourteous to a long-standing Member of this House as to say that I propose to dispose of his speech in the very short time of ten minutes. I think he deserves more than ten minutes. However, before I go on to deal with some of the arguments of the hon. Member, I wish to remind the House that he prefaced his speech by complimenting the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries and Fisheries and emphasizing the fact that the hon. Parliamentary Secretary is now saying what the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central himself said ten years ago.

කෙතමන් මයෝ.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

And says still.

ගරු බඩිලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டப்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I do hope that with the passage of ten years the hon. Parliamentary Secretary—I like him very much—will not meet with the same fate that the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central has met with.

I was surprised to hear a particular utterance of the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central. In my long experience in this House I have heard occasionally bloomers of a certain nature given vent to by hon. Members, but I was surprised to hear the statement of the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central, with his long experience, when he complained that the Prime Minister gave the assurance that the cutting of the rice ration would result in higher prices for the cultivator. What has happened? Today the open market price is not more than the guaranteed price. I said, "Well, why do you think that has happened?" and asked him whether it is not a justification of our claim to the success of the food production drive, of the rice production drive. What was his bloomer? He said, "No, this is due to hoarding by traders."

කෙනමත් මයො.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Rice millers.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සෝනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Millers are traders, but if there is hoarding the prices should go up still more.

କେନ୍ଦ୍ରମାନଙ୍କ ମଧ୍ୟେ

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I said that millers get together and force down the prices.

விசேஷ உதவி கெடுதலு, 1967-68

—தேவன் வர கிண்பி

செ. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

However, I am glad of that statement by the hon. Member. It is a justification of the claim that the rice production drive has been up to now a thorough success. It came out of his very mouth; he admitted that the price has not risen in the open market.

கெனென் மன.

(திரு. கெனென்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

The price of rice is Re. 1.10 per measure and the price of paddy is Rs. 12 per bushel.

செ. டி. டி. டி. குணவர்தன

(கௌரவ டி. பி. ரு. குணவர்தன)

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

You stick to your bread, you do not understand rice.

நிஷேஷ கலாநாயகர்

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

I think if there is less cross-talk the Hon. Prime Minister can continue his speech.

செ. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

There seems to be an argument in regard to their respective diets.

However, what were his main arguments? He said that this Budget is fictitious and that it has nothing to do with reality in the execution of the proposals. Then he quoted certain figures. He also quoted a certain deficit the Hon. Minister of Finance has stated it was not necessary to budget for. Surely, he is not ignorant of the fact that in our budgets there is a certain element of saving in current expenditure, a certain element of saving in capital expenditure. During the course of my speech I will prove by facts and figures that not only has a tremendous advance

been made in the unprecedented provision made available in these two years for capital development and capital expenditure, but that there has been a considerable lowering in the savings under those particular accounts as compared with the previous budgets, meaning that practically the full amount, except for small shortfalls, has been spent.

He must realize that in a Budget new items, subsequent to the presentation of the Budget, have to be provided for. Firstly, when the tea prices dropped—and I think hon. Members themselves wanted a subsidy given; they said that small-holders and the employees would be thrown out of employment otherwise—we brought forward a tea subsidy scheme at a cost of Rs. 55 million by way of extra budgetary provision. Did you say that we should not have done that?

Then what is the next item? The Agricultural Corps. That is a new measure that we started as a result of the rice cut.

If you make allowance for these two items, I say that the Budget has not gone completely out. The particular figure I understand will be Rs. 20 million. Compared to previous budgets, which the hon. Member has so vehemently supported in the past, is that a grave error?

That is the big point he made—that this Budget is fictitious.

The hon. Member, of course, conceded that we have not done anything illegal. Of course, we have done nothing illegal. We came before the House for those measures. The hon. Member knows well that we cannot expend any money not voted by this House. We have to come before this House, and we came before this House for the Tea Subsidy Scheme—there was a long debate on that—and for the Agricultural Corps.

Then, the hon. Member said that we have violated the Foreign Exchange Budget. Surely the hon. Member knows that the Foreign Exchange

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක]

Budget is not a thing that is accepted and passed by this House, even if he knows nothing of rice cultivation. It has to be chopped and changed according to the very many factors that arise particularly in an import-export economy like Ceylon. They are subject to the vagaries of the international market and the fact must be accepted that variations in the Foreign Exchange Budget have to be expected. It is only certain prognostications which are subject to correction as we go on to meet the circumstances.

The hon. Member stated that the economic position is even gloomier than we have stated. I am glad he realizes the seriousness of the situation. If you do realize the seriousness of the situation you will not try to disrupt the economy and make it gloomier. If you are true in what you say, that we are going through a critical time, then your activities as a patriotic citizen will be different.

The hon. Member spoke about the bookmakers. I shall leave that to the Hon. Minister of Finance. If I deal with that too, there will be not much for the Hon. Minister of Finance to deal with.

The hon. Member spoke about the exorbitant profits made by new industrialists. I agree. In certain instances it may be 100, 200, 300, maybe even 400 per cent. One of the measures that the Minister of Finance has taken in this Budget is the Exchange Licence Scheme so as to bring into the government coffers some of those exorbitant profits.—[Interruption]. There is a limit to which you can pass something on to the consumer. The consumer must be able to buy at a price. Some of the extra income that the Government will derive by this Exchange Licence Scheme will be paid by the industrialists themselves.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, then the next subject he spoke about was non-alignment and this new regional organization that is contemplated in this region. We will have a

better opportunity to discuss that when my Estimates come up during the Committee stage. But, I will ask him this question. Is he not ashamed to talk about non-alignment? If there is any party represented in this House which is thoroughly aligned to a bloc, it is the Communist Party. I cannot say the same thing about any other party. If there is a party which is represented in this House, thoroughly aligned to a power bloc, it is none other than Mr. Pieter Keuneman's Communist Party. And he comes here and glibly says, "You are departing from the policy of non-alignment", having stuck himself head, foot and soul and everything in his alignment. He has the audacity to preach non-alignment to us.—[Interruption].

කෙනෙත් මයා.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Tell us whether you will join.... [Interruption].

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

This Government is non-aligned and will continue to be non-aligned.

කෙනෙත් මයා.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Are you going to join this organization?

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I said I will deal with this at the Committee stage.

කෙනෙත් මයා.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

You can give us just an indication now.

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

First, we must know, hon. Member, what that organization intends doing. Once we have examined that we will decide. If it is against our policy of non-alignment, then we shall not be there. I do hope that the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central will never bring up the question of non-alignment again—[Interruption].—as I hope that he will never talk about rice again.—[Interruption]. The hon. Third Member for Colombo Central made some bloomers which I never expected him to make.

Now, I go back to the main criticism that has been levelled against this Government. Well, it is the duty of the Opposition to criticize the Government in power. We did it in our own time and I am glad that hon. Members seated opposite are fulfilling their task—and fulfilling their duty.

Many items were discussed here which normally would have found a place during the Committee stage discussions of the Budget. Certain details about various activities of Ministries, I feel, should find a proper place for discussion during the Committee stage when hon. Members, not being confined to one speech alone, will have the fullest opportunity to elicit any fact they want and get any reply from the Minister in charge of that subject. I do, therefore, propose to confine my speech to matters appropriate for a Second Reading Debate on the Budget. In spite of various governments having been in office, in spite of various groups and parties criticizing the various governments, if one were to look back upon the picture as a whole, one must admit that a great deal of progress has been achieved during these different periods. Here I will confine myself to the economic aspect of the progress that has been achieved.

The Central Bank Report which was condemned by the hon. Member for Yatiyantota—I understand that he is boycotting the proceedings now. However, I would have liked to have seen him here when meeting his arguments, but I may be pardoned for dealing with his utterances in his absence.—[Interruption]. He is boycotting; he told me so. He complained that there was nobody to listen to his speech and, therefore, he is boycotting. However, I will quote not so much opinions as such expressed in the Central Bank Report but certain facts and figures. One can consider them in any way one likes, but the facts and figures cannot be contested.

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

The hon. Third Member for Colombo Central is leaving. Is that another boycott?

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I have finished with him. I refer to page 16 of the Central Bank Report, Table II (A) 1, where you have a statement of the gross national product at factor cost prices and various other items from 1959 to 1966. In 1959 the gross national product was 5,978.4. Then it went up to 6,265.3 in 1960; in 1961 it was 6,309; in 1962—6,568.3; 1963—6,824.1; 1964—7,222.9; 1965—7,435.9; 1966—7,529.1. There has been, right along from 1959, an upward trend in the gross national product. I do not say that the rate by which it increased is satisfactory, but this upward trend has been manifested throughout these years, in the gross national product, reaching the maximum this very year in spite of the various difficulties in the export sector we experienced in 1966. That is a fact. Similarly, on the same page of the Central Bank Report you will find figures about the *per capita income*. *Per capita* income showed a

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ලැ. ඩබ්ලි සේනානායක]

slight progress from 1959 to 1966. So those figures support the point I wish to make. But whatever it is I am not trying to score a point on behalf of any government or any Opposition as such. Various governments were in office from 1959-1966 and during that period the gross national product of this country continued to increase, and the *per capita* income also continued to progressively increase. But I must admit that the rate of increase has not been satisfactory.

What are the adverse factors that this Government had to contend with in the year 1966 which continue even now to a certain extent? Here again I am quoting from the Central Bank Report, supported by facts and figures: there is no paucity of tables giving the actual facts. The very first paragraph of the report states:

“A drastic decline in export earnings was the most striking feature of the economic situation during 1966. Not only did export receipts decline sharply from the level of the previous year, but they reached the lowest level since 1958. Largely as a result of the disappointing performance of the export sector, economic growth suffered a set-back in 1966.”

That is what the opening paragraph of the Central Bank Report states. Then lower down in the fourth paragraph it states:

“As in 1965, this rather disappointing performance of the economy was brought about substantially by factors beyond the country's control. The major factor responsible for this was the decline in earnings from exports. Adverse weather conditions, labour unrest and a drastic fall in the price of tea resulted in the value of tea exports alone declining by Rs. 183 million in 1966 as compared with 1965.”

That is a decline in tea exports alone. There can also be a decline in exports of coconuts due to adverse weather conditions—Mr. Deputy Speaker, you come from a coconut growing area; I do not think the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central would know all these—because the adverse effects of rainfall on coconut begin to appear exactly one year later. The drought of 1965 affected

the crops drastically. The cumulative effect of the fall in tea prices, the decline in production due to weather conditions and the fall in earnings from coconut caused by the drought of 1965, was the loss of Rs. 240 million in foreign exchange as compared with 1965. That is a situation caused by factors completely outside the control of this Government. True, there were similar experiences in the past like “Hurricane Flora” that the hon. Member for Kolonnawa, the then Minister of Finance, spoke about. We scoffed the idea. We laughed at it. It is true. And we know that the hon. Member for Yatiyantota told us that we criticized on that occasion. But it is a fact. Nobody can contest the fact that there was this drought in 1965. Nobody can contest the fact that there was a fall in export prices of tea. And therefore those two factors contributed to our losing as much as Rs. 240 million in exchange compared to the previous year 1965.

I am reading from page 2 of the Central Bank Report:

“In the export sector there was a decline in the value of exports by 12.5 per cent.”

Then at page 3 of the same report you find:

“Real national income suffered even a greater set-back in 1966. Consequent on the sharp fall in export prices and the rise in import prices, Ceylon's terms of trade turned unfavourable by as much as 13.1 per cent.”

Apart from a fall in our export earnings there was also operating at the same time a rise in prices in our imports resulting in an adverse turn in the terms of trade in one year to the tune of 13.1 per cent. These are facts which cannot be met by a criticism of the Central Bank. These are actual facts which hon. Members here must accept.

Therefore, we have this position. We had a fall in prices of exports; we had an adverse turn in terms of

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

trade to the tune of 13.1 per cent. Now, what are the future prospects for some of these commodities?

Our economy, unhappily, has to depend on money crops—tea, rubber and coconut primarily. Hon. Members who spoke before me have dealt with the possible future of these crops. I agree with the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries that certain steps have to be taken to improve the position as regards tea. I am with him on that matter. But we would be foolish, indeed, as a country if we think that by taking those steps alone and by continuing our dependence on these three crops our future can be safe. I say no. I say that vast areas of tea are being opened up in Kenya. Conditions there are satisfactory for the opening up of tea. The climate is satisfactory and labour conditions too seem to be more attractive to those who wish to open up these vast expanses. Therefore, we are going to meet more competition with increased production.

I agree with him that we must break this ring, the middlemen's ring that is exploiting us. It is the intention of this Government to do everything in its power to break that ring.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, our prices here, to the producer, have shown a marked decline. But strangely enough the prices that the consumer has to pay at the other end have not shown a similar decline. Something is happening in between, I agree. We cannot go about in the manner of a bull in a china shop, but we intend taking this step along with the other great producer, India. Ceylon and India produce 82 per cent of the world's teas, and if these two countries can get together on a common step, we cannot be exploited by any ring in this world. Therefore, let us not think the future can be adjusted by a thorough dependence on tea alone.

Then we come to rubber. We are aware of the expansion of the syn-

thetic process of manufacturing rubber. In India, the other day they started on synthetic rubber. It is true we must explore other exports, but other exports will take some time before they become real export earners.

The Opposition berated the endeavours of the Hon. Minister of State in the field of tourism. Of course it is not going to replace our foreign exchange losses on tea, but I feel that tourism can be an exchange earner for the country.

Many countries much less charming than our own have developed tourism to such a pitch that it has become the chief source of foreign exchange earnings for some of them. Why should we not use the tremendous potential of our country for the purpose? That is what the Hon. Minister of State meant when he spoke on tourism in this Budget Debate.

If we are to survive as a nation, instead of developing new exports we may as well concentrate on tourism. On the one hand our exports are fetching lower prices in the world market, and on the other our staple food is becoming scarce. What is the situation as regards rice? You find the exportable surplus of some of the producing countries has declined. I do not want to mention the reasons for the decline. Suffice it to say that in a country like Thailand, the exportable surplus is decreasing because of the rapid increase in internal consumption caused by a rapid increase in population. That is what I was told by the people of Thailand when I met some of them on my way back to Ceylon.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is a strange fact that the most rapid expansion of population in the world has resulted among the rice eating countries in the world. There must be some characteristic quality in rice.

The hon. Third Member for Colombo Central (Mr. Keuneman), and I do not eat rice. So the obvious result has followed.

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

මෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.

(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ்)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

What about the hon. Member for Dompe ?

ගුරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I do not know. The hon. Member for Dompe may not be eating rice.

However on the one hand there is every likelihood of the price of rice increasing in the world market ; on the other hand, there is no immediate likelihood of the prices of our exports being stepped up. What is the obvious remedy ? It is that we must, if we are to stave off starvation in this country, be self-sufficient as quickly as possible. Surely, you do not want any political theory, you do not want any political philosophy, you do not want to be a double doctor, to say this obvious fact.

The hon. Member for Agalawatte (Dr. Colvin R. de Silva) and the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) built up a house of cards of their own during the course of this Budget Debate and continued in vigorous speeches to demolish their own house. Our argument never has been that agriculture should be stepped up to the detriment of industry. That is a premise of their own. They presumed that our position is that industry must be relegated to a distant corner in our plans and everything must be concentrated on agriculture. Who said that ? When did any one say that ? And I propose to show from the budgets that have been presented after this Government came into office, that that certainly has not been the policy we have pursued. But I say here—I have said it before—that industrial growth has to be sustained and supported by a rapid development of agriculture. That is the position we have taken up. The two doctors spent their whole time in the course of their speeches in

this Debate on the proposition that industries are being neglected and that we are concentrating only on agriculture. They built their own palace or house of cards and proceeded to demolish it. But that has not been our policy.

In the present circumstances we should naturally concentrate a great deal on the development of agriculture and agricultural production and we also know that the remedy in this situation is not development of that one sector alone. It is in those circumstances that I have outlined import substitution—import substitution by agriculture and by industry. That is the only remedy in the circumstances we find ourselves in.

I am glad that my old Friend from Akuressa (Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe) is not boycotting me. Now I shall proceed to deal with some of the activities we have been indulging in and following in the process of import substitution. Naturally, some figures would be necessary to support what I say. I refer first to the Central Bank Report. At the bottom of page 2 it says :

“In contrast to the performance of the export sector, there was an improvement in the output of goods and services for domestic use. In the domestic sector there was a larger expansion than in the previous year. The value of paddy production which had decreased sharply by 28.0 per cent in 1965 increased by 28.1 per cent in 1966. This together with modest increases in the value of output in consumer industrial goods, fish, transport and Government services, resulted in an increase in the net output of the domestic sector by 4.7 per cent compared to the rise of 2.7 per cent in 1965.”

In spite of that loss, a tremendous loss of 12.5 per cent in the export sector, the increase in the domestic sector, namely, through agriculture, fisheries and other things, has been 4.7 per cent. Hon. Members will see that not only in the agricultural sector but also in the industrial, fisheries and various other sectors, we are going forward. We are increasing production.

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

Then I turn to page 20, paragraph 3. It says :

"The domestic sector, in contrast to the exports sector, not only maintained an uninterrupted expansion in output but also showed a somewhat better performance than in the previous year. It will be recalled that paddy production had declined to 36.3 million bushels in 1965 from the peak level of 50.5 million bushels achieved in 1964. In 1966, paddy recovered very substantially to the level of 46.1 million bushels showing an increase of 27.0 per cent. over 1965. The net output of consumer industrial goods showed a moderate increase of 4.5 per cent. in contrast to a decrease, according to revised estimates, of 1.0 per cent. in 1965. This increase in industrial output partly reflects the increased availability of imported raw materials as reflected in customs data."

There, Sir, is the answer to some hon. Member who said that industries are being starved. I agree that industries are not getting all that they want but there has been a considerable increase in the raw materials allocations to these industries. Again it says :

"Fish production is provisionally estimated to have increased by 10.0 per cent. This is somewhat less than the rate of increase achieved in 1965, which was 11.1 per cent. Increases in the net output of Government and transport services also contributed to the expansion of the domestic sector."

I am reading from page 22 of the Central Bank Report. It says :

"An important aspect of the growth of gross national product in recent years has been the uninterrupted expansion in the domestic sector in contrast to the export sector whose net output has tended to fluctuate. This development is reflected in an increase in the contribution of the domestic sector to total gross national product from 76.1 per cent in 1959 to 82.1 per cent in 1966."

Now, Sir, in 1959 the contribution by the domestic sector to the gross national product was 76.1 ; in 1966 the contribution to the gross national product by the domestic sector was 82.1 per cent. You can see the change taking place in the composition of our national income where the productions of the domestic sector are having a greater impact on the gross national product.

If you want further facts and figures you get them in Table II (A) 3, page 19, of the Central Bank Report. It gives the various items that contributed to this increase. Some of the items mentioned are rice, various other crops, fish, factory industries and cottage industries. In that you will find the actual figures indicating the increases that have been taking place these years.

I made the point that in spite of everything there has been an increase in the contribution by the domestic sector to the gross national product of this country.

Now, I come to rice.—[Interruption]. Yes, I forgot corporations. They criticized us in regard to the working of the corporations. In fact, today the corporations have contributed Rs. 300 million of their money towards this Budget. I am not taking the credit for anything. These are facts. The hon. Leader of the Opposition said that they started these corporations. They started a good many of them and some were in a terrible state. I may say they are now in a state where for the first time they have been able to contribute Rs. 30 million to balance this Budget. That is the stage they have reached now.

You will find at page 36 of the Central Bank Report the actual figures in regard to paddy production. The hon. Third Member for Colombo Central spoke about crop-cutting surveys and the hon. Member for Yatiyantota pointed out that crop-cutting surveys must be done over a big area. If he had the foggiest idea of what crop-cutting surveys are he would not have said that. In crop-cutting surveys you take samples at random from various fields and then you carry out the survey. You do not need to have huge extents to carry out your crop-cutting surveys and then say how much it is.

The fact remains, admittedly, due partially to satisfactory weather conditions, that we had a good Maha

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ගරු බඩ්ලි සේනානායක]

crop. The hon. Third Member for Colombo Central said that the Yala is going to be disappointing. I would not be saying that. In certain parts of the country the crop is going to be highly satisfactory.

In fact in the Kegalle District where in the past they sowed for Yala only one third the acreage they used to sow for Maha, today it is more than three-fourths the acreage for Maha. There are many places, for example Pasyala, where the paddy fields had not been sown for Yala before; they are being sown for Yala today and they are about to harvest the crops. In various parts of the Kurunegala area very satisfactory crops are expected for Yala as well. The day before yesterday I was at Nikaweratiya. I am sorry the hon. Member for Nikaweratiya (Mr. M. Tennakoon) is not here. He will bear testimony to the results achieved. In that area they are getting over 200 bushels per acre on certain extents. I do not say that that is the common rule.

Hon. Members were talking of various imported varieties of paddy. We, too, have developed very satisfactory varieties of paddy. I like to take this opportunity of paying a compliment to the research workers of the Agriculture Department. I do not say that this was done by this Government; I do not say that this was done by your Government. Research has been going on under the various governments and they have evolved most satisfactory hybrids such as H-4 H-7 and H-8.

In the Nikaweratiya area, where it happened to be the day before yesterday, an average yield of 200 bushels per acre had been achieved over a considerable extent. That was H-4. The hon. Member boycotted the function.

The Acting Minister of Nationalized Services (The Hon. Welagedera) will bear testimony to the fact that in his area a yield of 196 bushels has been obtained.

These are, mind you, hybrid varieties developed by our own men, our scientists.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I understand that even in regard to the famous IRRI-8, one of our own men, Dr. Ponnamperuma, had a big hand in it, and he is still there.

Some hon. Members seem to be amused about my idea of self-sufficiency in rice. I admit that in the years gone by self-sufficiency in rice was a dim and distant dream. I say with the facilities now available, with the various varieties of seed paddy available, and having regard to the readiness with which the cultivator has taken up to scientific practices, we are on the verge of a break-through in paddy production in this country, and that is what I stated before. Some hon. Members keep on repeating that I stated that we will be self-sufficient in 1970. I said nothing of the sort. I believe that by 1970 we will have increased production from 50 million bushels to 75 million. That is our goal. By 1970 there will be an increase of 40 per cent. It will go on like that, and before long self-sufficiency can be achieved. But with the various irrigation schemes we have in view it may take some time.

It is true that with the full fruition of schemes planned by my Hon. Friend on my left, the Mahaveli Diversion Scheme and various other schemes, this country can be an exporter of rice. That is what I stated and that is what I repeat, and it will not be a dim, distant dream for Ceylon to be an exporter of rice. The day will come when rice will be an exchange earner for this country because the whole of this region will need that rice. The population of this region is expanding at a terrific rate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I must say something about the measures that have been taken. I functioned as Minister of Agriculture and Lands at one time and I realize the tremendous effort that is being put in by the present Minister of Agriculture and

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

Food. The hon. Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike) who said he would never come back even to plant grass, went to plant grass and in fact did something for agriculture. I would invite him to come round with me now—forget about your political difference with me and come round as a man who knows about agriculture much more than the hon. Member for Colombo Central (Mr. Keuneman) who spoke about agriculture—and I will show him what a difference has taken place.

I give the main credit to the cultivators for the patriotic manner in which they have responded to the country's call, cutting across all political barriers. I assure the hon. Member for Dompe that we do not—I do not—make political capital of this when I address the cultivator. I am only concerned with production. I do not care whether it is red rice or green rice or blue rice; I want rice.

Then, again, I had occasion to open a building donated by the Australian Government to the people of Ceylon—the research institute at Gannoruwa. I saw the extent to which today our research workers there are concerning themselves with the direct problems that the cultivator is confronted with. I would invite the hon. Member for Dompe to come there too and see this aspect of rice research particularly.

Not only the research, the Hon. Minister has got down to planning also at the village level. We have completely reorganized the system of planning. We had to get the kachcheris and the government agents back to the position they must occupy in a concentrated food drive. We have given all powers to these government agents to carry out the plan and programme at that level. The Hon. Minister has now got down to another level—the D. R. O. level and the cultivation committee level. He has got down to planning at that level.

Another factor that has contributed in no small way to the increase in rice production and other subsidiary food is free education. I can see the difference between the cultivator then and the cultivator of today. I came across cultivators 15 to 20 years back—how reluctant, how conservative they were about taking up new methods of cultivation. I can see the cultivator of today—he is better educated, thirsting for knowledge, reading everything he can set his hands on about better methods of cultivation and putting it into practice. Those are the facts that have greatly contributed to a complete change in the problems of the villager.

Then I say, in spite of what the hon. Members opposite have to say, that another great factor that contributes towards the greater production of rice and the greater enthusiasm manifested by the cultivator is the reduction in the rice ration. We were compelled to do so. I can understand the hon. Member for Yatiyantota boycotting this speech. He said that he can bring rice. Give him a chance, he said, and he will bring the rice that we need. But what is the position today? India wants rice; India finds it difficult to get rice. We have been able to lend two shiploads of rice to India. That is the position today. Probably, the hon. Member should go to India and advise them on how to get rice. You can get rice? What is the use of talking? An hon. Member with that long experience here—what is the use of those utterances? The fact remains that the people are now taking no notice of his utterances. That is the actual fact.

Cultivators all over are praising this Government for the step that it has taken about the rice ration. I challenge the hon. Member to go before the cultivators and advocate a restoration of the rice ration even if there is rice. Let hon. Members of the Opposition realize that this is the stark fact today; similarly with subsidiary foodstuffs. The position about

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ශ්‍රී ලංකා විප්ලවය]

chillies is rapidly improving. In fact, the Third Member for Colombo Central had occasions to say that I stated that a small quantity of chillies is available on the ration and a larger quantity outside the ration, at a higher price. But what is the position today? The position today is that in certain areas even the amount given on the ration is not moving, because in the areas where they are producing chillies they do not want that. That is the stark fact. Those are the facts as regards the increase in food production and the achievements on that front.

Then, as an anti-inflationary measure we had also to take certain steps. Here again, I refer to the Central Bank Report, page 2:

“Money supply which had been increasing continuously since 1958 recorded a decline of Rs. 56.8 million in 1966.”

To hold prices as best as we can, it was necessary to take anti-inflationary measures. We were able to restrict the money supply which in 1966 increased to Rs. 56.8 million. Of course, hon. Members must admit that although there may have been variations in price levels, we can claim that the cost-of-living index is lower this year than last year—there can be all manner of arguments in regard to calculation—and there has been no alarming increase in price levels. In adverse circumstances we have been successful in holding the price levels to a satisfactory extent. The figures, as I emphasized earlier, show a decline in our export earnings, and the aggregate demand, as measured by consumption and capital formation, has increased.

I am sorry the hon. Member (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike) is leaving the Chamber. I want to refer him to page 3 of the Central Bank Report where it states:

“Aggregate demand, as measured by consumption and capital formation, showed an increase in 1966.”

That means we were able, in spite of a fall in our export earnings, to provide more for consumption and more for capital formation. It continues:

“Consumption rose by 5.5 per cent while capital formation increased by 8.4 per cent. Total demand increased by 5.9 per cent. The increase in fixed capital formation took place both in the public sector and in the private sector, but it was more marked in the private sector than in the public sector, reflecting no doubt the larger allocations than in previous years of foreign exchange to the private sector.”

Faced with these facts the hon. Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike) has chosen to keep away.

The hon. Third Member for Colombo Central (Mr. Keuneman) stated that in the last two years we set aside for capital development a larger sum. That is true. I am glad he was willing to grant that. But what matters is what you really invest in, in the end. What is the picture? What is the true story as regards that aspect? I refer to page 5 of the Central Bank Report:

“It is, however, significant to note that the under-expenditure recorded on capital votes in 1965-66 was only 8.7 per cent. in contrast to 22 per cent in 1963-64.”

In 1963-64 the unspent amount of capital expenditure was 22 per cent., and on the 1965-66 Budget the unspent amount was only 8.7 per cent. There was a considerable improvement on that front.

The Planning Ministry has an Implementation Section attached to it. It is the duty of that section to see that budgetary provision is utilized and schemes provided for in the Budget are implemented, and, to a certain extent, you find that reflected in the considerable drop in under-expenditure on the capital side of the Budget.

Moreover, the rate of increase of current expenditure has been reduced. One criticism of the Budget in the past was that current expenditure kept on mounting at a terrific rate and that capital development suffered. It is natural to have, every

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

year, a certain increase in recurrent expenditure, but this year, in this Budget, the rate of increase of recurrent expenditure has been reduced. That is a fact. All these are movements in the correct direction.

Then at page 23 of the Central Bank Report you find this :

“Despite the fall in incomes from exports, the availability of resources increased at the same rate as in 1965 mainly on account of an increase in imports.”

Now, I would like to briefly state what has been done : the strengthening of initiatives in the development field through the acceleration of productive activities in the public and private sectors, which did contribute, in part at least, towards counteracting the decline in export receipts on income and employment; the safeguarding of the import programme; the acceleration of the food drive; the strengthening of the budgetary structure through modifications to the food subsidy; the avoidance of mass overall inflationary pressures; and the stepping up of development activities in both the public and private sectors in the background of an unprecedented shortfall in export earnings.

The hon. Third Member for Colombo Central criticized us, saying that we do not have a policy. It was by the conscientious pursuit of the policies I outlined that the achievement of the objectives of those policies became possible—I presented the facts and figures to the House—in spite of the tremendous setbacks as a result of the decline in our export earnings. Those are our objectives, and those are the achievements that this Government has brought about in this country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have taken more than my time, but the Hon. Minister of Finance is sacrificing some of his time for me. And I think the Hon. Minister will have less to say after I speak.

All these steps we have taken have resulted, as I stated earlier, in a definite advantage to the cultivator. That is evident everywhere. If you sincerely speak to a cultivator, he will tell you that. Therefore, steps had to be taken to alleviate the difficulties of the urban dweller. This Government, in spite of the difficulties it is facing, realizing the problems confronted by the urban dweller as well as by its own employees, took the step of granting a special allowance to government employees of certain categories. This was done in spite of the very difficult situation in which we were placed. The estimate on that score is as much as Rs. 60 million.

Now certain Members want to whip up enthusiasm on the Rs. 30 demand. What did the hon. Member for Yatiyantota say, when he was in the seat of the Finance Minister, about the Rs. 30? There were the 21 demands, and the Rs. 30 demand was one of them. What did the hon. Member for Yatiyantota then say? “Be patient”, he told the workers, “you will have to wait till better times.” In worse times we have given Rs. 20 of the Rs. 30.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have tried to show this House that we are going through a critical phase in this country's history. I am glad the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central also agrees with me, and he says the picture is gloomier. This is a time when a complete change in our economy has to be effected; it must be effected as soon as possible. This Government is taking the necessary steps to effect that change.

I have shown by facts and figures the changes taking place in that direction, and I have shown you that the cultivators of this country have responded. They have been given an opportunity, and they have clasped the opportunity with both hands. They have shown a rare spirit of patriotism in this hour of the country's need. We have also tried

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ගරු ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක]

to alleviate the difficulties caused to the town dweller, the Government employee.

I see and I hear certain rumblings, an endeavour to disrupt the economy in this critical phase of the country's history. I know this Government and the people are ready to deal with such traitors. I appeal to the government servants of this country not to be misled by these people. May I say this to them: you were misguided once on the 8th of January, do not be misguided a second time. Your co-operation is essential to pull this country out of the mire into which it has fallen, and I expect and I demand, not merely as Prime Minister but as a citizen of this country, your fullest co-operation to tide over the difficulties we have ahead. Sir, I thank you.

අ. හා. 5.55

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මහා.
(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I am glad in a way to have the opportunity to follow the Hon. Prime Minister because I suppose this is one of the important policy statements on behalf of this Government that has ever been made and I should like to deal with it in some detail. But before I come to that, first and foremost I should like to pay a warm tribute to my good Friend, the Hon. Minister of Finance, on his Budget. I did not have the opportunity unfortunately of being present in the House to listen to him when he made his Budget Speech. I would have liked to be present. But after having read it through, I wish to congratulate him on his objective statement—which he is quite capable of making with his political objectives—of the present economic situation. The standards and techniques of presentation are improving in his Budget year by year and I must say honestly—and this I do not say with any attempt to be sarcastic or anything of that sort—that really the Budget as a whole is certainly a

much clearer document than it has ever been for many years. I think I told the Minister of Finance once before that I considered he was one of the best Finance Ministers we have had in this country, not because I agree with the content of what he writes or the content of what he says, but I suppose being in the party to which he belongs, having the political limitations of that party, it is impossible for him to do better than that. But I must say that even Dr. Kelegama's style is improving, which is something. So that all said and done, if last year I told him he reminded me of the passage in "Geron-tion", this year I think he will have to agree with me that having waited for rain at last it has happened—at least in the Maha crop.

Now the Hon. Prime Minister, as usual, makes a loud and fighting speech. There is a change in his manner, technique and style. I suppose with my Christian background I cannot help but think of Samson Agonistes as the nearest parallel to Mr. Dudley Senanayake in politics—a man of great strength, gives an impression of great strength, a man almost blind—politically of course—and a man who when he wants to belabour his opponents, especially in regard to industry, relies on the jaw-bone of an ass.

You see, Sir, if you were to stop for a moment to analyze critically the arguments that were put forward, you will find that this Budget has belied almost all the expectations that were engendered in 1965, back to those days when you returned to this House once again as the Member for Chilaw, from one of the richest coconut-growing districts in this country. I will not say of any Government M. P. that he does not know his subject. I will not tell them that they do not eat rice. I will not tell them that they do not know anything. All I will say is this: remember the atmosphere on that day, how every one of you came into this House. The theme song of that Budget Speech was, "Happy days are here again. We are all going

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

to have a wonderful time. Apples and grapes are coming. Strawberry jam is on the way. All those taxes imposed by vicious people in the Sri Lanka Freedom Party to the disappointment of about 150,000 taxpayers are going to be removed and everything is going to be lovely."

What a different story we have today! In those days we were told that the S. L. F. P. did not get money by way of foreign aid, that they failed to get it in large goblets. We were to get in large goblets. We were told, "There are no further problems. Industrial development is going to take place. The economy will flourish. Tea, rubber and coconuts will sell." Well, where are we now? After 2½ years of U. N. P. government we have indeed reached a sorry pass.

You would remember the optimism of the Hon. Minister of Finance in his first Budget Speech. He spoke of how everything was going to come right for him when everything had gone wrong before. I remember, he refused to take the advice of his Colleague, the Hon. Minister of State, who told him, perhaps with somewhat more extreme overtones of the same political philosophy, that there were other approaches. The Hon. Minister of State's advice was rejected. He sat back smiling as usual and let the Hon. Minister of Finance make his own mistakes. He is, perhaps, the cleverest and downiest person in this whole House. Like Brer Rabbit, he says nothing but lies low. But I think times and events will prove that the Hon. Minister of State is right at least as far as his views are concerned.

You will find that from the glorious optimism of the time that everything was right in 1965, we came to 1966, when it was manifestly clear that the money was not coming. And in 1967 we have the complete collapse of all the Minister's plans. We are told that our export earnings have dropped, which is true. I am not blaming the Hon. Minister. Some

people have described it as a gloomy picture. Some people have talked of the degrees of optimism or pessimism one should put into a budget speech. I myself paid very little attention to this question of gloom or optimism. I do not think this question of gloom or optimism ever enters into this. But the truth of the matter is that over the last many, many years, as the Prime Minister stated, the country goes on. The gross national product in monetary terms continues to expand at a snail's pace at all times or not at all. The population continues to expand perhaps because of eating too much rice as the Prime Minister seems to think. Maybe, that is why he reduced the rice ration. He thinks that the reduction of the rice ration is a substitute for M. D. H. Jayawardena's pills. But, if I may say so with respect, the country has not grown at all. It is true. Whether it is the S. L. F. P. administration or the U. N. P. administration, in practical terms we have more or less been marking time. The country has not expanded at anything like the pace at which we ought to have expanded over the last several years.

I am not saying this as an indictment against any individual as I indicated to you clearly. I shall point out the differences in the political philosophy of the U.N.P. in a moment. The fact remains that there have been many disappointments and a lot of these disappointments are due to external causes beyond everybody's control, yours as well as ours. I am not trying to say that you are responsible for the drop in the external earnings although you tried to say so of us once upon a time. You all blamed my hon. Friend the Member for Kolonnawa (Mr. Ilangaratne) for a hurricane in Cuba, although what he could have done about it I do not know.—[Interruption]. May it be the Flora or the Fauna!

Anyway, I have never raised that kind of stupid argument because it is stupid. I am not trying to talk about the Finance Ministers being able to foresee this or that. But, I do so say

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.]

this: a drop in the export earnings is not unforeseeable. In fact, I would venture to say that it is probably going to continue. I do not know whether we can do much about it in practical terms except possibly one little thing you might consider, and that is the changing of Dr. Peiris. You might find that of the *peerisikuttamas* that particular *peerisikuttama* is not working very well. I think you will find that that opinion is not mine alone but it is shared by a number of people including people on your side.—[Interruption]. I am not necessarily saying that he is a bad man or that he is a wicked person, but I think his appreciation of the facts of commerce and trade, which is more important than even finance, in the present situation is deplorable and a major disaster for the country. Maybe in mid-term or in course of time the Ministers may think of a re-shuffle. If there is going to be one I think perhaps another cup and saucer might be considered to meet the needs of the present situation or if you want at least to sell a good cup of tea.

Now, take the case of export commodities. The prices are falling and the Hon. Prime Minister says quite honestly that there is very little he could do about it. He talks about the conditions in Kenya and Uganda; he talks about synthetic rubber produced in India. He is right. So he says that we must have import substitution. I agree with him. Import substitution is an essential thing. It is not a new idea; it is not something that was started in 1965. We had import substitution in varying degrees ever since I can remember. It has been a conscious and deliberate plan of every Government to aim at import substitution.

When we started the Ceramic Factory—I think it was in your time; I think it was the U. N. P. Government that started the Ceramic Factory at Negombo—what was the objective? The objective was to make all the ceramics that we need in our country

without having to import any of it.—[Interruption]. I hate to interrupt these love passages. When the Ceramic Factory was started by the U. N. P. Government their idea was to be self-sufficient in ceramics. When you started the Glass Factory, which was subsequently closed down, the objective was to be self-sufficient in glassware; when you started the Paper Factory, that again was the objective. When we started the Cement Factory at K. K. S., inaugurated by you all, the U. N. P., the objective was to be self-sufficient. There is no question about it. But the Hon. Prime Minister says that import substitution is something new.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

No.

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

He gave this as an answer to the problem of dwindling exports. He said that dwindling exports must be met by the strategy of import substitution. My point is that they are two independent strategies altogether. Import substitution by any yardstick is a good thing. It is something which is excellent and we ourselves have not been remiss by any means in that matter. Even the earlier governments have been working exactly for that very thing.

When the Industrial Products Act was taken out of operation during the time of the Sri Lanka Freedom Party Government in order that our products could be improved, in point of fact we did become self-sufficient in a number of commodities during that period. I remember the Ceramics Corporation was practically panicky when we imposed that import ban on foreign crockery—Johnson and Meakin were the order of the day then—and the Chairman of the Ceramics Corporation, Mr. Wijekoon, actually saw me

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

and said, "Do not do this. If we do not import them we would not be able to unload the stuff that we produce under the Industrial Products Act." I told him that within a year the Ceramics Corporation will have cause to rejoice, because instead of producing unmarketable quality goods it will be producing far better quality goods which will indeed supply the entire country; and within a year our expectation was in point of fact fulfilled as decided by a Board resolution of the Ceramics Corporation. I gave this by way of illustration.

This is not, if I may say so, a solution to the problem of dwindling exports, and I say that for this reason. If you substitute for imports, in any case, you are taking a step that will save Ceylon foreign exchange. If your exports are going to drop, in any case you can save the exchange by import substitution. But they are two essentially independent things, unless the political philosophy behind it is the very philosophy that the United National Party stands for, namely, the preservation of the rights of those who are involved in the export sector industries at the cost of the rest of the nation. In other words, when you have got a particular sector of the economy, a particular group of property owners whose interests are at stake, when their crops are not selling due to circumstances completely beyond the control of the Government—I am not suggesting that you should be unsympathetic—it is no solution to the problem to mortgage the rest of the country or give up the fundamental interests of the rest of the people in order to prop up those property owners. But that is precisely what the Minister of Finance is seeking to do by this Budget.

You will recall that when the rice ration was cut by the Hon. Prime Minister—I am one of those who agree with him unlike others

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

You opposed it.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බන්දාරනායක මය.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Of course, I opposed it for the very reasons I gave then, but I will tell you this. I still maintain that to provide Ceylon with the amount of rice Ceylon requires, even on the basis of the exportable surplus of other countries dropping, is not an impossible task; it is not an impossible task to import the rice Ceylon needs. But when you talk of the unavailability of rice as the reason for the rice-cut, you are not telling the whole truth. It is available, but you will have to pay a slightly higher price. Maybe you cannot afford it. But so far as Ceylon is concerned the amount of rice required in aggregate is relatively negligible. That is the whole truth of the matter. I am not suggesting that you can feed the whole of India. I am not saying that you can solve the problem of 500 million people in India, but you can feed the people of Ceylon with two measures of rice. That is by no means an impossible task but you chose not to do it.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Please address the Chair. I know you like to look up at that Gallery.—
[Interruption].

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බන්දාරනායක මය.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I looked up at the Distinguished Visitor's Gallery for a moment I must be excused. I have an old aunt of mine up there.—
[Interruption]. She was a strong supporter of the U. N. P. in the Chilaw District. She comes from Madampe. She was ever so pleased when the U. N. P. came into office

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.]

because she said at least she will not have any more of her nephew's budgets. Now she says the nephew might have been better and she has come to Parliament today.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

I think she has some doubts about that.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I think the doubts have now been cleared after the present performance of the Government.

To get back to the Budget and away from my aunt. The Prime Minister cut the rice ration. He now says it is going to be a good incentive to paddy production in this country. Very respectfully, I agree. That is true. If you cut the rice ration with the object of increasing paddy production you are a wise and a courageous man. But that is not the reason you gave. The reason you gave is that there was a world shortage of rice and that you were unable to supply the two measures of rice to the people of this country, which I say is not factually true—not factually true in regard to the aggregate required to feed the people of Ceylon.

If you say that you are going to increase paddy production by cutting the rice ration and creating an incentive, that is something with which I agree with you up to a point. You do create an incentive no doubt. In fact, if you cut the whole ration you might find the incentive becoming even greater. But, I am not advocating that you should do so. I am not suggesting for a single moment that if you eliminate the ration scheme altogether the farmer will not get a much better deal. If you are able to offer a guaranteed price three times what it was, you will also create a paddy incentive. In other words, the

basic reason why people grow food is because they hope to get money for it. If you can create the conditions in which the farmer will get more money for his crop, he will certainly produce more. True, the incentive factor is there and you can achieve that in many ways. Cutting the ration is not the only one. And let me say this. By cutting the ration you have no doubt created an external market for free rice and by creating the external market you have created conditions whereby the farmer might be able to sell at somewhat better prices.

But, what have you actually achieved in economic terms with the rice cut? You have saved roughly something between Rs. 100 and Rs. 150 million, not in foreign exchange, but on the internal subsidy on rice. You have saved, I thought, about Rs. 20 million on rice but my good Friend, the hon. Member for Nallur (Dr. Naganathan) told us that we are spending more on the import of rice plus cereals than we did before the rice cut. So, we have come to the amazing situation that we are spending more foreign exchange by cutting the rice ration to import its equivalent in food. This is fantastic.

The Hon. Prime Minister talks of the achievement of the Government and says he was compelled to do these things. Why? To save the export sector at all costs. When the export sector succeeds in increasing production—it happened once or twice when I was Finance Minister—the Hon. Prime Minister says, "There you are, it shows the private sector is efficient; the Government sector is inefficient. They can produce far better than you can." That was the argument. Now when the private sector fails, the Hon. Finance Minister in his Budget Speech says the export sector has failed due to adverse weather conditions. No one talks about efficiency and competence. No one talks about reasons. No one analyses the whys and wherefores of it. No one goes into the causes as to

whether the export sector has maintained its factory capacities, its production techniques up to modern standards, how much money has been re-invested over the years, how much has been expatriated out of this country. All that is forgotten. They milked us dry while the going was good. They took out all of the capital, profits, and dividends they were capable of taking out.

If you do not believe me, do not read my speech, but read the speech of the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries. It is one of the finest speeches he has made in this House and in the course of this Budget Debate, on which I must honestly and truly congratulate him. If you are contemplating a re-shuffle, there is a man for you.

In the course of his speech he demonstrated far more effectively than any of us could have done just precisely why the Hon. Minister of Finance should think again the whole question of the Finance Act of 1961 before he discards it into the waste paper basket. He demonstrated in most effective terms the reasons which led me to prohibit the creation of new accounts in foreign commercial banks in this country, of overdrafts for repatriating monies to foreign nationals who chose to exploit our land. You yourselves apparently in spite of the pronouncements of 1965 and 1966 have been having second thoughts with regard to the wisdom of repealing sections of the Finance Act of 1961. You are now talking of having negotiations with foreign banks in order to arrive at a mutually acceptable formula. Why? Has this problem become incapable of solution? In 1961 you were going to repeal that Act; one of the bad tax laws of Felix Dias Bandaranaike; one of the major causes of disquiet and discomfort in the hearts of U. N. P. stalwarts of those days, especially the major taxpayers. You are beginning to realize that the national interest demands measures of that type. You cannot allow the foreign commercial banks to continue the kind of exploitation

that is now going on, as pointed out by the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries.

Then, again, you talk of self-sufficiency in rice at some future date—a target of 70 million bushels in 1970 or 1971. No one is going to disagree. We all want rice to grow in this country. The more rice that is produced, the better for the country. But we do not believe that mere pep talk is going to make rice grow. We believe that the incentives of the essential sort must be provided. The Government cannot, merely by tall talk, solve a problem. If you want to get rice to grow in this country nobody is going to stand against it. We are not anxious to destroy all the standing crops on our soil in the hope of defeating you and coming to Parliament. We are not interested in that. We do want the rice, and we say that it cannot be grown without proper incentives, or on the basis of, shall we say, *shramadana*, or on the basis of merely saying, tea market prices are going to settle themselves in such a form as to create incentives themselves. We say, if you want to grow rice, by all means provide every single thing that the cultivator requires. Give him a decent life, give him a better standard of living, give him all that, and you will also automatically arrive at the self-sufficiency you are aiming for. It can be done. But it cannot be done in the framework of an inefficient bureaucracy about which you have done nothing.

You talk of strengthening the hands of your government agents. Some of the best government agents are living in an atmosphere of frustration today, incapable of doing any useful work, not because they cannot do it but because they are just crippled by the inefficient way of the bureaucratic machine.

You talk in terms of getting the people to produce various things. It can be done, but not on the basis of simply saying: let it happen. Take,

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.]

for instance, your food production drive. As far as I can see, "food production drive" itself is a misnomer. There is a lot of energy and enthusiasm on the part of the Prime Minister, the Minister of Agriculture, and, perhaps to a lesser degree, on the part of the Minister of Land.—[Interruption]. But that is the total of the food drive. The three of them, and some officials with them, wander round and talk to the people. The Prime Minister is no doubt a dynamic personality, like Samson Agonistes. I must say, he is really carrying the Government on his shoulders. He is doing his best to infect other people with his own enthusiasm and to some extent he succeeds. We are still a very vain people. We like talking to Prime Ministers. Even the lowliest farmer feels thrilled when the Prime Minister goes to him, talks to him and discusses his problems—even if the problem does not get solved, even if he continues to remain without water! At least it is some satisfaction if the Prime Minister talks to him, and he and his children can talk about it thereafter in perpetuity. It is a great honour to him. But has it solved the problem at all?

May I ask this: what precisely does your food production drive amount to? Rural credit—it was provided first in 1963 by the bad old S. L. F. P. Government, by the man who came back to plant grass. It was initiated by me. When I started it, I remember, in this House no one had anything to say about it. The Agrarian Services Department was the channel through which credit was channelled to the farmer. I agree it is not a very efficient instrument, but the best available, because the Agrarian Services Department at least had contact with the farmer. At least the divisional officers used to visit the farmers and attend the cultivation committees. And we provided it at 2 per cent interest to co-operative societies. The region of defaults—there were always defaults—was about 10 per cent. Ten per cent on Rs. 140 million credit is not so high as to make it an

uneconomical proposition. What did you do? You stopped it in the first instance. Then you started it again through the People's Bank at 9 per cent. So I do not know whether this is a food drive. Just what we are hoping to achieve, I do not know. I appreciate that whenever the economy begins to expand a little too much, like a balloon, the Hon. Minister of Finance squeezes it a little somewhere in the hope of exerting what he calls contractionary influence, but the result is that it begins to bulge somewhere else. That is what has always happened to the balloon of U. N. P. economics and finance.

You talked of seed paddy. Is it available? You talked in terms of fertilizer—the fertilizer stores programme was started by the S. L. F. P. Government; you are continuing with it, I see—but in practical terms what are the facilities made available to the small farmer who is the mainstay of your agricultural programme? Nothing at all.

On the other hand, look at the facilities you have given to big men, big companies like Farms Limited, Moosajeas, and so on. What about the 183 persons and corporations to whom, the Hon. Finance Minister says, 57,000 acres have been alienated? May I ask what are the facilities provided to them? Foreign exchange practically without limitations! Tractors made available to them out of what you call commodity aid! You have got jeeps, land rovers, mini-mokes and all that gamut of surplus vehicles dumped here and made available to these people.

May I ask what their output is in measurable terms? Can any one tell us what precisely has been done in relation to the money given to these people in foreign exchange, bank credit, local finance, and so on? But when it comes to the small farmer, you are too niggardly to give him loans at 2 per cent interest; you have got to increase the rate of interest to 9 per cent!

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

ද. සොයිසා සිරිවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. டி. சொய்ஸா சிறிவர்தன)

(Mr. de Zoysa Siriwardena)

12 per cent.

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

12 per cent. Co-operative societies
8 per cent.

You are now talking of the food drive and helping the wrong people. The Hon. Prime Minister, in his speech in the Throne Speech Debate, said that I had been critical about land being given and he asked "Why is it wrong to give land to the private sector?" You made a point, I agree. But it was never my intention—I can assure you of that; if you read the documents you will find that that is true—to merely give land to people in the hope that they will grow things. It must be given subject to definite conditions. Inspections must be imposed. You must make sure that the money you are spending is usefully spent. You must make sure that they are growing the crops you want them to grow. You must make sure that a definite programme is being followed by these people to develop the country in the way you want it developed.

That is exactly what has not been done. I am telling you that that has not been done. For example, take those people who are getting tractors for ploughing purposes. Look at the cage of the application form given by the government agent. I have seen it myself. The question asked in this cage is, "Are you prepared to plough—I think it is five or ten acres—government land or land nominated by the Government at Rs. 55 per acre?" Every single applicant says "Yes", and they all get tractors. Please tell me what machinery you have to ensure that the people who get tractors under that condition fulfil their obligation. Nothing of the sort!

The tractors that have been given by you are now being used for short-hauls as an alternative to lorry transport on the road. You buy a hitch and a trailer and put it on the road. You can keep your tractor much longer that way. You can make use of it for a much longer time. You can make much more money in that way than by using it for ploughing.

May I ask in practical terms whether you are getting real value for the money that you are spending? I say you are not. Why has the rate for tractor ploughing, which the Prime Minister himself referred to, gone up from Rs. 35 to Rs. 55 an acre? Why should it be so? With more tractors being provided now than ever before in the bad old days of the S. L. F. P. and the Coalition Government, what have you done? May I ask the Hon. Minister of Land, Irrigation and Power and the Hon. Minister of Food to tell us how many acres of the 57,000 acres that have been alienated have been cleared or planted by these people? And the tragedy of it is there is a scramble for the land. The Hon. Prime Minister, I know, does not like corruption. I know he hates to have anything which is improper. He appoints commissions—for example, we had the C. W. E. Commission—because he is concerned with improving institutions. I would ask him seriously to go into the work of the Special Leases Board and see for himself the number of highly placed persons, including Ministers, Junior Ministers and persons in contact with this Government, who are receiving land from the Special Leases Board. In the circumstances of today, I ask you seriously to do that. I am not making any charges against anybody. There is no law which says that a Minister or a Minister's wife or a Minister's child should not apply for land. But I ask you, do you think it correct that such things should happen?

I received a letter, curiously enough from a constituent of the Hon. Minister of Finance to whom I

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.]

related the story myself. The constituent's name was U. B. Wanninayake Rota-wewa, Yapahuwa, Maho. His letter was like this. He said that in the S. L. F. P. days he was given five acres on the banks of Rota-wewa by the S. L. F. P. Minister, the Hon. C. P. de Silva, and now this same piece of land has been taken by the grama-sevaka and the D. R. O. for alienation to another Minister of the National Government by the same Minister, the Hon. C. P. de Silva. Now, Sir, this is a fact, and I say these things must not happen.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරඹ උඩුගිලි ප්‍රදේශය)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Members of the Opposition also!

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.

(ශ්‍රී. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Maybe, and I could not care less. If there are Members of the Opposition among them, please stop leasing land to them too. I am not arguing for one side or the other. I say it is wrong and that it is unfortunate if the people of this country are made to feel that Members are allowed, by virtue of mutual exchange, to do them down in this type of thing. I hope the Hon. Prime Minister would share my view that such things should not be allowed to happen and I hope that he himself will call a halt to them. This is the kind of thing that gives politicians a bad name in the country. I do not think it matters whether the persons concerned are Members of the Government or of the Opposition.

I only wish we adopt the same standards in fundamentals. I remember the Hon. Prime Minister himself speaking after me in the Budget Debate last year. He said, "I concede that the hon. Member for Dompe had me completely when he read out a list of corporation directors." I had read out a former speech of the Hon. Prime Minister criticizing the appointment of defeated candidates, and the Hon.

Prime Minister said, "He had me completely there". But he still has the same corporation directors in 1967.

What is the point of our making speeches and drawing attention to matters, which the Hon. Prime Minister himself concedes are wrong, if we are going to be stuck in the situation of having conceded the mistake and still continuing to commit the same mistake? That is the tragedy of it. If you honestly think that we should not have done it on our side, then at least have the courage of your convictions and set right the matter when it is pointed out to you. How does it help to say, "You scored a victory over me in quoting a speech of mine and pointing out that I had done the wrong thing." Of course, when we point out these mistakes, you yourself say that it is the function of the Opposition to be critical. We criticize in order that our criticism can produce some worthwhile results. But what is the worthwhile result that is possible of you propose to say, "Well, we concede a verbal point, a verbal victory, but having conceded that we propose to continue doing exactly the same thing."?

Take the basic faults of your policy. The export sector is under no control today. The people who need help are not given help. Look at the low-country tea producer. Take the rebate scheme which is operating now. Rs. 55 million is being spent on it; this is part of the money saving that you are making on vitally needed foreign exchange, and you are saving it, for example, by feeding the people less. And yet there is no differential system in operation between the low-country and high-grown teas and to this date you have not recognized the need to draw that distinction between the low-country tea proprietors who are fundamentally Ceylonese, our own people, and the foreigners. Speak to the Government Members of Parliament from the Southern Province and see for yourself whether what I am saying is true or false. Find out where the problem

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

lies. Why is there no reference to these things? Why is foreign exchange being channelled on the basis that tea, rubber and coconut are kings, and must be preserved at all costs? I agree that they must be preserved, but you must apply your money independently to the correct places where the money is needed. That is not being done.

The Hon. Minister of Agriculture made a speech recently. I agree with the Hon. Prime Minister that the Minister is making a very good effort to do a good job of work. He has tried hard.

I think the Hon. Prime Minister said that I tried to grow grass too. I am willing to leave aside these personal arguments because they do not carry the case any further forward. If you are really concerned with building our country, that kind of argument has no place between us. Is the Hon. Minister of Finance really and truly able to make an impact? The fault lies elsewhere. You must recognize first things first. During the time of the two S. L. F. P. Governments the disparity between rich and poor was gradually narrowed, partly through education, started by the United National Party, partly by language changes, and the standard of living rose very substantially. The cost of living rose with it, I do not deny that. But, today, what is happening? Prices have gone up for certain commodities, and chillies, potatoes and onions are not available here and there. You describe it as periodic scarcities! In our time we would never have got away with it by calling it a periodic scarcity. You are able to deprive the people of all manner of things, and then talk about periodic scarcities.

But this is the point. In the life of a poor man, whether he be a villager or a town dweller, out of an income of Rs. 100 to Rs. 150 a month, he would have to spend more than sixty per cent on food. In the case of rich people earning about Rs. 2,000 or Rs. 3,000 a month, relatively rich people, the food bill constitutes a

negligible proportion of their budget. So, even a marginal shift in prices makes a world of difference to the poor man's standard of living. That is the difference.

The truth of the matter is that the standard of living is falling now, and is falling in such a way as to create a wider gap between the rich and the poor, and your Budget is helping to achieve that. By consciously and deliberately talking about contracting the money supply, by your efforts to keep the economy under control on paper, in order to show that the cost of living is not going up, you will only produce one result. You will depress the standard of living of the people; and that is something that is being done under the guise of holding prices, which you know you are not holding.

It is all well and good to say the index has dropped by .2. We all know that the cost of living now is much higher than it was a year ago; indeed, a year ago it was much higher than it was the year before. It keeps going up. Talk to anybody, talk to your own supporters, and they will tell you that.

I am not going to argue whether the index is properly computed or not. I agree it was not properly computed. It was not properly computed in our time, and it is not properly computed now. There is no fun in our arguing now about who is to blame for it. If you have got a broken thermometer with which to take the temperature, and if it records that the temperature is normal, it does not mean that the fever has dropped. The sickness remains, the pain remains, and the problems remain as before.

That is precisely what the Government offers in this Budget. Is there any policy hope at all? You are continuing your assistance to the export sector at the expense of the people. Your replanting subsidies to high-grown tea estates will continue at the rate of Rs. 3,750 an acre. Would it make much of a difference? When

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.]

we suggested that you offer them subsidies to replant unsuitable lands with other crops and other commodities, it was not done.

When I first talked of a blending and packeting corporation for the marketing of tea, in the course of a discussion on the Tea Propaganda Board (Amendment) Bill, I remember, the Minister of Agriculture laughed at me and said it was wrong and he did not propose to do it. But now what is happening? At least there are a number of back-benchers on the U. N. P. side of this House who recognize that this is one of the best ways to cut out the middleman. The Prime Minister today made a strong policy statement. He said, "We must also go against the middleman". I was very happy to hear him say that. I wish he says this to the agency houses; I wish he says this to the tea brokers. I wish he calls a conference and, instead of telling us and making bold Samson-like speeches about his great strength and how he is going to deal with his middlemen, I wish he does something. I wish he talks to them.

The famous argument is, "We are here pledged to protect democracy". The democracy we are protecting is something quite different. It is the democracy of vested interests. It is the democracy of a group of people whose fundamental right is the right to continue making large profits out of Ceylon. Minimal action and maximum right of repatriation—that is the democracy you are pledged to preserve. I do not think that a large majority of the Members of Parliament want to protect that kind of democracy.—[Interruption]. It is not true.—[Interruption]. There are a few who think like that, but the large majority of Members of Parliament are not concerned with that. You remain U. N. P'ers. As far as we are concerned we are not going to inveigle you here. But this is the point. Try and make your Ministers receptive to

the needs of the country and get them working on this job. What happens? After Members of Parliament get elected, nine out of ten spend their time playing snakes and ladders, with members of the Public Service as the pawns.

Look at the statement recently made in the Senate by the Hon. Minister of Commerce and Trade in regard to the resignation of Mr. Rafeek, the Chairman of the Insurance Corporation. I read that correspondence in the papers. It is fantastic. One of the things the Minister says in that statement is that in his opinion the rates of premia charged by the Insurance Corporation are too high and should be lowered. All I can say is this. If the Minister really holds this view, what is the difficulty in giving effect to it? All he has got to do is to talk to his Colleague, the Minister of Finance, and issue a general or a special directive to the members of the board. What is the point of restoring to verbal arguments in trying to solve the problem with Mr. Rafeek, who has kicked against the pricks in regard to appointment of minor staff to the Insurance Corporation?

The Minister wants to appoint clerks to the Insurance Corporation against all the rules of competence, selection boards and the like. It seems such a pettifogging thing for Ministers to have to worry about, but the fact is that Ministers do. These are the people with the holier than thou attitude, the whited sepulchres, who wanted a C. W. E. Commission probe. These are the Gentlemen in the front row. Honestly, one can understand it if you believe what you say, if you are not going to practise this sort of corruption which is petty and of no great significance. But what is actually happening is exactly the opposite.

Take the Bank of Ceylon, to which there is a reference in the Budget Speech itself. The Minister of Finance said that he proposes to appoint a commission because he is not entirely

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

satisfied with the lending policies, the credit policies, of the Bank of Ceylon. I know something about the Bank of Ceylon since I am the man who nationalized it when I was Minister of Finance. One of the things I did—I do not know whether you are aware of it; you ought to be—was to make it possible, by regulation published in the Gazette, for the Minister to amend the Bank of Ceylon Act. It is one of those rare cases of delegated legislative power under which you have been given authority by a stroke of the pen to amend the Bank of Ceylon Ordinance of 1938. You have also got the power to issue general and special directions to the board. If you are not satisfied with their lending policies during two years, what have you been doing? Does it require a commission to set right the lending policies of the Bank of Ceylon? If the Bank of Ceylon is not lending money in the way you would like them to lend money, why do you not issue a direction? Of course, they will not accept a direction if you tell them, "Give money to Mr. X"; and I do not think you will ever want to give a direction like that—at least, I should hope not. But if that is not the kind of dissatisfaction you suffer from, if your problem is about the percentage of Ceylonese to whom loans are not being given, the type of business for which money is not made available, why do you want a commission to investigate it at such large cost? After all, if a Minister does not know his business, a commission cannot teach him. If a Minister does not know how he wants the money lent, the commission is not going to be able to help him to solve that problem. The only problem is to rely on the Minister's ability to give a direction. But I am quite confident in my mind that that is not the problem of Hon. Wanninayake. He is quite capable of giving all the directions required to solve these problems. It is really this; there are other pressures standing in the way

so that it is necessary to use commissions to get over the embarrassment of having to do something which he knows is awkward and difficult to do.

There are problems of all sorts. We have talked about tourism, the food production drive and so on. The Minister of Health has put up a moan saying that he is not getting enough money to do certain things and he suggested that we should auction import licences. The Minister of State is going to build hotels. I wish him luck and I hope he will get not Rs. 200 million but Rs. 300 million. I hope the place will overflow with tourists.

There are so many amateur Finance Ministers now giving their own formulae to solve the problems of the Budget that one begins to wonder why it is necessary for Hon. Wanninayake to present a Budget at all. The Minister of State has told us about tourism. The Minister of Health has told us about how he would auction import licences. The infection has spread to such an extent that now the resthouse-keeper of Lunawa, fancying himself an amateur Finance Minister, has imposed a private turnover tax. The Government have reached the point at which their one interest is: let us keep the rich as well as they have been. After all, they are the democrats whom we saved; let us save them once again. Let us save them at the expense of the people. And that is the tragedy of it.

ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා

(கலாநிதி கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

Even at Lunawa.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බන්දාරනායක මහ.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

The Hon. Minister of Industries and Fisheries in the old days was an exponent of permanent revolution. There was a time when he held his disciples enthralled. Even a Member

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.]

of this House of the stature of—I do not know whether he is a double doctor or single doctor—Dr. Colvin R. de Silva was held enthralled to the disciplines of the permanent revolution as expounded by the great man from Avissawella. Now what has happened to this exponent of permanent revolution? All that we can witness now is the fact that he is in permanent revolution, in permanent orbit as a satellite, around the great feudal lord from Botale. Of course, like all satellites we always have a *pus vedilla*. At first he tried to go into orbit around the feudal lady from Mahawalatenne, but he missed it.

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීනායක

(කෙළරව වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

You were the broker.

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.

(තිරු. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

No, I was the rocket. That is true. But my point is this. We are not concerned with these little matters. If he likes to do a permanent revolution—I thought I saw the Cultural Revolution up in the Distinguished Gallery a moment ago, the brother! At least he is having a wonderful time in China.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

He must be seeing many wonderful things there.

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.

(තිරු. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I think, whether we are going to engage in these permanent revolution talks or not—I mean all the arguments about what can and should not be done—we really have to ask the Government, “Are you serious or sincere about any of the proposals you ever put forward?”

In 1965 you came out with the proposal that you were going to give *ande* cultivators the opportunity to become absolute owners of the fields they tilled. That was not stated for the first time in 1965; that was stated for the first time in 1964 when I introduced an Amendment to the Paddy Lands Act. The Hon. Prime Minister, as Leader of the Opposition then, raised an amendment at Committee stage and asked me, “Why are you not prepared to give these people full ownership?” I agreed. And the Bill was passed giving permission for schemes to be formulated to do exactly that. 1965 has passed. 1966 too has passed and now the Hon. Prime Minister is talking of his pride in the cultivators and how they are being so patriotic as to be with him and his Government in the food production drive. May I ask why the Government has not been so patriotic and so kind to the *ande* cultivators as to give them the full ownership of land all this time? Do you really believe in it? Why all this? Whom are you trying to fool?

You say the country is doing well; you quote passages from the Central Bank Report. I do not know; I am not sufficiently an economist to be able to tell you whether the gross national product has gone up by a couple of million rupees or it has come down by a couple of million rupees at factor cost prices. I will tell you, I do not believe a word about the method in which it is computed. I do not know whether there is any single method or formula which is true in regard to countries like Ceylon; whether with the special conditions of Ceylon you can, by an application of a formula to certain fundamental facts, say this is the gross national product. You can apply your formula and get the answer including the decimal point, but whether those figures represent any more truth than they had before is highly arguable. The Hon. Prime Minister says that the national gross product has gone up from 1959 on-

wards. I think he is right. It has

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

gone up, but the population also has gone up and when you reckon the gross national product against the *per capita* basis you will find that we have always remained stagnant. I shall give the figures.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

You will find the figures in the same column.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බන්දාරනායක මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I will show you the figures. In the same column you will find that it was 645 in 1962 ; even today it is 645. At page 16, Table II (A) I, you will find that. Have a good look at it. I am talking of the gross national product at factor cost prices increasing from 5900 million to 7500 million between 1959 and 1966. If you look at column two on the left hand side you will see that the gross national product *per capita* at 1959 factor cost prices was 645 in 1962 and that it was 645 in 1966 too.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

I do not want to interrupt the hon. Member, but how much longer will he take ?

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බන්දාරනායක මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

About another five to ten minutes.

This kind of figures prove nothing. In fact, it was the hon. Member for Wennappuwa (Mr. Festus Perera) who discovered that in addition to the planning unit that does not have plans, there is now an oxygen unit in the Central Bank which apparently has a little oxygen. If we are going to merely work on these figures and produce documents

and say the picture is a little brighter now than it was last year, that last year the decline was .7 but this year there is an increase of 1.1, I do not know what it means. I am just inventing figures ; figures are unimportant to me because these figures do not reflect anything. All that the figures tell you is that the economy of this country is marking time, the standards of living are falling—that is something that everybody knows—the cost of living is increasing, whatever the index might tell you—even my aunt agrees—so that ultimately what we are having in this country really is a sad situation, a situation of decline.

I know that you do not like communism, Frankly, neither do I. I am not a communist. But if you continue to run the country in the way you are doing now, my greatest fear is that quite unwittingly you will be the man who is going to usher in the permanent revolution in this land. I sincerely hope that it will not happen. I do not want it.—[Interruption]. I do not know whether it is his plan. It certainly is not a plan of mine. I would hate to see this country going communist. I do not think it is necessary ; the country can be made to grow so long as we see things in the correct perspective and are not going to serve the foreign interests. What is the logic, may I ask of the Minister of Finance, in repatriating Rs. 35 million on dividends ? In 1962 I was the first man who suggested putting a stop to it. I did not last enough to do it. My successor, now the hon. Member for Kolonnawa (Mr. Ilangaratne) did it by placing limitations on the dividends flowing out of this country. It was first stopped by him. The hon Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) when he was Minister of Finance followed and made it even more stringent. You have now come in and you send Rs. 35 million out every year.—[Interruption]. The hon. Member for Kolonnawa did it. I did not. I was not there long enough. The hon. Member for Yatiyantota also did it. You have undone it.

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

Do you realize what Rs. 35 million is in practical terms? It is equivalent to the total import value of any one of your subsidiary foodstuffs for a year. It is a fantastic amount.

So you are now producing in order to send money abroad to companies. You are saving Rs. 35 million a year in order to send it out to foreign companies!

You are now reduced to a position where every one of your own speeches particularly the speeches of the hon. Member for Wattala (Mr. D. Shelton Jayasinghe) in 1961 and 1962, become applicable to the actions of your own Ministers. Remember the days when you moaned about the public debt figures. Look at the public debt figures today. See what you have done. In those days it was described as mortgaging generations to come for the sake of consumption. What are you getting now? You are getting commodores on commodity aid. That is what the country has been reduced to under the U. N. P., and the commodores are getting overcarried to Australia!

You talked of administrative borrowings in our time. They were relatively little. But you described that as raiding the Post Office Savings Bank and raiding the Treasury. What are you doing now?—[*Interruption.*]

I admire the Minister of Finance. He is being asked to work to a brief. His job is to look after the vested interests in this country and he is doing it well. He has got to do that. They are the people who put him there. They saved democracy for him and he saves them, and the thing goes on in circles.—[*Interruption.*] I know I did a very bad job. I am not defending anything I did. I was such a rotten Finance Minister I had to get out. I am not complaining. But I am telling you this. You are doing an excellent job for the very reasons for which you were sent there. You are protecting those interests gloriously. After all you were put into power for a purpose and you are doing that extremely efficiently and

well. It does not matter what happens to the poor peasantry. It does not matter what happens to anybody else. You must protect the property owners of this land. You must protect their interests.—[*Interruption.*]

This Rs. 10 that you have given the government servants: what is the earthly use of your giving them Rs. 10 more this year to buy with it a little less than what they were able to get without that last year? That is in effect what you are doing by giving this Rs. 10. You are giving them the wherewithal to buy with that less than they could have bought last year without that Rs. 10. In other words you have given nothing.

Then you will say next year that notwithstanding the expansionary influence of that increase of Rs. 10 you have got a contractionary influence somewhere else. You have squeezed the balloon somewhere else. The bulge now comes somewhere else. In other words, his kind of financing does not fool anybody. We are conducting an empty debate, a meaningless discussion.

In regard to your food production drive, you talk in terms of giving Farms Limited and Moosajees Limited leases of land in the hope that they are going to produce more. Your Minister of Agriculture tells us that they are not producing what they are asked to produce; they are producing vegetables and other things; and he says that he will have to watch their performance and deal with them. When I say this the Prime Minister says I am wrong. That is why I say now, and I said it before, that when the S. L. F. P. some day comes back to power—maybe a long time hence—[*Interruption.*] The gentlemen who think they will keep their seats for 25 years are going to find that they were sadly mistaken. If you think this is a threat in order to topple your Government, I can assure you that it is not. You were put in office for 5 years to govern this country. It is the misfortune of the people that they made a wrong choice, but they will have

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

another opportunity. They will have the chance to choose a government, and the “democrats” will be able to work again to try and put you back in office to produce the same kind of budget in the hope of saving democracy once again!

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have really confined my speech to matters of a general nature pertaining to the Budget. There are many detailed criticisms to be made at the Committee stage. I shall do my best to be present when the Votes of each of the Ministries are taken up, particularly the Ministry of Agriculture. Matters pertaining to the industrial institutions I shall leave to the Hon. Prime Minister and his jaw-bone.—[Interruption] I trust that we shall have a very enjoyable discussion even if it does not do the country any good or serve any useful purpose.

අ. ආ. 7

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, listening to the hon. Member for Dompe, I was reminded of a lady who had given birth to many children but was pretending to be a virgin.—[Interruption]. Anyone listening to the hon. Member for the first time would have thought that he had never been a Finance Minister or a Minister of Agriculture of this country. What a lot of advice he gave us with regard to finance and agriculture! Most of us, however, know that he was Finance Minister and also Minister of Agriculture, and that he did not practise one-tenth of what he preached today. I shall come to him later. I have some very nice things to say. He taunted us saying that we were helping the rich man and not helping the poor man. I shall come back to him later and show how exactly he helped the poor man.

I must say that he made an inoffensive speech, in a light-hearted manner. Right through his speech

there was a note of frustration and disappointment. Anybody who listened to his speech with care would have seen the disappointment and frustration in it. When we recall the background we can understand and forgive him for some of the things he said.

I think I shall deal with his speech first. He said that in my first two Budgets I raised the hopes of the people of this country to high levels and that in the third Budget I dashed those hopes. If one reads the two Budget speeches without prejudice, one will see that that is exactly what I have avoided. In fact, the introductory paragraphs of both speeches stressed the economic, financial and administrative mess that we inherited from the past, and the difficulty in getting out of that mess. I said that without effective measures and without ample time it would not be possible for the Government to get out of that mess. In fact, I made that point in both my speeches.

The trouble with the hon. Member for Dompe is that he has forgotten that he raised very high hopes in the people of this country in his first and second budget speeches and let them down in his third Budget Speech and before I could confront him with that, I suppose, he thought the better thing would be to tell the present Finance Minister that he raised the hopes of the people in his first two budget speeches, and in his third Budget Speech he has let them down.

I shall quote to you one or two passages from his first and second budget speeches to show how high he raised the hopes and expectations of the people of this country. Here is what he said in his first Budget Speeches in 1960:

“We believe that the right to employment, a fair wage and decent working conditions also entail the obligation to work hard, loyally and honestly for the good of the country. If these obligations were not respected in the past as they should have been, it is only because Governments have failed to command complete confidence and because people have

[ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිකායක]
tended to become cynical when every genuine effort could be frustrated by corruption, nepotism and inefficiency at high levels.”—

Those were the very things that brought that Government down.

—“The best incentive that can lead people to make sacrifices in the name of progress is a sure and certain knowledge that every effort and sacrifice will make a positive contribution towards creating a prosperous and worthwhile environment for future generations. In order to provide that incentive, the Sirimavo Bandaranaike Government proposes to act sympathetically and equitably by all strata of our society, to maintain discipline and to maintain the goodwill and confidence of the people by the immediate implementation of the Ten-Year Plan formulated during the period of office of the late Prime Minister.”

Where is that Ten-Year Plan ? That is the biggest hoax, the biggest fraud, perpetrated on this country by the S. L. F. P. Government. The hon. Member for Dompe goes on :

“Let me say at once, Mr. Speaker, that I do not for a moment suggest that the plan as formulated is necessarily perfect. It is no more than a blue print of the structure we propose to build. It may be that in matters of detail the plan may need slight modification from time to time. But this country can ill afford to waste time, valuable time, in arguments upon the merits or demerits of particular points in the plan. We propose, therefore, to get on with the job. For this purpose the Government has already declared in the Throne Speech its intention to substitute for the National Planning Council and Secretariat, whose task in working out the plan is now over, a National Planning Department, which will consist of a group of economic advisers to work in close co-ordination with Ministries in implementing the plan. To get on with the job we need foremen, not architects, and with proper technical advice we are confident that the structure we build will run little risk of being jerry-built.”—
[OFFICIAL REPORT, 15th September 1960 ; Vol. 39, c. 1927].

Now who raised hopes in the hearts of the people of this country ? I shall read another passage. This is how he wound up his second Budget Speech :

“I give you the assurance that, given the goodwill and co-operation of the people, we will follow the democratic socialist road set for us by the late Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike and discharge our mandate to lay the foundations of a

planned socialist society to foster and protect the happiness and well-being of every individual.”—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 27th July 1961 ; Vol. 43, c. 945].

That is the assurance he gave. And he is taunting me with raising false hopes in the hearts of the people of this country. If you read the first two speeches of mine, you will see how carefully I have avoided raising undue hopes in the hearts of the people.

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්
(කෙළරාව අங்கத்தවාර් ඉරුවාර්)
(An hon. Member)

Here comes the hon. Member for Dompe !

ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිකායක
(කෙළරාව වන්නිනායක)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I was telling the House how in introducing your first Budget you said that you were introducing that with the idea of immediate implementation of the Ten-Year Plan. In your second Budget Speech you said : “It is true we are behind the targets a little, the targets of the Ten-Year Plan, but we ought to come in dead level with the targets in the course of the year. After that the whole thing will be plain sailing and the targets of the Ten-Year Plan will be achieved.”

What were the wonderful targets of the Ten-Year Plan ? That was the empty dream with which you beguiled the people of this country for two years. Before the introduction of the plan you went round the country, rousing up the masses, dangling this plan before them and saying. “We are preparing” —[Interruption]. Not you, the S.L.F.P. Government at the time. You were only a successor to it. Surely you are not rejecting your ancestors ! In Parliament and outside Parliament, in the vast meetings held on Galle Face Green and under all kinds of shady trees, they asked the people to wait for a short time till the plan was ready.

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

The other day the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) said that there are so many advisers going round the offices now. I am sure, you will remember, many more experts than now went round the offices during the time of the preparation of that Ten-year Plan. A number of foreign experts came to this country.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

They came and went.

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

What an amount of money, what an amount of time and energy, was spent on that plan! I do not want to take too much time on that plan now. Anyway, what were the targets? Full employment, doubling the *per capita* income, and self-sufficiency in a number of articles and commodities including rice.

The hon. Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike) was before long a disillusioned man. In the third Budget Speech he said—"I am not talking so much about the Ten-year Plan now; instead, I am presenting a Three-year Programme of Development. He quietly side-tracked the Ten-Year Plan. It was a tacit admission that the Ten-Year Plan had failed. The Three-Year Development Scheme or Plan—I will not say more about it now—was not implemented in any of the three years. So if anybody raised false hopes in the people it was the hon. Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike) as Minister of Finance. You will find that I have not raised undue hopes in the hearts of the people in the way he says I have done.

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීවරු

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர்கள்)

(Hon. Members)

You have no hopes, no plan.

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

What I say is that I have not raised undue hopes in the hearts of the people. I am not going to speak too much on this aspect of the matter.

In fact I should have commenced my speech by thanking all hon. Members on both sides of the House who participated in this Debate. It should have been my first duty. But I could not do so because I was taken away by the speech made by the hon. Member for Dompe.

I now thank hon. Members for the criticisms and suggestions they have made. Those criticisms fall into various categories. Some are constructive, others are not so constructive; some are useful, others are not so useful. Well, in the course of my speech if I do not refer to every one of those criticisms and suggestions it does not mean that I have not taken note of them. All those criticisms and suggestions will be taken due note of and we shall do all we can with them after due examination and scrutiny.

I must also thank my Colleagues on this side of the House for meeting adequately some of the arguments put forward by the other side of the House. I am particularly grateful to the Hon. Prime Minister for making my task very much lighter by the very comprehensive statement he just made.

I am sorry the hon. Member for Kolonnawa is not here. He was the one who opened fire from the Opposition. He said, "How can we say that the Budget is a good one? Look at the Galleries, they are not full! There are no well-dressed women in the Galleries!" Then he said, "Look at the country, the people are not excited! There is no anxiety on the part of the people!" He said, "Among the rich classes, the middle classes and even the lower classes there is no excitement, there is no anxiety. So, how can we say that this Budget is good?" If that is the way in which he judges the

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ශ්‍රී ලන්කායක]

Budget, I must tell the hon. Member for Kolonnawa that I provided for none of those things. I did not make arrangements to have people in the Galleries, or to have well-dressed women in the Galleries. I do not know why he referred to well-dressed women. I thought he might have referred to beautiful women. He seems to make a subtle distinction between well-dressed women and beautiful women! Also, I did not take the trouble to excite the masses.

ස්ටැන්ලි තිලෙකරත්න මහ. (කෝට්ටේ)
(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன—கோட்டே)
(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne (Kotte))

You cannot excite anyone!

ශ්‍රී ලන්කායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Because the hon. Member for Kotte has not the capacity to do so many things he thinks others are not capable of doing the same things.

In fact, I want to tell the hon. Member for Kolonnawa that I did not even arrange for a garland. The hon. Member for Yatiyantota had some interesting things to say about a garland at the time the hon. Member for Kolonnawa introduced his Budget as Finance Minister. I shall deal with that matter later.

Then he went on to say "I understand that the Hon. Minister of State is going to follow me", and he got so thoroughly scared that he left my Budget aside and began to reply to the undelivered speech of the Hon. Minister of State by quoting remarks he had made on the Budget introduced by the hon. Member for Yatiyantota. Well, that is an open invitation to me to quote the hon. Member for Yatiyantota on the Budget of the hon. Member for Kolonnawa. His remarks, I think, are much more relevant. After all, if he could have quoted the remarks of the Hon. Minister of State on the Budget of the hon. Member for Yatiyantota, I

think I have a better claim and reason to quote the hon. Member for Yatiyantota on the Budget of the hon. Member for Kolonnawa. It is a pity that the hon. Member for Kolonnawa is not here now. This is what the hon. Member for Yatiyantota said:

"Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would have liked it if the Hon. Minister of Finance had been here because I hope in the process of my remarks to contradict a number of statements he has made, question some of the theories he has put forward and dispute even some of the facts he has placed before this House.

First of all, may I say that we witnessed something very unusual after this Budget speech was made? There was a garland going round in the Lobby of this House. It went from neck to neck and finally alighted on somebody's neck—I do not know whose.....

It was certainly unusual in the experience of this House but I do not want to grudge him that garland,...."

Nor do I want to grudge him that garland, Sir! Then he went on to say:

"I shall prove as I go along that this ray of sunshine"—

That is the Budget of the hon. Member for Kolonnawa—

—"is only going to be a ray of moonshine."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 19th August 1963; Vol. 52, cs. 2688-9.]

Then, referring to the hon. Member for Kolonnawa, he said:

"My good Friend, generally slow of gait and thought showed an unusual nimbleness of political adjustment."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 19th August 1963; Vol. 52, c. 2689.]

I shall not take much of your time, but there are one or two passages I want to read. Here is one passage.

"The Hon. Minister in the course of his Speech has given us a very rosy picture of the present as well as the future expectations of this country. I want to ask him in all seriousness, does he accept this programme of a department which ostensibly is working under him although attached to the Prime Minister,"—

He is referring to the Planning Ministry, Sir—

—"because what is stated in the Plan contradicts the whole position taken up by the Hon. Minister of Finance. The

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

position taken up in this Plan is not borne out by any of the statements made by the Hon. Minister in the course of his speech. What is the secret of this? The secret is this. One set of experts drew up the Plan, another set of experts drew up his Speech and the Hon. Minister is suspended in mid air between the two.”—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 19th August 1963; Vol. 52, c. 2693.]

It has been said that one of the best achievements of the Sri Lanka Freedom Party Government was their achievement in the field of industry. May I read what certain hon. Members thought about it?

කෙනෙත් මය.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Last time also it was read.

රු වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I think this should be read at every Budget Debate because it is so important. Some of these industries had been started earlier and we know how they were running at the time they were taken over by our Government. It is very well described in the following passage. I shall read it :

“That is not all. I have already indicated to you that, when you talk about a high proportion or the satisfactory increase of the industrial share of the gross national product, you must also bear in mind that you have invested not less than Rs. 100 million in various corporations for which we are getting absolutely no return.

Who do you think said that? The hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera).

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බන්ඩරනායක මය.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

And he confessed he was wrong afterwards.

රු වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

There are more things to come.

“In the Minerals Corporation you have invested Rs. 8 million for which you have nothing to show by way of an end-product. In the Small Industries Corporation you have invested Rs. 1.8 million and you have nothing to show by way of an end-product. In the Eastern Paper Mills, you have invested Rs. 29 million, and the accumulated losses of the Eastern Paper Mills are Rs. 8 million. You have invested Rs. 15.7 million on Paranthan Chemicals; but what is the return for that? In the Kantalai Sugar Corporation you have invested Rs. 28.9 million so far. What is the return you have got? You have produced a few hundred tons at an enormous cost to the taxpayers of this country.

That is not all. The best part is yet to come. I think those Members who are talking about their industries must listen to this part:

“In the Plywoods Corporation you have invested Rs. 2.8 million and you still continue not to show any profits. In the Bus Corporation—apart from nearly Rs. 80 million spent—one accumulated losses come to Rs. 28 million: The total is well over Rs. 100 million, entirely due to bad management, bad planning, inefficiency, incompetence and corruption, worst of all corruption.—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 19th August 1963; Vol. 52, cs. 2753-4.]

ද සොයිසා සිරිවර්දන මය.

(திரு. டி. சொய்ஸா சிறிவர்தன)

(Mr. de Zoysa Siriwardena)

When did he say that?

රු වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

When he was speaking on the Budget.

ද සොයිසා සිරිවර්දන මය.

(திரு. டி. சொய்ஸா சிறிவர்தன)

(Mr. de Zoysa Siriwardena)

What year?

රු වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

In 1963. No so long ago.—
[Interruption].

பிஷ்ப்பன் பதவி கெட்டுப்பத, 1967-68

—தேவன் வர் கியவிலை

நியோஜன கலாநாயகர்

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Hon. Members in the Opposition all quoted old speeches. Let him also quote.—[Interruption.]

செ. வந்தியானை

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

What have you done by spending the Rs. 100 million on industries? This is the effect on the economy:

—“On that basis, you cannot have any substantial development in this country. When you talk of the gross national product you have got to take into account this Rs. 100 million you have wasted. Are you surprised, therefore, that you have at least Rs. 100 million extra in the hands of the consumers, for which you have nothing to show?”—

Inflation—that is how he put it.

—“It is these accumulated things that really increase prices of all goods in this country.”—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 20th August 1963; Vol. 52, c. 2754.]

செ. வந்தியானை சிரிவர்தன மஹா.

(திரு. டி. சோய்ஸா சிரிவர்தன)

(Mr. de Zoysa Siriwardena)

Give the date.

செ. வந்தியானை

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Not long ago. Wait till I finish. I shall tell you the whole thing. And this is how he wound up. That is also important:

“And that had been the charge that we levelled against the United National Party. It is all right to criticize the Government, to point out the defects of the Government;—

That was advice tendered to the U. N. P.

—“but you must put up an alternative programme before the people. That is what we have done. We have continuously in this House and outside stated over and over again that proceeding in this way there is no solution to the problems of this country, that the only correct solution is what we have put forward, namely working along socialist lines.

That is the solution; that is the answer. That is why the Budget of my good Friend has no relevance to the problems of this country. Working along these lines we are only marching towards ruin. Therefore, I appeal to all those who are progressive minded, who want to see the development of this country, who want to bring prosperity to the poor people of this country, that they should join us”—

The United Left Front. That was the time they had formed the United Left Front.—[Interruption].

அலுவலர் கௌரவ டி. சி. டி. சி.

(கலாநிதி கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

We did not know there was a thief in the night at that time.

செ. டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன

(திரு. டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

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

But the bigger thieves got on to the other side.—[Interruption].

அலுவலர் கௌரவ டி. சி. டி. சி.

(கலாநிதி கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

Always the thief emerges.

நியோஜன கலாநாயகர்

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

We have got on very well. Why do we want to talk of thieves now?

ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன மஹா.

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

Cattle thieves.—[Interruption].

அலுவலர் கௌரவ டி. சி. டி. சி.

(கலாநிதி கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

I say a corpse stinks. That corpse also must stink.

நியோஜன கலாநாயகர்

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Let us hear the Minister of Finance.

விசேஷ உதவி கமிட்டி, 1967-68

—தேவன் வர கிசவி

செ. உதவி

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

This is an appeal to join the United Left Front—

—“in furthering a genuine programme of socialist development for this country.”—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 20th August 1963 ; Vol. 52 cs. 2758-9.]

The hon. Member for Yatiyantota appealed to everybody to join the United Left Front against the S. L. F. P. and for some reason or other he and a few of his friends went and joined the S. L. F. P.

செ. உதவி

(திரு. டி. சொய்ஸா சிறிவர்தன)

(Mr. de Zoysa Siriwardena)

What is the date?

செ. உதவி

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

This was in 1963. Only a few years back.—[Interruption]. About the plan, I have said enough.

செ. உதவி

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

Now tell us where to get Nespray.

செ. உதவி

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Ask your friends who hoard them.

About foreign aid, quite a lot of criticism was levelled against us for joining the I. M. F., the I. B. R. D., for going to their meetings, for getting loans and aid from them. Some

people have forgotten the history of this aid. Who started this game really? I remember, when I was Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance—I was in the Senate then—we used to get some aid from certain countries. We never brought it into the Budget. We never made use of it to finance the Budget. The then Minister is here ; he used to say, “We have got a present from some country or other ; why must we make use of that to finance our normal expenditure? Therefore we will keep it aside and do some special job out of it and tell the country that gave us the aid, “We have done this special job, thank you very much.”” That was the attitude adopted by the U. N. P. at that time to aid.

If you look at our budgets at that time you will find that foreign aid had not been made a part of the Budget. Who started this game? The very people who started this game are now taunting us with going in for foreign aid on a large scale. It was done during the period of the S. L. F. P., the M. E. P. and even the Coalition Governments.

செ. உதவி

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

It is not ours.

செ. உதவி

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I know you are going to say that you did not do what we did with the I. M. F. and the I. B. R. D. But every one of those Finance Ministers was governor for Ceylon in the I. M. F.

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ගරු වන්නිනායක]

and I. B. R. D. and attended their meetings. Even my hon. Friend the Member for Yatiyantota attended a meeting when it was held at Tokyo the last time. They made use of this aid, but now they are blaming us for making use of it to finance our Budget. Who made use of this aid to finance the Budget? The only thing is that they have created such a position in this country by misusing this aid on so large a scale and brought about such a deterioration in our economic and financial situation that we are also compelled, for some time at least, to make use of this aid. But I make it quite clear to the Opposition and to everyone else in this country that our objective in obtaining this foreign aid is to end it as early as possible. We want to get out of the clutches of foreign aid as early as possible. But because of the mess that the Opposition have put us into we have got to make use of this aid for some time in order to enable us to end it as early as possible. I do not think the Opposition are justified in taunting us with going in for foreign aid on a large scale.

Then I come to the question of the cost-of-living index. We said that there is a decline in the cost-of-living index. But everybody in the opposition kicked up a row and said, "Look here your yardstick is all wrong." But the hon. Member for Dompe, when he was Finance Minister, measured it with the same yardstick. The hon. Member for Kolonnawa also measured it with the same yardstick.

ආඩායම් කොල්වින් ආර් ද සිල්වා
(கலாநிதி கொல்வின் ஆர். டி சில்வா)
(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

How do you bring rice into your cost-of-living index? I should honestly like to know.—[Interruption.] No, it cannot be. I say that it is not so and there is trickery involved.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා
(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Order please! Hon. Member for Agalawatte, I must remind you that this is not Question time.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Now they say, this is unrealistic. Surely, even the hon. Member for Yatiyantota never suggested at that time, "This cost-of-living index is unrealistic. Let us take steps to put it right." You never took any step.

කෙනමන් මය.
(திரு. கௌமன்)
(Mr. Keuneman)
I said so.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

What is the use of your saying so, when you are not the Minister of Finance? I will say many more things than you do if I am not the Finance Minister. The hon. Member for Yatiyantota did nothing about it, nor did the Member for Kolonnawa. Of course, the hon. Member for Dompe never referred to it. Now after I became Finance Minister they say "Look here, the yardstick must be lengthened for measuring your

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

cost of living." They say it must be lengthened. Therefore if we are lengthening the yardstick, let us measure all over again all the cost of living indices that we have had from the very beginning. I am not against the lengthening of the yardstick; only the measurement must apply to all the indices.

Many of the criticisms levelled against this Budget could have been avoided if the hon. Members agreed with me on the main cause that I have put forward. All these difficulties in the various aspects of the economy of this country stem from that fact. What is the fact? I made it quite clear that as a result of a drastic decline of 13 per cent in the terms of trade—the lowest, I think, in the last ten or twelve years—brought about by a sharp decline in export prices, a slight increase in import prices and a decline in the volume of exports of tea and coconut, we had to face a drop of Rs. 235 million in our export earnings.

ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා
(கலாநிதி கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)
(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

How do you account it on the last Government?

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I am not doing so.

You will see that this drop of Rs. 235 million, after all, gets reflected in the various aspects of the economy, whether you look at the balance of payments or the external assets or the government revenue or the

balancing of the Budget. Whichever way you look at it, this amount gets reflected in the various aspects of the economy. We tried to do as much as we could by taking various steps to prevent this having a full effect on the various aspects of the economy, but we were not hundred per cent successful.

In the course of my speech I said that this drop of Rs. 235 million in our export earnings was due to two reasons. One was due to conditions beyond our control, and the other was the fall in our export volume due to adverse weather conditions. The moment I said that all the ex-Finance Ministers raised their hands in horror and said, "Where on earth does a Minister of Finance refer to adverse weather conditions, where on earth does a Minister of Finance refer to conditions beyond the country's control?" They tried to make out that this was the first time that a Minister of Finance had referred to these factors.—[Interruption]. That is what you said. I took it pretty seriously and looked up some of the past speeches.

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

No fear! you and I both criticized.

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I think I should read from the 1963-64 Budget Speech of the now hon. Member for Kolonnawa (Mr. Langaratne)—page 14 of the booklet

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ශ්‍රී ලන්කීයයක]

containing his Budget Speech. In fact the hon. Member for Yatiyantota was the loudest in his criticisms. He said, "Who is the Finance Minister who refers to conditions beyond the country's control? Who is the Finance Minister who refers to adverse weather conditions?" But this is what the hon. Member for Kolonnawa said in his Budget Speech of 1963-64:

"Ceylon's external assets had declined year by year from 1955 with the deterioration in the terms of trade. The country's external assets reached the lowest level in October 1962, when they amounted to Rs. 492.9 million. The deterioration in the terms of trade was mainly the result of a drastic decline in Ceylon's export prices by about 18.4 per cent. between 1955 and 1962, while import prices remained more or less constant. The deterioration in the terms of trade resulted in a loss of about Rs. 1,156 million in foreign exchange for the country in this period. In other words, Ceylon would have earned an additional sum of Rs. 1,156 million of foreign exchange if export and import prices had remained throughout this period at the same level as in 1955. It was mainly this deterioration in the terms of trade which reduced the country's external assets to a low level and at the same time reduced the Government's revenue and thereby enlarged its Budget deficits. This fact of the deterioration in the terms of trade which is not within our control is often ignored by persons who blame the Government for the decline in external assets.

He goes on expanding on that theme.

Here is what the hon. Member for Yatiyantota said when he was Minister of Finance. He found fault with me for referring to matters beyond the control of the Government. He also asked, "Who talks about weather conditions in a Budget?"

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I did not say that.

ශ්‍රී ලන්කීයයක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

This is what the Hon. Dr. N. M. Perera said:

"Internationally we are at the mercy of the World Market—both in respect of our exports as well as our imports. Many of the ills that we are confronted with today arise from the fact that we are getting much less for our exports than we had hitherto got. There has been a steady deterioration of world prices in the three major products that we export. At the same time, our essential imports have shown a tendency to rise in price." —[OFFICIAL REPORT, 30th July 1964; Vol. 56, cs. 1592-3.]

This is what he said about the weather:

"During the last year, even the elements turned against us—"

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

The elements and the elephants!

ශ්‍රී ලන්කීයයක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

"During the last year, even the elements turned against us. Both rubber and coconut underwent a serious drop in the quantity produced, mainly due to adverse weather conditions." —[OFFICIAL REPORT, 30th July 1964; Vol. 56, c. 1593.]

I think I used the identical phrase in my speech. But there is a difference. The Hon. Dr. N. M. Perera continued:

"Similar unfavourable weather conditions abroad shot up the prices of some of our essential food imports from abroad." —[OFFICIAL REPORT, 30th July 1964; Vol. 56, c. 1593.]

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත, 1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

The difference is this: I referred only to local weather conditions; he referred to weather conditions both local and abroad.

There are a number of other interesting matters I would like to refer to but there is not time for all that now.

I must say something about housing. The hon. Member for Akuressa (Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe) said, "Look at this Finance Minister from the Wanni. He has refused to give allocations for housing." Look at these figures.

දෛනිකාධාරය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

I was going on what I read in the "Daily News."

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

That is the trouble with you. You read the capitalist press.

These are the figures in respect of loans given by the National Housing Department:

1957-58	..	Rs. 8.5 million
1958-59	..	Rs. 7.7 million
1959-60	..	Rs. 7.9 million
1960-61	..	Rs. 6.5 million
1961-62	..	Rs. 4.3 million
1962-63	..	Rs. 4.3 million
1963-64	..	Rs. 2.6 million

That is during the Member for Kolonnawa's time. Bigger the socialist, lesser the amount allocated for housing! 1964-65—Rs. 4.8 million. That is in your time. In 1965-66 it was Rs. 16.6 million. Why do you say that this man from Wanni has not given anything for housing? According to the Estimates for 1966-67

the provision for housing is in the region of Rs. 23 million. When you read the capitalist press you must read it carefully!—[Interruption].

On the question of the budget deficit, expansionary deficit and so on, the hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa), and the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central (Mr. Keuneman) spoke about the performance being wide off the mark in the Estimates and so on. They speak in such a plausible, in such an all-knowing manner, that unwary people listening to them will think there is no flaw in their arguments. The holes in their arguments are many. But the point is that they talk so plausibly and fluently that some people listening to them are taken in.

I shall take one point mentioned by the hon. Joint Member for Colombo South. He said, "You planned for an unfinanced gap of Rs. 85 million in the 1965-66 Budget and it has turned out to be Rs. 122 million. How do you account for it?" If you look at past performances you will see how much wider it had been. He referred to the Budget introduced by the hon. Member for Yatiyantota. Of course, the full credit does not go to him. Half the credit is due to me because I worked the Budget!

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

Droughts too.

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I shall come to the droughts—[Interruption].

விவரம் பற்றி கெட்டுப்போன, 1967-68

—தேவன் வர கிடைத்த

அவையின் கைக்குள் அந்த உரிமை
(கலாநிதி கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)
(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

You inherited a good budget and spoiled it.

அவர் மன்றம்

(கொளரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I shall tell you how this went up to Rs. 122 million. Let us take my Friend's Budget. He provided for no expansionary deficit. But it turned out to be Rs. 35 million. How? He provided for a certain expenditure under the internal guaranteed price scheme. The drought came and they brought very much less paddy. He saved Rs. 50 million to Rs. 60 million on that operation. There adverse weather conditions came to his rescue.—[Interruption].

அவர்கள் மன்றம். உரிமை. பெற்றோர்

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Not a single of my tax proposals went through.

அவர் மன்றம்

(கொளரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I implemented only the tax proposals that were passed in the House, and there were certain other proposals like the Toddy Tax proposal which was beyond me.—[Interruption]. If you add that deficit of Rs. 35 million to my finance gap it comes to Rs. 122 million. I will tell you how the gap increased. We had to make an unforeseen additional subscription to the I. M. F. in the course of the year amounting to Rs. 20

million. If you take account of that also you will find that my performance is better than his. If you read the previous years' figures you will find the deficits were Rs. 165, Rs. 200 and even Rs. 300 million. He did not go into that at all.—[Interruption]. In the course of the year there was a decision that we should pay a higher subscription to the I. M. F.

The hon. Third Member for Colombo Central took my Budget for 1966-67 and wanted to show the performance, but he carefully avoided taking the Budget for 1965-66 for which the final figures are available.—[Interruption]. Those are not the final figures; those are only the Estimates.

The Hon. Prime Minister explained what happened to the current Budget. There was a sharp fall in export earnings and an unforeseen expenditure of Rs. 55 million on the tea rebate scheme and about Rs. 12 million on the Land Army. As a result of the fall in export earnings, naturally, we had to restrict the volume of imports. It had repercussions on all the sectors, and, as a result the Budget has gone off the mark. I can assure you that it would not be so wide off the mark as you tried to make out.—[Interruption]. I am telling you how it came about.

Sir, one difficulty that some of the hon. Members on that side have in supporting this Budget according to them, is: there is nothing for the poor man in this Budget. That is the difficulty they say they have. Let us take a typical budget of the previous Government where there was provision for the poor man—the Budget introduced by the hon. Member for

Dompe sometime back. What did he do? He raised the price of a box of matches from 3½ cents to 5 cents and collected Rs. 3.2 million. He raised later the price of kerosene oil. Now, look at the result: a poor man in a poor family who has not got the money to buy a box of matches and a little kerosene oil, is compelled to live in darkness. Those poor people were not only condemned to live in darkness, but also to die in darkness. Imagine the thousands of patients that must have died as a result; medicines that had to be applied externally may have been given to drink in the darkness. Other complications that would have arisen in those dark homes, I dare not mention. —[Interruption].

That is not all. In the same Budget he did another thing. This is what he did for the poor man. His heart bleeds for the poor man. He raised the price of flour by five cents and the price of sugar by five cents, at the same time. There is one thing about what the hon. Member for Dompe does. When he does something, he does not do it in singles, always in doubles—matches and kerosene oil, sugar and flour! And that at a time—he himself says that in the course of his speech—when he was making a profit of Rs. 29.6 million on the flour. He imposed this additional burden on the people, and, he says, as a result the reduction in the entire food subsidy was about Rs. 30 million.

He was not going to pass that Rs. 30 million down to the people. He wanted to collect an additional Rs. 42.5 million by the imposition of another five cents on a pound of sugar and five cents on a pound of flour. And my Friends opposite who so wholeheartedly supported those budgets find it difficult to support this Budget.

Then, again, the hon. Member for Dompe imposed a tax on tobacco and raised the price of a cigarette by two cents. My tax will raise the price of a cigarette by one cent. They cannot

support the one cent increase, but they supported the two-cent increase! See the logic of these people!

I have increased the import licence fee from 1 per cent to 10 per cent, but nobody talks about the imports that are excluded. All the imports of the Food Commissioner are exempt from that. What are they? Rice, flour, sugar, maldivian fish. Then, milk foods, infant foods.—[Interruption].

நிஷேஷ கலாநாயகர்

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

The Hon. Minister will have to finish his speech soon.

செ. வந்தியான

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்கர்)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

The import licence fee does not affect goods like milk foods, cotton yarn, drugs and pharmaceuticals, fertilizers, kerosene, mammoities and other small implements for agricultural use—alavangoes and things like that.

அவரேசு உன். பி. பி. பி.

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Your first Budget also gave that.

செ. வந்தியான

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்கர்)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

That kind of budget they cannot support. Well, you were making a profit of Rs. 42.5 million as a result of increasing the price of flour by five cents a pound and the price of sugar by five cents a pound. You can support that kind of budget. Then you raised the price of cigarettes by two cents and so on.

நிஷேஷ கலாநாயகர்

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

I must remind the Hon. Minister that I have to put the Question to the House at 8 P.M. according to the Standing Orders.

விவரணை பற்றி கருத்து, 1967-68

—தேவன் வர கியவீடு

சுரு வந்திநாயகன்

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Then I shall conclude my speech by thanking you and all the hon. Members for the patient hearing given me. I say that I have set apart nearly Rs. 800 million for development. Of course, criticisms were made here on the Floor of this House to the effect that it was one thing to set apart money for development and another thing to make use of it. I agree with that criticism. Every one who has anything to do with the spending of this money should see to it that the maximum use is made of it in the interests of this country at large.

I thank you once again for giving me a very patient hearing.

“பற்றி கருத்து என் தேவன் வர கியவீடு” என ப்ரஸ்தாபிதம் செய்து கொடுத்தார்.

“மகோதா இப்பொழுது இரண்டாம் முறை மதிப் பிடப்படுமா” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டது.

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

கருத்துக்குப் பற்றி “பற்றி” மன்றத்தின் ப்ரஸ்தாபிதம் செய்து கொடுத்தார்.

குரல்களின் படி “ஆம்” என்றவர்களுக்கு வெற்றி யென உபசபாநாயகர் அவர்களால் பிரகடனப்படுத்தப் பட்டது.

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

பி.பி. டி. வியட் கிளார்க்நாயகன் மொ.

(திரு. எம். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Divide!

மன்றத் தீர்மானம் ஒரு படி வந்த பின்னாலும்—
பன்ம 87; விரோதம் 51; எனவே—தீர்மானம்:

சபை பிரிந்தது: சார்பாக 87; எதிராக 51.

The House divided: Ayes, 87; Noes, 51.

பன்ம

சார்பாக

AYES

சுரு வியட் கிளார்க்நாயகன்

கௌரவ டட்லி சேனநாயக்க

The Hon. Dudley Senanayake

சுரு டி. எம். ஆர். எ. ஈரியகொல்ல

கௌரவ ஐ. எம். ஆர். எ. ஈரியகொல்ல

The Hon. I. M. R. A. Iriyagolle

சுரு என். எச். எ. எம். கருணரத்ன

கௌரவ என். எச். எ. எம். கருணரத்ன

The Hon. N. H. A. M. Karunaratne

சுரு டி. பி. டி. குணவர்தன

கௌரவ டி. பி. டி. குணவர்தன

The Hon. D. P. R. Gunawardena

சுரு ஜி. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன

கௌரவ ஜி. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன

The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene

சுரு எம். டி. எச். ஜயவர்தன

கௌரவ எம். டி. எச். ஜயவர்தன

The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena

சுரு மோன்ட்வேக் கியவீடு

கௌரவ மோன்ட்வேக் கியவீடு

The Hon. Montague Jayewickreme

சுரு டி. பி. டி. டி. டி.

கௌரவ டி. பி. டி. டி. டி.

The Hon. C. P. de Silva

சுரு டி. பி. டி. டி. டி.

கௌரவ கலாநிதி டி. பி. டி. டி.

The Hon. Dr. W. Dahanayake

சுரு எம். டி. பி. டி. டி.

கௌரவ எம். டி. பி. டி. டி.

The Hon. M. D. Banda

சுரு எம். டி. பி. டி. டி.

கௌரவ எம். டி. பி. டி. டி.

The Hon. M. H. Mohamed

சுரு டி. பி. டி. டி. டி.

கௌரவ டி. பி. டி. டி. டி.

The Hon. U. B. Wanninayake

பதிலு

சார்பாக

AYES

பி. பி. அபிதேவ மயா.

திரு. டி. பி. அபிதேவ

Mr. D. P. Attygalle

பி. பி. அபிதேவ மயா.

திரு. சி. எஸ். டபிள்யூ. எதிரிசுரியா

Mr. C. F. W. Edirisuriya

பி. பி. அபிதேவ மயா.

திரு. எச். பி. எக்கநாயக்க

Mr. H. B. Ekanayake

பி. பி. அபிதேவ மயா.

திரு. எஸ். கதிரவேலுப்பிள்ளை

Mr. S. Kathiravelupillai

பி. பி. அபிதேவ மயா.

திரு. சி. என். கன்னங்கர

Mr. C. N. Kannangara

பி. பி. அபிதேவ மயா.

திரு. சந்திரா கருணாரத்ன

Mr. Chandra Karunaratne

பி. பி. அபிதேவ மயா.

திரு. எச். குலரத்ன

Mr. H. Kularatne

பி. பி. அபிதேவ மயா.

திரு. எஸ். ஜே. வி. செல்வநாயகம், கியு.வி.

Mr. S. J. V. Chelvanayakam, Q.C.

பி. பி. அபிதேவ மயா.

திரு. வேணன் ஜொங்கிளஸ், கியு. வி.

Mr. Vernon Jonklaas, Q.C.

பி. பி. அபிதேவ மயா.

திரு. எம். ஏ. டானியல்

Mr. M. A. Daniel

பி. பி. அபிதேவ மயா.

திரு. டி. எ. திலகரத்ன

Mr. D. E. Tillekeratne

பி. பி. அபிதேவ மயா.

திரு. கே. துரைரத்தினம்

Mr. K. Thurairatnam

பி. பி. அபிதேவ மயா.

திரு. எஸ். தொண்டமான்

Mr. S. Thondaman

பி. பி. அபிதேவ மயா.

திரு. கே. டபிள்யூ. தேவநாயகம்

Mr. K. W. Devanayagam

பி. பி. அபிதேவ மயா.

திரு. ஆர். எம். தர்மதாஸ பண்டா

Mr. R. M. Dharmadasa Banda

பி. பி. அபிதேவ மயா.

திரு. வி. தர்மலிங்கம்

Mr. V. Dharmalingam

பி. பி. அபிதேவ மயா.

திரு. வி. நவரத்தினம்

Mr. V. Navaratnam

பி. பி. அபிதேவ மயா.

திரு. டாக்டர் எ. எம். வி. நாகநாதன்

Dr. E. M. V. Naganathan

பி. பி. அபிதேவ மயா.

திரு. ஏ. பிலப்பிற்றிய

Mr. A. Pilapitiya

பி. பி. அபிதேவ மயா.

திரு. பெஸ்ரஸ் பெரேரா

Mr. Festus Perera

பி. பி. அபிதேவ மயா.

திரு. ஜி. ஜே. பாரிஸ் பெரேரா

Mr. G. J. Paris Perera

பி. பி. அபிதேவ மயா.

திரு. ஜி. ஜி. பொன்னம்பலம், கியு. வி.

Mr. G. G. Ponnambalam, Q.C.

பி. பி. அபிதேவ மயா.

திரு. என். டென்சில் பெர்னாண்டோ

Mr. N. Denzil Fernando

பி. பி. அபிதேவ மயா.

திரு. எம். ரஸ்கின் பெர்னாண்டோ

Mr. M. Ruskin Fernando

පණුව

சார்பாக

AYES

ඩබ්ලිව්. එම්. ජී. පී. බණ්ඩා මයා.

திரு. டபிள்யூ. எம். ஜி. ரி. பண்டா

Mr. W. M. G. T. Banda

ඩී. එම්. පී. බණ්ඩාර මයා.

திரு. டி. எம். ரி. பண்டார

Mr. D. M. T. Bandara

එස්. එම්. මානික්කරාජා මයා.

திரு. எஸ். எம். மாணிக்கராசா

Mr. S. M. Manickarajah

සී. එන්. මැතිව් මයා.

திரு. சி. என். மத்தியூ

Mr. C. N. Mathew

පී. ජී. මුතුබණ්ඩා මයා.

திரு. பி. ஜி. முத்துபண்டா

Mr. P. G. Muthubanda

එම්. ඊ. එච්. මොහමඩ් අලි මයා.

ஜனாப். எம். ஈ. எச். முகம்மது அலி

Mr. M. E. H. Mohamed Ali

ඩී. බී. රණතුංග මයා.

திரு. டி. பி. றணத்துங்க

Mr. D. B. Ranatunga

වෛද්‍යවරයා එ. රත්නපාල

வைத்தியகலாநிதி ஏ. இரத்தநபால்

Dr. A. Ratnapala

සී. රාජදුරේ මයා.

திரு. சி. இராசதுரை

Mr. C. Rajadurai

එස්. එම්. රාසමානික්කම් මයා.

திரு. எஸ். எம். இராசமாணிக்கம்

Mr. S. M. Rasamanickam

එස්. බී. ලේනව මයා.

திரு. எஸ். பி. லேனவ

Mr. S. B. Lenawa

ඩී. බී. විජේතුංග මයා.

திரு. டி. பி. விஜேதுங்க

Mr. D. B. Wijetunga

ආර්. පී. විජේසිරි මයා.

திரு. ஆர். பி. விஜேசிறி

Mr. R. P. Wijesiri

එඩ්මන්ඩ් විජේසූරිය මයා.

திரு. எட்மண்ட் விஜயசூரிய

Mr. Edmund Wijesuriya

පී. බී. ඒ. වීරකෝන් මයා.

திரு. பி. பி. ஏ. வீரக்கோன்

Mr. P. B. A. Weerakoon

වෛද්‍යවරයා එම්. එච්. සද්ධසේන

வைத்திய கலாநிதி எம். எச். சத்தாசேன

Dr. M. H. Saddhasena

පර්සි සමරවීර මයා.

திரு. பேர்வழி சமரவீர

Mr. Percy Samaraweera

ඒ. ලතිෆ් සින්නලෙබ්බෙ මයා.

ஜனாப் ஏ. லத்திப் சின்னலெப்பை

Mr. A. Latiff Sinnalebbe

ජේ. එල්. සිරිසේන මයා.

திரு. ஜே. எல். சிறிசேன

Mr. J. L. Sirisena

එම්. සිවසිනම්පරම් මයා.

திரு. எம். சிவசிதம்பரம்

Mr. M. Sivasithamparam

ටී. සිවසිනම්පරම් මයා.

திரு. டீ. சிவசிதம்பரம்

Mr. T. Sivasithamparam

ඊ. එල්. සේනානායක මයා.

திரு. ஈ. எல். சேனாநாயக்க

Mr. E. L. Senanayake

ඒ. සී. එස්. හමීඩ් මයා.

திரு. ஏ. சி. எஸ். ஹமீத்

Mr. A. C. S. Hameed

එස්. හෙට්ටිගේ මයා.

திரு. எஸ். ஹெற்றிகே

Mr. S. Hettige

එස්. බී. හේරත් මයා.

திரு. எஸ். பி. ஹேரத்

Mr. S. B. Herat

விருவ

எதிராக

Noes

ஈர். பி. ஈபுபுதாமி மை.

திரு. ஆர். எம். அபுபுதாமி
Mr. R. M. Appuhamy

பி. பி. ஈபுபுதாமி மை.

ஜனாப எ. எல். அபுபுதாமி மஜீது
Mr. A. L. Abdul Majeed

பி. பி. ஈபுபுதாமி மை.

திரு. டபிள்யூ. பி. ஜி. ஆரியதாஸ
Mr. W. P. G. Ariyadasa

பி. பி. ஈபுபுதாமி மை.

திரு. பி. பி. இலங்கரத்தன
Mr. T. B. Ilangaratne

பி. பி. ஈபுபுதாமி மை.

திருமதி ஜே. பி. ஓபயசேகர
Mrs. J. P. Obeyesekere

பி. பி. ஈபுபுதாமி மை.

திரு. பி. பி. ஜி. கலுகல்ல
Mr. P. B. G. Kalugalla

பி. பி. ஈபுபுதாமி மை.

திரு. எச். ஜி. ஏ. காரியவசம்
Mr. H. G. A. Kariyawasam

பி. பி. ஈபுபுதாமி மை.

திரு. இராஜா குலத்திலக
Mr. Raja Kulatillake

பி. பி. ஈபுபுதாமி மை.

திரு. பி. ஜி. பி. கெனமன்
Mr. P. G. B. Keuneman

பி. பி. ஈபுபுதாமி மை.

திரு. சம்னி குணவர்தன
Mr. Cholmondeley Goonewardene

பி. பி. ஈபுபுதாமி மை.

திரு. லெஸ்லி குணவர்தன
Mr. Leslie Goonewardene

பி. பி. ஈபுபுதாமி மை.

திரு. சோமவீர சந்திரசிரி
Mr. Somaweera Chandrasiri

பி. பி. ஈபுபுதாமி மை.

திரு. இலக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி
Mr. Lakshman Jayakodir

பி. பி. ஈபுபுதாமி மை.

திரு. எவ். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க
Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike

பி. பி. ஈபுபுதாமி மை.

திரு. ஸ்ரான்லி திலகரத்தன
Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne

பி. பி. ஈபுபுதாமி மை.

திரு. பி. எவ். துடாவே
Mr. B. Y. Tudawe

பி. பி. ஈபுபுதாமி மை.

திரு. எம். தென்னக்கோன்
Mr. M. Tennekoon

பி. பி. ஈபுபுதாமி மை.

திரு. பி. எம். கே. தென்னக்கோன்
Mr. P. M. K. Tennekoon

பி. பி. ஈபுபுதாமி மை.

திரு. பி. பி. தென்னக்கோன்
Mr. T. B. Tennakoon

பி. பி. ஈபுபுதாமி மை.

திரு. நீல் த அல்விஸ்
Mr. Neal de Alwis

பி. பி. ஈபுபுதாமி மை.

திரு. ஆர். ஜே. ஜி. த மெல்
Mr. R. J. G. de Mel

பி. பி. ஈபுபுதாமி மை.

கலாநிதி கொல்வின் ஆர். த சில்வா
Dr. Colvin R. de Silva

பி. பி. ஈபுபுதாமி மை.

திரு. எல். சி. த சில்வா
Mr. L. C. de Silva

பி. பி. ஈபுபுதாமி மை.

திரு. எம். பி. த சோய்சா சிறிவர்தன
Mr. M. P. de Zoysa Siriwardena

1959

නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය

1960

විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත,—1967-68

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

කල් තැබීම

විරුද්ධව

எதிராக

NOES

කල් තැබීම

ஒத்திவைப்பு

ADJOURNMENT

මෛත්‍රිපාල සේනානායක මය.

திரு. மைத்திரிபால சேனநாயக்க

Mr. Maithripala Senanayake

ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මය.

திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனநாயக்க

Mr. R. G. Senanayake

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මය.

திரு. பேரூட் சொய்சா

Mr. Bernard Soysa

ටී. බී. එම්. හේරත් මය.

திரு. டி. பி. எம். ஹேரத்

Mr. T. B. M. Herath

පනත් කෙටුම්පත ඊට අනුකූලව දෙවන වර කියවන ලදී.

පනත් කෙටුම්පත, අංක 57 දරන ස්ථාවර නියෝගය යටතේ, ලබන සඳුදා පවත්වන පූර්ණ මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩල කාරක සභාවට පවරන ලදී.

அதன்படி, மசோதா இரண்டாம் முறை மதிப்பிடப் பெற்றது.

மசோதா, நிலையற் கட்டளை இல. 57 இன்படி, எதிர்வரும் திங்கட்கிழமை நடைபெறவிருக்கும் முழுச் சபைக் குழுவுக்குச் சாட்டப்பட்டது.

Bill accordingly read a Second time.

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House under Standing Order No. 57 for Monday next.

ශ්‍රී සී. පී. ද සිල්වා (ඉඩම්, වාට්මාර්ශ් හා විදුලිබල ඇමති හා සභානායක)

(கௌரவ சி. பி. டி. சில்வா—காணி, நீர்ப் பாசன, மின்விசை அமைச்சரும் சபை முதல்வரும்)

(The Hon. C. P. de Silva—Minister of Land, Irrigation and Power and Leader of the House)

“මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය දැන් කල් තැබිය යුතුය” යි මා යෝජනා කරනවා.

ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදින්, සභා සම්මත විය.

வினா விடுக்கப்பெற்று ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

Question put, and agreed to.

මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය ඊට අනුකූලව අ. හා. 8.10 ට අද දින සභාසම්මතිය අනුව, 1967 අගෝස්තු 15 වන අඟහරුවාදා අ. හා. 2 වන තෙක් කල් ගියේය.

அதன்படி, பி.ப. 8.10 க்கு சபை அதனது இன்றைய தீர்மானத்திற்கிணங்க 1967 ஓகஸ்ட் 15 ஆம் தேதி, செவ்வாய்க்கிழமை பி.ப. 2 மணிவரை ஒத்திவைக்கப் பெற்றது.

Adjourned accordingly at 8.10 P.M. until 2 P.M. on Tuesday, 15th August 1967, pursuant to the Resolution of the House this Day.

ලිඛිත පිළිතුරු

ලිඛිත පිළිතුරු

ප්‍රශ්නවලට ලිඛිත පිළිතුරු

வினாக்களுக்கு எழுத்துமூல விடைகள்

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

බකිනිගහවෙල වි. සේ. ස. සමිතිය :
සභාපති බඩු වංචා කිරීම

பக்கினிகுறாவெல ப. நோ. கூ. ச. : தலைவர்
பொருட்களைக் கையாடல்

BAKINIGAHAWELA M.P.C.S.: MISAPPROPRIATION OF GOODS BY PRESIDENT

146/67

ආර්. එම්. ධර්මසාස නිකායා මයා.
(බිබිලෝ)

(திரு. ஆர். எம். தர்மதாச பண்டார—
பிபிளை)

(Mr. R. M. Dharmadasa Banda—Bibile)

කෘෂිකර්ම හා ආහාර ඇමතිගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය : (අ) 1966 සිංහල අලුත් අවුරුදු සමයේ මොනරාගල දිස්ත්‍රික්කයේ බකිනි ගඟවෙල විවිධ සේවා සමුපකාර සමිතියේ සභාපති ඇම්. අයි. ඇම්. සිද්දික් නැමැති අය විසින් එම සමිතියට පහළ උඟව විවිධ සේවා සමුපකාර සමිති සංගමයෙන් රෙදි පිළි, බී ලුනු හා මිරිස් ආදී සිල්ලර බඩු ගෙන ගොස් ඇති බව එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ආ) එයින් සිල්ලර බඩු සමහරක් හා රෙදි පිළි හැරුණුවිට බී ලුනු හා මිරිස් ආදිය සමිතියට බෙදා හැරීමට නොදී තමන්ගේ පුද්ගලික වෙළඳසැලේ තබා විකුණාගත් බව එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ඉ) මේ පිළිබඳව බිබිලේ සමුපකාර සංවර්ධන සහකාර කොමසාරිස් ගෙන ඇති පියවර කුමක්ද? (ඊ) මේ පිළිබඳව පරීක්ෂණයක් ඇති කරනවාද? (උ) මෙම වංචා කටයුතු කළ අයට විනයානුකූලව කටයුතු කිරීමට එතුමා ක්‍රියා කරන්නේද? (ඌ) නොඑසේ නම්, ඒ මන්ද?

விவசாய, உணவு அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா :

(அ) 1966 ஆம் ஆண்டு சிங்களப் புதுவருட
காலத்தில் மொனருகலை மாவட்ட பக்கினி
கஹாவெல பலநோக்குக் கூட்டுறவுச் சங்கத்

தின் தலைவரான ஜனாப் எம். ஐ. எம். சித்தீக் என்பவர் பகல ஊவ பலநோக்குக் கூட்டுறவுச் சங்கத்திலிருந்து துணிவகையோடு பம்பாய் வெங்காயம், மிளகாய் போன்ற பொருட்களையும் பெற்றதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஆ) சில சில்லறைப் பொருட்களையும், துணிவகையையும் தவிர, பம்பாய் வெங்காயம், மிளகாய் முதலிய பொருட்கள் சங்கத்திற்குக் கொடுக்கப்படாது அவருடைய சொந்தக் கடையில் விற்பனை செய்யப்பட்டதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (இ) இவ் விடயம் சம்பந்தமாக பிபிலைப் பகுதிக் கூட்டுறவு அபிவிருத்தி உதவி ஆணையாளர் என்ன நடவடிக்கைகள் எடுத்துள்ளார்? (ஈ) இதைப் பற்றி ஒரு விசாரணை நடத்தப்படுமா? (உ) இந்த நேர்மையற்றவர் மீது ஒழுக்காற்று நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கப்படுமா? (ஊ) இல்லையெனில், ஏன்?

asked the Minister of Agriculture and Food : (a) Is he aware that during the Sinhala New Year period of 1966, Mr. M. I. M. Siddeek, President of the Bakinigahawela M. P. C. S. in the Monaragala District, had taken textiles and sundry goods such as Bombay onions, chillies, etc., from the Pahala Uva M. P. C. S. Union to the said society ? (b) Is he aware that out of them except for some sundry goods and textiles, the Bombay onions, chillies, etc were not given to the society for distribution but were sold in his private shop ? (c) What steps have been taken by the Assistant Commissioner of Co-operative Development, Bibile, in regard to this matter ? (d) Will an inquiry be held regarding this ? (e) Will he take disciplinary action against this dishonest person ? (f) If not, why ?

பீனத பிபீதூர்

பீனத பிபீதூர்

ரூர் பி. பி. மனீவர (காபீகரீம ஸா
பாபார் பூமநி)

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

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

(அ) நூ. மகிநிபவலேர விவிமசேலா
பிபிபகார் பிபீநிப பாரிபேகிக அனயகி
நோபூ. (பா) பூ நகிநீநே நூ. (ஆ) பூ
நகிநீநே நூ. (இ) பூ நகிநீநே நூ. (ஈ)
பூ நகிநீநே நூ. (உ) பூ நகிநீநே நூ. (ஊ)
பூ நகிநீநே நூ.

(அ) இல்லை. பக்கினிகஹாவல பல்நோக்
கூக் கூட்டுறவுச்சங்கத்தில் நூகர்ச்சியாளர்
பிரிவொன்று இல்லை. (ஆ) எழவில்லை. (இ)
எழவில்லை. (ஈ) எழவில்லை. (உ) எழவில்லை.
(ஊ) எழவில்லை.

(a) No. There is no consumer
section in the Bakinigahawela Multi-
Purpose Co-operative Society. (b)
Does not arise. (c) Does not arise.
(d) Does not arise. (e) Does not
arise. (f) Does not arise.

டிஜிட்டல் : டிஜிட்டல் வெவ்வேறு பதிப்புகள் கீழ்க்கண்ட விலைகளில் 12 மாதங்களுக்கு
 ரூ. 32.00. அச்சுப்பிழைகள் கீழ்க்கண்ட விலை ரூ. 35.00. மூலம் 6 மாதங்களுக்கு அரைக்கட்டணம்;
 பதிப்பினைத் தவிர 30, தபால்மூலம் 45 சதம், முற்பணமாக அரசாங்க வெளியீட்டு
 அலுவலகத்தின் பதிப்புகள் (த. பெ. 500, அரசாங்க கருமகம், கொழும்பு 1) செலுத்தலாம்.

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