71 වන කාණ්ඩය
15 වන කලාපය

අඟහරුවාදා
1967 මාර්තු 21

පාර්ලිමේන්තු විවාද

(හැන්සාඩ්)

නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ

නිල වාර්තාව

අන්තර්ගත ප්‍රධාන කරුණු

ප්‍රශ්නවලට වාචික පිළිතුරු [නී. 2037]

ලංකාවේ සංවර්ධන මුදල් නීතිගත සංස්ථා (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත [නී. 2060] :

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

PUBLIC LIBRARY
JAFFNA.

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

தொகுதி 71
இல.15

செவ்வாய்க்கிழமை
21, மார்ச் 1967

பாராளுமன்ற விவாதங்கள்

(ஹன்சாட்)

பிரதிநிதிகள் சபை

அதிகார அறிக்கை

பிரதான உள்ளடக்கம்

வினுக்களுக்கு வாய்மூல விடைகள் [ப. 2037]

இலங்கை அபிவிருத்தி நிதிக் கூட்டுத்தாபனம் (திருத்த) மசோதா [ப. 2060] :

இரண்டாம், மூன்றும் முறை மதிப்பிடப்பெற்று திருத்தப்பட்டவாறு நிறைவேற்றப்பட்டது.

Volume 71
No. 15

Tuesday,
21st March 1967

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OFFICIAL REPORT

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 2037]

DEVELOPMENT FINANCE CORPORATION OF CEYLON (AMENDMENT) BILL [Col. 2060] :

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

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

නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය

பிரதிநிதிகள் சபை

House of Representatives

1967 මාර්තු 21 වන අඟහරුවාදා

செவ்வாய்க்கிழமை 21, மார்ச் 1967

Tuesday, 21st March 1967

පූ. භා. 10 ට මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය රැස් විය. කථානායකතුමා [ශ්‍රීමත් ඇල්බට් එෆ්. පීරිස්, කේ. බී. ඊ.] මූලාසනාරූඪ විය.

சபை, மு. ப. 10 மணிக்குக் கூடியது. சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள் [கௌரவ ஸ்ரீமான் அல்பட் எப். பீரிஸ், கே. பி. ஈ.] தலைமை தாங்கினார்கள்.

The House met at 10 A.M., MR. SPEAKER [THE HON. SIR ALBERT F. PERIES, K.B.E.] in the Chair.

ලිපි ලේඛනාදිය පිළිගැන්වීම

சமர்ப்பிக்கப்பட்ட பத்திரங்கள்

PAPERS PRESENTED

(454 වන අධිකාරය වන) රජයේ ඉඩම් ආඥා පනතේ 62, 95 සහ 96 යන වගන්ති යටතේ සම්පාදිත නියෝගයක්—[ගරු සී. පී. ද සිල්වා]

සභාමේසය 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

ඇල්පිටිය ආනන්ද මහා විද්‍යාලයට ක්‍රීඩා භූමියක්

அல்பிட்டி ஆனந்த மகா வித்தியாலயம்: விளையாட்டிடம்

ELPITIYA ANANDA MAHA VIDYALAYA: PLAYGROUND

4. එච්. ජී. ඒ. කාරියවසම් මයා. (බෙන්තර-ඇල්පිටිය)

(திரு. எச். ஜீ. ஏ. காரியவசம்—பெந்தர-எல்பிற்றிய)

(Mr. H. G. A. Kariyawasam—Bentara-Elpitiya)

අධ්‍යාපන හා සංස්කෘතික කටයුතු ඇමතිතෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය: (අ) ඇල්පිටිය ආනන්ද මහා විද්‍යාලය 56,000ක් ඡන්ද දායකයින්ගේ හා 1,50,000ක් ජනගහනය ඇති මුළු බෙන්තර-ඇල්පිටිය ආසනයේම තිබෙන ප්‍රධාන විද්‍යාස්ථානය බව එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ආ) එම විද්‍යාලයට ක්‍රීඩා භූමියක් අවශ්‍ය බව එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ඉ) එයට ඉතාමත් අවශ්‍ය ඉතාම සුදුසු ඉඩම 1963 වර්ෂයේදී එකල අධ්‍යාපන ඇමතිතුමා රජයට පවරා ගත් බව එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ඊ) ඊට පසු අධ්‍යාපන දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවේ වියදමින්, කුඹුරක්ව පැවති මේ ඉඩම බොහෝ මහන්සියෙන් ගොඩ කළ බව දන්නවාද? (උ) මේ ඉඩම ගැනීම ආරංචි කිරීමෙන් පසු ඉඩම ගැනීම වැළැක්වීම සඳහා ප්‍රසිද්ධ ගම්සභා සභාපතිවරයෙක්ව සිටි මේ ඉඩම් හිමිකරු, මේ ඉඩමට බඹ 2ක් තරම් නුදුරින් ප්‍රසිද්ධ සුසාන භූමියක් තිබියදීත්, මේ ඉඩමේ මිනී වැලලූ බව එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ඌ) මිනී දෙකක් මේ ඉඩමේ වැලලූ නිසා එකල සිටි ඇමතිතුමා ප. 20ක් වෙන් කළ බව දන්නවාද? (එ) මේ ක්‍රීඩා භූමියට ඉතාමත් සුදුසු ඉතාමත් අවශ්‍ය භූමි ප්‍රමාණයෙන් රු. 2ක් ආපසු දීමට කටයුතු කරගෙන යන බව එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ඒ) මෙය ඉතාම අවශ්‍ය ඉඩමක් බැවින් මෙය වැළැක්වීමට එතුමා කටයුතු කරනවාද?

கல்வி, கலாசார விவகார அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா: (அ) அல்பிட்டி ஆனந்த மகா வித்தியாலயம் 56,000 வாக்காளர்களினதும், 1,50,000 மக்களினதும் தொகுதியான பெந்தர—எல்பிற்றியத் தொகுதியிலுள்ள பிரதான கல்வி நிலையமென்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஆ) அக்கல்லூரிக்கு ஒரு விளையாட்டிடம் அவசியமென்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (இ) அதற்கு மிகவும் அவசியமானதும், தகுந்ததுமான காணியை 1963 ஆம் ஆண்டில், அப்பொழுதிருந்த கல்வியமைச்சர், அரசாங்கத்திற்கு வாங்கினர் என்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஈ) அதன் பின்னர், கல்விப் பகுதியின் செலவில் வயற்காணியாகக் கிடந்த இக்காணி மிகச்சிரமத்துடன் நிரப்பப்பட்டது என்பதை அறிவாரா? (உ) இக்காணி எடுக்கப்பட்ட தகவல் கிடைத்த பின்னர், காணியை எடுப்பதைத் தடுப்பதற்காக, கிராமச்சங்கத் தலைவராகவிருந்த இக்காணிச் சொந்தக்காரர் இக்காணிக்கு 2 பாகத் தூரத்தில் பொது மயான

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

[කාරියවසම් මයා.]

பூமியொன்று இருக்கத் தக்கதாக இக்காணியில் பிரேதங்களைப் புதைத்தார் என்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஊ) இரு பிரேதங்கள் இக்காணியில் புதைக்கப்பட்டதன் காரணமாக, அப்பொழுதிருந்த அமைச்சர் 20 பர்சஸ் காணியை ஒதுக்கினார் என்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (எ) இவ்விளையாட்டிடத்திற்கு உகந்ததான அவசியமான காணியில் 2 றூட் காணித் துண்டை, திருப்பிக் கொடுக்க நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கப்படுகின்ற தென்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஏ) விளையாட்டு மைதானத்திற்கு இக்காணி மிகவும் அவசியமானதாகையினால், இதனைத் திருப்பிக் கொடுப்பதைத் தடுப்பதற்கு அவர் நடவடிக்கை எடுப்பாரா?

asked the Minister of Education and Cultural Affairs: (*a*) Is he aware that Elpitiya Ananda Maha Vidyalaya is the leading educational institution in the entire Bentara-Elpitiya electorate which has 56,000 voters and a population of 150,000? (*b*) Is he aware that this Vidyalaya needs a play-ground? (*c*) Is he aware that in 1963, the then Minister of Education acquired the most essential and the most suitable land for this purpose? (*d*) Is he aware that thereafter this land which was a paddy field was reclaimed with great effort with funds from the Education Department? (*e*) Is he aware that the owner of this land who was a village committee chairman, on hearing of the proposed acquisition of this land, with the intention of preventing such acquisition, buried dead bodies in this land although there was a public burial ground about two fathoms away from this land? (*f*) Is he aware that as two dead bodies were buried in this land, the then Minister set aside 20 perches of this land? (*g*) Is he aware that action is being taken to give back 2 roods from that part of the land which is most essential and most suitable for the play-ground? (*h*) Will he take steps to stop this, as this land is most essential for a play ground?

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

(திரு. காமனி ஜயசூரிய—கல்வி, கலாசார விவகார அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி)

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

(අ) ඔව්. (ආ) ඔව්. (ඉ) ඔව්. (ඊ) ඔව්, පුරවන ලද කොටසින් සුළු ප්‍රමාණයක් පමණක් ආපසු දෙන කොටසට අයත් වේ. (උ) නැත. (ඌ) වැළලූ මිනී ගණන නොදනිමි. එහෙත් සොහොන් භූමියක් ලෙස පරිහරණය කළ හෙයින් කලින් සිටි ඇමතිතුමා පර්චස් 20ක පමණ බිම් කොටසක් අත්කර ගැනීමෙන් ඉවත් කිරීමට තීරණය කරන ලදී. (එ) රූඩ් 2ක් ආපසු දීමටත් ඉතිරි හරිය තැග්ගක් වශයෙන් නොමිලයේ ලබා ගැනීමටත් කටයුතු කර ගෙන යනු ලැබේ. (ඒ) නැත.

කාරියවසම් මයා.

(திரு. காரியவசம்)

(Mr. Kariyawasam)

ඇල්පිටිය ආනන්ද මහා විද්‍යාලයට අවශ්‍ය නිසා ගොඩ කර ගත් මේ ඉඩමින් රූඩ් දෙකක් තරම් වූ ප්‍රමාණයක් ධනවතෙකුට ආපසු දීමට කටයුතු සලස්සන්නේ මොන කාරණයක් නිසා දැයි අහන්න කැමතියි. අත්‍යවශ්‍ය කටයුත්තක් සඳහා 38 (ඒ) වගන්තිය යටතේ රජයට පවරා ගන්නා ලද ඉඩමින් මෙසේ රූඩ් දෙකක් ආපසු දීමට යන්නේ ඇල්පිටිය ආනන්ද මහා විද්‍යාලයේ ගුරු දෙගුරු සමිතියේත් මහජනතාවගේත් විරුද්ධත්වය ප්‍රකාශ කරද්දී නිසා එය නතර කිරීමට කටයුතු කරන්නේ දැයි ගරු ඇමතිතුමාගෙන් අහන්න කැමතියි.

ගරු අයි. එම්. ආර්. ඒ. ඊරියගොල්ල (අධ්‍යාපන හා සංස්කෘතික කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමති)

(கௌரவ ஐ. எம். ஆர். ஏ. ஈரியகொல்ல—கல்வி, கலாசார விவகார அமைச்சர்)

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

පාඨශාලාවට අවශ්‍ය ප්‍රමාණය ගැනීමට කටයුතු කරගෙන යනවා. එය සොහොන් පිටිවනියක් නිසා—අයිතිකාරයින්ගේ

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

දෙමව්පියන් ආදීන් පවා වළලන ලද සථානයක් නිසා—අපට අවශ්‍ය කොටස තබාගෙන අනවශ්‍ය කොටස අත් හරින්නයි යන්නෙ.

සෞඛ්‍ය දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවේ අනියම් ලිපිකරුවන්

சுகாதாரத் திணைக்களம் : சமயோசித எழுது வினைஞர்

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH : CASUAL CLERKS

9. **ලක්ෂ්මන් ජයකොඩි මයා** (දිවුල පිටිය)

(திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி—திவுலபிட்டிய)

(Mr. Lakshman Jayakody—Divulapitiya)

මුදල් ඇමතිගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය: (අ) සෞඛ්‍ය දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවේ සේවය කරන සහන ලිපිකරු සේවයේ නියුක්ත අනියම් ලිපිකරුවන් ද භාණ්ඩාගාර නො. 588/1/2/14 (X) හා 685 වැනි චක්‍රලේඛනය ප්‍රකාර තාවකාලික තත්ත්වය හා මාසික වැටුප් ප්‍රදානය කිරීමේ වැඩ පිළිවෙලට අඩංගු කිරීමට කට යුතු සලස්වනවාද? (ආ) එසේ නම් කවදාද? එසේ නොවේ නම් ඒ මන්ද?

நிதியமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா: (அ) சுகாதாரத் திணைக்களத்தின் பதிற் கடமை எழுது வினைஞர் சேவையிலுள்ள சமயோசித எழுது வினைஞர்களையும் இல. 588/1/2/14 (X), இல. 685 ஆகிய இலக்கங்களைக் கொண்ட திறை சேரிச் சுற்றறிக்கைகளின்படி தற்காலிக அந்தல்தும், மாதச் சம்பளமும் வழங்கும் திட்டத்தின் கீழ் கொண்டுவர அவர் நடவடிக்கை யெடுப்பாரா? (ஆ) அப்படியானால் எப்பொழுது? இல்லையெனில், ஏன்?

asked the Minister of Finance: (a) Will he take action to bring the casual clerks employed in the relief clerical service of the Health Department also within the scheme of granting temporary status and monthly salaries according to the Treasury Circular No. 685 bearing Treasury No. 588|1|2|14 (X)? (b) If so, when and if not, why?

එන්. විමලසේන මයා. (මුදල් ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්)

(திரு. என். விமலசேன—நிதி அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி)

(Mr. N. Wimalasena—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance)

(අ) නැත. (ආ) ආරෝග්‍යශාලා ලිපිකරු සේවයේ ස්ථිර නිලධාරීන් හා වාර්ථවු ලිපිකරුවන් නිවාඩු පිට නොපැමිණ සිටි අවස්ථාවන්හි දී මෙහි සඳහන් කරන ලද ලිපිකරුවන් ආදේශකයින් ලෙස කඩින් කඩ සේවයේ යොදවන ලද අය වෙති. එවැනි ආදේශකයින් මුදල් රෙගුලාසි 1110 යටතේ සේවයේ යොදවන ලද අතර, 66.3.23 වැනි දින අංක 685 දරණ භාණ්ඩාගාර චක්‍රලේඛයේ සඳහන් සහන යන් ලැබීමට ඔවුහු හිමිකම් නොලබති.

1965. 3. 23 දිනෙන් පසු සිංහල ප්‍රවීනතා පරීක්ෂණ පිළිබඳ විස්තර

23.3.1965 க்குப் பின் நடந்த சிங்களத் தேர்ச்சிப் பரீட்சை விபரங்கள்

SINHALA PROFICIENCY TESTS SINCE 23.3.1965: DETAILS

1. **ජයකොඩි මයා.** (කේ. වයි. එම්. විජේරත්න බණ්ඩා මයා.—සොරණාතොට—වෙතුවට)

(திரு. ஜயக்கொடி—திரு. கே. வை. எம். விஜேரத்ன பண்டா—சொரணத்தோட்டை—சார்பாக)

(Mr. Jayakody—on behalf of Mr. K. Y. M. Wijeratne Banda—Soranatota)

මුදල් ඇමතිගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය: (අ) 1965.3.23 දිනෙන් පසු සිංහල ප්‍රවීනතා පරීක්ෂණවලින් සමත් වූ රජයේ ලිපිකරුවන්ගේ සංඛ්‍යාව කොපමණද? (ආ) ඔවුන් අතුරෙන් කීදෙනෙකුගේ වාර්ෂික වැටුප් වැඩිවීම් මේතාක් ගෙවා ඇද්ද? (ඉ) ගෙවා නැත්නම්, ඊට හේතු කවරේද? (ඊ) ගෙවා නැත්නම්, අප්‍රමාදව ගෙවීමට එතුමා ක්‍රියා කරනවාද? (උ) නොඑසේ නම්, ඒ මන්ද?

நிதி அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா: (அ) 23.3.1965 க்குப் பின்னர் சிங்களத் தேர்ச்சிப் பரீட்சையில் சித்தியடைந்த அரசாங்க எழுது வினைஞர் எத்தனை பேர்? (ஆ) அவர்களில் எத்தனை பேருக்கு இற்றைவரை அவர்களுக்குரிய ஆண்டுச் சம்பள ஏற்றம் அளிக்கப்பட்டது? (இ) கொடுப்பனவு அளிக்கப்படவில்லையாயின், அதற்கான காரணம் யாது? (ஈ)

Digitized by Noolaham Foundation
noolaham.org | aavanaham.org

[ජයකොඩි මයා.]

கொடுப்பனவு அளிக்கப்படவில்லையானால், அதனைக் கொடுப்பதற்கு அவர் காலதாமத மின்றி நடவடிக்கை மேற்கொள்வாரா? (உ) அன்றேல் ஏன்?

asked the Minister of Finance: (*a*) How many Government Clerks have passed the Sinhala Proficiency Tests since 23.3.1965? (*b*) How many of them have been paid their annual increments of salary to date? (*c*) If payment has not been made, what is the reason for it? (*d*) If payment has not been made will he take steps to pay without delay? (*e*) If not, why?

විමලසේන මයා.
(திரு. விமலசேன)
(Mr. Wimalasena)

(අ) 796 දෙනෙකි. (ආ) 676 දෙනෙකි. (ඉ) පාලන රෙගුලාසි යටතේ වැටුප් වැඩි වීම් උපයා ගැනීමට අපොහොසත් වීම. (ඊ) මේ සම්බන්ධයෙන් යම් දුක්ගැන විල්ලක් ඇති නිලධාරියකු යෝග්‍ය බලධාරියා වෙත අභියාචනයක් ඉදිරිපත් කළ යුතුය. (උ) මේ ප්‍රශ්නය පැන නොනඟී. ඉහත (ඊ) යටතේ දී ඇති පිළිතුර බලන්න.

හීනාගම පාසල, කටුගස්තොට: බුරුත ගස් කැපීමට ලබාගත් අවසරය

கட்டுகஸ்தோட்டை, ஹீனகமப் பாடசாலை: மூதிரை மரங்களைத் தறிப்பதற்கு அனுமதிப் பத்திரம்

HEENAGAMA SCHOOL, KATUGASTOTA: PERMIT FOR FELLING SATINWOOD TREES

2. ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා (යටියන්තොට)
(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா—யட்டியாந்தோட்டை)
(Dr. N. M. Perera—Yatiyantota)

ඉඩම්, වාරිමාර්ග හා විදුලිබල ඇමතිගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය: (අ) කටුගස්තොට හීනාගම පාසැලේ විහලය සෑදීම සඳහා බුරුත ගස් 41ක් කැපීමට අවසර පත්‍රයක් ලබාගත් බව එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ආ) වහල සෑදීම සඳහා ගස් 10යකට වඩා අවශ්‍ය නැති බව එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ඉ) ඒ මඟු අයිතිකරුවන් වන එම්. එන්. විජේතුංග, ධර්මසේන හා සේරසිංහ යන මහත්වරුන්ට මෙම අවසර පත්‍රය විකුණන ලද බව එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ඊ) මෙම අවසර පත්‍රය ප්‍රයෝජනයට ගනිමින්, උඩුදුම්බර ප්‍රාදේශීය ආදායම් නිලධාරි කොට්ඨාශයේ, මිනිපේ ප්‍රදේශයේ තිබෙන බුරුත ගස් කැපූ බව එතුමා දන්නවාද? (උ) උඩුදුම්බර ප්‍රාදේශීය ආදායම් නිලධාරිතැන මෙම වංචාව සොයාගෙන මිනිපේ ග්‍රාම සේවක ගේ වැඩ තහනම් කළ බවත් හාරිස්පත්තුවේ ප්‍රාදේශීය ආදායම් නිලධාරි තැන මෙම ලී කොටන් කටුගස්තොටදී බරිගම දී අල්ලා ගන්නා ලද බවත් එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ඌ) මේ සම්බන්ධයෙන් වරදකරුවන් වී සිටින අයට විරුද්ධව නඩු පැවරීම සඳහා දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව විසින් කිනම් ක්‍රියා මාර්ගයක් ගෙන තිබේද? (එ) කිසිදු ක්‍රියා මාර්ගයක් ගෙන නැත්නම්, ඒ මන්ද?

காணி, நீர்ப்பாசன, மின்விசை அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா: (அ) கட்டுகஸ்தோட்டையிலுள்ள ஹீனகமப் பாடசாலையின் கூரை அமைப்பிற்கென 41 மூதிரை மரங்களைத் தறிப்பதற்கு அனுமதிப்பத்திரமொன்று பெறப்பட்டதென்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஆ) சம்பந்தப்பட்ட கூரையை அமைப்பதற்கு 10 மரங்களுக்குமேல் தேவைப்படாதென்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (இ) மரக்காலைச் சொந்தக்காரர்களான திருவாளர்கள் எம். என். விஜயதுங்க, தர்மசேன, சேரசிங்க என்னும் மூவருக்கு, சம்பந்தப்பட்ட அனுமதிப்பத்திரம் விற்கப்பட்டதென்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஈ) உடதும்புற மாவட்ட இறைவரி உத்தியோகத்தரது பிரிவைச் சேர்ந்த மினிப்பே பகுதியில் இவ்வனுமதிப் பத்திரத்தை பயன்படுத்தி பெருந்தொகையான மூதிரை மரங்கள் வீழ்த்தப்பட்டனவென்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (உ) உடதும்புற பிரிவின் மாவட்ட இறைவரி உத்தியோகத்தர் இம்மோசடியைக் கண்டுபிடித்து மினிப்பேக் கிராம சேவகரைத் தற்காலிக பதவிநீக்கம் செய்தாரென்பதையும், ஹரிஸ்பற்றுவ மாவட்ட இறைவரி உத்தியோகத்தர் பரிகம, கட்டுகஸ்தோட்டை ஆகிய இடங்களில் அம் மரக் குற்றிகளைக் கைப்பற்றினரென்பதையும் அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஊ) சம்பந்தப்பட்ட குற்றவாளிகளுக்கெதிராய் வழக்குத் தொடருவதற்கு

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

திணைக்களத்தால் எடுக்கப்பட்ட நடவடிக்கை என்ன? (எ) நடவடிக்கை எதுவும் எடுக்கப் படவில்லையெனில் ஏன்?

asked the Minister of Land, Irrigation and Power: (a) Is he aware that a permit was obtained for felling 41 Satin wood trees for the construction of the roof of Heenagama School, Katugastota? (b) Is he aware that the construction of the roof would not need more than 10 trees? (c) Is he aware that this permit was sold to three gentlemen, Mr. M. N. Wijetunga, Mr. Dharmasena and Mr. Serasinghe who are owners of Timber Depots? (d) Is he aware that utilizing this permit, a large number of Satin wood trees had been felled in the Minipe area within the Uda Dumbara D. R. O's Division? (e) Is he aware that the D. R. O. of the Uda Dumbara Division detected this fraud and interdicted the Grama Sevaka of Minipe and that the D. R. O. of Harispattu seized these logs at Barigama and Katugastota? (f) What action has been taken by the Department to file action against the guilty parties concerned? (g) If no action has been taken, why?

ගරු සී. පී. ද සිල්වා (ඉඩම්, වාරිමාර්ග, විදුලිබල ඇමති හා සභානායක)

(கௌரவ சீ. பீ. டி சில்வா—காணி, நீர்ப்பாசன, மின்விசை அமைச்சரும் சபை முதல்வரும்)

(The Hon. C. P. de Silva—Minister of Land, Irrigation and Power and Leader of the House)

(a) No. However, a permit for 41 Halmilla trees and 5 Etathimbiriya trees had been issued to the Parent-Teachers' Association for the construction of the roof of Heenagama School, Katugastota. (b) The permit for the timber was issued on the recommendation of the Education Department for 425 cubic feet of timber. (c) No. (d) No. However, there had been illicit felling in the Uda Dumbara D.R.O's Division of timber of the variety for which the permit under reference, had been issued and the representatives of the Parent-Teachers' Association are alleged to have transported illicitly felled timber without a permit. (e) (i) No. (ii) D.R.O. Harispattuwa seized on suspicion some timber transported by the Parent-Teachers' Association and found at a timber depot close to the School. However, on investigation it was revealed that the timber seized was the identical timber covered by the transport permit issued by the D. R. O., Udadumbara. This timber was therefore released to the P.T.A. (f) Since the Grama Sevakas of Pallegaladebokka and Udattawa have failed to carry out the instructions issued by the D.R.O., Udadumbara with a view to preventing the illicit transport of timber and as no formal inquiry has been made into the offence, it has so far not been possible to take legal action against offenders. Desciplinary action is being taken against the officers concerned. Further inquiries are being made with a view to taking legal action against the offenders. (g) This does not arise in view if the answer at (f) above.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Will you keep me informed of what takes place after the inquiry?

ගරු සී. පී. ද සිල්වා

(கௌரவ சீ. பீ. டி சில்வா)

(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

Yes.

උප තැපැල් ස්ථානාධිපති තනතුරු: සුදුසුකම්

உப தபாற் கந்தோர் அதிபர் பதவிகள்: தகைமை

POSTS OF SUB-POSTMASTER: ELIGIBILITY

3. **ජයකොඩි මයා.** (ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා.—දඹදෙණිය—වෙනුවට);

(திரு. ஜயக்கொடி—திரு. ஆர். ஜீ. சேனநாயக்க—தம்பதெனிய—சார்பாக)

(Mr. Jayakody—on behalf of Mr. R. G. Senanayake—Dambadeniya)

රජයේ වැඩ, තැපැල් සහ විදුලි සංදේශ ඇමතිගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය: (අ) 1965 ට පෙර උප තැපැල් ස්ථානාධිපතීන් පත් කිරීමේදී පළාතේ පදිංචි කණිෂ්ඨයා සමත්

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

[ජයකොඩි මයා.]

ආදේශිකයන්ට එම තනතුර සඳහා ඉදිරිපත් වීමට අවසථාවක් තිබූ බව එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ආ) 1965න් පසු උප තැපැල් ස්ථානාධිපති තනතුරට සුදුස්සන් වශයෙන් සලකන්නේ ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨත්වය සමත් පළාතේ දස අවුරුද්දක පදිංචියක් ඇත්තන් පමණ බව එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ඉ) එම නිසා වර්ෂ කීපයක් සේවය කර ඇති කණිෂ්ඨය සමත් ආදේශිකයන්ට උප තැපැල් ස්ථානාධිපති තනතුර ලබා ගැනීම අහිමි වීමෙන් ඒ අයට කිසිම අනාගතයක් නොමැති වී ඇති බව එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ඊ) කණිෂ්ඨය සමත් පළාත් වාසී වර්ෂ කීපයක් සේවා පළපුරුද්ද ඇති ආදේශිකයන්ට උප තැපැල් ස්ථානාධිපති තනතුර සඳහා ඉදිරිපත් වීමේ වරප්‍රසාදය දීම ගැන එතුමා සලකා බලනවාද?

அரசாங்க கட்டுவேலை, தபால், தந்திப்போக்கு வரத்து அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா: (அ) 1965 ஆம் ஆண்டுக்குமுன் உபதபாற் கந்தோர் அதிபர்களை நியமிப்பதில் அப்பகுதியில் குடியிருக்கும் கனிட்ட வகுப்பில் சித்தியடைந்தவர்களான பதில் ஆட்கள் அப்பதவிக்கு விண்ணப்பிக்க சந்தர்ப்பம் இருந்ததென்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஆ) 1965 ஆம் ஆண்டிற்குப் பின் உபதபால் கந்தோர் அதிபர் பதவிக்கு அப்பகுதியில் பத்து வருடமாகக் குடியிருக்கும் சிரேட்ட வகுப்பில் சித்தியடைந்தவர்கள் மாத்திரமே தகுதியுடையவர்களாகக் கருதப்படுகின்றனர் என்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (இ) ஆகவே பல வருடங்கள் சேவை செய்துள்ளவர்களும் கனிட்ட வகுப்பில் சித்தியடைந்தவர்களுமான பதில் ஆட்கள் உபதபால் கந்தோர் அதிபர் பதவியைப் பெற உரிமையற்றிருப்பதால் அவர்களுக்கு எவ்வித எதிர்காலமும் இல்லையென்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஈ) கனிட்ட வகுப்பில் சித்தியடைந்து அப்பகுதியில் குடியிருக்கும் பல வருட சேவை அனுபவமுள்ள பதில் ஆட்கள் உபதபாற் கந்தோர் அதிபர் பதவிக்கு விண்ணப்பிக்கச் சந்தர்ப்பமளிப்பது பற்றி அவர் கவனிப்பாரா?

asked the Minister of Public Works, Posts and Telecommunications: (*a*) Is he aware that when sub-post masters were appointed prior to 1965, substitutes who were residents of the area and who had passed the Junior School Certificate examination had the opportunity to apply for such posts? (*b*) Is he aware that after 1965, only those who had passed the Senior School Certificate examination and had been resident in the area for a period of ten years are being considered eligible for posts of sub-post masters? (*c*) Is he aware that, therefore, those substitutes who had served for several years and who had passed the Junior School Certificate examination have no future as they are deprived of the opportunity of securing appointments as sub-post masters? (*d*) Will he ccnsider extending to those substitutes who have passed the Junior School Certificate examination, resident in the area and have had several years of experience, the right to apply for posts of sub-post masters?

විජයපාල මෙන්ඩිස් මයා. (රජයේ වැඩ, තැපැල් හා විදුලි සන්දේශ ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්)

(திரு. விஜயபால மெண்டிஸ்—அரசாங்கக் கட்டுவேலை, தபால் தந்திப் போக்குவரத்து அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி)

(Mr. Wijayapala Mendis—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works, Posts and Telecommunications)

(අ) ඔව්. (ආ) ඔව්. මෙය රාජ්‍ය සේවා කොමිෂන් සභාව විසින් අනුමත කරන ලද නව බඳවා ගැනීමේ පරිපාටියක් අනුව වේ. (ඉ) නැත. (ඊ) මෙය රාජ්‍ය සේවා කොමිෂන් සභාවේ විෂයයන්ට අයත් කාරණයකි. අවුරුද්දකට වඩා වැඩබලා ඇති වැඩබලන උප තැපැල් ස්ථානාධිපතීන් ස්ථිර ඇබෑර්තු සඳහා සලකා බැලීම පිණිස, ඔවුන්ගේ අධ්‍යාපන සුදුසුකම් පහත් කිරීමේ ප්‍රශ්නය දැනට රාජ්‍ය සේවා කොමිෂන් සභාව විසින් පරීක්ෂා කරගෙන යනු ලැබේ.

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

වාචික පිළිතුරු

ගිනිගත්හේනේ අඹගමුව කෝරළයේ විවිධ සේවා සමුපකාර සමිති සංගමයේ අයථා ක්‍රියා

ගිනිகத்தேஹேன அம்பகமுவை கோரளையைச் சேர்ந்த பலநோக்குக் கூட்டுறவுச் சங்கம் : ஊழல்கள்

GINIGATHHENA AMBAGAMUWA KORALE MULTI-PURPOSE CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETY : MALPRACTICES

ඊ. බී. වයි. තුඩාවේ මයා. (මාතර—ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.—හබරාදුව—වෙනුවට)

(திரு. பி. வை. துடாவ—மாத்தறை—திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர—ஹபரதுவ—சார்பில்)

(Mr. B. Y. Tudawe—Matara—on behalf of Mr. Prins Gunasekera—Habaraduwa)

කෘෂිකර්ම හා ආහාර ඇමතිගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය : (අ) ගිනිගත්හේනේ අඹගමුව කෝරළයේ විවිධ සේවා සමුපකාර සමිති සංගමයේ අයථා ක්‍රියාවන් වගයක් ගැන පසුගියදා, එනම් 1967 ජනවාරි මස 20 වැනිදා හදිසි පරීක්ෂණයක් පැවැත්වූ බව එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ආ) කොළඹ නිලධාරීන් පැවැත්වූ එම හදිසි පරීක්ෂණයේදී සංගමයේ දූෂණ රැසක් හෙළිදරව් වීද? ඒ මොනවාද? (ඉ) මේ දූෂණයන් ගැන වගකිව යුත්තෝ කවුද? (ඊ) මෙවැනි දැ යළි නොසිදුවීමට එතුමා වග බලා ගන්නවාද?

விவசாய, உணவு அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா : (அ) கினிகத்தேஹேன அம்பகமுவை கோரளையைச் சேர்ந்த கூட்டுறவுச் சங்கத்தின் தகாத நடவடிக்கைகள் சம்பந்தமாக, 1967 ஆம் ஆண்டு ஜனவரி மாதம் 20 ஆந் தேதியன்று திடீர்ப்பரிசோதனை நடத்தப்பட்டதென்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஆ) கொழும்பு உத்தியோகத்தர்கள் நடத்திய இத் திடீர் பரிசோதனையின்போது, பல ஊழல்கள் கண்டுபிடிக்கப்பட்டனவா? அவை யாவை? (இ) இவ்வூழல்களுக்குப் பொறுப்பாளி யார்? (ஈ) அவ்வித ஊழல்கள் மீண்டும் நடைபெறுமலிருப்பதற்கு அவர் வகை செய்வாரா?

asked the Minister of Agriculture and Food : (*a*) Is he aware that on 20th January, 1967, a surprise check was made in regard to certain malpractices at the Ginigathhena Ambagamuwa Korale Multi-purpose Co-operative Society? (*b*) Were many malpractices of the society revealed at this inquiry, which was conducted by officers from Colombo? (*c*) Who are the persons responsible for these malpractices? (*d*) Will he take steps to prevent such occurrences in future?

ඊ. ඩී. ඉඹුලාන මයා. (කෘෂිකර්ම හා ආහාර ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්)

(திரு. பீ. சீ. இம்புலான—விவசாய, உணவு அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி)

(Mr. P. C. Imbulana—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Food)

(අ) ඔව්. (ආ) පරීක්ෂණ මෙතෙක් අවසන් කර නැත. (ඉ) ඉහත සඳහන් "ආ" ප්‍රශ්නයට දී තිබෙන පිළිතුර අනුව පැන නගින්නේ නැත. (ඊ) ඉහත සඳහන් "ආ" ප්‍රශ්නයට දී තිබෙන පිළිතුර අනුව පැන නගින්නේ නැත.

රජයේ රෝහල් සහ ඩිස්පැන්සරි : සිංහලෙන් නාම පුවරු සවි කිරීම

அரசாங்க ஆஸ்பத்திரிகளும் மருந்துச்சாலைகளும் : சிங்கள பெயர்ப்பலகைகள்

GOVERNMENT HOSPITALS AND DISPENSARIES : SINHALA NAME-BOARDS

6. **එල්. සී. ද සිල්වා මයා.** (බලපිටිය—පී. බී. විජයසුන්දර මයා.—කිරිඇල්ල—වෙනුවට)

(திரு. எல். சீ. டி சில்வா—பலப்பிட்டிய—திரு. பீ. பி. விஜேசுந்தர—கிரியல்ல—சார்பாக)

(Mr. L. C. de Silva—Balapitiya—on behalf of Mr. P. B. Wijesundara—Kiriella)

සෞඛ්‍ය ඇමතිගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය : (අ) රජයේ රෝහල්වල සහ ඩිස්පැන්සරිවල බොහෝ ගණනක හැඳින්වීමේ පුවරු තවම තිබෙන්නේ ඉංග්‍රීසි භාෂාවෙන් පමණක් බව එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ආ) එකී ආයතනවල නාම පුවරු සිංහලෙන් සවි කිරීමට අප්‍රමාදව එතුමා ක්‍රියා කරනවාද?

சுகாதார அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா : (அ) பெரும்பாலான ஆஸ்பத்திரிகளிலும் மருந்துச் சாலைகளிலும் பெயர்ப்பலகைகள் இன்னும் ஆங்கில மொழியில் மட்டுமே இருப்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஆ) அந் நிறுவனங்களில் சிங்களப் பெயர்ப்பலகைகளை நிறுவுவதற்கு அவர் உடனடியாக நடவடிக்கை எடுப்பாரா?

asked the Minister of Health : (*a*) Is he aware that a large number of Government hospitals and dispensaries

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

[එල්. සී. ද සිල්වා මයා.]

still have their name boards in English only? (b) Will he take early action to install name boards in Sinhala at such institutions?

ගරු එම්. ඩී. එච්. ජයවර්ධන (සෞඛ්‍ය ඇමති)

(கௌரவ எம். டீ. எச். ஜயவர்தன—சுகாதார அமைச்சர்)

(The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena—Minister of Health)

(a) Yes. (b) Action has already been taken and instructions have been issued to heads of decentralised units.

රජයේ ලොතරැයි ටිකට් පත්වල නාම අක්ෂර ඉංග්‍රීසියෙන් මයදීම

அரசாங்க அதிஷ்டச் சீட்டுக்கள்: ஆங்கில எழுத்துக்களை உபயோகித்தல்

GOVERNMENT LOTTERY TICKETS: USE OF ENGLISH LETTERS

7. ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා (විජය සුන්දර මයා. වෙනුවට)

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா—திரு. விஜேயசுந்தர சார்பாக)

(Dr. N. M. Perera—on behalf of Mr. Wijesundara)

මුදල් ඇමතිගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය: (අ) රජයේ ලොතරැයි ටිකට් පත්වල නාම අක්ෂර තවම ඉංග්‍රීසි භාෂාවෙන් පළකර වන්නේ මන්දැයි එතුමා ප්‍රකාශ කරන වාද? (ආ) මේ හේතුවෙන් එම ටිකට් පත් විකුණන ළමයින් කරදර හිරිහැර වලට මුහුණ පාන බව එතුමා දන්නවාද?

நிதி அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா: (அ) அரசாங்க அதிஷ்டச் சீட்டுகளில் பெயர் எழுத்துக்கள் இன்னும் ஆங்கில மொழியில் வெளியிடப்படுவதற்கான காரணத்தை அவர் கூறுவாரா? (ஆ) இந்தக் காரணத்தினால் அச்சீட்டுக்களை விற்கும் சிறுவர்கள் தொந்தரவுக்குள்ளாகிறார்கள் என்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா?

asked the Minister of Finance: (a) Will he state why letters in the English alphabet are still printed on Government lottery tickets? (b) Is he aware that, as a result, children who sell these tickets are inconvenienced?

විමලසේන මයා.

(திரு. விமலசேன)

(Mr. Wimalasena)

(ආ) මෙතෙක් කල් පවත්වාගෙන ආ පුරුද්ද එයයි. මේ පුරුද්ද වෙනස් කිරීමේ ප්‍රශ්නය දැන් සැලකිල්ලට භාජනව තිබේ. (ආ) නැත.

චාවාකච්චේරි නාගරික සභාව

சாவகச்சேரி நகரசபை

CHAVAKACHCHERI URBAN COUNCIL

8. එල්. සී. ද සිල්වා මයා. (විජයසුන්දර මයා. වෙනුවට)

(திரு. எல். சீ. டி சில்வா—திரு. விஜேயசுந்தர சார்பாக)

(Mr. L. C. de Silva—on behalf of Mr. Wijesundara)

පළාත් පාලන ඇමතිගේත් ප්‍රවෘත්ති හා ගුවන් විදුලි ඇමතිගේත් පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්ගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය: (අ) රජයේ ගෘහට් නිවේදනය කින් දැනුම් දුන් පරිදි චාවාකච්චේරි යේ නාගරික සභාවට සාමාජිකයින් තෝරා ගැනීම උදෙසා නාම යෝජනා පත්‍ර භාර ගැනීම වර්ෂ 1966 නොවැම්බර් 1 දිනට යෙදී තිබුන බව එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ආ) එකී නාගරික සභාව කලින් සුළු නගර සභා තත්ත්වයක තිබුන බවත්, නගර සභා තත්ත්වයට උසස් කරන ලද්දේ නැවත කොට්ඨාශ කඩා වෙන් කිරීමෙන් බවත් එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ඉ) මෙම නාගරික සභාවේ නැවතත් වරක් කොට්ඨාශ කඩා වෙන් කිරීමට එතුමා අදහස් කරනවාද? (ඊ) එසේ නම්, ඒ කුමක් නිසාද? (උ) අප්‍රමාදව එකී නාගරික සභාවේ නාම යෝජනා පත්‍ර භාර ගැනීමට ක්‍රියා කරන ලෙස එතුමා මැතිවරණ කොමසාරිස්තුමාට නිර්දේශ කරනවාද?

உள்ளூராட்சி அமைச்சரினதும், தகவல், ஒலிபரப்பு அமைச்சரினதும் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசியைக் கேட்ட வினா: (அ) அரசாங்க வர்த்தமானி மூலம் அறிவித்திருந்தபடி சாவகச்சேரி நகரசபைக்கு உறுப்பினர்களைத் தேர்ந்தெடுப்பதற்கான நியமனப்பத்திரங்கள் 1966, நவம்பர் 1 ஆம் தேதி ஏற்றுக் கொள்ள ஏற்பாடு செய்யப்பட்டிருந்ததை அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஆ) அந்த நகரசபை

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

முன்பு பட்டண சபை நிலையில் இருந்ததென் பதையும் வட்டாரங்களை மீண்டும் பிரித்து வேறுக்கியதன் பின்னர் அது நகரசபை நிலைக்கு உயர்த்தப்பட்டது என்பதையும் அவர் அறிவாரா? (இ) அந்நகரசபை வட்டா ரங்களை மீண்டும் பிரித்து வேறுக்க அவர் உத் தேசித்துள்ளாரா? (ஈ) ஆமெனில், ஏன்? (உ) தாமதமின்றி அந்த நகரசபைத் தேர்த லுக்கான நியமனப்பத்திரங்களை ஏற்க நட வடிக்கை எடுக்குமாறு தேர்தல் ஆணையா ளருக்கு அவர் சிபார்சு செய்வாரா?

asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Local Government and to the Minister of Information and Broadcasting: (*a*) Is he aware that in terms of a notification in the Government Gazette, the receiving of nomination papers for the election of members to the Chavakachcheri Urban Council was fixed for November 1, 1966? (*b*) Is he aware that the said Urban Council was formerly a Town Council and that it was upgraded to an Urban Council after a delimitation of wards? (*c*) Does he intend to redelimit the wards of this Urban Council? (*d*) If so, why? (*e*) Will he re-recommend to the Commissioner of Elections that action be taken to receive nominations for the said Urban Council?

ආර්. ප්‍රේමදාස මයා. (පළාත් පාලන ඇමතිගේ සහ ප්‍රවෘත්ති හා ගුවන් විදුලි ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්)

(திரு. ஆர். பிரேமதாச—உள்ளூராட்சி அமைச்சரதும், தகவல், ஒலிபரப்பு அமைச் சரதும் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி)

(Mr. R. Premadasa—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Local Government and to the Minister of Information & Broadcasting)

(අ) රජයේ ගැසට් පත්‍රයෙහි පළ කරන ලද කිසියම් නිවේදනයක් ගැන මම නොද නිමි. කෙසේ වෙතත්, නාම යෝජනා පත්‍ර භාර ගැනීම 1966 නොවැම්බර් මස 1 වැනි දිනට නියම කරගෙන තිබුණි. (ආ) ඔව්. (ඉ) ඒ ද කොට්ඨාශ නැවත බෙදා වෙන් කිරීම දැනටමත් කර ඇත. (ඊ) බදු ගෙවන් නන් විසින් ඉදිරිපත් කරනු ලැබූ කරුණු අනුව හා කලින් පැවති ඒ ද කොට්ඨාශ බෙදා වෙන්කිරීමේ කොමිෂන් සභාවේ නිර් දේශයන්ට අනුකූලවය. (උ) නැත. 1967 ජූනි මස 30 වැනි දිනෙන් අවසන් වීමට නියමිත සියලුම නගර සභාවල නිලකාලය, 1968 ජනවාරි මස 31 වැනි දින දක්වා දීර්ඝකර ඇත.

නාගදීපයේ රජයේ රෝහලට දිස්ත්‍රික් වෛද්‍ය නිලධාරියකු පත් කිරීම

நயினாதீவு அரசாங்க ஆஸ்பத்திரிக்கு மாவட்ட வைத்திய உத்தியோகத்தர்

D. M. O. FOR GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL, NAINATIVU

10. **එම්. පී. ද සොයිසා සිරිවර්ධන මයා.** (මිනුවන්ගොඩ—එස්. ඩී. බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.—ගම්පහ—වෙනුවට)

(திரு. எம். பீ. டி சொய்சா சிறிவர்தன—மினுவாங்கொட—திரு. எஸ். டீ. பண்டார நாயக்க சார்பாக)

(Mr. M. P. de Zoysa Siriwardena—Minuwangoda—on behalf of Mr. S. D. Bandaranayake—Gampaha)

සෞඛ්‍ය ඇමතිගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය: (අ) මෙම වර්ෂයේ ජනවාරි මසදී නයිනතිව්හි (නාගදීපයේ) රජයේ රෝහලට දිස්ත්‍රික් වෛද්‍ය නිලධාරියකු පත්කර යැවීමට යොදා තිබූ බවත් මේ කරුණ සඳහා සුදුසු බංගලා වක් කුළියට ගැනීමට සොයා ගෙන තිබූ බවත් එතුමා දනිසිද? (ආ) එම දිස්ත්‍රික් වෛද්‍ය නිලධාරි තැන පත් කිරීම අවලංගු කළේ කුමක් හෙයින්ද? (ඉ) ඉතා ඉක්මණින් දිස්ත්‍රික් වෛද්‍ය නිලධාරියකු පත් කිරීමට එතුමා අවශ්‍ය පියවර ගනිසිද?

சுகாதார அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா: (அ) இவ்வருஷம் ஜனவரி மாதத்திலிருந்து, நயினா தீவில் (நாகதீபாவில்) ஒரு மாவட்ட வைத் திய உத்தியோகத்தரை நியமிப்பதற்கு ஏற் பாடு செய்யப்பட்டு, இதற்கென ஒரு வங்களா வும் வாடகைக்கு எடுக்கப்பட்டதென்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஆ) இந்த மாவட்ட வைத் திய உத்தியோகத்தரை நியமித்தல் ஏன் பின் னர் ரத்துச் செய்யப்பட்டது? (இ) அங்கு வெகு விரைவில் ஒரு மாவட்ட வைத்திய உத்தியோகத்தரைப் பதவியிலமர்த்துவதற்கு அவர் உரிய நடவடிக்கை எடுப்பாரா?

asked the Minister of Health: (*a*) Is he aware that a D. M. O. was due to be posted to the Government Hos-

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

[ද සොයිසා සිරිවර්ධන මයා.]

pital, Nainativu (Nagadeepa), in January this year and a suitable bungalow on rent was found for this purpose? (b) Why was the posting of that D. M. O. cancelled? (c) Will he take necessary steps to post a D. M. O. very early?

ගරු එම්. ඩී. එච්. ජයවර්ධන
(கௌரவ எம். டீ. எச். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena)

(a) Yes. (b) In view of the representations made by the officer, setting out the personal difficulties he had in proceeding to Nainativu. (c) The post is likely to be filled when the next moves of medical officers take place in June 1967.

මහජන ගැලරි වසාදැමීම
கலரிகளை மூடல்
GALLERIES: CLOSURE OF

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා. (දකුණු කොළඹ)
(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்சா—கொழும்புத் தெற்கு)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa—Colombo South)

Mr. Speaker, before we go on to the Motions for the Day, there is a matter I want to raise in regard to the Galleries. I understand that in pursuance of your Order the Galleries have been denied to the public. I also understand that Members of the other House too are not permitted to enter the Galleries. Is that also on your Order?

කථානායකතුමා
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

It has been done on my Orders. I have received certain information, and I am acting on that.

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

But surely, Members of the other House should be permitted to enter the Galleries.

කථානායකතුමා
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

Do they want to come in?

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்சா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Yes.

කථානායකතුමා
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

I have been informed that no Senator has so far applied for a ticket.

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

Why not?

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்சா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Senator J. P. Obeyesekere has been refused admission.

කථානායකතුමා
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

Members of the other House, if they wish to, can apply for tickets and come in.

මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ කටයුතු
சபை அலுவல்
BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

ගරු සී. පී. ද සිල්වා
(கௌரவ சீ. பீ. டி சில்வா)
(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

I move,

"That the proceedings on items 1-17 of Public Business appearing on the Order Paper be exempted at this day's Sitting from the provisions of Standing Order No. 8."

කථානායකතුමා
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

This Motion should be passed without amendment or Debate. But I shall at my discretion allow a certain amount of discussion.

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

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

I only want to ask a question. I understood at the Party Leaders' Meeting that two days this week were allocated for a particular item, but the Government is now going beyond that. The understanding was that you wanted item No. 1 passed and you gave us two days for the Debate. —[*Interruption*]. For whatever reason you could not complete any work yesterday—

කථානායකතුමා
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

Yesterday cannot be counted as a day of Business.

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

I am only raising this question because what is proposed now is not what was agreed to at the Party Leaders' Meeting. Why are you changing that position today ?

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்சா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Why are you going beyond item 1 ?

කථානායකතුමා
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please !

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

I am on my feet. I would like to know why the Government want to do this, because they are going contrary to their own promise. The understanding was that two days were to be allocated for discussion of this particular Bill.

කථානායකතුමා
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

Hon. Members know the reason. I shall now put the Motion to the House.

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

No, Sir. I would like to ask the Hon. Leader of the House whether he would be satisfied if item 1 is discussed as agreed at the Party Leaders' Meeting. Surely, they must stand by whatever agreement they come to.

ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්
(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)
(An hon. Member)

No.

ද සොයිසා සිරිවර්ධන මයා.
(திரு. டி. சொய்லா சிறிவர்தன)
(Mr. de Zoysa Siriwardena)

You said that you would give us two days to discuss the Development Finance Corporation of Ceylon (Amendment) Bill.

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන (රාජ්‍ය ඇමති සහ අග්‍රාමාත්‍යතුමාගේත් ආරක්ෂක හා විදේශ කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමතිගේත් පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්)
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன—இரா ஜாங்க அமைச்சரும் பிரதம அமைச்சரதும் பாதுகாப்பு, வெளிவிவகார அமைச்சரதும் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசியும்)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene—Minister of State and Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and Minister of Defence & External Affairs)

The agreement was broken.

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

Is that the reason why you want to break your own agreement ?—[*Interruption.*]—No, Sir. That is a different matter. What you wanted to

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

[ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා]

take up was the first item on the Order Paper. Why are you, therefore, violating your own agreement that was arrived at ?

ගරු සී. පී. ද සිල්වා
(கௌரவ சீ. பீ. டி சில்வா)
(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

An agreement has to be kept by both sides.

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

That means, hereafter you do not want to come to an agreement. That is all right. We well understand that. If you take up that position we are equally prepared to take up the same position. It is all right by us.

ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදී.

කටහඬවල් අනුව "පක්ෂ" මන්ත්‍රීන්ට ජය බව කථානායකතුමා විසින් ප්‍රකාශ කරන ලදී.

විශූ විදුක්කප්පට්ට්‍රදු.
குரல்களின்படி "ஆம்" என்பவர்களுக்கு வெற்றி யென சபாநாயகர் அவர்களால் பிரகடனப்படுத்தப் பட்டது.

Question put.

MR. SPEAKER, *having collected the Voices, declared that the "Ayes" had it.*

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

Divide !

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்ணட் சொய்சா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Divide, by name !

කථානායකතුමා :
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

I disallow a Division by name.

මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය 48 වන ස්ථාවර නියෝගය යටතේ—පක්ෂව 67; විරුද්ධව 22; ඡන්දයෙන්—ඔබතුමේය.

சபை 48 ஆம் நிலையற் கட்டளையின் கீழ் பிரிந்தது : சார்பாக 67; எதிராக 22.

The House divided (under Standing Order No. 48) : Ayes 67; Noes 22.

මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ රැස්වීම
சபை அமர்வு
SITTING OF THE HOUSE

ගරු සී. පී. ද සිල්වා
(கௌரவ சீ. பீ. டி சில்வா)
(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

I move,

"That this House at its rising this day do adjourn until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, 4th April, 1967."

ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදින්, සභාසම්මත විය.

விஞ விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

Question put, and agreed to.

ලංකාවේ සංවර්ධන මුදල් නීතිගත සංස්ථා (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත
இலங்கை அபிவிருத்தி நிதிக் கூட்டுத் தாபனம் (திருத்த) மசோதா
DEVELOPMENT FINANCE CORPORATION OF CEYLON (AMENDMENT) BILL

දෙවන වර කියවීමේ නියෝගය කියවන ලදී.

இரண்டாம் மதிப்பிற்கான கட்டளை வாசிக்கப்பட்டது.

Order for Second Reading read.

பූ. භා. 10.18

ගරු යූ. බී. වන්නිනායක (මුදල් ඇමති)
(கௌரவ யூ. பி. வன்னிநாயக்க—நிதி அமைச்சர்)
(The Hon. U. B. Wanninayake—Minister of Finance)

I move,

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

The Bill seeks to amend the Development Finance Corporation of Ceylon Act with a view to (*a*) extending the scheme and the scope of the activities of the corporation and (*b*) eliminating certain difficulties that stand in the way of its efficient implementation.

There are four principal amendments proposed.

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

The first amendment is necessary to increase the share capital of the corporation from Rs. 8 million to Rs. 24 million and to increase the provision for borrowing from foreign organizations from Rs. 24 million to Rs. 72 million. These increases are necessary because the Development Finance Corporation finds that its operations are restricted due to lack of sufficient capital.

Between 1956 and 1966 a total amount of Rs. 36 million approximately has been invested. This includes repayments and reinvestments. This Rs. 36 million comprises (*a*) Rs. 8 million provisional share capital, (*b*) Rs. 16 million Government loan, and (*c*) borrowings from bank sources.

Further investments in development projects are not possible for want of adequate funds.

The second amendment is necessary to widen the scope of the activities of the corporation. As it is, the scope of operations is restricted to agricultural and industrial activities. The amendment to Section 4 will include commercial activities also. Commercial activities will be only those that help development.

The third amendment is needed to extend the repayable period for the Rs. 16 million Government loan from fifteen years to twenty-five years. Already ten years have passed and it is unlikely that, with its present commitments, the Development Finance Corporation will be in a position to repay the Government loan of Rs. 16 million during the next five years without impairing its efficient working. The amendment is to increase the period of repayment from fifteen to twenty-five years.

The fourth amendment is to Section 5 of the principal Act. The corporation can guarantee loans made only by private investment sources. Now that such major investment sources as the Bank of Ceylon, the People's Bank and the Insurance Corporation are Government sources, it is necessary that the Development Finance Corporation should be enabled to guarantee the repayment of loans from these sources as well.

Those are the four principal amendments that are being proposed.

I should like now to give the House some idea of the general picture of the working of the Development Finance Corporation. The general picture of the Development Finance Corporation since 1955 is as follows. The total investment of the corporation to date is approximately Rs. 36 million, as I stated earlier, inclusive of repayments and reinvestments. This is spread over 64 projects.

The broad areas of investment are as follows :

Beverages—Rs. 1.6 million
Building materials—Rs. 5.2 million
Electrical products—Rs. 2.108 million
Engineering—Rs. 2.3125 million
Large-scale Agriculture—Rs. 2.35 million
Metal Products—Rs. 1.275 million
Miscellaneous Chemical Products—Rs. 5.425 million
Miscellaneous Food Preparations—Rs. 2.25 million
Printing and Packaging—Rs. 1.88 million
Ready-made Garments—Rs. 4.345 million
Rubber Products—Rs. 2.3 million
Textiles—Rs. 2.5 million
Miscellaneous—Rs. 3.14 million

These investments have been judiciously made and the corporation has suffered no major loss in the course of its activities.

The profitability of the corporation's activities can be gauged from the fact that the corporation has paid income tax of approximately Rs. 4 million during the past ten years. The corporation was not able to pay dividends in the first three years of its operations, but from 1960 onwards it has paid dividends and in 1966, the dividends rate was 7 per cent.

It is expected that these amendments will enable the International Finance Corporation to make an in-

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

[ගරු වන්නිනායක]

vestment of approximately four million dollars in the Development Finance Corporation.

I move the Second Reading of this Bill.

ප්‍රශ්නය සභාගිමුඛ කරන ලදී.

வினு எடுத்தியம்பப்பெற்றது.

Question proposed.

පූ. භා. 10.25

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I am afraid the Hon. Minister is either very naive or he does not understand the gravity or the seriousness of his own Bill. It is not so innocuous as the Hon. Minister tries to make out. The one thing he should have explained to us was how for the first time in our Bills the Governor-General comes into the picture. How does the Governor-General come into the picture in regard to Bills for the first time in the history of this country ? That I thought was a very important change. The Hon. Minister might have tried to explain to this House how the Governor-General comes into the question of a Bill. Anyhow, that is not the only point that I want to urge.

The Development Finance Corporation, as pointed out by the Hon. Minister, was set up by an Act of this House. You find that in Chapter 165 of the Legislative Enactments. The Development Finance Corporation of Ceylon Act was first passed by this House on 4th October, 1955 ; at least it was promulgated and came into operation on the 4th of October, 1955, in the period of the U. N. P. Government.

What were the purposes of the Corporation ? The purposes were to assist in the establishment, expansion and modernization of private industrial and agricultural enterprises in Ceylon and to encourage and promote the participation of private capital, both internal and external, in such enterprises.

Now the whole purpose of that was to provide easier means of getting financial help for various private ventures in this country sponsored by various parties either as joint stock companies or as individual concerns. It made no distinction as between joint stock companies, limited liability companies and private individuals. To achieve this purpose the powers of the corporation were set out in Section 5 of the Act. Section 4 of this Act was amended in 1958, and the following addition was made :

" (2) Any industrial or agricultural enterprise in Ceylon in which the Government holds not more than twenty per centum of the capital shall, for the purposes of paragraph (*a*) of sub-section (1), be deemed to be a private industrial or agricultural enterprise in Ceylon. "

That made it possible for those other enterprises with which Government also was associated to get a certain amount of financial help. This amendment was brought by the late Mr. Bandaranaike's Government and moved by the then Finance Minister, Mr. Stanley de Zoysa. The earlier position was that only private enterprises could get assistance from this corporation. Now, even in the case of those enterprises where Government had a share which was not more than 20 per cent, it was possible for the Development Finance Corporation to come in and help.

What are the ways in which this help was rendered ? All that is set out in Section 5 of the original Act :

" (i) provide finance in the form of long-term or medium-term loans with or without security,..... "

The Hon. Minister might have informed us of the basis on which the 64 projects have been assisted in various ways. Is it on the basis of purchasing shares of the companies, or on the basis of outright loans with or without security ? Some loans have been given with security and some

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

without, depending, I suppose, upon the status and position of the individuals concerned.

Section 5 goes on to say :

" (ii) underwrite new issue of stocks, shares, bonds, debentures and other securities ; "

That is, if a new venture floats a company and shares are not purchased by the outside public, then by way of an additional guarantee or in order to fill in the gap, the Development Finance Corporation will come in and purchase the shares.

" (iii) guarantee loans from other private investment sources ; "

If a loan is granted by a private party to a company, that can be guaranteed, just like what Mercantile Credit does. This guarantees loans issued by various private parties.

" (iv) make funds available for reinvestment by selling any investments of the Corporation when and as appropriate ; "

This means that when the corporation has already made an investment it can be reinvested in any other company.

" (v) borrow funds for the purposes of the business of the Corporation from sources either in Ceylon or abroad and give security for any loans obtained ; "

There is provision here—that is why I am reading from the original Act—for the Development Finance Corporation to borrow money from abroad. There is no limitation placed upon the Development Finance Corporation to borrow any money they want from outside sources.

I shall presently show you that the original Act actually provided for the I.B.R.D.

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

(திரு. டீ. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்க—கைத் தொழில், கடற்றொழில் அமைச்சரின் பாராளு மன்றக் காரியதரிசி)

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

They have already done so in the past.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

They have already done so. Therefore when the Hon. Minister comes here he must justify the reasons for this addition. If it is purely a question of enlarging the quantum of money that they can borrow, instead of having an upper limit of Rs. 8 million, all that the Hon. Minister has to do is to increase the upper limit to Rs. 24 million. But he has gone very much beyond that, and I want to show him why he has done that.

There is no limitation on the activities of the corporation in so far as borrowing money from abroad is concerned. This is what Section 5 (v) of the Act says :

" borrow funds for the purposes of the business of the Corporation from sources either in Ceylon or abroad and give security for any loans obtained. "

Nor are there any restrictions by which the Corporation is limited to any particular type of loans from abroad. It can go to an institution, to any private party, or adopt any other means by which foreign monies can be obtained, maybe by means of debentures or any other means.

Section 5 (vi) is interesting : The corporation can

" furnish managerial, technical and administrative advice and assist in obtaining managerial, technical and administrative services to private industrial and agricultural enterprises in Ceylon ; "

That is one aspect on which we might have had some information from the Hon. Minister. Has this body been able to provide technical, managerial and administrative advice to any of the existing companies ? If so, to which companies have they provided this type of assistance ?

Section 5 (vii) says the corporation may—

" invest idle funds and reserves of the Corporation in idle securities ; "

and sub-section (ix) of the same section says that the Corporation may " acquire, hold, take or give on lease

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

[ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා]

or hire, mortgage, pledge and sell . . .". Now, that is all right. The rest of the powers of the corporation are also not bad. They can " give any guarantee or indemnity to, and enter into any arrangements with, the Government, any local authority, or any body corporate or other person, in order to obtain any rights, concessions and privileges that may seem to the corporation to be conducive to any object of the corporation". They can also, according to sub-section (xiii), make provision for the welfare of employees. That too is all right.

I am reading these sections out so as to point out to the Hon. Minister that the existing law is sufficiently wide and extensive, in fact, almost exhaustive, so far as the original purposes are concerned. But the Hon. Minister has now come before this House and wishes to go beyond the original purposes contemplated in the Act. And what does he start with ? The amendment of Section 4 is,

> " to assist in the promotion, establishment, expansion and modernization of private industrial, agricultural and commercial enterprises in Ceylon ".

Why has the Development Finance Corporation come into what is purely a speculative business of commerce ? Does the Hotels Corporation come within this Act, or does the question of import and export business come within this Act ? That is what the Hon. Minister did not make clear to this House and to this country. What are your limits ? What is this organization supposed to do ? Does it intend to enter into commercial enterprises in Ceylon ? That is not the purpose of a Development Finance Corporation.

I can understand the Development Finance Corporation coming into the picture if you say you are guaranteeing exports, speculative exports.— [*Interruption*]. Economic development ? I thought economic development is covered by your industrial and agricultural activities.

ගරු වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Commercial activities.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

But commercial activities are quite different. There is no limit to commercial activities because by that the whole business of imports and exports is caught up. This will apply even to the textile merchants. You might even find the *karavadu* business coming in. What is the name of the gentleman who owns a house like a ship ?

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.

(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

Boniface Fernando.

ගරු ඉරියගොල්ල

(கௌரவ ஈரியகொல்ல)

(The Hon. Iriyagolle)

His house remains. He is gone.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

We do not know how the house came into existence.

What is behind the intention of the Hon. Minister when he says, " We are extending the corporation's activities to commercial enterprises in Ceylon. " ? Mind you, that is one activity that you should have left completely alone. That is the job of the bank. Why is the Finance Corporation doing this ? That is precisely the job of the bank, because there the whole question of exchange transactions is involved, the whole question of bills of exchange is involved. You do not want the experts to do that. Your job is purely technical, to find out the feasibilities of industrial ventures, agricultural ventures, propositions where you can help. That is why I read out that

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

portion where it says, "To provide technical, managerical and administrative expertise." I can understand that.

The Finance Corporation is a solid institution; it is not entering into speculative transactions of the type that you have in commercial ventures. Here there is a certain amount of risk involved. I am not denying that. But that is different from the kind of speculation indulged in by commercial banks where price fluctuations occur from day to day, involving questions of foreign exchange. I do not think it is a wise move at all for this corporation to embark on this type of commercial enterprise.

The Hon. Minister will notice that the second sub-section makes appropriate changes again. For the words "any industrial or agricultural enterprise in Ceylon" you want to substitute the words, "Any industrial, agricultural or commercial enterprise in Ceylon". The whole thing is now broadened out. The original Section 4 is now being completely transformed. My grave objection is that the people who do commercial work and embarking on commercial enterprises are much more vociferous, much more, shall I say, pressing people. They are likely to bring more influence to bear on a corporation like the Finance Corporation and a good deal of the finances of the Development Finance Corporation will be absorbed by these commercial enterprises when in point of fact your money, your resources, should be diverted to the actual industrial and agricultural development of this country. That is why I am objecting to this. I think it is a wrong emphasis that is being put.

The whole purpose of this Finance Corporation was to encourage the industrial development of this country more than even the agricultural development, and that is the one thing that will now go by the board, because the people who are most capable of bringing the maximum amount of pressure to bear through, shall I say, lobbying of various types, will be people with commercial backing. They are the people who are likely to give a lopsided direction to this whole Finance Corporation of yours. This says, "Section 5 of the principal Act is hereby amended as follows:

In Clause 3 of this amending Bill, one amendment is:

> "in paragraph (iii) of that section, by the substitution, for the words 'from other private investment sources;', of the words 'from investment sources;;"

Now, Section 5 (iii) of the original Act says: "guarantee loans from other private investment sources". In other words, if a joint stock company wants to get financial assistance from any private investment source, that private investment source will say: We will give you the money that you require, provided you get the guarantee of the Development Finance Corporation—a government-backed institution. Why have you suddenly dropped the word "private" here? Obviously, the Minister is not thinking of the Development Finance Corporation guaranteeing loans granted by any public institution in this country, say, the Bank of Ceylon or the People's Bank. They do not want a guarantee from the Development Finance Corporation. The Bank of Ceylon, for instance, itself is a national institution, and therefore it has all the backing that you require. Why is it that the Minister has now decided to drop the word "private"? That is what is not clear to me. I want the Minister, instead of innocently sitting down and saying that this is a harmless Bill, and so on, to tell us the reason for dropping the word "private" here. If the Hon. Minister had devoted some time to giving us a real analysis of this whole Bill then we could have understood this.

The statement of legal effect says:—

> "(*d*) will enable the Corporation to guarantee loans made by State-owned financial institutions such as the Bank of Ceylon, the People's Bank and the Insurance Corporation of Ceylon."

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

[ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා]

Is that the reason why the word "private" has been dropped ? Surely, this Development Finance Corporation is not going to tie itself up with loans that national institutions are granting. Suppose a national institution grants a loan, say, to a brewery company or any other industrial venture. As you know, we produce almost all our requirements of barbed wire, nails, and so on. Suppose one of those institutions requires a loan from the Bank of Ceylon or the People's Bank. Is it necessary that the Development Finance Corporation should guarantee that loan ? Surely, the Bank of Ceylon is capable of studying the requirements, understanding the requirements of any firm, finding out the standing, the status, the financial position of the firm, and then granting the loan. Why is the Development Finance Corporation going to tie itself up on such a loan by guaranteeing it ? What does the guarantee mean ? How much interest is going to be charged in order to provide that guarantee, and why is this additional burden placed upon that firm ? The poor firm will have to pay an additional interest. Surely, the Bank can find out whether it is worth helping a particular firm or not. Surely that is not the reason. There is something behind this when you drop the word "private". The fact is that the Hon. Minister is not taking this country into his confidence.

The fact is you are going to guarantee loans from other financial institutions abroad. Those are the conditions under which the I. B. R. D. and other financial institutions abroad agreed to grant additional assistance to the Development Finance Corporation. Why does not the Minister tell us the truth ? That was a condition precedent to any further assistance to the Development Finance Corporation. That, in fact, is the truth. That is why the word "private" has been dropped, not because you want an additional guarantee from the Finance Corporation for loans granted by the People's Bank, the Insurance Corporation or the Bank of Ceylon. These national institutions require no further guarantees from another institution that is also sponsored by the State and where the major portion of the money is also found by the State. One national institution guaranteeing another national institution ! The thing is ridiculous. Obviously the answer is that the various banks and private institutions abroad are not prepared to give assistance other than on that basis. That is the basis on which they are prepared to do so and that is why the word "private" has been dropped. When you have the words "other investment sources" that includes mainly loans from abroad.

The first point is the tendency to widen the scope by bringing in commercial enterprises. The second point is we are not at all happy about the effort that you are now making in various ways to bring in American capital investment into this country. This is the thin end of the wedge. We are frightened, Sir, that we are going to get American investors here. If they are going to invest in this country we must have reasonable safeguards ; otherwise we shall have the same situation that you had and are having in a number of countries where economic exploitation is taking place. This economic exploitation, the neo-colonialism of the United States of America, might creep into Ceylon through your various corporations if you do not have the proper safeguards. That is what will happen. This is the thin end of the wedge so far as public institutions are concerned.

They are coming in and they will get a guarantee from the Government. They will come in and gradually this Finance Corporation might very well be the handmaid of the industrialists, speculators or investors of the United States of America. There is nothing to prevent that ; there is no limit to the kind of insidious intervention that will take place through this corporation.

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

As I said earlier, if the Hon. Minister came to this House and said that the amount of money left at the disposal of the Finance Corporation, the original Rs. 8 million, was not adequate and therefore we should please increase the amount, we would have had no objection at all. But all these other amendments make us suspect that there is something else. Obviously this is part and parcel of the Government's policy to become another South Vietnam. You are going to be ruled by the United States of America.

It is a very significant fact that the Malaysian dollar is the base of the most recent loan granted by the I.M.F. It is no longer the American dollar. What is the significance of that ? It shows how far and fast the Americans have infiltrated.

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.
(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்க)
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

Regional co-operation.

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

The American dollar becomes the great investor through the Malaysian dollar. The American dollar is now working in close co-operation with the Malaysian dollar.

This innocuous-looking Bill is, therefore, a far-reaching document affecting the economic development of this country.

In the light of this I strongly suspect the amendment to Section 5 proposed in Clause 3 whereby the following is sought to be added :

"nominate a representative of the Corporation to serve on the governing body of any enterprise in which the Corporation has a financial interest."

If the American investor did not come into the picture I would not have minded it, but in the light of what is happening I certainly suspect that amendment. It will be dangerous to allow the American tentacles to spread in this country.

I do not think anybody can seriously argue against the mere increase of the corporation's capital from Rs. 8 million to Rs. 24 million, because I think if the corporation wants any finances it should be provided in order to help the enterprises it serves. But what is now being contemplated is something quite different.

This is what Clause 5 of this Bill states :

"Section 9 of the principal Act is hereby amended in sub-section (5) of that section, by the substitution, for the words 'any private industrial or agricultural enterprise', of the words 'any private industrial, agricultural or commercial enterprice.'"

You will find that right along various attempts have been made to widen the scope of the corporation's activities and to upset the original intention of the principal Act.

You are also seeking to enlarge the number of directors ; the number is to be increased from six to eight.

I do not think there is any objection to increasing the period of repayment of the loan granted by the Government. I do not think anybody can seriously object to that.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the next important point is the amendment that is sought to be made to Section 14 of the principal Act.

Section 14 (1) of the original Act says :

"The Government is hereby authorized to guarantee, on such terms and conditions as the Government may determine, loans raised by the Corporation from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The loans authorized to be guaranteed under this subsection may be denominated in foreign currency. No guarantee shall be given under this subsection if the aggregate amount of all loans guaranteed under this subsection exceeds, or as a result of the loan to be guaranteed would exceed, the equivalent of twenty-four million rupees at the rate of exchange prevailing at the date of the loan agreement to which such guarantee would apply."

PUBLIC LIBRARY JAFFNA
Digitized by Noolaham Foundation.
noolaham.org | aavanaham.org

[ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා]

Now this sub-section is also to be amended :

"in sub-section (1) of that Section, by the substitutian,—

(*a*) for the words 'from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.' of the words 'from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, or from any other international or foreign organization approved by the Government.'."

Now, why art you permitting foreign organizations ?

Take an institution like the Irving Trust. It is a lending institution in the United States of America.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

It must be approved by the Government.

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

Yes. What is the difficulty of your approving the Irving Trust ? You have already approved in advance. The Government by agreeing to sponsor this Bill has approved in advance. Is the Hon. Minister saying, for instance, that if the Irving Trust which has so many American investments in so many countries applies to come in under this section, he would refuse it ?

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Why not ?

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

No. Obviously the whole purpose is to enable American investors to come into this country and come in with a double guarantee.

I can understand the I.B.R.D. which is a recognized world institution. That I can understand, bad enough as it is. A loan to Government I can understand. I can understand the I.B.R.D. granting loans to Government on a 50-year basis. Some of the loans granted by the I.B.R.D. have been very favourable like the loans to India, Pakistan and so on. But that is different. There you know the loan is granted to the Government. Here why is it that this Development Finance Corporation is now to have dealings with the I.B.R.D. and other foreign organizations ? "Approved by the Government" is only a cover. It means that the Government will not approve any other financial institution. Obviously, no Soviet financial institution will be approved by Government. You will sanction all the West German, American—

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Anything promoting the interests of the country.

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

Promoting the interests of the country through the American investors ! That makes a great deal of difference.

The Britishers, when they came here, were also promoting the interests of this country, but they did not hesitate to exploit us to the full. They were also promoting the interests of this country. The American investors also would come in in order to promote the interests of this country but in the end they will see that we are well and truly colonized under the new-colonialist system they have adopted.

ජයකොඩි මයා.
(திரு. ஜயக்கொடி)
(Mr. Jayakody)

Oil companies.

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

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

Yes, the oil companies also came in in our own interests for which we paid Rs. 50 million. Does the Hon. Minister know that for the original establishment of the oil companies, for the setting up of the tanks, we paid Rs. 50 million ? In the end you were so generous that you gave them more than what they asked for, after having set them going on the basis of money invested by us. All those tanks were put up by us. They exploited us for 65 years and at the end of it they were very much better off than before.

Anyhow, this is something to which we strongly object. We cannot possibly agree to the inclusion of "any other international or foreign organization approved by the Government." Section 14 provides for the I.B.R.D. to come in.

By the way, can the Hon. Minister tell us whether any money has been obtained from the I.B.R.D. ? I do not think so. Anyhow, why is it that the I.B.R.D. had hitherto not decided to give the Development Finance Corporation any help ? What makes the Hon. Minister think that they will now come in in order to help the Development Finance Corporation ? It is more likely that institutions like Irving Trust and such other investors will, under the double guarantee given by the Government, come in for this purpose.

This provision is very suspect so far as we are concerned. We are not at all happy about it.

May I draw the attention of the Hon. Minister to Sub-sections (2) (3) and (4) of Section 14 of the original Act ? What does Sub-section (2) say ?

"(2) All sums payable by the Government under any guarantee given under sub-section (1) "—

that is, to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development,

—"are hereby charged on the Consolidated Fund of Ceylon."

In other words, it is a charge on the revenue of this country. In a sense, the revenue of this country is being mortgaged to the I.B.R.D. This is under existing Section 14.

What does the Hon. Minister now do ? He is going to give that same guarantee or that same tie-up to any kind of foreign organization, as I mentioned earlier, like the Irving Trust in the United States. That same right will accrue to this private organization which is a purely investing organization—investing for the purpose of exploiting this country.

This is like giving the people who came here to start tea companies of various types a guarantee—not merely a Government guarantee but a promise—that any interest due to them and all sums payable to them will be a charge on the Consolidated Fund of Ceylon. Can the Hon. Minister seriously justify such a venture ?

Let me take an extreme case. Assume for a moment that the Development Finance Corporation finds itself in difficulties as a result of the various commercial enterprises that it has undertaken or assisted or promoted. Due to the fault of the Development Finance Corporation, why should the taxpayer be called upon to pay for what is really a private venture? Some finance organizations in the United States, for some reason unknown to us, may decide to come and join in a commercial enterprise, assisted by the Development Finance Corporation. But why are the taxpayers asked to foot that bill ? Suppose it goes wrong or something happens and the whole thing fails. Why is it that the taxpayers are to be called upon to foot that bill ? Under what conceivable or logical argument can you defend such a position ? Why are these people given a special privilege which does not accrue to any other investors ? I think it is a very serious matter for a Minister, without so much as an explanation by him, to come before this House and say that

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

[ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා]

we are committing the revenues of this country to purely speculative and maybe risky enterprises undertaken by various foreign organizations through the Development Finance Corporation. Why is our revenue held liable for all their commitments ?

Look at Sub-section (3) of Section 14 of the Act. This is what it says :

"All sums payable by the Corporation in respect of principal, interest and other charges on any loan to the Corporation from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development or by the Government under any guarantee given under subsection (1) shall, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in any law of Ceylon, be paid—

(a) without deduction for, and free from, any taxes duties or fees now or hereafter imposed by or under any law of Ceylon, and

(b) free from all restrictions now or hereafter imposed by or under any law of Ceylon."

In respect of principal, interest and other charges, all these private monopoly organizations—investing bodies —in the United States of America, or for that matter in Western Germany or even in England, will hereafter, in perpetuity, be free from all taxes, duties or fees imposed or to be imposed in the future by any Government of this country. That is what is provided for under Section 14. How can you justify these things ? How can the Hon. Minister justify the fact that he is binding the people of Ceylon in perpetuity to give a tax exemption to these various financial institutions ? Already, under Section 14, the I.B.R.D. is exempted, but why are the other purely private organizations brought in ? So far as we are concerned, we wish to say that, if ever the Opposition gets back to power, we will repudiate this Bill outright and without hesitation. Let the foreign investors know that we will not stand by one word of what is written here, that we may repudiate this one hundred per cent.

It was bad enough for this Government to have granted the Shell Company compensation free from all taxes. Believe me, that was not one of the things that they argued about with me for the whole of the six weeks I negotiated with them. It was understood clearly by them they would have to pay the normal taxes due to be paid by any person who got compensation in this country. But this Government was prepared to grant them their compensation entirely free of taxes.

And now they are going beyond that. Surely, if I am investing money in a venture, I must know that I am investing the money taking into consideration the taxation system that exists in this country. But why are you now exempting these people from any future tax, too, to be levied by any future Government in this country ? Can this Government tie posterity down ? I honestly do not understand this attitude of the Government. And the Hon. Minister gaily says that this is a harmless Bill ! I heard the hon. Parliamentary Secretary tell him to formally move the Second Reading and sit down, and here some of the most far-reaching proposals have been made, ostensibly in an innocuous Bill—something which has never happened in this country. Can the Hon. Minister seriously get up and tell me that there has been a single Bill passed in this House which guarantees for all time an exemption from taxes to be levied in the future ? When a Government raises loans, it can say they will be free of taxes. That I can understand. That often happens and it is understandable. But this is private parties giving a loan to another private—I may say, to a semi-government—institution. The Development Finance Corporation runs its own business in its own way and we have only a remote control over it.

As the Hon. Minister says, it has invested in 64 ventures. Some of them may be good and some of them may not be good—we do not know. But anyhow they have the freedom to invest in any particular corporation or any venture they think is feasible and reasonable. Maybe it is a mistake.

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

Suppose they do lose money? Why are we tying ourselves down for all time not to charge any interest on capital? For all time they are going to be free of all charges. That is a nice how-do-you-do! Can any investment be more gilt-edged than this? Can the Hon. Minister show me a single example from any part of the world where a private investor will have this amount of security?

Mind you, they are going in for equity shares. There is no limit placed upon the interest they might draw. What is the rate of interest? We do not know what rates of interest are going to be charged. But yet you are prepared to give them absolute freedom from all taxes, duties or fees, now or hereafter imposed by any laws of Ceylon.

That is not all. You also free them from all restrictions now or hereafter imposed under any laws of Ceylon: absolutely free, like a bird on the wing in the air.

After all, all these people are investing money in order to make profits. Why are you giving all this freedom?—[*Interruption*]. That is what I want to know. I can understand it if it is a loan granted to a government. Then you can say they may be free from tax. I can understand that.

Then you say that this is not a concession granted to the investor in Ceylon. A person who is investing money in Ceylon, even in government stock, is not free from any taxes that may be levied in the future. He is free from taxes that are to be levied now. Any day Parliament can say, from now onwards you will be taxed. But you are now trying, by giving this guarantee, to free these people from all taxes for all time, for the rest of history. This is like that entrenched clause of the Constitution, Clause 29, which cannot be amended even with the unanimous consent of the people of this country. It is most dangerous. These Ministers do not see or understand what they are doing, or they are just mortgaging this country for the fun of it. You are mortgaging this country.

ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්
(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)
(An hon. Member)

I would like to know who drafted this Bill.

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

Most probably the foreign investors themselves must have drafted this Bill.

Section 14 (5) of the original Act says:

"(5) Every guarantee agreement between the Government and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development pursuant to this Act and every guarantee given by the Government pursuant to any such guarantee agreement shall, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in any law of Ceylon, be valid and enforceable in accordance with their respective terms."

You see, these terms are enforceable in law "notwithstanding anything to the contrary in any law of Ceylon." And that covers not merely the I.B.R.D. That is my complaint. If you restrict yourselves to that I can understand this; the Minister can say that this has been going on and that he is not making any change. But when you bring in private investment organizations in the U.S.A. who really want to exploit us and grant them immunity from all taxes now and for generations yet to come, then the position is different.

Section 14 (6) says:

"(6) In the case of any loan made to the Corporation by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and guaranteed by the Government, the Government shall bear any loss, and be entitled to any profit, resulting from any revaluation of the Ceylon rupee in relation to the currency or currencies in which that loan is expressed."

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

[ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා]

They have everything on their side: losses covered, revalutation covered, immunity from taxes! What is it that they will lose?

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

They are exempted even from stamp fees and registration.

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

I do not understand this. Are you so bankrupt that you want to get money on any terms? I can understand if you tell the U.S.A.: "You take this country over and run it." But why are you maintaining this pretence that you are running this country? Why do you not write and say: "We give this whole country over to the American investor"?

This is now being amended right along. My objection to it is this. You leave out "from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development" and add the words "from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, or from any other international or foreign organization approved by the Government".

I must say, we strongly resist any attempt to bring in any such foreign body which is likely to be an exploitative body.

The next point I want to refer to is this. The Minister seeks to amend Section 14 in order to bring in these international and foreign organizations, and then he goes on to add a new sub-section which reads as follows:

"(7) The Governor-General, or any person authorized in that behalf by the Governor-General by instrument under his hand, is hereby empowered, on behalf of the Government, to sign any guarantee agreement between the Government and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development or any other international or foreign organization approved by the Government."

Now, will the Hon. Minister please explain why he is asking the Governor-General to sign guarantees for purely private institutions in the U.S.A.? Why are you bringing down the most cherished person in this country, the Governor-General, to the level of signing guarantee bonds for private organizations? For the first time in the history of this country, the Governor-General signs guarantee bonds!

ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්
(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)
(An hon. Member)

Shame!

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

The Governor-General does not even sign a treaty between this country and another. He is placed in a much lower level with regard to these foreign institutions. Why is it that the Minister of Finance cannot sign on behalf of the Government?

ටී. බී. ඉලංගරත්න මයා. (කොළොන්නාව)
(திரு. ரீ. பி. இலங்கரத்ன—கொலொன்னவ)
(Mr. T. B. Ilangaratne—Kolonnawa)

He is not acceptable.

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

These foreign investing organizations are so powerful that they have been able to impose such humiliating conditions on the Government of this country that the Governor-General has to sign bonds. They are not prepared to accept the word of this Government. What kind of Government have we got? Have we no sense of shame and self-respect in this country that we must bring down the status and position of the Governor-General by getting him to sign guarantee bonds? What are

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

these but mortgage bonds? What kind of Government is this that it has come down to this level? In no other Act have we got a provision in terms of which the Governor-General is called upon to sign a guarantee bond. Does the Monetary Act provide for it? The Central Bank negotiates loans and borrows money from various central banks in the world; foreign loans are raised by us; but the Governor-General does not sign any one of those documents. But why are you, in order to satisfy the Irving Trust and various other financial institutions in the United States, getting the Governor-General to sign guarantee bonds? This is most humiliating. What kind of thing is this? I do not understand this.

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary wanted this Bill to be passed without a discussion. He said, "It is formal". He was the person who said that. He said, "Let us just move it formally and go." "No, no" තමයි: මම අහගෙන හිටිය. This is what you have done: you have brought the prestige of the highest office in this country down to the lowest depths. Can you imagine the Governor-General signing උගස් ඔප්පු? That is what you are asking him to do. You are mortgaging this country and asking him to sign the guarantee agreements. Your foreign investors are not prepared to accept any name other than the Governor-General's name. Where do you get this type of procedure? Give me a single instance where the Governor-General has signed bonds for us. He does not sign even foreign treaties. Before I left the Ministry of Finance we got a credit loan of Rs. 250 million from East Germany and I signed the agreement on behalf of the Government. It was not the Governor-General who signed it. I believe you have signed many agreements in respect of loans raised. The Hon. Minister of State has signed agreements in respect of loans, but never the Governor-General.

If foreign governments are satisfied with the signatures of Ministers, why are these wretched institutions, the money-lending institutions of the United States of America, not satisfied with the signatures of our Ministers, but must have the Governor-General's signature? This is monstrous on the face of it. Must we demean ourselves to that extent? Have we no sense of self-respect at all? We may be beggars, but let us starve rather than stoop to this level for the purpose of getting a few dollars from the United States of America. Is this the level to which we have been reduced? I do not understand this.

Here is the Government asking us to endorse a Bill which provides that——

"The Governor-General, or any person authorized in that behalf by the Governor-General by instrument under his hand, is hereby empowered, on behalf of the Government, to sign any guarantee agreement between the Government and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development or any other international or foreign organization approved by the Government."

Why cannot the Minister sign it? Why should we get the Governor-General to sign it? What are the institutions that you have in mind apart from the kind of institutions mentioned now? There are plenty of banking institutions in the United States of America.

Please give me a single instance where we have got the Governor-General to sign an agreement of this nature with a foreign country or Government. We have signed a number of agreements with foreign countries. There have been credit agreements, not ones like this but running into millions. As I mentioned just now, we have signed a credit loan agreement with East Germany. It was not signed by the Governor-General but by me on behalf of the Ceylon Government. Why should we get the Governor-General to sign an agreement on behalf of the Government in this case? I must say this is really an insult to this country.

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

[ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා]

Let the Governor-General have nothing to do with this agreement. Surely a Minister can sign this agreement? Please delete the word "Governor-General" and instead have the word "Minister". Let us not demean ourselves to that extent. If we are hard up for money that is a different matter.

Clause 9 says :

"Section 18 of the principal Act is hereby amended as follows : "

Originally, the definition in the Interpretation Section was :

"'agricultural enterprise' means a large scale agricultural or live-stock enterprise operated on a commercial basis ; "

Now you are changing the definition. This is how you are changing the definition :

"in the definition of 'agricultural enterprise', by the substitution, for the words 'enterprise operated on a commercial basis ;' of the words 'enterprise operated by a limited liability company on a commercial basis ;' "

In other words that means that hereafter the Development Finance Corporation will not be in a position to give assistance to any private individual but only to a limited liability company. Is that the position? If the hon. Member for Deniyaya (Mr. C. N. Kannangara), who is an enterprising agriculturist, wants to borrow money from the Corporation he will not be able to do so because he is not a limited liability company. There are individuals in this country who engage themselves in industrial, commercial and agricultural enterprises who want help. Why should we not help them? Why introduce this unnecessary restriction?

These are all amendments that the Minister is introducing at the behest and the request of the American banker. That is the trouble. The Americans are now going to get a stranglehold on the Development Finance Corporation. That is the basis on which they are prepared to give assistance. I shall come to that point presently. That is why you are now bringing in the Governor-General into this matter.

Then, there is another amendment to section 18 in clause 9 :

"by the insertion, immediately after the definition of 'board of directors' of the following new definitions :—

'commercial enterprise' includes any large scale enterprise operated by a limited liability company, not falling within the description of an agricultural or industrial enterprise, which shall be conducive to the economic development of Ceylon . . . "

Everything is conducive to the economic development of Ceylon. Even your presence here is conducive to the economic development of Ceylon, according to you ; otherwise you will not be here. So there is nothing that is not conducive to the economic development of Ceylon. That is sufficiently wide to cover anything and everything.

But that is not the point. My point is that you are defining these enterprises to cover only limited liability companies. The purpose of the original Act was to help private individuals who are deserving of help. Limited liability companies and joint stock companies only do not run these enterprises. Are there not in this country private individuals who run these enterprises, particularly in agriculture? Why are you imposing this restriction?

This Bill has far-reaching consequences and I am sorry that we cannot endorse it. If the Minister confined this Bill merely to increasing the amount of the capital from Rs. 8 million to Rs. 24 million, we would not have had any objection. The Minister says that there is a good case to increase the share capital of the Corporation. We are prepared to agree. But the Bill has gone beyond that. As it is it is a different proposition altogether. You are bringing in outside countries without any reference and you are trying to bind future governments in this business. I see no reason to endorse this Bill as it stands.

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

Before I sit down, I wish to say this. Six months have passed after the Minister introduced his Budget. Where are we now ? The question is asked by every person, " What is the position of the country today ? Where do we stand ? What is our financial position ? "

On the last occasion when we raised this question the Minister said that he could not make another Budget speech. Why not ? You have made such fundamental changes in your financial structure that you are under an obligation to come before us and to tell us what is the position today in this country. You made a fundamental change when you knocked the bottom out of the G. P. S. Scheme. When you cut off one measure of rice from the poor people of this country, you made a considerable change in your whole economic system, because the whole system of subsidies has been now thrown to the winds. The Hon. Minister is under an obligation to tell this House and the country what the resultant financial position of this country is.

I am getting more and more perturbed. Here on one side you are talking about American money coming in and so on while my good Friend, the Hon. Minister of Industries and Fisheries, had something very vehement to say when he went before this wonderful body called the International Press Institute where they talked very big about the freedom of the press—the same people who have now kept in suppression the " Jana Dina " for one month without any reason whatever.

Freedom of the press for whom ? Is it only for one section of the people ? I suppose it is freedom only for the Lake House press and nobody else. About one hundred workers at " Jana Dina " are out of employment. The Government has taken its legal remedy also. We have no objection to that. Assume for a moment that the paper has committed some wrong : you have taken your legal remedy and charged them in the courts. Very good, we have no objection. But do not then adopt this hypocritical attitude of suppressing a whole paper—not only the paper but the whole press also—and then going before the International Press Institute and saying, " We saved this country ; we saved the freedom of the press ". Wonderful freedom this is ! Freedom for only some people in this country. Democracy is only for you.

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

You wanted to close down all newspapers.

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

That is all right. That is understandable. But we did not decide to close down only one section. That is the difference. We did not say, " Close down your paper only ". At no stage was it proposed by us to close down any paper. We decided to control. That is a different issue. But that is not what you are proposing now. Your own Minister is proposing to control the press. So, why are you talking so much ?

ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්
(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)
(An hon. Member)

The crackpot !

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

The crackpot !

This is what your Minister of Industries says—I want to know whether this is endorsed by the Government or not. Here the Hon. Minister, before an august foreign body—of all people international journalists —makes this statement :

" Experts from the World Bank come and tell us that unless we fulfil certain conditions they cannot give us aid. It is far better that they stay in their country and mind their own business. "

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

[ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා]

This is what your Minister of Industries is saying and you are bringing Bills here to get more and more money from America. Where do we stand ?

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Where is it said " America " ?

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

You are talking about foreign organizations. Will the Hon. Minister get up and say this is not meant for American investing organizations ? Please tell me. Why are you playing hide and seek with us ? Do not play hide and seek with us. Tell us honestly, through the I. B. R. D. and your other finance organizations, this is not meant for American organizations. Please do not try to mislead this country. If you want to get money from the United States of America, say so. Let us have a fair and square deal. Do not try to tell this country one thing and then do something else. That is not fair.

This is what your Minister is saying. I want to know whether you endorse this :

" It is far better that they stay in their country and mind their own business.

This is what the Minister of Industries and Fisheries, Mr. Philip Gunawardena, said yesterday at a dinner given in honour of the Asian Press delegates by the Kandy Municipality. "

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

You are reading it out of context.

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

I am reading out of context ? I am reading the whole thing and nothing out of context. Now you are wanting to defend your Minister, is it ?

Your Minister the other day praised some members of your corporations, and now suddenly they are dished. They have been all packed home.

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

No.

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

What do you say " no " ? You are shaking your head. Is Lakshman Rajapakse still continuing in the Textile Corporation ?—[*Interruption*]. I raised the question here on the Floor of the House and your Minister defended him. Do not shake your head. You have forgotten what I raised here.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

It was at that time.

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

It was before he was found out.

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

I am glad you admit that he has now been found out.—[*Interruption*]. In other words, it took you two years to learn what we told you two years ago.—[*Interruption*]. So much for your efficiency—never mind about the other things.

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

We act with consideration.

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

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

By the time you act with consideration it will also be time for you to pack up and go home.

ටී. බී. සුබසිංහ මයා. (කටුගම්පොළ)
(திரு. ரீ. பி. சுபசிங்க—கட்டுகம்பொள)
(Mr. T. B. Subasinghe—Katugampola)

I think it is about time they packed up.

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

This is what your Minister said :

" Rich countries do not know what to do with their money. World Bank experts come and tell us what to do. We know what to do if they would pay us a little more for our commodities. "

This is something I am prepared to endorse, but what is the Hon. Minister of Finance doing ? He is going a-begging. The Hon. Minister further said :

" We must stop begging from rich countries. "——

That is what your Minister of Industries is saying, and what the Hon. Minister of Finance is doing is that he is not only begging but he is also dragging the Governor-General along in the process of begging.

—" We must stop begging from rich countries. Countries in the Asian region should get together and compel the rich countries to pay more for our products. . . I am speaking as a member of the National Government. "

Is what has been stated by the Minister of Industries the policy of the Government, or is it what is in this Bill ? Which is it ? Surely, we are entitled to know what the policy of the Government is ? How many Ministers speak and in how many voices ?—[*Interruption*]. This Bill is an incentive to investment and, therefore, you are granting exemption from taxes also ?

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

We have to decide whether we should consider individual cases ; this is subject to approval by the Government.

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

Please, Mr. Minister. You have not read your Bill.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

They are not going to force their money on this country.

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

Section 14 says that every one of these loans will be free of interest and taxes now or hereafter imposed by or under any law of Ceylon. The moment you accept a loan that condition will operate. You cannot change that.—[*Interruption*]. Then do you think that this has been introduced for fun and not to get any loans ?

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

Investment loans.

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

This is what your Minister says :

" I am speaking as a member of the National Government. I am asking you who have come from various parts of Asia to go back and tell your people that it is time that the poor developing countries should trade on normal terms rather than go abegging.

" We are forced to beg from the so-called advanced countries who give us loans . . . "

You are now talking of investment loans.

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

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.
(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)
What can we do ?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා
(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)
Ah, that is a different proposition ! What can you do ? That solves the point. There is one thing which you can do. You can go home. There is nothing to prevent you from going home.

සුබසිංහ මයා.
(திரு. சுபசிங்க)
(Mr. Subasinghe)
When a Government says, "What can we do", it is time that they went home.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා
(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)
What did your Minister say ? He said :

"We are forced to beg from the so-called advanced countries who give us loans, aid and long-term credit so that we may re-equip our factories and provide clothing and shelter for our people. It is the dilemma in which we are now. We work hard and produce more but our purchasing power is not sufficient to buy the needs of our population.

The prices of our primary exports are falling."

The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene, Minister of State, had said that he agreed with the Hon. Minister of Industries and Fisheries and that trade and not aid was the panacea for our economic difficulties.—[*Interruption*]. This Bill is not for trade but for aid.

So, one Minister says, "We want trade and not aid", and another Minister says, "Do not go abegging. Ask the World Bank to stay and look after their business. We will look after our business." Then, why are you coming with this Bill to this House ?

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.
(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)
You cannot have development in water-tight compartments.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා
(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)
You cannot have development in water-tight compartments. Then what do you do ?

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.
(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)
Of course, you cannot.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා
(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)
Of course, you cannot ; but then, you do not need to go on bended knees to foreign countries for the purpose of getting their aid. We must know the Hon. Minister's views. He must give us a true picture of the position. That is my complaint. You are now speaking in different voices at different times. You say one thing for some to consume, and another thing for another party to consume. And you bring Bills which are a disgrace to this House.

Now, what does the Central Bank say ? Let us see what it has to say about the position in the country. That is why I say it is important for the Minister to tell us what the position is. I am going to read from the Central Bank Bulletin for December, 1966 :

"The first eleven months of 1966"—

By the way, the Central Bank Annual Report for 1966 should be here now. This is March. In previous years, by this time the Central Bank Report was out. This Bulletin is dated December, 1966, and this is the latest. It is two months out of date. The February Bulletin should be in our hands now.

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

සුබසිංහ මයා.
(திரு. சுபசிங்க)
(Mr. Subasinghe)

The Central Bank is hiding the truth.

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

Of course, it is hiding the truth. Do not shake your head. Hiding the truth on instructions !

This is what the December Bulletin says :

"The first eleven months of 1966 experienced a decline in money supply by Rs. 60.4 million or 3.5 per cent. as compared with an increase of Rs. 54.8 million or 3.4 per cent. during the corresponding period of the previous year."

So you have created a deflationary situation.

"The decline in external assets continued to be a prominent contractionary factor in money supply. The external assets of the banking system contracted by Rs. 186.9 million during the period under review as compared with an increase of Rs. 101.5 million during the same period of 1965."

That is your position.

"The second major contractionary factor under money supply was the increase of time and savings deposits in the private sector. The Government borrowings from the banking system continued to be the largest single expansionary factor on the money supply."

This Government, when in the Opposition, attacked the Minister of Finance many times for borrowing moneys from the banks. What are they doing now ? That is their main source of income today—borrowing money from the banks.

"The expansionary impact of the Government sector operations was more than double that of the same period of the previous year.

The term of trade as measured by the Central Bank trading indices deteriorated by 23.6 per cent. in October 1966 as compared with the same months in 1965."

23.6 per cent ! I think it is a record drop in the terms of trade.

"The cumulative trade position at the end of the first ten months of 1965 showed a deficit of Rs. 213.7 million as compared to a surplus of Rs. 436.3 million in the corresponding period of 1965. While the value of exports declined by Rs. 191.5 million, the value of imports increased by Rs. 458.5 million."

Do you not think that it is only proper that you should come before this House and explain the whole financial position to this country in the light of these things, instead of merely introducing Bills which all have a bearing on the financial position of this country ? Does not the Hon. Minister think that it is very important that he should come before this House and tell us what the true position of this country is ?

The summary for November 1966 says :

"Ceylon's gross external assets declined by Rs. 39.7 million in November 1966 to Rs. 313.5 million."

The Minister of Finance twitted me for leasing the external assets at Rs. 341 million during the period of the last Government. They talked about an empty coffer. I would like to ask how much emptier can empty be ? Your external assets are now at Rs. 313.1 million and you have a long way to go. You were very worried when it was Rs. 341 million.—[*Interruption*]. This is like your democracy. Democracy for you and dictatorship for the rest ! It goes on to say :

"The decline in external assets was comprised of a fall of Rs. 25.1 million in the foreign assets of the government, a fall of Rs. 10.3 million in the International Reserve of the Central Bank and a fall of Rs. 4.3 million in the foreign exchange holdings of the commercial banks."

It says again :

"During the period January-November 1966, Ceylon's gross external assets declined by Rs. 126.4 million. The decline in external assets was reflected mainly in the International Reserve of the Central Bank which fell by Rs. 138.8 million. In addition during this period Ceylon

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

[ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා]

borrowed net sums of Rs. 35.6 million from the International Monetary Fund and Rs. 41.5 million from other foreign sources respectively."

Notwithstanding these borrowings your net position is that you have a deficit of Rs. 138.8 million. Surely are you not under an obligation then to tell this House and this country what the true financial position is? You are in a pretty parlous situation. That is why you are making these unforgivable and inconceivable concessions to foreign and particularly American investors. The summary states further as follows :

"These borrowings helped considerably to support the International Reserve, specially in the second half of the period under review, when external assets began to decline more rapidly consequent on a sharp bunching of payments, particularly in the third quarter arising from the settlement of accumulated deferred liabilities on government account."

You have heavily borrowed from the International Monetary Fund.

I do not want to speak at length. But what I have stated is enough to indicate that this country and this Parliament view the present situation with the gravest disquiet. We are gravely concerned about the failure of this Government to tell the truth to the country. You have cut down on every conceivable article that you can think of. There has been a cut on all the food-stuffs ; even the quota of coriander that you give has been reduced by a further ounce, while for the Sinhalese New Year you have increased the quota of chillies. Coriander is something which every village child requires. Ask the mother behind you ; she knows. Next to milk, coriander is the most important thing for the village children. They cannot get milk food, and the mother that breast-feeds her child falls back upon coriander as the supplementary food for the child. Yet, this Government has reduced the quota from two ounces to one ounce. Why cannot this Government provide enough coriander? Coriander is available in plenty in the blackmarket.

ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

World shortage!

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

There is a world shortage in everything! The moment this Prime Minister comes into power there is a world shortage in rice!

Mr. Minister, you have a lot to explain. In fairness to the people of this country, you must, when you take such a measure as introducing a Bill of this type, explain why you are rushing through a measure like this which involves this country in permanent liability to foreign investors. Does not the Minister think that he has a lot to explain? Why is he doing this? It is incumbent on the Minister to tell the country : "This is the financial position of this country ; we are in a difficult position Therefore, we are providing this temporary measure—if you like." But this is not a temporary measure. This is getting on the statute book. It has far-reaching provisions in Clause 14 in particular I can understand if the Minister says that this is with regard to government to government loans. Then we can immunize those loans from taxes. But I do not see how the Minister can grant these immunities to private investors.

I regret very much to inform not only this Government but the country,—and let the foreign investors know—as I have already stated, that we will repudiate this law at the first opportunity we get. And we will endeavour to the best of our ability to remove all those vicious features, particularly the provision where you have brought the loftiest institution in this country to the lowest possible depth by dragging the Governor-General into signing guarantee bonds for foreign investors. We cannot possibly endorse the principle enshrined in this Bill.

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

කථානායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

The Sitting is suspended till 2 P.M. On resumption the Hon. Deputy Speaker will take the Chair.

රැස්වීම ඊට අනුකූලව නාවකාලිකව අත්සිටුවන ලදින්, අ. භා. 2ට නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායක තැන්පත් ඩී. එස්. ෂර්ලි කොරයා මහතාගේ සභාපතිත්වයෙන් නැවත පවත්වන ලදී.

இதன்படி அமர்வு பி.ப. 2 மணிவரை இடைநிறுத்தப்பட்டு, மீண்டும் ஆரம்பமாயிற்று, உப சபாநாயகர் [திரு. சீ. எஸ். ஷேளி கொறயா] தலைமை தாங்கினார்.

Sitting accordingly suspended till 2 P.M. *and then resumed,* MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER [MR. C. S. SHIRLEY COREA], *in the Chair.*

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்ணட் சொய்சா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera), who was the first speaker for the Opposition in this Debate has already dealt with some of the more important aspects of the Hon. Minister's Bill. The Bill in itself, on any first reading appears to be merely an extension of what was planned and thought of in 1955 when the Development Finance Corporation of Ceylon was first created. It would appear that this is merely an extension of what was then thought to be necessary and that this House and the country need have no fears regarding the possible consequences of the proposed Bill.

There are certain important differences, however, between what there was in 1955 and the situation today. A large number of features in respect of international finance and the manner of operation of metropolitan centres in regard to this part of the world have become evident over the past so many years since 1955. And even hon. Members on the other side who once had illusions regarding the benevolence of those who say that they want to assist us or claim to be wanting to assist us, have now begun to drop a number of those illusions. Persons in the colonial world or in the semi-colonial world have developed a cynicism in regard to professed intentions of goodwill on the part of the major capitalist powers. Their own behaviour in respect of one another has also not been one that is calculated to inspire confidence.

We are, in fact, today debating a Bill in a situation in which from 1955 to 1967 there has emerged upon the world scene a colossus, the capitalist colossus of the United States of America. This colossus which bestrides the world actually draws out of its own operation, both East and West, money, billions of dollars in earnings every year, and is now faced with the situation of not knowing what to do in order to re-invest that which cannot be spent. There is, therefore, on the part of the *enterpreneurs* of the giant monopolies of the United States a looking towards the still undeveloped lands of Asia and Africa and even the lands to the south of the United States in Latin America. Hungry glances are being cast in these directions, betraying a desire on the part of this giant to take into its maw all that can possibly be extracted from these parts of the world.

It is in that context that we are discussing this Bill, and if hon. Members of this House forget that background, we would be doing a tremendous disservice to this country. My fear is that, faced with certain financial difficulties, faced with the inability to find and mobilize the amount of capital considered to be necessary by our planners here in Ceylon, unable to find and mobilize that capital in the private sector, and acting in accordance with their own philosophy of extensive support for the private sector, the Government has rushed into this Bill without due consideration and without due thought being given to the possible long-term consequences of what they are planning to do.

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

[බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.]

Much has changed since 1955, and for this honourable House not to take note of those changes in giving assistance to the Minister in regard to the Government's fiscal and financial policies would be a grave dereliction of duty on the part of elected representatives.

I know that the Minister of Finance is a great admirer of British institutions. Two years ago at the annual general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association the Minister put up a spirited defence of the British Commonwealth of Nations. He struck out at a large number of persons, nobody knew who. It was a tremendous and spirited defence. But even those who are admirers of British institutions will not, having regard to the crisis through which Great Britain herself is passing today in respect of her own financial commitments to the United States, lightly commit themselves to the proposals envisaged in this particular Bill.

Whether the financing institution passes off under any one of these various titles of World Bank, I.B.R.D., I.M.F., O.E.C.D. and the like, it all comes down to this. The United States of America is the principal donor country. Next came Western Germany. Then you find others trailing behind. So that we are not concerned with the particular set of initials or the designation of the institution. It may be anything. The principal donor remains the same, and it is vis-a-vis this donor that the question arises not merely as a matter of financial policy in this country and of theories in regard to economic development but as a matter of international relations and the foreign policy of this country which is now in danger.

The Minister would probably in his reply mention the fact that when the original Act was passed in 1955 it was passed without a Division. nevertheless Hon. Members were suspicious even then. The present Hon. Leader of the House, the then Member for Polonnaruwa, the then Member for Kotte who is now His Excellency the Ambassador for Ceylon in the People's Republic of China, and also the hon. Member for Yatiyantota, who was then Member for Ruwanwella voiced a number of fears. But the fact remained that the Bill was passed without a division. And why? Because it was represented as merely a form of getting some capital investment in this country, that the commitments were nothing we need fear and that there was no reason at all why we should not enter upon this business of getting money from abroad if we could and at the same time set up a credit institution in this country for mobilizing credit within the country. It was painted in the first instance as a credit institution created primarily for the purpose of mobilizing capital resources within this country for development. That is how it was originally placed before Parliament.

Here is what the Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena, then Minister of Finance, the present Minister of Health, said in introducing the Bill in 1955 :

"This Bill proposes to fulfil one need, and that is to help industries to obtain finance which is so necessary."

Then, there was no talk of commerce and there was very little talk of agriculture. The talk was about industries. But very significantly in the section of definitions in that original Bill they omitted the definition of "industry". If you look through the new Clause 9 of the present Bill to amend Section 18 of the original Act, you will find that "industry" has been defined for the first time. It was not defined in the original Act, but the Hon. Minister of Finance of that day said :

"This Bill proposes to fulfil one need, and that is to help industries to obtain finance which is so necessary. So far, our banks have been interested only in helping our export industries by giving them short-term credit. It is essential that we

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

should have a credit institution which would lend money for long periods. Hon. Members may say that there is the Agricultural and Industrial Credit Corporation. But the finances of that Corporation are not sufficient to finance industries of a big nature. Further the Corporation makes loans direct, gives direct advances.

We propose by the Development Finance Corporation to go one step further. That is, the Development Finance Corporation would be entitled, under the law, to buy shares in these new ventures. In buying shares in new ventures, the Corporation helps in two ways. If you give a direct loan to a nascent industry, it might find difficulty in paying the interest for the first few years of its existence. So, we have considered that it is far more essential, instead of giving a direct loan, for the Development Finance Corporation to buy shares. Then not only will the Corporation give certain stability to the industry but also be able to guide it. The Government has accepted this position."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 18th August 1955; Vol. 22, cc. 2138-9.]

This was the philosophy that animated the Hon. Minister of Finance at that time and he did not hide the fact that he was falling in line with the recommendations of the World Bank. The World Bank Mission Report had made certain recommendations, and the establishment of the Development Finance Corporation was the creation of a finance corporation tailor-made to suit the needs of the World Bank recommendations.

Here is what the World Bank Mission said, which the Hon. Minister quoted :

"'We believe that there is need for new institutional machinery through which government initiative based on the broad social needs of the country may play its part alongside private business interests; but we are convinced that, if efficient enterprises are to be created, this initiative must take a form other than direct operation of factories by government departments. Moreover, although government may play a useful role in getting such enterprises started, once they are launched they should be given maximum freedom to develop by themselves.'"

I would like to draw the attention of this honourable House through you to this particular sentence :

"....needs of the country may play its part alongside private business interests; ....."

and they are convinced that if efficient enterprises are to be created, this initiative must take a form other than direct operation of factories by government departments. I shall come back to this particular philosophy later.

This is based also on what Mr. Gunasena de Zoysa had said when he functioned on a committee. This is what the then Minister of Finance said in reply to the then Member for Ruwanwella, now the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) :—

"We have for several reasons accepted, as a policy, that Government should not undertake any industrial enterprises but that it should help private enterprise to do so. In coming to that conclusion we have been fortified by the findings of the Gunasena de Zoysa Committee which investigated Government industrial undertakings."

What were these industrial undertakings ? They were the paper factory, the glass factory, the cement factory which was opened three times by the hon. Member for Jaffna (Mr. Ponnambalam) when he was Minister. He was also once depicted in a cartoon in the "Times of Ceylon" with the various factories put in the boot of his car, in which he sat himself down comfortably in the rear seat, saying "Home, James" !

The various factories that were set up in the Northern and Eastern Provinces at that time were examined. At that time even the Kottukachchiya farm was considered an industrial undertaking by the U. N. P. Government of that day. The ceramic factory which is nearer home to you, and all these industrial enterprises were examined by Mr. Gunasena de Zoysa who came to the melancholy conclusion that the government cannot run industrial undertakings and that the private sector must be asked to do it. This theory has been effectively disproved.

However, in order to enable the private sector to do what they said the government could not, they were

Digitized by Noolaham Foundation
noolaham.org | aavanaham.org

[බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.]

going to provide the necessary finances, in addition to the Agricultural and Industrial Credit Corporation, through the Development Finance Corporation, and pump into the private sector Rs. 16 million. That, Sir, is what the Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena set out to do.

Before the corporation commenced business it was stipulated that 60 per cent. of the shares should be allocated to Ceylonese investors and 40 per cent may be taken up by foreign commercial banks and insurance companies operating in Ceylon.

In regard to this matter the Hon. Minister has not told us whether this position was reached or not. We do not know. There was an authorised capital of Rs. 8 million, divided into 80,000 shares of Rs. 100 each. What amount was subscribed and what was not is not even stated in the Central Bank Report. That was a matter which was kept secret, known only to the Treasury and the Minister of Finance, and possibly to the Cabinet. I do not know whether those who held ministerial office in the last Government are in a position to enlighten us. I do not know myself.

If you examine this whole question in relation to what was originally intended, then we come back to what Mr. M. D. H. Jayawardena said. This is what he said in regard to the loan that the Government was giving :

"In our case, instead of obtaining money under the Colombo Plan, we are taking this money out of the Consolidated Fund, namely Rs. 16 million, and giving it to the Corporation as an interest free loan for fifteen years,"—

That is to be stretched out now to twenty-five years, by the addition of another ten years.

—"and thereafter it will have to be repaid at the rate of Rs. 1 million a year."

This was a corporation which was supposed to be a combination of a number fo firms, of corporate bodies, functioning in the private sector.

"As long as that money is given in the form of a loan the Government will have some control over it because the Government will have one Director on it."

This is the statement by the then Minister of Finance.

The Act provides that so long as there is a loan from the Government there will be one Government Director. Originally, the number was one out of four directors ; now, it will be one out of six directors. As you increase the commitments of Government, as you increase the amount of the authorized capital of the concern, the Government's representative on the board of directors gets reduced proportionately ! You had Rs. 16 million— I do not know how much has been repaid or whether anything has been repaid. And when you are extending the term of repayment of that loan by another ten years, you proportionately reduce the Government's influence to that extent by saying, where you originally had one out of four directors, you will now have one out of six. But, Sir, this is how the then Hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. M. D. H. Jayawardena) defended the Bill : "As long as that money is given in the form of a loan the Government will have some control over the Corporation because the Government will have one director in it."

By that very argument, the Hon. Minister will now have less control over the destinies of this corporation than he had before, and he is planning to have less control over it. This is not an accidental consequence ; it is the deliberate intention of the Government. That, Sir, is one of the evil features of this Bill.

Then I come to the World Bank which dominates our economy in this way. The Hon. Prime Minister the other day announced with satisfaction that the World Bank is now happy that money in this country is being diverted from consumption to investment projects. And spelling the abandonment of the original conception of the welfare state of the United National Party Government

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

of 1947, or the distortion of that conception of a welfare state which they got from the later economists of the Central Bank who had their education in the London School of Economics, the 'do-gooders' of the Central Bank, who advised the United National Party Government to formulate the policy of the welfare state with the particular trimmings that they gave to it in this country, the Hon. Prime Minister said, "The World Bank wanted us to have a credit squeeze. We squeezed the people in that way. They wanted a credit squeeze and we did it." So that, there has been practically a freezing of wages in this country, a drying up of the sources from which the small man obtains loans: the People's Bank and the like and the credit institutions which were giving money to the small man. All these things were done at the dictates of the World Bank. He is going into reverse gear in regard to the philosophy of the welfare state. And he announced with satisfaction, "We have done all these things to please them, and therefore we should now be in a position to get the money we want."

He went further thereafter and introduced the rice cut, a great controversial issue. The rice which he gave in March 1960—unasked,—he takes back in 1967 in the face of opposition! Why? The World Bank wanted that done.

And now he is expecting aid. Did he get it? Will he get it? Has he got it? On that question the Hon. Minister of Finance refuses to answer. He has not got it, and there does not seem to be the slightest prospect of his getting it. So now he wants aid to be given to the private sector by way of loans. That is the truth of the matter. Without the necessary political commitments—it is our case against this government that they have gone far in that direction already—without the complete political subjection which is demanded you are not going to get the aid that you want. We know how the Americans have told them, "Friendship is friendship. Business is business. If you can abandon all your talk of non-alignment and the like and be our friend, we will give you all that you want on account of friendship. But if you want to do business that is another matter."

The Government is going far in that direction. But it has not reached the total commitment in that matter which has been required by the Americans and therefore there does not seem to be any prospect of aid of the extent they want. They gave the Hon. Minister of Finance a dubious gift the other day; a few million dollars were given and at the same time they brought down the price of our rubber, by releasing out of their stockpile a quantity of rubber into the market to compete with our rubber and depress the prices, so that every cent of the dollars given may be wiped out on that deficit. But we will be saddling the generation to come with the repayment of that loan with interest. That is how Uncle Sam has been treating the Hon. Minister of Finance, Uncle Wannie. Despite the sense of satisfaction with which the Prime Minister announced the other day, "We have done these things that were required of us," what next? Here is what the Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardene, the then Finance Minister in 1955 stated:

"You will be happy to know that most of the recommendations contained in the World Bank Report have now been implemented."—

ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්
(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)
(An hon. Member)

In which year?

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னட் சொய்சா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

This was in 1955 when the Act was first discussed. He goes on to say as follows:

"Firstly we have the Planning Secretariat and the Planning Committee of the Cabinet; then there is the Institute of Scientific and Industrial Research to give

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

[බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.]

technical advice in regard to industries, and now we are setting up this Development Finance Corporation which is to finance new industries. So that, one can feel happy that as far as the Government is concerned, it has done everything that a Government could be expected to do in order to help the industries, firstly, in giving money, and secondly in giving technical advice. So that, this Bill marks an important milestone in the history of the development of this country."—OFFICIAL REPORT, 18th August 1955, Vol. 22, c. 2144.).

They were brave words in 1955, and since that time what did the Planning Secretariat do? They planned and produced the so-called Six-Year Plan, they modified that into a Ten-Year Plan and at the end of it there was no plan. And in 1956 the Planning Secretariat had to sit down again and draft a new plan, revising not merely the very targets but the very basis of what was originally announced as the U. N. P. Government's Six-Year Plan. They had the Planning Secretariat, they had the Planning Committee of the Cabinet, but what did they achieve? They got together the undigested reports of the various Ministries, put all that together in what is commonly known in our country as the "*pissige palamalla*", and said "Here is our plan". That was planning in those days. They created the credit institution and the Hon. Minister today read a melancholy list of these various enterprises that had been assisted.

The Hon. Minister and this Government should realize that this whole question of the development of industries in this country has not followed the intentions or the plans of any of these Governments. There was a belief that they had only to create a favourable atmosphere and if you create that atmosphere industries were bound to develop, the *entrepreneurs* in the private sector were going to develop this country.

The other part of the philosophy was that if you give tax concessions, those concessions would act as stimuli in order to entice people on towards development. So you had a wide variety of tax concessions. The Inland Revenue Act for years was loaded with a number of contradictory clauses: Some in which you are trying to take money out of the man's pocket, and others in which you are trying to put it back again. On the one side, Ministers of Finance were trying to tighten the screw and get a little bit more by way of taxation, and at the same time they were unloosening other screws elsewhere! There are a large number of contradictory clauses like that: your development rebates, lump sum depreciation allowances—a whole range of them. I do not want to recite the entire lot.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

A Taxation Commission is sitting.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்ணட் சொய்சா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

The Taxation Commission is going to recast the whole thing! We had the same thing recast once by Mr. Kaldor, and he did something which was worth while, I do not agree entirely with the Kaldor scheme, but he said: You are not going to induce the capitalists to develop this country with these various concessions; you must drive them into doing it. And for the purpose of driving them into doing it, he put a penalty upon gifts, a penalty upon expenditure; and he said: We will now give you the inducements in regard to development. There was an expenditure tax, a gift tax, and the like, and in order to prevent the money going into those various channels he introduced a penalty tax, and said: Now you put your money into development. What happened? Kaldor himself has mentioned how in every country in which he had put forward that scheme the vested interests got together in order to sabotage the scheme completely.

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

The Hon. Minister's first Budget spelt the death-knell of the Kaldor scheme. That was the end of it, and he, inspired no doubt by the present Commissioner of Inland Revenue, formulated a new scheme of inducements, the approved investment scheme, to help the private sector once again, and substituted the carrot for the goad. I am asking the Hon. Minister: How much development have you got out of all this from the private sector ? The Hon. Minister does not even deign to listen. The basic fact remains that until the hon. Member for Dompe as Minister of Finance introduced all the curbs upon imports into this country and created a situation in which import substitution was profitable, until then not one single *entrepreneur* wanted to step into the industrial field—not your inducement or penalties, not your carrots or your goad, neither functioned until the situation was created for import substitution.

We are still proud of that degree of industrial development that took place. But let us not make a mistake. The specific gravity of that even degree of development that took place in the total economy is negligible. Let us also admit that. We are glad that some degree of industrial development took place; we are glad that import substitution industries were started in this country despite the racketeering that took place alongside of it, despite the highway robbery that went alongside of it, despite the various captains of industry who grew up in various places; despite all that, we are glad of that industrial development and the production of certain things in this country which need not be imported from outside. But the specific gravity of the totality of that development in our economy is not worth talking about.

I am asking this Government which was committed to the development of the private sector—it has now been two years in office—What has been added to the totality of that production of the Government that preceded you ?

පී. ජී. බී. කෙනමන් මයා. (මැද කොළඹ තුන්වන මන්ත්‍රී)

(திரு. பீ. ஜீ. பி. கெனமன்—கொழும்பு மத்தி மூன்றும் அங்கத்தவர்)

(Mr. P. G. B. Keuneman—Third Colombo Central)

Zero !

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்சா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

The Minister of Industries and his Parliamentary Secretary can enlighten you. Nothing worth while. You have duplicated certain things that need not have been duplicated. There was a policy in the planning section of the Industries Department, of temporarily, for the purpose of developing an industry, creating a monopoly situation. You do not put several persons into competition with one another and thereby discourage them from proceeding. That has been abandoned. For whom ? For the favoured vested interests that support the United National Party.

In that competition even the brother of the Hon. Prime Minister suffered, as far as the Minister of Industries is concerned, where he had entered into competition—[*Interruption*]. No, Sir. That is the tale of industrial development in this country.

I am asking you to measure that up against what the Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena said in 1955. He said : " We have satisfied the World Bank ; we have created the necessary conditions they have asked us to create in this country for industrial development." This is what he said :

> "You will be happy to know that most of the recommendations contained in the World Bank Report have now been implemented."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 18th August 1955 ; Vol. 22, c. 2144.]

He spoke in that strain. He expected development ; he expected money from outside. What happened ? No money came from outside ; there was no development.—[*Interruption*]. That also happened He did not come back.

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

[බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.]

Now, we have gone back again to the same position. For nine years that Hon. Minister of Finance of that Government was in the political desert, and now he has come back to shoulder the problem of health. The present Minister of Finance has been brought down here from the Upper House of those days to shoulder the problems of finance in this country. The Hon. Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance have gone back—the entire circle is complete—once again to this philosophy of satisfying the World Bank. The Prime Minister says, "We have done all that they wanted us to do. We had a credit squeeze, we have frozen wages and we have cut the rice ration. We have done all these things. We may get the money now. There is going to be development." Sir, it is a repetition, going back to the same old philosophy, the same position, the same anticipation and the same attitude of 1955, with the same results.

Now, Sir, this is what the then Member for Kotte (Mr. D. B. R. Gunawardena), now His Excellency the Ambassador for Ceylon in the People's Republic of China, said :

"We are not greatly concerned about foreign capital coming in, but our fear is that most of the controlling powers in this Corporation will go to big agencies."—

Prophetic fears, Sir !

Then he went on to say :

—"We have at the moment various irrigation schemes in the Island on which Government has spent millions and millions of rupees. It was only recently that we handed over 1,000 acres in the Gal Oya Valley to a special company."—

That has been repeated.

——"Now, these foreign companies will come into this corporation, buy up the shares and eventually end up in controlling most of the industries in this country once again.—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 18th August 1955 ; Vol. 22, c. 2149-50.]

කෙනමන් මයා.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

The prophet without honour in his own country !

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னட் சொய்சா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

I presume he has obtained the necessary recognition elsewhere.

This is what the then Member for Polonnaruwa and now the Hon. Leader of the House said. He wanted an explanation from the Minister of Finance of that day. He did not get it. He says :

".... Clause 4 (b) of the Bill which states :

'to encourage and promote the participation of private capital, both internal and external, in such enterprises.'

What exactly does "participation of private capital, both internal and external, in such enterprises" mean ?"

He wanted an answer to that question. He did not get it, and what he said remains true today.

—"Thre is however no provision in the Bill for Government to control the directors in the event of a majority of the directors appointed by the shareholders disagreeing with the Government director, even though Government has given a loan of Rs. 16 million."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 18th August 1955 ; Vol. 22, c. 2150-51.]

What have you to say to that ? This is what the Hon. Leader of the House said : "You have only one director and you have no means in the event of a disagreement between that director and the others of influencing the decision of the corporation".

Now, Sir, that was a statement of what was expected by Government in 1955, and experience has shown to what extent those expectations have been belied. The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena thought this was going to be superior as a credit institution to the Agricultural and Industrial Credit Corporation on two points. One was that the Development Finance Corporation would buy shares in new enterprises ; the other was that it would have more money at its disposal for the purpose of granting loans.

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

I now refer to the Central Bank Bulletin for December 1966. According to Table 13, which relates to the Agricultural and Industrial Credit Corporation, for the period 1944-45 the total loans outstanding at the end of the period, represented in rupees thousand, amounted to 3,643 ; in 1947-48 it amounted to 8,256, and so on, and it went on rising till in November 1966 the amount remained at 32,008, that is, Rs. 32,008,000. Let us compare this with the Development Finance Corporation. In units of rupees thousand, the total loans and equities outstanding in 1957 amounted to 1,001, that is, Rs. 1,001,000. At the end of November 1966 the total loans and equities outstanding amounted to 28,942.

I mentioned this for this reason. The Minister of Finance of that day expected that this new credit institution would be one that could mobilize much larger resources. All these expectations have proved unfruitful.

What are the important amendments that the Minister of Finance has made since the position emerged as in 1955 ? There was one significant amendment made in 1958 by the Hon. Stanley de Zoysa as Minister of Finance. A definition was required of what is considered to be "private enterprise." They then introduced into the Act an amendment which said that any corporate body which has less than 20 per cent Government shareholdings will be considered to be a private enterprise. In other words, if Government holdings in any concern are over 20 per cent. that enterprise would not be entitled to be financed by the Development Finance Corporation. That limitation was brought by the Hon. Stanley de Zoysa in 1958. We are operating with that limitation today. That amendment to the Act was made at the request of the then directors of the Development Finance Corporation, as it was said, "in order to make the Act workable." Some of the present amendments of the Minister of Finance are also being brought in "in order to make the Act workable." This Act was passed in 1955, but we are still tinkering with it in 1967 to make it workable. What is wrong is not with the Act. The objective situation in this country does not permit this kind of thing to thrive. That is the situation.

What are the amendments you are bringing ? The first is the addition of commercial enterprises. What is a commercial enterprise ? A commercial enterprise is defined here thus :

"'commercial enterprise' includes any large scale enterprise operated by a limited liability company, not falling within the description of an agricultural or industrial enterprise, which shall be conducive to the economic development of Ceylon."

The commercial enterprise, first of all, has to be conducive to the economic development of Ceylon, and anything that is conducive to the economic development of Ceylon which is not industrial and not agricultural is commercial. That which is not agricultural or industrial is commercial. That is what it means. Now this is a very curious thing.

How do you define "industrial enterprise" ? "Industrial enterprise" is defined for the first time in this amending Bill. The original Act was to promote industries, but there is no definition of "industry" in the Act. It is defined for the first time in this Bill. This is what it says :

"'industrial enterprise' means a large scale enterprise for productive purpose.."

The same basis on which the Kottukachchiya Farm was considered to be an industrial enterprise by a previous U.N.P. Government ! The Kottukachchiya Farm was considered an industrial enterprise by a previous U.N.P. Government !

"'industrial enterprise' means a large scale enterprise for a productive purpose ...."

An industrial enterprise—how is that different from agriculture ? Is agriculture not for production ?

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

[බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.]

Here is the snag.

"'industrial enterprise' means a large scale enterprise for a productive purpose operated by a limited liability company on a commercial basis."

But a commercial enterprise is that which is not an industrial enterprise and not an agricultural enterprise. An industrial enterprise is a productive enterprise operated on a commercial basis, an agricultural enterprise is operated on a commercial basis, and a commercial enterprise is that which is neither agricultural nor industrial. This is a very strange way of defining things, and commercial enterprise has been brought in for the first time.

Private commercial enterprises are to be assisted by this Development Finance Corporation. So, this is not the Minister of Finance going to the assistance of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries. He is being left out in the cold. The principal object of this Bill is to go to the assistance of the Hon. Doctor in the other place and the Hon. Minister of State in some of his enterprises. Your Hotels Corporation, tourism—I do not know whether they are considered productive. Is tourism considered productive?

I was in Yugoslavia in the popular Tourist Centre known as Dubrovnik. There was a waiter employed in one of those hotels on whose behalf maintenance had to be paid to three different countries by the Government of Yugoslavia. There were five separate ladies who were requiring maintenance to be paid in internationally instituted actions on the basis that he was the parent of a child, but since the Yugoslavian law says that the amount that can be deducted from an employee's wages is only so much the Government of Yugoslavia has now been saddled with the burden of payment of maintenance on behalf of his children. He had been so productive. He had been very very productive. That is obviously a large scale enterprise. It was an international operation. The amount had to be paid in five different countries.

I just do not know what exactly the Hon. Minister is going to assist. He would not take us into his confidence. What was the necessity of bringing in a commercial enterprise at this stage and defining it in this way? Why cannot he take us into his confidence? He made a speech for ten minutes in introducing this Bill. What are these enterprises? Why are you broadening the spectrum of your activities? What is it that has been left out from the point of view of being financed by this Development Finance Corporation which you want to bring in now? Why does he not tell us? What are the enterprises that come within the definition of "commerce"? I am prepared to give way to the Hon. Minister if he will mention one.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I will give my reply.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னட் சொய்சா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

What is the use of our having the information when you reply? We cannot do anything about it.

I am intrigued by this definition of "commerce" and by this new definition of "industry". All the activities of the Hon. Minister of Education can be defined as industrial enterprises according to this Bill. His would be a large-scale enterprise for a productive purpose. Only the liability is not limited. Other than that the activities of the Hon. Minister of Education in education come within this definition.

This is doing violence to the English language, apart from anything else. It does not matter what he produces or how he produces it.

ජයකොඩි මයා.
(திரு. ஜயக்கொடி)
(Mr. Jayakody)

What about massage clinics?

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

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்சா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Now, Sir, Section 5 of the original Act is to be amended in order to increase the possibility of guaranteeing loans from outside to this corporation. The original Act in section 5, sub-section 3, says :

"guarantee loans from other private investment sources ; "

In this new Bill the word "private" is dropped. Why ? Is it in order to conform to what is stated in the Statement of Legal Effect, namely :

"will enable the Corporation to guarantee loans made by State-owned financial institutions such as the Bank of Ceylon, the People's Bank and the Insurance Corporation of Ceylon." ?

Is that your intention ? Why should the Development Finance Corporation which is operating on a government loan and which may have to get loans from outside, guarantee loans given to private enterprise by a bank ?

Now, Sir, there is this very curious thing : The question of the guaranteeing of loans from other private investment sources is not merely a matter for the future ; you can step in and guarantee a loan that has already been given.

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.
(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)
(Mr Shelton Jayasinghe)
Like Mercantile Credit.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்சா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Yes, Sir. You can guarantee a loan that has already been granted, as the hon. Parliamentary Secretary pointed out, from any one of these private sources. Private sources are included. So, it has been broadened to include what ? We do not know what it proposes to include. This does not exclude the private lending enterprises although the word "private" has been dropped. What else are you trying to bring in ? That is one difficulty we have. The Hon. Minister did not tell us what it was. In fact he wants to bring in the foreign lending agencies.

Then Clause 3 (2) is again to amend Section 5, by the introduction of a new sub-section (iiia) which will give this Development Finance Corporation the right to "nominate a representative of the corporation to serve on the governing body of any enterprise in which the corporation has a financial interest." You will have the right to nominate a representative of the corporation to serve on the governing body of any enterprise in which the corporation has a financial interest.

කෙනමන් මයා.
(திரு. கெனமன்)
(Mr. Keuneman)
There is no Quorum, Sir.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා
(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)
There is a Quorum.

කෙනමන් මයා.
(திரு. கெனமன்)
(Mr. Keuneman)
Surprising ! It must be on this side of the House in that case.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்சா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

I say that this Section is unworkable. You are taking upon yourself the right to nominate a representative. What happens to the Articles of Association of that firm ?

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

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

They have not a chance.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்சா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

What happens to the Articles of Association which are valid under the Companies Act? How are you going to insert this representative of yours into its governing body irrespective of what the Articles define as the governing body? I know of a limited liability company, a private limited liability company which is not excluded under the provisions of this corporation. The limited liability company can be either a public company or a private company. I know of a private limited liability company which has a board of directors, and over and above that board of directors there are two governing directors who have overriding powers over the board of directors. It is a company registered under the Companies Ordinance.

When the Hon. Minister says that he must nominate a representative to serve on the governing body, what does he mean by that? Does he mean the board of directors as constituted by the Articles of Association or does he mean that he is going to add another governing director to the two provided for in the Articles of Association to be among the governing directors? I trust the Hon. Minister is listening to what I say and he will do something at the Committee stage to amend this Bill because this new sub-clause (iiia) cannot be operated at all. It is an unworkable clause.

This Government has distinguished itself by bringing in all kinds of Bills here, which have not been duly considered. It was only the other day that the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Local Government brought a Bill to extend the life of members of local authorities by one year, and he called it a Bill to extend the life of local authorities. If this matter had not been pointed out, the Bill would have been unworkable. We are conscious of our duty as hon. Members here. If it was our intention to sabotage that Bill the best way to have done it would have been to keep silent and to allow the Bill to become law as it stood. It could then never have been operated on without a further amending Bill being brought here. But as I said we are conscious of our duty as Members of this House. And therefore I pointed out the defect which was remedied.

Now, the Hon. Minister brings this Bill. This Clause is to Inspire confidence in the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and so on. A representative of the corporation is to serve on the governing body of any enterprise in which the corporation has a financial interest. But he has brought in this clause which cannot be worked. The law of the land as it is today does not allow what has been suggested to happen.

Then, Clause 4 says that Section 7 of the principal Act is to be amended in order to increase the capital from Rs. 8 million to Rs. 24 million. The Government is very fond of the figure three. It multiplies everything by three. In the course of this Bill, I will explain elsewhere that everything is multiplied by three.—[*Interruption*]. We know that you have your own fertility symbol. Please spare this House the repetition of those matters.

The Hon. Minister has increased the figure from 8 to 24. But there are a number of consequential amendments that have not been thought of. Now if you read this Clause providing Rs. 24 million together with the clause which requires that 60 per cent. of it shall be subscribed before the corporation can function, how are you going to tie the two together? I refer to Clause 8:

> "The Corporation shall not transact any business until at least sixty thousand of the shares referred to in section 7 have been fully subscribed and allotted."

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

Does this mean that you are increasing this figure of 60,000 or are you going to keep it as it is? Then what is the purpose of having it in the first instance?

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

That does not matter. It does not require any amendment now.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

It is possible that no amendment is required. If in fact the Hon. Minister's original intention is to be satisfied, then you are called upon to amend it. If you say that you have now abandoned that intention, then it is a different matter.

Then, Sir, the number of directors has been increased. The minimum of four and the maximum of six are now changed to a minimum of six and a maximum of eight. It is possible that your one director will now be one of eight. At the best it will be one of six. That means government control would be less over the Development Finance Corporation.

Now regarding the amount that the Government has given by way of loan to the Development Finance Corporation, the repayment will commence in the twenty-sixth year. This repayment has been put off for another ten years.

Then the Hon. Minister goes on to amend Section 14 of the Act by Clause 8. In the original Act he expected money from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Now he has added the words, "or from any other international or foreign organization approved by the Government." What are these organizations? The Hon. Minister mentioned the International Finance Corporation, and that is also mentioned in the statement of legal effect. What are the bodies that he has got in mind? We are now participating in the Asian Development Bank. Is that one? Why cannot he take us into his confidence in this matter?

The point, however, is this: whether it is the I.B.R.D. or some other organization, we know that the donor countries are limited to a small number. In your Asian Development Bank you have Japan entering in a big way, but still, even with the presence of Japan as a donor country the fact remains that the biggest donors are those that are behind the World Bank—the I.B.R.D., the I.M.F., the O.E.C.D., the I.A.D.B., and the like—the same donor countries of whom the principal country is the U. S. A.

The next section has already been referred to by the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera). Before I come to that, there is this question of the guarantees against revaluation of the rupee. This, I suppose, goes back to the devaluation of 1948. In the event of revaluation there is a guarantee given here that there will be no loss to any foreign organization that grants a loan to the corporation.

Then comes the section that was attacked by the hon. Member for Yatiyantota—the bringing in of the Governor-General into this business of signing guarantee bonds. The Hon. Minister never explained why he wanted to do it. Why cannot the Minister sign this? The Ministers sign our treaties, the Ministers sign other loan agreements on behalf of the Government of Ceylon. But when it comes to the question of the I.B.R.D. or one of the other organizations giving money, not to the Government of Ceylon, but to the Development Finance Corporation which will invest that money in private enterprises, then the Minister is insufficient. His Excellency the Governor-General himself must sign the guarantee bond.

Sir, this is the depth of degradation to which these people can bring this country. His Excellency the Governor-General, the repository of

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

[බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.]

sovereignty of this country, the repository of sovereignty within the Constitution, you want to bring him into commercial transactions between some body known as the I.B.R.D. and your Development Finance Corporation tied to the private sector. This is degrading, and it is with a sense of shame that one has to consider this kind of thing.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

That never happened before ?

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Even if it has happened before, why should you repeat it ?

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I will tell you how the Governor-General comes in when I reply.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Why could you not tell us in the first instance ? All his bright thoughts he keeps for his reply when they cannot be further criticized.—[*Interruption*]. It is here in the Act. [*Interruption*]. Thank you very much, Sir, for drawing my attention to the fact that my audience is a little larger than the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries.

We would have been glad if the Hon. Minister of Finance had told us the reasons. We had a former Governor-General who had his fingers in a number of financial pies. That is true ; but that is no reason why we should continue with that position in the future.

Then, everything is tax free. In addition to all the freedom from taxes that is guaranteed, there is under clause 8 a new Sub-clause (8) under which there will be no stamp duty levied from any one of these organizations.

There is an amendment to Section 18 which brings in all the brilliant definitions that I mentioned. I want to ask the Hon. Minister one question, and I trust he will give the answer in his reply. This Government, while eschewing very strongly the principle of nationalized enterprises and while committing itself to development through the private sector, has always told us that they are also interested in the development of the co-operative sector. The Hon. Minister of Industries was the father of the multi-purpose co-operative idea in this country. Why has the Hon. Minister left out the co-operative sector ? You do not like nationalized enterprises. Why cannot this Development Finance Corporation provide the finance for appropriate concerns in the co-operative movement ?—[*Interruption*]. Limited liability companies ? It is excluded by your definition. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary must read the definition. The definition says :

"'commercial enterprise' includes any large scale enterprise operated by a limited liability company...."

"'industrial enterprise' means a large scale enterprise for a productive purpose operated by a limited liability company on a commercial basis ;"

In the original Act, "agricultural enterprise" was defined as a large scale agricultural or live-stock enterprise operated on a commercial basis. This is the only sector in which the limited liability company idea is not forcibly introduced. Oh ! I am sorry. Clause 9 (1) reads thus :

"....'agricultural enterprise', by the substitution, for the words 'enterprise operated on a commercial basis ;', of the words 'enterprise operated by a limited liability company on a commercial basis ;'"

So, all your enterprises will have to be operated by limited liability companies, which means that you are shutting out the co-operative movement. Your Development Finance Corporation cannot provide any finance to any co-operative undertaking.

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

We have consumer co-operative stores in this country, and a large number of them are corrupt bodies. I also know that this Government has done its best to undermine the co-operative movement by asking the co-operative managers in these stores to distribute free the one measure of rice, to distribute free something which is worth its weight in gold in the black market. You are, by that, placing a strain upon human nature that even a saint would find it difficult to bear. We know that some managers of co-operative stores are far from being saints. By doing this you have undermined the co-operative movement, the consumers' co-operative movement in this country. I know that the co-operative movement is already mismanaged in a number of directions, and as a result of the activities of the Government it is likely that it will suffer further deterioration. But there are a number of industrial ventures which have been gainfully and properly inaugurated by some multi-purpose co-operative societies and co-operative unions and I do not see any reason why they should be shut out from the benefits of the Development Finance Corporation.

I cannot understand why the Parliamenary Secretary to the Minister of Industries and Fisheries did not, on behalf of his Minister, fight against this limitation, because I know that the present Minister of Industries is in fact the father of the multi-purpose co-operative movement. In fact he got into trouble in a previous Government because he wanted to develop the co-operative movement to embrace practically the entirety of the Government of Ceylon. That is what his fellow Ministers resented in that Cabinet, in the Cabinet of the late Prime Minister. But today the Hon. Minister of Industries and Fisheries is party to a Bill which shuts out the co-operative movement from the benefits of capital development in this way.

So much for the contents of the clauses in this Bill.

Why do we object to this Bill, apart from these specific questions? This particular measure fits into the pattern of what we call neo-colonialism in the world.

There was a little booklet which was given by the Minister of Finance at the time he presented the annual Estimates. It makes very interesting reading. This appears at page 1 of that booklet:

"The Rationale of Aid

The concept of foreign aid for development is essentially a post-war phenomenon."

And why? Because imperialism in the pre-war years was of a completely different order from what it is today. After World War II there were a number of new emergent nations in Asia and Africa. The old pattern of imperialism with complete political domination was broken down. The metropolitan countries found that they could no longer hold the colonial world in the old way and, therefore, countries like India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon got independence in varying degrees. The same pattern has been followed in respect of the countries of Africa. That is why you find this business of foreign aid being discribed in this booklet as an essentially post-war phenomenon.

"The concept of foreign aid for development is essentially a post-war phenomenon. In the 19th and early 20th centuries substantial investments were made by metropolitan powers in colonial territories, but these were primarily from private funds and largely directed to sectors having an export potential. The shift in the post-war period, to official transfers of funds, as against private lending, has been notable. In 1964, official loans and grants to developing countries accounted for nearly two-thirds of the total flow of capital from the developed 'market economy' countries."

Now, Sir, this fits in entirely with the new pattern of imperialism in the world today. Unable to have any confidence in the safety of moneys directly invested, they prefer loans, they prefer grants, and they prefer to exploit aid and trade, the two things which the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister

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

[බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.]

of Industries and Fisheries said cannot be kept in watertight compartments. For the purpose of neo-colonialism they prefer to exploit aid and trade. After the Second World War people no longer tolerate a foreign conqueror on their soil. Therefore, imperialism has devised new ways. The principal forms are the control of trade and aid. The aid comes in through the control of finance. The banking system, insurance, government to government loans, and the like, all that is covered in one direction. The next form is the control of shipping and communications and ancillaries to trade. I mentioned insurance. It plays a part here too. And the last is the control of the world market. The control of banking, the control of currency, the control of values of various currencies in the world, the ability to deploy various fiscal measures in various countries—all that is one of the instruments used. The next one is shipping and ancillaries to trade. The last is the control of the entire market.

That is why the Hon. Minister's little booklet itself goes on to say this :

"The rationale of aid to developing countries has been conventionally expressed in terms of a 'savings gap', "—

I am not quoting from any Marxist literature ; I am quoting from the Hon. Minister's own booklet.

——" which is the gap between investment needs for a desired rate of economic growth and domestic savings. More recently, and particularly since the 1964 United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, attention has been focussed on a 'trade gap', i.e., a gap between the minimum import requirements for a given rate of economic growth, and export earnings."

In other words, your aid is said to be meant to bridge the gap between your export earnings and that which is required for a given rate of economic growth. We are in an even worse situation than that which the Central Bank reported last year : the figure in respect of the Gross National Product has now dropped to a minus figure. We are in an even worse situation than the one described in this booklet.

So the gap that has got to be financed is very large, and that is called "aid", on which you pay interest to somebody else.

During World War II where a number of allies were fighting on the side of Britain and America and there was a lot of talk of aid being given, there was a phrase that was invented by those who were in the battle line, "that those who offered aid were prepared to offer every kind of aid except help". That is the situation in which we are. We are given every kind of aid but not help. Help is not given to us.

This was repeated only two weeks ago by a Fellow of the Royal Society of England, of Great Britain, who went as a guest speaker to the United States Congress for the Advancement of Science. These congresses for the advancement of science are places where very important political pronouncements are made. We had one in Ceylon in which the Hon. Minister of State made a very powerful criticism of the democratic structure of political institutions in this country. Here is one in the United States itself where a visiting British Professor as a guest speaker mentioned the fact that in the under-developed sector of the world the annual improvement that has been noted is 1.5 per cent. That means that these under-developed countries, if they are to improve their standards of living by twice what it is at present, will take some 66.6 years in order to reach that level. And of the 1.5 per cent. of development, 1 per cent. is said to be due to aid, which shows the extent of the dependence of these countries upon the so-called donor countries. That is the crux of neo-colonialism and that is what the Hon. Minister of Finance has failed to take note of. What is the use of his Colleague in the Cabinet, the Hon. Minister of Industries, stating at a conference of pressmen that we would like better prices and that it would be much

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

better for us to have improved trade rather than depend upon this aid, when the philosophy behind this Bill of the Minister of Finance is something quite different? That dependence is continuing.

Now in regard to foreign aid, whether it be from the I. B. R. D. or I. M. F. or any other source, here is what the Hon. Minister of Finance says :

"The United Nations has estimated the 'trade gap' of developing countries as a whole to be US $20 billion by 1970, if the 5 percent growth target of the UN Development Decade is to be achieved. The total transfer of capital to developing countries at the present time from all sources, through aid and private investment, is only about US $10 million. In a recent assessment, the IBRD has stated that developing countries have the capacity to absorb some $3-4 billion worth of more aid annually than is now available to them."

What is the position? There is a trade gap but even the aid that is given is insufficient to bridge that gap. You can never do it. That is the position. I have mentioned this because the Hon. Minister can tell us in no uncertain terms that the aid that is given to us, under-developed countries hoping to develop, is in itself a form of exploitation.

If we examine that idea a little more closely we will see that all these institutions are alike. There are a large number of them known by their initials. There is on the American continent the famous EXIM Bank, and apart from that there are the IBRD, ODI, OECD, UNCTAD, the IMF, and there is another organization which the hon. Second Member for Akurana (Mr. A. C. S. Hameed) started the other day—the UNOID—

ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්
(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)
(An hon. Member)
What is that?

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னட் சொய்சா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)
I do not know. It is said to be an Organisation for Industrial Development. Whatever be the name by which these organizations are called, the fact remains that the donor countries more or less remain the same.

The continent of South America also has an organization knows as the IABD, that is, the Inter-American Development Bank, which is more or less of the same status as your Asian Development Bank, for which we passed the necessary legislation the other day. Here is what is said about this IABD :—

"The purpose of the Inter-American Development Bank (IABD) as stated in Article 1 of its By-laws is 'to contribute to the acceleration of the process of economic development of the member countries'...."

Acceleration like what is said in your present Act.

"...'To promote the investment of public and private capital .... to encourage private investment in projects, enterprises and activities.....to reorient their development policies' ....."

and here is a crucial sentence which is frankly and openly stated in this Article, which is not mentioned in other similar Articles of the IMF and IBRD :

"To reorient their development policies with the objective of making their economies more complementary."

Complementary to what? To the economy of the United States of America. The grant of the loan is for the purpose of making the economy, the economy of the recipient complementary to that of the United States of America.

Now, Sir, with regard to all these organizations it is the same. If you take the whole of Latin America and you look at the loans that have been granted, you will find that vast sums that have been given out by way of loans—to Argentina 29 million dollars; to Bolivia 14 million dollars; to Brazil 31 million dollars; to Chile 33 million dollars; to Columbia 36 million dollars; to Costa Rica 6 million dollars; to Venezuela, the largest, 41 million dollars—and what

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

[බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.]

are the enterprises in the private sector that they are developing through these ? Favoured private interests, themselves tied up with US interests.

Most of this aid comes within the definition of what the Hon. Minister described in his booklet on Foreign Aid as "tied aid". He described in his booklet the three kinds of aid, namely, tied aid, project aid, and the third which he does not discuss but which he refers to as "food aid."

There is this trade gap which is mentioned by the Hon. Minister. Before the Hon. Minister asks us to commit ourselves to this, we should be glad from the point of view of the national interest to see to what extent this matter had been pursued by his Government. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Commerce and Trade, and the Hon. Minister himself who is in the other place, they both complained about it. The Hon. Prime Minister has mentioned the matter at conferences elsewhere. The Hon. Minister for Industries addressed pressmen at the I.P.I. the other day and told them the same tale : the question of the depression of the prices of primary products and the inflation of the prices of capital goods sold to us, the widening gap, the unfavourable balance of trade that is developing and is sucking things out of this country.

The unfavourable political consequences of the recent overturn in Ghana, are known to everybody. Hon. Members on the other side will appreciate the nature of the changes in a reactionary direction that have taken place in Ghana, in Nigeria, and also in the neighbouring country of Indonesia.

Preceding those political changes was a state of things in those countries very similar to what is happening in this country. I would ask the Hon. Minister of Finance to remember that in the first few years of independence, Ghana, through the marketing of her cocoa to the United Kingdom and to other European countries, had a reserve in foreign assets to the extent of 200 million. Although this was credited as the foreign assets of the country of Ghana, the fact remains that the Cocoa Marketing Board dominated by outsiders owned a larger portion of it. Nevertheless, though the ownership rested elsewhere, the country was credited with that extent of foreign assets.

On the basis of the first Ghanaian Development Plan, what was required was the release of 2 million every year for the purpose of financing that plan. To finance that plan they required only 2 millon every year, so that there would have been enough to last, on that basis, something up to a hundred years. But let us grant that with each successive year the amount that was needed for financing as development capital would have increased beyond the original 2 million per year. Even if it were to rise to 3 million or 4 million, or even to 5 or 6 million a year, the assets held could very well have gone on for a number of years. What happened ? Before 1961 every single penny of that 200 million was wiped out on an unfavourable balance of trade. That is what you are faced with today on account of the depression in tea prices that worsened last year. There has been no improvement in that position. And in addition to that the United States, Uncle Sam, gave the Hon. Minister a present a few days ago, with one hand and took it away with the other, by further depressing the price of rubber through the release of their stock-pile rubber in the world market.

This has happened in the history of every one of those countries where unfavourable, reactionary, backward and retrogressive political developments have taken place. The preceding economic situation was exactly the same. I am asking the Hon. Minister what he is doing to face up to this problem. You are getting money now and you are hoping to

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

get this money for assisting the private sector. Even with all such assistance, I have told you what happened to Ghana. They also had I.M.F. assistance. And this is how the imperialists have treated one of the largest countries in Latin America, Brazil, which is also one of the most miserable countries in the world today. There the practice started as far back as 1842. When Brazil received independence, the British Government floated a loan. Strangely enough, it was called the "Independence Loan." And that loan was repaid 138 years afterwards. This is what is said :

"Two years after its independence from Portugal, Brazil negotiated its first foreign loan. Paradoxically the three million pound loan signed with British bankers (with the Bank of England at the head) was called 'the independence loan'. The Brazilians who negotiated the loan, Caldeira Brandt and Gameiro Pessoa, could not have imagined that the debt would be liquidated in December 1962, 138 years after it was signed, when the final instalment of 350,000 pounds was paid.

Thus began in 1824 the long history of Brazil's indebtedness and the political pressure associated with the big stick policy of foreign interests. For a long time, Brazil was financially dependent upon Great Britain and later upon France. From 1930 on, this dependence passed to the United States and became accentuated after the Second World War, when the U. S. emerged as the nation most benefited by the war. The 'independence loan' was enlarged, reprogrammed, postponed and amortized—several times over."

Now, Sir, this is a large country and a much more powerful country than ours—Brazil. And this is how Brazil fared in respect of her dealings with the colossus, the United States of America.

I am asking the Hon. Minister of Finance, this great gentleman from the Wanni, how he proposes to stand up to this colossus. I can read to you the long-term effects on Brazil of this loan that has been taken, and said to be for the purpose of development—the impact it has on human lives, the numbers that live in sub-human conditions, the increasing misery, the increasing rate of infantile mortality, the reduced expectation of life, the misery of malnourishment, bad housing, lack of education, lack of proper transport, lack of anything called cultural facilities, for the broad mass of the people.

That is what happens by being tied up in this way in the interests of so-called development.

Now the Hon. Minister is pumping this loaned money—once again in accordance with the philosophy of this Government—into the private sector. How much can be expected from this sector ? Regarding that aspect of the matter, I mentioned the fact that if any industrial development took place in this country, it was only after import substitution became a possibility.

To strengthen my argument, I will quote a previous Minister of Finance or several previous Ministers of Finance. Here is what the Hon. J. R. Jayewardene when he was Minister of Finance said in 1950. He wrote a book—"Economic and Social Development of Ceylon from 1926 to 1950—a Survey"—like the present Minister giving us a little booklet on Foreign Aid when he presented his Budget. This is what he says on private enterprise in this country, at page 38. I have often quoted this passage on the Floor of this House :

"So long as we accept the principle of private enterprise, a great contribution to economic contribution can come from the private sector. The Government's function is to create the necessary conditions that favour economic development including the provision of satisfactory utility services. This, the Government has done. It is also the function of government to create the necessary atmosphere that will attract foreign capital"——

The same philosophy over and over again : the Prime Minister says it, the Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena

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

[බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.]

said it, the Hon. J. R. Jayewardene said it, and now the present Minister of Finance is saying it.

——"if such capital is required. The Government has fulfilled its task, but private enterprise is still lacking."

"Private enterprise is still lacking"—that was in 1950. Then came the Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena. He also wrote a booklet like this, and he also said that private enterprise was lacking. The Hon. Stanley de Zoysa as Minister of Finance also complained that the private sector was not doing its job. Then came the hon. Member for Dompe. He published an implementation programme, and in the preface of that implementation programme he says: "The private sector is on trial".

'The private sector is on trial."

And you have been now in office for two years. There is not one single item in regard to which you can show that the private sector has embarked upon development under your beneficent patronage—with all the carrots that you have been dangling in front of the *entrepreneur*, your approved savings scheme, your tax reliefs, your guarantees against nationalization in the case of foreign investors. You openly and unashamedly said so in your last Budget Speech: "We shall not nationalize". Why? the I. M. F. had said so: "Create a favourable atmosphere for private enterprise". That means no nationalization. And did you get your development? No, you cannot.

And how did the Hon. Minister diagnose the disease?—"Alas, there is no capital, and we must provide the capital."

We have the Bank of Ceylon, we have the People's Bank from which one Honourable Minister of this Government has still an outstanding loan of about a million rupees. But these credit institutions are insufficient for the *enterpreneur* apparently, the Rs. 32 million outstanding in the Agricultural and Industrial Credit Corporation, the Rs. 28 million outstanding already in the Development Finance Corporation, all that was not enough to stimulate development, and therefore we must pump this up to Rs. 72 million! And for that we must get the assistance of the I. B. R. D. and other institutions of a similar nature, and from the American donors, and tie that up with the Development Finance Corporation purchasing shares thereafter in local private enterprise. What has happened to this Government? They are pleading with the foreign *entrepreneurs* to come here and develop our country. Hilton Hotels are coming here, not capital-wise, but with the technical know-how. People do not want to risk their capital here. If they were coming capital-wise they would have done so during the great bonanza of the 1947 Government of the U. N. P. What guarantees can you give them now? They have no confidence in your future. Why should they give your money? So, they are not coming in here with their capital. It is not that I want them. I am discussing Government's hopes.

The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene in his time invited private capital; other Ministers too have done so; and the Hon. U. B. Wanninayake, the present Minister of Finance made a plea in his last Budget Speech also inviting private enterprise to come in and invest their capital in this country. They are not coming. When Hon J. R. Jayewardene asked them to come they did not come. Only one enterprise came with all the encouragement he gave to the private sector. With all the encouragement given the private sector developed only two enterprises; one was associated with rubber and another was associated with biscuits; one foreign enterprise came in and killed the one single national enterprise that was started on the same basis—the shoe manufactoring industry. That is all the response he had to his invitation. No wonder he is taking

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

time to assure the whole of Asia through the I. P. I. that he is not a crack-pot.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා
(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)
How long will the hon. Member take ?

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னட் சொய்சா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)
Are you trying—

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා
(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)
It is only for information.

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)
Are we adjourning for tea ?

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා
(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)
That is why I wanted to find out from the hon. Member, whether he would be taking a long time.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னட் சொய்சா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)
I shall probably continue after tea also.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා
(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)
I know that when the hon. Member has finished with the Bill he would have exhausted himself.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னட் சொய்சா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)
We are discussing the principle of this matter.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා
(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)
The hon. Member was speaking about the hon. Parliamentary Secretary. He wants only ten minutes to reply.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னட் சொய்சா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)
The hon. Parliamentary Secreary ? He is always a man of few words.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා
(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)
He is a man of action.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னட் சொய்சா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)
Now, Sir, this is the private enterprise which the Hon. Minister is seeking to stimulate with capital. Has he examined the position why there is a dearth of capital for private enterprise ? Why is that so ? The fact is that your trade is still conducted on unfavourable terms. Of our trade earnings a large proportion still belongs to foreigners. The fact is that out of our earnings on tea which is produced locally only a meagre amount accrues as profits to the people of this country while the larger amounts, the real profit is earned between the point of auction and the point of the consumption of tea in other countries. If you take the price of a pound of tea at the auction and the price at which it enters into consumption as a cup of tea either at Lyon Restaurants or anywhere else in the world you will find that in between they earn about 480 per cent. profit, which is not accruing to us at all.

I said that the new pattern of imperialism is through the control of these two things—banking and finance on the one side and the

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

[බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.]

markets on the other. It is through these that you get neo-colonialist exploitation.

On a previous occasion I mentioned how these are exploited, and that is why you do not have the capital resources for development in the way you want, whether it is for public enterprise or private enterprise.

Whether you get the money from the I.B.R.D. or from any other sources, you are still tying yourself up once again in the same pattern of things. There must be a break somewhere. I know a break is going to be painful. You will have to take drastic steps, and this Government does not want to take drastic steps. You have to fight vested interests, foreign and local. But the Minister does not want to embark upon such a fight. Therefore he has this situation of once again enslaving the people of this country for the purpose of obtaining the money required for enterprises in the private sector.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I showed the nature of this unfavourable balance on a previous occasion when I quoted certain figures given by Ernesto "Che" Guevara when he addressed a U.N.-sponsored conference of trade and development. He showed how over the years the quantity of the primary product needed for export in order to buy a 30-39 h.p. tractor had increased. These are the figures.

Commodity	*Unit of measurement*	*Country*	*1955*	*1962*
Cocoa	Metric tons	Ghana	3.06	7.14
Coconut oil	Metric tons	Philippines	11.21	13.63
Coffee	Metric tons	Brazil	2.38	4.79
Copper	Metric tons	Rhodesia	4.23	5.45
Cotton	Metric tons	U. A. R.	2.11	3.41
Petroleum	Barrels	Venezuela	938	1118
Rice	Metric tons	Burma	28.33	32.57
Rubber	Metric tons	Malaysia	3.27	5.55
Tea	Metric tons	Ceylon	1.89	2.93
Tabacco	Metric tons	Turkey	1.77	2.90
Wool	Metric tons	Uruguay	1.94	2 59

Now, these figures are telling. They show the extent to which the prices of our primary products are being depressed and the prices of capital goods are being increased, and the method of exploitation that is resorted to.

Here is what Che Guevara said in the course of that speech :

"The inflow of capital from the developed countries is the prequisite for the establishment of economic dependence. This inflow takes various forms ; loans granted on onerous terms ; investments which place a given country in the power of the investors ; almost total technological subordination of the dependent country to the developed country ; control of a country's foreign trade by the big international monopolies ; and in extreme cases, the use of force as an economic weapon in support of the other forms of exploitation."

The last is what we find taking place in Vietnam today.

That is why we object to this Bill. We object to that philosophy which permits a Government to go in for aid which is tied with so many strings. We have no objection to borrowing as such. Every Finance Minister who is faced with a difficulty has to go to international sources for money particularly for foreign exchange. I am not blaming him. I do not blame the Hon. Minister for going to the I.B.R.D. or the World Bank. The question is, what is the degree of dependence you have ? What is your philosophy ? What is your outlook ? What is your attitude ? Are you trying to increase your dependence or decrease it ?

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

That is the question you have to answer. The Hon. Minister over the last two years has expounded the basic position of this Government that it is, far from being one of decreasing the dependence, one of increasing it ; and that is why, in that context, we have to condemn this Bill.

Contrary to my earlier anticipations, I think I will be briefer than I said I would be a few minutes back.

We are tying ourselves up, through these various agencies, with the economic policies and the political philosophies of the donor countries. It is stated in the Articles of Association of these various banks—the Asian Development Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and so on—that there will be no interference with the internal political structure of these various countries. That is stated as an Article of Association. That having been stated, in practice it is continuously and permanently violated.

The question whether there should be a rice cut or not in this country was a political one basically. It became a political question. It was a question as to whether the Government, in furtherance of certain interests, was going to make an onslaught upon the standard of living of the mass of the people, whether, in the interests of so-called development in a country in which the gap between poverty and riches has not been bridged and cannot be bridged in the near future, an onslaught was to be made upon the meagre forms of relief that had been won by the mass of the people—the have-nots. That was the question. The role of the rice cut in the economy, treated purely as an economic question, can win textbook approval. Even such a distinguished economist as Oscar Lange mentioned, when he came here to discuss development plans, that the whole question of capital resources would have to be reviewed in the light of the fact that quite a large proportion of the money available in this country and its resources are being used for consumption, but he did not advocate the particular measure that the Government has taken. It is because the standard of living in this country is so low, because though its productive capacity remains high actual production remains low, because in terms of the situation obtaining here the output from labour is so very low, because you have induced a sense of despair in our people, because you have caused a sense of frustration in the vast mass of producers in this country that the subsidy is needed. These things which you blame upon the people's idleness, their desire for lotus-eating, the lack of a sense of duty, the lack of a sense of patriotism and the like, are all due to the sense of frustration induced over the years. It is on account of the low per capita earnings that we find that it has become necessary to subsidize their living, and that is why the various subsidies have played an important part in the structure of the lives of our people and the way in which they exist from day to day.

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

Order, please ! The Sitting is suspended for half an hour.

රැස්වීම ඊට අනුකූලව තාවකාලිකව අත් සිටුවන ලදින් අ. භා. 4.30 ට නැවත පවත්වන ලදී.

அதன்படி அமர்வு இடை நிறுத்தப்பட்டு, மீண்டும் பி. ப. 4.30 மணிக்கு ஆரம்பமாயிற்று.

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

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

I do hope, now that you have partaken of the cup that cheers, we will have a cheerful termination of the Debate.

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

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்சா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

On the contrary, Sir, the drinking of a cup of tea has only served to remind me of the parlous state of our economy in respect of tea. It has only served to depress me just as, at present, the price of tea has been depressed in the world market.

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

So long as it does not depress you, it does not matter.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்சா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

It is difficult for me to remain unduly depressed, especially with you, Sir, in front of me as an object of contemplation.

Before we adjourned for tea, I was mentioning the fact that the Articles of these various banks that are supposed to give this money contain a stipulation that there will be no interference with the internal policies of any country. Despite that, the report of the World Bank Mission, which was referred to as far back as 1955 by the Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena, violated the stipulation, as may also be seen in the correspondence between the Ministry of Finance and the World Bank over the last two years. In all these matters there is direct and deliberate intervention in the politics of this country. There is not the slightest doubt about it.

I will give you one instance. You know that when the Petroleum Corporation was set up and the question of payment for the installations came up for discussion, the United States Government stopped every form of aid to this country. Now, that was direct Government aid. So, one might defnitely say that the American Government stopped their aid because of this nationalization.

In 1964, when the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) was the Minister of Finance, he went to Tokyo sessions of the World Bank, and there he was seeking to negotiate a loan. What was the statement made at that time by the Governor of the World Bank who came to the conference? It was that in respect of two countries which had carried out acts of nationalization—Indonesia and Ceylon—it would not be possible for the World Bank to give assistance as long as that policy remained in force.

I want to remind this honourable House of that announcement. They used a curious word. They did not say "nationalization". They used the word "sequestration" of property. Now, the word "sequestration" has a strange history. Sequestration is a word that came up as a legal concept in the capitalist revolution against the feudal system in England, and in France after the French Revolution. The question of the taking away of the property that the feudalists possessed is described as sequestration. In the Civil War in England which ended with the execution of Charles I, the Cavaliers and the families that had supported Charles, the feudal land owners who supported King Charles I in the Civil War, had their property confiscated. Sequestration was considered a taking away of the property of those who are considered to be against the national interest. And that is why the idea of sequestration has come into common law as part of the penalty for those who seek to conspire against the State. That is one of the penalties in our Criminal Law: you have the property of those who conspire against the State being confiscated by the State. The act of confiscation by the State of property which belongs to those who work against the national interest is described as sequestration.

Strangely enough the Americans decided to describe as sequestration the taking away of property from non-nationals of this country by

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

persons who were interested in fostering the national interest. The taking away of the oil installations by the Government of the day was described as an act of sequestration, not of nationalization. Because of this sequestration, they told the hon. Member for Yatiyantota at Tokyo that they could not consider the giving of a loan to this country. They also mentioned Indonesia and the United Arab Republic. I would like this honourable House to remember that. Despite all the Articles, which say, "we shall not interfere in the politics of a country" there was this deliberate pressure applied by the World Bank for that purpose. Can anybody be so naive as to believe that further political control will not be sought through this measure? Here is pressure upon the State, upon the Government of this country. I ask hon. Members to consider what is going to happen particularly if the tie up is with the private sector in this country. You will have agencies created in this country who will be the tools of foreign financiers. That is what you will create. Your private sector promoters who get this money through this Development Finance Corporation, which in turn obtains its money from the I. B. R. D. and sources like that, will definitely be under the control of a foreign government.

The extent of our Government's control is being reduced by this Hon. Minister. Where the board of directors had one director out of four that form of control is to be reduced to one out of six. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund, the International Finance Corporation, the Asian Development Bank, any one of these agencies from whom you are going to get the money will have its direct dealings with the Development Finance Corporation, and through the nominee of the Development Finance Corporation on the governing boards of the private sector. Every one of these limited liability companies in the so-called commercial sector, the industrial and the agricultural sectors of this country, can become the tools of those who control the original source of the money. That is the structure.

I mention this fact as a protest against the pressurising on the part of the World Bank because that pressure is admitted even by those who do not share my political philosophy, by those whose philosophy definitely stands for the continuation of the private sector, of the capitalist system as it functions in Europe and in America today.

I will quote from a book written by two authors, I. M. O. Little and J. M. Clifford on "International Aid." Here are some of the things they reveal. They are certainly not Marxists by any description. Here, Sir, is a table in which they give the total of the funds that have flown out of the O. E. C. D. to the developing countries. The total of O. E. C. D. funds in 1956, in units of a million dollars, was 3,270. That is 3,270 million dollars. Out of that amount, France held 648 million dollars; Germany 161 million dollars; the United Kingdom 205 million dollars; and United States of America 2,006 million dollars. That was in 1956. In 1963 the position was this. The total of O. E. C. D. moneys that had gone to the developing countries was 6 billion 48 million U. S. dollars. Of that France held $863 million; West Germany $424 million; the United Kingdom $414 million; and the United States of America three billion 721 million dollars. So you see, whether it be the O. E. C. D. the I. B. R. D., the World Bank, the I. M. F. or the I. A. D. B., the principal donor is the United States of America. And here is what the authors say regarding this matter: they say it distinctly in regard to

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

[ඩර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.]

German aid policy. They praise German aid, and at page 43 they state :

"There is a certain conflict between the desire to promote private enterprise and directly productive investment, the unwillingness to lend direct to private enterprise. . . . ."

So there is an unwillingness to lend direct. That is why they want this agency known as the Development Finance Corporation guaranteed by His Excellency the Governor-General. But at the same time they want to promote private enterprise, and that is why their preference is not to give government to government loans or to give aid through or aid to a government, but aid to the private sector, through one of these agencies. That is one preference.

Then again they state that there is a desire to give money for infrastructure projects rather than for any other kind of project. This is what they state as the reasons for this emphasis at page 189 :

"This emphasis has occurred for various reasons, the most important of which are (1) the attraction of the fact that infrastructure projects are usually politically neutral, (2) that donors, for administrative economy, dislike small projects, (3) that donors dislike financing recurrent expenditures, which often comprise a large part of small projects, (4) that for obvious reasons aid is given almost entirely to governments, and many donors dislike financing things in the public sector which private enterprise might undertake," . . ."

The preference is therefore for projects, other than infrastructure projects which a government might undertake. The preference is to keep the private sector to handle a larger number of enterprises. Then again they definitely mention the fact that the I. B. R. D. has constantly expressed the preference to give its moneys to private enterprises, to the private sector, rather than to government. Although it is true that governments have drawn moneys from the I. B. R. D. the preference is to give moneys to private enterprise.

That is the philosophy which animates these donor countries, and that is the reason why I have to ask this House to shed that naivete which believes that merely because the bank or any credit institution may have as one of its Article of Association a refusal to interfere, an explicit stipulation not to interfere with the internal affairs of a country, there is no doubt that there is a shaping of national policies to suit the political ideologies of the donors. True, the Hon. Minister does not require any shaping. His political philosophy and that of his party had already at its inception been shaped in the direction of private enterprise development or of encouraging private enterprise and he hardly needs stimulation in that direction. He does not require any shapnig. But there is not the slightest doubt that when he gets this Bill passed and it becomes law, to the extent to which the Development Finance Corporation obtains aid you will create the situation of countries which are hostile to socialist planning, giving monies to this agency in which State control has been reduced for the purpose of granting that aid as capital loans to various firms operating in this country who will themselves, therefore, directly be agencies of foreign governments on Ceylon soil. That is what you are creating, that is what you will be nourishing to the extent to which this becomes a reality. You will be creating a situation in which organizations like the CIA could have a ready-made apparatus in this country for the purpose of political influence. You are creating a ready-made apparatus and handing it over to the CIA for the purpose of controling the destinies of this country to suit this colossus, this financial colossus of the U. S. A., looking hungrily at the undeveloped countries in Asia and Africa.

No, Sir. We have to object to this Bill on all those grounds. As far as we are concerned, this is not an innocuous Bill. Whatever may have been the

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

attitude of this House in 1955 in respect of the original Bill for the purpose of creating the Development Finance Corporation, the years that have passed between 1955 and today have only confirmed the belief in our minds that every one of the actions taken by this Government within the framework of the existing structure of financial relations internationally will only help to enslave this country more and more.

We are against the enslavement of this country financially, we are against the creation of a new breed of compradores in this country who can be used by any external agency against the national interest. If development is necessary—and everybody agrees that it is—let us mobilize the resources that are available here. We can do that if you are prepared to take a bold—

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

Where are they ?

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னட் சொய்சா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

They are here.—[*Interruption.*] We are glad to note that the Hon. Minister of State is being very generous towards religious objectives in recent times. But if he could only deploy the resources that are here we can make a serious contribution to the volume of capital available for development. I am not objecting—let it not be misunderstood—I am not objecting to getting any monies from outside, but it is the entire nature of the kind of relationship that you establish that is worrying us ; and the kind of relationship to which you get committed, the structure you are creating with this Bill, is one of complete dependence politically, economically and in other ways. That is why we object to this. The Hon. Minister of State is shaking his head. I know that he has been identified in his political life with a kind of philosophy that animates this particular Bill. I am glad that he even as a gesture wishes to dissociate himself from that outlook, but we have the gravest misgivings in regard to the consequences of the implementation of this Bill.

We do not want slavery. Slavery is none the more pleasant because the slave wears a collar of gold. That, Sir, is not the future that we can contemplate. I have to urge upon this honourable House that this Bill which is being sought to be rushed through this House in all its stages today, is one that is most deleterious and harmful from the point of view of the national interest. I call upon those who have the freedom of this country, its future progress, the development of its economy, and the maintenance of our freedom, at heart—I call upon every hon. Member, through you—to reject this Bill with the contempt that it deserves.

අ. භා. 4.49

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

Sir, I would first wish to address my remarks in brief reply to a few points raised by the hon. Member for Yatiyantota who opened the Debate for the Opposition immediately after the presentation of this Bill by the Hon. Minister of Finance. In this connection I would wish to emphasize his final words. He said, "Let it be known that we will take every possible step to repudiate loans of this nature. We will not take the responsibility of implementing an Act like the one proposed by an amendment to the Development Finance Corporation". The spirit of his whole argument was one in which he wanted to put to naught all efforts made by this Government. The Opposition has indicated this position in every one of their speeches and actions. At the same time they say that they offer constructive criticism and advice and that if the Bill did not contain these vicious clauses they would have supported it and so forth.

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

[හෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.]

But, in whatever form we bring in legislation and however much we attempt to proceed with constructive work there is always this barrage of criticisms that the hon. Members of the Opposition throw at us, particularly, those criticisms made by the L.S.S.P. and the Communist Party.

I want to take up the hon. Member on one point first and that is on the question of the Governor-General having to sign these guarantee agreements. He spoke in most disparaging terms about the Government. He in fact said that this is a debased Government, a degraded Government, and that we have brought the highest in the land to the lowest depths of society by making him a guarantor for loans. He also said that this had never been done in the past. His words were, "This is the first time in the history of this country that we have got the Governor-General to underwrite loans for us." I am amazed and shocked that a knowledgeable person like the hon. Member for Yatiyantota who is supposed to know Finance Acts from cover to cover should make such a statement. I want to refer him to two things. First, let it be clearly understood that this set-up of going a-begging was not originated by us but by another Government that was in power in 1956.—[*Interruption*]. No, definitely not. The quest for foreign loans, the acceptance of foreign loans, the signing of agreements in respect of loans, all that was started by the Government that was in power from 1956. Let that be clearly understood. It was not started by us. If anybody started this "begging game" it was started by another Bandaranaike in 1956. It was this same Bandaranaike, the late Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike who used the Governor-General as a guarantor for the first time under a Finance Bill. I refer to Foreign Loans Act, No. 29 of 1957. I want the hon. Member for Yatiyantota to listen to me.

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

I do not think that you can force him to listen.

හෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.
(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

Sometimes he pretends to be deaf. Section 2 of the Foreign Loans Act, No. 29 of 1957 states :

"2. The Governor-General or any person specially authorised by him in that behalf may, in the name and on behalf of the Government of Ceylon, sign—

(*a*) a loan agreement relating to a foreign loan to the Government of Ceylon, and—

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

With the Government of Ceylon.

හෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.
(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

Wait a minute.

"(*b*) any bond, promissory note or other document required by such loan agreement to be executed by the Government of Ceylon."

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

It says there "in the name and on behalf of the Government of Ceylon". There is a big difference between that and what is in this Bill.

හෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.
(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

I am replying to your earlier statement that the Governor-General did no such thing before this, that he had never been used as a guarantor for any bonds.

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

Going a-begging for foreign aid was not started by us. It was started by another Government.—[*Interruption*].

Then another point was made about loans being granted for private enterprises and public enterprises. What is the degree of differentiation that is sought to be made? The Development Finance Corporation is an institution over which the Government has a certain amount of control, and the hon. Member for Yatiyantota is fully aware of it, and the requirements of the present day are such that it is necessary that the government should have agencies to negotiate loans and so on and the Development Finance Corporation is one such instrument. It is an institution in which the Government has a say although it is not bound hand and foot. I do not want to go through the whole Act but the Government has ample control over the Development Finance Corporation.

In regard to what was said about what the Government is doing because it is in need of foreign exchange, may I remind the hon. Member for Yatiyantota that when he was Minister of Finance he said that he desperately needed foreign exchange.—[*Interruption*]. He went further and said that he did not mind from what source it came and he would use it. That is what he said when he was Minister of Finance, in regard to foreign aid. What are we doing with this foreign aid that we so desperately require? We know that there are dangers in using foreign aid, that if foreign aid is allowed to come in freely to the private sector certain evils may arise from it. We are aware of it and it is for that very reason that we want this foreign aid to be channelled through the Development Finance Corporation, and you should offer your co-operation.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்சா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Over which you have no control.

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

If you mean one-tenth of what you said and took three hours to put across, then you should agree with us.

He says that the Government must have control. I have shown you that Government has control. What does he say? He reads this Bill with a peculiar vision. He refers only to the I.B.R.D., the I.M.F. and the American lending institutions. Who has limited this Bill to only an American investment? Is this your concept of the Bill?

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்சா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

You have mentioned two.

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

"And such." That could mean anything. The Comecon countries, if they want to come in, are welcome as any one of the American institutions. I say they are even more welcome because we have received so much aid from the Comecon countries and I should say that that aid has been more than useful or that the starting point of our real industrialization has come from the Comecon countries. They are not shut out from this. Why do you try to interpolate an argument in this way? You spoke to the country and said, "We are against American imperialism. This is a weapon of neo-colonialism." Your Comecon countries—are they also neo-colonialistic? Is that so? I do not know. It is a cross-purposes argument. This is an instrument that is welcoming or seeking foreign aid.

He said that we are having the finance here locally. But surely you are that much of an economist to know that your financing locally will not help. It is the counterpart in foreign exchange that we seek, not

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

[ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.]

the landed property of the Hon. Minister of State. You do not have to make a jest at him. It is not his property or somebody else's property. It is the counterpart of foreign exchange which your leader, the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) flew from Tokyo to London to find—desperately begging hat in hand for foreign aid. So have all Ministers of Finance done. The hon. Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike), published a booklet on this, and you referred to the opening bars of that. But we accept it. Nobody else has any argument against it unless everybody is so naive as to accept what you say—that money found here internally is sufficient for our industrial build-up or is sufficient for our agricultural break-through. The argument is unworthy of the hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa.)

What does this Bill seek to do? This Bill, in attempting to promote development in industry and agriculture, paves the way for development through investment in the Development Finance Corporation. It is not sought to be achieved by tying our hands to anybody. The Government has taken adequate steps.

The hon. Member for Yatiyantota again deliberately attempted to mislead the House. He read out chapter and verse in this Bill, but he did not mention one important sentence where it says "government approval".—[*Interruption*]. He failed to emphasize "government approval". They read the Bill out of context and they read it without reference to the original Act and expect this House and the country to believe what they say.

I want to say that adequate safeguards have been provided for by the Minister of Finance. There are set standards required to receive this approval. I must inform the House that as far as the Ministry of Industries is concerned we have even gone so far as to categorize industries. Some industries are today shut out and even saturated. Some are regarded as top priority. In some industries, one can come in only if you have the foreign component. That is the explanation for the word "approved", and it is a key word in this Bill, where the Finance Minister has control not only of the inflow into the Development Finance Corporation but also on the investment that the Development Finance Corporation will make. That is more than an adequate safeguard in my view.

What did the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) and the hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa) attempt to do? They drew a red-herring through this Debate. They attempted to show that there was finance available from the People's Bank and from the Bank of Ceylon, and therefore there was no need for this extra Rs. 20 million from the Development Finance Corporation. They did not mention—

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

You did not understand what I said. I do not blame you.

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

I do not blame you either. Age must also tell its tale, my Friend.—[*Interruption*].

Referring to finance he says, why do we want the Development Finance Corporation when we have the People's Bank and the Bank of Ceylon? He also tried to make out that there are so many companies and industries which have been financed by local banks before. There are so many types of industries that have been financed by the People's Bank and the Bank of Ceylon and these loans have been underwritten by the Mercantile Credit Company. Who should know more about Mercantile Credit than he?

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

What is the difference between financing through the Development Finance Corporation and financing through the Bank of Ceylon and the People's Bank? This is the difference. To a hard-pressed industrial or agricultural economy the Development Finance Corporation hopes to bring that much-sought after foreign aid investment; the foreign component. The local counterpart money can be supplied by the People's Bank and the Bank of Ceylon, but not the much sought after foreign component. This Bill has been brought for the purpose of obtaining that foreign component without which industry and agriculture cannot be given the impetus which we desire to give them. That is the reason why we are seeking investors through the Development Finance Corporation.

The hon. Member for Colombo South spoke about neo-colonialism, about control over strategic commodities, prime exports, and so on. We are all conversant with those facts We do not require any tutoring from the hon. Member for Colombo South. This is a story that goes back three to four hundred years. From the mere schoolboy to the oldest professor, everybody is conversant with our situation. I do not want to blame any Government. This is an old, old story. But for reasons now beyond our control, this Government has been put in the position of beggars. We are not happy that we have to beg. We are not happy that we have to go to other countries for foreign exchange. We would prefer that the much-sought-after foreign exchange comes to us from our trade rather than aid. But you know that well-worn adage, "Beggars cannot be choosers." They just cannot be choosers. It has not been possible—not for this Government nor for the Governments that preceded it, nor even for the Ministers of Finance who came before—to do otherwise. Every one of them, at one time or another since 1952, had to go on this begging mission.

It is not necessary for me to speak about the wild spending spree of the 1956 days. The hon. Member for Yatiyantota knows what the bank interest was in 1956. Bankers stood at their doorstep, searching for clients for possible investments. People who had one or two cars were allowed to purchase three and four. There was then no limit on foreign travel; any amount of money could then have been spent abroad Those were the so-called happy days of 1956. There is no point in indulging in any recriminations of that nature, or in trying to throw the ball back into someone's court, or to tar someone else. But there is one point I would like to emphatically put across to you, and that is that under the guise of constructive criticism Members of the Lanka Sama Samaja Party and of the Communist Party must not attempt to misinform this House and to mislead the people outside.

I have shown you, Sir, that from 10.30 this morning up to about 5 o'clock this afternoon, it was one deliberate, twisted tale that was presented to us, but they have not challenged any one of the statements I made.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்ணட் சொய்சா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

How do you spell the word? Tail or tale?

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

You have many tales, my Friend. Do you want me to speak about them? We can have the pleasure of doing so outside this House. I do not want to take up the valuable time of this House for that purpose. —[*Interruption*].—Yes, Sir, they have spoken about disputes including industrial disputes. They have spoken about Mercantile Credit Ltd. They have done all that. There is no point in my speaking further on those matters.

Digitized by Noolaham Foundation
noolaham.org | aavanaham.org

[ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.]

Then there is one other aspect of this Bill which has not been discussed so far by this House. If what they intended was constructive criticism, then I think they should have spoken a few words on the subjects I am now about to speak on. The Hon. Minister of Finance is seeking the approval of the House to enable the Development Finance Corporation not only to increase its capital but also to extend the life-term of the repayment of loans. On these two matters there is not one word of congratulation from hon. Members who spoke before me. These two matters you could have, if you wished, isolated from the principle of the Bill. What has this got to do with their principles which they spoke about? We are collecting more money for development, more money is assured to go into industry and agriculture, and the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) and the hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa) do not want them. We are giving an extended term for repayment. You know the difficulties and hazards of industry and agriculture today. The Government is sympathetic and is prepared to give an extended term for repayment.

I congratulate the Hon. Minister of Finance for bringing this up and I wish it may be possible for him before long, with offers of further aid from American investors, continental investors, or with help from our good Friends the Comecon countries, to come before this House again and get a further increase of capital for the Development Finance Corporation.

අ. භා. 5.16

ඉලංගරත්න මයා.
(திரு. இலங்கரத்ன)
(Mr. Ilangaratne)

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයෙන් විස්තර සහිත හා විවේචනාත්මක කථා දෙකක් අසන්ට ලැබුණා. ඒ කෙසේ වෙතත් මේ පනත් කෙටුම්පත පිළිබඳව මමත් වචන කීපයක් ප්‍රකාශ කරන්ට කල්පනා කරනවා.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මට ප්‍රථමයෙන් කථා කළ කර්මාන්ත හා ධීවර කටයුතු පිළිබඳ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමාගේ කථාවට පිළිතුරක් වශයෙන් කිවයුතු කිසිම දෙයක් නැහැ. තර්කයක් වශයෙන් එතුමා ඉදිරිපත් කළ කිසිම කරුණක් අපට පෙනෙන්නට නැහැ. පාත්‍රයත් අරන් හිඟාකෑමට ගියෙ අපේ ආණ්ඩුව බලයට පත් වූවාට පසුවය කියා එතුමා වරක් ප්‍රකාශ කළා. එසේ ප්‍රකාශ කර විනාඩි පහක් පමණ ගත වූවාට පසු එතුමා කිව්ව, මේ රටේ පවතින ආර්ථික තත්ත්වය අනුව 1952 සිටම හැම ආණ්ඩුවකටම, හැම මුදල් ඇමතිවරයකුටම, විදේශ රටවලට ගොස් හිඟා කන්ට සිද්ධ වුණාය කියා. මේ ප්‍රශ්නය පිළිබඳව අපේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමා වැඩිය කල්පනා නොකර කථා කළ බව අපට එයින්ම පෙනෙනවා.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, 1948 දී මේ රටට එක්තරා අන්දමක දේශපාලන නිදහසක් ලැබුණු බව අප කවුරුත් දන්නවා. නමුත් මේ රටට නියම නිදහස ලබා ගැනීමට පුළුවන් වෙන්නෙ දේශපාලන හා ආර්ථික වශයෙනුත් සංස්කෘතික හා සමාජමය වශයෙනුත් නිදහසක් ලබා ගත හැකි වන දිනකය කියා අප කවුරුත් කල්පනා කළා. 1948 සිට මේ රටේ රජ කළ ආණ්ඩුව කලින් තිබුණු යටත් විජිතවාදය අනුවම පාලනය ගෙන ගියා මිස එයින් සෑහෙන තරම් දුරට ඈත් වෙන්න වීර්ය කළේ නැහැ. ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම 1948 පටන් ගත් ආණ්ඩුවට බොහෝ කාලයක් ගත වන තුරු පිටරට වලින් මුදල් ඉල්ලන්ට වුවමනාවක් ඇති වුණේ නැහැ. ඒ මක්නිසාද කිවහොත්, මෙහි තිබුණෙ එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂ ආණ්ඩුවක් වුණාට මොකද ඊට පිටුපසින් සිටියෙ අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන් නිසයි. අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී යටත් විජිත ක්‍රමය අනුවම ඒ ආණ්ඩුව කටයුතු කර ගෙන ගිය නිසා අපට ආර්ථික නිදහසක් තිබුණෙ නැහැ. ඒ කාලයේදී අප මුදල් ඉල්ලුවෙ නැතිවාට මොකද, යටත් විජිත ප්‍රතිපත්තිය අනුව විදේශ ආණ්ඩු මේ රටේ මුදල් යොදවා තිබුණා. ඒ යෙදූ මුදල්වලින් අපේ රටට

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

හෝ ජාතියට සේවයක් වුණාද නැත්නම් ඒ මුදල් යෙදූ රටවලට සේවයක් වුණාද කියා අප කල්පනා කළ යුතුව තිබෙනවා. පළමුවෙන්ම විදේශ රටවලට ගිහින් ආධාර මුදල් හා ණය මුදල් ඉල්ලුවේ අපය කියා පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමා කිව්ව. නමුත් එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයෙ නාස් ලණුව සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම අල්ලා ගෙන සිටියෙ අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන් නිසා ණය මුදල් ගන්න ඒ ආණ්ඩුවට අවස්ථාවක් තිබුණෙ නැහැ.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මා සංඛ්‍යා කීපයක් පෙන්වන්ට සතුටුයි. 1949 දී විදේශ ප්‍රාග් ධනය කෝටි 3.4 ක් මේ රටට එවා තිබෙනව. ලංකාවෙන් පිට තට යැවූ විදේශ ප්‍රාග් ධනය කෝටි 28.5 යි. මේ රටට 3.4 ක් එව්ව. මේ රටින් යැව්ව 28.5 ක්. ඒ වාගේම විදේශීය ව්‍යාපාරිකයන් විසින් ලංකාවෙන් පිටතට යැවූ ලාභ සහ ලාභ කොටස් 35.9 යි.

1950 වර්ෂය දෙස බලන්න. මේ රටට එවා තිබෙනව 3.6 ක්. පිටරට යවා තිබෙනව 36.1 ක්. ලාභ කොටස් වශයෙන් 67.4 ක් යවා තිබෙනව.

1951 දී 60.7 ක් මේ රටට එවා තිබෙනව. පිටරට යවා තිබෙනව 72.5 ක්. ලාභ වශයෙන් 84.4 ක් යවා තිබෙනව.

1948 නිදහස ලබා ගත්තාට පසුවත් අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන් අපේ රටේ ආර්ථික තත්ත්වය කෙරෙහි කොයි තරම් දුරට බල පා තිබෙනවාද කියා මේවායින් පෙනෙනව. මේ රටට ටිකක් එවනව. හුඟක් පිටරට යවනව. ප්‍රාග් ධනය වශ යෙන් වාගේම වෙනත් නොයෙක් අයුරින් මේ රටේ ධනය පිටරට යවනව. ලාභ කොටස් වශයෙනුත් මේ තරම් විශා ල මුදලක් පිටරට යවා තිබෙනව.

1951 දී මේ රටට එව්වෙ 60.7 යි. පිට රට යවා තිබෙනව 72.5 ක්. ලාභ කොටස් වශයෙන් 84.4 ක් යවා තිබෙනව.

1952 දි 7.1 යි එවා තිබෙන්නෙ. පිටරට යැවූ මුදල් එන්න එන්නම වැඩි වී තිබෙ නව. ඒ අවුරුද්දෙ පිටරට යැවූ මුදල 25.9 යි, ලාබ කොටස් වශයෙන් 60.6 යි. මේ විධියට ටික ටික වැඩි වේගත ගිහින් 1956 න් පස්සෙ තමයි ටික ටික අඩු වෙන්නෙ.

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

ඔය ඉලක්කම් ගත්තෙ කොහෙන්ද?

ඉලංගරත්න මයා.
(திரு. இலங்கரத்ன)
(Mr. Ilangaratne)

මධ්‍යම බැංකුව මගින් නිකුත් කර තිබෙන 1956-1962 ආර්ථික හා සමාජ ප්‍රගතිය නමැති පොතෙන්. මේ විධියටයි ඒ කාලයේදී විදේශීය මුදල් යෙදුවෙ; ඒ සමගම ප්‍රාග් ධනය වශයෙන් පිටරට යැව්වෙ. මේක අළුත් එකක් නොවෙයි. ගරු කර්මාන්ත ඇමතිතුමා ඊනියා අන් තර් ජාතික පත්‍ර නියෝජිතයන් ඉදිරියේ මේ සම්බන්ධව ප්‍රකාශයක් කිරීම ගැන මම සන්තෝෂ වෙනව. අපට වුවමනා කරන්නේ ආධාර නොව අපේ බඩුවලට නියම මිළක් ගෙවීමය කියා ගරු කර් මාන්ත ඇමතිතුමා කළ ඒ ප්‍රකාශය ගැන ගරු රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා එකඟ වීම ගැනත් මම ඒ සමගම සන්තෝෂ වෙනව. නමුත් මම අහන්නට කැමතියි, මේක ආණ්ඩුවේ ප්‍රතිපත්තියද එහෙම නැත්නම් ගරු කර් මාන්ත ඇමතිතුමාගේ පමණක් ප්‍රතිපත් තියද කියා. රටට එකක් කියා වෙන එකක් කරනවද කියාත් ඒ සමගම අහන්න කැමතියි.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මේ ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙන සංශෝධන පනත සම්බන්ධව ඊ ළඟට වචන ස්වල්පයක් කිය යුතුයි. පළමු වැනි ආඥා පනත ඉදිරි පත් කළේ 1955 දියි. ගරු පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමා ඒ සම්බන්ධවත් කිව්වා. මේක ආණ්ඩුවේ පාලනය යටතේ තියෙ න සංස්ථාවක්ය කිව්වා. එය සම් පූර්ණ අසත්‍යයක් බව මම කියන්න කැම තියි. මධ්‍යම බැංකුවේ 1955 වාර්ෂික වාර් තාවේ මේ විධියට සඳහන් කර තියෙනව. ඒ කාලයේ සිංහල පිටපතක් නැති නිසා මට එය ඉංග්‍රීසියෙන් කියවන්න සිදු වී තිබෙනව:

"56. Though the Corporation has been established with the support of the Government, it has been designed as an autonomous private body without Government control over its management. It will be a private enterprise, making financial assistance and technical advice available to private industrial and

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

[ඉලංගරත්න මයා.]

agricultural enterprises. The broad national interests of the country are protected by the statutory proviso that a majority of the shareholder-directors shall at all times be citizens of Ceylon."

එයින් තේරෙනවා, ගරු පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමා මේ සම්බන්ධව වැරදි අදහසක් ප්‍රකාශ කළ බව.

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

I said, "A certain amount of control".

ඉලංගරත්න මයා.
(திரு. இலங்காரத்ன)
(Mr. Ilangaratne)

අද තියෙන තත්ත්වය මොකක්ද? මේ සංශෝධන පනතින් පාලනය අයිති වන්නෙ ආණ්ඩුවට නොවෙයි, සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම විදේශිකයන්ටයි. ආණ්ඩුවට පාලනය අයිති වුනා නම් අපි ටිකක් දුරටවත් සතුටු වෙනවා. නමුත් ආණ්ඩුවට පාලනය නැහැ. හුඟක් දුරට විදේශිකයන්ටයි, පාලනය ගිහි වන්නෙ. එපමණක් නොවෙයි. කලින් තිබුණු පනත අනුව අධ්‍යක්ෂවරුන් 6 දෙනාගෙන් තුන් දෙනෙක් නිලධාරින්; අනික් තුන් දෙනා කොටස් අයිතිකරුවන්. දැන් ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙන සංශෝධන පනතෙ හැටියට ඒ සීමාවත් නැහැ. දැන් නිලධාරින් 3 දෙනයි, කොටස් කරුවන් 5 දෙනයි. පටන්ගැන්මේදී පරමාර්ථය වෙලා තිබුනෙ ලාංකිකයන්ට අවස්ථාවක් දීමයි. මේ සංශෝධන පනත අනුව ලාංකික කිරීමත් සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම අහෝසි වෙනවා. විදේශීය මුදල් විශාල වශයෙන් මෙහාට ආවොත් පාලනයට ඇඟිලි ගැසීමට ඒ අයට බලයක් ඇති වෙනවා. මේ සංශෝධන පනතින් ඒ විධියේ බලයක් දී තිබෙනවා. 1955 දී මේ සංවර්ධන මුදල් නීතිගත සංස්ථාව ඇති කළේ ලංකාවේ සිටින ව්‍යාපාරිකයන්ට යම්කිසි අවස්ථාවක් දීමටයි. මා කලින් කිව්වා වගේ 1947 සිටම ආර්ථික නහ ලණුව අල්ලාගෙන සිටියේ විදේශිකයන්. ඒ නිසා අපි සන්තෝෂ වෙනවා, විශේෂයෙන්ම සමාජවාදී විපක්ෂයේ බල කිරීම නිසා ඒ විධියේ ආඥා පනතක් ඉදිරිපත් කර, ලංකාවේ සංවර්ධන මුදල් නීතිගත සංස්ථාවක් ඇති කර අපේ නොයෙකුත් කර්මාන්තවලට සහ ගොවි කර්මාන්තයට ආධාර දීමට නියම කර ගැනීම ගැන.

ලංකාව ස්වාධීන කර ගන්නට වුවමනා නම් ව්‍යාපාරිකයන් වශයෙන් ලංකාව තුළ මුදල් වැය කළ යුතුවා සේම ජාතිය පිළිබඳ වේදනාවක් ඇති උදවිය ව්‍යාපාරික ජීවිතය සඳහා උනන්දු කරවිය යුතු බව අනාගාරික ධර්මපාලතුමා වැනි ජාති හිතෛෂීන් කාලයක් තිස්සේම කී බව අප දන්නවා. මේ වගේ කීම් නිසා එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂය අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී පක්ෂයක් වුණත් ජාතික හැඟීමක් ඇති කිරීම පිණිස මෙවැනි සංස්ථාවක් ඇති කිරීම ගැන අප සතුටු වෙනවා. එහෙත් නොයෙක් ආණ්ඩු විසින් නොයෙකුත් සංස්ථා ඇති කරනු ලබන්නේ ප්‍රචාරය සඳහා පමණයි. ඒ සංස්ථා ක්‍රියාත්මක කිරීමට යුහුසුළු වන්නේ නැහැ. විදේශිකයන්ගේ බලපෑම් නිසා විශේෂයෙන්ම එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ ආණ්ඩුවට මෙවැනි පනතක් ක්‍රියාවේ යෙදවීම අමාරු වුණා.

එසේ වුවද, 1965 දී මහජන එක්සත් පෙරමුණේ ආණ්ඩුව ආවාසින් පසු පෞද්ගලික ව්‍යාපාරිකයන්ට පමණක් නැන නොදී ආණ්ඩුවටත් කොටස් ලබා ගැනීමටත් ආණ්ඩුවත් සමඟ සම්බන්ධ වූ ව්‍යාපාරිකයන්ට ප්‍රයෝජනයක් ලබා ගැනීම පිණිස අවස්ථාව සලසා දීමටත් 1958 දී මුල් පනත සංශෝධනය කළා. ඒ සංශෝධන පනතේ අන්දමට යම් කිසි ආයතනයක කොටස් 20 කට අඩු ගණනක් ආණ්ඩුවට තිබුණා නම් එවැනි ආයතනවලටත් මේ සංස්ථාවෙන් ප්‍රයෝජන ලබා ගන්නට පුළුවන්කම ලැබුණා. ඒ සංශෝධනයෙන් පසු ජාතික සංවර්ධනය ඇති කිරීමේ රජයේ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය උඩ පසුගිය කාලය තුළදී විශාල කාර්මික විප්ලවයක් මේ රට තුළ ඇති කරන්නට පුළුවන් වුණු බව තමුන්නාන්සේ දන්නවා ඇති. අප විසින් ඇති කරන ලද කර්මාන්තයෙහි නියම ප්‍රතිඵල ලබා ගැනීමේ අවස්ථාවට දැන් මේ ආණ්ඩුව එලඹ සිටිනවා. මහජනතාවටත් ඒ ප්‍රතිඵල ලබා ගැනීමට අවස්ථාව සැලසීම ගැන අප සතුටු වෙනවා.

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

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, ඊයේ උත්සවාකාරයෙන් වානේ කර්මාන්ත ශාලාව විවෘත කරන්නට යෙදුණා. මේ පිළිබඳව අප රුසියාවට අතිශයින්ම කෘතඥ විය යුතුයි. මෙම වානේ කර්මාන්ත ශාලාව සාදන ලද්දේ රුසියන් ආධාර ලබාගෙන යි. ඊයේ විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයේ සිටින අපත් ඒ උත්සවයට සහභාගී වුණා. එහෙත් මේ කාරණය ගැන එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් අතර ඒ තරම් සැලකිල්ලක් තිබුණු බවක් පෙනුණේ නැහැ. මෙය ජාතික ආයතනයක් නිසා විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයෙන් හුඟ දෙනකු මීට සහභාගී වුණා. එහෙත් කර්මාන්ත ඇමතිතුමාගෙ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමාත් සෞඛ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමාත් හැර එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ වෙනත් කිසිම මන්ත්‍රීවරයකු මීට සහභාගී වී සිටිනු අප දැක්කේ නැහැ. එසේ කරන්නට ඇත්තේ එක්කෝ කර්මාන්ත ඇමතිතුමා කෙරෙහි කල කිරීමක් ඇති නිසා විය හැකියි. එසේ නැත්නම් මේ කර්මාන්ත ශාලාව ගොඩ නැඟීමට රුසියාවෙන් ආධාර ලැබුණු නිසා එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ ධනපති කොටස් ඊට සහභාගී නොවුණා විය හැකියි.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, පරණ එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයට වඩා අලුත් එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂය හොඳ යයි අප කල්පනා කළා. පසුගිය මහා මැතිවරණ සමයේදී ඒ පක්ෂය ප්‍රචාරය කෙළේත් ඒ විධියටයි. "අපි පරණ අය නොවෙයි. දැන් තිබෙන්නේ සමාජවාදී එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයක්, ජාති මාමක එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයක්" යනුවෙනුයි, මැතිවරණ සමයේදී ඒ පක්ෂය ප්‍රකාශ කෙළේ. එහෙත් දැන් තිබෙන එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂය එදා 1955 දී තිබුණු එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයටත් වඩා ප්‍රතිගාමී බව මේ සංශෝධන පනතෙන්ම පෙනී යනවා. මේ සංශෝධන පනත අනුව කලින් ගත්තාටත් වඩා ප්‍රතිගාමී පියවර රාශියක් ගන්නට මේ ආණ්ඩුවට සිදු වෙනවා. මේ ආණ්ඩුව බලයට පත් වුණු හැටියේම අගමැතිතුමා කීවේ, "මෙය ගොවි රටක්. ඒ නිසා කර්මාන්ත කරන්න අවශ්‍ය නෑ. ගොවි රටක් හැටියටම මෙය ගෙන යනවා" කියලයි. අවුරුදු 9 ක් තුළ බලයෙන් පහ වී සිටීම හේතුකොටගෙන රටේ මොනවා වෙනවාද කියා නොදැන සිටි නිසා සමහර විට එවැනි ප්‍රකාශ කරන්ට පුළුවන්කම ලැබෙන්ට ඇති.

මේ සංශෝධන කෙටුම්පත් පනතින් සිදු වන්නෙ මොකක්ද? මෙහි මුල් පනතින් 1955 දී බලය ලබා ගත්තෙ ගොවිකමටයි, කර්මාන්තවලටයි ආධාර මුදල් යොදන්ටයි. එසේ කෙතෙක් දුරට යෙදුවාද කියන එක වෙනම ප්‍රශ්නයක්. නමුත් මේ සංශෝධිත පනත් කෙටුම්පතින් බලය ලබා ගන්ට අදහස් කරන්නෙ, වෙළඳාම සඳහාත් එම මුදල් යොදවන්ටයි.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, අපේ ආණ්ඩුව බලයට පත් වුණාට පස්සෙ මේ රටට වුවමනා කරන දේවල් පිටරටින් ගෙන්වීම් කරගෙන ගියෙ රජයේ සංස්ථා හා දෙපාර්තමේන්තු මඟින් බව ඔබතුමා දන්නවා. සමූපකාර තොග වෙළෙඳ ආයතනය වැනි සංස්ථා මඟිනුත්, රජයේ බඩු ගබඩාව වැනි දෙපාර්තමේන්තු මඟිනුත් මෙරටට අවශ්‍ය බඩු ගෙන්වීම් කරගෙන ගියා. ඒ නිසා "කාගිල්ස්", "මිලර්ස්" වැනි විදේශීය ධනපති කොම්පැනිවලට අකුළාගෙන යන්ට සිද්ධ වුණා. "වෙළඳාම ලාංකික කළ යුතුයි, මෙරටට අවශ්‍ය බඩු රජය මඟින්ම ගෙන්විය යුතුයි" යනුවෙන් විශාල උද්ඝෝෂණයක්, රජය කෙරෙහි ජනතා බලපෑමක් මේ රටේ තිබෙනවා, එසේ තිබියදීත් ගොවිකමටත්, කර්මාන්තවලටත් පමණක් ආධාර දීමට ඇති කළ ගත් මේ සංස්ථාව—

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

කර්මාන්තවලට දුන් හැටි [බාධා කිරීමක්]

ඉලංගරත්න මයා.
(திரு. இலங்கரத்ன)
(Mr. Ilangaratne)

ඒක වෙනම ප්‍රශ්නයක්. [බාධා කිරීමක්] වෙළඳාම හදන හැටි මම කියන්නම්. මේ සංස්ථාවෙන් වාණිජ කටයුතුවලටත් ආධාර ලබා දීමට තමුන්නාන්සෙලා කටයුතු කරන්නෙ, අකුළා ගෙන ගිය ඒවාට නැවත අවස්ථාවක් දෙන්ටද? මාස 2 කට පමණ පෙර ලංකාවේ විශාල ව්‍යාපාරයක් —"ගිල්ටන් හෝටලය"—ඇති කරන්ට

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

[ඉලංගරත්න මයා.]

කටයුතු කළා. මේ හෝටලය සම්බන්ධයෙන් අපේ ආණ්ඩුවත් එක්තරා අන්දමකට ක්‍රියා කරගෙන ගියා. අපි ක්‍රියා කර ගෙන ගියේ විදේශීය ආණ්ඩුවක ආධාර ඇතිව රජයේ සංස්ථාවක් හැටියට පවත්වා ගෙන යන්ටයි. දැන් මොකක්ද සිදු වී තිබෙන්නෙ? එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයෙ බලපුළුවන්කාරයන් පස් හය දෙනකුගෙ මාර්ගයෙන් හදන හෝටලය කට වුවමනා කරන බඩු විදේශයන්ගෙන් ගෙන්වා ගැනීමට කෝටි දෙකකට පමණ මේ ආණ්ඩුව ඇප වෙන්ට යනව. ඒ වුව මනාවන් පිරිමසා ගැනීම සඳහාද, මේ සංස්ථාවෙන් මෙවැනි වාණිජ ව්‍යාපාරවලටත් ආධාර දෙන්ට පුළුවන් වන ආකාරයට පුළුල් කරන්ට යන්නෙ?

ගිය අවුරුද්දෙත් ඊට කලින් අවුරුද්දෙත් කළ කථාවලින් ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා මේ රජයේ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය කියන්ට යෙදුණ. ජනසතු සේවාවන් ධනපති සතු සේවාවන් කරන්ට යන බව අපි දන්නව. ඒ වගේම රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා පනත් කෙටුම්පත් කරගෙන යනව, ජනසතු සේවාවන් නොයෙක් විධියෙ කොම්පැණිවලට ආපසු භාර දීම සඳහා. විශේෂයෙන් වාණිජ ව්‍යාපාර භාර දීමට කටයුතු කරගෙන යනව. එහෙම නම් කෙළින්ම අපට කියන්න, මේ ආධාර මුදල් මේ මේ කටයුතුවලට යොදවනවා කියා. කරවල සංස්ථාවක් ඇති කරන්ට යනව. හිටපු කරවල වෙළෙඳුන්ටම නැවත වතාවක් දූෂණ ක්‍රියා කරන්ට ඉඩ දීමටයි එසේ කටයුතු කරන්නෙ. එහෙම නම් අපි දැනගන්ට කැමතියි. එවැනි කටයුතුවලට ඉඩ දෙන්ටද මේ සංස්ථාවෙන් ආධාර මුදල් ගන්ට යන්නෙ කියා. ජනසතු කළ ඛනිජ තෙල් ව්‍යාපාරය නැවත වරක් කොම්පැණි සතු කරන්ට නොයෙකුත් පියවර ගෙන තිබෙනව. එදා ගරු ඇමතිතුමා විරුද්ධ වුණ නිසා ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් වැඩිදුර කරුණු කියන්ට මට අවකාශයක් ලැබුණෙ නැහැ. ඛනිජ තෙල් නීතිගත සංස්ථාව මඟින් ගෙන්වූ සමහර ඛනිජ තෙල් කොටස්—"ඉන්කෝ ප්‍රඩක්ට්ස්"—නැවතත් දැන් ෂෙල් කොම්පැණිය මඟින් ගෙන්වනව. මෙවැනි ආධාර මුදල් දෙන්ට යන්නෙ, ජනසතු සේවා ධනපති සතු සේවා කරන්ටද? වාණිජ ව්‍යාපාර වලට ආධාර කරන්ට රජය අදහස් කරනවා.

මේ සංශෝධන පනත් කෙටුම්පතේ කරුණු කීපයක් සඳහන් කර තිබෙනව. එකක්, සංස්ථාවේ පරමාර්ථ වශයෙන් තිබුණු "කම්මාන්ත හා කෘෂිකාර්මික" යන්නට "වාණිජ ව්‍යාපාරත්" ඇතුළත් කිරීම. ඒ කාරණය මා දැන් විග්‍රහ කළා. අනික් කාරණය, ප්‍රතිසංස්කරණ හා සංවර්ධන බැංකුවෙන් ගන්නා ණය පමණක් නොව රජයට කැමති වෙනත් ආයතනවලින් ණය ගැනීමට සංස්ථාවට බලය ලබා ගැනීමයි. [බාධා කිරීමක්] ඔව්. ඒක හොඳයි කියා තමුන්නාන්සේ හිතනව ඇති. නමුත් ඒක ඉතාමත්ම භයානක වැඩක්. කාගෙන්ද මේ ණය මුදල් ගන්ට යන්නෙ? සමහර විට හිල්ටන් කොම්පැණියෙන් ගන්ට පුළුවන්. නැත්නම් වෙනත් පෞද්ගලික ආයතනයකින් ගන්ට පුළුවන්. ගන්නට කමක් නැහැ. මොනවාද ඒ අයට ආපසු දෙන්ට යන්නෙ? ලංකාවේ ධන හිමියන්ට නැති නොයෙක් සහන ඒ අයට දෙන්ට මේ සංශෝධන පනතෙ වගන්ති යොදා තිබෙනව. ඔවුන්ගෙන් මුද්දර ගාස්තු අය කරන්නෙ නැහැ. කිසිම වෙනත් බද්දක් අය කරන්නෙ නැහැ. ඒ හැම එකකින්ම ලාංකිකයන්ට වඩා විශාල තත්ත්වයක් මේ සංශෝධන පනතින් ඉල්ලා තිබෙනව. අපි මේකට විරුඛ ඒකයි.

අනික, මුදල් සම්බන්ධතාවන් ඇති ව්‍යාපාරයක පාලක මණ්ඩලයට සංස්ථාවේ නියෝජිතයන් ඇතුළත් කිරීම. යම්කිසි විධියකින් විදේශීය කොම්පැණිකාරයකු, මෙම කොම්පැණියක කොටස්කරුවකු වශයෙන් මෙහාට ගත්තොත් ඔහුට බලය තිබෙනව, ඔහුගේ රටෙන් ඒ කොම්පැණියෙන් මෙහාට පිරිස් ගෙන්වා පදිංචි කරවන්ට. එවැනි අය පදිංචි කෙරෙව්වම ඒ උදවිය කොයිතරම් දේශපාලන බල තල පාවිච්චි කරනවාදැයි තමුන්නාන්සේ දන්නව. දකුණු කොළඹ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.) විසින් ප්‍රකාශ කරන්ට යෙදුණ. තෙල් වන්දි ප්‍රශ්නය සම්බන්ධයෙන් එවකට සිටි මුදල් ඇමතිවර ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා මහත්මයාට මොන තරම් තර්ජනවලට මුහුණ පාන්ට සිදු වුණාද කියා.

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

රක්ෂණ සංස්ථාව ඇති කළාට පසුව මටත් විශාල තර්ජන ඇති කළා. මා මුදල් ඇමතිවරුන්ගෙ සාකච්ඡාවට ලන්ඩනයට ගිය අවස්ථාවේදි රක්ෂණ ව්‍යාපාර ජනසතු කිරීම සම්බන්ධයෙන් මහා ලොකු රක්ෂණ කොම්පැණිකාරයින් ඇවිත් අප සමග සාකච්ඡා කළා. අපට ඒ අය සමග සාකච්ඡා කරන්ට සිද්ධ වුණේ "කරුණාකර මේ අයට සාකච්ඡා කරන්ට ඉඩ දෙන්ට" යයි ඒ ආණ්ඩුවේ මුදල් ඇමති අපෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටි නිසයි. රක්ෂණ සංස්ථාව ඇති කළාට පසු මොකද කිව්වෙ? "අපට වන්දි ගෙවීවෙ නැත්නම් අපි මේ ප්‍රශ්නය සම්බන්ධයෙන් ලංකාණ්ඩුව ජාත්‍යන්තර උසාවියකට ඉදිරිපත් කර නව" කිව්ව. අපි කියා සිටිය, "ජාත්‍යන්තර උසාවියක් ඉදිරියට යන්ට අප භය නැහැ. ලංකාවට වුවමනා විධියටයි, අපි ජනසතු සේවා ඇති කළේ" කියා. එවිට අපට තරවටුවක් කළා, "ලංකාවේ ආර්ථික තත්ත්වය විශාල වශයෙන් රඳා පවතින්නෙ තේ වෙළඳාම උඩයි. යම්කිසි විධියකින් ජනසතු කළ රක්ෂණ සමාගම්වලට වන්දි නොගෙවීවොත් අපට තේ බීම පවා නවත්වන්ට සිද්ධ වෙයි" කියා. ඒ අවස්ථාවෙදි මට කියන්ට සිදු වුණා, "උඹලට අයිති තේ වතුවල, උඹලම කර්මාන්ත ශාලා හදාගෙන උඹලම නිෂ්පාදනය කරන උඹලගෙ තේ උඹල බොන්නෙ නැත්නම්, වතුවල පාලනය ගැනත්, වතුවල අයිතිවාසිකම් ගැනත් අපට නැවත සලකා බලන්න සිද්ධ වෙනව" කියා. මේ විධියේ තර්ජනවලට නිදහස් ජාතියකට මුහුණ පාන්ට සිදුවී තිබෙන නිසයි, මේ ආර්ථික ලණු ඔය විදේශිකයන්ට, විශේෂයෙන්ම අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන්ට, අපි දෙන්ට කැමති නැත්තෙ.

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)
ඒ ධනපතින්ගෙ තර්ජනයක්.

ඉලංගරත්න මයා.
(திரு. இலங்கரத்ன)
(Mr. Ilangaratne)
ඔව්. ධනපතියන්ගෙ තර්ජනයක්. ආණ්ඩුවත් පිටුපසින් සිටගෙන හොඳට අනුබල දෙනව. [බාධා කිරීමක්] තෙල් සංස්ථාව ගැන විලිස් නෝන ඇවිත් කොච්චර තර්ජනය කළා ද ?

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)
ඒ ඇමරිකාව [බාධා කිරීමක්].

ඉලංගරත්න මයා.
(திரு. இலங்கரத்ன)
(Mr. Ilangaratne)
එංගලන්තයත් එහෙමයි. [බාධාකිරීමක්] මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා කිව්ව, කරුණාකර සාකච්ඡා කරන්න—

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා. (දොම්පෙ)
(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க—தொம்பே)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike—Dompe)
විලීස්ගෙ බනිස් නැති වුණා. [බාධාකිරීමක්].

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)
ඒක ඇමරිකාවෙ නීතියක්.

ඉලංගරත්න මයා.
(திரு. இலங்கரத்ன)
(Mr. Ilangaratne)
ඇමරිකාව මේ නීතිය ඇති කළේ තෙල් සංස්ථාව නිසාමයි. අපි තෙල් සංස්ථාව පිහිටුවා 6 මාසයකට පස්සෙයි ඒ නීතිය ඇති කරල අපට තර්ජනය කළේ.

තමුන්නාන්සේලා බලයට පත් වුණාට පසු වන්දි ගෙව්ව. ඔය තරම් වන්දි ගෙවලත් තමුන්නාන්සේලාට තවම ආධාර ලැබුණෙ නැහැනෙ. වන්දි ගෙවල හොඳහිත ඇති කර ගත්තට තවම ආධාර ලැබුණෙ නැහැ. ඒ නිසයි කර්මාන්ත ඇමතිතුමාට අද කෑ ගහල කියන්ට සිදු වෙලා තිබෙන්නෙ, "උඹලගෙ සල්ලි ඕනෑ නැහැ, ගිහින් කියපල්ල උඹලගෙ රටවලට අපට ඕනෑ කරන්නෙ අපේ තේවලට, අපේ පොල්වලට, අපේ රබර්වලට නියම මිළක්" කියා. රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමාත් ඒක අනුමත කළා. එම නිසා මේ කාරණය ගැන අම්මාපප වන්ට වුවමනා නැහැ. අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන් කිසි කලෙක අපට හොඳක් කරන්නෙ නැහැ. ඒ අයට පන්දම් ඇල්ලීමෙන් සිදු වන්නෙත් කාලය ගතවන එක පමණයි.

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

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)
එය පිළිගන්නවා.

ඉලංගරත්න මයා.
(திரு. இலங்கரத்ன)
(Mr. Ilangaratne)
එහෙම නම් ප්‍රතිපත්ති වෙනස් කරන්න. නැත්නම් අපට තැනක් දෙන්න.

මෙවැනි අවස්ථාවක fපින්ලන්තයේ සිදු වූ සිද්ධියක් ගැන කියන්න කැමතියි. විදේශ ආධාර නැත්නම් විදේශ ණය මුදල් පිළිබඳව fපින්ලන්තයේ සිදු වූ දෙයක් ගැන කියවන්න කැමතියි. "The Fund and Bank Review—Finance and Development, Volume III, June 1966, Number 2" නමැති පොතෙන් මම කියවන්නම්. තමුන්නාන්සේලාගේ ස්වාමි රටේ පොතක්.

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)
කියවන්න.

ඉලංගරත්න මයා.
(திரு. இலங்கரத்ன)
(Mr. Ilangaratne)
මම කියවන්නම්.

"The Year 1951 was a good one for Finland ;—"

fපින්ලන්තයේ තත්ත්වය කියෙව්වාම අපේ තත්ත්වය ගැනත් දැනගන්නට පුළුවන්.

"—the world market was favourable to Finnish exports, and the country's balance of payments improved considerably. But the next year was a difficult one. Because of the substantial amounts of foreign currency that had been available in 1951, Finnish importers had ordered large quantities of goods for delivery in 1952.—"

මෙන්න මේකයි සිදුවෙන්න යන්නෙ. වාණිජ ව්‍යාපාරවලට මේ සංස්ථාවෙන් විශාල වශයෙන් මුදල් දෙන්නට යනවා. ඊට පසුව "ෆ්ලෝයිඩන්බර්ග්" වැනි කොම්පැනි බොහොම ප්‍රාණවත් වී නැවතත් වීර්ය කරාවි මේ රටට අවශ්‍ය නොවන ද්‍රව්‍ය ගෙන්වන්න. පින්ලන්තයේ සිදු වුණේ එහෙමයි. තොග ගණන් ණය මුදල්—ආධාර මුදල්—දුන් විට ඕනෑම බඩුවක් ගෙන්වා වෙළඳාම් කරන්න වෙළෙඳුන් පටන් ගන්නවා. මේ රටට වුවමනා නැති බඩුත් ගෙන්වනවා. එසේ ගෙන්වීමෙන් fපින්ලන්තයේ සිදු වුණේ මෙන්න මේකයි :

"—In that year, however, Finland's exports declined, partly because of restrictions on timber purchases imposed by the British Government.—"

ඒ අයට ආධාර මුදල් දීලා ඉන් පසුව ඒ රටේ ලී ගන්නේ නැතිව සීමා කළා. නැත්නම් අඩු මිලක් දුන්නා. අපේ රටටත් සිදු වී තිබෙන්නේ ඒකයි. නොයෙක් විධියේ ආධාර මුදල් දෙනවාය කියා අමෙරිකාව පොරොන්දු වෙනවා. ඊළඟට අපේ බඩු විකුණන්න තැනක් නැති වේවි. එක්කෝ රබර් තොග සම්පූර්ණයෙන් මාර්කට් එකට දමනවා. එක්කෝ ඔලිව් ඔයිල් මාර්කට් එකට දමනවා. ඔය විධියට අපට අවහිර කරනවා. fපින්ලන්තයේ සිදු වුණේ ඒකයි.

"—When an economy depends very largely on a few products, a deterioration in export conditions is likely to affect the entire economy immediately. This happened in Finland; production stagnated, and unemployment increased sharply. Holdings of foreign exchange fell. Although reserves were much larger than at the end of 1950, they consisted mainly of currencies that were of little help in meeting current obligations.

. . . . . In the years after 1952, improved conditions in the major markets of Finnish exports and increased production capacity, together with the cessation of reparation payments, helped to enlarge the real resources of the country. In January 1955, all drawings on the Fund were fully repaid."

එය සිදු වුණේ වෙළෙඳුන්ට ඕනෑ තරම් මුදල් දීම නිසා ඔවුන් අනවශ්‍ය බඩුත් ගෙන්වීම නිසයි. ඒ අතරතුර ඔවුන්ගේ අමු ද්‍රව්‍ය බ්‍රිතාන්‍යය ගත්තේ නැහැ. ඉතාම නරක තත්ත්වයක් ඇති වුණේ. ඊට පසුව ඒ රටට ආර්ථික ප්‍රශ්න විසඳා ගන්නට පුළුවන් වුණේ කර්මාන්තවලට මුල් තැන දී ඒවා පිටරට යැවීමෙනුයි. මේවා පෙනෙද්

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

දී අපේ රටෙත් මේවා ඇති වන බවට තවත් විග්‍රහ කර දක්වන්න ඕනෑකමක් නැහැ.

මේ සහරාවෙහිම විදේශික ආධාර ගැනත් අදහසක් තිබෙනවා.

"Finally, aid-giving governments are under a political necessity to assure, and demonstrate to their peoples, that the assistance being paid for by their taxpayers is being used as effectively as possible to foster economic progress."

ආධාර දෙන රටවල් ඒ රටවල සිටින වැසියන්ට වගකීමක් ඇතිව කිය යුතුව තිබෙනවා ඒ දෙන ආධාරවලින් ආර්ථික දියුණුවක් ඇති වෙනවාය කියල. මෙය ලංකාවට ලැබෙන ආර්ථික දියුණුවක්ද? එහෙම නැත්නම් ඇමෙරිකාවට ලැබෙන ආර්ථික දියුණුවක්ද? ඒ ආධාරය දීමෙන් ඒ රටේ ආර්ථික දියුණුවක් ඇති වෙනවායයි තමන්ගේ ආණ්ඩුවට කියන්නට ඇමෙරිකාවේ ඉන්න වැසියන්ට සිද්ධ වෙලා තියෙනවා. එතකොට ඒ ආධාරය දෙන්නෙ අපට වුවමනාවට—අපේ ප්‍රයෝජනයට—නොවෙයි.

"Likewise, the recipient governments have to provide similar assurances to their peoples, who will eventually have to make available counterpart resources in money and manpower and, in some cases, reimbursement—at least in part—of the aid received."

මේ විධියට විදේශිය ආධාර ලබා ගැනීමෙන් අපේ රටට කොයි තරම් දුරට ලාභයක් වෙනවද, අලාභයක් වෙනවද යන්න මෙයින් තේරෙනවා.

සංශෝධන පනත් කෙටුම්පත තවත් යෝජනාවක් කර තිබෙනවා. මොකක්ද ඒ යෝජනාව? සංස්ථාවේ මූලික ධනය අසූ ලක්ෂයේ සිට ලක්ෂ දෙසිය හතළිහ දක්වා වැඩි කිරීමයි ඒ යෝජනාව. ඇයි මේ මූලික මුදල ලක්ෂ 80 සිට එකෑවරම ලක්ෂ 240 දක්වා නැංගුවෙ? ඒ එක යෝජනාවක්. අනෙක අධ්‍යක්ෂවරුන්ගේ ගණන වැඩි කිරීම පිළිබඳ ප්‍රශ්නයයි. අධ්‍යක්ෂවරුන්ගේ සංඛ්‍යාව හයේ සිට 8 දක්වා වැඩි කිරීමයි ඒ ප්‍රශ්නය. දැන් ඉන්න පිරිස නිලධාරී අධ්‍යක්ෂවරුන් තුන් දෙනකු සහ කොටස් හිමි අධ්‍යක්ෂවරුන් තුන් දෙනකු යනුවෙන් හය දෙනයි. ඒ ගණන කොටස් හිමි අධ්‍යක්ෂවරුන් පස් දෙනකු දක්වා වැඩි කිරීමෙන් මුළු ගණන අටක් කර තිබෙනවා. එතකොට ආණ්ඩුවේ නිලධාරීන්ටවත් අයිතිවාසිකමක් ලැබෙන්නෙ නැහැ කොටස් හිමියන්ට ලැබෙන තරම්.

සංස්ථාව මගින් ණයට ගත් මුදල් ආපසු ගෙවීම හා සම්බන්ධ කාල සීමාව අවුරුදු 16 වෙනුවට අවුරුදු 26 දක්වා ප්‍රමාද කිරීමට බලය ලැබෙන අනෙක් සංශෝධනය ගැන බලමු. 1955 දී පටන් ගත් ව්‍යාපාර දැන් අවුරුදු ගණනාවක් ඒ මුදලින් ප්‍රයෝජන අරන් තිබෙනවා. ණය මුදල් ගෙවීම ප්‍රමාද කරන්නට හේතුව මොකක්ද? පළමුවෙන් ණයට ගත් මුදල් ආපසු ගෙවන්නට තවත් ඉතිරි වී තිබෙන්නේ අවුරුදු හයක් හෝ හතක් පමණයි. එහෙම නම්, ඇයි තවත් අවුරුදු දහයකට කල් දමන්නෙ? මේ ව්‍යාපාරවල යෙදී සිටින්නෝ කවුරු ද? එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ ආධාරකරුවන් ඉන්න නිසාද, එසේ නැත්නම් වෙන මොන කාරණයක් නිසාද ඒ කාල සීමාව තවත් අවුරුදු දහයකින් දීර්ඝ කරන්නෙ?

"ප්‍රතිසංස්කරණය හා සංවර්ධනය පිළිබඳ ජාත්‍යන්තර බැංකුවෙන් හෝ රජය විසින් අනුමත කරනු ලැබූ වෙන යම් ජාත්‍යන්තර හෝ විදේශීය සංවිධානයකින්" යනාදි වශයෙන් ඇප දීමට බලය ලබා ගැනීම සම්බන්ධයෙන් සඳහන් වෙනවා. ආණ්ඩුවක්, ආණ්ඩුවකින් යම්කිසි ආධාර මුදලක් ලබාගෙන ක්‍රියා කිරීම ගැන අපේ විරුද්ධත්වයක් නැහැ. එහෙත් දැන් ඕනෑම කෙනකු—ඕනෑම ධනපතියෙකුට—මුදල් මෙහාට දෙන්න පුළුවනි. ආණ්ඩුව ඇප වෙනවා. ආණ්ඩුවට බලයක් නැහැ. ව්‍යාපාරත් ගෙන යන්නෙ පෞද්ගලික අයයි. ඒ වගේම සමහර ව්‍යාපාරවලින් ලාභ වෙනවද නැත්නම් පාඩු වෙනවද කියන්න දන්නෙත් නැහැ. ඒ කොයි හැටි වෙතත් ආණ්ඩුව ඇප වෙනවා.

රජය විසින් කරනු ලබන මේ කටයුත්තේදී රජය වෙනුවෙන් අත්සන් කිරීම සඳහා අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරවයාට හෝ අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරවරයා විසින් නම් කරනු ලබන නැනැත්තකුට බලය පැවරෙනවා. ගරු පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමා මීට පෙර මේ ගැන කිව්වා. අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරතුමාගේ නම යොදා තිබෙන්නේ ඇයි කිව්වා. ආණ්ඩුවකින් ආණ්ඩුවකට යන

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

[ඉලංගරත්න මයා.]

ක්‍රමයට ආධාර මුදලක් ගන්න අවස්ථාවලදී පමණයි අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරතුමාගේ නම යෙදිය යුත්තේ. එසේ නැතිව පෞද්ගලික කෙනෙකුගෙන් තවත් පෞද්ගලික ව්‍යාපාරයකට ගන්න විට අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරතුමාගේ නම අප දමා නැහැ.

මෙයින් අපට පෙනෙනවා මොකක්ද මේ කරන්න යන්නෙ කියන එක. 29 වැනි වගන්තිය වෙනස් කරන්න එපායයි කියමින් කෑකෝ ගහනවා. ප්‍රිවි කවුන්සලයට—රාජාධිකරණයට—ඇපැල් අරන්—අභියාචනය කර—සුප්‍රීම් උසාවිය—ශ්‍රේෂ්ඨාධිකරණය—ගත් තීරණයක් වෙනස් කර අනෙක් පැත්තට කරකවනවා. එහෙමත් කරන නමුත් දැන් මොකද කරන්නෙ? දැන් අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරතුමාගෙ අත්සන යොදන්න ඕනෑ මේ රටේ ඉන්න ධනපතියෙකුට වෙනත් රටක ඉන්න ධනපතියෙකුගෙන් ණයක් ගැනීමට. මෙය පෞද්ගලික ප්‍රශ්නයක් නොවෙයි. මෙය මුළු ලංකාවටම කරන අවමානයක්. එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ ආණ්ඩුව ගෙන යන්නෙ මුළු රටටම අවමානයක් ලබා දෙන දෙයක්. ඇමෙරිකානු යටත් විජිත වාදයක් හැටියටයි මෙය ගෙන යන්නෙ. මේය රටටත්, ජාතියටත්, ආග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරවරයාටත් කරන අවමානයක් බව කියන්න ඕනෑ.

ද සොයිසා සිරිවර්ධන මයා.
(திரு. டி. சொய்ஸா சிறிவர்தன)
(Mr. de Zoysa Siriwardena)
කැතයි.

ඉලංගරත්න මයා.
(திரு. இலங்காரத்ன)
(Mr. Ilangaratne)

නීතිගත සංස්ථාව මගින් ලියා අත්සන් කර දෙනු ලබන ගිවිසුම් ආදියට මුද්දර ගාස්තුවලින් නිදහස ලබා දීම ගැන යටි යන්තොට ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා) විස්තරයක් කළා. ලංකාවේ කිසිම කෙනකුට මෙවැනි සහනයක් නැහැ. එතකොට මුද්දර ගාස්තුවකුත් නැහැ. මොකක්ද මේ කරන්න යන්නෙ? රාජ්‍ය කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ගරු ඇමතිතුමා ඇමෙරිකාව සමඟ මොනවා හරි ගිවිසුම් ඇතිකර ගෙන තිබෙනවාද? මොන විධියේ ප්‍රති පත්ති අනුගමනය කරමින්ද මේවා කරන්නෙ? අපිත් පනත් කෙටුම්පත් ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙනවා. අපිත් ආණ්ඩු පක්ෂයෙ ඉඳලා තියෙනවා. නමුත් මේ විධියෙ ඇස් බැන්දුම් අපි කවදාවත් කරලා නැහැ. ලංකාවේ සංවර්ධන මුදල් නීතිගත සංස්ථා (සංශොධන) පනතෙ නීතිය බල පෑමේ ප්‍රකාශයෙ (අ) කොටසෙ මෙසේ සඳහන් වෙනවා:

"ලංකාවේ පුද්ගලික අංශය දියුණු කිරීම සඳහා විදේශීය මූල ධනය යෙදවීම සිදු කෙරෙමින් ජාත්‍යන්තර මුදල් නීතිගත සංස්ථාව සහ ප්‍රතිසංස්කරණය හා සංවර්ධනය පිළිබඳ ජාත්‍යන්තර බැංකුව වැනි ජාත්‍යන්තර මුදල් ආයතනවලට නීතිගත සංස්ථාවේ කොටස් හා ණය ප්‍රාග්ධනයට සහභාගී වීමට හැකි වනු ඇත."

නමුත් පනත් කෙටුම්පතේ 2 වන පිටුවෙ 8 වන කොටසෙ මෙහෙමයි:

"ප්‍රතිසංස්කරණය හා සංවර්ධනය පිළිබඳ ජාත්‍යන්තර බැංකුවෙන්" යන වචන වෙනුවට "ප්‍රතිසංස්කරණය හා සංවර්ධනය පිළිබඳ ජාත්‍යන්තර බැංකුවෙන් හෝ රජය විසින් අනුමත කරනු ලැබූ වෙන යම් ජාත්‍යන්තර හෝ විදේශීය සංවිධානයකින්" යන වචන ආදේශ කිරීමෙන්——"

නීතිය බලපෑමේ ප්‍රකාශයෙ එකක් තියෙනවා. පනත් කෙටුම්පතේ වෙන එකක් තියෙනවා. නීති කෙටුම්පත්කාරයන් මොකක්ද මේකෙන් බලාපොරොත්තු වෙන්නෙ? ඇයි කෙළින් කියන්න බැරි? හැම එකටම කොළේ වහල ගහන්ට බැහැ. විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයෙ නායිකාවට මෝටර් රථයක් තෑගි කිරීම සම්බන්ධයෙන් පත් කළ කොමිටියෙ වාර්තාව ඉදිරිපත් කළ අවස්ථාවෙදි වුවත් එහි නිගමනය කුමක්ද යන්න කියන්න පුළුවන්කමක් නැති කරමටයි තිබුණෙ. ඒ අන්දමේ කොළේ වසා ගහන ගැහිලිමයි මේ ආණ්ඩුව කර ගෙන යන්නෙ.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, නීතිය බලපෑමේ ප්‍රකාශයෙ තිබෙන්නෙ මෙයයි කියා කෙළින්ම කියන්ට බැරි ඇයි? ඊළඟට නීතිය බලපෑමේ ප්‍රකාශයෙ (ආ) කොටසෙ සඳහන් වන්නෙ මෙයයි:

"නීතිගත සංස්ථාව විසින් මුදල් යෙදවීය හැකි නිෂ්පාදන කටයුතුවල විෂය ප්‍රමාණය පුළුල් කරනු ඇත."

මෙන්න මේ විධියටයි පුළුල් කරන්නෙ කියා කියන්ට බැරි ඇයි? මුල් ආඥා පනතෙ තියෙන්නෙ ගොවිකමටයි

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

කර්මාන්තවලටයි පමණක් ආධාර කරන වය කියායි. මෙතන තියෙන්නෙ පුළුල් කිරීමක් නොවෙයි; එකතු කිරීමක්. වෙළඳාම එකතු කිරීමක්. මේ වාණිජ ව්‍යාපාර යනුවෙන් හඳුන්වන්නෙ මොන වද කියා මා නැවතත් ප්‍රශ්න කරනව. රක්ෂණ ව්‍යාපාර තව සැරයක් විදේශීන් ඇතුළු රක්ෂණ කොම්පැනිකාරයන්ට භාර දෙන්ට යනවය කියා ලොකු කතාවක් පවතිනව. එහෙම දෙයක් තියෙනවද? ඛනිජ තෙල් සංස්ථාවෙ කොටස් දැන් දී තිබෙනව. එය සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම දෙන්ට යනවද? කරවල ගෙන්වීම නැවත වරක් ලොකු ධනපතින්ට දෙන්ට යනවය කියා කතාවක් තිබෙනව. ඒක එහෙම කරනවද? ධීවර සංස්ථාවත් දෙන්ට යනවද? මොන වද මේ වාණිජ ව්‍යාපාර? වෙළඳාම් කරන්ට මොකටද විදේශීය මුදල්? "British India Company" නමැති කොම්පැණිය ඇවිත් නේද මේ රට ඇල්ලුවෙ? ඒව ආපහු යැව්වට පස්සෙ නැවත වරක් තමුන්නාන්සෙල ඒ අයට රට පාවා දෙන්ට යනව.

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

ඉලංගරත්න මයා.
(திரு. இலங்கரத்ன)
(Mr. Ilangaratne)
ඊළඟට නීතිය බලපෑමේ ප්‍රකාශනය (ඇ) කොටසෙ මෙසේ සඳහන් වෙනව:

"ලංකා බැංකුව, මහජන බැංකුව සහ ශ්‍රී ලංකා රක්ෂණ සංස්ථාව වැනි රජය සතු මුදල් ආයතන විසින් දෙනු ලබන ණය මුදල් සම්බන්ධයෙන් ඇප වීමට නීතිගත සංස්ථාවට හැකි වනු ඇත."

මට පෙනෙන හැටියට එය මේ පනතෙ කොතැනකවත් අඩංගු කර නැහැ. "පුද්ගලීක" යන වචනය කපා දැමීම සමහර විට මෙයින් බලාපොරොත්තු වන්න ඇතැයි යටියන්තොට ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා) කිව්ව. නමුත් මෙහි මොන විධියෙ අපේක්ෂාවක් තිබෙනවදැයි අපට පේන්නෙ නෑ.

4 වැනි ඡේදයෙ දැක්වෙන අන්දමට, මූලික මුදල රුපියල් ලක්ෂ 80 සිට එක පාරටම ලක්ෂ 240 දක්වා—තුන් ගුණයක්—වැඩි කරන්නෙ ඇයි? මුදල මේ තරම් වැඩි කරන්න කලින්, මේ සංස්ථාවේ තරම මොකක්ද, මෙතරම් බරක් දරන්නට ඊට ශක්තියක් තියෙනවද, මේ විධියෙ වගකීමක් ඊට බාරදෙන්න පුළුවන්කමක් තියෙනවද, ආදී කරුණු සොයා බැලිය යුතුව තිබුණ. 1965 අවුරුද්දෙ අන්තයෙදි මේ සංස්ථාවෙහි ඉතිරි වී තිබුණු මුදල රුපියල් 28,316 ක් පමණක් බව මා මේ අවස්ථාවෙදි විශේෂයෙන් මතක් කරන්න කැමතියි. එවැනි මුදලක් පමණක් ඉතිරි වන ජාවාරමක් මේ සංස්ථාව කළා නම්, එක පාරටම මේ මූලික මුදල රුපියල් ලක්ෂ 240 දක්වා වැඩි කරන්න හේතුව මොකක්ද?

අධ්‍යක්ෂවරුන් පත්කිරීමත් ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම අපේ ස්වාධීනත්වය නැති වන අන්දමට සිදුවන බව මම නැවත වරක් කියන්න කැමතියි. නිළ ලත් අධ්‍යක්ෂවරුන් 3 දෙනකුත් කොටස් හිමි 3 දෙනකුත් දැන් සිටිනව. යෝජනා කර තිබෙන්නෙ, නිළ ලත් අධ්‍යක්ෂක වරුන් 3 දෙනකුත් කොටස් හිමි 5 දෙන කුත් පත් කරන්නයි. නමුත් මේ මුදල් ලබා ගන්න අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරතුමාත් ඇපකරු වකු වශයෙන් අත්සන් කරනව. ආණ්ඩුවත් සෑම සහනයක්ම දෙනව. බදු අය කරන්නෙ නෑ; මුද්දර ගාස්තු අය කරන්නෙ නෑ. එහෙම කරලත් සම්පූර්ණ බලය කොටස් හිමියන්ට දෙනව. ආණ්ඩුවට දැනට තිබෙන බලයත් නැති වෙනව.

ඊළඟට 14 (5) ඡේදය ගැන කල්පනා කර බලන්න. අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරතුමාත් අපේ රටත් මෙවැනි නින්දිත නීහීන තත්ත්වයකට නොදමන ලෙස මම ඉතාමත් ඕනෑකමින් කරුණාවෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටිනව. අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරතුමාට විරුද්ධව නඩුවක් පවරන්නට පිටරටකින් පැමිණි විදේශීය පුද්ගලයකුට මේ අනුව පුළුවන්කම ලැබෙනව. අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරතුමාගේ නිළ පදවියත් අපේ රටත් මේ තරම් පහත් තත්ත්වයකට දමන්නෙ ඇයිදැයි මම අහනව.

"වර්ල්ඩ් ඊකොනොමික් සර්වේ" එක 1958 දී කර තිබෙන ඉතා වැදගත් ප්‍රකාශයක් මේ අවස්ථාවේ දී පෙන්වා දෙන්න කැමතියි. 1961 සිට ප්‍රාග්ධනයේ ආක්‍රමණය පල් වුණා ය යි එම වාර්තාවෙ කියා තිබෙනව. 1961 වෂී

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

[ඉලංගරත්න මයා.]

යේදී දියුණු බටහිර රටවලින් හා සමාජවාදී රටවලින් නොදියුණු රටවලට ඩොලර් ප්‍රකෝටි 9.1 ක් ගිය බවත් 1964 වනතුරුම වෙනසක් වුණේ නැති බවත්, එහෙත් 1964 දී බටහිර රටවලින් ඉස්සරට වඩා මුදක් අඩු වූ අතර සමාජවාදී රටවලින් යැවුණු මුදල ටිකක් වැඩි වුණු බවත් එහි කියා තිබෙනවා. 1964 වර්ෂයේදී, නොදියුණු රටවල්, තමන්ට ලැබුණු අරමුදල් වලින් බාගයක්ම පොලී සහ ලාභ මුදල් වශයෙන් දියුණු රටවලට ගෙවූ බවත් ඒ වාර්තාවෙම සඳහන් වෙනවා. මෙයින් ලාභ ඇති වන්නෙ කාටද යන බව මේ කාරණයෙන් හොඳ හැටි පෙනෙනවා. එසේම සඳහන් වෙනවා මේ නොදියුණු රටවල ජාතික ණය, 1955 දී ඩොලර් ප්‍රකෝටි 9 ය 1964 වන විට ප්‍රකෝටි 33 දක්වා නැග තිබෙන බව. මේ අනුව ඒ වාර්තාවෙ සඳහන් කරන්නට සිදුවෙලා තිබෙනවා මේ දියුණු වේගෙන යන රටවල විදේශ විනිමය තත්ත්වය හොඳටම පල්ලම් බැස තිබෙන බව.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, අපට පෙනෙන හැටියට නම් මේ සංශෝධන පනත් කෙටුම්පත ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙන්නෙ මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා හිය අවුරුද්දෙ මුලදී දුන් පොරොන්දු ඉෂ්ට කිරීමටයි. ආණ්ඩුවක් බලයට පත් වුණාම බොහොම ඉහළ යන බව අප දන්නවා. අතීතය කුමක් ද, අනාගතයෙ කුමක් වෙයිද යන කිසිවක් ගැන නොබලා ජය පානය බොන්න සිතනවා. එවැනි අවස්ථාවකදී තමයි මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා මේ වරම් දී තිබෙන්නෙ. රජවරු තමන්ගෙ බිසෝවරුන්ට වරම් දුන්න වගෙ මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාත් එවැනි අවස්ථාවකදී මේ ප්‍රතිඥා දී තිබෙනවා. 1966 මාර්තු මාසයේදී ධවල පත්‍රිකාවකින් කිව්ව නූතන සමයේ මේ රටට ආධාර දෙන උදවියටත්, ඒ අයගේ පවුල්වලටත්, සමාගම්වලටත් වුවමනා අන්දමට හැම සැප පහසුකමක්ම පිළියෙළ කර දෙනවාය කියා. ඒවාගේම "ඊසන්ට් ඊකොනොමික් ට්‍රෙන්ඩ්ස්—සිලෝන්" යන සංග්‍රහයෙ මේ කියමනට මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාට ප්‍රශංසා කර තිබෙනවා. මේ තරම් පහසුවෙන් මූලික ධනයත් පොලියත් ලාභයත් ලංකාවෙන් පිටට ගෙන යන්ට පහසුකම් සලසා දීම ගැන ප්‍රශංසා කර තිබෙනවා. එයින් තවත් ධෛර්යමත් වූ මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා 1966/67 අයවැය කථාවේදී තවත් පැහැදිළිව අපේ ආර්ථික නිදහස විදේශීන්ට පාවා දෙන අන්දම විස්තර කළා. මේ රටට විදේශ රටවලින් දෙන ආධාර පදනම් කර ගෙනම අපේ රටේ ආර්ථික ප්‍රශ්න විසඳන්නට උත්සාහ කරනවා නම් අපට කිසි කලෙක නිදහස් ජාතියක් හැටියට ජීවත් වෙන්ට අවස්ථාවක් නොලැබෙන බව මා කණගාටුවෙන් සඳහන් කරනවා.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මේ සම්බන්ධව බණ්ඩාරනායක අගමැතිතුමා කළ ප්‍රකාශයක් මා අවසාන වශයෙන් සඳහන් කරනවා. එතුමා ප්‍රකාශ කළේ මෙහෙමයි: "තමන්ගේ අභිවෘද්ධිය සඳහා වෙර වඩන අයට දෙවියන් වහන්සේගේ ආධාරය ලැබෙන්නේ යයි යන කියම නෙහි බොහෝදුරට සත්‍යයක් තිබෙන බව ඔබ හැම දෙනාම දනිති. සිය ආර්ථික සෞභාග්‍යය සඳහා මගේ රටවත් අපගේ අන් කිසි රටක්වත් සමස්ත ලෝකය පුරා ඇති අපගේ හිත මිතුරන් දෙන ආධාරය කෙරේම ගැනීවී සිටීම හොඳ යයි මම කල්පනා නොකරමි. අපද අපගේ දියුණුව සඳහා වැඩ කළ යුතුයි." ඒ කයි බණ්ඩාරනායක අගමැතිතුමාගේ දර්ශනය. ඒ දර්ශනයට අනුකූලව, ආර්ථික ස්වාධීනත්වයක් ඇති කරගෙන නියම ජාතික නිදහස ලබා ගත හැක්කේ කෙසේද යන්න මැනවින් අවබෝධ කරගෙනයි 1956 සිට 1960 දක්වා අප ක්‍රියා කළේ.

මේ රටේ කර්මාන්ත 420 ක් පමණ ආරම්භ කර තිබෙන්නෙ **එම දර්ශනය** අනුවයි. ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම ඒ සමහර අංශවල දොස් තිබෙන්න පුළුවන්. අපි නැත කියන්නෙ නැහැ. අප ඊයෙ එක් කර්මාන්ත ශාලාවක් විවෘත කළා. 23 වැනිදා තවත් කර්මාන්ත ශාලාවක් විවෘත කරනවා. ලබන සතියෙ තවත් කර්මාන්ත ශාලාවක් විවෘත කරනවා. ආර්ථික තත්ත්වය රැකගන්න පුළුවන් වෙන්නෙ, දියුණු කරගන්න පුළුවන් වෙන්නෙ ඒ අන්දමේ වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් අනුගමනය කළහොත් පමණයි. එසේ නැතිව අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන්ගේ අතකොළු වශයෙන් ක්‍රියා කරමින් අපේ ආර්ථික තත්ත්වය දියුණු කර ගැනීමටවත් ආරක්ෂා කර ගැනීමටවත් පුළුවන්

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

වෙන්නෙ නැහැ. සේවක අර්ථසාධක අර මුදල පිහිටුවා භාණ්ඩාගාරයට විශාල මුදලක් අත්පත් කරගැනීමට අප මාර්ගය සලසා තිබෙනව. අප ඇති කළ ඒ සේවක අර්ථසාධක අරමුදල නිසා රුපියල් හතළිස් කෝටියක පමණ මුදලක් රටේ සංවර්ධන කටයුතු සඳහා යෙදවීමට පුළුවන් වී තිබෙනව.

ඒ වාගේම ලංකා ඛනිජ තෙල් සංස්ථාව පිළිබඳව ජනසතු සේවා ඇමතිතුමා කර තිබෙන ප්‍රකාශයක් මා පත්‍ර මාර්ගයෙන් දුටුවා. ලංකා ඛනිජ තෙල් නීතිගත සංස්ථාව නිසා සෑම මාසයකම දස ලක්ෂයකට වැඩි විදේශීය විනිමය මුදලක් ඉතිරි වෙනවාය කියා එතුමා ඒ ප්‍රකාශයෙහි සඳහන් කර තිබුණා. ඒ කියන්නෙ අවුරුද්දකට ලක්ෂ 120 ක විදේශීය විනිමයක් මේ රටේම ඉතිරි වන බවයි. මේවා කොම්පැනිකාරයින්ටම තිබුණා නම් කවදාවත් මේ මුදල් භාණ්ඩාගාරයට ලැබෙන්නෙ නැහැ. නමුත් මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා ඉදිරිපත් කරන මෙවැනි පනත් කෙටුම්පත්වලින් අදහස් කරන්නෙ අප ජනසතු කළ අංශ නැවතත් ආපසු දීමට ද කියා මා දැනගන්ට සතුටුයි. අප ජනසතු කළ සමහර කොටස් දැන් ආපසු භාර දී තිබෙනව. කොම්පැනිකාරයින්ටම ලිහිස්සි තෙල් පිළිබඳ අංශය භාර දී තිබෙනව. විදේශීය විනිමය උපයා ගන්න පුළුවන් ඒ විධියෙ දේවල් කිරීමෙන් නොවෙයි.

රක්ෂණ සංස්ථාව මෙතෙක් ලබා ඇති ආදායම කෝටි 15 යි. ඉතිරි කර ගැනීමට හැකි වූ විදේශ විනිමය රුපියල් හය කෝටි විසි ලක්ෂයයි. මාසයකට පනස් ලක්ෂයක් ඉතුරු වෙනව. ආර්ථික නිදහස ලබා ගන්න පුළුවන් ඔය විධියටයි. විදේශිකයන්ගෙ අතකොළු වෙලා කවදාවත් ඒ නිදහස ලබා ගන්න බැහැ. අනාගත පරම්පරාවත්, රටේ අනාගතයත් සම්පූර්ණයෙන් සුන් කරලා —ඒ විදේශිකයන්ට කල්පයකට බදු සහන දීලා—ආර්ථික නිදහස ඇති කර ගන්න බැරි බව දැන්වත් තමුන්නාන්සේලා වටහා ගන්න ඕනෑ.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, සමුපකාර තොග වෙළඳ සංස්ථාවේ වාර්ෂික ලාභය රුපියල් එක් කෝටි අසූ ලක්ෂයයි. දැන් නැවත වෙළඳාම කොම්පැණි කාරයන්ට කොටස් ක්‍රමයට දෙන්න යනවා. එහෙම දෙන විට තමුන්නාන්සේලාගේ රුපියල් ඉතුරු වෙන්නෙත් නැහැ; පවුම්, ඩොලර් ඉතුරු වෙන්නෙත් නැහැ. මහජන බැංකුවෙන් ලැබෙන වාර්ෂික ලාභය රුපියල් විසි ලක්ෂයයි.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, අපි ජාතික ලොතරැයි මණ්ඩලය ඇති කළේ සංවර්ධන ව්‍යාපාරයට මුදල් ලබා ගැනීමටයි. දැන් තමුන්නාන්සේලා හැම තැනම ඇඟිලි ගහලා, නොයෙක් විධිවලින් ඉතිරි කර තිබෙන මුදල්වලින් අමාරු පිරිමසා ගන්න යනවා. විදේශ විනිමය හිඟ නම් තමුන්නාන්සේලා ලොතරැයි මණ්ඩලයේ තැගි වලට කාර් ගෙන්වා බෙදා දෙන්නෙ ඇයි කියා අහන්න කැමතියි. පටන් ගත්තෙ මගේ කාර් එකෙන්.—බෙන්ස් කාර් එකෙන්. දැන් රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා යන්නෙ කාගෙ බෙන්ස් කාර් එකෙන්ද? ආණ්ඩුවේ බෙන්ස් කාර් එකෙන් නොවෙයි ද? දැන් ආණ්ඩුවෙ නිවාසවල ඇමතිවරු කව්රුත් නැද්ද? ගරු සොඛ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා යන්නෙ මොකකින් ද?

දැන් මඩ ගැහුවා ඇති. සිලෝන් ඉන්ෂුවරන්ස් සමාගමෙන් ලැබුණු කාර් එක ගැන සඳහන් කරමින් ලංකාවේ හැම තැනම ගිහින් තමුන්නාන්සේලා විපක්ෂ නායිකාවගේ චරිතය ඝාතනය කරන්න වීරිය කළා. ධනපති පත්‍රවලින් ඒක ප්‍රචාරය කළා; වේදිකා වලින් ඒක ප්‍රචාරය කළා. නමුත් දැන්වත් මේ සභා ගර්භයේ නැගිටලා විපක්ෂ නායිකාව ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් නිදොස්ය කියන්න ආත්ම ශක්තියක් නැහැ. ඒක කිව්වෙ නැහැ. ඒකෙන් තමුන්නාන්සේලට වාසි වෙලා තිබුන නම් ඒක මෙතැන හඬ නගා කියනව ඇති. ඇයි ඔය විධියට ක්‍රියා කරන්නෙ?

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, දැන් අපට වුවමනා කරන්නේ වචන නොවෙයි. දැන් අපට වුවමනා කරන්නේ ජාතික වූත්, සමාජවාදී වූත් ආර්ථික ක්‍රමයක් ඇති කර ලාංකිකයන්ට නිදහස් ජාතියක් වශයෙන් අනාගතයක් ඇති කර ගැනීම සඳහා පියවර දමා ගැනීමයි. ඒ පියවරට මේ සංශෝධන පනත නිසා විශාල යකුළු පහරක් වදින බව කියමින් ඒ නිසා මේ සංශෝධන පනත ඉල්ලා අස් කර ගන්නා ලෙස ඉතා ඕනෑකමින් ඉල්ලා සිටිමින් මගේ කථාව අවසාන කරනවා.

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

අ. භා. 6.10

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

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to follow the speech made by my Colleague, the hon. new Member for Kolonnawa (Mr. Ilangaratne), who has dealt rather exhaustively with the contents of the Statute and I do not propose therefore to take much time in a detailed analysis clause by clause of the particular Act which we are now discussing. I propose at this stage to restrict myself only to the general principles of the draft law under consideration in the form of a Bill.

The first thing that strikes me is that discussion in this House should proceed on an informed basis. It is very unfortunate if hon. Members of this House are to discuss matters not only with an empty Gallery but also with an empty state of facts pertaining to the matters under discussion.

For instance, I should like to ask the Hon. Minister in charge: Have we yet in this House seen the last accounts of the Development Finance Corporation? Are we aware what transactions have taken place with the Development Finance Corporation? I have inquired from the Library, I have sought to ascertain the facts from copies of the relevant documents for the purpose of the discussion, and one point stands out extremely clearly, that with the capital allocation of Rs. 16 million which has been with the Development Finance Corporation since its very inception, to this very date this House has no control over the activities of the Development Finance Corporation. In the normal way we are supposed to be the group of people in this country authorizing expenditures. It is our job and our task to ensure that the money of this nation is safeguarded and utilized in the directions that this House sees fit, but to this date as far as the Development Finance Corporation is concerned it has not been possible for this House to do its task.—[*Interruption*]. I think I tabled one document. It was not required by law but I did it in point of fact. I remember this. In 1961 I included it in one of the documents which I tabled when I presented the Budget. I saw to it that the activities of that year of the Development Finance Corporation were included in the documents tabled by me on the occasion of the 1961 Budget. If you wish to challenge me, may I say that I have never conducted the affairs of this country behind the back of this House. That is one charge that certainly cannot be made against me during the period of my stewardship. More documents than have ever been seen by hon. Members were produced systematically with every Budget, and I am glad to say that my successors have followed the precedents I set them commencing in 1961.

What is the consequence of our not knowing the facts? This instrument, the present law, seeks to create a closer link with the World Bank among other things.

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.
(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்க)
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

Not necessarily.

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

Not necessarily? I followed the argument of the hon. Parliamentary Secretary. I will deal with his argument in a moment. I am not going to slur over it.

The World Bank, mentioned by name as the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, certainly figures very largely in the present law. It is in the present law also as far as the guarantee section is concerned. This is not merely a guarantee section. This enables various other outside institutions to participate in the operation of the

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

Development Finance Corporation and the World Bank is one such institution.

Now look at the consequence of this. First and foremost, to this day we have no up to date information in this House of what the present borrowing from the World Bank are. We have the statement made by the Minister of Finance in the last Budget Debate, which statement was out of date even at the time when he presented his Budget. The figures which he gave then made nonsense of the facts as they existed in July 1966, when he told us how strong the economy was, how the money supply had declined, how external asssets were rising and under control, basing all his arguments on the state of the economy as at December 1965. And we were discussing the matter in July and August 1966. Speaking in that Budget Debate, we told him in plain terms, "you project your own argument forward, take your own figures, you will find you are talking nonsense." The economic situation has declined under your stewardship to unimaginable levels.

What is the position today? He has not even the strength to publish the Central Bank monthly bulletin up to date. The last one published, which is available, is for December 1966. Never before had we reached a stage when the Central Bank monthly bulletin could not be published in the following month. It has never happened in the past, and now in the month of March 1967, we are still guessing as to what the present economic situation of this country is. I can tell you the reason: this Minister of Finance has broken new ground. He has demonstrated a theory which no one has ever demonstrated in the past. I always thought that there were certain absolutes at least in the matter of language. I thought it was impossible to have a rounder circle or a squarer square, but he has proved that it is possible to have an emptier emptiness as far as an empty Treasury is concerned!

He told us that he got Rs. 341 million as external assets from his predecessor, the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera), that he had inherited an empty Treasury, and that was the reason for all these shortcomings. They have repeated it on political platforms thereafter and failed at every single by-election in consequence! But the stark fact remains that December, 1966, has shown a decline of nearly 30 million below the level of what he got from the hon. Member for Yatiyantota, with all the accretions from the I.M.F., the World Bank, and in-payments into the external assets account with the Central Bank. And in this stage of facts, unable to tell us the facts and figures, he comes and says: Please give us the authority to allow the World Bank to finance the operations of the Development Finance Corporation.

I will tell you why we are opposed to this. If you consider it very logically, this House must necessarily be jealous of its own rights. We are the sole authority to control expenditure; we are the sole authority to have external relations and even to control external finance with international organizations in foreign countries. In those circumstances, why are we being invited to permit foreign institutions, notably the World Bank, to contribute to Ceylon's economic development, as they call it, through the Development Finance Corporation, if it were not for one purpose—to prevent this House controlling the very purposes for which foreign aid is to be utilized in future?

I agree with what the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries and Fisheries (Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe) says: "This is only an enabling statute." Maybe the Soviet Government will come and give us a steel mill—not to the Government of Ceylon in future; maybe they will give it to the Development Finance Corporation. He says: "Who knows, Comecon countries may come and make contributions." But I can assure any person who knows the first

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

[එෆ්. ආර්. බයස් මහතා

thing about international relations that socialist countries have always expressed preference for bilateral dealings with sovereign states. They have never worked on the basis of subordinate state institutions. Every time a socialist country has entered upon an agreement, it has been hitherto in the shape and form of an agreement in the nature of a bilateral treaty, whether it takes the shape and form of an economic aid agreement or a treaty agreement or any other form.

There is no reason for the Soviet Government to deal with individual companies or corporations. If they wish to enter the country to buy car batteries from Browns the Soviet Government will not enter upon a treaty. There will be some import-export organization in the Soviet Union, no doubt government-controlled, which is quite capable of dealing with Brown & Company. But I do not understand the argument as to why we are having special enabling statutes authorizing these institutions to finance the Development Finance Corporation, unless it be with one object—the object of preventing this House having a control over the investments and the expenditure incurred by foreign countries in financing individual institutions in this country and individual capitalist organizations within this country; and if that is so, with a political purpose. That is our objection.

Money is perhaps the simplest way to exercise political influence, and there is no question but that the World Bank has done so in the past. I remember an occasion in 1961 when I had occasion to visit Washington and the World Bank. At that time the President of the Bank was Mr. Eugene Black. He is no longer there now; I think he has been succeeded by Mr. Woods. But Mr. Black, at that time, was the President, and in the course of a conversation I had with him I raised the question about the financing of the Aswan Dam in the U. A. R., and asked him as a matter of interest why it was that the World Bank withdrew from its commitment to finance the construction of the Aswan Dam, and whether it was not that decision that precipitated the crisis which led to President Nasser's decision to nationalize the Suez Canal and almost led to the invasion of the U. A. R. by parachute regiments from Britain and France. When I asked him that question, Mr. Black gave a very significant reply. He said the Bank was not only interested in financing the Aswan Dam project, which was certainly a very good project, but the U. A. R. had entered upon certain transactions to buy weapons from the Soviet Union and in that situation, to use his own words, "Mr. Dulles got mad at Nasser," and the consequence was the withdrawal of the World Bank aid for the Aswan Dam project.

Now, situations like that can and do arise. You cannot help it. It is in the nature of international politics and polity that the World Bank is influenced, as it is, very largely by the forces of American capital. It is true that we have also contributed our little mite in the form of a capital contribution. I concede that. We are also a member of the World Bank. But the World Bank is, still for all that, American dominated. I do not mind that. We must look to all sources for help. Certainly. I am not going to argue against American imperialism and say that we do not want money from American imperialists. I will say certainly that we want money and when we want money we are not in a position to choose the sources.

But we must safeguard our independence. We cannot allow financial institutions, however great, and however great our need for money may be, to impose themselves upon us and to undermine our independence in the subtle manner in which it is sought to be done by the very framework of this Bill. That is our fundamental objection.

Hitherto the Development Finance Corporation, although an independent institution, was a creature of the

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

Ceylon Government. The Ceylon Government controlled the operations of the D. F. C. through a Government Director, notwithstanding the participation of private capital. When the United National Party Government in 1955 set up the D. F. C., it was meant to be a government institution basically, with the Bank of Ceylon participating in it, and I think Mr. Loganathan was the Government of Ceylon director on the D. F. C.

Why are we giving up this control? Under the present Bill you are in effect doing exactly that—you are giving up that control.

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.
(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)
No.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.
(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)
You have no choice. You are creating a situation of majority shareholders and directors built upon participation in private capital. You are giving up the position of supremacy which the Government had within the D. F. C. by the technique of increasing the capital and increasing the shareholders and the directorate. The hon. Member for Kolonnawa (Mr. Ilangaratne) read out the relevant clauses and gave the figures. I am not going to waste the time of the House by repeating the figures in order to demonstrate my point. The fact remains that the whole objective of this Government, by the manipulation of increasing capital and the directorate, is to insidiously hand over the control, the financial control, of the D. F. C. from the Government of Ceylon to a much larger number of directors who could even be foreigners. In a situation where foreign capital can come in and participate in very large terms, the Government of Ceylon ceases to have an overall and overriding control on the operations of the Development Finance Corporation. The moment foreign capital comes in and invests in the D. F. C. and the D. F. C. picks out a particular enterprise in Ceylon and says that it will finance that enterprise, automatically, under the law you are seeking to enact, those foreign elements will claim the right to appoint a director in the governing body of that enterprise. What is the consequence of that? I think it is commonly accepted that he who holds the purse-strings calls the tune. It means in effect that any commercial, industrial or agricultural enterprise can be at the mercy of whatever foreign organization chooses to invest money in it, and that, too, independent of Parliament.

In other words, it ceases to be a question of whether we consider in this House that a particular commercial enterprise is worthwhile. For instance, if somebody in the Development Finance Corporation, in a less responsible and mad moment, were to decide that night-clubs constitute a good form of investment commercially—

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.
(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)
Government approval is necessary.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.
(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)
Government approval may be given or not given. I am interested in the approval of the House. I have never heard of a single act of the Development Finance Corporation being brought before the House. Who knows what a Government, for financial considerations, may or may not agree to?—[*Interruption*].

I know, you might find yourself financing massage clinics. That is one way in which the American Government has definitely acquired its influence and power in certain countries in South-East Asia.

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

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)
Mahanuga Gardens.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.
(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)
I do now know. If you want to establish one in Mahanuga Gardens, you are welcome to buy land there.

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)
There is one already there.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.
(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)
You sold your land to the Chinese and I do not know what they are doing there or whom they are massaging except Mr. Hameed.

But, really, the nature of any enterprise is not even defined. "Commercial enterprise" is defined as being an enterprise "conducive to the economic development of Ceylon". That is the definition. But, may I ask, how is that definition going to be operated under this Act? What is there to prevent anything being defined as a commercial enterprise? What are these commercial enterprises?

For example, is it not possible in effect to introduce private capital into every one of the nationalized institutions of this country under cover of this law? What is there to stop, for example, the steel factory, which was inaugurated yesterday by the Hon. Minister of Industries, being given an injection of aid from some foreign source through the Development Finance Corporation and the entire steel factory itself being brought under the authority and influence of a foreign organization? What is there to prevent the Petroleum Corporation, a commercial enterprise—no doubt carrying the approval of the Government, to use the language of the Parliamentary Secretary—being financed in exactly the same way? What is there to stop it? We are being asked to give a blank cheque and to authorize an increased expenditure free from the control of this House, in any manner that pleases you, for the financing of any individual you like, for the creation of a new form of political power, for the creation of a new set of puppets to dance at the end of American strings.

What do you want it for? You tell us, "What can we do?" You can dance at the end of American strings. That, you are doing now, I can see, but you are dancing very ineffectively and they are not prepared to give very much at the moment.

Compare the speeches you have made and the speech made by the Hon. Minister of Industries. I can read them to you if you like. The Hon. Minister tells the World Bank, "Take it and go", in the same way that a petulant child, when he does not get sufficient cake, says, "Please take it and go; I do not want it." It is very good if you do not want it, but why are you crying for it here? Why are you coming before this House and begging for it, trying to create a situation for people, whose aid you say you do not want, to come and invest money here?

You cannot fool all the people all the time, however clever you may be. You can call your colleagues crackpots but we are all not crackpots. You will not hit the jackpot every time either with that kind of technique.—[*Interruption*]. I know. If you are trying to score debating points you will not succeed here because what is in issue is much more than a debating point. What is in issue is ultimately the independence of our country.

You talk of a private sector. You are going to have an American-financed sector. You are going to have a situation in which practically

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

every institution in this country—industrial, agricultural, and commercial—will be free of control by this country, and financed and directed on policy lines by foreign institutions. That is a situation which we certainly will not ever accept.

I am not saying this merely for the sake of debate; I am speaking here with the full authority of the Sri Lanka Freedom Party and of the Opposition. Our position is quite clear and manifest in this matter. If any investments are going to be made under this Bill, which undoubtedly you can pass with your majority, I assure you that we will accept no part of the responsibility. The Sri Lanka Freedom Party, when we come into power in the fullness of time—we are in no hurry, but judging from your string of defeats in the by-elections that day may not be far off—will not hesitate to nullify the effect of this law and to take over every single investment made under this law. And there is no question of the security or safety of a single cent of the money which may be invested by any foreign investor who, the Hon. Minister thinks, is going to be attracted by the blandishments of his law.—[*Interruption*]. "It is not a question of being scared by us in the Opposition. We, in the Opposition, are an unimportant group of people. You have saved democracy. Please keep your democracy. But I can assure you that your kind of democracy is not going to frighten us nor are we going to be frightened and bullied, however much you may need money, into accepting a completely disgraceful law under which you are sacrificing and undermining the very independence of our country. That is something which the Sri Lanka Freedom Party will certainly not accept nor will any section of the Opposition.

This is not new. We have said it before. We said it when you decided to alienate land to big companies—I think in the 1965 Throne Speech Debate—and it will bear repetition. However much you may give leases of land for twenty-five years, those leases will not be worth the paper they are printed on in the event of a change of Government. Let the people who have taken those leases from you do everything in their power to keep you in office for as long as possible. They will have to keep you in office for twenty-five years if they want to secure their investments.

Not only that. All the tax rebates you have given them will be written back. If they think that after taking all the timber from those lands and ruining the assets which legitimately belonged to the people they are going to escape merely because they hold a piece of paper or because some legislation has been passed by this House with a steam-roller majority, I can assure them that they will think so only for so long as your steam-roller majority lasts. The moment your steam-roller breaks up, let them look after themselves.

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

That is your concept of law.

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

That is my concept of law. Laws are something which last as long as Parliament wants them to last. Parliament has repealed laws before more than once, and Parliament will no doubt repeal laws in the future.—[*Interruption*]. Have you ever heard of a law that lasts beyond the will of Parliament? I have not. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary wants this law to last for ever. It is only crackpots and people who talk of crackpots who think in that way. These are the democrats who want their laws to go on for ever making the will of the people ineffective when the people whom they represent have ceased to be behind them.

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

[එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

It will not last for ever. We declare in all sincerity that every single cent that is obtained under this kind of law to create new institutions and to finance them shall, if and when we come to power—we are prepared to wait—certainly be taken over by the State, and there will be no question of paying compensation. This type of investment, this type of foreign intervention in the independence of our nation, can certainly not be tolerated.

May I refer to an instance of what happened under foreign intervention in the past? Let us take the advice given by the World Bank. We have seen recently a series of reports by the World Bank. We started bringing them to light in the 1966 Budget Debate. I produced the World Bank Report and read it and showed this House what precisely the World Bank at that time thought of the financial policies and the economic stability aimed at by the present administration. At that stage the Hon. Prime Minister admitted it and went away. Subsequently they published it.

Stop and examine for yourself the advice they have given you. They wanted you to reduce the rice ration. Well, that has been done. But are you getting the aid? They have told you that they do not approve of your educational policy. They do not approve of your land army. They do not approve of the scheme of the Hon. Minister to set up a thousand handloom centres. They have told you all these things.—[*Interruption*]. They did not want the Steel Corporation. That is an earlier story. I am not going back to 1962. I am talking of 1965 and 1966 and the recent documents of those years. They tell you they do not approve of your educational policies. I do not think they have even heard of the efforts of Mr. Iriyagolle, the Hon. Minister for Education. If they have, I am sure they will approve of them even now. But the question I am raising is this. For what purpose are you doing all this? You are doing all this in the hope of getting aid. In order to grant you that aid they laid down as their first requirement that you should pay the compensation due to the oil companies and that aid would start flowing thereafter. If you read the documents which have been presented by the hon. Member for Kolonnawa (Mr. Ilangaratne) you can see the figures. The country has been given promises, but they still remain as promises; they have not been realized.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක (අග්‍රාමාත්‍ය, ආරක්ෂක හා විදේශ කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමති, ක්‍රම සම්පාදක හා ආර්ථික කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමති සහ ප්‍රවෘත්ති හා ගුවන් විදුලි ඇමති)

(கௌரவ டட்லி சேனநாயக்க—பிரதம அமைச்சரும் பாதுகாப்பு, வெளி விவகார அமைச்சரும் திட்ட அமைப்பு, பொருளாதார விவகார அமைச்சரும், தகவல், ஒலிபரப்பு அமைச்சரும்)

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

Why not? We have got money.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

That is why we are still starving; that is why there is a world shortages of kottamallie, chillies, and other essential commodities. This is the type of commodity aid that we are getting.—[*Interruption*]. This is fantastic. We are asked to come here and vote on laws without even a declaration of what the financial situation is in relation to the World Bank. That is exactly the point at which I started before the Prime Minister came into the House.—[*Interruption*]. He did not hear the first part of my speech. That does not matter. I am not repeating what I said even for his benefit.

The point I am making is that we have not come here to give blank-cheque authority without any knowledge of the facts, to authorize moneys being channelled into this country to finance private investment, independent of the will of this

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

House in relation to its direction. If, as the Hon. Prime Minister says, they have received all that money, why is it that the Minister of Industries makes speeches saying, "Please tell the World Bank to go home."? He says, "we want trade, not aid." I quite agree with him. This is one of the matters in regard to which, I think, the Hon. Minister of Industries—I think it was stated recently by Mr. Osmund Jayaratne—has remained true to his past. I respectfully and entirely agree with the Hon. Minister. We cannot afford to lose our self-respect. I overheard the Hon. Minister of Education in the course of a debate on an earlier occasion saying, "We must look after ourselves." I quite agree with him. We must do that. But this is not the method of looking after ourselves. However much we may think that, by trying to please these foreign authorities, we are going to get something out of it, I can assure the Members of the Government that they will not succeed. Look at the past record. We paid out millions in compensation to the oil companies. What precisely have we got out of it? The Prime Minister said that we have got something. But you are still unable even to publish the Central Bank monthly bulletin for the last month. You are still three months behind time. As I told you, your Minister of Finance has now established a new proposition that there can be an emptier emptiness as far as the Treasury is concerned. This is no remarkable achievement. If you say that we ruined the country in nine years, you have now proved that you can certainly ruin it better and faster in two years!

This is fantastic. What earthly reason can there be for not making this subject to the authority of the House? Why? I shall give you the answer.

Many speakers from the Opposition have drawn attention to this peculiarity in the Bill about the Governor-General signing documents. It was pointed out, I think by the hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa) in the latter part of his speech while I was here, and again by the hon. Member for Kolonnawa (Mr. Ilangaratne) too. Why has this been done? The member for Kolonnawa rightly pointed out that the Governor-General has hitherto not signed any instrument except one between State and State, where he, as the Head of the State representing our State, has signed commitments with foreign states. But certainly we have had no situation where he has acted as a guarantor for a private institution abroad lending money to a private borrower in Ceylon. One might almost visualize the Governor-General as being the friend and comrade of every Ceylonese capitalist in need—a very useful institution—like the guarantor who signs on every hire-purchase agreement. But why is the Governor-General being involved in this?

I will tell you the reason. The reason is precisely what I stated a moment ago. The Government, well knowing that the Opposition is not going to brook this type of investment hopes and feebly imagines that, by involving the Governor-General in this type of transaction, at least self-respect for our own Head of State will force the Opposition to hold its hand and prevent the Opposition from dishonouring and repudiating agreements entered into by the representative Head of State. I can assure you that where the Governor-General acts constitutionally he has no choice in the matter, and the Opposition is not going to be concerned or worried over that. It matters little to us if the Governor-General is being put in an impossible position. The fact that he is going to sign the document is certainly not going to make the slightest difference as far as we are concerned. Even if you involve him and force him with a pistol pointed at his head to say "I am going to act constitutionally on the advice given by my Ministers, I have got to sign this paper and I am going to sign it," it certainly is not

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

[එව්. ආර්. බයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

going to give that paper any additional sanctity merely because the Governor-General has signed it.

It makes little difference to us who signs it.—[*Interruption*]. Exactly, and I am telling you why you put his name into it. Why could you, for example, not sign it yourself ?—[*Interruption*]. I know, but why do you not sign it and take the Governor-General's name out of this transaction ? You are a Governor of the Fund, you a Governor of the Bank, you got your alternate Governor, the Governor of the Central Bank who can sign for you. Why do you want to involve the Head of State ? What constitutional principle or reason is there ? The Governor-General's name has never transpired in any part of the Development Finance Corporation Act. [*Interruption*].

I was not here for the hon. Member for Yatiyantota's speech. I came here late, unfortunately.—[*Interruption*]. As far as the conduct of our parliamentary struggle is concerned we have never had the slightest difference between us. I can assure you of that.—[*Interruption*]. I am also beginning to wonder. The difference seems to lie in the fact that you seem to see within our side a right wing and a left wing. I can assure you that on our side there is neither a right wing nor a left wing ; we have got a body. We are not seeking to fly, we are seeking to progress forward, and we can assure you that we will progress extremely fast—and at the proper stage. You, on the other hand, have neither a right wing nor a left wing : you only have crack-pots and jackpots ! And you can take your—[*Interruption*]. I am not sorry about the crackpots, I am only sorry about the jackpots.

Sir, in this law we have got a kind of danger to which this country must be alerted : it is the danger of foreigners being provided an instrument with which to belabour us, with which to create neo-political power, with which to create a situation where their money is out of control of Parliament: and I can assure you that if you examine the long history of financial affairs of this country the Sri Lanka Freedom Party at every stage brought this mischievous monster under control.

The Parliamentary Secretary told us a little while ago that we are the party that first sought foreign aid and obtained it. He is right. The S. L. F. P. certainly was the Party that obtained foreign aid. At that stage, the Hon. Minister of State rather proudly boasted that the United National Party never sought foreign aid and never wanted foreign aid. It looks as though he has reversed on his own tracks now.—[*Interruption*]. I appreciate that.

Now let us see what happened. When we brought foreign aid into this country we saw to it that it was channelled through the Budget. From 1960 onwards every single cent of foreign aid received in this country—whether in the form of P. L. 480 flour, whether it came in the form of CARE assistance—every single cent was channelled through the Budget.—[*Interruption*]. What else are you doing now ? It makes not the slightest difference. We are having a deficit Budget, and we all know that. So what about it ? But my point is that Parliament can control it. Parliament can tell you whether your utilization of foreign aid is good or bad or indifferent. You certainly cannot use it to finance massage clinics or whore houses, as the Hon. Minister of State seemed to contemplate a moment ago. That kind of thing will not happen. I certainly would like to see foreign aid beng utilized, but we must ensure that you do not have private deals with commercial enterprises and foreign organizations behind the back of this House, because the Ceylon Government will be responsible for the repayment with guarantees from the Governor-General. This is money which is sought to be introduced here without any form of control Why are you moving away from

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

control ? Is it because your American masters have laid down conditions and told the Government that this law has got to be passed in this form if we are to be creditworthy ?

These are not new threats. I have seen it even in the time of the S. L. F. P. I remember the Hon. Minister of Land, Irrigation and Power, seated here in this House, telling me once, " The World Bank insists that the Electrical Department should become an electricity corporation. So, I am now trying to make it a corporation. " And his idea was that the corporation should be exactly identical or equivalent to the department, except that it would be called a corporation. The Hon Minister of Land is laughing ; I can see the amusement in his face because what I am saying is true. He himself knew that the only purpose of the law that he was introducing was to fool the World Bank. They wanted it to be called a corporation. He said, " Right, I am willing to call it anything you like. " He had lots of problems on his hands. The employees of the department promptly said, " We must be paid compensation for loss of career ; we want re-employment terms ; we want one-third more on our salaries. " The Hon. Minister had many sleepless days and nights trying to solve this. I tried to help him to fool the World Bank. If the World Bank wants the price of electricity to be raised, if they say electricity must become a commercially self-sufficient venture and if they say it must pay for itself, so it should be. I know that by putting up the price of electricity to a level which it has not reached in the whole of South-East Asia, certainly we will have very expensive electricity. I think it is good. But the only thing is that the Hon. Minister is still talking of hydro-electricity while the rest of the world is moving towards atomic piles. It may be that we are concentrating on the wrong type of piles. Maybe, we are doing a little too much of sedentary work. We should stand up and get on with the job.

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

I hope you are not standing up too long !

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

No, Sir. I can assure you that I will stand up, if necessary, all night in order to defend—

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

I would not prevent you.

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

I can assure you, Sir, that the kind of piles that will develop here will be on the bottoms of other people.

Now, if I may be permitted to continue my comments on the World Bank, may I say that however much you try to satisfy these people you will not succeed. The Hon. Minister of Land knows it as well as I do. However much Peter Cargil might come here and read long lectures in regard to the World Bank's requirements, he listens with one ear and it goes out of the other ear ; and the Hon. Minister carries on unperturbed. He wants to divert Mahaweli in his own way and he is going to divert it in his own way. He wants to divert it into the Jaffna Lagoon and desalinate it if he can. It is a very laudable idea. I think it is wonderful to think of it. That is what he told me. He said, " I am going to see that the Jaffna Lagoon is desalinated. " It is a marvellous conception. It is almost worthy of a cartoon by Heath Robinson. I do not think any one else could do justice to it. Those are the facts, and the Hon. Minister carries on unperturbed by the World Bank and its advisers, and, I think, to that extent the Hon. Minister is right. Resisting the World

Digitized by Noolaham Foundation
noolaham.org | aavanaham.org

[එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

Bank, at least, is right. If our country must be ruined it is better that it be ruined by the Hon. C. P. de Silva rather than by the World Bank. Then, at least, it will be ruined by one of our own citizens and not by foreigners. But what is the position ?

We have got, first of all, the promise that, if you pay compensation, large amounts of foreign aid will flow in —the word used was "flow"—but something has blocked this flow, the flow has dropped. I do not know whether the Hon. Minister diverted it, but certainly the flow is not coming in our direction. It seems that we do not have sufficient communists at our doorstep. To wage war against Pieter Keuneman and crowd you do not require millions of American dollars as they do need them in Vietnam. If you had a communist enemy at the doorstep in the shape and form of live Russians or live Chinese, you might be able to do better. You have not succeeded, you have not been able to find them, and even those that came in this direction during the elections have disappearted into thin air. When questions were asked after that in this House, you could not find them. Even the maritime Agreement with China remains in spite of the objections of the Hon. C. P. de Silva. So how can you expect aid from America ? Whom are they going to fight ? The President of the U.S. does not have the authority to authorize the loan of moneys except to fight the communists. If it is aid to undeveloped countries he has to go through the appropriations of the U.S. House of Representatives and the Senate and those appropriations are given very grudgingly as everybody knows—Hickenlooper and all that !

Therefore, in the circumstances, why do you not face facts, as you yourself said ? You must think in terms of regulating your own affairs to meet that situation. You cannot for ever live in hope of foreign aid that is not coming. You must get down to it as the Hon. Minister of Home Affairs (Dr. W. Dahanayake) has done. For instance, the World Bank told him that they do not like his 1,000 looms proposal, but he says he does not care about them. He is going to give the 1,000 looms. He is going to establish a greater degree of self-sufficiency in textiles than has ever been reached before, notwithstanding the National Textile Corporation, be it under Lakshman Rajapaksa or Cyril Attygalle. He says, "I do not care whether you cannot buy our sarongs. I do not care whether I have the money to give you thread. I am going to establish those looms and I don't give a damn what the World Bank says."

The Minister of Home Affairs is to be congratulated. He is doing the right thing, at least right to the extent that he is not concerned with foreign interference and foreign authority. I do not know that his scheme cannot be improved upon. That is a different matter. At least the Minister is going on the basis that the destinies of this country have been entrusted to them in the Front Bench. Their intellects must take the responsibility ; they must bear the creaking burden of having to deliver the goods. Let it be so. We are not trying to stop that. But we certainly oppose any attempt to dance to the tune of foreign masters, independent of this House.

Foreign aid ? Yes, by all means—with the approval of the House, channelled through the House. One of the basic alterations which is necessary in the present law is to bring the operations of the Development Finance Corporation subject to the review of Parliament, to make the contracts entered into in relation to foreign investments subject to scrutiny and debate here ; and if you believe in democracy, I do not see why you should object to that unless you consider that this is something to do with the crackpots.

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

In this Bill you are creating this situation which existed in the past. There was a situation once where the United States Government had the authority, independent of the Ceylon Government, to utilize counterpart funds in Ceylon and to disburse them in any way they liked. I see the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries and Fisheries (Mr. D. Shelton Jayasinghe) nodding. He will remember the incident. He will remember how he himself once participated in a Debate pointing out the danger of counterpart funds being available at the hands of a donor institution, to be given to any individual or group of individuals and thereby creating political power.

I remember the Parliamentary Secretary himself telling me this and questioning us pretty closely in regard to our investigations about precisely such a charge——the funds realized from the sale of U.S. flour in Ceylon under P. L. 480. At that time—I think it was during the March 1960 elections—the American Government through its Embassy withdrew a sum of nearly Rs. 5 million from its counterpart funds and nobody to this day knows where that money went.

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.
(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)
You should know.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.
(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)
I can assure you we do not.—[*Interruption.*] We investigated the matter and tried hard to find out but we never succeeded. I do not know who received it but certainly I can tell you that the Americans were not over-happy with us at that time. Where it went—I am not making any charge—I do not know. Certainly we tried to investigate but we were up against a blank wall. At that time American aid had not been brought under Government control. There was no way to find out. But today the situation is different. That has been remedied in subsequent agreements. It is not possible for the Government of the U. S. A. to disburse a single cent out of its counterpret funds without the concurrence of the Central Bank and the Finance Ministry. That difference has been created after that. Why are you now going back to the old system ?—[*Interruption*]. I had started the investigation earlier and run up against a blank wall. I can assure you—look back into HANSARD—that I have been far more vigilant than you have been as far as catching crooks in this country is concerned. I can assure you of that. I have done it in practical form. People who enjoy a great degree of political favour now have, in my time, of which I am not ashamed, been caught red-handed in the act, whether it was smuggling or anything else—people who enjoy a high degree of political patronage and occupy very high positions in some of the commercial enterprises, which are no doubt going to benefit by the largesse to be bestowed by the Development Finance Corporation in the future.

If we look at the principles of the Bill, the basic objection is that in practically every institution—Government, Government-sponsored, private—made subject to the authority and control of foreign investors through the Development Finance Corporation, the Government is losing its tenuous threads of control. Without any control by Parliament, this is objectionable. If the Government wants to introduce a law to provide for people to make investments, let them first of all devise some procedures and means by which Parliament is consulted. In accordance with the will of Parliament, investments can then be approved for specified purposes. It seems to me that that is the most commonsense procedure to adopt.

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

[එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

This country needs foreign investments. Certainly there are agreed areas in which both Government and Opposition would like to see foreign investment. I do not think it would be correct to say that the Opposition favours foreign investment only from Russian and Chinese sources and does not like investments from British or American sources. That is not true. But certainly Parliament is jealous of its rights, and if you want to achieve any kind of permanency and stability in regard to the introduction of foreign finance, it can only be on the basis of consultation between the Government and the Opposition. If the Government think they can introduce foreign investment insidiously bypassing Parliament and without consulting our authority, they are barking up the wrong tree and they will find that foreign investment is certainly not going to come for a totally different reason. The basic thing that attracts an investor is the stability and certainty of his investment. He is not interested in gambling. An investor does not come here to gamble upon possibilities. An industrialist is a realist. He is interested in a rapid turnover of his money. We are interested in rapid economic development of our country. But obviously we have different ideas in regard to certain things.

Even in regard to the role of the private sector, there are differences between us. There are some of us who would agree with the Minister of Industries in telling the World Bank to go home and in telling the press to carry the message, as the Minister of State wanted, back to their home countries in South-East Asia. There may be some of us who agree with the crackpot. But whatever that may be, we all want our country to frow. But our country cannot grow on this basis of private enterprise for which money is channelled through the Development Finance Corporation independent of Parliament. You cannot, by side-stepping Parliament, achieve anything in this country.

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

You have not done that ?

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

We have never done so. From 1960 onwards, I challenge the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to demonstrate one instance where the uitilization of foreign aid has not been subject to review by Parliament. I am glad to say that not only I but all my successors, including the Hon. Wanninayake, have always channelled every cent of foreign aid through the Budget and brought it under Parliamentary control. This is not something which I claim as a credit for myself. I say it for Mr. Ilangaratne, for Dr. N. M. Perera, and for the Hon. Wanninayake, and I have no doubt that this healthy tradition will be continued.

Why are you discontinuing the practice now ? Why are you trying to introduce a new principle here through the Development Finance Corporation Act ? Certainly this business of introducing directors nominated by the Development Finance Corporation on to other institutions is the most dangerous form of creating monopoly controls that I have ever seen. It is to be done under the new Sub-section (iiia) to Section 5 of the Development Finance Corporation of Ceylon Act. You are giving the Development Finance Corporation the structure of a monolith controlling practically every business in this country—agricultural, industrial, and commercial. As they pull the strings we have to dance.

If they tell Brown & Company to stop manufacturing this and start manufacturing something else to preserve a foreign market elsewhere, Brown & Company will have to follow suit. If Brown & Company are told that they should stop the manufacture of car batteries because someone wants to export batteries to this

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

country, and are asked to manufacture something else, Browns will have to do so. If Browns become a recipient of aid—I am only taking an example—you will place them at the mercy of this new institution. If money is advanced to any institution, nationalized or otherwise, that institution will be at the mercy of this monolith. It would not matter even if that institution is subject to government control.

After all, governments are elected. If you claim the right to dictate financial policy, agricultural policy, industrial policy and so on, we can criticize it. But it is your right. You have been elected democratically for that very purpose. You have the right to govern this country well or badly.

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.
(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)
With government approval.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.
(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)
It has nothing to do with government approval. There is no question of government approval coming into financial matters. The control of expenditure of money is essentially a matter for Parliament and not for Government. Government can propose and Government can use its majority in Parliament, but Parliament as an institution consisting of Government and Opposition must certainly be responsible for finance. That, I think, is an elementary principle which even the hon. Parliamentary Secretary by now should have understood.

We do not have a Budget Debate here and say it is only the Government which approves the Budget. The Government presents the Budget. The Hon. Minister of Finance knows that when he presents his Budget he ought to get it through because he has a sufficient number of backbenchers to support him. He knows that all the discussions here in this House have got foreordained results. But does that mean that Government is passing the Budget? No, Sir. It is Parliament that is responsible for the control of expenditure. It is Parliament that criticizes and determines the direction of expenditure, indicates the will of the people, of this House and the country, and Parliament consists of more than one side.

You are not tired of telling us that democracy demands an Opposition. Why are you then concerned only with the approval of the Government? Is this also part of the "crackpot tendencies" which your Minister of State referred to? One does not know. How is it that the Development Finance Corporation is the institution you have chosen for this very purpose?

Why do you not, for example, choose the Bank of Ceylon or the People's Bank? I will tell you why. It is because the People's Bank and the Bank of Ceylon are still subject to parliamentary control while the Development Finance Corporation is the one institution that is not, due to an oversight perhaps at the time when you people drafted the initial law in 1955, and that is where the objection lies to this Bill.

The Development Finance Corporation is a dangerous instrument, a danger to which every one of us should be alert.

Now, Sir, I wish to get to my second point.

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)
How many more points have you?

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.
(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)
I have only reached my second point.

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

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.
(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)
You seem to have quite a number of points.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.
(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)
I have got quite a few points.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ (අකුරැස්ස)
(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ—அக்குறஸ்ஸ)
(D. S. A. Wickremasinghe—Akuressa)
He has to make a full case and he must be allowed to do so.

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.
(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)
Unfortunately your point is not effective.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.
(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)
You will find that my point can be quite effective.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා
(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)
Let us hope so.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.
(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)
I wish to make a very substantial point. That is, under this Development Finance Corporation law, you must also consider an important aspect of credit policy as far as the Government of Ceylon is concerned. This Government from 1965 onwards, under the Wanninayake stewardship, has adopted one policy as a plain and stark factor of economic life. And that is that they insist on making credit prohibitively expensive to one and all. Their method of inducing a restriction on the money supply, of preventing a quantity of money being in circulation in our land, has been to ensure that credit is more and more difficult to obtain. That is factually true. The bank rate has been raised. It is certainly more expensive. The People's Bank and the Bank of Ceylon are certainly much more restrictive in the giving of credit. The hon. Member for Tissamaharama is about to leave, but I have no doubt that he himself will accept the fact that credit was much easier for farmers under the Sri Lanka Freedom Party Government where the Agrarian Services Department gave out Rs. 550 per acre to every single cultivator who cultivated an acre at a rate of interest of one and a half per cent.

Now they are talking of a scheme to lend money through the People's Bank at eight per cent. But still it is only a scheme. They have not come to the stage of giving out a single cent as agricultural credit yet. The People's Bank is still formulating schemes for the Hon. Minister. In industry, hardly any credit is forthcoming for anybody in the private sector. In agriculture—I do not know about the large scale enterprises in Mahiyangana ; I have not bothered to find out the facts about it—as far as the little people are concerned, there is practically no credit.

Here you are providing credit to a different group of people under this law. It is a curious thing. Industrial enterprises, commercial enterprises, agricultural enterprises, all come in under this law. All of them are centred on the limited liability company. Why is that necessary ? Why are you restricting the Development Finance Corporation, with its foreign assistance, to helping only limited liability companies ? We all know what the limited liability companies are in this country at present.

There seems to be some fundamental objection here. Why is it prohibited from helping a good

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

co-operative which carries, as the hon. Parliamentary Secretary would say it, the approval of the Government? Why is it considered bad to help an individual whose enterprise may be considered by the Government to be a worthy cause? Maybe it is not even a profit-making cause, but good for economic development. Why are you preventing that?—[*Interruption*].

He is reconsidering that point, I see. So, some good has come of my second point after all. But might I ask, why we are restricting credit to some. Why are you making credit available to the richest sections of society, to the sections of society that least need credit, and making it more difficult for the sections of society that most need credit?—[*Interruption*].

Whether you consider it foreign credit or internal credit, it is still credit. Whether you are borrowing from foreign sources or from local sources, it makes not the slightest difference. Does it make any difference whether it is a rupee loan or a foreign loan if the goods you are getting with that are still foreign goods? If you are giving them a permit, lending them money in Ceylon rupees from the Bank of Ceylon to import vehicles from abroad, or even tractors, does it make any difference? It is still for all a foreign loan. Whether you get it by negotiating for it directly with the Austin Motor Van Company in England or the Rootes Group, or whether you negotiate with the Bank of Ceylon through Walker Sons and Company, it still comes to the same thing.

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary will see what I mean. But why are you giving it to the wrong people?

ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

Even jeeps.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I think some jeeps are definitely given to the wrong people. Some people are using them to transport their children from school. I see a whole lot of them lined up at Royal College. You will be surprised at the number of Land Rovers which are doing food production outside Royal College! You will also be surprised at the number of Land Rovers helping to defeat the United National Party at by-elections, especially their own ones.

Now, in this situation, you must surely give thought to this question. If credit is to be made available, why should the selection be left to foreign people in regard to who are to be the recipients of foreign borrowing? Why should the Americans or the Russians or anyone else you like have the power to choose recipients? Should it not be the Government of Ceylon? Maybe you do not like selecting individuals, but at least you can select groups or categories to which foreign assistance should be made available through the Development Finance Corporation, and propose a list of priorities or projects to be authorized or approved by Parliament. Why are we resisting that idea? Why is it that you with the great faith you are placing in your food drive—[*Interruption*].

ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

You want the list approved by Parliament?

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Yes. I want the list approved by Parliament. I want a list of projects—the details, the ideas, and not individuals. I am not interested in individuals. I am interested in considering the priorities which you

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

[එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

are laying down—whether you are going to finance brothels or whether you are going to finance hotels. It has a world of difference and you can finance either under the present law.

Why should not Parliament have the right to say what we want financed and what we do not want financed? Why are you resisting that? I cannot think of a reason, unless it is that you have merely been told: this law in this form is satisfactory, please pass it, we will then consider giving you something.

That is exactly what happened to the Minister of Land with the Electricity Board. We have seen this happen before. This is not something new. And these are the pressures under which you are hoping to collect your foreign aid.

You are hoping that the consortium which is meeting next month is going to be happy about this, and that the aid is going to be much more forthcoming than it has been in the past. You are in for another disappointment. You will not get it, and ultimately what will happen here will probably be something like what happened in India, where Americans were really responsible for the defeat of the Congress Party at the last elections. They insisted through the World Bank on devaluation, a step which could not possibly make economic sense in relation to the problems of India, with its vast size and magnitude, and on the occasion they did it.

And yet they had no choice. They were caught like a nut in the arms of a nut-cracker. It was a question of the Congress Party going under to a huge economic pressure, of getting submerged by a wave, if they did not somehow or other manage to get a little money. The World Bank promised it, but at a price. The price was devaluation. Look at the consequences that followed. The political destinies of India are being determined from abroad. The consequence of it is quite manifestly plain. Are we going to put ourselves in that position? Are we going to create a situation where foreigners are going to determine the pattern of our future in this country?

We may have our own differences. But those differences are small matters. Those are matters we can quarrel about, as we have every right to do. But these are friendly quarrels. I can assure my friends on the other side of the House that we have had occasion to argue very bitterly in the past, whether from this side or from the other side of the House, on a number of issues. And we have tried to further our respective roles as well as we could. I remember a number of occasions when you from the Opposition were telling us exactly what you thought of us and of our policy. But we never took it amiss. We never regarded it as a private quarrel between individuals. There was no bitterness.

But if you allow this to happen we are definitely going to engender a new kind of bitterness in this House, because it will not be a friendly fight where by exchange of opinions we seek to bring to the surface the minimal differences between us and try to find an area of common agreement, but we will really be resisting the inroads against our independence by foreign authorities through institutions and instruments created by ourselves. We will be resisting the very bludgeon which you are now seeking to put into the hands of our foreign foes. That we cannot agree to.

Then you will come to a stage when you yourselves will want to throw away these instruments and say, "We now see the dangers of what we did and we no longer want these." But by then you may find it is too late. You may find that the very instruments you are forging today have become the guillotine that will chop off your heads. This is where the danger lies.

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

So when we do this, please, I beg of you, do consider this not in the sense of merely an argument being raised to score a political victory over you in this House. There is far too much of a tendency to look upon these things as political partisan arguments. Every time we raise a point in the Opposition, everyone seems to think: well, this is an obstructive tactic; we must deal with it; we must stop it. That is wrong. When you debated for hours and hours, into the late hours of the night, on every single subject under the sun from 1960 to 1965, we found it a nuisance, no doubt, to sit here. Our Reporters sometimes used to sit up all night, and they used to resent it. They used to beg for mercy and say: Please at 11 o'clock even give us half an hour off for dinner. Fair enough. But at no stage did the Hon. C. P. de Silva, the then Leader of the House, fail in his pre-eminently democratic task of accommodating the Opposition. The trouble is, since he saved democracy, democracy has acquired a new meaning for him now: democracy means the elimination of the Opposition. It is a good approach, it is a very convenient approach, but it is basically an approach which will defeat the very objective that you have in mind.

I can see the Hon. Minister of Home Affairs smiling. As the leader of his own party and as the leader of the Hon. Leader of the House, I think he knows that what I am saying is true. But I am not saying it just to score a political debating point. I do want you to realize the dangers of what you are doing with this Development Finance Corporation law. Bypassing Parliament is no solution. In actual terms, probably, you will get little or no money out of this any way. So, not much harm will be done. I do not really foresee that because you are passing this law the Americans are going to start unleashing their money belts and becoming forthcoming in the way of cash. I frankly do not expect it.

I think Mr. Wanninayake will keep on delaying the publication of the Central Bank bulletin, and I think that towards the third quarter he may find himself perhaps out of control with the nation's finances—not because he is a bad manager. I concede that he is probably one of the best Finance Ministers we ever had. I said that in 1965 and I would repeat that now. I am saying that to him in all sincerity. The unruly horse that he is seeking to ride is not of his own creation, but certainly he has done nothing towards taming it except to help it to run away a little faster. It is merely the fact that he has got advisers who give him contradictory advice and the fact that the Government, for all its talk, have not shown the slightest anxiety to get on with the job. The Government is talking, hoping that by a great propaganda surge they will achieve the millennium. You will not.

The Prime Minister tells us one day: I am going to be stern with all the public servants who obstruct national economic development and get in the way of each other and do not do the job. Recently he went to Rajangane or some place, and there was a story in the newspapers about how they had failed to provide irrigation water in time to the cultivators. I would like to ask the Prime Minister: To this day, what have you done?

We are told, day by day, about how the Public Service is being re-organized and geared to the task of economic development. From what I can see, the Public Service today is caught in two minds. There are some who think that the best prospect is to stooge for this Government. There are others who think that the safest course lies in working according to the book of rules and doing the minimum possible for fear that there might be a change of government, and by stooging for the Government they might get into more difficulties. Two different points of view. But all of this is not going to help the country. What is essential is that a hundred per cent. of the

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

[එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

Public Service must work for the country, and you are not achieving that today. Certainly, your own actions have not been such as to inspire confidence. By seeking to wreak political vengeance on those whom you consider your foes for loyalty to a former administration, you have certainly ensured that approximately fifty per cent. of the Public Service is going to be against you any way. That is the present situation. You are achieving nothing.

Your Public Service Commission is worse than crazy. There is a case of an irrigation engineer that I am aware of against whom a disciplinary inquiry was held recently. I would like the Minister for Irrigation to pay a little attention to me if he is not too engrossed with the Parliamentary Secretary. What happened ? An inquiry was held. Mr. Pullenayagam, a civil servant, held the inquiry and exonerated the officer concerned, and after his exoneration the Director of Irrigation did not take any action one way or the other but reported him to the P S. C., and the matter was raised with the Prime Minister. I myself raised it with the Prime Minister, and I know the Prime Minister wrote a letter to the Director of Irrigation calling for a report. A report was never sent. The Chairman of the P. S. C. without even consulting his colleagues in the P. S. C. dismissed the officer ! Even the other colleagues were not consulted, and this is the sort of thing that is going on—wreaking political vengeance. I am telling you that if you wreak political vengeance in this way—the essential conditions are economic development, the expenditure of monies is for that purpose—you are not going to achieve development, and if you are not going to achieve it what is the good of this talk ? What is the good of talking of bringing money here, or bringing machinery here to rust and rot in the sun and rain in the yards of the Irrigation Department ? These things are happening day after day. We all know it. And the best of all is that you are now talking in terms of virtually handing over our destiny to foreigners. That is our principal complaint against this law and we must insist upon the sovereignty of this House in financial matters being always regarded as sacrosanct and supreme.

Sir, the World Bank is the major institution we are concerned with. What is the attitude of this Government to the World Bank ? The Hon. Minister of Industries tells us that they have failed ; that these experts from the World Bank come here and tell us impractical things, things that we do not want to hear and which we cannot accept. I think his speech was reported in the " Observer " of 15th March 1967. This is what he said :

" Rich countries do not know what to do with their money. World Bank experts come and tell us what to do. We know what to do if they would pay us a little more for our commodities.

We must stop begging from rich countries. Countries in the Asian region should get together and compel the rich countries to pay more for our products.

Continuing Mr. Philip Gunawardena said : I am speaking as a member of the National Government. I am asking you who have come from various parts of Asia to go back and tell your people that it is time that the poor developing countries should trade on normal terms rather than go a-begging.

We are forced to beg from the so-called advanced countries who give us loans, aid and long-term credit so that we may re-equip our factories and provide clothing and sheltor for our people. It is the dilemma in which we are now. We work hard and produce more but our purchasing power is not sufficient to buy the needs of our population.

The prices of our primary exports are falling. When you get back I hope you will create sufficient public opinion to compel the people in advanced donor countries to pay five cents more for our tea, rubber and minerals. It is time we told them to do so. "

The Hon. Minister of State endorsed this position in the " Daily News " of 17th March 1967. This is the speech in which he talked about " crackpots "—I see the Hon. Minister

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

of Education here—and the Hon. Minister completely agrees with what has already been stated by the Hon. Minister of Industries.

Now, Sir, what is the attitude of this Government to the World Bank ? Do you really want the World Bank to tender advice ? Do you accept their advice ? Do you think that their advice is correct ? You have been publishing various reports of the World Bank given from time to time, but having published them, we want to ask you this simple question : do you agree with the advice they are giving you ?

That is my third point. If you do not agree with their advice why are you asking us to approve a law authorizing the World Bank to come and finance institutions in this country independent of Parliament ? If you think the advice of the World Bank is marvellous and correct and it is going to lead to rapid economic development, I can understand the argument. But if on the other hand you reject it as the Hon. Minister of Industries has indicated in his speech—He says, " We know what to do. We do not want to be told. " That was his view and I agree with it—I do not think it is necessary for us to be told by the World Bank what we should do.

But the fact is that the World Bank is putting us in a spot ; they are applying the pinch and we are definitely being told what to do, and the one thing that we have to do before the next consortium meeting is to pass the present law in its present form. This will ultimately be the surrendering of our economic sovereignty.

Tell me if this is going to lead us to do something for our country, because then we can think about it. What is the position ? Tell us wether the reports published by you and circulated among us in regard to different spheres—in regard to transport, education, infrastructures, agriculture, industries—are the views of the Notional Government or what the Hon. Minister of Industries stated in his speech as a member of the National Government are the views of the National Government. I take it that the Hon. Minister of Industries expressed the views of the National Government and not the views of an individual. I am not one of those who are trying to create cleavages among you. I am not going to do that. I assume for the purpose of argument that those are the views of the Hon. Minister of Finance who introduced this Bill. If you do not accept the advice of the World Bank and if you do not intend to follow their advice, why are you trying to create this situation here by law ? Why, then, are you trying to create this situation here by law of authorizing the World Bank to come and finance individuals ? What is the sense of this ?

If, on the other hand, you think the World Bank is giving correct advice on certain things, please tell us what those things are, and what are the things on which they have given wrong advice, advice which you have rejected. But you leave the matter in the air. You are not prepared to take us into your confidence. You are not prepared to give us the facts and figures on the Development Finance Corporation. You are not prepared to give us a single Report in regard to its operations. How much of the original Rs. 16 million remains unexpended we do not know to this day. You give us no facts and figures and reports. You do not even tell us what ventures have been financed. I happen to know a few because I was Minister of Finance some time ago.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I mentioned them.

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

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

I was not here. But what I say is this. Why cannot we see the documents, the Statement of Accounts, like any other statement of accounts? If we are entitled to look at the C. T. B. Accounts and the Petroleum Corporation Accounts, what is there that makes the Accounts of the Development Finance Corporation particularly secret? There is no logic in what you are doing. And with all this the World Bank gives you wrong advice, advice which you reject. But you still need the money and you say, let us have it, let us have it on their terms.

This is the grossest act of capitulation of sovereignity that has been witnessed in this country over a long period of time. It is a shame and a sad day for us when we have as a legislature even to consider the question of surrendering our economic powers. Hitherto I know of no single instance where Parliament has given up its control of the direction of expenditure.

However far we have delegated, we have always retained control in some form or another. The matter has come before us even in the form of a report tabled in this House, even if there is no opportunity for discussion. There are many situations where we do not have motions or resolutions introduced but we have at least the document tabled before us.

Here is a law under which practically the entire financial structure of this country, industrial, commercial and agricultural, is going to be brought under foreign control.

This is my fourth point. The definition of "commercial enterprise" is something that is new to the Development Finance Corporation. The Development Finance Corporation Act passed in 1955 concentrated on agriculture and industry. The word "commerce" did not figure in that law at all. But in practically every clause of this present Bill the phrase "commercial enterprise" has been introduced.

I would like to ask hon. Members, what are the commercial enterprises that the Government has in mind that are going to aid economic development? I am not asking for what exists. I am asking what it could be. After all, if you wish to have economic development there must be some practical way of envisaging what you want; otherwise you are not going to be able to develop the country at all. I am not talking of the institutions that exist. I am not talking of, for example, corporations to deal with any particular export commodity. I am talking in terms of what you envisage. What are these "commercial enterprises"?

As far as I am aware the only commercial enterprise you have talked about from the time you came into office in 1965 is the Hotels Corporation. I am not aware of a single other commercial enterprise. Television has been talked about, but my latest information is that that has been postponed for another three years. The promise of 1965 might come up after the next general election. For the present we have only got the Hotels Corporation as a new commercial enterprise.

If it is to finance the Hotels Corporation that you want foreign money, I hardly think the Development Finance Corporation is the way to get it, because you started the Hotels Corporation anyway without the D. F. C. You started issuing shares locally on the basis that you would finance it. Even now in the different offices of the Bank of Ceylon you find a tin like a cancer collection till box—"Applications for Shares—Hotels Corporation." People are invited to drop in the slot their letters of application for allotment of shares. These tills are there in the Bank of Ceylon offices all over Colombo. They have still not been

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

able to close the subscriptions in regard to some of those shares. I believe Mrs. J. L. M. Fernando's "Sun and Sand" is still in the sand and facing the rigours of the sun. That is the leperarium near Hendala.—[*Interruption*]. I am talking of the leperarium.

My point is that this kind of talk takes you nowhere. If you want to build a hotel, I do not think you require all these complications. I think you hardly need have financial institutions of the World Bank or anywhere else to finance the construction of maybe a ten-lakh or a twenty-lakh hotel. If it is a question of obtaining money from abroad for the construction of a hotel, there are sufficient institutions abroad which would be quite prepared to come in and deal with the local organization here; and the Government has approved it and a specific institution exists in the Hotels Corporation. The law is there already authorizing them to raise money, to enter into contracts with foreign organizations, to build hotels in this country. All the legislative powers you want are there.

What are these commercial enterprises you are now talking of? They logically cannot be the hotels. Then what are they? Can you please give us an answer to that question, Mr. Parliamentary Secretary? What are these commercial enterprises approved by the Government conducive to economic development you have in mind? What could they be? They cannot be agricultural enterprises; nor can they be industrial enterprises. What are these commercial enterprises? This is something new in the framework of the Development Finance Corporation law.

If there is sufficient authority in law for the Hotels Corporation to raise money externally to finance their building operations, if there is a foreign source prepared to lend money to invest in the form of building a hotel, why should you worry about it? That is fair enough. That power is there. They can contract with the Hotels Corporation without any difficulty. The law has already been approved by Parliament.

What is the new situation, what is the new corporation, what is the new limited liability company you have in mind which you have described as a commercial enterprise conducive to economic development? Please tell us. Tell us what it could be. There is not a single that I can think of, unless you are thinking of institutions like the C.W.E., those which are existing, enterprises which you know perfectly well and which it has always been your intention to hand over to the private sector, to give foreign trade an opportunity of exercising monopoly conditions here against the policies which were previously exercised by the former Government. You want to do it but you have not the strength to do it.

There were times before when the Minister of State talked about creating corporations in partnership with the C.W.E. We challenged him and said, when he passed that law, "please show us the first corporation." He said that he is going to establish one corporation for the import and distribution of textiles. He insisted that the law should be passed urgently because he wanted to set up the corporation at once. Many moons have passed since that date and we have still not got a corporation for the import of textiles or anything else running in partnership with private capital. What happened to these things? Do you really think you are fooling anybody?

This is nothing but a naked and blatant attempt to bring every single state controlled institution in this country—insurance, petroleum, the bus services, nationalized institutions, the C. W. E.—under total foreign domination. That is the only object that this law can possibly have. I challenge you to show us what else it could be.—[*Interruption*].

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

[එව්ජ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

The capital of the corporation is Rs. 20 million. The borrowing limits of the corporation as far as I can see have not been set out anywhere. Please understand you are not fooling anyone. The corporation's capital and the corporation's borrowing limits are two different matters. A corporation with a capital of Rs 20 million is not in any way prescribed or prevented from borrowing up to a thousand million rupees if there are people who are prepared to lend that money, let us not misunderstand, especially when there is a Governor-General signing as guarantor. This is what you are talking of, but you are not going to fool anyone.

You know your subject, Mr. Parliamentary Secretary. You have been debating long enough in this House. You have shown your competence, your capacity to understand commercial and financial problems, and you have participated in debates for too long a time for any of us to be fooled or to be misled into the impression that you draw. You know what you are talking about, you understand very clearly, and not only that, you regret it in your heart of hearts. One has only to look at your face to realize that on this occasion you are not being flippant or saying things for fun. You are being flippant merely to hide the agony of feeling in your own heart, the sense of shame that you feel at what your Government is being forced into merely because they lack the guts to do anything else and because they have not got a sense of pride to depend on themselves by forging the necessary instrument to take care of their own destinies and to shape their destinies. You are hanging your head now. You make verbal points by saying that the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) had worded a phrase wrong or had stated something slightly out of line. But having made that verbal point in which you excel and in which you enjoy yourself, you still have not touched the fringe of the subject. You have not explained to us, you have not stated one word why it has become necessary to include commercial enterprises or what these commercial enterprises are.

The truth of the matter is that this is the instrument by which we mortgage our whole country—its assets, its public sector, and its private sector—to foreign masters, and you are asking us now to sign an unconditional bond by which we will hold ourselves in pledge for all time. That we in the Opposition refuse to do. We will not accept it nor will we honour the bond. That is our position.

I have made it as plain as I can and if I spoke with some feeling, I did so not out of any wish to take time or to embarrass you in this Debate. I have tried to keep to the point. I tried to make my point as clear and as cogent as I could. I did not do so only for the purpose of convincing the hon. Parliamentary Secretary. He is already convinced.

I am quite certain that if we meet outside he and I will meet as friends, and in most financial matters I find that we are not very far apart although we may find ourselves constrained to say things which look very flamboyant on paper and in HANSARD as though we are attacking each other violently. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary at least has a clear understanding of what he talks about. At least he reads his document and studies his material which is more than what I can say for some.

So that, when we are talking here, please do not look at this thing as merely a question of scoring a debating point over the Opposition. That is easy. You have the numbers. You can vote against us at any time and apply the Closure when you want to. The power of the vote is always on your side. You can name us all if you want, one by one, but you are not really going to achieve anything.

Is this the democracy you are pledged to defend; is this the purpose for which we meet here in this

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

House ; or is it an attempt to come to some common degree of understanding ? You yourselves talk about Comecon, the possibility of the Soviet Government, of the Eastern European countries being able to come and invest under this agreement. Do you really believe that ? Do you believe in your heart of hearts that a single socialist country is going to use this instrument to come in as a vehicle of investment in this country ?

There may be some socialist countries that want to invest in this country. East Germany, at the moment, is going to build a textile factory at Tulhiriya in the constituency of the Hon. Prime Minister. At the moment tractors are at work there. I have seen it myself and I can assure you, I am honestly glad about it. I can assure you when we come into power we will not uproot it. We shall leave it exactly where it is. We shall estabish textile factories.—[*Interruption*]. It may be the graveyard of the Hon. Prime Minister. Certainly it benefits the country. Make no mistake, we are not actuated by motives of revenge in removing things from one place to another. That is not the way to develop the country. We do not believe that the way to create employment opportunities in this country is to sack an existing lot appointed by you and to appoint a new lot, which is your method of doing things. That we have not done and we shall not do. We shall create new employment opportunities, and we believe socialist-wise it is possible to do so.

We do not believe this country is bogged down in a situation where we are incapable of creating employment opportunities. It is merely that you lack the vision and the guts. Your Finance Minister, hoping to control the unruly horse, thinks that by starving the people of credit he will achieve his end. He will not succeed. One of the only methods which you can adopt here is to increase local credit in this country as a means for solving the problem. It is a dangerous thing to do I grant. It has its risks. It is certainly less risky than watching the waves engulf you and getting submerged in the process. Certainly this instrument is not going to help you one way or the other. Do you really think you want this instrument for socialist assistance ? Do you think the Comecon countries are going to be attracted by this ? Is this law being presented to Parliament to satisfy the requests of the socialist countries ? Be honest with yourselves. They on their part are quite prepared to deal with you even if the government is a U. N. P. Government. There is not a single socialist government that I am aware of that has ever said, " We will not deal with you because you are the U. N. P. " Not even the governments which you have slandered in the past, not even the governments about which you have said the most diabolical things at election time in the hope of gaining some local victory, have said such a thing—except of course to individuals who walk into their embassies and seek to insult them on material gathered from American propaganda. That is a different cup of tea altogether.

Certainly as a government you have never run into that kind of thing. And you do not want this instrument for aid from those countries. If you want economic aid from the socialist countries, it can be obtained without any difficulty. I can assure you, we for our part would welcome assistance projectwise from any source, whatever the source, but we do not like to see a blank warrant of authority given to foreign institutions and foreigners to deal directly, independent of Parliament and free of parliamentary control, with any individual company or organization in this country where the accounts will never be submitted to Parliament, never be supervised, and by

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

[එව්ජ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

which the economic power and authority of Parliament is going to be undermined for all time.

අ. භා. 7.42

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, ලංකාවේ සංවර්ධන මුදල් නීතිගත සංස්ථා (සංශෝධන) පනත දෙවන වර කියවීමේ විවාදයට සහභාගී වන අවස්ථාවේදී මේ රටේ ආර්ථික හා කාර්මික සංවර්ධනය පිළිබඳව මෑතදී ඇති වුණු විශාලතම, ප්‍රධානතම සිද්ධිය ගැන සඳහන් නොක ළොත් එය මගේ යුතුකමක් පැහැර හැරියා වන්ට පුළුවනි. ඒ නිසා මේ විවාදයට සහභාගිවන අතර මා පළමුකොටම ඊයේ හවස්වරුවේ අගනුවරින් එතරම් ඈත නොවූ ඔරුවලදී මේ රටේ ආර්ථික හා කාර්මික සංවර්ධනය පිළිබඳව විවෘත වූ ඒ අයෝමය ද්වාරය, යකඩ දොර, වානේ සංස්ථාව, පිළිබඳව සඳහන් කළ යුතුව තිබෙනව.

මේ රටේ ජාතික නිදහසත්, ඒ සමගම ජාතික සංවර්ධනයත් යන දෙකම ආරක්ෂා කරන, අපේක්ෂා කරන, ඒ සඳහා දහඩිය මහන්සියෙන් ක්‍රියා කරන, සාමාන්‍ය මහජනතාව වෙනුවෙන් ඊයේ ඒ ආරම්භ වූ කාර්මික සංවර්ධනයේ, ඊයේ ඒ විවෘත වූ කාර්මික සංවර්ධනයේ, අයෝමය ද්වාරය පිළිබඳ වගකීම පැවරී ඇති, ඒ යහපත් ආලෝකවත් යුගය ආරම්භ කිරීමට අපට ආධාර දුන් ලෝකයේ ප්‍රථම සමාජවාදී රජයට මේ රටේ පොදු මහජනතාව වෙනුවෙන් අපගේ කෘතඥතාව පළ කළ යුතුව තිබෙනව. නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, ඊයේ හැන්දෑවේ මේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේදී මේ රටේ මෑතකදී පැවති අතුරු මැතිවරණය කදී මේ රජය ගෙන ගිය, මේ රජයේ අනුදැනුම ඇතුව සිදු වූ, ඇතැම් අයථා ක්‍රියාවන් ගැන විරුද්ධත්වය පළ කිරීමට ගරු මන්ත්‍රීන් කීප දෙනකු කථා කිරීමේ මූලික ජනසම්මතවාදී අයිතිය සඳහා නැගිට සටන් කරද්දී, කථානායකතුමාගේ නියෝගයෙන් ඔවුන් බැහැර කිරීම සඳහා මේ රජය අදහස් කර—

ගරු සභාවේ දොර විවෘත වෙද්දී ඔරුවල දී වානේ සංස්ථාවේ ඒ අයෝමය ද්වාර යත් විවෘත වුණා.

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

The hon. Member might keep to the Motion before the House.

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

මා සඳහන් කරන්ට උත්සාහ කරන්නෙ කාර්මික සංවර්ධනය පිළිබඳව ඊයේ ඇති වුණු වැදගත් සිද්ධිය ගැනයි. ඊයේ ඔරුවලදී කාර්මික සංවර්ධනය පිළිබඳ අයෝමය ද්වාරය විවෘත වුණා. ඒ සිද්ධිය ඓතිහාසික වශයෙන් වැදගත් වනුයේ කාරණා කිපයක් නිසයි.

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

ඒ සම්බන්ධව දැන් කථාකරන්ට බැහැ කියන එකයි මගේ තීන්දුව.

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

ඔරුවල සිද්ධිය ගැන මා සඳහන් කළේ කාර්මික සංවර්ධනය සඳහා මේ පනතින්—

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

කරුණාකර පනත ගැන කථා කරන්න.

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

—කරුණු කීපයක් ඉදිරිපත් කරන්ට

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

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

මන්ත්‍රීතුමා සඳහන් කළ කාරණා මේ පනතට අදාළ නැහැ.

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

දැන් කථා කරල ඉවරයි. ශත වෂී $4\frac{1}{2}$ක පමණ කාලයක් තිස්සෙ බටහිරදිග අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන් සමඟ සම්බන්ධකම් පැවතුනත්, යටත් රාජ්‍යයක් හැටියට ඒ අවුරුදු හාර සියය, නැත්නම් හාරසිය පණහ පමණ කාලය ඇතුළත දී මේ රටේ නොසිදුවූ වැදගත් ආර්ථික දියුණුවක ආරම්භයයි ඊයේ ඇති වුණේ. ඒ ඇති වුණේ අවුරුදු 10ක් පමණක් සමාජවාදී රජයක් සමඟ පැවති සම්බන්ධකම්වලින් පසුවයි. මේ සිද්ධියේ වැදගත්කම තේරුම් ගැනීමට මේ පනතින් ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙන අලුත් සංශෝධනවල නියම අර්ථය වටහා ගන්ට ඕනෑ. අපේ අවබෝධය අනුව නම් අද විවාදයට භාජන වන මේ පනතින් මේ රටේ කාර්මික හෝ කෘෂිකාර්මික හෝ වාණිජමය හෝ සංවර්ධනයකට මඟ පාදන බවයි, අප කියන්නෙ. මෙය පසුගිය ශත වෂී හතරහමාරක පමණ කාලය තුළ මේ රට බැඳ තබාගෙන සිටි අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන්ම නැවත වරක් මේ රට යට කිරීමේ උත්සාහයක් බව අපේ විශ්වාසයයි. ඊයේ සිදු වුණු ඔරුවල විප්ලවය ගැන මා සඳහන් කෙළේ ඒ නිසයි. ශත වෂී හතරහමාරක පමණ කාලයක් තිස්සේ බටහිර අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන් සමඟ අපේ සම්බන්ධකම් තිබුණා. ඔවුන් සමඟ ආර්ථික, කෘෂිකාර්මික, වාණිජමය හා තවත් නොයෙකුත් සම්බන්ධකම් තිබුණා. එහෙත් ඒ ඔරුවල විප්ලවය හා ඒ සම්බන්ධකම් ගැන සිතන විට අපට හැඟෙන්නේ කුමක්ද?

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මේ පනතින් බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ ඇමෙරිකන් ධනය බෙදා හරින ජාත්‍යන්තර ආයතනවල මාගීයෙන් මේ රට තුළ ඇමෙරිකන් ධනය යොදවා වාණිජමය සංවර්ධනයට අදාළ වැඩ වගයක් කිරීමටයි. ශත වෂී හතරහමාරක පමණ කාලයක් තිස්සේ බටහිර අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන් සමඟ අපේ සම්බන්ධකම් තිබුණේ, කවරදාක්වත් මේ රටට යහපතක් සිදු වන විධියේ වැඩක් නොකෙරුණා නම්, දියුණුවක් නොසිදු වුණා නම්, එසේම කර්මාන්ත යුගයේ දියුණුවක් හැටියට හැඳින්විය හැකි පියවරක් ගන්නට හැකි වූයේ ඊයේ නම්, මේ යෝජනා කරන ඇමෙරිකන් මුදල් මාර්ගයෙන් අපට කවරදාක්වත් දියුණුවක් ලබන්නට බැරි බවයි, තර්කයක් හැටියට මා ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නෙ. අන්න ඒ නිසයි, ඔරුවල සිද්ධියත් මේ පනතත් අතර ඇති වෙනස් බව ගැන සඳහන් කරන්නට මා උත්සාහ කෙළේ.

සමාජවාදී රටවල් සමඟ සම්බන්ධකම් ඇති කර ගැනීමට ලංකාවට පුළුවන් වුණේ 1956 න් පසුව පමණයි. වානේ කර්මාන්ත ශාලාව මාර්ගයෙන් අවුරුදු දහයක සුළු කාලයක් ඇතුළතදී නවීන ලෝකයේ කර්මාන්ත දියුණුවක් ඇතැයි කියා සඳහන් කරන්නට පුළුවන් වන ඒ ප්‍රධාන පියවර ගන්නට මේ රටට පුළුවන් වුණා. ශත වර්ෂ ගණනක් තිස්සේ බටහිර අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන් සමඟ සම්බන්ධකම් තිබුණත් මේ රටේ ඇති වූ දියුණුව කුමක්ද? මේ ප්‍රශ්නයට පිළිතුරු දීමේදීත්, අද විවාදයට භාජන වී ඇති සංශෝධන පනතේ නියම අර්ථය වටහා ගැනීමේදීත්, එක් අතකින් ඉකුත් මාස කීපය තුළදී වර්තමාන ආණ්ඩුවට අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී ඇමෙරිකන් බැංකුවලින් දෙන ලද උපදෙස්ද, අනික් අතින් මේ බැංකු එසේ නැත්නම් මේ ආයතන ඇමෙරිකන් සංවිධාන මාර්ගයෙන් වෙනත් රටවල ඇති කරන ලද පරිවර්තනයන් හා වෙනස්කම්ද, දේශීය වශයෙන් හා ආභ්‍යන්තරික වශයෙන් අප සලකා බැලිය යුතුයි.

දේශීය වශයෙන් මේ ආණ්ඩුව බලයට පත් වුණායින් පසු ඇමෙරිකන් උපදෙස් මත පිහිටා නිකුත් කරන ලද ආර්ථික කරුණු පිළිබඳ වාර්තා කීපයක් මේ ගරු සභාවට ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නට මා අදහස් කරනවා. ඇමෙරිකන් උපදෙස් අනුව කට යුතු කරන්නට ගොස් මහජන මතය දිනා ගන්නට බැරිව මේ ආණ්ඩුව එදී සිටින ප්‍රපාතය ගැන මා පසුව විස්තර කරනවා.

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

[ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.]

ඊට කලින්, ජාත්‍යන්තර වශයෙන් අමෙරිකන් සල්ලි යොදවා වැඩ කරන්ට ගොස් අනෙකුත් ආසියාතික හා ලතින් අමෙරිකානු රටවලට සිදු වී තිබෙන දේ ගැන ඩිංගක් මතක් කරන්ට කැමතියි.

පිලිපයිනය, දකුණු වියට්නාමය, කාම්බෝජය, වැනි රටවල පැරණි ඓතිහාසික අනිතය සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම යට කර අමෙරිකන් ඩොලරයෙන් වසා ජාතිකත්වය විනාශ මුඛයට යවා තිබීම නිසා අද ඔවුන් මහා අමාරු තත්ත්වයකට මුහුණ පා සිටිනව. විශේෂයෙන් දකුණු වියට්නාමයේ මේ දිනවල සිදු වන්නෙ මොකක්ද කියා තමුන්නාන්සෙ දන්නව. ලංකා මුදල් නීතිගත සංස්ථාව මාර්ගයෙන් ගරු රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා විසින් පිහිටුවන්ට යන හිල්ටන් හෝටල් කඩ පේලිය මාර්ගයෙන් වේවා, "ජුනියර් ක්ලබ්ස්" තරුණ සංවිධාන මාර්ගයෙන් වේවා, අමෙරිකන් මුදල් උපකාරයෙන් පවත්වාගෙන යන නොයෙකුත් ආයතන මාර්ගයෙන් වේවා, කෙළින්ම අමෙරිකන් ආරක්ෂක දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවෙන් පටවා යවන යුද්ධ නැව් අහස් යාත්‍රා බෝම්බ මාර්ගයෙන් වේවා, මොන ආකාරයෙන් හෝ අමෙරිකන් ධනය, අමෙරිකන් යන්ත්‍රෝපකරණ, අමෙරිකන් බලපෑම මිනිස් වගීයා විනාශ කරනව. අමෙරිකන් ධනය යම්කිසි රටකට ගියා නම්, ඒ රටේ ජාතිකත්වය ඉවරයි; අතීතයේ සිට පැවත ආ වටිනා පැවැත්ම කම්මුතුයි.

ඇමෙරිකාව වියට්නාමයට මේ දක්වා හෙළන ලද බෝම්බ ගණන දෙවැනි මහා ලෝක යුද්ධයේදී මුළු ලෝකයේ හැම තැනටම හෙළූ බෝම්බ ගණනටත් වැඩි බව පසුගිය දිනවල පළ වූ ඇමෙරිකන් සඟරාවක සඳහන් වී තිබුණ. වියට්නාමය වෙනුවෙන් ඇමෙරිකාව දවසකට වියදම් කරන ඇමෙරිකන් ඩොලර් ප්‍රමාණය අපගේ දුප්පත් රටක් වෙනුවෙන් අවුරුද්දකදී වියදම් කළත් අපේ ජීවන තත්ත්වය අද තිබෙනව වගේ දෙතුන් ගුණයකින් දියුණු කරන්ට පුළුවන්. රටක් නැති කිරීමේ විනා දියුණු කිරීමේ ගතියක් ඇමෙරිකන් ඩොලර්වල කවදාවත්ම තිබුණෙ නැහැ. ඇමෙරිකාව තමන් දියුණු කර ගත්තත්, ඇමෙරිකන් ඩොලර් විසින් දියුණු කළ රටක් තිබෙනවද? ඇමෙරිකන් ඩොලර් යම් රටකට ගියා නම් ඒ රට විනාශයි. අද දකුණු වියට්නාමයේ ඇමෙරිකන් සොල්දාදුවන් 4,00,000ක් ඉන්නව. දකුණු වියට්නාම් භූමියේ පය ගැසීමට ඇමෙරිකන් සොල්දාදුවන්ට තිබෙන අයිතිය කුමක්ද? ඇමෙරිකන් එක්සත් ජනපද රාජ්‍යයේ සිට හැතැප්ම 6,000 කට වඩා ඈතින් පිහිටි වියට්නාමයට ගොඩබැස ඒ රටේ සිටින අහිංසක මහජනතාව—කුඩා දරුවන්, මහල්ලන් හා මැහැලියන් පවා—මරා දැමීමට ඇමෙරිකන් සොල්දාදුවන්ට තිබෙන අයිතිය කුමක්ද?

මේ පසුබිමේ සිටගෙනයි, අපි මේ පනත් කෙටුම්පත තේරුම් ගන්ට උත්සාහ කළ යුත්තෙ; විග්‍රහ කළ යුත්තෙ. මේ විධියට ඇමෙරිකන් ඩොලර් මේ රටට එන්ට ඉඩ හැරියොත්, අපටත් කවදා හෝ සිදු වන්නෙ වියට්නාමයේ අහිංසක මිනිසුන්ට සිදු වී තිබෙන විධියට ඇමෙරිකන් බෝම්බවලට මුහුණ දී දිවි නසා ගැනීමටයි. ඊට ඉඩ දෙන්ට බෑ. ඇමෙරිකන් සල්ලි මොන රටට ගියත්, ඇමෙරිකන් ඩොලර් මොන ආකාරයෙන් ඒ රටේ යෙදෙව්වත්, ඔය විධියෙ විපතකින් හැළවෙන් එවැ රටට කවදාවත් ලැබෙන්නෙ නැහැ.

අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී යුගය පටන් ගත් කාලයෙ—මීට ශත වර්ෂ 1 1/2කට කලින් රටවල් ඇල්ලූ කාලයෙ—ඉස්සරවෙලා බෝම්බ දමා, පසුව තේ පැළ රබර් ගස් ඉන්දුව. දැන් අධිරාජ්‍යවාදයේ මුහුණුවර ටිකක් වෙනස් කර තිබෙනව. දැන් කෙලින්ම බෝම්බ යවන්නේ නැතිව රන් කාසි නැත්නම් ඩොලර් යවනව. මේ රටේ ඩොලර් තැන්පත් කරන බැංකු වන්නේ ගරු රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමාගේ හිල්ටන් හෝටල් තමයි. ගරු රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමාගේ ඒ හෝටල් සංස්ථාවේ ප්‍රධානියා නම් එයට කැමති වේවි. ඔහු පසුගිය කාලයේ කුමන්ත්‍රණයකට අසු වී සැඟ වී සිටියේ මිරිස්ස පැත්තේ ගරු රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමාට සම්බන්ධකම් ඇති දුපතකය කියා ආරංචියි. අන්න ඒ රොයිස් ද මෙල් මහතා නම් මේ ඇමෙරිකන් ඩොලර් එනවාට කැමති ඇති. ඒ මගින් උත්සාහ කරාවි වැටෙන්නට යන එන්. පී. ආණ්ඩුව ආරක්ෂා කර ගන්නට. ඔහු ඒ කාලයේ උත්සාහ කළේ

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

තිබෙන ආණ්ඩුව පෙරළන්නටයි. දැන් වැටෙන්න යන ආණ්ඩුවක් ආරක්ෂා කරන්න උත්සාහ කරනව. මේවා මහජනයාට තේරෙන විධියට කියන්න.

මේ පනත ඉදිරිපත් කරන ගමන් මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාත් ආණ්ඩු පක්ෂය වෙනුවෙන් කථා කළ කර්මාන්ත හා ධීවර ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමත් මුදල් තැන්පත් කරන අයගේ හිත් සනසන්නට කිව්වේ මොකක්ද? "බයක් වෙන්න වුවමනාවක් නැහැ; මේ මුදල් නැති වෙන්නෙ නැහැ; අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරතුමා ඇපයට සිටිනව; ඒ නිසා මුදල් ඕනෑ තරමක් මේ රටේ යොදවන්න" කියා කිව්ව. එහෙත් මා මේ කථා කරන්නෙ ණයකාරයන්ට ඇහෙන්නට නොවෙයි. මා කථා කරන්නේ අවුරුදු දහස් ගණනක් මේ රටේ සිංහල බෞද්ධ සංස්කෘතිය රැකගෙන ආ දුප්පත් සිංහල මිනිසුන්ට ඇහෙන්නයි. ඒ සිංහල බෞද්ධ සංස්කෘතිය ආරක්ෂා කර ගන්න ඕනෑ නම් මේ ඩොලර් වැහි මේ රටට වහින්න ඉඩ දෙන්න එපා. දැන් තිබෙන මේ අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී ක්‍රමය කලින් තිබුණු බ්‍රිතාන්‍ය අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී ක්‍රමය වගේ නොවෙයි. ඒ කාලයේ රටවල් කොල්ල කෑවේ සොල්දාදුවන් හදිසියේම පැමිණ ඔවුන්ගේ සපත්තුවට ජනතාව යට කරගෙන රට අල්ලා ගත් පසුවයි. එහෙත් අද දියුණුවට පත් වී තිබෙන අමෙරිකන් අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී ක්‍රමය රටවල් කොල්ල කන්නේ ඒ විධියට නොවෙයි. බ්‍රිතාන්‍ය අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන් කෙලින්ම සොල්දාදුවන් එවනවා වගේ මොවුන් පළමුවෙන්ම එවන්නේ ඩොලර්. ජේම්ස් බණ්ඩල, හොරුන්ගෙන් හොරු, කෙලින්ම එවනව. ඒ අය තැන් තැන්වල හිල්ටන් හෝටල් වැනි බත්කඩ ඇති කරනව. මේවා තමයි අපේ සංස්කෘතියේ විනාශය ආරම්භ කරන විෂ සහිත වූ විසකුරු සර්පයින් ආරක්ෂා කරන හුඹස් බවට පත් වෙන්නෙ. ගරු රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමාගේ අනුමැතිය, අනුග්‍රහය හා ආශීර්වාදය ඇතිව ගොඩනඟන්නට යන මේ හිල්ටන් හෝටල් සංස්ථාව තමයි, මේ රට කාබාසිනියා කරන විසකුරු සර්පයින් ආරක්ෂා කරන හුඹස් වන්නෙ. ගරු රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා හිනාවෙනව. එහෙත් එතුමා තවත් අවුරුදු 25 ක් ජීවත් වුණොත්—තව අවුරුදු 25ක් එතුමා ජීවත් වේවා කියා මා ප්‍රාර්ථනා කරනව—ඇමෙරිකානුවන් කරන විපත ගැන එදාට එතුමා කණගාටු වේවි. [බාධා කිරීමක්] අනවශ්‍ය සටනක් කරන්නට අපට සිදු වෙනව. නිවීසැනසිල්ලෙ අපට පුළුවන් විධියකට මේ රටේ ජීවත් වන්න අපට ඉඩ ලැබෙන්නෙ නැහැ. අපට වුවමනා නැහැ ඇමෙරිකන් ඩොලර් සංස්කෘතිය. අපට ඒ තරම් වේගයෙන් ජීවත් වෙන්න ඕනෑ නැහැ. සමහර ගම්වලත් ඉන්නව ඔය වගේ උදවිය. ලොතරයි ඇදී ඊයේ පෙරේදා පොහොසත් වී ගම්වල චණ්ඩින් වගේ ඉන්න ඇත්තන් අපට දකින්න ලැබෙනව. ජාත්‍යන්තර වශයෙන් ඇමෙරිකන් රාජ්‍යය ඊට සමාන ලෙස හඳුන්වන්න පුළුවනි. ඒ අය කරන චණ්ඩිකම් අපට දකින්න ලැබෙනව. ඇයි, වියට්නාමය සමඟ කෙරෙන දේවලින් ඒ බව පෙනෙන්නෙ නැද්ද? දකුණු වියට්නාමයට පමණක් නොවෙයි, උතුරටත් ගිහිල්ලා බෝම්බ දමනව.

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)
පනතට අදාළවද ඔය කථාකරන්නෙ?

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා
(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)
කරුණා කර පනතට අදාළව කථා කරන්න.

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)
ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, පනතේ තිබෙන වචන ටිකම හැම වෙලාවෙම කියවීම නොවෙයි විවාදයකදී කරන්න තිබෙන්නෙ. ලෝකයේ හැම තැනකින්ම උදාහරණ ඉදිරිපත් කරන්න පුළුවනි, විවාදයකදී.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා
(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)
ලෝකයේ තිබෙන හැම දේම අරන් කථා කරන බව පෙනෙනව. එහෙම නොකර කාරණයට අදාළ දේවල් පමණක් ඉදිරිපත් කරමින් කථා කරන්න.

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

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)
ඇමෙරිකන් සල්ලි ගැන පනතේ කියා තිබෙන බව පිළිගන්නවා නේද?

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)
ඒ නිසාම එහෙම කියන්න බැහැ.

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)
ඇමෙරිකන් සල්ලිවලින් සිදු වන විපත්ති ගැනයි මා කියන්නෙ. කාර්මික, කෘෂිකාර්මික සහ වාණිජමය සංස්ථාවකට නැත්නම් සංවිධානයකට ඇමෙරිකන් සල්ලි රිංගවන්න ගියොත් සිදු වන්නේ මොකක්ද?

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)
දැන් ඒ ගැනත් කියල තියෙනව නේද?

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)
වෙන දෙයක් තබා සංස්ථාවලට අයුතු විධියට ඇමෙරිකන් ආණ්ඩුවෙන් නොයෙක් අවස්ථාවල මුදල් රිංගවීමෙන් ඒ සංස්ථා වල විනාශයටත් කරුණු සිදු වී තිබෙනව. ඊයේ පෙරේදා ඒ ගැන ලොකු ගාලගෝට්ටියකුත් ඇති වුණා. ඒ සිද්ධිය ගැන සඳහන් වෙලා තියෙනව. "සෙන්ට්‍රල් ඉන්ටෙලිජන්ස් ඒජන්සි" නමින් රහස් සංවිධානයක් ඇමෙරිකාවෙ තිබෙනව. ඒ රහස් සංවිධානයේ ප්‍රධාන කාර්යයක් තමයි ඇමෙරිකන් ආණ්ඩුවට වුවමනා කරන දේවල් ඒ අන්දමට කරවා ගැනීමට ක්‍රියා කිරීම. හැම ආයතනයක් මගින්ම හැම සංවිධානයක් මගින්ම හැම සමාජයක් මගින්ම ඇමෙරිකානු ආණ්ඩුවට අවශ්‍ය වන ආකාරයට තමන්ගේ ආයතනයේ සංවිධානයේ සමාජයෙ ප්‍රතිපත්ති සකස් කරවා ගැනීමට මුදල් යෙදවීම එහි ප්‍රධාන කාර්යයක්. මේ සිද්ධිය ගැන මීට සුමාන දෙකකට පමණ ඉහතදී ඇමෙරිකාවෙම විශ්ව විද්‍යාලවල ඉන්න මහාචාර්යවරුන් ප්‍රමුඛ නිදහස් මතධාරීන් අතර ගාලගෝට්ටියක් ඇති වුණා. මේ රහස් සංවිධානය මගින් මුදල් යොදා යම් යම් ආයතන වලත්, සංවිධානවලත් ස්වාධීනත්වයට නිදහසට බරපතල හානි කර තිබෙනවා යනුවෙන් ඒ අය කියා සිටියා. තමන්ගෙම රටේ තිබෙන නිදහස් ආයතනවලට ඇමෙරිකන් ඩොලර්වලින්ම මේ විධියට බල පානවා නම් මේ අහිංසක අපේ රටට එන ඩොලර් වලින් අපට මොනවා කරාවිද යන්න සම්බන්ධයෙන් අපට සැකයක් තිබෙනවද?

ඇමෙරිකන් ඩොලර් යොදා—අමෙරිකන් සල්ලි යොදා—ආයතනවලත් සංවිධාන වලත් සමාජවලත් විද්‍යාලවලත් ස්වාධීන තාවට කළ හානි ගැන ඇති වූ ඒ උද්ඝෝෂණයේදී සී. අයි. ඒ. හෙවත් චරපුරුෂ සංවිධානයේ නායකයින්ට පවා තමන්ගේ ආයතනය මගින් ඒ ආකාරයට මුදල් යොදා තිබෙන බව පිළිගන්න සිද්ධවුණා. මෙය ඊයේ පෙරේදා සිට කෙරෙන්නක් නොවෙයි. ඇමෙරිකානු ආණ්ඩුව සදාකාලික වම ප්‍රතිපත්තියක් වශයෙන් මුදල් දී ඒ ඒ ආයතනවල සංවිධානවල සමාජවල ස්වාධීනත්වය යට කර තමන්ට ඕනෑ දේවල් ඒවා ලවා කරවා ගන්න බව පිළිගන්න ඕනෑ. සී. අයි. ඒ. නැමැති චරපුරුෂ සංවිධානය කෙළින්ම වැඩ කරන්නෙ නැහැ. ඒ අය ඇතට වෙලා ඉඳගෙන වෙනත් මාඟී වලින්, වෙනත් ආයතන මගින් වෙනත් උදවියගෙ ආධාරයෙන් තමයි ක්‍රියා කරන්නෙ.

ලෝකයේ හැම රටකම පාහේ පැතිර යන "ටයිම්ස්" නැමති සඟරාවේ මීට සති දෙකකට පමණ පෙර පළ කරන ලද—නිකුත් කරන ලද—කලාපයේ ඒ ගැන විශේෂ ලිපියක් ලියා තිබෙනව. පෙබරවාරි 24 වැනිදා නිකුත් වූ කලාපයෙහි එය පළ වී තිබෙන්නෙ. අමෙරිකන් සල්ලි නිසා අමෙරිකන් සංවිධානවලට වන විපත්තිය එළි දරව් කිරීම සඳහා මා එයින් පේලි තුන හතරක් කියවන්නම්:

"The use of front foundations to handle CIA money is an old technique. More than a score of obscure philanthropies have turned out to be contributors of millions to free-world student groups, notably the World Assembly of Youth

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

in Brussels, the International Student Conference, which is headquartered in The Netherlands, the Independent Research Service in Washington, and the U. S. Youth Council in New York. Over the past 15 years, funds were donated to one organization or another in the name of the Independence Foundation, the J. Frederick Brown Foundation, and the Sidney and Esther Rabb Charitable Foundation, all of Boston, the San Jacinto Fund of Houston, the Foundation for Youth and Student Affairs of New York. In several cases, the forms that tax-exempt foundations are required to submit as public records with the Internal Revenue Service were strangely missing from the files of district offices."

කෙළින්ම මුදල් දෙන්නෙ නැති එකයි කියන්නෙ. මේ යෝජනා කර ඇති සංශෝධන පනතෙන් අසුවල් දේටය කියා පැහැදිලි කර නැහැ. මේ අමෙරිකන් සල්ලි යොදවන්නෙ කොහොමද කියන එක විස්තර කර නැහැ. ලංකාවේ සංවර්ධන මුදල් නීති ගත සංස්ථාවෙ මුල් පනතෙ හැටියට කරුණු දෙකක් සඳහා පමණයි මේ ආකාරයට විදේශීය මුදල් ලබා ගන්ට පුළුවන් වුණේ. කාර්මික හා කෘෂිකාර්මික අංශ දෙකයි ඒ. නමුත් යෝජිත සංශෝධන පනතෙ දෙවන වගන්තියෙ (2) (ආ) කොටසෙ මෙසේ තියෙනවා:

"ලංකාවේ පුද්ගලික කර්මාන්ත හෝ කෘෂිකාර්මික ව්‍යාපාරයක්" යන වචන වෙනුවට "ලංකාවේ පුද්ගලික කර්මාන්ත, කෘෂිකාර්මික හෝ වාණිජ ව්‍යාපාරයක්" යන වචන ආදේශ කිරීමෙන් ද වේ.

දෙයාකාර ව්‍යාපාරයන් සඳහා මේ මුදල් යොදවන්න පුළුවන් බවයි ඉස්සෙල්ල කියා තිබුණෙ. මෙහි තිබෙන වැදගත් ම වෙනස නම් මේ තෙවන ආකාරයට වාණිජ ව්‍යාපාර සඳහා මුදල් යොදවන්ට ඉඩකඩ සලසා දීමයි. මා මීට මොහොතකට පෙර සඳහන් කළ අමෙරිකානු සහරාවෙ පෙනෙන ආකාරයට අමෙරිකානු මුදල් යොදවා තිබෙන්නෙ හුදෙක් වාණිජමය කටයුතුවලට පමණක් නොවෙයි, අධ්‍යාපනික කටයුතුත් ඇතුළත් සංවිධාන සඳහායි. කෙළින්ම අමෙරිකන් ආණ්ඩුවෙන් වත් ඔය කියන චරපුරුෂ සේවයෙන්වත් නොවෙයි, වෙන වෙනත් සංවිධානවලින් තමයි ඒ විධියට මුදල් යෙදෙව්වෙ. ලංකාවෙදී කෙළින්ම එය කරන්ට අමාරුයි. මෙහෙ අමෙරිකන් තානාපති කාර්යාලයට ග්‍රාම සංවර්ධන සමිතියකට හෝ පුජා මණ්ඩලයකට හෝ වනිතා සංගමයකට හෝ මහිලා සමිතියකට නැතිනම් සමුපකාර සංගමයකට හෝ කෙළින්ම සල්ලි දෙන්ට පුළුවන්කමක් නැහැ. අමෙරිකාවෙ සී. අයි. ඒ. සංවිධානයෙ ශාඛා කොටස් තවම මේ රටේ මුල් බැහැගෙන නැහැ. "ටයිම්" සඟරාවෙ කියන විධියට වෙන වෙනත් සංවිධාන මාඟීයෙන් ශිෂ්‍ය සමිති වාගෙ තැන් කෙරෙහි බලපාන්න කටයුතු සලසගන්න පුළුවනි. ඒක තවම ලංකාවෙ කරන්ට අමාරුයි. එම නිසා ඉස්සෙල්ල මෙහෙ ඇවිත් මුල් අල්ලා ගන්ට ඕනෑ. මෙන්න මේ "වාණිජ ව්‍යාපාර" කියා ආණ්ඩුව ඉදිරිපත් කරන සංශෝධනවලට අනුව අමෙරිකන් ඩොලර්වලට මෙහෙ ඇවිත් මුල් අල්ලා ගන්ට අවසථාවක් සැලසෙනවා. මේ රට ඇමෙරිකන් සල්ලිවලට යට වී දෙවැනි වියවිනමායක් වේදෝසි භීතියක් මේ රටේ සාමාන්‍ය මිනිසුන් අතර පැතිර යන්නෙ මෙන්න මේ පසුබිම නිසයි. මේ යෝජිත සංශෝධන පනතෙ "වාණිජ ව්‍යාපාරය" යන්නෙහි අර්ථය විග්‍රහ කර තිබෙන්නෙ මෙසේයි:

"'වාණිජ ව්‍යාපාරය' යන්නට කෘෂිකාර්මික හෝ කර්මාන්ත ව්‍යාපාරයක් පිළිබඳ විස්තරයකට ඇතුළත් නොවන, ලංකාවේ ආර්ථික සංවර්ධනයට හේතු විය යුතු, සීමා සහිත වගකීම් ඇති සමාගමක් විසින් කරගෙන යනු ලබන යම් විශාල ප්‍රමාණයේ ව්‍යාපාරයක් ඇතුළත් වේ."

මේක පුදුම විධියේ අර්ථ විග්‍රහයක්. මෙය හරියටම, පොල් ගහ ගැන විග්‍රහයක් කිරීමේදී, පොල් ගහ වනාහි කඳක් තිබෙන, තාලවර්ගයට අයිති ගසක්යයි කීම වැනි අර්ථ විග්‍රහයක්. පොල්ගහ ගැන කරන මෙවැනි විග්‍රහයක් කිතුල් ගහටත් පුවක් ගහටත් තාල වර්ගයට අයිති වෙනත් ගස කටත් එක විධියටම යොදන්නට පුළුවන් කම තියෙනවා. යෝජිත පනතෙහි තිබෙන "වාණිජ ව්‍යාපාරය" පිළිබඳ අර්ථ විග්‍රහයත් හරියටම ඒ වගෙයි. තේරුම් ගන්නට බෑ. "වාණිජ ව්‍යාපාරය" යන්න කුමක් දැයි මෙහි පැහැදිලි කර නෑ.

ලැබෙන්නට යන සල්ලි කොයි විධියට යොදනවද යන වග අඩු ගණනෙ මෙම පනත ඉදිරිපත් කළ ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාවත් අපට පැහැදිලි කර දුන්නෙ නෑ. මේ පිළිබඳ ඇත්ත කිව්වොත්, ආණ්ඩු පක්ෂයෙ මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්ට මහ පාරෙ බැහැලා සාමාන්‍ය පුළුවන් වන්නෙ නෑ. කෘෂිකාර්

Digitized by Noolaham Foundation
noolaham.org | aavanaham.org

[ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.]

මික, කර්මාන්ත හා වාණිජමය සංවර්ධන යේ නාමයෙන් ඇමෙරිකන් කාරයින්ට මේ රටේ ජාතික නිදහස යටපත් කෙරෙන මේ පනත පිළිබඳ ඇත්ත මහජනයා ඉදිරි යෙහි එළිදරව් වුණොත් මේ ආණ්ඩුවට පුළුවන්කමක් නෑ මහජනයාට මුහුණ දෙන්නට. කර තිබෙන මේ යෝජනාව තේරුම් ගත යුත්තෙ, පසුගිය කාලසීමාව තුළදී ඇමෙරිකාව එහි බලපෑම් පිට මේ ආණ්ඩුවට දී තිබෙන උපදෙස් හා අවවාද අනුශාසනා අනුවයි. අද මේ ආණ්ඩුව වැටී සිටින අමාරුවට එක් ප්‍රධාන හේතුවක් වුණේ පසුගිය සුළු කාලය තුළදී කැබිනට් මණ්ඩලය විසින් ගන්නා ලද ඇතැම් තීරණයන් බව තමුන්නාන්සෙ දන්නවා ඇති. හාල් ප්‍රශ්නය එයින් විශෙෂ එකක්.

හාල් ප්‍රශ්නය රටට ඉදිරිපත් කරන අවස්ථාවේදී ගරු අගමැතිතුමාත් ගරු ආහාර ඇමතිතුමාත් මුළු කැබිනට් මණ්ඩලයත් කියා සිටියෙ, මේ රට මුහුණ පා තිබෙන ආර්ථික ප්‍රපාතයෙන්, ආර්ථික අමාරුකමෙන්, ආර්ථික දුෂ්කරතාවෙන්, මුදා ගන්නට නම් කළ යුත්තෙ, වෙන කිසිම දෙයක් නොව, කොහොම හරි මේ රට කෘෂිකාර්මික අතින් ස්වයංපෝෂිත කිරීම බවයි. නමුත්, ඇත්ත මේකද? ඇත්ත දැනගන්න නම්, මීට සති කිපයකට කලින් ඇමෙරිකන් උපදෙස් අනුව පළ වුණු වාර්තාව කිය වන්න ඕනෑ. ඇමෙරිකන් උපදෙස්වල තිබෙන භයානකකම පෙන්වා දීම සඳහා මා ඒ වාර්තාවෙන් වාක්‍ය කීපයක් පම ණක් කියවන්නට අදහස් කරනවා. අමෙරි කානුන් මේ රටේ මුල්බැස ගැනීමේ චේත නාවෙන් පසුගිය අවුරුදු දෙක තුළදී දෙන ලද උපදෙස් අනුව ක්‍රියා කරන්නට යාම නිසා මේ රටේ අපට අනාගතයේදී සිදු වන විපත මහජනයාට එයින් තේරුම් යන්නට ඕනෑ. ඇමෙරිකන් අධිරාජ්‍ය වාදීන් සමඟ අත්වැල් බැඳගෙන ඔවුන් ගෙ අවවාදානුශාසනා අනුව ක්‍රියා කරන්නට යාම නිසයි මේ රජයට අද මේ තත්වයට මුහුණ දෙන්න සිදු වී තිබෙන්නෙ. මොකක්ද මේ හාල් ප්‍රශ්නය පිළිබඳව ඇමෙරිකන් ලෝක බැංකුව මගින් රජයට දුන්න උපදේශය? මේ අවස්ථාවෙ

නය යටතේ මේ රටේ සංවර්ධනයට මුදල් දෙන්න යන ඒ බැංකුවට අදාළ නියෝජිත පිරිසක් විසින් පසුගිය සැප්තැම්බර් මාස යේ නිකුත් කරන ලද වාර්තාවෙනුයි, මා දැන් කියවන්න බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නෙ. ඒ මිනිසුන් ගෙන්මයි, අපට සල්ලි එන්නෙ. ඒ මිනිසුන් අපට දුන් උපදෙස් මොනවාද කියා දැන් සොයා බලමු.

Recent Economic Trends—Ceylon හෙවත් "ලංකාවේ නූතන ආර්ථික සංවර්ධනය" පිළිබඳ ඇතැම් කරුණු නමැති ශීර්ෂය යටතේයි, ඒ වාර්තාව නිකුත් කරල තියෙන්නෙ. මේ ආර්ථික විශේෂඥයන් ආණ්ඩුවට දුන්න උපදේශය මොකක්ද? "අද අනුගමනය කරන ප්‍රතිපත්තිය අනුව තමුන්නාන්සේලාට කවදාවත් මේ රට දියුණු කරන්න බැහැ. මේ රටේ දුප්පත් මහජනයාට ලාභයට හාල් දීලා කවදාවත් මේ රට දියුණු කරන්න බැහැ. මේ රටේ වැඩ කරන මිනිසුන්ට ලාබෙට බස්වලින් යන්න ඉඩ දීලා—බස් ගාස්තු සීමා කරලා —කවදාවත් මේ රට දියුණු කරන්න බැහැ. මේ රටේ සාමාන්‍ය මිනිසුන්ගේ දරුවන්ට නිදහස් අධ්‍යාපනය දීලා කවදාවත් මේ රට දියුණු කරන්න බැහැ. ඒ නිසා වහම මේවා නවත්වන්න ඕනෑ."

මා මේ කිව්වෙ ඒ ඇමෙරිකානු ආර්ථික උපදේශකයන් දුන් උපදෙස් සම්පිණ්ඩනය කරලයි. ඒ වාර්තාවේ 32 වැනි පිටුවේ 79 වැනි ඡේදයේ මේ උපදෙස් සඳහන් වී තිබෙනවා. ඒ වාර්තාව මුල සිට කියවන්න වෙලාවක් නැහැ. අද මේ රට මුහුණ පා තිබෙන ආර්ථික දුෂ්කරතාවලට හේතු මොනවාද යන්න ඒ වාර්තාවේ සඳහන් වෙලා තියෙනවා. මේ රට ආර්ථික වශයෙන් අමාරුවට වැටී තිබෙන්නෙ පසුගිය ආණ්ඩුවේ වැරදි තොගයක් නිසාය, ඒ නිසා එයින් ගොඩ එන්න නම් මෙන්න මේවා කරන්න ඕනෑය, කියා ඒ වාර්තාවේ කියා තිබෙනවා. ඒ ඩොලර් උපදේශකයන් ආණ්ඩුවට කියන්නෙ ඒකයි.

"Possible courses of action

79. In the absence of further investigations, it is not possible to offer precise solutions to this dilemma but it seems that a three-pronged approach to the solution of this problem might be relevant. While the scope on the revenue side is small—with revenue already at 23 per cent. of GNP—some action is both

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

possible and necessary to review and raise the level of import and possibly excise duties. On the expenditure side"—

මේකයි, වැදගත් කාරණය. ආණ්ඩුව මුදල් වියදම් කරන ප්‍රමාණය වැඩිවූ. අධ්‍යාපනය සඳහා, ආහාර ද්‍රව්‍ය සඳහා, අඩු මිළට හාල් දීම සඳහා—ඔය විධියේ දේවල් සඳහා—ආණ්ඩුව වියදම් කරනවා වැඩිවූ.

—"On the expenditure side, the scope for economy is very small (although some economies might be possible in education) and it seems inevitable that a change must be made in the largest and most rapidly growing element—the food subsidies."

ඒ අනුව නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, ඊයේ පෙරෙසිදා හාල් සලාකය කපන්නට හේතු වුනේ ලෝකයේ තිබෙන හාල් හිඟයක්ද, එසේ නැත්නම් ඇමෙරිකන් උපදේශකයන්ගේ අනුශාසනා ද, කියායි අපට අසන්න සිදු වී තිබෙන්නෙ. හාල් සලාකය කපන්නය කියා සැප්තැම්බර් මාසයෙදි කිව්වා. දෙසැම්බර් වන විට ඒක කැපුවා. මෙතැන අහම්බෙන් වගේ සඳහන් කරල තියෙනවා, නිදහස් අධ්‍යාපන ක්‍රමය ගැන. නිදහස් අධ්‍යාපන ක්‍රමය ගැන ඊයේ පෙරෙසිදා වාර්තාවක් නිකුත් වුනා. කරන්නට වුවමනා දේ මොනවාද කියා ආර්ථික උපදේශකයන් එහි කියා තිබෙනවා. ඒ පියවරත් ගන්න තෙක් තමයි, දැන් අපි බලාගෙන ඉන්නෙ. මේ උපදේශකයන්ගේ උපදෙස් අනුව වර්තමාන රජය ක්‍රියා කරන නිසා තමයි, හදිසි නීතිය පනවන්නත් මේ රජයට සිදු වී තිබෙන්නෙ. හාල් සලාකය කැපීමේදී බරපතල දේශපාලන අර්බුද ඇති වන්න පුළුවන්ය කියා ඔවුන් කියා තිබෙනවා. මා ඉහතින් සඳහන් කරන ලද වාර්තාවේ 80 වැනි ඡේදයෙහි, "Needless to say, for the same reasons, any change in these areas may well be highly politically charged" යනුවෙන් සඳහන් කර තිබෙනවා. හාල් සලාකයට අත ගැසීමෙන් දේශපාලන වශයෙන් බරපතල අර්බුදවලට මුහුණ පාන්නට පුළුවනැයි ඇමෙරිකන් උපදේශකයන් කියා ඇති නිසයි, එක හාල් සේරුවක් නොමිළයේ දෙන ගමන් හදිසි නීතියද පනවා තිබෙන්නෙ.

නොමිළයේ කන්න දෙන විට තුවක්කු වකුත් අතේ තබා ගන්නේ මොන රටෙද? දන් දෙන කොට කවදාවත් තුවක්කුවකුත් එක අතක තබා ගන්නවා ද? හාල් සේරුවක් නොමිළයේ දීමත් දානයක් නොවෙයිද? බල්ලකුට වුවත් යමක් කන්නට දෙන කොට ළඟ තිබෙන පොලු කැබෙල්ල අහකට විසි කරනවා. පොලු කැබෙල්ලක් තිබුණොත් ඒකත් අහකට විසි කරලයි, බල්ලාට කන්නට දෙන්නෙ. එහෙත් මෙම ආණ්ඩුව හාල් සලාකය නොමිළයේ දෙන වායයි කියන ගමන්ම හදිසි නීතියත් පනවාගෙන සිටිනවා. නොමිළයේ කන්නට දෙන ගමන්ම වෙඩි තබන්න ලෑස්ති වී සිටිනවා. මේ කරුණු හොඳින් දැන ගන්නට නම් මේ වාර්තා හරිහැටි කියවන්නට ඕනෑ. ඇත්තෙන්ම මහජනයා රැවටීමක් හැටියට මේ ආණ්ඩුව හාල් සේරුවක් නොමිළයේ දෙන්නට පටන් ගත්තා. ආර්ථික දුෂ්කරතාවලට මුහුණ පා ඩිටින මේ ආණ්ඩුවට එයින් වාසියක් ලැබී තිබෙනවා. සේරුවක් ශත විසිපහ ගණනේ හාල් සේරු දෙකක් ශත පණහකට දෙන වාට වඩා එක් හාල් සේරුවක් නොමිළයේ දීම ආණ්ඩුවට ලාභයි. ඇමෙරිකන් උපදෙස් අනුව මේ විධියට ක්‍රියා කරන්නේ ඒකයි. මිනිසුන් කාලා ඇඳලා යහතින් ජීවත් වෙනවාට ඇමෙරිකාව කවදාවත් කැමැති නැහැ. මිනිසුන් ඒ විධියට සිටීමෙන් ඇමෙරිකාවට යහපතක් සිදු වන්නේ නැහැ. අපේ රටේ මිනිසුන් ඒ විධියට සිටීම නිසා ඇමෙරිකාවේ යුද්ධෝපකරණ විකිණෙන්නේ නැහැ. එම කර්මාන්ත දියුණු වන්නෙ නැහැ.

අපේ රට මෙතෙක් කල් විදේශාධාරවලින් වැඩි කොටසක් යෙදෙව්වේ නිදහස් අධ්‍යාපනය, සෞඛ්‍ය පහසුකම්, ආහාර මිළ අඩු කිරීම වැනි සමාජ සේවා වැඩ වලටයි. ඒවා වැරදි වැඩ යයි සමහර ආර්ථික විද්‍යා විශේෂඥයන් කියනවා ඇති. නමුත් මා නම් එසේ කියන්නේ නැහැ. හැම වගකිව යුතු රටකම යුතුකම වන්නේ තම රටේ ජනතාව හාමතේ තබන්නේ නැතිව ඔවුන්ට පහසුවෙන් ජීවත් වන්නට ක්‍රම සැලසීමයි. ජනතාවගේ යහපත සඳහා ජනතාවට පහසුකම් සැලසීම සඳහා මේ ආණ්ඩුව වුවද ගන්නා ඕනෑම පියවරකට සමාජවාදයේ නාමයෙන් අප සහයෝගය දෙන්න ඕනෑ.

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

[ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.]

ලෝක බැංකුවේ විශේෂඥයන්ගේ උප දෙස් අනුව හාල් කැපීමට තීරණය කළා සින් පසුව අගමැතිතුමා ප්‍රකාශයක් කර තිබුණා. අගමැතිතුමාගේ ප්‍රකාශය සමඟම තවත් හාමුදුරු නමකගෙන්ද ලිපියක් ලබාගෙන ප්‍රසිද්ධ කොට තිබුණා. "සබ්බේ සත්තා ආහාරට්ඨිතිකා—සියලු සත්වයෝ ආහාරය නිසා ජීවත් වෙති" යනුවෙන් සඳහන් කර තිබුණු ඒ ලිපියෙහි හාල් සේරුව නොමිළයේ දීමෙන් මේ ආණ්ඩුව ලොකු පින්කමක් කර ඇතැයි තමන් වහන්සේ අදහස් කරන බවද සඳහන් වුණා. ආණ්ඩුවට ආවඩන සමහර හාමුදුරුවන් මේ අන්දමට තැන් තැන්වල බණ කියනවා. නමුත් හාල් සේරුවක් කැපීමේ උපදේශය මේ ආණ්ඩුවට ලැබුණේ ඇමෙරිකන් උපදේශකයන්ගෙනුයි.

ඇමෙරිකාවේ සිටින සල්ලිකාරයන්, ධන කුවේරයන් සාමාන්‍ය මිනිසුන් හොඳට කාලා ඇඳලා සිටිනවා දකින්නට කැමැති නැහැ. ලංකාව ඇමෙරිකාවෙන් ආධාර ඉල්ලුවිට, "හාල් සේරුව කපපන්. එතකොට ආධාර දෙනවා" යනුවෙන් ඇමෙරිකාව කී නිසා ඒ අනුව ක්‍රියා කරන්නට මේ ආණ්ඩුව පෙළඹුණා. අපේ මිනිසුන් ලාභයට කාලා ඇඳලා සිටියාම ඇමෙරිකාවට වන යහපත කුමක් ද? ඇමෙරිකන් කාරයන්ගේ ආර්ථික ක්‍රමය දියුණු වන පිළිවෙළක් තිබෙනවා නම් ඒ ධන කුවේරයන් තව තවත් බලයෙන් බලයට පත් වන යම්කිසි මාර්ගයක් තිබෙනවා නම් අන්න ඒකට ඇමෙරිකන් උපදේශකයන්, මේ ආර්ථික විශේෂඥයන් කැමති වෙනවා ඇති. ලාභ මුදලට හාල් ටිකක් ඉල්ලුවාට ඔවුන් කැමති වන්නේ මොකට ද? සමහර විට ටිකක් තදින් වෙඩි වදින තුවක්කු තොගයක් ඉල්ලුවා නම් ඔවුන් කැමති වේවි. දහස් ගණනක් සිටින තැනකට දැමූ විට ඒ දහස් ගණනම මූර්ඡා කරන්නට පුළුවන්කමක් තිබෙන කඳුළු ගෑස් බෝම්බ ටිකක් ඉල්ලුවා නම් කැමති වේවි. අල්ලපු රට සමඟ සටන් කිරීමට අහස් යාත්‍රා ටිකක් ඉල්ලුවා නම් කැමති වේවි. නමුත් මීට වඩා ලාබෙට හාල් සේරුව දෙන්ට සල්ලි ටිකක් දෙන්නය කියා ඉල්ලුවොත් ඊට අමෙරිකාව කැමති නැහැ. මේ. වර්තමාන අධිරාජ්‍යවාදයේ නව මුහුණුවරයි.

අමෙරිකාව සල්ලි දෙන්නෙ සමාජ සේවා වැඩට නොවෙයි, මිනිසුන්ගෙ ජීවන තත්ත්වය උසස් කිරීමට නොවෙයි, සංස්කෘතික සංවර්ධනයට නොවෙයි. අමෙරිකාව ඩොලර් කෝටි ගණන් වියදම් කරන්නෙ ඔවුනොවුන් මරා ගන්නා මිනී මරු යුද්ධ යුධ ලබා දීමටයි. ඒ බව මෑතකදී අමෙරිකන් ආණ්ඩුවත්, බ්‍රිතාන්‍ය ආණ්ඩුවත් මගින් නිකුත් කරන ලද යුද්ධ උපකරණ පිළිබඳ සංඛ්‍යා ලේඛන සහිත වාර්තා කීපයකින් හොඳ හැටි එළිදරව් වුණා. අමෙරිකන් මුදල් වැඩිපුර යොදවන්නෙ මොන වාටද කියා එයින් පැහැදිළි වෙනව. "වාණිජ ව්‍යාපාර" යන නාමයේ හෙවනැල්ලට මුවා වී අමෙරිකාව වැඩිපුර මුදල් වියදම් කරන්නෙ මොනවාටද කියා එම වාර්තාවලින් පැහැදිලි වෙනවා.

ඒ වාර්තා දෙක විස්තර වශයෙන් තමුන්නාන්සෙ ඉදිරියේ තබන්ට වුවමනා නිසා මම අපේ පුස්තකාලයෙන් ඒ වාර්තා ඉල්ලා ගැව්ව. නමුත් අපේ පුස්තකාලය ඒ තරම් අළුත් පොත් ලබාගත හැකි තැනක් නොවෙයි; පරණ පුස් කෑ පොත් ටිකක් පමණක් තිබෙන තැනක්.

මේ වාර්තා දෙකේ මා කියන කාරණා බොහොම විස්තර ඇතිව සඳහන් වෙනව. එකක් "Arms to developing countries by the British Institute of Stratagic Studies" හෙවත් "සංවර්ධනය වන නවීන රටවලට සපයන යුද්ධ උපකරණ" නමැති වාර්තාවයි. එය බ්‍රිතාන්‍ය ආයතනයක් මඟින් පර්යේෂණ පවත්වා, සංඛ්‍යා ලේඛන ඇතිව නිකුත් කළ වාර්තාවක්. අනික, "Arms Sales and Foreign Policy" යනුවෙන් හැඳින්වෙන, අමෙරිකන් ආණ්ඩුව විසින් නිකුත් කරන ලද වාර්තාවක්. මේ වාර්තා දෙකෙන් පැහැදිලි වන්නෙ අප වැනි නොදියුණු දුප්පත් රටවලට, අමෙරිකාව, බ්‍රිතාන්‍ය හා බටහිර ජර්මනිය වැනි දියුණුය කියන බටහිර අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී රටවල් මුදලින් උපකාර කර තිබෙන්නෙ මොන මොන හේතූන් නිසාද කියායි.

"අපට බඩගිනියි, අපට අඳින්ට නැහැ, අපේ පොඩි එවුන්ට උගන්වන්ට ඉස්කෝල නැහැ, අපට ඉස්කෝල ටිකක් නැත්නම් විද්‍යාගාර ටිකක් හදා ගන්ට සල්ලි ටිකක් දෙන්ට" කියා අපි ඔවුන්ට කීවොත් "සල්ලි නැහැ" කියා ඔවුන් අප

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

එළවා දමනව. අපි කිවොත් "අපට යුද්ධ කරන්ට අහස් යාත්‍රා ටිකක්, සටන් කිරීමට යුද්ධ ටැංකි නැත්නම් මිනී මරන්ට බෝම්බ ටිකක් දෙන්ට" කියා, ඔවුන් අපට ඩොලර් කෝටි ගණනින් ආධාර කරයි. ඒ බව මේ වාර්තා දෙකෙන් හොඳට පැහැදිලි වෙනව. දියුණුය කියන බටහිර අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී රටවල් මඟින් නොදියුණු රටවලට එක අවුරුද්දකදී රුපියල් කෝටි 429 ක යුද්ධ උපකරණ සපයා තිබෙනව. ප්‍රහාරක ජෙට් ගගන යාත්‍රා 4,600 ක් සපයා තිබෙනව. 1945 සිට අද දක්වා යුද්ධ ටැංකි 5,000 ක් සපයා තිබෙනව. යුද්ධ කටයුතු සඳහා පාවිච්චි කරන හෙලිකොප්ටර් 25,000 ක් සපයා තිබෙනව. නමුත් අපේ දුප්පත්කම මඟහරවා ගන්ට නැත්නම් බඩගින්නෙ ඉන්ට බැරිය කියා හාල් ටික අඩුවෙන් ගන්ට සල්ලි ටිකක් ඉල්ලුවොත් "Recent Economic Trends in Ceylon" නමැති වාර්තා මාර්ගයෙන් අපට කියනව, "ඒ වියදම් නවත්වන්න, ඒවට දෙන්ට සල්ලි නැහැ" කියා. කලින් එහෙම කියල මාස කීපයකට පසුව දැන් එනව මේ විවාද වන සංශෝධන පනත මාර්ගයෙන් වෙනත් ආකාරයකින් මේ රට ඇමරිකන් ඩොලර්වලට යට කර ගන්න මග පාදා ගන්න.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මේ පනතේ තිබෙන භයානකකම තව පැය දෙක-තුනක් කථා කළත් සම්පූර්ණයෙන් විස්තර කරන්ට අමාරුයි. හුදෙක් විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයේ මන්ත්‍රීවරයකු හැටියට එක් සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයට දෙස් පැවරීමේ අපියෙන් පමණක් මා කථා කරනවා නොවෙයි. ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම මේ විධියට අමෙරිකන් මුදල් අපේ රටට රිංගවන්ට ඇරියොත්, සීමාරහිත විධියට, අදෘශ්‍යමාන විධියට අමෙරිකන් ධන බලය අප අතරට කා වදින්ට ඉඩ දුන්නොත්, අද අපේ ගම්බද ඉතා කුඩා ආයතනවල පවා පවත්නා ස්වාධීනත්වය එහෙම පිපින්ම යටවෙලා විනාශ වෙලා යනව. මෙන්න මේ භය නිසා විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයේ මන්ත්‍රීන් කීප දෙනකුම ඉතා විස්තර වශයෙන් පැහැදිලි කර දුන්නා, කොයි කොයි මාර්ගවලින් මේ විපත්තිය සිදුවන්ට පුළුවන්ද කියා.

යෝජනා කර තිබෙන සංශෝධන අනුව ආයතනයේ මූලික ධනය හත්-අට ගුණයකින් වැඩි කර තිබෙනව. එහෙත් ඔවුන්ට ලබාගත හැකි ණය ප්‍රමාණයේ සීමාවක් නැහැ. ණය ප්‍රමාණයේ සීමාවක් නැතිවා පමණක් නොවෙයි, මේ පෞද්ගලික ආයතන සඳහා මේ විධියට ලබා ගන්න බලා පොරොත්තු වන ණයට ඇපකාරයෙකුත් කොහෙන්ද ඇදල අරගෙන තිබෙනව. යටියන්තොට ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ආචාර්‍ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා) කථා කරන අවස්ථාවේ මා සිටියෙ නැහැ. එතුමා කථා කරද්දි, මේ පනතේ අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරතුමා ඇපකරු හැටියට සඳහන් කිරීම සම්බන්ධයෙන් කළ ප්‍රකාශය වැරදි යයි කර්මාන්ත හා ධීවර කටයුතු පිළිබඳ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමා තම කථාවෙදි කිව්ව. ගරු පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමා මේ පනත් දෙකේ තිබෙන වෙනස හරිහැටි තේරුම් ගත්ත නම් යටියන්තොට ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාට ඒ විධියේ චෝදනාවක් කරන්නෙ නැහැ. Foreign Loans හෙවත් විදේශ ණය පනතෙ—1957 අංක 29 දරණ ඒ පනතෙ—පරමාර්ථය මේකයි:

"An Act to make provision regarding foreign loans to the Government of Ceylon."

ලංකාණ්ඩුවට ලැබෙන විදේශ ණය පිළිබඳ විධාන පැණවීමේ පනතයි මේ. අද සාකච්ඡාවට භාජන වී තිබෙන්නෙ ලංකාණ්ඩුවට ලැබෙන මුදල් වගයක් ගැන නොවෙයි. මෙහි සඳහන් වෙන්නෙ "Development Finance Corporation of Ceylon" කියන පෞද්ගලික සංස්ථාවට ලැබෙන මුදල් ගැනයි. පුද්ගලයකුට ලැබෙන මුදල් සම්බන්ධයෙන් ඇපකරුවකු වශයෙන් අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරතුමා ඉදිරිපත් කිරීමත්, ලංකාණ්ඩුවට ලැබෙන මුදලක් සම්බන්ධයෙන් ඇපකරුවකු වශයෙන් අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරතුමා ඉදිරිපත් කිරීමත් අතරේ වෙනසක් තිබෙන බව පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමාට වෙන වෙලාවක නම් තේරෙනව ඇති. හැන්දෑවෙලා වැඩි නිසා ඕව ගැන——

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

ඒ කාරණය තේරුම් කරල දුන්න, කොලොන්නාවෙ මන්ත්‍රීතුමාත්, දොම්පෙ මන්ත්‍රීතුමාත්.

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

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

මේ අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරතුමා ලංකා සංවර්ධන පනතේ ණයවලට ඇපකාරයා හැටියට ඇතුළු කිරීමෙන් අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරතුමාගේ ඇපයත් ගහලා යන වැඩකුයි කරල තිබෙන්නෙ. ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම මේ හේතූන් නිසා ප්‍රමාණක් නොවෙයි අප මේ පනත් කෙටුම්පතට විරුද්ධත්වය ප්‍රකාශ කරන්නෙ. අපේ ස්ථාවර නියෝගවල අන්දමට අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරතුමා ගැන විශේෂ යෝජනාවක් ඉදිරිපත් නොකර එතුමා ගැන මේ ගරු සභාව තුළදී සඳහනක් කරන්ට බැරි බව ඔබතුමා දන්නව. අපේ ස්ථාවර නියෝගවල, 88 හා 89 වන ස්ථාවර නියෝගවල, මේ අන්දමට සඳහන් වෙනව.

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

අප සියලු දෙනාම ඒව ගැන දන්න නිසා ඒව සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම කියවන්නෙ නැතිව——

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

නමුත් මේ ආණ්ඩුව ක්‍රියා කරන්නෙ ඒව ගැන කිසිම දෙයක් නොදන්න විධියටයි. දැන් මේ ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙන පනත් කෙටුම්පත අනුව ලංකාවේ සංවර්ධන මුදල් නීතිගත සංස්ථාවට ලැබුණු ණයක් ගැන කථා කරමින් අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරතුමාට ඕනෑ හැටියට දෙස් කියන්ට පුළුවන් නොවැ. ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම තමුන්නාන්සේ මේ සංශෝධන පනත් කෙටුම්පත රීති විරෝධීය කියා ප්‍රතික්ෂේප කරන්ට ඕනෑ. මේ සංශෝධන පනත් කෙටුම්පත මේ තිබෙන අන්දමට නීතිගත වුණොත්, 88 වන හා 89 වන ස්ථාවර නියෝගවලට පටහැණිව ඇපකාරයගෙ ඇපෙත් නැත කියා විලියම් ගොපල්ලව මහත්මයට ඕනෑම අවස්ථාවක බණින්ට පුළුවන් නොවැ. තමුන්නාන්සේට ඒක නතර කරන්ට පුළුවන්කමක් නැහැ.

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

ඒ වෙලාවට මම තින්දුව දෙන්නම්. දැන් මොනවටද ඒව ගැන කථා කරන්නෙ?

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

අප එතකොට කථා කරන්නෙ අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරතුමකු ගැන නොවෙයි; මහා රාජිණීන් වහන්සෙගෙ නියෝජිතයකු ගැන නොවෙයි. ලංකාවේ සංවර්ධන මුදල් නීතිගත සංස්ථාවෙ ණයක ඇපකාරය ගැනයි. පේනව නේද, කොහේද නැති අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරතුමකු මේ පෞද්ගලික සමාගම්වල ණය දෙන මිනිසුන්ට ඇප තියන්න ඇදගෙන, අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරතුමත් වෙළඳ පොළට ඇදගෙන වැටෙන්න යන අමාරුව? එම නිසා අඩු වශයෙන් කාරකසභා අවස්ථාවේදීවත් මෙය සංශෝධනය කරනවා ඇතැයි මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරතුමාට තමන්ගෙ රජ වාසලේ සැපසේ ජීවත් වෙන්න ඉඩ හැර මේ වගන්තිය සංශෝධනය කරන මෙන් මා නැවතත් ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මේ පනත් කෙටුම්පත ගැන අද මේ ගෙන යන විවාදය ඊයේ වූ යම් සිද්ධියක් නිසා මේ ගරු සභාවට දුන් දඬුවමක් වගෙයි.

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

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

දඬුවම හැමෝටමයි. වෙලාවට ඉස්කෝලෙට නොපැමිණි ළමුන් නැත්නම් පන්තිය තිබියදී ටිකක් වේලාසනින් ගෙදර ගිය ළමුන්, පසුවදා පන්තිය අවසානයේදී නවතා ගන්නව වගේ වැඩක් තමයි ගරු කථානායකතුමත් ආණ්ඩු පක්ෂයෙ මන්ත්‍රීවරුත් එකතු වී මේ ගරු සභාවට කර තිබෙන්නෙ. ඊයේ රැස්වීම වේලාසනින් කල් දමන්ට සිද්ධ වූ නිසා අද එළි වෙන

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

තුරු හරි විවාදය ගෙන යන්ට කල්පනා කරනවා. අපිත් ලෑස්තියි ඒ අන්දමට විවාදය ගෙන යන්න. ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම මේ පනත් කෙටුම්පතෙහි කියා නිම කරන්ට බැරි තරම් දේවල් තිබෙනවා. අපට ඒවා ඉදිරිපත් කරන්ට පුළුවනි. මේ පනත් කෙටුම්පතට අප තුළ තිබෙන විරුද්ධත්වය දැන් මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් කීප දෙනෙකුගෙන්ම පළ වුණා. එම නිසා මා දීර්ඝ වශයෙන් කථා කරන්ට අදහස් කරන්නෙ නැහැ.

අවසාන වශයෙන්, මේ පනත් කෙටුම්පත අනුව වාණිජ ව්‍යාපාර මාර්ගයෙන් ලංකාවට ඇබ්බැහි කරන්ට උත්සාහ දරණ ඇමරිකන් වාණිජ සංස්කෘතිය නිසා අපේ රටේ අප ගරු කරන අපේ පැරණි බෞද්ධ සංස්කෘතිය විනාශ වීමට ඉඩ තිබෙන බව මා සඳහන් කරනවා. ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම එයින් අපේ ආදරණීය මාතෘ භූමියේ ගෞරවය සහ සාධීනත්වය විනාශ වී යාමට ඕනෑ තරම් අවකාශ තිබෙනවා. එය හුදු මනස්කල්පිත භීතියක් නොවෙයි. යම් තැනක ඇමරිකන් මුදල් පැළපදියම් වුණා නම් ඒ සෑම තැනක්ම විනාශ වුණා. ඒ නිසා නොයෙක් මාර්ගවලින් මේ රටට නොපෙනෙන විධියට, අදෘශ්‍යමාන විධියට, මේ රටේ සාධීනත්වයට පහර ගැසීමටත් මේ රටේ සංස්කෘතිය විනාශ කිරීමටත්, ඇමරිකානු සංස්කෘතිය මේ රටේ බෝ කිරීමටත් ප්‍රථමකොටම එන තානාපතිවරුන් හැටියටයි, අපි මේ ඩොලර් සලකන්නෙ. ඒ නිසා මේ රටට ආදරය තිබෙන, මේ රටේ සංස්කෘතියට හිතවත්කමක් දක්වන, මේ රටේ අතීතය ගැන ආඩම්බරයක් තිබෙන හැම දෙනාම මේ ඇමරිකන් සංග්‍රාමයට නැත්නම් මේ සංශෝධන පනත් කෙටුම්පතට විරුද්ධව ඡන්දය පාවිච්චි කරන හැටියට මා ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා.

අ. භා. 8.44

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ
(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)
(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, කථාව පැහැදිලි නැති වුණත්, කිසිම තර්කයක් ඉදිරිපත් නොකළත්, ඉතාමත්ම භයානක, රටේ ඉරණම පාවා දීමට යන, අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී යටත් විජිත ක්‍රමයක් ඇති කරන, විනාශදායක මේ පනත් කෙටුම්පත ගැන ආණ්ඩු පක්ෂයෙන් කථා කළ වත්තල ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ඩී. ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.) කළේ යටියන්තොට ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාට (ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා) වුවමනා නැති තර්ක ඉදිරිපත් කිරීම පමණයි. වත්තල ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාට දැන් ටිකක් සාගින්න ඇති වී තිබෙන හෙයින් මෙතනින් පිට වී යෑමට බලාපොරොත්තුවෙන් සිටින නිසා, එතුමාගේ කථාව සම්බන්ධව සුළු විවේචනයක් කිරීමට මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. ඒ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයාගේ විවේචනයේ අදක්ෂකම නිසා තර්කයක් ඉදිරිපත් කිරීමට බැරි වුණත් එතුමා කී යම් යම් කරුණු ගැන විවේචනයක් කරන්නම්.

ප්‍රධාන පනත අනුව පෞද්ගලික ආයතනවලට ලෝක බැංකුවෙන් ගන්නා ණය සම්බන්ධව ආණ්ඩුවේ වගකීම නීතිගත වී තිබෙනවා. මේ ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙන සංශෝධනය අනුව ලෝක බැංකුවට දී තිබුණු ඒ විශේෂ ස්ථානය වෙනස් වී නැති අතර, අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී රටවල වෙනත් බැංකුවලින් මේ රටේ පෞද්ගලික ආයතනවලට ගනු ලබන යම් මුදලක් තිබෙනවා නම් ඒ මුදල සඳහා ගරු අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරතුමාගේ ප්‍රමුඛත්වය ඇතිව ලංකාව වග කියනවා. ඒ අනිකුත් ආයතනත් ලංකාවේ ආණ්ඩුව වගකියනු ලබන ආයතන යයි මේ සම්බන්ධව ලොකු තර්කයක් ගෙනාවා. අනික්වා අපි පැත්තකින් තබා ලෝක බැංකුව පමණක් ගනිමු. ඒ සඳහා අනුමැතියක් අවශ්‍ය නැහැ. ප්‍රධාන පනත අනුව ලෝක බැංකුවෙන් දෙන ණය අනුමත කිරීම ලංකාණ්ඩුවට අනිවාර්යයි. ඒ නිසා අපට තිබෙන පළපුරුද්ද අනුව ලෝක බැංකුව ගැන ටිකක් කල්පනා කර බලමු.

ඊයේ පැවැති උත්සවයකට ඉතාමත් තෘප්තිමත් ලීලාවකින් ගරු කර්මාන්ත ඇමතිතුමත්, එතුමාගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම් වත්තල ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමත් සහභාගි වුණා. ඒ අවස්ථාවේදී ගරු කර්මාන්ත ඇමතිතුමා කළ කථාවෙන් සුළු කොටස් පුවත්පතකින් මම කියවන්නම්. අද "ඔබ්සර්වර්" පත්‍රයේ මෙන්න මෙහෙම තිබෙනවා:

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

ලංකාවේ සංවර්ධන මුදල් නිතිගත සංස්ථා (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ]

This appears in today's "Observer."

"*When the World Bank said 'No' to a steel mill*

A landmark in the history of economic progress in this country. This is how the Industries Minister, Mr. Philip Gunawardena, described the opening of the Steel project at Oruwela yesterday.

Mr. Gunawardena added—'I consider it an honour to be associated with the completion and commission of the project. Industrialisation and industrial development of a country are not possible without an iron and steel industry.

The Government had prepared plans by 1952. But it had been abandoned on the advice of the World Bank.'"

ලංකාවට ඉතාමත් අවශ්‍ය මූලික කර්මාන්තශාලාවක් ඇති කිරීම 1952 සිට 1967 වනතුරු අවුරුදු පහළොවක් අතපසු වුණා. ලෝක බැංකුව රටට ද්‍රෝහිකම් කරන ඇමෙරිකන් ඩ්‍රිතාන්‍ය ආණ්ඩුවල වාසියට ක්‍රියා කළා. පෞද්ගලික ඒකාධිකාරී කොම්පැනිවල වාසියට ලංකාවේ ආර්ථික තත්ත්වය සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම නට බුන් බවට පත් කිරීමේ පරමාර්ථයෙන්—බලාපොරොත්තුවෙන්—කර්මාන්ත තහනම් කළා. වානේ සංස්ථාව සම්බන්ධයෙන් ගරු ඇමතිවරයා මීට මාස හයකට පමණ පෙර වාර්තාවක් ඉදිරිපත් කළා. එදා පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්වරයා කළ කථාව මොකක්ද? මේ රට විනාශ වන සුදු අලියකු හැටියට වානේ සංස්ථාව නැත්නම් වානේ කර්මාන්තශාලාව විස්තර කරමින් එදා එතුමා කථා කළා.

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.
(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)
කවුද?

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ
(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)
(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)
චත්තල මන්ත්‍රීවරයා ගැනයි මා කිව්වෙ. එතුමා එදා චාලි අබේසේකර මහත්මයා බෝඩිංකාරයකු, නිවටයකු, ක්‍රියා කරන්න බැරි කෙනකු, දූෂණවලට පත් වූ පුද්ගලයකු, ඉතාමත් අදක්ෂ නිලධාරියකු හැටියට හඳුන්වා දෙන්න තැත් කළා.

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.
(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)
කොහෙදිද? කවදද?

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ
(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)
(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)
මේ නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයෙදි. හැන්සාඩ් වාර්තාවෙ තිබෙනව. දැන් ඒවා මතක නැහැ. මානික්කම් නමැති සාමාන්‍යාධිකාරිවරයා—ජෙනරල් මැනේජර්—ඉන්ජිනේරු වෘත්තියෙන් ලත් සුදුසුකම් නැති කෙනකු හැටියට හඳුන්වා දුන්නා. සුදුසුකම් නැති මෙවැනි අදක්ෂ නිලධාරීන් ඉන්න වානේ කර්මාන්ත ශාලාව මේ රටට සුදු අලියකු බව එදා ප්‍රකාශ කරමින් කථා කළා. කර්මාන්ත ඇමතිවරයා ඊයේ කළ කථාව අහගෙන හිටියා. තමන්ගෙ කථාව කරන්න ඉස්සර වෙලා සංස්ථාවෙ සභාපතිවරයා වන චාලි අබේසේකර මහත්මයගෙ කථාවට උන් නැහේ ඇහුම්කන් දුන්නා. එදා අදක්ෂයකු හැටියට හඳුන්වා දෙන ලද පුද්ගලයා විසින් කරන ලද සේවය ගැන විශාල ලෙස වර්ණනා කර තිබෙනව. ඒ අවස්ථාවේ කළ වර්ණනාව සම්පූර්ණයෙන් අනුමත කරන බවත්, ව්‍යාපාරය පටන් ගත් දවසේ සිට උනන්දුවෙන් වැඩ කළ නිසා එවැනි වර්ණනාවකට සුදුසු බවත් කියා සිටියා. කලින් ඔහොම නින්දා අපහාස කරමින් කථා කළ නමුත් ඊයේ කළ වර්ණනාව ඇසීමෙන් මට පරණ කියමනක් මතක් වෙනව. ලජ්ජා බිය නැති වුණාම කරන්න බැරි නොහොඹිනාකමක් නැහැ.

1955දී තිබුණු එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ ආණ්ඩුව අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන්ට පක්ෂපාතීවීම නිසා රාජ්‍ය අංශයෙන් කර්මාන්ත ඇති කිරීම සම්පූර්ණයෙන් ප්‍රතික්ෂේප කළා. ඒ සඳහා වාර්තා පිට වාර්තා පිට කළා. දැන් ඒවා ගැන කියන්න වුවමනාවක් නැහැ. වුවමනා කළත් ඊට දැන් වෙලාවකුත් නැහැ. මොනවද ඒ වාර්තා? හය අවුරුදු සැලැස්ම—Six-Year Plan—කර්මාන්ත ප්‍රතිපත්තිය—Industrial Policy—පස් අවුරුදු සැලැස්ම, දැන් ඉන්න සෞඛ්‍ය ඇමති එම්. ඩී. එච්. ජයවර්ධන මහත්මයගෙ හය අවුරුදු සැලැස්ම. ඔය හැම එකම තිබුණෙ එකම එක මන්ත්‍රයක් පම

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

ණයි. බර කර්මාන්ත කරන්න ලංකාවේ බැහැ කියන එකයි කිව්වෙ. දක්ෂකම නැහැ, හැකියාව නැහැ, සල්ලි නැහැ, පුරුද්ද නැහැ, යනාදියයි කිව්වේ. ලෝකයේ ඒකාධිකාරී ධනපති කොම්පැනි සමග තරඟ කරන්න අපට බැහැ කිව්වා. තරඟ කරන්න ගියොත් විනාශ වෙනවය කිව්වා. ගෘහ්‍ය කර්මාන්ත වැනි සුළු කර්මාන්ත පමණයි කරන්න පුළුවන් ලංකාවෙ. විදේශීය ආයතන ජනසතු කිරීම සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම විනාශදායක දෙයක්ය යනාදි වශයෙන් කිව්වා. පසුගිය අයවැය විවාදයේදී මේ කරුණු ප්‍රකාශ කරමින් කියෙව්වා. මා කියන දේවල් ගැන සැක උපදිනව නම් මගෙ කථාවල පිටපත් ගෙන කියවා බැලුවොත් ඒ බව තමුන්නාන්සෙලට අවබෝධ වෙනව ඇති. පුද්ගලික ආයතන මගින් ජාවාරම් කිරීම සඳහා ලෝක බැංකුවෙන් මුදල් ගන්නකොට ලංකාණ්ඩුව ඊට වග කියනව. 1956 දී ඇති වුණු විප්ලවවාදී වෙනස්වීමෙන් පසු මෙම සංවර්ධන මුදල් සංස්ථාව තහනම් කිරීමෙ කටයුත්ත, ඒ කියන්නෙ මෙය සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම නීති පොතෙන් ඉවත් කිරීමෙ කටයුත්ත කළා නම් ඉවරයි. නමුත් කළේ නැහැ. බණ්ඩාරනායක අගමැතිතුමාගෙ නායකත්වයෙන් යුත් ආණ්ඩුවට එය කරන්ට අමාරුකම් තිබුණ. එහෙත් මොකද එදා කළේ? ඊට සුදුසු ප්‍රතිකර්ම යෙදුව. 1956දී මේ රටේ කරන්නට සිදු වී තිබුණෙ කියුබාව තුළ කළා වාගෙ සමාජවාදී විප්ලවයක් නොවෙයි. එම අවස්ථාවෙදි අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන්ට රට පාවා දෙමින් පැවති ද්‍රෝහී ආණ්ඩුවක් පරදවන්ට සිදු වී තිබුණ. ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදී අසිතිවාසිකම් භුක්ති විඳින්ට බලය යොදවන ආණ්ඩුවක් ඇති කරන්ට එදා සිදු වුණා. ඒ අනුව එදා දේශපාලන නිදහස සම්පූර්ණ කර ගැනීමෙ බලයක් බිහි කරන්ට පුළුවන් වුණා; සමාජවාදී ආර්ථික ක්‍රමයක් ඇති කර ගැනීමෙ උසස්ම ක්‍රියාව කරන්ට පුළුවන් වුණා. නමුත් නීතිය සම්පූර්ණයෙන් අවලංගු කරන්ට පුළුවන් වුණේ නැහැ. එදා රට පාවා දුන් ද්‍රෝහී එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂය [බාධා කිරීම්] සෑන්ෆ්‍රැන්සිස්කෝ නුවරදී ජපානය පාවා දීමට අත්සන් කළ රාජ්‍ය ඇමති [බාධා කිරීම්] ඒ අයවලුන්ගෙ එම ද්‍රෝහී ආණ්ඩුව ලංකාවෙ සංවර්ධන කටයුතු කිරීම සඳහා සමාජවාදී රටවල් සමඟ සම්බන්ධ වන විධියෙ වැඩ පිළිවෙළවල් 1956 වන තුරු යෙදුවෙ නැහැ. එදා සමාජවාදයට විරුද්ධ, කොමියුනිස්ට් ක්‍රමයට විරුද්ධ ප්‍රතිපත්ති තමයි තිබුණෙ. එම නිසා ඒ ධනපති ආර්ථික ක්‍රමය නෙරපා දැමීමට හැකි වන පරිද්දෙන් සමාජවාදී රටවල් සමඟ තානාපති සබඳකම් හා සංවර්ධන කටයුතු සඳහා ගිවිසුම් ඇති කර ගෙන කටයුතු කරන්ට වැඩ පිළිවෙළ යොදන්ට සිදු වුණා. එහි ප්‍රතිඵලයක් වශයෙන් තමයි, රජයෙ වානේ කම්හල එහෙම ඇති වුණේ.

ලෝක බැංකුව පිළිබඳ ප්‍රශ්නයක් තිබුණෙ නැහැ. ඒ අය බැරිය කීවත්, ඒ අය කුමන අන්දමේ කොන්දේසි දැම්මත් ඒ අයගෙන් ණය නොගත්තත්, එම කටයුතු කරන්ට පුළුවන් වන අන්දමට මේ රටේ අළුත් යුගයක් බණ්ඩාරනායක අගමැතිතුමා විසින් ඇති කරන්ට යෙදුණ. අද මේ ආණ්ඩුව මහන්සි ගන්නෙ එම යුගය වෙනස් කර යටත් විජිතවාදී පැරණි වහල් ක්‍රමයට ඇබ්බැහි වූ රටක් බවට මේ රට නැවතත් පත් කිරීමට වැඩ පිළිවෙළ යොදන්නයි. අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන්ගෙ වහළුන් හැටියට කටයුතු කළ එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂය සිරිමා බණ්ඩාරනායක ආණ්ඩුව පැවති යුගයෙදි කුමක්ද කළේ? වානෙ කර්මාන්ත ශාලාව, ටයර් කර්මාන්ත ශාලාව යනාදියෙහි වැඩ කටයුතු කඩාකප්පල් කිරීමට මහන්සි ගත්ත. [බාධාකිරීමක්] අපි මේ කරුණු කියන්ට ඕනෑ. අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී රටවල බැංකුත් සමග සම්බන්ධ වීමෙ භයානකකම පෙන්වන්ට වුවමනා නිසයි මම මේ කරුණු කියන්නෙ. [බාධා කිරීම්] තමුන්නාන්සෙලට දැන් මේව මතක නැතුව ඇති. අද තමුන්නාන්සෙලගෙ සිහි කල්පනාව හොඳ මදි බව අපට පේනව. පාවා දීමේ කටයුතු අප විසින් පෙන්වා දෙන අවස්ථාවලදි ඒව විහිළුවට බාරගෙන හිනා වීමේ පුරුද්දක් ඒ පාවා දීම් කරන උදවිය ඇති කරගෙන තිබෙනව. එක් නරියෙකුත් මොකවත්ම කර ගන්නට බැරිව අන්තිමට මැරෙන්නට යන මොහොතෙදි නිකම්ම නියවගෙන හිටිය බව කියවෙන කථාවක් තියෙනව. එවැනි අවස්ථාවක් අද මේ පාවා දෙන ද්‍රෝහීන්ටත් ඇති වී තිබෙනව. ඒව ගැන අපි කල්බල වෙන්නෙ නෑ. ඒවා ස්වාභාවික

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

[වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ]

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, 1961 අවුරුද්දෙ එවකට සිටි කර්මාන්ත ඇමති මෛත්‍රිපාල සේනානායක මහතා වානේ සංයුක්ත මණ්ඩලය පිහිටුවීමට එය නීති ගත කිරීමේ වාර්තාව ඉදිරිපත් කළ අවස්ථාවෙදී, එදා සිටි විරුද්ධ පක්ෂයෙ නායක —දැන් අගමැති—දැදිගම ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයා වානේ සංස්ථාව පිහිටුවීම සඳහා රුසියාව යෝජනා කර තිබෙන මුදලෙන් හතරෙන් එකක් පමණක් වියදම් කර ඉතාමත් ලාබෙට ඒ කටයුත්ත කරන්න කැනඩාවෙ කොම්පැනියක් යෝජනා කර තිබෙන බව කියා, එදා වානේ සංස්ථාව පිහිටුවීම තාවකාලිකව නතර කරන්න යෝජනාවක් ඉදිරිපත් කළා. කරුණු සොයා බලන විට, දැනගන්න ලැබුණෙ, කැනඩාවෙන් ඒ විධියෙ කිසිම දැන්වීමක් කර නොතිබුණු බවයි. අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන් සමඟ එකතු වී මේ ව්‍යාපාරය තාවකාලිකව නතර කොට කඩා කප්පල් කරන්නට උත්සාහ කිරීම ගැන මම අද එතුමාට—දැන් එතුමා මෙතැන නැතත්—චෝදනා කරනවා.

කිසියම් කර්මාන්ත ව්‍යාපාරයක් වෙනුවෙන් වියදම් කරන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වන මුදලෙන් හතරෙන් එකක් පමණක් වියදම් කර ඒ ව්‍යාපාරය කරන්නට කෙනෙක් යෝජනා කරන අවස්ථාවකදී ආණ්ඩුව ඒ අඩු මුදල බාරගන්නෙ නැත්නම් ඒ ආණ්ඩුවට මහජනයට මුහුණ දෙන්න බැරි තත්ත්වයක් ඇති වෙනවා. එදා වානේ සංස්ථාව පිහිටුවීමේ වැඩ පිළිවෙළ කඩාකප්පල් කරන්න මේ උදවිය යෙදුවෙ ඒ විධියෙ ක්‍රමයකුයි. මේ රජය කරන යෝජනා අපි සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම අවිශ්වාස කරන්නෙ ඒ නිසයි. මේ උදවිය පාවා දීමේ කටයුතු කර තිබෙන බව පරණ ඉතිහාසය අනුව අපට ඔප්පු වී තිබෙනවා. එසේ නැතිව මෙය පුහු අවලාදයක්වත් පුහු දෝෂාරෝපණයක්වත් නොවෙයි. රජයේ යෝජනා ගැන අප තුළ විශ්වාසයක් නැත්තෙ ඊට හේතු තිබෙන නිසයි.

ඊළඟට ලෝක බැංකුව ගැනත් වචනයක් කියන්න ඕනෑ. රට සංවර්ධනය කරන්න මේ ආණ්ඩුවට වුවමනා වී තිබෙන ප්‍රධානම ඇලි මුගටිය ලෝක බැංකුවයි. පසුගිය නොවැම්බර් මාසයෙදී ලෝක බැංකු වෙන් මෙහි ඇවිත් සිටි උදවිය මේ රට ගැන සකස් කළ වාර්තාවක කියා තිබෙන්නෙ මෙසේයි:

"Growth prospects: Ceylon is not among the group of developing countries where rich natural resources await exploitation.

Obstacles to growth: lack of investment, shortage of managerial, technical and administrative capabilities including opportunies ready to be exploited."

ඊළඟට ආයෙමත් මෙසේ කියනවා:

"Scope for industrial development limited by small size of domestic market, lack of new materials, absence of a well-established group of industrial enterprises."

ඊළඟට, ලංකාවෙ ආණ්ඩුව දැනට කර ගෙන යන වැඩ ගැන මෙහෙම කියනවා:

"The Government is considering the construction of an oil refinery probably in co-operation with a foreign company."

ගිය ආණ්ඩුව සෑම දෙයක්ම යෝජනා කර සාකච්ඡා කර ස්ථිර කළේ රජයේ අංශය සම්බන්ධයෙන් පමණයි. ඊළඟට මේ වාර්තාවෙ තවත් කරුණක් මේ විධියට දක්වා තිබෙනවා:

"There are however other large and costly projects such as a steel mill and a tyre factory whose economic justification is questionable."

මේ ආණ්ඩුව 1966 දී ලෝක බැංකුවෙ විශෙෂඥයින් මෙහි කැඳවා සකස් කරවන ලද මේ වාර්තාව කඩාකප්පල්කාරී එකක්. වානේ සංස්ථාව විවෘත කරන්නට ලැබීම ගැන ගරු කර්මාන්ත ඇමතිවරය නම් ඊයෙ පෙරෙයිදා බොහොම ආඩම්බරයෙන් කථාකර තිබුණා. මේ කරල තියෙන්නෙ මහා විනාශයක්ය, අඩිතාලම කඩා වැටෙනවය, විශාල ගඟක් ගලා බසින ස්ථානයකය අඩිතාලම දමා තියෙන්නෙ, ගඩොල් ලක්ෂ ගණනක් ගෙනෙන්න සිදු වුනාය, මුදල් කෝටි ගණණක් කාබාසිනියා කරල තියෙනවය කිව්වා. ඒ නිසා දැන් යෝජනා කරල පිළියෙල කර තියෙනව, ඒ ව්‍යාපාරය සම්බන්ධයෙන් සම්පූර්ණයෙන් වාතී කිරීම සඳහා ලංකාවේ දුප්පත් ජනතාවගෙන් බදු වශයෙන් ගන්න මුදල් වියදම් කර බ්‍රිතාන්‍ය කොම්පැනියකින් උපදේශකයන් ගෙන්වීමට. ඒ කොම්පැනියේ කෙනෙක් කොහේදෝ සිට ඇවිත් ගමන් ඊයේ උත්සවයට එනවය කියා

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

තිබුණා. මම ටිකක් කථා කරන්න ඒ පුද්ගලයාව හෙව්වා. නමුත් මට වෙලා තිබුනෙ නැති නිසා මම ආවා.

මේ ව්‍යාපාරය නැති කරන්න කටයුතු කළා පමණක් නොවෙයි, ඒ ව්‍යාපාරයෙන් ලැබෙන වැදගත් ප්‍රයෝජන මහජනයාට නොලැබෙන විධියට දැනටම කටයුතු යොදා තිබෙනවා. දේශීය හා විදේශීය එකාධිපති ධනපති කොටස් එකතු වෙලා එවැනි වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් ගෙන යනවා. මේ සභාවේ සිටින ධනපති උදවියට—මම නම් කියන්නෙ නැහැ—සම්බන්ධකම් තිබෙන, ඇමෙරිකානු ධනවතුන්ට අයිති ලොකු බංගලාවක් මගේ ආසනය අසල මුහුදු අද්දර තියෙනවා. එය මේ රට පාවා දීමේ වැඩ පිළිවෙළකට කුමන්ත්‍රණ කරන මධ්‍යස්ථානයක් වෙලා තියෙනවා.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මීට කලින් තිබුණු ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයේ ආණ්ඩුව සහ සභාග ආණ්ඩුව අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී බැංකුවලින් ආධාරයක් නැතිව, මීට කලින් කිසිම දවසක ලබා නොගත් අන්දමට වාසිදායක විධියට සියයට දෙකේ පොලියට මුදල් ලබාගෙන සංවර්ධන කටයුතු කළා. නමුත් මේවායේ සම්පූර්ණ ලාභ ප්‍රයෝජන විදේශීය ධනපති කොටස්වලටත්, ලංකාවේ ධනපති කොටස්වලටත් අරගෙන මේ රටේ සාමාන්‍ය ජනතාවගේ ජීවන තත්ත්වය පහත් කිරීමට දැන් මුල් පියවර තබා තිබෙනවා. ඊයේ උත්සවයෙදි කව්රුත් වානෙ දැක්කා. ඒ වානෙවලින් ලංකාවට ප්‍රධාන වශයෙන් වුවමනා ද්‍රව්‍ය හදන්න පුළුවන්; කොරුගේටඩ් සින්ක් ෂීට්ස් හදන්න පුළුවන්. දැන් ඒවා සෑදීම පෞද්ගලික කොම්පැනි දෙකකට භාර දීල තියෙනවා. කොරුගේටඩ් සින්ක් ෂීට්ස් සෑදීම මේ කර්මාන්තශාලාවේ සැලැස්මේ දෙවැනි පියවරට ඇතුළත් කර තියෙනවා. වානේ කදන් ගෙනැවිත් ඒවා රෝල් කරලා වුවමනා දේට යොදවන්න පුළුවන් තත්ත්වයට ගෙන ආවම ඒ වුවමනා ද්‍රව්‍ය සෑදීම තමයි, මේ කර්මාන්ත ශාලාවේ වැඩ අංග සම්පූර්ණ වුනාම කෙරෙන්නෙ. එසේ අංග සම්පූර්ණ වුනාට පස්සෙ කෙරෙන වැඩ කොටස් තමයි, ලාභ ලැබෙන කොටස්. ලෝක බැංකුවේ උපදෙස්වල හැටියට අපට මේ වානේ කර්මාන්තශාලාවේ වැඩ වාසිදායක අන්දමට කරන්න බැරි නිසා පෞද්ගලික ධනපති කොම්පැණිකාරයන්ට අමු ද්‍රව්‍ය සපයන මධ්‍යස්ථානයක් බවට පමණක් මේ වානේ කර්මාන්ත ශාලාව පත් කරල තියෙනවා. පෞද්ගලික ධනපති කොම්පැනි කාරයන්ට අධික ලෙස ලාභ ලබා ගැනීමට පුළුවන් වන අන්දමට මේ වානේ කර්මාන්ත ශාලාවේ වානේ ඔවුන්ට ඉතා අඩු මිළට ලබා ගැනීමට පුළුවන් වන අන්දමට මේ බැංකුත් සමග එකතු වෙලා දැන් වැඩ කටයුතු යොදාගෙන යනවා. මේ ආණ්ඩුව බලයේ හිටියොත් අනාගතයේදී මෙය නිසැකයෙන්ම සිදු වන බව අනාවැකියක් වශයෙන් කියන්නට මට පුළුවනි. ඒ එක්කම එවැනි දෙයක් නොසිදු වන බව කිව යුතුයි. කිසිම ඡායාවක්වත් ඉතුරු නොකර මේ ආණ්ඩුව සෝදා හරින්නට මේ රටේ මහජනයා ක්‍රියා කරනු නිසැකයි. එහෙයින් එවැනි ද්‍රෝහිකම් කරන්නට මේ ආණ්ඩුවට බැරි වෙනවා.

ලංකාවේ අමු ද්‍රව්‍ය නැතැයි ලෝක බැංකුව කියනවා. හොඳයි, ඇමෙරිකාවේ අමු ද්‍රව්‍ය තිබෙනවාද? ඒ පිළිබඳවත් මේ වාර්තාවේ සඳහන් කර තිබෙනවා. [බාධා කිරීමක්] රුසියාවේ යමක් ඇති නිසයි, ඒ රට ඉදිරිපත් වී අපේ රටේ වානේ කර්මාන්ත ශාලාවක් හැදුවෙ. බ්‍රිතාන්‍ය අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන් අවුරුදු 150 ක් තිස්සේ මේ රට ආණ්ඩු කළත් අල්පෙනෙත්තක් නිෂ්පාදනය කරන්ටවත් කර්මාන්තශාලාවක් සෑදීමට ඉඩ දුන්නේ නැහැ. නමුත් රුසියාවේ උදව් ඇතිව වානේ වාත්තු කරන්නට පුළුවන් කර්මාන්ත ශාලාවක් දැන් මේ රටේ සදා තිබෙනව නේද? ඊයේ තමන්ගේ ජීවිතයේ භාග්‍යමත් දිනයක් බව කර්මාන්ත ඇමතිවරයා ප්‍රකාශ කළා.

National Security Seminar 1961-62 —Washington Report :

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

ඕවා කියවන්නට වුවමනාවක් නැහැ. දැන් ඔය අදහස් කිව්වා නොවැ. තවත් මොනවටද?

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

ලංකාවේ සංවර්ධන මුදල් නීතිගත සංස්ථා (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

ලංකාවෙහි කර්මාන්ත දියුණුවක් ඇති කිරීම අනවශ්‍ය යයි ලෝක බැංකුව කියනවා. වැරදි අවබෝධයක් ඇතිව යමකු අවංකව යමක් ප්‍රකාශ කරන විට එය නිවැරදි කර ගන්නට පුළුවනි. නමුත් ලෝක බැංකුව වැරදි කරන්නේ දැන දැනමයි. ඉතින් මේවා මහජනයාට පෙන්වා දීම අපේ යුතුකමයි.

"National Security Seminar 1961-62 : Washington Report :

U. S. imports for consumption :

Oil	..	20 per cent.
Iron ore	..	30 per cent.
Copper	..	32 per cent.
Lead	..	69 per cent.
Cobalt	..	79 per cent.
Manganese	..	85 per cent.
Bauxite	..	85 per cent.
Nickel	..	89 per cent.
Chromium	..	90 per cent.
Tin	..	100 per cent."

ඇමෙරිකාවට වුවමනා කරන මේ මූලික අමු ද්‍රව්‍ය ඇමෙරිකාව විදේශවලින් ගෙන්වා ගන්නවා. පිටින් අමු ද්‍රව්‍ය ගෙන්වා කර්මාන්ත කරගෙන යන්නට ඇමෙරිකාවට පුළුවන් නම් අනික් රටවලට එවැනි දේ කිරීම සඳහා ලෝක බැංකුව අනුශාසනා නොකරන්නේ ඇයි? ලංකාවේ යපස් නැති වුණත් ජපානය මෙන් පිටින් යපස් ගෙන්වා වානේ කර්මාන්තය ලංකාවේ කරගෙන යන්නට බැරි මන්ද? පුළුවනි. ඒ බව ලෝකය පිළිගෙන තිබෙනවා. එසේ හෙයින් ඒ කාරණය අපේ රටේ මහජනයාට අවබෝධ කර දිය යුතුයි. ඒකාධිකාරී බැංකු යොදවා පෞද්ගලික ව්‍යාපාර තහවුරු කිරීමට යෑම ගැන මහජනයාට පෙන්වා දිය යුතුයි.

ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, තවත් කාරණයක් කියන්නට ඕනෑ. මීට කලින් කීප දෙනකුම වියට්නාමය ගැන සඳහන් කළා.

1961 U. S. State Department

"We have only partially exploited South-East Asian resources. Nevertheless, South-East Asia supplied 90 per cent. of the world's crude rubber, 60 per cent. of its tin, 80 per cent. of its copra and oil. It has sizeable quantities of sova, tea, coffee, tobacco, petroleum, bauxite, iron ore, etc."

This is what President Eisenhower said in 1953 when the French were still fighting. These are his very words :

"Now let us assume that we lost Indo-China. If Indo-China goes the tin and tungsten so greatly valued would cease coming. We are after the cheapest way to prevent the occurrence of something terrible : the loss of our ability to get what we want from the riches of the Indo-Chinese territory and from South-East Asia."

මේ ලෝක බැංකුවත් අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී ආණ්ඩුවකට සමාන කරන්ට පුළුවන්. ඒ අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී රටවල බැංකුවලට, ඒකාධිකාරී ධනපති සංවිධානවලට ඒ ආණ්ඩුවෙ කටයුතුවලට විශාල බලපෑම් කරන්ට පුළුවන්. ඉස්සර රොක්ෆෙලර් ෆවුන්ඩේෂන් ආයතනවල අධ්‍යක්ෂවරයෙක් හැටියට කටයුතු කළ ඩීන් රස්ක් එතැනින් මාරු වුණේ, අමෙරිකාවෙ රාජ්‍ය ලේකම් හැටියටයි. කැබට් ලොජ් ආණ්ඩුවෙ නිලධාරියෙක් වශයෙන් ඉඳල දැන් යුද්ධ ආයුධ නිෂ්පාදන කරන විශාල කොම්පැණියක අධ්‍යක්ෂවරයෙක් වෙන්ට යනවා. මේ අනුව බලන විට ඒ අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී රටවල ආණ්ඩුවයයි කියන්නෙ, ඒකාධිකාරී ධනපති කොම්පැණිවලටයයි කියන්ට පුළුවන්. ලෝක බැංකුව කියන්නෙ ආණ්ඩුවට බලපෑම් කරන්ට පුළුවන් එසේම බලපෑම් කරන විශාල සංවිධානවල කෘත්‍යාධිකාරී මණ්ඩලයටයි. ඒ අනුව තමයි ඒකාධිකාරී ධනපති ක්‍රමය අනුව අමෙරිකාව තමන්ගෙ රටේ පාලනය පමණක් නොව ලෝකයේ වෙනත් රටවල ආර්ථික කටයුතු පාලනය කිරීමටත් ක්‍රියා කරන්නෙ. මෙතෙක් හමස් පෙට්ටියෙ තිබුණු මේ පනතට සංශෝධන ගෙන ඒමෙන් දැන් කරන්නෙ, සමාජවාදී රටවලින් නොදියුණු රටවල සංවර්ධනය සඳහා ලැබුණු නිදහස් ආධාර නතර කරන විධියෙ යෝජනා ඉදිරිපත් කිරීමකුයි. ඒ නිසයි, මම මේ කරුණු මතක් කරන්ට කල්පනා කළේ. ඒ නිසා මේ ගැන ඉතා හොඳින් පැහැදිලි වශයෙන් කල්පනා කර බලන්ට සිදු වී තිබෙනව. අපේ දියුණුවටය කියා මේ බැංකුවලට අපේ රටේ මුදල් යෙදවීම සඳහා සහතිකයක් දීමට කිසිම වුවමනාවක් නැහැ. එමෙන්ම තවත් නොයෙකුත් විදේශීය බැංකුවල

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

ටත් අපේ රටේ දියුණුවටය කියමින් මුදල් යොදවන්ට ඉඩ දීමේ කිසිම තේරුමක් නැහැ. අප සමාජවාදී රටවල් සමඟ සම්බන්ධකම් පවත්වනවා නම් අපේ කර්මාන්ත පමණක් නොවෙයි කෘෂිකාර්මික කටයුතු හා අනෙක් කටයුතුවලටත් එම රටවලින් සෑම ආධාරයක්ම ලබා ගන්ට අපට පුළුවන්. සමාජවාදී රටවල් විසින් 1956 න් පසු මේ රටට ආධාර දෙන්ට පටන් ගත්තාට පසුව—මේ රටට පමණක් නොව අනෙකුත් නොදියුණු රටවල් සිය ගණනකට සමාජවාදී රටවල් ආධාර කරනවා—අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී රටවල් විසින් නොදියුණු රටවල් කෲර ලෙස සූරා කෑ පළමු ප්‍රතිපත්තිය හෙවත් හෙළුවැලි සූරාකෑම ටිකක් වෙනස් කර තිබෙනවා. ඒකාධිකාරී ධනපති ක්‍රමය අනුව අපේ රටින් ආර්ථික වශයෙන් ලාභ ගැනීමට ඊට පසුව ඔවුන් පටන් ගෙන තිබෙනවා. අපේ රට ඒ අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන්ගෙ වෙළඳ නිප්පොළක් කර ගැනීමට ඔවුන් උපක්‍රම යොදා තිබෙනවා.

අද බෞද්ධාගමත් ආයුධයක් කර ගෙන තිබෙනවා. ළඟදී සියම් සඟ රජ හිමියන් ලංකාවට වැඩියෙත් අමෙරිකන් සී. අයි. ඒ. සංවිධානයෙ අනුදැනුම ඇතිවයි.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා
(උප සභානායකර් அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)
කරුණාකර මේ කෙටුම්පත් පනතට අදාළව කථා කරන්න.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ
(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)
(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)
වියට්නාම් යුද්ධය සඳහා එක්තරා තොටුපළක් වශයෙන් සියම පාවිච්චි කරනවා.

සියම බෞද්ධ රටක්. අමෙරිකන් අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන් විසින් වියට්නාමයේ යුද්ධ ප්‍රකාශ නොකර වියට්නාම් බෞද්ධ ජනතාව මරා දැමීම සඳහා තොටුපළක් වශයෙන් බෞද්ධ රටක් වන සියම පාවිච්චි කරනවා. යුද්ධ කරන්ට මත්තෙන් යුද්ධ ප්‍රකාශ කර යුද්ධ කිරීම ශීලාචාර ක්‍රියාවක් හැටියට ධනපති ආණ්ඩු පිළිගත් ප්‍රතිපත්තියක්; ඒ අතින් බලන විටත් මේ යුද්ධය අශීලාචාරයි. නමුත් උතුරු වියට්නාම් රජය පිළිගන්නෙත් නැතිව යුද්ධ ප්‍රකාශ කරන්නෙත් නැතුව වියට්නාම් බෞද්ධ ජනතාව විනාශ කර දැමීම සඳහා බෞද්ධ තායිලන්තය යුද්ධ අහස්යානා තොටුපළක් හැටියට පාවිච්චි කරනවා.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා
(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)
ඔව, පනතට අදාළ නැහැ.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ
(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)
(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)
මේ සංශෝධිත පනත් කෙටුම්පත ගෙනැවිත් තිබෙන්නෙ අපේ ආර්ථික ක්‍රමය අමෙරිකන් ඒකාධිකාරී කොම්පැණිවලට සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම පවරා දීමටයි.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා
(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)
කලිනුත් කීවානේද? අපේ ස්ථාවර නීති අනුව එක වරක් කියූ දෙයක් නැවත නැවතත් කීප වරක්ම කියන්ට බෑ.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ
(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)
(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)
කාවද්දන්ටයි, කියන්නෙ.

ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, තවත් එක කාරණයක් කියන්ට ඕනෑ. මේ පනත රජය ඉක්මණින් අනුමත කර ගන්නට යාම ගැන එක අතකින් අප එතරම් කලබල වන්ට වුවමනා නැහැ. මේ ආණ්ඩුව 1954 දී මහජනයා නොමඟ හැරීමට ගෙන ගිය ව්‍යාපාර දැන් ක්‍රමයෙන් මහජනයා අවබෝධ කරගෙන තිබෙන බව විටින් විට ආණ්ඩු පක්ෂයට ලැබෙන අන්ත පරාජය වලින් පැහැදිලි වෙනවා. එමෙන්ම මේ පනත ක්‍රියාවේ යෙදවීම ආණ්ඩුවේ බලය සම්පූර්ණයෙන් අතුගා දැමීමට උපකාර වන නිසා අපි ඒ තරම් මේ ගැන කලබල වන්ට වුවමනා නැහැ. [බාධාකිරීම්] ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, ආණ්ඩු පක්ෂයේ උදවිය ටිකක් කලබල වෙලා. එයින්

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

[වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ]

පෙනී යනව, මා කිව්ව දේවල් ටිකක් ඇති තිබෙන බව. ඒකත් හොඳ ලකුණක්. සමහරවිට ඇතැම් උදවියට, සිහි කල්පනා වෙන් සිටින අවස්ථාවල දැන් මේ කරන ද්‍රෝහිකම් යම් දවසක අවබෝධ වන්ට පුළුවන්. එවිට මේ මා සඳහන් කළ කාරණා තවදුරටත් විමසා මෙවැනි ද්‍රෝහිකම් වැළැක්වීමට ක්‍රියා කරන ලෙස මා මතක් කරනව.

අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන්ට, විදේශ ඒකාධිකාරී කොම්පැණිවලට, අපේ ආර්ථික ක්‍රමය සම්පූර්ණයෙන් පාවා දෙන්ට ලංකාවේ ප්‍රධාන ධනපතින් සමග එකතු වෙලා රජය ගෙන යන මේ වැඩ පිළිවෙළ සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම අප හෙළා දකිනව. උසස් ආදායම් ඇති උදවියගේ බදු අඩු කර, සාමාන්‍ය ජනතාවට ලැබෙන සහන කපා හැරීමයි රජයේ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය. විශාල ධනපතින්ට ලාභ ප්‍රයෝජන ලැබෙන විධියට රජය කටයුතු කරනවා නම් තමයි, ලෝක බැංකුව ලංකාවට ආධාර දෙන්ට ලැහැස්ති වෙන්නෙ. ඒ ආධාර දෙන්නෙ පුද්ගලික ආයතනයකට මේව දෙන්ට ඕනෑය කියන කොන්දේසිය උඩයි. ඒ ආධාරවලින් රජයේ ආයතන ශක්තිමත් කරනවාට ලෝක බැංකුව සම්පූර්ණයෙන් විරුද්ධයි. ඇමෙරිකන් ආණ්ඩුවේ ප්‍රතිපත්තියටත් විරුද්ධයි. පී. එල්. 480 ක්‍රමය යටතේ යම් රටකට ලැබෙන ආධාර ඇමෙරිකන් ආයතනවල ජාවාරම්වලට අවාසි වන ව්‍යාපාරවලට යොදවන්ට පුළුවන්කමක් නැහැ. ආධාර ලබන රටට පුළුවන්කමක් නැහැ, ඇමෙරිකන් සමාගම් නිෂ්පාදනය කරන බඩු සමග තරඟ කිරීමට ඒ වර්ගයේ බඩු නිපදවීමේ ව්‍යාපාරවලට ඒ ආධාර යොදවන්න. ඒ විධියේ කර්මාන්තවලට කිසිම ආධාරයක් දෙන්ට බැරි යයි "හුලි එග්‍රිමන්ට්" එකේද කොහෙද විශේෂ නීතියක් තිබෙනව. ලංකාවට ඒ රටෙන් මුදලින් හෝ පිටිවලින් ලැබෙන ආධාර ඇමෙරිකානු ආර්ථික ක්‍රමයට බාධා වන අන්දමට කිසි ලෙසකින් යෙදවීම සම්පූර්ණයෙන් නීතියෙන් තහනම් කර තිබෙනව.

ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්
(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)
(An hon. Member)
Your time is up.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ
(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)
(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

"Time is up" එකක් නැහැ. නමුත් මම මීට වඩා කථා කරන්ට අදහස් කරන්නෙ නැහැ. අවසාන වශයෙන් මා කියන්නෙ මේ පනතත්, පළමුවෙන් තිබුණු පනතත් සම්පූර්ණයෙන් නිෂ්ප්‍රභ කරල මේ රටේ ආර්ථික තත්ත්වය ධනපති රාමුවෙන් ක්‍රමයෙන් නිදහස් කර ගැනීමටත්, සමාජවාදී ආර්ථික ක්‍රමයක් කරා ගෙන යාමටත් වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් සකස් කළයුතු බවයි. ලෝක බැංකුවත්, "වෙනත්" ය කියන බැංකුත්—ඒවා නම් කර නැති වුණත්—මේ අනික් බැංකු මොනවාද යන්න ආණ්ඩුවේ ප්‍රතිපත්තිවලින් පෙනී යනව.

අනික් කාරණය, සමාජවාදී රටවල මේ වගේ කොම්පැනි නැහැ. සමාජවාදී රටවල් සමග ගනු දෙනු කරනවා නම් ආණ්ඩුවත් සමග ගනු දෙනු කරනවා මිස වෙනත් පිළිවෙළක් නැහැ. අපි වැඩි කල් යන්ට මත්තෙන් මේ රට පෞද්ගලික කොම්පැණිවලට පාවා දීමේ මේ වැඩ පිළිවෙළ සම්පූර්ණයෙන් නැතිකිරීමත් සමගම රට සංවර්ධනය කිරීමට වෙනත් වටිනා ක්‍රමයක් උපයෝගී කර ගත යුතුව තිබෙනව. මා මොහොතකින් ඒ ක්‍රමය මතක් කරන්නම්.

රජයේ ආර්ථික අංශය ශක්තිමත් කිරීම සඳහා දැනට මේ රටේ පිහිටුවා තිබෙන වානේ කර්මාන්තශාලාව, ටයර් කර්මාන්තශාලාව හා සමාජවාදී රටවල ආධාර ඇතිව පිහිටුවා තිබෙන වෙනත් නොයෙක් ව්‍යාපාර සමග පෞද්ගලික ආයතනවලට තරඟ කිරීමට ඉඩ දීමට දරන මේ ප්‍රයත්නය සම්පූර්ණයෙන් වෙනස් කර මේ රටේ කාර්මික දියුණුවක් ඇති කිරීමට නම් මේ විධියේ කොන්දේසි නොමැතිව අපේ පාලනය යටතේ ක්‍රියාත්මක වන වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් සකස් කළයුතුයි. කොම්පැණිවලට කිසිම අයිතියක් ඇති නොවන අන්දමට, අපේ සැළැස්මවල් අනුව අපේ නිදහස ආරක්ෂා වන ආකාරයට, අපට බලය තිබෙන අන්දමට රජයේ අංශයෙන් සංවර්ධන ක්‍රමයක් සකස් කර එය සමාජවාදී ක්‍රමයකට පරිවර්තනය කර ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්ට පුළුවන්

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

බව මතක් කරමින්, ඒ ක්‍රමය අනුමත කරන නිසා, ඒ වැඩ පිළිවෙළ තහනම් කරන මේ සංශෝධන පනතට විරුද්ධත් වය ප්‍රකාශ කරමින්, මේ පනත ක්‍රියාවේ යෙදෙන විට තමුන්නාන්සේලා දේශ පාලන බලයෙන් ඉක්මණින් ඉවත් කරන්ට මෙය උපකාර වන බව මතක් කරමින් මගේ වචන ස්වල්පයෙන් අවසාන කරනවා.

අ. භා. 9.23

ගරු වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not propose to take too much of the time of this House.

Criticisms of the Bill were very few. Very many extreneous matters were raised. Many red herrings were drawn and I do not propose to follow the trail of those red herrings.

The occasion was made use of to sing the virtues of nationalization, to decry the evils of private sector development.—[*Interruption*]. The occasion was used to air the deep-seated prejudices of some of the Members of the Opposition, prejudices against certain countries, particularly the United States of America. I was surprised at the number of times they referred to the United States of America.—[*Interruption*]. There is not a word in the amending Bill about the United States of America.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

You are blissfully ignorant of your own statement.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

I think the hon. Member for Akuressa has spoken enough.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

He cannot make this idiotic statement and—

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Many people make idiotic statements and we have to put up with them.—[*Interruption*].

ගරු වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

The loans proposed to be raised under this Bill are not confined to any particular country nor are they confined to any one particular group of countries. They are not even confined to any one continent. Any country in any part of the world, any country in any continent, can send up proposals for loans. It is up to the Government of this country to examine each loan proposal on its merits and approve or disapprove of it.

Most of the speakers on the other side, as the hon. Parliamentary Secretary pointed out, now and again made a passing reference to government approval but they did not emphasize it enough. That is the key to the whole situation. No loan proposal will be accepted and no international organization will be allowed to make a contribution to the Development Finance Corporation without the Government examining each proposal on its merits and only after the Government has approved such organization, international and foreign, can contributions be made to the Development Finance Corporation.

The point to remember is that this Bill is more or less on the same lines as similar Bills in operation in other countries like India, Pakistan, Malaysia. There is nothing new or novel in what we are trying to introduce here.

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

ගරු ජේ. ආර් ජයවර්ධන
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயர்வதன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)
Yugoslavia ?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා
(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)
No fear.

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)
Why not ?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා
(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)
The social set-up is different.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)
It is a very important point to remember. Most hon. Members of the Opposition lost sight of this fact. I think they saw through it but they did not emphasize it or refer to it to suit their argument.

An international or foreign organization cannot invest money in private concerns in this country. They can only invest money in the D.F.C. The point was made that when this Bill is passed there will be such a rush of capital into this country that they will get hold of all the private investors, and you will find here overnight what they call " neo-colonialism ".

The other point is that not only have they to invest in the D.F.C. but even the shares the foreign organizations will buy must have the prior approval of the Government. The recipients of aid through the D.F.C. and also the projects to be undertaken must have the prior approval of this Government. Further, the recipients of aid through the D. F. C. and also the projects have to be decided not by the foreign and international organizations, but by the Board of the Development Finance Corporation. And the Development Finance Corporation itself, in turn, has to select projects from those which are being approved by the various Ministries functioning in this country. Surely, Sir, is that not the way it is going to be done ?—[*Interruption*].

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා
(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)
Where do you get that in the Bill ? —[*Interruption*].

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)
How can they finance industries which are not approved by the government ?—[*Interruption*]

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා
(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M Perera)
All these 64 items are approved by the Government ?—[*Interruption*]. There are 16 firms dealing with the manufacture of wire nails and barbed wire. Are they all being approved by you ?—[*Interruption*].

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)
I am not talking of the past. I am talking about the future.—[*Interruption*].

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා
(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)
What is the difference between the past and the future ?

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා
(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)
Clause 8 speaks about approval by the Government.—[*Interruption*].

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

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Sir, all these hon. Members have argued forwards and backwards. They argued that whatever incentives you offer—they say that the previous Finance Ministers have offered various types of incentives—you will not get capital into this country. That is the argument they put forward. And then in the same breath they said, "Look here, once you pass this Bill, capital will flow into this country and all the investments will be dominated by the Americans and there will be neo-colonialism in this country." That is the kind of logic they use. They also said, "You will not get any capital." and then went on to say, "Once you pass this Bill you will get so much of capital from outside that we will lose our independence and also all control over our investments." Both those things cannot be true.

ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්
(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)
(An hon. Member)

You will alienate national capital.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

You will get alienated very soon from this House. After all the fact of the matter is this. We are arguing on a different premise. They are arguing on nationalization as a basis of development of this country. They believe in the nationalization of everything in this country, of the means of production, distribution, exchange, and I do not know what more—[*Interruption*]. I am not referring to the speech of the hon. Member for Akuressa (Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe). It is not worth quoting.

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

I would request the Hon. Minister to go on with his speech and not take notice of the interruptions.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Yes, I think it is not worth taking notice of those interruptions. They are arguing on the ground that everything in this country should be nationalized. They are trying to preach that theory to us. We do not believe in that theory. We believe in a mixed economy. We believe that certain sectors of the economy should be nationalized. We also believe that it is necessary to develop the private sector. According to our philosophy we believe in democracy as we understand it, and the democratic freedoms that we value cannot be preserved except under a mixed economy of the type suggested by us.

So that, we are arguing on different premises. You are now trying to preach your philosophy to us. How can we accept your philosophy?—[*Interruption*].

Now, let me come to some of the direct criticisms that were made on this Bill. One thing they said was, "Look here, you have done something monstrous that has never been done in the history of this country. You have brought down the Governor-General to the level of signing an agreement with foreign countries."

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

No, with private parties.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

At the beginning you said that never in the history of this country has the Governor-General signed an agreement.

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

Yes. Give me a single case.

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

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I will give you. Here is evidence in Foreign Loans Act No. 29 of 1957.

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

The Act says, "to the Government of Ceylon."

ගරු එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා (කෘෂිකර්ම හා ආහාර ඇමති)
(கௌரவ எம். டீ. பண்டா—விவசாய, உணவு அமைச்சர்)
(The Hon. M. D. Banda—Minister of Agriculture and Food)

Let us see what it says.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

You have forgotten these things or you do not know these things. We have copied this verbatim from this Act. The Act says :

"The Governor-General or any person specially authorised by him in that behalf may, in the name and on behalf of the Government of Ceylon, sign—

(*a*) a loan agreement relating to a foreign loan to the Government of Ceylon, and

(*b*) any bond,—"

Even promissory notes.

"—promissory note or other document required by such loan agreement to be executed by the Government of Ceylon.—"

It goes on to say :

"—In this Act, the expression "foreign loan" means a loan in any currency granted by a foreign Government or the agency of a foreign Government or by any international organisation."

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

It speaks of foreign loans to the Government of Ceylon.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

You are trying to split hairs. First of all he argued on the premise that the Governor-General has never signed an agreement.

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

You have not given us a single instance.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Now you are trying to split hairs and draw a subtle distinction between this Bill and that Act. I know, Sir, all of them have forgotten this. Sometimes these things are forgotten ; we lose sight of these things.—[*Interruption*]. This Act was passed in 1957.

The question was raised by my hon. Friend as to on what basis assistance is to be given. I have got the figures. Rs. 22million loan on security and Rs. 4 million on shares. He also asked the question whether technical and managerial advice on a large scale has been received so far. No, only a limited volume of technical and managerial advice has been received so far. We hope that we will be able to get, after this amendment is passed, much more technical and managerial advice than we have received hitherto.

The other big point raised was, why include commercial activities ? It is clearly laid down ; we have defined the commercial activities—commercial activities that will result in economic development. It has been found that under the present law or under the provisions of the present Act service industries like transportation, building construction, engineering, cannot be financed or given assistance to by the Development Finance Corporation.

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

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

Engineering ?

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Certain aspects of engineering. That is the reason for this definition. It is certainly not speculative commercial activities. Speculative commercial activities will not be eligible for assistance from this Development Finance Corporation. I think it is commonsense that no government, no board, will approve finance from the Development Finance Corporation to be utilized for ordinary commercial activities of a speculative nature.

The other point raised was, why give guarantees to national institutions like the People's Bank, Bank of Ceylon and the Insurance Corporation ? It may be that some private concern wants to obtain a loan from the bank, and if the bank feels that the risk it is taking is too high the D. F. C. can underwrite or guarantee the loan for that concern. We are merely making provision for him to do so whenever such applications are made by these institutions.

The next point raised was about the question of nomination of a representative of the corporation to the boards of the institutions to which assistance, aid, or loans are granted. That is being done now. We want to make it law. It may be that the articles of association of such concerns will have to be amended to enable a representative to be appointed. If any concern wants a loan, or is anxious to get a loan, it should be prepared to amend the articles of association in order to be eligible for a loan. I think that point was raised by the hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa).

The other point raised was that by this Bill we are excluding private individuals and bringing in only limited liability companies in the matter of loans. But on other occasions we have heard hon. Members on the other side complain that we help to fatten private individuals. Limited liability companies apply to a number of people and to all kinds of people. So that we are now paying more attention to limited liability companies. Their activities are more public and we have better opportunities of scrutinizing their activities. They lend themselves to better examination and inspection. That is why the limited liability companies are being preferred to individuals in the matter of granting loans. In fact I understand that this is the practice in many development finance corporations in many other parts of the world. They prefer to give loans to limited liability companies rather than to private individuals because the continuity of the concern is better assured, and certainly more confidence could be placed in limited liability companies than in private individuals in the matter of loans.

The other matter that was mentioned is that borrowers from the D. F. C. would get interest-free loans. Someone mentioned that. That is not correct. The loan is interest-free to the D. F. C., but when the D. F. C. lends to various concerns they have to pay interest at the rate of 6 per cent. The point was made that we were making money available to certain private individuals and concerns without interest. That is not correct.

Then these people who make loans available have not the right of vote in the election of directors. It is only those people who buy shares—and in the purchase of shares they have to get the prior approval of the Government—who are entitled to vote at the election of the directors.

Then, Sir, the usual scare was raised, the fear of certain countries. I do not know whether it was a real or pretended fear. Some tried to peddle their own political ideologies and make this occasion a first-class debate for their political views. I do not think that the ghosts they said they saw in this Bill are really there.

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

[ගරු වන්නිනායක]

If this law is worked properly in the interests of the country and if the loan proposals are examined on their own merits—and the Government will see to it that no loan proposal is accepted which is not in the best interests of the future of this country—we would be taking another step forward in the development of this country.

I move that the Bill be now read a Second time.

"පනත් කෙටුම්පත දැන් දෙවන වර කියවිය යුතුය," යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදී.

කටහඬවල් අනුව "පක්ෂ" මන්ත්‍රීන්ට ජය බව කථානායකතුමා විසින් ප්‍රකාශ කරන ලදී.

"மசோதா இப்பொழுது இரண்டாம் முறையாக மதிப்பிடப்படுமாக" எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பெற்றது.

குரல்களின்படி "ஆம்" என்பவர்களுக்கு வெற்றி யென சபாநாயகர் அவர்களால் பிரகடனப்படுத்தப் பட்டது.

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

MR. SPEAKER, *having collected the Voices, declared that the "Ayes" had it.*

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

Divide, by name!

මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය මතු පළ වන අන්දමට— පක්ෂව 51; විරුද්ධව 14; යනුවෙන්—බෙදුණේය:

சபை பிரிந்தது: சார்பாக 51; எதிராக 14.

The House divided: Ayes, 51; Noes, 14.

පක්ෂව

சார்பாக

AYES

ගරු අයි. එම්. ආර්. ඒ. ඊරියගොල්ල
கௌரவ ஐ. எம். ஆர். ஏ. ஈரியகொல்ல
The Hon. I. M. R. A. Iriyagolle

ගරු එන්. එච්. ඒ. එම්. කරුණාරත්න
கௌரவ என். எச். ஏ. எம். கருணரத்ன
The Hon. N. H. A. M. Karunaratne

ගරු ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන
கௌரவ டீ. பீ. ஆர். குணவர்தன
The Hon. D. P. R. Gunawardena

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන
கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன
The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene

ගරු සී. පී. ද සිල්වා
கௌரவ சீ. பீ. டி சில்வா
The Hon. C. P. de Silva

ගරු ආචාර්‍ය ඩබ්ලිව්. දහනායක
கௌரவ கலாநிதி டப்ளியூ. தகநாயக்க
The Hon. Dr. W. Dahanayake

ගරු එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා
கௌரவ எம். டீ. பண்டா
The Hon. M. D. Banda

ගරු එම්. එච්. මොහමඩ්
கௌரவ எம். எச். முகம்மது
The Hon. M. H. Mohamed

ගරු ඩබ්. බී. වන්නිනායක
கௌரவ யூ. பி. வன்னிநாயக்க
The Hon. U. B. Wanninayake

ගරු වී. ඒ. සුගතදාස, එම්.බී.ඊ.
கௌரவ வீ. ஏ. சுகததாச, எம். பி. ஈ.
The Hon. V. A. Sugathadasa, M.B.E.

ගරු ඊ. එල්. බී. හුරුල්ලේ
கௌரவ ஈ. எல். பி. ஹுருல்ல
The Hon. E. L. B. Hurulle

පී. සී. ඉඹුලාන මයා.
திரு. பீ. சீ. இம்புலான
Mr. P. C. Imbulana

විමලා කන්නන්ගර මිය. එම්.බී.ඊ.
திருமதி விமலா கன்னங்கர, எம். பி. ஈ.
Mrs. Wimala Kannangara, M.B.E.

ඩී. ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.
திரு. டீ. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்க
Mr. D. Shelton Jayasinghe

එස්. ද එස්. ජයසිංහ මයා. ඕ.බී.ඊ.
திரு. எஸ். டி எஸ். ஜயசிங்க, ஓ.பி.ஈ.
Mr. S. de S. Jayasingha, O.B.E.

ගාමිනී ජයසූරිය මයා.
திரு. காமனி ஜயசூரிய
Mr. Gamani Jayasuriya

එස්. ඒ. පීරිස් මයා., ඕ.බී.ඊ.
திரு. எஸ். ஏ. பீரிஸ், ஓ.பி.ஈ.
Mr. S. A. Peeris, O.B.E.

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

පක්ෂව

சார்பாக

AYES

ආර්. ප්‍රේමදාස මයා.
திரு. ஆர். பிரேமதாச
Mr. R. Premadasa

ඩී. ආර්. බෙලිගම්මන මයා.
திரு. சீ. ஆர். பெலிகம்மன
Mr. C. R. Beligammana

විජයපාල මෙන්ඩිස් මයා.
திரு. விஜயபால மெண்டிஸ்
Mr. Wijayapala Mendis

එන්. විමලසේන මයා.
திரு. என். விமலசேன
Mr. N. Wimalasena

ඩී. බී. වෙලගෙදර මයා.
திரு. டீ. பி. வெலகெதர
Mr. D. B. Welagedera

වී. අන්නාමලෙයි මයා.
திரு. வீ. அண்ணாமலை
Mr. V. Annamalay

එම්. fපලිල් අබ්දුල් කfපූර් මයා. එම්.බී.ඊ.
ஜனாப் எம். பளில் அப்துல் கபூர், எம். பி. ஈ.
Mr. M. Falil Abdul Caffoor, M.B.E.

ජෝර්ජ් අබයගුණසේකර මයා.
திரு. ஜோர்ஜ் அபயகுணசேக்கர
Mr. George Abeyagoonasekera

ඒ. අමිර්තලින්ගම් මයා.
திரு. ஏ. அமிர்தலிங்கம்
Mr. A. Amirthalingam

වී. ඒ. අලගකෝන් මයා.
திரு. வீ. ஏ. அழகக்கோன்
Mr. V. A. Alegacone

ඇලික් අලුවිහාරේ මයා.
திரு. அலிக் அலுவிஹார
Mr. Alick Aluwihare

ඩී. පී. ආටිගල මයා.
திரு. டீ. பீ. ஆட்டிகல
Mr. D. P. Attygalle

සී. එෆ්. ඩබ්ලිව්. එදිරිසූරිය මයා.
திரு. சீ. எப். டபிள்யூ. எதிரிசூரிய
Mr. C. F. W. Edirisuriya

චන්ද්‍රා කරුණාරත්න මයා.
திரு. சந்திரா கருணரத்ன
Mr. Chandra Karunaratne

එච්. කුලරත්න මයා.
திரு. எச். குலரத்ன
Mr. H. Kularatne

ඩී. ඊ. තිලකරත්න මයා.
திரு. டி. ஈ. திலகரத்ன
Mr. D. E. Tillekeratne

කේ. ඩබ්ලිව්. දේවනායගම් මයා.
திரு. கே. டபிள்யூ. தேவநாயகம்
Mr. K. W. Devanayagam

ආර්. එම්. ධර්මදාස බණ්ඩා මයා.
திரு. ஆர். எம். தர்மதாச பண்டா
Mr. R. M. Dharmadasa Banda

වී. ධර්මලිංගම් මයා.
திரு. வீ. தர்மலிங்கம்
Mr. V. Dharmalingam

ශ්‍රීමත් රසික් fපරීඩ්, ඕ.බී.ඊ.
ஸ்ரீமான் ராசிக் பரீத், ஓ. பி. ஈ.
Sir Razik Fareed, O.B.E.

fපස්ටස් පෙරේරා මයා.
திரு. பெஸ்றஸ் பெரேரா
Mr. Festus Perera

එම්. රස්කින් ප්‍රනාන්දු මයා.
திரு. எம். றஸ்கின் பெர்ணண்டோ
Mr. M. Ruskin Fernando

ටී. ක්වෙන්ටින් ප්‍රනාන්දු මයා.
திரு. ரி. குவெண்டின் பெர்ணண்டோ
Mr. T. Quentin Fernando

ඩබ්ලිව්. එම්. ජී. ටී. බණ්ඩා මයා.
திரு. டப்ளியு. எம். ஜீ. ரீ. பண்டா
Mr. W. M. G. T. Banda

ඩී. එම්. ටී. බණ්ඩාර මයා.
திரு. டீ. எம். ரீ. பண்டார
Mr. D. M. T. Bandara

වෛද්‍යාචාර්‍ය ඒ. රත්නපාල
வைத்திய கலாநிதி ஏ. ரத்னபால
Dr. A. Ratnapala

එස්. බී. ලේනව මයා.
திரு. எஸ். பி. லேனவ
Mr. S. B. Lenawa

ඩී. බී. විජේතුංග මයා.
திரு. டீ. பி. விஜேதுங்க
Mr. D. B. Wijetunga

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

පක්ෂව

சார்பாக

AYES

එම්. සිවසිතම්පරම් මයා.

திரு. எம். சிவசிதம்பரம்

Mr. M. Sivasithamparam

ආර්. සිංගල්ටන්-සැමන් මයා., සී.බී.ඊ.

திரு. ஆர். சிங்கல்டன்-சமன், சீ. பீ. ஈ.

Mr. R. Singleton-Salmon, C.B.E.

එස්. බී. හේරත් මයා.

திரு. எஸ். பி. ஹேரத்

Mr. S. B. Herat

ආර්. පී. විජේසිරි මයා.

திரு. ஆர். பீ. விஜேசிறி

Mr. R. P. Wijesiri

පී. බී. ඒ. වීරකෝන් මයා.

திரு. பீ. பி. ஏ. வீரக்கோன்

Mr. P. B. A. Weerakoon

ජේ. එල්. සිරිසේන මයා.

திரு. ஜே. எல். சிரிசேன

Mr. J. L. Sirisena

විරුද්ධව

எதிராக

NOES

එස්. බී. යාලෙගම මයා.

திரு. எஸ். பி. யாலேகம

Mr. S. B. Yalegama

පර්සි වික්‍රමසිංහ මයා.

திரு. பேர்ஸி விக்ரமசிங்ஹ

Mr. Percy Wickremasinghe

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ

Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe

කෙටුම්පත් පණත ඊට අනුකූලව දෙවන වර කිය වන ලදී.

அதன்படி, மசோதா இரண்டாம் முறையாக மதிப் பிடப் பெற்றது.

Bill accordingly read a Second time.

මතු පළ වන යෝජනාව සභාසම්මත විය.

"කෙටුම්පත් පණත පූර්ණ මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩල කාරක සභාවට පැවරිය යුතුය."—[ගරු වන්නි නායක]

பின்வரும் பிரேரணை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது :

" மசோதா முழுச்சபைக் குழுவுக்குச் சாட்டப்படுமாக".

—[கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க.]

Resolved :

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

කාරක සභාවෙහිදී සලකා බලන ලදී.

[නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා මූලාසනා රූඪ විය.]

முழுச் சபைக் குழுவில் ஆராயப்பெற்றது.

[உப சபாநாயகர்—துணைமை தாங்கினார்.]

Considered in Committee.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER IN THE CHAIR.]

1 වන වගන්තිය කෙටුම්පත් පණතෙහි කොට සක් හැටියට නිබිය යුතුයයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.

1 ஆம் வாசகம் மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமென ஆணையிடப்பட்டது.

Clause 1 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

ටී. බී. ඉලංගරත්න මයා.

திரு. ரீ. பி. இலங்கரத்ன

Mr. T. B. Ilangaratne

පී. බී. ජී. කලුගල්ල මයා.

திரு. பீ. பி. ஜி. கலுகல்ல

Mr. P. B. G. Kalugalla

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.

திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர

Mr. Prins Gunasekera

ලක්ෂමන් ජයකොඩි මයා.

திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி

Mr. Lakshman Jayakody

ටී. බී. තෙන්නකෝන් මයා.

திரு. ரி. பி. தென்னக்கோன்

Mr. T. B. Tennekoon

නීල් ද අල්විස් මයා.

திரு. நீல் டி அல்விஸ்

Mr. Neal de Alwis

එල්. සී. ද සිල්වා මයා.

திரு. எல். சீ. டி சில்வா

Mr. L. C. de Silva

එම්. පී. ද සොයිසා සිරිවර්ධන මයා.

திரு. எம். பீ. டி சொய்ஸா சிறிவர்தன

Mr. M. P. de Zoysa Siriwardena

කේ. ඩී. ඩී. පෙරේරා මයා.

திரு. கே. டீ. டீ. பெரேரா

Mr. K. D. D. Perera

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா

Dr. N. M. Perera

සිරිමාවෝ ආර්. ඩී. බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.

திருமதி சிறிமாவோ ஆர். டீ. பண்டாரநாயக்க

Mrs. Sirimavo R. D. Bandaranaike

Digitized by Noolaham Foundation
noolaham.org | aavanaham.org

CLAUSE 2.—(*Amendment of Section 4 of Chapter 165*).

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

I move, that in page 1, line 19 the words "commercial enterprises" be left out.

I am not quite convinced by what the Hon. Minister of Finance said with regard to the implications of the two words "commercial enterprises". Although it is true that commercial enterprises are to be in the interests of the economic development of the country, there is nothing to indicate that the term extends to cover the economic development of the country. Anything that a Government does can be treated as being conducive to the economic development of the country. The kind of argument he advances, namely that certain sections of engineering cannot for instance be covered by the definition given to industrial and agricultural enterprises, cannot be accepted. If that is wanted, all that is required is to give a wider definition to the words "industrial enterprise" or "agricultural enterprise", without bringing in "commercial enterprise" which covers an entirely different set of circumstances.

"Commercial" would mean that you are embarking on trade. Commerce here does not mean industrial activity. Commerce really means trade activity, and I am not quite happy about this interpretation, of the Development Finance Corporation coming into commercial activity. In the course of my earlier remarks I drew attention to the dangers inherent therein. Whether it is speculative or not, commercial enterprises cannot be met by loans to be provided by a corporation like the Development Finance Corporation. The Development Finance Corporation, by its very connotation, means something quite different from a purely trading activity. It must be confined to something agricultural or industrial.

Normally, commercial activities must be carried out by banks, whether they are normal commercial business or not. Quite rightly, all banks are called commercial banks; they deal with commerce. They are the people who are really the expertise, the people with the necessary know-how, the experts who deal with questions of trading activity, bills of various types, and documents relating to bills of lading, and so on.

I do not know how the Development Finance Corporation can get involved in this type of activity. The whole concept of commercial activities is involved in this, and that is why we are scared of the use of the words "commercial enterprise" as an extention of the activities of the Development Finance Corporation. There is nothing even in the statement of legal effect which gives us the impression that commercial activities are to be brought within the scope of this new amending Bill. I would therefore urge that the words "commercial enterprise" be dropped from the scope of activities of the Finance Corporation. Now, the definition at page 5 of the Bill says:

> "'commercial enterprise' includes any large scale enterprise operated by a limited liability company, not falling within the description of any agricul ural or industrial enterprise, which shall be conducive to the economic development of Ceylon."

So it can be anything. Is there any trade which is not conducive to the economic development of Ceylon? All trading activities are conducive to the economic development of Ceylon; whether you import goods or whether you export goods, they all contribute to the economic development of the country. But, surely, the purposes of a development finance corporation cannot include that.

If the Hon. Minister is thinking in terms of an export guarantee scheme, then that must be done by another type of organization. That is a different proposition. An export guarantee scheme must be undertaken by an

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

[ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා]

organization which is set up for the purpose of encouraging exports and providing certain guarantees in case of losses—for instance, bad trade debts on the other side. But you cannot possibly extend the scope of your Development Finance Corporation, which was specially, originally and quite deliberately set up in 1955 for the purpose of promoting industrial and agricultural activities, to provide that type of guarantee.

The Hon. Minister cannot justify it on the ground that the word "industry" or "agriculture" is not comprehensive enough. All that he has to do is to provide a new definition in that case to cover all engineering activities, all agricultural activities, all industrial development activities, of one type or another. You can widen the scope of your industrial enterprises, and I have no objection to that. But I certainly object—[*Interruption*].

You may vote us down. But that is not the point so far as I am concerned. I want to have this on record. I think this is certainly defeating the original objects and bringing in certain activities within the scope of this organization, activities which can only be understood as being contrary to the original purposes for which the Finance Corporation was set up. I press my amendment.

ඉලංගරත්න මයා.
(திரு. இலங்கரத்ன)
(Mr. Ilangaratne)

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, ඒ යෝජනාවට උණුසුමින් පක්ෂ වෙනව. මේ වාණිජ ව්‍යාපාර මෙයට ඇතුළත් කිරීමේ යෝජනා වෙන් අපේ ආර්ථික නිදහස සම්පූර්ණ යෙන්ම ආපසු යෑමක් සිදු වන බව මා ඉතා කණගාටුවෙන් මතක් කරන්න කැමතියි. මෙය නිසා අපේ වෙළෙඳ ඇමතිතුමාට විශේෂයෙන්ම විශාල කරදරයකට මුහුණ පාන්නට සිද්ධ වෙනව. අද අපට තිබෙන අමාරුව විදේශ විනිමයයි. අපට අවශ්‍ය දේවල් ගෙන්වා ගැනීමට විදේශ විනිමය නැතිකම බෙහෙවින්ම බිල පානව. එහි පාඩුව පිරිමසා ගැනීමට වෙළෙඳ ගිවිසුම් ඇති කර ගෙන ඒ ඒ රටවලට වුව මනා කරන බඩු භාණ්ඩ අපේ රටෙන් ඒ ඒ රටවලට යවා ඒ වෙනුවට ඒ ඒ රට වලින් එවායේ නිපදවන බඩු භාණ්ඩ අපේ රටට ගෙන්වා ගැනීමයි කෙරෙන්නෙ. එහෙම නැතිව මේ විධියට මේ රටට ධනය ගෙනැවිත් විදේශිකයන්ට මෙහි ව්‍යාපාර වල යොදන්නට ඉඩ දුන්නොත් එයින් රටට ඇති වන ලාභය සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම පාහේ අහෝසි වෙන්නට පුළුවනි.

අපට වුවමනා කරන්නෙ අප රටට අවශ්‍ය දේවල් පුළුවන් තරම් ලාභයට ගන්න පුළුවන් වෙළෙඳ පොළකින් ලබා ගැනීම වත් අපේ ද්‍රව්‍ය සඳහා වැඩිම මිළක් ලබා ගන්න පුළුවන් රටකට හෝ රටවලට විකිණීමවත් නොවෙයි. අද ලෝක ආර්ථික තත්ත්වය දෙස බලන විට එවැනි දෙයක් කරන්න අමාරුයි. ඉහළ මිළට බඩු විකිණීමත් අඩුම මිළට බඩු ගැනීමත් යන දෙකම කොහොම නමුත් කරන්න පුළුවන් දේවල් නොවෙයි අද පවත්නා තත්ත්වය අනුව. නිදහස ලැබී තිබෙන බොහොමයක් රටවලම විදේශ විනිමය පිළිබඳ ප්‍රශ්නය අපට වගේම බල පානව. ඒ නිසා අපට පුළුවන් වන්නේ අපේ නිෂ්පාදන පිටරට යවා අපට වුවමනා දේවල් ඒ වෙනුවට ඒ රටවලින් ගෙන්වා ගැනීමටයි. ඒ නිසයි වෙළෙඳ ගිවිසුම් ඇති කර ගන්නෙ. නොයෙක් කර්මාන්ත ශාලා ඇති කිරීමට අපට ආධාර කරන රටවල් සමග වෙළෙඳ ගිවිසුම් ඇති කරගෙන අවශ්‍ය කොන්දේසි ඇති කළේ ඒ නිසයි. එසේ නොකළොත් කරදරකාරී තත්ත්වයකට මුහුණ පාන්නට සිදු වන බව කියන්න සිදු වී තිබෙනව.

මෙවැනි සංශෝධනයක් ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නෙ මන්දැයි නැවතත් අහන්න කැමතියි. අපේ දැනුමේ හැටියට නම් මෙවැනි සංශෝධනයක් ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙන්නෙ අර හෝටල් කරන්නන්ට අවස්ථාවක් දෙන්නටයි. මාස කිහිපයකට පෙර හෝටල් කොම්පැණියක් විදේශ විනිමය ගෙන්වා ගෙන ආණ්ඩුවේ ආධාර යත් ලබාගෙන—ආණ්ඩුවේ ඇප ලබාගෙන —හෝටල් කොම්පැණියක් ඇති කරන්න යෝජනා කර තිබෙනව. මීට පෙර අප අද හස් කළේ ආණ්ඩුව මගින් මෙවැනි හෝටල් ඇති කර ආණ්ඩු දෙකක් අතර

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

ඇති කර ගනු ලබන ගිවිසුමකින් ඒ ව්‍යාපාර තව තවත් දියුණු කර එයින් ලැබෙන ලාභය ජාතික සතු කරන්නටයි; එහෙත් දැන් තිබෙන හැටියට මේ රටේ ඉන්න ධනපතියන් පස් දෙනෙක් හය දෙනෙක් කොම්පැනියක් හදාගෙන ආණ්ඩුව ලවා ඇප තබවාගෙන විදේශවලින් භාණ්ඩත් ගෙන්වාගෙන අවුරුදු පහකින් පසු කොටස් දෙක බැගින් ආපසු සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම ගෙවීමට ගිවිසුමක් ඇති කරන්නටයි.

ඒ වගේම ගරු වෙළෙඳ ඇමතිතුමාගේ අදහසේ හැටියට අප විසින් ජනසතු කරන ලද ආයතන—විශේෂයෙන්ම ජනසතු කළ වෙළෙඳාම—ආපසු ධනපතියන් සතු වෙනවා. එවැන්නකට මෙයින් ඉඩ දෙනවා. අප කාටත් මතකයි අපට මුහුණ පෑමට තිබුණු තත්ත්වය. කර්මාන්තවලට හෝ ගොවිතැනට හෝ විදේශ විනිමය නැතිකමින් කොයි තරම් කරදරයකට මුහුණ පාන්ට සිද්ධ වුණාද යන්න කවුරුත් දන්නවා. ආර්ථික තත්ත්වයේ සවාධිනත්වය ඇති කර ගැනීමට ඇමෙරිකාවෙ නුත් එංගලන්තයේ ධනපතියන්ගෙනුත් නොයෙක් විධියේ තර්ජන ඇති වූ බව අප දන්නවා. එම නිසා වෙළඳ අංශයටත් වාණිජ අංශයටත් මේ අන්දමට ධනපති මුදල් ගත්තොත් ඒ විදේශීය ධනපතියන්ට නැවතත් මේ රටට පා තැබීමට අවස්ථාවක් ලැබෙන අතර ඔවුන්ට නැතිවූ බලතල යළිත් ලබා ගැනීමට ඉඩ තිබෙනවා. එසේ වුවහොත් අපේ දේශපාලන නිදහසත් ශීඝ්‍රයෙන් නැතිවී යන්නට ඉඩ තිබෙනවා. එම නිසා විශේෂයෙන්ම මෙම වගන්තියට අපේ තදබල විරුද්ධත්වය ප්‍රකාශ කරනවා.

ජයකොඩි මයා.
(திரு. ஜயக்கொடி)
(Mr. Jayakody)

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, මේ සංශෝධනයෙන් ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙන්නෙ වාණිජ ව්‍යාපාර ගෙන යන අයත් මේ පනතට අඩංගු කර ඒ අයටත් ණය ඇතුළු වෙනත් සහනාධාර ලබා දීමය කියා කියන්ට යෙදුණා. දැන් මේ අවස්ථාවේදී මා දැන ගන්ට සතුටුයි මොන මොන ව්‍යාපාර වර්ධනය කරන්ට එතුමා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවාද කියා. දැන් එක් අතකින් කෘෂිකර්ම ව්‍යාපාර තිබෙනවා. අනෙක් අතින් කර්මාන්ත ව්‍යාපාර තිබෙනවා. ඒවාට පිටස්තර වශයෙන් දැන් වාණිජ අංශයටත් ඇතිලි ගහන්ටයි ඇමතිතුමා යන්නෙ. මේ මණ්ඩලයේ දැනට සිටින සාමාජිකවරුන් කවිද කියා මා සොයා බැලුවා. මේ මණ්ඩලයෙ එනම් ලංකාවේ සංවර්ධන මුදල් නීතිගත සංස්ථාවේ සාමාජිකයන් හැටියට කටයුතු කරනව කීප දෙනෙක්. රිචඩ් පීරිස් මහත්මය එහි සභාපති හැටියට කටයුතු කරනවා. ඊළඟට ඩී. පී. බැරිංටන්, ජී. බී. එස්. ගෝමස්, සී. ලෝගනාදන්, සී. නඩේසන්, එන්. ඊ. වීරසූරිය හා ඩබ්ලිව්. එච්. සොලමන්ස් යන මහත්වරුන් ඉන්නවා. මා මේ 1966 වාර්තාවක් අනුවයි කථා කරන්නෙ. ඒ වගෙම ආචාර්ය ජී. පොන්නම්පෙරුම හා සී. ඒ. වීරසිංහ යන මහත්වරුන් දෙදෙනත් එහි සිටිනවා. මේ මහත්වරුන් ගැන කල්පනා කරන විට ඒ ඒ අංශ පිළිබඳව ඉතාමත් දක්ෂ අය මේ මණ්ඩලයෙ සිටින බව පෙනෙනවා. මා මේ කිසිම වරදක් කියනවා නොවෙයි.

මේ බැරිංටන් කියන පුද්ගලයා කවිද කියා මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා දන්නවා ඇති. දැන් මාස තුන හතරකට පෙර අපට විශාල බැංකු වැඩ වර්ජනයකට මුහුණපාන්ට සිදුවූ බව තමුන්නාන්සේලාට මතක ඇති. ග්‍රින්ඩ්ලේස් බැංකුවෙ මැනේජර් මහත්මය තමයි බැරිංටන්. මුදල් දෙන සංස්ථාවක මැනේජර් මහත්මයෙක්. සංවර්ධන මුදල් නීතිගත සංස්ථාවෙ සමහර මහත්වරුන් ගැන මා කිසිම ප්‍රශ්නයක් මතු කරන්නෙ නැහැ. කෘෂිකර්ම අංශයෙහි වාගේම කාර්මික අංශයෙහිත් කටයුතු පිළිබඳව දක්ෂ ලෙස කටයුතු කළ හැකි මහත්වරුන් එහි සිටින බව මා පිළිගන්නවා. නමුත් මේ රටේ දැනට තිබෙන තත්ත්වය යටතේ මේ බැරිංටන් වැනි පුද්ගලයින්ට පවා ඒ සංස්ථාවෙ අධ්‍යක්ෂ ධුර ලබාගන්ට පුළුවන් නම් මේ රටට තවත් විදේශීය බලපෑම් ඇතිවන විට එය අපේ රටේ වාණිජ අංශය කෙරෙහි කොයි තරම් දුරට බලපානවා ද යන්න පමණක් මා පෙන්වා දෙන්ට සතුටුයි. කොලොන්නාවේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ටී. බී. ඉලංගරත්න මයා.) එක්තරා කාරණයක් ඉදිරිපත් කළා. තමුන්නාන්සේලා එය පිළිගන්නට ඕනෑ. අපේ මූලික ද්‍රව්‍ය

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

[ජයකොඩි මයා.]

වලට ඉතාමත්ම අඩු මිළක් ලැබෙන්නෙ. අනෙක් අතට අපි මේ රටට ආනයනය කරන ද්‍රව්‍යවලට අපට ඉතාම වැඩි මිළක් ඉගවන්ට සිද්ධ වී තිබෙනව. එම නිසා තමයි අද අපේ විදේශ විනිමය තත්ත්වය මේ තරම් භයානක ලෙස පහත වැටී තිබෙන්නෙ.

කෙලින්ම වෙළඳ ද්‍රව්‍ය හුවමාරු ගනුදෙනු ඇති කරගත් රටවල් කීපයක් ගැන ප්‍රවෘත්තියක් මා ඊයෙ පෙරේදා පත්‍රවල දුටුව. ඒ ගනුදෙනු ඇති කරගෙන තිබෙන පිළිවෙළ අනුව ඒ රටවල් විදේශ විනිමය ප්‍රශ්නය සෑහෙන තරම් දුරට විසඳාගෙන තිබෙන බව පෙනෙනව. විශේෂයෙන්ම ඉන්දියාව එක්සත් අරාබි ජන රජය සමග ඇති කරගෙන තිබෙන ගිවිසුමෙන් ඒ බව පෙනෙනව. එක්සත් අරාබි ජන රජයෙන් ඉන්දියාවට වුවමනා කරන පෝර වර්ගත් "Muriate of Potash, Rock Phosphate" වැනි පෝර වර්ගත් සිමෙන්ති ද්‍රව්‍යත් ලෝකයෙන්ම අගනා කපුත් ලබා ගැනීමට පුළුවන් වී තිබෙනව. ඉන්දියාව එක්සත් අරාබි ජන රජයට තේ දෙනව. එවැනි වෙළඳ ගනුදෙනු ඇති කර ගෙන තිබෙන අවස්ථාවකදී අපේ මූලික ද්‍රව්‍යවලට ඉතාමත්ම අඩු මිළක් ලැබෙන අවස්ථාවකදී මගේ කල්පනාවේ හැටියට නම් අපි පුළුවන් තරම් අඩුවෙන් මේ අන්දමේ ව්‍යාපාර කළ හොත් හොඳයි. ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, චීනයත් ලංකාවත් ඇති කරගත් හාල්-රබර් ගිවිසුම අනුව ලංකාවට කොයි තරම් සහනයක් ලැබෙන වාද කියා තමුන්නාන්සෙ දන්නව. අපට කොතරම් සහනයක් ලැබෙනවද? ශත 05ක වැඩිපුර මිලක් ලැබෙනව. ද්‍රව්‍ය පැක් කිරීම වැනි කටයුතුවලට ශත 05ක මිලක් ලැබෙනව. වෙන කිසිම රටකට එම වාසිය ලැබෙන්නෙ නැහැ. එම නිසා විදේශ ධනයෙන් යම් බලයක් අපේ වාණිජ අංශයට දමන්ට ගියොත් අපේ ද්‍රව්‍යවලට ලැබෙන මිල සෑහෙන තරමකින් අඩු වෙන්ට ඉඩ තිබෙනව. ඒ තරම් නිදහසක් දෙන්ට හොඳ නැහැ. අද ලෝකයෙ නානා විධ රටවල් අතර වෙළඳාම පිළිබඳ ගනුදෙනු කෙරෙන්නෙ ලොකු සම්බන්ධතාවයක් ඇතුවයි. මූල ද්‍රව්‍ය විකිණෙන රටවල් අතර ගණුදෙනු කොතරම් සම්බන්ධතාවයකින් කෙරෙනවද යන්නට නිදර්ශන ඉදිරිපත් කරන්ට පුළුවනි.

මීට අවුරුදු තුන හතරකට පෙර අප රටට වුවමනා කරන පිටි ඕස්ට්‍රේලියාවෙන් ගෙන්වා ගන්නට ගියා, හුවමාරු ගිවිසුමක් උඩ නැතිනම් තෑග්ගක් හැටියට. ඕස්ට්‍රේලියන් රාජ්‍යය අපට පිටි දෙන්ට හැදුව. ඊළඟට අමෙරිකාව අපට පිටි දෙන්ට ගිය විට ඕස්ට්‍රේලියාව මොකද කීවෙ? "ලංකාව අපේ වෙළඳ පොළක්, එම නිසා දෙන්ට එපා" කීව. ඒ වගෙම පොල් තෙල් ටිකක් අපි පාකිස්තානයට විකුණන්ට ගිය විට එක පාරටම අමෙරිකාව කීවෙ මොකක්ද? "උඹලට පාකිස්තානයට පොල්තෙල් දෙන්ට එහෙම බැහැ. අපි ගනුදෙනු කරන රටක් තමයි පාකිස්තානය" යනුවෙන් කීව. ඒ අය පාකිස්තානයත් සමග වෙළඳ ද්‍රව්‍ය හුවමාරු කරනවට විරුද්ධ වෙන බව කීව. මේ වෙළඳ ගනුදෙනුවල එතරම් බල පෑමක් තියෙනව. අපේ මූල ද්‍රව්‍යවලින් සෑහෙන ලාබයක් ලබා ගැනීමට හැකි වන්නෙ වෙළඳ හුවමාරු ගනුදෙනුවලින් තමයි. අනික් අංශවලින් නිදහසේ වැඩ කටයුතු කරන්ට ඉඩ දුන්නොත් අපි එන්ට එන්ට අමාරුවෙ වැටෙනව. එම නිසා මෙම අවස්ථාවෙදි විදේශ ධනයෙන් එම වාණිජ ව්‍යාපාර දියුණු කරන්නට යාමෙන් අපි එන්ට එන්ටම ප්‍රපාතයෙ වැටෙන බව කියන්ට ඕනෑ. එතකොට විදේශීන්ට අවස්ථාවක් ලැබෙනව අපේ ආර්ථික ක්‍රමයට ඇවිත් ඇඟිලි ගසන්ට.

අ. භා. 10.15

පර්සි වික්‍රමසිංහ මයා. (කඹුරුපිටිය)
(திரு. பேர்சி விக்ரமசிங்ஹ—கம்புறுப்பிட்டிய)
(Mr. Percy Wickremasinghe—Kamburupitiya)

අයි. බී. ආර්. සී. එකෙන් ණය අරගෙන පුද්ගලික ව්‍යාපාර තර කරන්ට ලංකාණ්ඩුව බැඳෙනව නම් ඊට අපේ විරුද්ධතාවය ප්‍රකාශ කරන්ට ඕනෑ. පුද්ගලික වාණිජ ව්‍යාපාරවලට මේ අයුරින් මුදල් ලබා ගැනීමේදි ආණ්ඩුවට පුළුවන්ද ඒ වට වග කියන්ට? හොඳයි, මුසාජී කොම්පැනියට වග කියන්ට ආණ්ඩුවට පුළුවන්ද? එහෙම නැති නම් වෙනත් යම්කිසි කොම්පැනියකට වග කියන්ට පුළුවන්ද? පුද්ගලික

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

ව්‍යාපාරවලට වග කියන්ට අපට පුළුවන් කමක් නැහැ. යම්කිසි ලෝක සංස්ථාවකින් හෝ ආයතනයකින් ණයක් ගන්න විට රජය ඊට වග කියන්ට ඕනෑ. නමුත් පූද්ගලික වාණිජ ව්‍යාපාරවලට එහි යම්කිසි අයිතියක් දෙනව නම් ඊට අපේ විරුද්ධත්වය ප්‍රකාශ කරන්ට ඕනෑ. [බාධාකිරීම්] රාජ්‍ය කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ගරු ඇමතිතුමාට මා කියන දේ හොඳට තේරෙනව ඇති.

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

තමුන්නාන්සෙගෙ නායකයත් එහෙම කීව.

පර්සි වික්‍රමසිංහ මයා.
(திரு. பேர்சி விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Percy Wickremasinghe)

එතකොට මම හිටියෙ නැහැ.

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

නමුත් මම හිටිය.

පර්සි වික්‍රමසිංහ මයා.
(திரு. பேர்சி விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Percy Wickremasinghe)

හිටිය නම් කමක් නැහැ. නායකය කියන දේට අපිත් එකඟයි. තමුන්නාන්සෙල අයි. බී. ආර්. ඩී. එකෙන් බැරි නම් ඕනෑ එකකින් මුදල් ගත්තට කමක් නැහැ. පුද්ගලික ව්‍යාපාරිකයන්ගෙ ගනුදෙනුවලට වග කියන්ට ලංකා රජය යම් ආකාරයකින් බැඳෙනව නම් ඒකට එකඟ වන්ට බැහැ. ඊට ඉඩ දෙන්ට බැහැ.

සභාපතිතුමා
(அக்கிராசனர்)
(The Chairman)

ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා එකම දේ නැවත නැවත කියනව. දැන් වෙලාව රාත්‍රි 10.20ත් වෙලා.

පර්සි වික්‍රමසිංහ මයා.
(திரு. பேர்சி விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Percy Wickremasinghe)

සමා කරන්න. සභාපතිතුමනි, මම මේ ප්‍රශ්නයෙ තිබෙන වැදගත්කමයි පෙන්වා දෙන්න උත්සාහ කළේ. වාණිජ අංශයට යම්කිසි විධියක ආධාර දීමේ වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් මේ ආණ්ඩුව ඇති කරන්නට යනව නම් අපි ඒකට විරුද්ධයි.

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

I just want to ask one question pertaining to this clause. No answer has yet been given to the question as to what are the commercial enterprises contemplated within the framework of this Bill. What are the commercial enterprises which today are not qualified to receive foreign assistance in that way? The answer is that there is not a single one.

When we are talking of promotion, establishment, expansion and modernization of private commercial enterprises, what precisely is in contemplation? If you are talking of establishment and promotion, obviously you are talking of institutions that do not now exist.—[*Interruption*]. If that is so, I would be grateful for enlightenment in regard to what precisely the institutions are that are in contemplation. I am not talking in terms of expansion and modernization, because that would obviously apply to institutions that do exist. It could be, for example, the Lake House; it could be the "Dawasa" group of newspapers; it could be the "Siyarata" newspaper, the "Jana Hitha" newspaper, owned by political groups having a political interest; but I am now on a different question: What are the new enterprises?

As I have already been at pains to point out in the Second Reading Debate, the only commercial enterprises that I am aware of in which this Government has taken any practical interest since its inauguration two years ago—I think its birthday is tomorrow, an unhappy event!—are the Hotels Corporation, and the television project which has now been postponed. As far as the Hotels Corporation is concerned they have obtained power, they have asked for authority to form a partnership with the private sector and the C. W. E.

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

[එව්ජ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

They passed a law sitting till midnight once before and promised to do it, but up to date nothing has happened. We are still waiting to see the textile organization set up for the import and distribution of textiles.

What I want to ask the Hon. Minister is this: How can the Development Finance Corporation establish or promote a new commercial enterprise? I should be grateful to have some indication as to what he has in mind. Quite apart from our dislike of the Bill and our attitudes to it and our declared objective, and informing you what we propose to do at some future time, all I want to say is this: Please do help this House to understand what you have in mind by explaining clearly to us what precisely these institutions are.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னட் சொய்ஸா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Further to the point I made in the Second Reading Debate, the definition of commercial enterprise that is given here by the amendment of Section 18 is one that is not acceptable—for various reasons. "Comercial enterprise" here includes "any large scale enterprise operated by a limited liability company, not falling within the description of an agricultural or industrial enterprise, which shall be conducive to the economic development of Ceylon;". "Which shall be conducive to the economic development of Ceylon" is the requirement in regard to which we have no means of determining the standards that could be applied by this corporation.

The second aspect of the matter arises when you say that it includes everything other than the industrial and agricultural enterprises mentioned in the same clause. In other words, when you add "commercial" and say "commercial" includes everything other than industrial and agricultural, then it includes everything. You are in a position to aid everything. That is what you want to do, provided the enterprise is managed by a limited liability company. The only stipulation is that.—[*Interruption*]. If the United National Party is incorporated tomorrow, they can be assisted. If they are incorporated they can get aid.—[*Interruption*]. The Orient Club Company, which attends to a considerable amount of development in this country and whose activities, I have no doubt in the view of its members, are conducive to the economic development of Ceylon, can be financed by the Development Finance Corporation. I have not the slightest doubt that quite a number of the directors of the Development Finance Corporation are members of the Orient Club Company. Now, this is a stimulus to persons to form companies for the purpose of obtaining this assistance. Anybody would say that we can have confidence in the Government and in the administrators and directors not to allow themselves to be bamboozled in this particular field.

But there are two matters to which I want to draw the attention of the Hon. Minister. There are quite a number of so-called industrialists to whom exchange facilities have been given out of a desire for development on the part of the administrators. I am not saying that they took bribes or anything of that kind. Out of a sheer desire to see development in this country, they have given those facilities; and those facilities have been mis-applied, misused, for the purpose of private accumulation of foreign assets abroad, out of which pre-paid tickets are now being supplied *ad lib.* to all kinds of persons to make trips abroad. When we find that such a situation has arisen, how can we have confidence in the capacity of those individuals who select these enterprises, unless you have a schedule here in regard to those enterprises to which you propose giving assistance? I want to ask the Hon. Minister, why does he not limit the number and the range of enterprises to which he wants to give assistance

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

under the word "commercial" by redefining "commercial enterprises" to mean any commercial enterprise which is mentioned in the schedule, and by giving in the schedule the number and the nature of the enterprises which he wants to assist? Why do you not do that? If you do that, we might even consent; we might agree to withdrawing any amendment in this matter because we will know the position, the country will know the position, and your Development Finance Corporation will have a guide in the matter. Are you anxious —let us know—to promote tourism? Are you anxious to promote the establishment of hotels? Are those the ventures that you are thinking of? Or are you thinking of the market *mudalalis* on Kachcheri Road if they form themselves into a limited liability company? Are you thinking of Farms Limited?—[*Interruption*].

සභාපතිතුමා
(அக்கிராசனர்)
(The Chairman)

He says Farms Limited will come under agriculture.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னட் சொய்ஸா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

It has an agricultural side; it also has a marketing side. I am more concerned with the marketing side, which will probably come within the definition of "commercial enterprise." I am entirely in favour of any measure that would bring down the cost of living. I confess that I am no great admirer of private enterprise in this country, particularly the kind of enterprise that was promoted, but when I was invited to one of those functions—the opening ceremony of Farms Limited —I attended it because I thought there was the possibility of its functioning as a price-controlling factor in Colombo, that the price at which they would sell commodities would act as a price-controlling factor in Colombo and thus provide a cheaper range of commodities, at least to a sectional population. What do I find? In addition to the agricultural enterprise that the hon. Appointed Member (Mr. Singleton-Salmon) mentioned I find that far from operating as a price-controlling factor, they are encouraging black-market prices today. And I will tell you how. They purchase from the same sources that supply vegetables to the Colombo markets, thereby reducing the supplies available to consumers who have hitherto gone to the municipal markets, and to the extent to which there is a reduction in supplies, the prices of those commodities rise.

Why does not the Minister give a Schedule? It can be as large as he likes. Then the Development Finance Corporation will have a guide; it will know the mind of the Government in the matter. I suggest that the Minister clarify this matter by redefining "commercial enterprise" as "any enterprise mentioned in the Schedule."

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Do you want me to draft a schedule now?

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னட் சொய்ஸா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

We have unlimited time to draft a schedule.

Are you pleased to accept this suggestion or is it that you have already closed your mind to any kind of wisdom from any quarter?

අ. භා. 10.30

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා තමන්ගේ පිළිතුරු කථාවේදී බොහොම ජයග්‍රාහක ලීලාවෙන්, විරුද්ධ පක්ෂය ගෙන හැර පෑ තර්කවලට පිළිතුරු දීලා වැඩක් පෙන්නුවා. එතුමාගේ කථා

PUBLIC LIBRARY JAFFNA
Digitized by Noolaham Foundation. noolaham.org | aavanaham.org

[ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.]

වේදී කිව්වෙ අපේ දර්ශනය මේකයි, පෞද්ගලික අංශයට අපි සදාකාලිකවම ආධාර කරන්න ඕනෑ, එසේ නොකර ජනසම්මත වාදය ආරක්ෂා කරන්න බැහැ කියායි. ඒ දර්ශනය අනුවයි ආණ්ඩුව වාණිජ ව්‍යාපාර වලට තැනක් දෙන්න අදහස් කරල තියෙන්නෙ මේ සංශෝධන පනත යටතෙ. මම ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාගෙන් අහන්න කැමතියි, එතුමන්ලා පසුගිය අවුරුදු දෙක තිස්සේ බදාගෙන සිටි පෞද්ගලික අංශයෙන් ආණ්ඩුවටත් වැඩක් කෙරිල තියෙනවද කියා. ඒ පෞද්ගලික අංශයෙන් මේ රටේ ආර්ථික හා කෘෂිකාර්මික සංවර්ධනයට රුකුළක් ලැබීම පැත්තකින් තියෙද්දී ආණ්ඩුවටවත් යහපතක් වෙලා තියෙනවද කියා මම අහන්න කැමතියි. නමුත් අයවැය කථාවෙදි නම් පෞද්ගලික අංශය මුව නොසැහෙන විධියට වර්ණනා කරනව. පළමු වැනි අයවැය ලේඛන කථාවෙදි කළේ ඒකයි. දෙවැනි අයවැය කථාවෙදිත් ඒ තැටියමයි, ගැහුවෙ. අවුරුදු දෙකක් තිස්සේ තමුන්නාන්සේලා බදාගෙන සිටි ඔය පෞද්ගලික අංශය මොනවද කළේ?

තමුන්නාන්සේලා පෞද්ගලික වෙළඳ සමාගම් කීපයකට වගා කරන්නය කියා කැලෑ අක්කර දහස් ගණනක් දුන්නා. වගා කිරීම කෙසේ වෙතත් ඒ කොම්පැනි කාරයෝ ඒ කැලෑවල තිබුණු අවුරුදු සිය ගණන් පැරණි ගස් ටික කපා ඉරලා කොළඹට ගෙනත් විකුණා ගත්තා. ආහාර වගා කිරීම අතින් රට ස්වයංපෝෂිත කිරීමටය කියා විදේශීය ධනපතින් ටික දෙනකු සන්තක වූ වෙළඳ සමාගම් කීපයකට මේ රටේ ජාතික වස්තුව වූ කැලෑ බදු දී ඒ මිනිසුන් ලවා අපේ කැලෑ නාස්ති කර වීමද, පෞද්ගලික අංශය මගින් කළ සංවර්ධනය? තමුන්නාන්සේ දැන් උත්සාහ කරන්නෙ විදේශික ධනයත් ඔය විධියේ දේවලට දීලා ඔයිට වඩා ඉක්මණින් අපේ කැලෑ ටික නාස්ති කරන්නද? තමුන්නාන්සේලාගේ දර්ශනයේ තියෙන බංකොලොත් බවයි ඔයින් පෙනෙන්නෙ.

තමුන්නාන්සේලා හැම තිස්සෙම කියනව, අපේ දර්ශනයෙත් ඔය පැත්තෙ ඉන්න අයගේ දර්ශනයෙත් බරපතළ වෙනසක් තියෙනවය, ඔය පැත්තේ ඉන්න අයගේ දර්ශනය මෙන කිහිලා කරන්න පුළුවන් ජනසතු කිරීම පමණක්ය කියා. තමුන්නාන්සේලා පෞද්ගලික අංශයට තැන දීලා පසුගිය අවුරුදු දෙකේදී මොනවද කළේ? හාල් සේරුව කැපීම පමණයි කළේ. මේකද තමුන්නාන්සේලාගේ දර්ශනය? මේ රටේ මිනිසුන්ට දැන් තමුන්නාන්සේලාගේ දර්ශනය ඇති වෙලා තියෙනව. මේ සංශෝධන, දර්ශනයක් නැතිකම නිසා ගෙනෙන ඒවා.

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, වාණිජ ව්‍යාපාර මගින් විදේශීය ධනය මේවට යොදවා මේ රටට තව තවත් බටහිර වාණිජ සංස්කෘතිය ඇබ්බැහි කිරීමට අපි විරුද්ධයි. මේ රට නැති වුනේ මේ රටට ඔය විධියට වාණිජ සංස්කෘතියක් ඇබ්බැහි කරන්න ගිහිල්ලයි. එංගලන්ත අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන් ඉංග්‍රීසි භාෂාව ඔස්සේ වාණිජ සංස්කෘතියේ එක්තරා අංශයක් මේ රටට ගෙනාවා. දැන් ඇමෙරිකන් අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන් ඔය වාණිජ ව්‍යාපාරය ඔස්සේ ඇමෙරිකන් සංස්කෘතියක් ගෙනෙන්න යනවා. මේ රටේ තිබුණු සංස්කෘතියේ සවිශක්තිය නිසා සුද්දන්ට බැරි වුනා ඔවුන්ගේ වාණිජ සංස්කෘතියෙන් අප නැති කරන්න. දැන් තමුන්නාන්සෙගෙ මේ යෝජනාවෙන් මේ රටට කැඳවන ඇමෙරිකන් සල්ලිවලින් මේක නැති කරන්නයි, ඊළඟට උත්සාහ කරන්නෙ. තමුන්නාන්සෙගෙ දර්ශනයට ඔක පෙනෙන්නෙ නැහැ. මම තමුන්නාන්සෙට අනුකම්පා කරනව. තමුන්නාන්සේ සමග ඉදිරි පෙළේ සිටින අනික් පුද්ගලයන්ටත් මම අනුකම්පා කරනව. මිශ්‍ර ආර්ථික ක්‍රමයෙන් මේ රට හදන්නට පුළුවන් වේය කියා තමුන්නාන්සේලා ආඩම්බර වෙනව. අදට හරියට අවුරුදු දෙකක් තමුන්නාන්සේලා බලයේ හිටියා. අඩියක්වත් ඉදිරියට ගිහිල්ලා තියෙනවද?

ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයේ ආණ්ඩුව බලයෙන් අයින් වන විට මේ රටේ ආහාර සඳහා දවස් 4 කට සැහෙන තරමට වඩා මුදල් තිබුනෙ නැත කියා තමුන්නාන්සේලා නිතරම කියනව. අද රටේ පවතින ආර්ථික තත්ත්වය මොකක්ද? 1965 දී ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂ ආණ්ඩුව බලයෙන් පහවෙද්දී තිබුණාට වඩා අද ආර්ථික තත්ත්වය පහත වැටී තිබෙනව නේද? 1960 වර්ෂය වෙනුවෙන් මහ බැංකුව

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

විසින් නිකුත් කරන ලද ප්‍රකාශනය අනුව, අද විදේශ ධනය එදා ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයෙ ආණ්ඩුව බලයෙන් ඉවත් වන අවස්ථාවෙ තිබුණට වඩා පහළ නේද?

සභාපතිතුමා
(அக்கிராசனர்)
(The Chairman)

The Hon. Member is making a Second Reading Debate speech.

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

නැහැ සභාපතිතුමනි, වාණිජ අංශයෙන් කවදාවත් වැඩක් නොවන බව ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාට කියන්නයි මට වුවමනා කරන්නෙ. වාණිජ අංශයට සල්ලි දැමීම හරියටම ගඟට ඉනි කැපීම වගෙයි. මේ විධියට කෘෂිකර්ම අංශයටත් කර්මාන්ත අංශයටත් අවස්ථාව ලබා දුන්නා. කෘෂිකර්ම අංශය සඳහා ඉඩම් ලබාගත් කොම්පැනිකාරයින් කළේ අපේ රටේ කැලෑවල තිබුණු වටිනා ලීදඬු ටික කපා කොළඹට ගෙනත් විකුණා ගැනීමයි. අමෙරිකන් ඩොලර් වාණිජ අංශයට යෙදවීමෙන් වන්නෙ, දැනටමත් ඉතාමත් නරක විධියට දූෂණය වී තිබෙන සමාජය තවත් නරක් වීමයි. පගා ගැනීම, හොරකම් කිරීම, පුළුවන්තරම් අඩුවෙන් වැඩ කිරීම වැනි දූෂිත අංග ලක්ෂණ අපේ රටට බෝ වුණේ බටහිර වාණිජ සංස්කෘතියෙන් තමයි. මෙය තව තවත් අපට බෝ කරන්න වුවමනාවක් නෑ. ඔය බංකොලොත් දර්ශනයෙන් සිදුවන්නෙ රට නැත්තටම නැති වීමයි. අවුරුදු දෙකක් තිස්සේ අඟ ලක්වත් ඉදිරියට යන්න තමුන්නාන්සේලාට බැරි වුණා. ඒ නිසා වාණිජ අංශයට අමෙරිකන් ඩොලර් යෙදීමෙන් කවදාවත් මේ රෝගය සුව කරන්න බෑ.

ආර්. සිංගල්ටන්-සැමන් මයා. (පත් කරන ලද මන්ත්‍රී)
(திரு. ஆர். சிங்கல்டன்-சமன்—நியமன அங்கத்தவர்)
(Mr. R. Singleton-Salmon—Appointed Member)

Sir, on a point of Order, is all this relevant in Committee?

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

ආ, මේ රටේ තවත් දත් හැලිච්ච, ලොම් වැටිච්ච, කෙස් පැහිච්ච, හොඬු ඇකිලිච්ච බ්‍රිතාන්‍ය අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී කරදාසි කොටියෙක් රාත්‍රී 10 ට ඇත ගුහාවෙ ඉඳගෙන ඉගොරවනව.

සභාපතිතුමා
(அக்கிராசனர்)
(The Chairman)

The hon. Member should not make personal remarks.

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

වාණිජ අංශයට අමෙරිකන් සල්ලි දමන්නට මේ පනතෙන් ඉඩකඩ සලසා දීමෙන් මේ රටේ ආර්ථික රෝගය කවදාවත් හොඳ කරන්න බෑ. එසේ කරන්නට ඕනැයි කියන මේ අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී කරදාසි කොටින්ගේ ආරක්ෂක භටයින් රෑ බෝවන විට ගෙරවූ පළියට ඊට අපේ රටේ සිටින සමාජවාදීන් බිය නොවන බවයි මම කියන්නෙ. කැලේ සිටින කොටි හැන්දෑවන විට ගොරවන පළියට, නිදහස්ව ජීවත් වන්නට සිටින මිනිසුන් බිය වෙනවද? මෙම පනතින්, අමෙරිකන් අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන් මේ රට අල්ලා ගන්නට යොදන උපක්‍රමය නතර කරන්න, අද අප අතර සිටින බ්‍රිතාන්‍ය අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී ආරක්ෂක භටයින්ට වත් බැරි වෙනව. දැන් බ්‍රිතාන්‍ය අධිරාජ්‍යවාදය බොහොම අබලන්. අමෙරිකානුන් දැන් ඔවුන් යටකරගෙන ඉදිරියට යනව. මේ පනතින් බ්‍රිතාන්‍ය අධිරාජ්‍යවාදය සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම අතුගා දමා අමෙරිකන් අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන් සම්පූර්ණ බලය අල්ලා ගන්නව. ඒකයි මෙයින් අදහස් කරන්නෙ.

සභාපතිතුමා
(அக்கிராசனர்)
(The Chairman)

Why not come back to the Clause we are discussing?

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

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

නැහැ, සභාපතිතුමනි, මම කියන්නෙ අමෙරිකන් අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන්ගෙ වාණිජ අංශයෙන් කවදාවත් අපට වැඩක් නොවන බවයි. මීට කලින් අපි කෘෂිකර්ම අංශයත් කර්මාන්ත අංශයත් දී තිබුණා. ඒ එකකින් වත් මේ රටේ ආර්ථික තත්ත්වය ගරිගස්සන්න බැරි වුණා. මිශ්‍ර ආර්ථික කුමය නමැති බංකොලොත් දර්ශනයට වැළඳී තිබෙන, හොඳ කරන්න බැරි අසාධ්‍ය රෝගයක් මේක. කලින් බෙහෙත් දෙකක් දී තිබෙනවා. නමුත් සුව කරන්න බැරි වුණා. දැන්, වාණිජ ව්‍යාපාර නමැති පත්තුව ගාල මේ බරපතල රෝගය හොඳ කරන්න මුන්නැහෙල සූදානම් වෙනව. එහෙත්, ඔය අමෙරිකන් ඩොලර් උරච්චි කර ගාල නම් කවදාවත් රෝගය සුව කරන්න බැරි බව වන්නියෙ නායක ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාට මතක් කරනවා.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

ඇමෙරිකන් සල්ලි ගෙනැවිත් වාණිජ ව්‍යාපාරවල යෙදවීමට මෙම පනතෙන් යෝජනා කර ඇතැයි හබරාදූවේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.) ප්‍රකාශ කළා. එහෙම දෙයක් මෙහි නැහැ. ඒ නිසා ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් වැඩි යමක් කියන්නට අදහස් කරන්නෙ නැහැ.

වාණිජ ව්‍යාපාර එකින් එක නම් කරන ලෙසද ඉල්ලීමක් තිබෙනවා. [බාධා කිරීමක්] වාණිජ ව්‍යාපාරවල ලේඛනයක් සකස් කරන ලෙස දකුණු කොළඹ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.) කීවා. ඒවා එකක් එකක් පාසා නම් කරන්නට පුළුවන්කමක් නැහැ. [බාධා කිරීමක්] ණය දීමට සුදුසුකම් ඇති ඒවාට පමණයි ණය දෙන්නේ.

ද සොයිසා සිරිවර්ධන මයා.
(திரு. டி. சொய்ஸா சிறிவர்தன)
(Mr. de Zoysa Siriwardena)
මොනවද ඒවා?

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

ඒවා එකින් එක නම් කරන්න බැහැ. ණය ඉල්ලුම් පත්‍රයේ සඳහන් කරුණු අනුව සලකා බලා ක්‍රියා කරනවා. අදාළ අමාත්‍යාංශයේත්, රජයේත් අනුමැතිය ඇතිවයි, ණය දෙන්නේ. රජය අනුමත නොකරන කටයුතුවලට ණය දෙන්න බැහැ.

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

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)
ලැයිස්තුවක් සාදන්නට යයි මට කීවාට දැන් ඒක කරන්නට පුළුවන්ද?

ද සොයිසා සිරිවර්ධන මයා.
(திரு. டி. சொய்ஸா சிறிவர்தன)
(Mr. de Zoysa Siriwardena)
කරුණාකර එකක් දෙකක් ගැනවත් සඳහන් කරන්නට පුළුවන්ද?

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)
ගමනාගමනයට සම්බන්ධ ඉංජිනේරු කටයුතුවලට සම්බන්ධ කටයුතු වන්නට පුළුවනි.

කෘෂිකාර්මික හා ව්‍යාපාරික කටයුතුවලට සම්බන්ධ කරන්නට බැරි කාරණා සඳහා බල පවත්වන්නටයි, මේ පනත ඇති කර තිබෙන්නේ. හැබැයි, මේ වාණිජ කටයුතු කෙළින්ම ආර්ථික සංවර්ධනයට උදව් දෙන ඒවා විය යුතුයි. It shall be conducive to economic development.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා
(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)
It shall be conducive is not කෙළින්ම.

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

ද සොයිසා සිරිවර්ධන මයා.
(திரு. டி. சொய்ஸா சிறிவர்தன)
(Mr. de Zoysa Siriwardena)

එක කාරණයක් දැන ගන්නට කැමතියි. ආනයන හා අපනයන වෙළෙඳාම මේකට ඇතුළත් වෙනවද?

අ. භා. 10.45

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

The Hon. Minister's answer raises an importance point. In other words, he is not clear in his own mind as to what he wants under this law. We asked him a simple question. He tries to get out of it by saying that one Member wants a list of all the enterprises that are going to be approved by the Government. That is completely false. That was never stated by the Opposition. No one asked for a complete list of the future. No one wanted any prophecies. If the Minister's understanding is as limited as that, let us be charitable and put it down to the lateness of the hour and the fact that he has obviously not been paying attention. Maybe, he dreamt that part. We asked him to give us an indication of the type of commercial enterprise he has in mind. In answering this question, when we challenged him to give one instance, the only instance he was able to think of was the engineering enterprise.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

It is not caught up under this.

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

It is obviously caught up. Might I ask how an engineering enterprise could not come under the category of "industrial enterprises"? Can he think of a single engineering enterprise that will not come under this category? The truth of the matter is this: The Hon. Minister has either got no clear conception in his own mind of what he wants or, I hate to suggest this, he is not prepared to be frank with this House and to take us into his confidence and say what these particular enterprises he has in mind are.

I remember that when I asked the question the Minister of State interrupted and said, "Why, you can even finance a massage clinic at Mahanuge Gardens", in the course of the Second Reading Debate. That was the Minister of State's interpretation, to which my answer would be that the Mahanuge Gardens massage clinic would be a very exclusive one catering only to the Hilton residents and not to anybody else and for that purpose it will not require foreign assistance at all.

The Hon. Minister of Finance in his reply is unwilling to tell us what exactly he has in mind. Is it surprising that the Opposition, in the circumstances, look with grave suspicion upon this? The Hon. Minister tells us that we are seeing ghosts which are non-existent. We give the categorical assurance that we will lay those ghosts one by one as and when the occasion arises in the future. The entire Statute itself will be dealt with in that way. But I still see no reason why the Hon. Minister cannot tell us what the types of commercial enterprises contemplated are. If you are asking for a widening of authority, away from agricultural enterprises, away from industrial enterprises, away from inter-commercial enterprises, what exactly is it that you have in mind?

May I say this. You are talking in the abstract. It is perfectly plain that what you have in mind is something extremely sinister if you are not even able to formulate it. At least may I ask the Hon. Minister to give us this assurance that before any action is taken in respect of this amorphous commercial enterprise he has in mind, he will at least inform this House and obtain its approval. Under the present law

PUBLIC LIBRARY JAFFNA
Digitized by Noolaham Foundation.
noolaham.org | aavanaham.org

[එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

the objectives of the D.F.C. are widened in an extremely messy way.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

The hon. Member for Dompe was not here when the hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa) suggested that I give a list of specific projects. Now he is imagining that no suggestion like that was made here. He is irrelevant, which is characteristic of his speeches. Listening to him one would think that he has had nothing to do with the finances of this country. If he had practised one-tenth of what he has been preaching today, this country would never be facing the economic situation it is facing today. —[*Interruption*]. He is condemning the World Bank, the I.M.F. and all kinds of organizations. He is the one who attended meetings of these organizations and he never, when he was on this side of the House, advised the Government that these are very sinister organizations which are out to exploit their members and other countries, and that we should have nothing to do with them. Never did he utter a word here to say, when he was Minister of Finance, that these are all dangerous organizations. Now he is trying to preach to us all kinds of theories, and one listening to him without knowing his history will think that he had nothing to do with the finances of this country.

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

ඊනි ප්‍රශ්නයක්. මේ ඇමතිතුමා කියන කථාව යටියන්තොට ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙන සංශෝධනයට කොයි විධියටද අදාළ?

සභාපතිතුමා
(அக்கிராசனர்)
(The Chairman)

ඒක ඊනි ප්‍රශ්නයක් නොවෙයි.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

What I was trying to make out was this. The hon. Member for Dompe does not sit in his seat and—[*Interruption*]. He goes out. And After the hon. Member for Colombo South made the suggestion to me that I should give a specific list of priorities of all the projects that are to be covered by these commercial enterprises, and I replied to him, the hon. Member for Dompe says he did not make a request like that and that I am irrelevant. The hon. Member for Dompe was not here to listen to that. That is not my fault. He should have found out from the hon. Member for Colombo South who made the request.

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

There is one particular aspect which the Hon. Minister has not yet dealt with and that is the question of what are the projects we are going to deal with as commercial enterprises under the proposed amendment. That is the question at issue and that is the matter in regard to which I certainly charge the Hon. Minister with irrelevancy. And I repeat it again because I maintain that the hon. Member for Colombo South did not ask for a specific list of projects or companies that are to be financed by the Development Finance Corporation.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

He did.

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

He did not. I repeat it again and I say that the hon. Member for Colombo South wanted to know the nature of the projects that are going to be financed. This was underscored and repeated time and time again.

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

He says we did not condemn the World Bank as a bad institution or an institution which is going to subvert the economic independence of our country. I respectfully agree with the Hon. Minister to the extent that I never said in the course of the Second Reading Debate or anywhere else that the World Bank is a bad institution. Others may have said it, but certainly not I. All I have said is that whatever the financial functions of the World Bank in regard to Ceylon, they must be channelled through the authority of Parliament and be subject to that authority. And certainly during the period I held that Portfolio, we saw to it that Parliament was always informed. I can also assure the Hon. Minister that we had occasion to receive plenty of money from the World Bank. We had occasion to receive it, declare it in the Central Bank monthly bulletins, and to announce it to the House. On every single occasion it was made subject to parliamentary approval.

What I object to now are the backdoor methods adopted by the Hon. Minister of Finance who introduced World Bank money by the backdoor into private institutions of an unnamed and sinister character which he is not prepared to disclose. He did so under the guise of cmomercial enterprise conducive to economic development, on which he is not prepared to give a categorial statement. That is where the charge lies.

It is no use talking of irrelevancies and other people's thoughts and ideas. Let me remind this Hon. Minister that practically everything he has said at different stages he has had to swallow as a dog returns to his vomit.

එම්. සිවසිතම්පරම් මයා. (උඩුප්පිඩ්ඩි)
(திரு. எம். சிவசிதம்பரம்—உடுப்பிட்டி)
(Mr. M. Sivasithamparam—Uduppiddi)

What about you? You wanted to plant grass.

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

He must first of all remember that if he has taken a lead out of anybody's book, it is out of my book. Let him remember that having first of all condemned any increase in the price of flour, he proceeded to do exactly that, following the 1961 pattern, as early as 1966. Let him also remember that having condemned a rice cut, he promptly proceeded to come back to the rice cut.

එම්. සිවසිතම්පරම් මයා.
(திரு. எம். சிவசிதம்பரம்)
(Mr. M. Sivasithamparam)

Now you are condemning the rice cut. You had better eat your own words.

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

I certainly condemned non-existent world shortages. I said so before. There is a world shortage in corriander ; there is a world shortage in chillies ; there is a world shortage in rice; indeed a world shortage in everything you touch !

එම්. සිවසිතම්පරම් මයා.
(திரு. எம். சிவசிதம்பரம்)
(Mr. M. Sivasithamparam)
Except grass.

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

There is no shortage of grass because I planted enough—

එම්. සිවසිතම්පරම් මයා.
(திரு. எம். சிவசிதம்பரம்)
(Mr. M. Sivasithamparam)

That is why the cattle are dying.

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

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

For people like you to eat. Hon. Members will remember that even if there is a shortage of poonac, they will be all right with my grass.

The Hon. Minister should first of all remember that before he resorts to irrelevancies, he should say what are the commercial enterprises contemplated by this Clause. All that we have up to this moment received in answer is "engineering enterprises might be covered."

සභාපතිතුමා
(அக்கிராசனர்)
(The Chairman)

He says they will not be covered.

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

The only reference so far made by him in one form or another is to the engineering enterprises and nothing else. And that certainly cannot shed any light to this House in regard to what he has in contemplation in this Bill. The suspicions engendered remain exactly where they are. The ghosts have not been laid. The ghosts still remain, not merely for himself but for members of the Government in the days to come.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

I asked the Hon. Minister to prepare a schedule, and said that we would like to know whether it includes hotels, tourism and the like. I did not mention the Galle Face Hotel or some such other company like that. Nor did I ask you to mention specific enterprises. I only mentioned hotels coming under the generic term of enterprise, as the hon. Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike) pointed out. That is what I want, not a list of limited liability companies.

අ. භා. 11

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

The Hon. Minister made a statement which is not borne out by anything in this Bill. I want him to clarify that for our benefit and for the benefit of the country. He gives the impression that no project will be sanctioned by the corporation without the prior knowledge of the Government. There is nothing of that sort in this Bill. I read that again very carefully.

You also referred me to Clause 8 of this Bill. There is nothing here which enjoins the corporation to consult the Government as to the precise projects which they should serve.

The Hon. Minister gave us a list of the enterprises that were launched. I took down the list, under the general term "beverages" for instance, and the amount. I want to know from the Hon. Minister whether certain enterprises have, even in a generic sense, specifically received the prior sanction of the government. I say no, because if they had, how, for instance, could the Government have sanctioned 16 enterprises for barbed wire, creating a glut in the market of wire nails and barbed wire? That means obviously there is something wrong in the whole set-up.

So, if the Hon. Minister says that he will, in the future at least, lay down as a prior condition that the Finance Corporation should get the prior sanction of the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Industries, then that will be some sort of an assurance to us.

There is nothing in the law which enjoins this corporation to come and consult him. Once the moneys have been obtained the Government has to give its approval for any loans from any foreign organization. If it is the I.M.F., or the Irving Trust, or any other trust in the United States, England or Germany or any other country, the Government has to give the sanction.

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

The Government believes it could say, "Oh, this is all right," and the loan would be granted by the institution to the Finance Corporation. Not at all. They might give it to X, Y, or Z within the enterprises specified here. You have absolutely no control. The position is not at all clear. The Development Finance Corporation has to get the money from an approved source. That is as far as control is concerned. The Government has to be satisfied as to the source and the conditions laid down. But once the money gets into the hands of the Corporation, the Government has no control. That was the point raised by the hon. Member for Dompe, and that is why we are worried. The Hon. Minister has not given us an idea of what type of commercial enterprises he has in mind. We are worried because we do not know what they are and you have no control over them. The Government has no control over the directors of the Corporation, except in the case of one.

Let us be frank and face the question. Either the Minister must take more control or tell this House what precisely he has in mind. We must know precisely where we stand.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

In regard to the categories of projects contemplated, I must say I am not in a position to mention them now. I can only say this, that commercial activities which are directly conducive to economic development are the ones that will be entitled to receive assistance.

අත්හැරීමට යෝජනා කළ වචන වගන්තියේ කොටසක් හැටියට තිබිය යුතුය යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදින්, සභා සම්මත විය.

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

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

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

வாசகம், மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்கவேண்டுமெனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

2 ஆம் வாசகம், மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமென ஆணையிடப்பட்டது.

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

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

Clause 2 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

CLAUSE 3.—(*Amendment of Section 5 of the principal Act.*)

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

I move,

"In page 1, leave out lines 35 to 38."

The whole purpose of this subclause is to drop the word "private". The original Section 5 (3) says :

"In carrying out its purposes the Corporation may exercise all or any of the following powers :—

(iii) guarantee loans from other private investment sources ;"

The Minister is now proposing to drop the word "private" and say : "guarantee loans from other investment sources". Why ? The original purpose was to see that when other private individuals gave loans and they wanted a guarantee, the Corporation gave the guarantee. That is an understandable position. But when you drop the word "private", what does that means ? It means that your Development Finance Corporation is now going to guarantee all manner of loans, which is quite unnecessary. Has it to guarantee loans from outside organizations or only bank loans ?

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Bank loans.

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

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

That is what I gather from the statement of legal effect. It says :

". . enable the Corporation to guarantee loans made by State-owned financial institutions such as the Bank of Ceylon, the People's Bank and the Insurance Corporation of Ceylon."

Is it necessary for you to guarantee that over again ?

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

If it becomes necessary.

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

I am not pressing the amendment. I only wanted to get some information.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Only if it becomes necessary.

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

The hon. Member for Yatiyantota raised the question of the meaning of the word "private" in the new section. Well, as I see it the reason for the change can be—I am only guessing the intentions of the Government ; we do not know them—that for the first time we are introducing a new element, a new investment source, namely, a foreign source. What was originally in contemplation were public and private sources in Ceylon. In other words, the original idea was that the money invested in the Development Finance Corporation would be either money of private investors who would contribute to the share capital of the Development Finance Corporation—

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

Section 5 (v) says, "... either in Ceylon or abroad ....". There is provision for that. That is why I do not understand this.

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

If that is the case, there is no real reason for the change.

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

So far as the banks are concerned, they do not want any further guarantees from the Development Finance Corporation.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

If it becomes necessary.

සභාපතිතුමා
(அக்கிராசனர்)
(The Chairman)

Any other amendments ?

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

I move,

"In page 2, leave out lines 4 to 8."

That is, I am moving to leave out the new sub-clause (iii*a*) :

"nominate a representative of the Corporation to serve on the governing body of any enterprise in which the Corporation has a financial interest ;".

In the light of foreign money coming in, there is a danger in this provision. If the loans were entirely local or Government money, I would have no objection, but when you get foreign money coming in there is the possibility of "influence". I want the Hon. Minister to take his mind away from the fact that he is going to

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

be in office always. He is not going to be the Minister of Finance for all time. This provision is not at all necessary. You do not have this power now ; you can buy shares but you have no right to go and nominate directors into organizations. If you like, you can make special mention of the fact that this provision will apply only where the Government is involved, or something like that. This is a dangerous provision. I do not see why you should be given this right.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)
There are two dangers.

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.
(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)
Actually you cannot implement it.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)
You can implement it in a way.

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.
(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)
How can you change the directors of companies ?

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)
The Articles of Association will have to be amended in order to permit it.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)
They will have to amend them ; otherwise, they cannot get loans.

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.
(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)
Who is going to surrender his rights ?

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)
The fact remains that there are two dangers. One is the foreign danger to which the hon. Member for Yatiyantota drew attention. You will get through the Development Finance Corporation one of its persons nominated to the boards in these companies, and you will get these companies more and more subservient not to your direction or to your plans or to your intentions but to the policies that are determined elsewhere by foreign interests. You will get them more and more subservient to foreign interests. That is one pressure.

The other is this. With the best will in the world and with the safeguard that you have got whereby you say that any person who is a shareholder will not be able to give money to any company in which he has an interest, you can still get the position of a shareholder, a subscriber to the Development Finance Corporation being nominated to a board of one of his rivals in business ; and that other body, just because they have asked the Development Finance Corporation for financial assistance, will be compelled to accept as the price of that assistance the nomination of a business rival to their board. How are you going to prevent that ? That is the local danger. There is also the foreign danger.

This can be a most harmful clause. If you are operating on Government funds alone, on that Rs. 16 million, we would have been entirely in agreement, but not in this way, where your control of the Board of Directors of the D.F.C. is so limited. This is a most heinous kind of clause with the most dangerous consequences.

If you provide for a proper audit and inspection of the Development Finance Corporation, a proper check of how that money is spent, that is a different matter. Let the Ministry

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

[බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.]

of Finance and the Planning Secretariat have a report and examine every one of these projects. It will then be your control. We want to increase the Minister's control over these enterprises, not the control of private agencies, local or foreign.

අ. භා. 11.15

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

According to what the hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa) and the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) said, with which I agree, one of the biggest problems we are having with this law in its present draft form is the absolute absence of ministerial control over the Development Finance Corporation. It is not a question of whether we agree with what you are doing but as to whether this is the best way of doing it.

It is quite possible, for instance, under the present framework you are creating, for the D.F.C. to be almost entirely foreign dominated. It is possible for the majority of directors to be foreign. It is quite possible if they contribute sufficient money and take up sufficient shares for them to have a controlling interest in the entire organization. It can happen. The Minister must be alive to the fact that there is no control by which he is given even the power to discriminate and choose in regard to who the foreign agents shall be and who shall have the power to come into the D.F.C. Even that safeguard is not there.

If, for example, the Minister did have such power, it may well be argued that inasmuch as the Minister himself is a Member of this House and to that extent he is subordinate to the control indirectly exercised by this House, to some extent the theoretical objection raised by the Opposition might be met. But that is not the position here. The draft statute presented by the Minister in effect creates powers in the Board of Directors and the shareholders of the new organization, enlarges the share capital and reduces the power of the Government director. And when you seek the power to introduce a controlling element on to the governing body of a commercial enterprise or an agricultural enterprise or an industrial enterprise, you are in effect creating the framework within which a foreign agency or a group of foreign agencies could very well control not merely the policy but even the loyalties of the aid recipient. Take a case where by law the directorate or the shareholders of a particular organization are required to be Ceylonese. It is possible under this framework to introduce a foreigner who is a non-Ceylonese on to that board contrary to the very provisions which we have ourselves enacted in this House. I myself would not have the slightest objection if this law were applicable only where Ceylonese capital or Government capital in one form or another is coming into a private enterprise as indicated by the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera). But that is not the case here.

As to what the Hon. Minister is seeking to do, whether by means of amendment of articles or otherwise, is a question of interpretation at a later stage. It may even be argued that under the wording of this clause it might not be necessary to even amend the articles. It may be argued that automatically the articles are amended to the extent required by the statute. It is possible to found a legal argument on that basis. As to what interpretation may be upheld, one does not know.

I am only stating to the Hon. Minister for his consideration that certainly no harm would be done by deleting the provisions of this clause. There is no overriding reason that anyone can see as to why this clause should be there. Although it may be late in the night and tempers may be getting somewhat frayed, it is

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

certainly a matter that merits consideration and I would therefore ask him to consider the deletion of this particular clause.

සිංහල්ටන්-සැමන් මයා.
(திரு. சிங்கல்டன்-சமன்)
(Mr. Singleton-Salmon)

I was going to bring up the same point that the hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa) has brought up : you might find that a director or a nominee of the Development Finance Corporation was a competitor, and was nominated to the board of a company that had asked for assistance. I was also going to bring up the question as to whether this could be interpreted as having retrospective effect. In other words, this gives the power to nominate a representative of the corporation to serve on the governing body of any enterprise in which the corporation has a financial interest.

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

That has a continuing effect.

සිංහල්ටන්-සැමන් මයා.
(திரு. சிங்கல்டன்-சமன்)
(Mr. Singleton-Salmon)

Not only a continuing effect but an effect that goes back possibly to 1955. And anybody who under the conditions which were in force then between 1955 and March 1967, obtained financial assistance, would now be forced to accept a nominee of the corporation. That is a point I would like the Hon Minister to clarify. Does the actual wording of this amending clause give the corporation the power to nominate directors to boards even though the financial assistance was given many years ago when that provision did not apply ?

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

The nomination of a representative is being done even now under Section 5 (xiv). The amendment seeks to make the practice explicit. You want to make the point that foreign money is coming in and therefore it is dangerous. It is being done now.

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

They have no such power.

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

Have you appointed any directors like that ?

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

It is being done.

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

To which corporation or to which company ? Give us one instance.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Over a dozen.

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

Not that I know of.

සිංහල්ටන්-සැමන් මයා.
(திரு. சிங்கல்டன்-சமன்)
(Mr. Singleton-Salmon)

No.

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

Unless by virtue of shares you have bought.

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

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)
Yes.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා
(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)
That is a different proposition.

සිංගල්ටන්-සැමන් මයා.
(திரு. சிங்கல்டன்-சமன்)
(Mr. Singleton-Salmon)
It has got to be by election to the board and not by nomination.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)
Foreign bodies and organizations cannot buy an unlimited number of shares. That again has got to be approved.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.
(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)
There is no control over it.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)
There is control.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.
(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)
You have no control over it.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා
(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)
Except that you have general powers as a Government.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)
The Central Bank can have control over it.

සභාපතිතුමා
(அக்கிராசனர்)
(The Chairman)
I shall put the amendment to the House.

අත් නැරීමට යෝජනා කළ වචන වගන්තියේ කොටසක් හැටියට තිබිය යුතුය යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදින්, සභාසම්මත විය.

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

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

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

வாசகம், மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்கவேண்டுமெனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

3 ஆம் வாசகம், மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமென ஆணையிடப்பட்டது.

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

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

Clause 3 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

4 වන සහ 5 වන වගන්ති කෙටුම්පත් පණතෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට තිබිය යුතුයයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.

4 ஆம் 5 ஆம் வாசகங்கள், மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமென ஆணையிடப்பட்டது.

Clauses 4 and 5 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

CLAUSE 6.—(*Amendment of Section 10 of the Principal Act.*)

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்சா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)
I move,

"In page 2, line 28, after the word 'directors', to add the words 'provided that one of the directors other than the director appointed under section 10 (2) shall be appointed by the Minister of Finance in consultation with the Minister for the time being in charge of the subject of planning."

The Ministry of Planning will have some voice in the matter of the allocation of these funds. The activities of this corporation will have

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

to be dovetailed according to some plan. It is quite obvious that what we fear about what might happen to these various limited liability companies receiving assistance has already taken place.—[*Interruption*]. The language of this Bill has been drafted somewhere else, and they dare not accept an amendment. He cannot accept a single amendment.

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.
(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)
Who told you that ?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා
(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)
I dare you to make a single amendment.

සභාපතිතුමා
(அக்கிராசனர்)
(The Chairman)
Are you accepting the amendment ?

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)
No.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்ணாட் சொய்சா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)
Is there a Planning Ministry representative in this ?

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)
Yes.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்ணாட் சொய்சா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)
How is he in this ?

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)
All foreign aid must come through the Ministry of Planning. It happens now, and it will happen in the future.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்ணாட் சொய்சா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)
It happens and can happen only so long as loans are given to Government, but where loans are given to the Development Finance Corporation there is no guarantee that it must go through the Planning Ministry. It has nothing to do with the Government. It can be a private negotiation between those parties.

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.
(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)
I do not think so.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்ணாட் சொய்சா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)
Why ? Supposing you approve Rs. 2 million and you get the Rs. 2 million. What about the detailed allocation of that sum ? It will have to be allocated according to the needs of your plan and the extension of your plan into the private sector.—[*Interruption*]. You are not accepting it ?

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)
I am not accepting the amendment.

එම වචන එකතු කළ යුතුය, යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදින්, නිෂ්ප්‍රභ විය.

6 වන වගන්තිය කෙටුම්පත් පණතෙහි කොට සක් හැටියට තිබිය යුතුය, යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදින්, සභාසම්මත විය.

6 වන වගන්තිය කෙටුම්පත් පණතෙහි කොට සක් හැටියට තිබිය යුතුයයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.

குறித்த சொற்கள் அங்கே சேர்க்கப்படவேண்டுமெனும் விஞ்ஞ விடுக்கப்பட்டு நிராகரிக்கப்பட்டது.

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

6 ආම් වාසකම්, මසෝතාවින් පකුතියාක ඉරුක්ක වේණ්ටුමෙනුම් විණ්ණ විටුක්කප්පට්ටු ඒත්‍රුක්කොළ්ළප් පට්ටතු.

6 ආම් වාසකම්, මසෝතාවින් පකුතියාක ඉරුක්ක වේණ්ටුමෙන ආණෙයිටප්පට්ටතු.

Question, that those words be there inserted, put, and negatived.

Question, that Clause 6 stand part of the Bill, put, and agreed to.

Clause 6 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

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

7 ආම් වාසකම්, මසෝතාවින් පකුතියාක ඉරුක්ක වේණ්ටුමෙන ආණෙයිටප්පට්ටතු.

Clause 7 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

CLAUSE 8.—(*Amendment of Section 14 of the principal Act.*)

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

I propose the deletion of the words in lines 5 to 12 on page 3. The whole purpose of my amendment is to remove the foreign organizations, namely, any international or foreign organization other than the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

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

He should logically move the deletion of (2) (*a*) and (*b*).

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

I will be moving them separately.

I do not want to speak at length. The Government is keen on getting financial assistance from all manner of foreign organizations, from organizations of one type or another. If the Hon. Minister seriously objects to our saying that this is money coming from the United States of America—he says there is nothing here to indicate that it is coming from the United States of America—he must tell us the truth instead of playing hide and seek.

අ. භා. 11.30

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

There is nothing to prevent us getting the money from Japan or Germany.

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

I quite agree. It is possible that you can get aid from Japan and Western Germany. It can be from England. It can even be from France. But certainly it will not be from the socialist countries because socialist countries will never give except on a government to government basis.

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

How do you know ?

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

They may not have given, but they may give.

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

We have had offers from Czechoslovakia and Rumania. They have made offers.

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

They will finance private organizations ?

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

They also change. They are not static.

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

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

They cannot possibly change their basis. Czechoslovakia and Rumania have not changed. Are you talking of any institution in Czechoslovakia or Rumania which is not owned by the Government? There are no private organizations there. What are you talking about?

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

They have made offers.

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

They have made offers through the institutions run by Government and owned by Government. I am prepared to believe that money can possibly come in, but if you imagine that Japan or Western Germany can give you money, you are mistaken. There is only one country that is in a position to give you aid—the United States of America. Western Germany is not in a position to give you any help at the present moment. Malaysia is in a better position because I. B. R. D. loans are coming in Malaysian dollars.

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන .
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

What about Kuwait?

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

They might come and invest in hotels, but at very high rates of interest. Let us not kid ourselves. The Hon. Minister knows that this Bill has been drafted by the World Bank, that these are the conditions laid down by the World Bank. Anyhow, so far as we are concerned, we are opposed to this. However, we do not mind any government to government transaction.—We have no objection to that—or finance through an international organization like the U. N. O. Then there is a guarantee that there will be no exploitation of our country, that they will not use a thing like the Hickenlooper Amendment as a big stick over us. That is the important point. The important thing is that aid must not be channelled through a private organization. It must be government to government or through some international organization. That is why I am pressing the amendment.

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, 3 වැනි පිටුවේ 5 වැනි පේළියේ "ලැබූ" යන වචනයට අගින් "එහෙත් ඇමරිකන් ධන බලය නො මැති" යන වචන එකතු කළ යුතුය යන සංශෝධනය මා ඉදිරිපත් කරනව.

ඒ සංශෝධනයත් සහිතව ඒ වැකිය කියැවෙන්නේ "ප්‍රතිසංස්කරණය හා සංවර්ධනය පිළිබඳ ජාත්‍යන්තර බැංකුවෙන් හෝ රජය විසින් අනුමත කරනු ලැබූ එහෙත් ඇමරිකන් ධන බලය නො මැති වෙන යම් ජාත්‍යන්තර හෝ විදේශීය සංවිධානයකින්" කියලයි. මේ සංශෝධනය ඉදිරිපත් කිරීමට හේතුව මේකයි: මා කලින් කථා කර වාඩි වූ හැටියේම ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා ඇහුව, ඇමරිකන් සල්ලි පමණක්ය කියා තිබෙන්නෙ කොතනද, කියල. එහෙනම් මේ ප්‍රතිසංස්කරණය හා සංවර්ධනය පිළිබඳ ජාත්‍යන්තර බැංකුව කාගෙ එකක්ද කියා ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා කියන්න. එහි චීන සල්ලි තිබෙනවද? බුරුම සල්ලි තිබෙනවද? නවසීලන්තයේ සල්ලි තිබෙනවද? මේ ප්‍රතිසංස්කරණය හා සංවර්ධනය පිළිබඳ ජාත්‍යන්තර බැංකුව කියන එක කාගෙ වැඩක්ද? එහි තිබෙන්නෙ කාගෙ සල්ලිද? එහි ඕස්ට්‍රේලියාවේ සල්ලි තිබෙනවද? නව චීනයේ හෝ පෝමෝසාවේ සල්ලි තිබෙනවද? එහි සියයට 70 ක් පමණම තිබෙන්නෙ ඇමරිකාවේ සල්ලි නේද?

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

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon Wanninayake)
අපේ සල්ලිත් නිබෙනව.

ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්
(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)
(An hon. Member)
කිරිල්ලි කියල දන්නෙ කොහොමද?

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)
තමුන්නාන්සෙගෙ සල්ලි ගන්න නම් පනතක් ඕනැයැ. තමුන්නාන්සේලා මේ විධියට මිනිසුන් රවටන්නේ ඇයි? අපි මේක කරන්නෙ ඇමරිකන්කාරයින්ට ඕනෑ විධියටයි කියා කිව්වම කථාවක් නැහැනෙ.

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)
කිරිල්ලි නේන්නම්. තමුන්නාන්සේලාට ඒකවත් තේරුම් ගන්න බැරිද? ජනසතු කළ ඇමරිකන් තෙල් සමාගම් වල දේපොලවලට වන්දි නොදෙන්නේ නම් ඇමරිකාවෙන් සතයක්වත් දෙන්නේ නැත කිව්ව.

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.
(திரு. ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ)
(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)
කියන්නම්, කියන්නම්.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon Wanninayake)
කවුද කිව්වෙ?

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)
තමුන්නාන්සෙ නම් කියාවි. තමුන්නාන්සෙ ඉන්නෙ කොයි වෙලාවෙ ගිහින් සැතපෙන්නද කියල බලාගෙනයි. අපි මෙය කරන්නෙ සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම ඇමරිකන් සල්ලිවලට යට වෙලාය කියා ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා කියන්න.

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)
ඇමරිකන් තානාපතිවරිය.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)
කාටද කිව්වෙ?

ඇමරිකන් සල්ලි ටිකක් තැන්පත් කර තිබුණු තෙල් සමාගම් ජනසතු කළ අවස්ථාවේ අපට සිදු වුණේ මොකක්ද - තෙල් සමාගම්වල වැඩිපුර තිබුණේ බ්‍රිතාන්‍යයේ සල්ලි. එහෙත් ඇමරිකන් සමාගම් දෙකක් වන "කැල්ටෙක්ස්" හා "සොකනි" සමාගම් ජනසතු කළ අවස්ථාවේ ඇමරිකන් සල්ලි නිසා අපට සිදු වුණේ මොකක්ද? ඒ දවස්වල මෙහි ඇමරිකන් තානාපති කාර්යාලයේ සිටි කිරිල්ලි අපට තර්ජනය කළා නේද?

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)
ඒ දිනවල තිබුණු ආණ්ඩුවට. ඒ සිද්ධිය හැම පත්තරයකම පළ වුණා. ඇයි තමුන්නාන්සේලා දන්නෙ නැද්ද? ඊට පසු, මේ ආණ්ඩුව බලයට පත් වුණාට පසු, මේ කුරුල්ලො ගිහින් ඒකෙ ලැගල ඇමරිකන්කාරයින් සමග බිත්තර දමන්නට පටන් ගත්ත.

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

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

කුරුල්ලො බිත්තර දමනවයැ.

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

ඇමරිකන් සල්ලිවලට ඉඩ දුන්නම වෙන දේ ඒකයි. ඒ නිසා ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා සඳහන් කළ ආකාරයට පොදු වේ හැම රටකින්ම ලැබෙන එකක් නම් අපට බයක් නැහැ. ඒ නිසා මා ඉදිරිපත් කළ සංශෝධනය පිළිගන්න. පොදුවේ ජාත්‍යන්තර වශයෙන් හැම රටකින්ම ලැබෙන සල්ලිවලින් අපේ ආර්ථික දියුණුව ඇති කර ගන්න නම්—එයට අකමැත්තක් නැත්නම්—මේ සංශෝධනය පිළිගැනීමට තමුන්නාන්සේලාට පුළුවන්. එසේ නැතිව ඇමරිකන් සල්ලිවලට මුල් තැනක් දීලා කටයුතු කරන්නට ගියොත් අර වගේ තර්ජන ඇති වන්නට පුළුවන්.

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, මේ පනත් කෙටුම්පත දෙවැනි වර කියවීමේ විවාදයේදී විරුද්ධ පක්ෂය වෙනුවෙන් කථා කළ හැම ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයකුම කිව්ව තමුන්නාන්සේලාගේ ආණ්ඩුව යටතේ මේ විදේශ සල්ලි මේ රටට ගෙන්වා ගත්තත් යම් දවසක විරුද්ධ පක්ෂයට බලය ලැබී ආණ්ඩුවක් පිහිටෙව්වොත්, ඔවා ජනසතු කරනවා කරනවාමයි කියල. මේ පනත ඔය විධියට ගියොත් අර තෙල් ජනසතුවේදී අපට තර්ජනය කළා වගේ, මේ ඇමරිකන් සල්ලි ජනසතු කරන විටත් ඇඟිල්ල උලුක්කර අපට තර්ජනය කරාවි. ඒ නිසා ඇමරිකන් ධන බලයට යටත් නොවන ආයතනවලින් පමණක් මේ ආධාර ලබා ගන්නට අපි කැමතියි කියන මේ සංශෝධනය පිළිගන්න.

ජයකොඩි මයා.
(திரு. ஜயக்கொடி)
(Mr. Jayakody)

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, යටියන්තොට ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා) විසින් සංශෝධනයක් ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙනවා. එම සංශෝධනය නම් 3 වැනි පිටුවේ 5 වැනි පේළියේ සිට 11 වැනි පේළිය තෙක් ඇති වචන ටික ඉවත් කරන්නය කියන එකයි.

"Approved by the Government" යනුවෙන් 4 වන පිටුවේ 9 වන හා 10 වන පේළිවල සඳහන් වචන "approved by the House of Representatives of Ceylon" යනුවෙන් සංශෝධනය කරන ලෙසයි මා කියන්නෙ. අප දන්නවා, විශේෂයෙන් පුද්ගලික අංශයෙ කර්මාන්ත සඳහා මුලින්ම අනුමත කරන අය නොවෙයි අවසානයේදී එම කර්මාන්ත ගෙන යන්නෙ. මේ වගෙ පුද්ගලික අංශයෙ කර්මාන්ත ලාංකික යන්ට දුන් අවස්ථාවලදි ඒ සමහර ලාංකිකයන් තමන් සතුව තිබුණු කොටස් විශාල වශයෙන් බෝරකාරයන්ට, ඉන්දියානුවන්ට මෙන්ම වෙනත් නොයෙකුත් විදේශිකයන්ට විකිණීම නිසා, ලාංකික යන්ට දුන් කර්මාන්ත අවසානයේදී හිමි කර ගෙන තිබෙන්නෙ මේ රට සූරා කන පිරිසක් විසින් බව අපට බොහෝ අවස්ථාවල පෙනී ගොස් තිබෙනවා. ඒ නිසා රජය අනුමත කළ පුද්ගලයන්ම එම කර්මාන්ත පවත්වා ගෙන යාවිය කියා අපට විශ්වාසයක් තබන්ට බැහැ. ඒ විධියට කටයුතු සිදු වී ඇති බව මා හොඳාකාර දන්නා නමුත් මේ අවස්ථාවේදි එම පුද්ගලයන් නම් කරන්ට යන්නෙ නැහැ. එම නිසා ඒ කර්මාන්ත ලාංකිකයන්ගෙන් පිට යාමට ඉඩ නොදී ආරක්ෂා කළොත්, මා හිතනවා සෑහෙන දුරට ස්වාධීන ලාංකික කර්මාන්ත ව්‍යාපාර ගෙන යන්ට පුළුවන් වේය කියා. එම නිසා, එම වචන අස් කිරීමට ගරු ඇමතිතුමාට පුළුවන්කමක් නැත්නම් අඩු

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

[ජයකොඩි මයා.]

ගණනේ ඒවා අනුමත කළ යුත්තේ මේ ගරු සභාවේ අනුමැතිය ඇතිව බව සඳහන් කරන මෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටිනව.

මා එම සංශෝධනය ඉදිරිපත් කිරීමේ තවත් හේතුවක් තිබෙනව. විශේෂයෙන් 3 වන ඡේදයේ 2 වන උප ඡේදයේ (III අ) වගන්තිය යටතේ ගරු ඇමතිතුමා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනව, විදේශිකයන් ලංකාවේ සංවර්ධන මුදල් නීතිගත සංස්ථාව යටතේ නොයෙකුත් කර්මාන්තවලට සම්බන්ධ කරගන්ට. ඒ අනුව විදේශිකයන්ට සැහෙන බලයක් ලැබෙනව, අපේ කර්මාන්ත පාලනය කිරීම සඳහා කටයුතු කරන්ට. ඒ අනුව එම සංස්ථාවෙ පාලක මණ්ඩලයට විදේශිකයන් ඇතුළු වුණාම අපේ කර්මාන්තවල ආරක්ෂාව ක්‍රමයෙන් අඩු වන්ට ඉඩ තිබෙන නිසා, ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් මේ ගරු සභාවේ අනුමැතිය ලැබිය යුතුය යන සංශෝධනය පිළිගන්නා මෙන් මා ගරු ඇමතිතුමාගෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටිනව.

අ. භා. 11.45

සභාපතිතුමා

(அக்கிராசனர்)

(The Chairman)

I shall put the amendment of the hon. Member for Yatiyantota to the House, viz., to delete the words in lines 5 to 12 on page 3.

අත්හැරීමට යෝජනා කළ වචන වගන්තියේ කොටසක් හැටියට තිබිය යුතුය යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදින්, සභා සම්මත විය.

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

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

සභාපතිතුමා

(அக்கிராசனர்)

(The Chairman)

The amendment of hon. Member for Habaraduwa, is to add the words "එහෙත් ඇමෙරිකන් ධන බලය නොමැති" after the word "ලැබූ" in page 3, line 5.

එම වචන එකතු කළ යුතුය, යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදින්, නිෂ්ප්‍රභ විය.

குறித்த சொற்கள் அங்கே சேர்க்கப்படவேண்டுமெனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு நிராகரிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, that those words be there added, put, and negatived.

සභාපතිතුමා

(அக்கிராசனர்)

(The Chairman)

The amendment of the hon. Member for Divulapitiya, viz., to delete the words "approved by the Government" in page 4, line 9, and insert the words "approved by the House of Representatives of Ceylon".

අත්හැරීමට යෝජනා කළ වචන වගන්තියේ කොටසක් හැටියට තිබිය යුතුය යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදින්, සභා සම්මත විය.

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

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

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I move,

"In page 4, line 13, to leave out the words "The Governor-General" and insert the words "The Minister of Finance.".

සභාපතිතුමා

(அக்கிராசனர்)

(The Chairman)

Are you accepting that amendment?

ගරු වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

No.

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

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

You said in the Second Reading Debate that you will. Does the World Bank object to that also?

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

The Governor-General has hitherto come in only for foreign loans raised on behalf of the Government.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

On behalf of all Government corporations.

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

No. I like to be corrected if I am wrong. My recollection is that the Governor-General has up to date never signed any document. It becomes a very reprehensible practice if the Governor-General is brought in to guarantee private loans.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

"Or any person authorized . . . . by the Governor-General"——

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

The authorization must be by him. In other words, the responsibility is on him. Why are you placing this responsibility on him? Why cannot the Minister take the responsibility? Do you think the World Bank and the various institutions are not satisfied with the *imprimatur* of the Minister of Finance?

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Foreign Government or agent of foreign Government or of any international organization.

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

Granted to the Ceylon Government, not to private organizations—certainly not to private organization—[*Interruption*]. How can you get the Governor-General to guarantee somebody else's private loan? Take Moosajees, for instance.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

No.

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

What did you say?

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

He is guaranteeing the loan to the D. F. C.

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

The Chase Manhattan Bank is not prepared to give you a loan unless the Governor-General signs as guarantor.

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

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

He is guaranteeing the loan to the D. F. C.

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

The D. F. C. is not a Government institution. What it says is this :

"The Governor-General, or any person authorized in that behalf by the Governor-General by instrument under his hand is hereby empowered, on behalf of the Government, to sign any guarantee agreement between the Government and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development or any other international or foreign organization approved by the Government."

I am sorry. I do not think we can possibly agree to the Governor-General being brought down to the position of having to sign any such agreement. We are pressing this to a Division.

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, යටියන්නොට ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ආචාර්‍ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා) මෙම සංශෝධනය ඉදිරිපත් කරමින් එක් තරා හේතූන් වගයක් කිව්ව. මම මේ සංශෝධනයට පක්ෂ වෙන්නෙ ඒ හේතූන් නිසා පමණක් නොවෙයි. කිසියම් පෞද්ගලික සමාගමකට ලැබෙන ණයක් සඳහා විදේශික කොම්පැණියකට අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාර වරයා ඇප වුණාට පසුව මේ මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ පැවැත්වෙන විවාද වලදී ඒ ගැන විවේචන කරන්ට ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්ට නිදහස තිබෙන්න ඕනෑ. අපි කියමු, බංකොලොත් වුණු පෞද්ගලික සමාගම කට ඇමෙරිකන් බැංකුවකින් ණය මුදලක් දුන්නා කියා. මේක සම්පූර්ණයෙන් වෙළඳ ක්‍රම අතිනුත් නරක වැඩක්. එවැනි අවස්ථාවක ඒ ණයට ඇපකාරයා වූ පුද්ගලයා මේ ගරු සභාවේදී විවේචනය කිරීමේ නිදහස අපට තිබෙන්ට ඕනෑ. එහෙත් අපේ 88 වෙනි සහ 89 වෙනි ස්ථාවර නියෝග යටතේ අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරවරයා ගැන වචන යක්වත් කියන්ට පුළුවන්කමක් නැහැ, විශේෂ යෝජනාවක් ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නෙ නැතිව. ඇයි මේ සංශෝධනය මාර්ගයෙන් අපේ අත පය බැඳ දමන්ට ඉඩ දෙන්නෙ? අපි ඇපකාරයෙකුට ඉදිරිපත් වන්ට ඉඩ දෙනව. ඒ සමගම ඒ ඇපකාරයා ගැන වචනයක්වත් කියන්ට එපා කියන ස්ථාවර නියෝගය යටතේ අපේ අත පය බැඳෙනව. මේක මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්ගේ බල තල සීමා කර ගැනීමක්. මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා සමහර විට මේ ගැන කල්පනා නොකළා වෙන්ට ඇති. ලෝක බැංකුව දන්නෙ නැහැ, අපේ ස්ථාවර අණපනත්වල තිබෙන්නෙ මොන වාද කියා.

කබල් කොම්පැණියකට දෙන ණයක් සම්බන්ධයෙන් අපේ අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරවරයා ඇපකාරයා වෙනව. [බාධාකිරීමක්] මොක ද නැත්තෙ? එවැනි අවස්ථාවක අපට පහර ගහන්ට සිද්ධ වෙන්නෙ මුදල් ඇමතිවරයාට නොවෙයි. අපට පහර ගහන්ට සිදු වෙන්නෙ ඇපකාරයාටයි. නීතිඥයකු හැටියට තමුන්නාන්සේ දන්නව කෙනෙක් ඇපයකට ඉදිරිපත් වුණාම මුල් විත්තිකරු හිටි ගමන් අතුරුදන් වුණොත් ඇපකාරයාට සිතෑඩි කරන බව. ඔහුගෙන් ඇපය රාජසන්තක නොකරන්ට හේතු මොනවාදැයි අහනව. මේ මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේදීත් අපට ඒ අයිතිය තිබෙන්ට ඕනෑ. ඇපකාරයා මේ මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය ඉදිරියට ගෙනත් තමුන්නාන්සේ ඉදිරිපත් කළ

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

ඇපය රාජ්සන්තක නොකරන්ට, ඒ ගැන වග නොකියන්ට හේතු තිබෙනවාදැයි අහන්ට අපට බලය තිබෙන්න ඕනෑ. කවුද මේ ඇපකාරයා? අළුත් සංශෝධනය යටතේ අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරයායි ඇපකාරයා. කථානායකතුමා මූලාසනයේ වාඩිවෙලා කියාවි, අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරතුමා ගැන වචනයක්වත් කියන්ට එපා කියා. එහෙත් අප මෙතැන සම්මත කරන්ට යන නීතිය යටතේ අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරතුමාට ඇපකරු හැටියට අත්සන් කරන්ට ඉඩ දී තිබෙනව. මේක කැකිල්ලෙ රජ්ජුරුවන්ටත් අහන්ට බැරි නඩුවක්. කරුණාකර ලෝක බැංකුවට කියන්න, අපේ ස්ථාවර නියෝග යටතේ මෙවැනි කරුණකට ඉඩ නැහැ කියා.

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)
හොඳයි.

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)
තමුන්නාන්සෙ නොවෙයි. මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාට කියන්න එහෙම කියන්න කියල. [බාධාකිරීමක්] තමුන්නාන්සෙලාට ටෙලි ග්‍රෑම් එන දවස එතරම් දුර නොවෙයි. ටෙලි ග්‍රෑම් එක ළඟදීම එනව.

මේ වගේ අවුල් සහිත නීති සම්මත කර ගන්ට හදන්නේ ඇයි? දවසක් මේ වගේ තකහනියේ සමුපකාර නොග වෙළඳ සංස්ථාවේ නීති සංශෝධනය සඳහා පනතක් රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා ගෙනාව. එහෙත් සංශෝධනය කිරීමෙන් පසු නීතිගත වුණේ මුලින් ගෙනා සංශෝධන පනත නොවෙයි. ඊටත් වඩා අන්න අවුලකටයි, මේක පත් වෙන්නෙ. කොහේවත් සිටින තමුන්නාන්සේලාගේ නායකයෝ, තමුන්නාන්සේලාට නියෝග නිකුත් කරන ඇමෙරිකන්කාරයෝ කියන විධියට නීති ගෙනල්ල සම්මත කර ගන්නව. ඒව ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්ට ගියාම අමාරුවෙ වැටෙනව. මේව කළාට තමුන්නාන්සේලාට වැටී සිටින අමාරුවෙන් බේරෙන්ට පුළුවන් කමක් නැහැ.

ජයකොඩි මයා.
(திரு. ஜயக்கொடி)
(Mr. Jayakody)
ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මේ වගන්තියෙන් සැහෙන තරම් දුරට අපේ ස්වාධීනත්වය නැතිවී යනව. ඒ වගේම යටියන්තොට ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ආචාර්‍ය්‍ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා) තම සංශෝධනයෙන් කියන්නෙ, මෙයට මුදල් ඇමතිවරයාගේ හෝ භාණ්ඩාගාරයේ ලේකම්තුමාගේ හෝ මහ බැංකුවේ අධිපතිතුමාගේ හෝ නම යොදන්න කියලයි. ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම විදේශීය ණයක් ලබාගන්න කොම්පැණියක් බංකොලොත් වුණායයි හිතමු. එවැනි අවස්ථාවක ඔවුන්ගේ ලංකාවේ තිබෙන සල්ලි ටික ගෙන යන්ට වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් යොදාගෙන යන අවස්ථාවකදී මොකක් හෝ නඩුවක් ඇති වන්ට ඉඩ තිබෙනව. එහෙම අවස්ථාවක සමහරවිට දුප්පත් අහිංසක කෙනෙක් අමාරුවෙ වැටෙන්ට ඉඩ තිබෙනව. මේ මුදල් ඇමතිවරයා නොවෙයි, වෙන මුදල් ඇමතිවරයෙක් ඔය ස්ථානයේ වාඩි වන්ට ඉඩ තිබෙනව. වෙනත් කෙනෙක් භාණ්ඩාගාරයේ ලේකම් වශයෙන් පත් වන්ට ඉඩ තිබෙනව. සමහරවිට මේ ගරු සභාවේ සිටින අගමැතිතුමා අර අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාර තත්ත්වයට පත්වන්ට පුළුවන්කම තිබෙනව. එවැනි අවස්ථාවකදී මේ සංශෝධන පනත අනුව අගමැතිවරයා අල්ලා ගන්නෙ අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරවරයාගේ බෙල්ලෙන්. එම නිසා ඉතා ඉක්මන් සුදුසු සංශෝධනය හැටියට, මේ

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

[ජයකොඩි මයා.]

සංශෝධන පනතේ 8 වෙනි වගන්තියේ යොදා ඇති, මුල් පනතේ 14 වන වගන්තියට අළුතෙන් ඇතුළත් කිරීමට යෝජනා කර තිබෙන අංක 7 දරණ උප වගන්තියට පහත දැක්වෙන වචන ටික ඇතුළත් කරන ලෙස මා ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා:

"The Hon. Ukku Banda Wanninayake, the Minister of Finance, or any person authorized in that behalf by instrument under his hand, is hereby empowered."

"Governor-General" යන්න වෙනුවට "The Hon. Ukku Banda Wanninayake" කියන නම යෙදුවොත් මතුවට ඔය ස්ථානයට පත්වන අනික් අයට උසාවිවලට ඉදිරිපත් නොවී බේරෙන්ට පුළුවන්.

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

කටහඬවල් අනුව පක්ෂ මන්ත්‍රීන්ට ජය බව සභාපති විසින් ප්‍රකාශ කරන ලදී.

விடப்பட வேண்டுமென பிரேரிக்கப்பட்ட சொற்கள் வாசகத்தின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமெனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பெற்றது.

குரல்களின்படி "ஆம்" என்பவர்களுக்கு வெற்றி யென சபாநாயகர் அவர்களால் பிரகடனப்படுத்தப் பட்டது.

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

THE CHAIRMAN, *having collected the Voices, declared that the "Ayes" had it.*

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

මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය 48 වන ස්ථාවර නියෝගය යටතේ—පක්ෂව 34; විරුද්ධව 8; යනුවෙන්—බෙදුණේය.

சபை, 48 ஆம் நிலையற் கட்டளையின் கீழ் பிரிந்தது; சார்பாக 34; எதிராக 8.

The House divided (under Standing Order No. 48) : Ayes 34; Noes 8.

රාත්‍රී 12

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

I have another amendment. I move,

"In page 4, after line 32, add:

'As soon as possible after the end of each financial year the Minister of Finance shall cause to be laid before the Senate and the House of Representatives a Report on the Statement of Accounts of the Development Finance Corporation and of every loan, bond and guarantee entered into under this Act as amended, during the course of that financial year.'"

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.
(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)
(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

I was going to suggest the same amendment to Section 16 of the Act which talks about a report.

සිංගල්ටන්-සැමන් මයා.
(திரு. சிங்கல்டன்-சமன்)
(Mr. Singleton-Salmon)

Sir, on a point of Order, can the hon. Member propose an amendment to a section which is not in the Bill before the House—[*Interruption*]. It has been held in this House many times that you cannot move amendments to sections that are not mentioned in the amending Bill.

සභාපතිතුමා
(அக்கிராசனர்)
(The Chairman)

I uphold the point of Order.

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

In that case, my amendment stands. I have already moved it.

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

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

Sir, the hon. Member for Dompe's amendment is also an amendment to the original Act.—[*Interruption*].

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

I am not talking of the report transmitted to the Minister of Finance by the board of directors. That is not the report I am contemplating. I am contemplating now a report by the Minister to the House. The Minister can receive a report from the directors, and I am asking that the Minister should inform the House. I am not even asking for the approval of the House. I am asking that it should be laid before the Senate and the House of Representatives, especially now that the Governor-General is going to make guarantees.

සභාපතිතුමා
(அக்கிராசனர்)
(The Chairman)

The hon. Member for Dompe is in Order. He says that as the Governor-General is going to sign certain bonds, they should be placed before the House.

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

I am not asking the Governor-General to come here. I am asking the Minister to cause to be laid a report of the transactions of the D.F.C. under these provisions.

When I consider the situation of the Minister of Finance I am reminded of a debtor I once saw in the courts who when asked the reason for his indebtedness and was being examined under section 219 of the Civil Procedure Code said, "What to do when happen comes." The situation of that man is analogous to the situation in which the Minister of Finance finds himself today.

It is true that the World Bank is having a consortium meeting in April and it is true that the Minister in the hope of getting something practical is compelled to pass a law in these terms, but I do not think it will be necessary for us to grovel so low. But now that this law has been introduced, let us at least preserve the elements of self-respect of this House by accepting this amendment under which this House will at least be acquainted and informed of all actions that are going to be taken under this law. I am not asking that there should be approval or disapproval. I am not even in the course of this amendment seeking to create any problems for the Minister of Finance. I am asking that this House must have full information of all actions that have been taken. I want the papers laid before the Senate and the House of Representatives. If somebody wants to disapprove of something he will bring in a substantive Motion, but I am not asking for any form of approval or disapproval which would in any way delay the proceedings or actions of the Minister in obtaining assistance from the World Bank. I am asking for a report in regard to the accounts

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

[එව්ජ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

of the previous financial year, and in regard to guarantees, loans and bonds. I am asking you to table a report in this House in regard to the accounts of the previous year plus bonds, loans and guarantees.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I accept it.

එම වචන එකතැනට එකතු කළ යුතුය, යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදින්, සභාසම්මත විය.

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

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

அச் சொற்கள் அங்கே சேர்க்கப்படவேண்டும் எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

வாசகம் திருத்தப் பெற்றவாறு மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்கவேண்டுமெனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக் கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

8 ஆம் வாசகம் திருத்தப்பெற்றவாறு மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமென ஆணையிடப்பட்டது.

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

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

Clause 8, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

CLAUSE 9.—(*Amendment of section 18 of the principal Act.*)

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

I move,

"In page 4, leave out lines 35 to 40."

There is an existing definition of "agricultural enterprise." I want the original definition to come back.

සභාපතිතුමා
(அக்கிராசனர்)
(The Chairman)

You want the entirety of lines 35 to 40 deleted ?

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

Yes.

සභාපතිතුමා
(அக்கிராசனர்)
(The Chairman)

Is the Hon. Minister of Finance accepting that amendment ?

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

No.

සභාපතිතුමා
(அக்கிராசனர்)
(The Chairman)

Is the hon. Member for Yatiyantota pressing his amendment ?

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

There are two objections to this amendment. I would like to know why the Hon. Minister cannot possibly allow an agricultural enterprise run by an individual to get any assistance from the Development Finance Corporation. Why are you only restricting it to limited liability companies ?

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

No, Sir.

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

I do not see the point in your objection. If you are broadening this out getting the Development Finance Corporation to assist all

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

agricultural enterprises, whether it is by individuals or limited liability companies, it would not make a difference.

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

Control is more difficult in the case of individuals.

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

The Development Finance Corporation has assisted individuals. As a result of this amending Bill, are you going to withdraw all the loans you have granted ?

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

The definition says, "commercial enterprise".

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

I am talking about agricultural enterprises. In the subsequent definition you find that "commercial enterprise" includes any large scale enterprise operated by a limited liability company, and therefore does not exclude private individuals. You have a private sector. Sub-clause (1) says, for the words "enterprise operated on a commercial basis", substitute the words "enterprise operated by a limited liability company on a commercial basis." Therefor, only those organizations will get help.

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

We want to widen the scope.

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

I do not see the reason. You have already helped private individuals. What about partnerships ? Why not cover them, too ? If partnerships or individual enterprises deserve to be helped, the Development Finance Corporation should look into them and help them. I do not see why they should not be helped. I do not quite follow the logic of this.

At least the Hon. Minister must tell us what will happen to those people who have already got assistance.

ගරු වන්නිනායක
(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

No new loans have been granted.

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

That cannot be correct. Look at your own list. Those people who, for instance, manufacture barbed wire and so on, are not companies. There are plenty of individuals like that.

What we should like to know from the Minister is why idividuals cannot get help. If an individual is running an enterprise satisfactorily and he wants assistance, the Development Finance Corporation, if it is satisfied, should grant him a loan.

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

He is not excluded.

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

He is excluded under "agricultural enterprises", but not under "commercial enterprises." Does the Minister say that agricultural enterprises are sufficiently covered ? I do

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

[ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා]

not think so. Anyhow, there must be some logical reason for your showing a difference of treatment as between agricultural enterprises and commercial enterprises.

ගරු වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

The general practice I understand in Development Finance Corporations is to give preference to limited liability companies when this kind of assistance is given. That I understand is the reason why private individuals have been left out. I suppose at a later stage, if it is found necessary that private individuals should be included, it can be done.

සභාපතිතුමා

(அக்கிராசனர்)

(The Chairman)

Are you pressing the amendment ?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

No.

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

ප්‍රඥප්ති වගන්ති සහ නාමය කෙටුම්පත් පණතෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට තිබිය යුතුයයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.

කෙටුම්පත් පණත, සංශෝධන රහිතව, වාර්තා කරන ලදී.

9 ஆம் வாசகம் மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமென ஆணையிடப்பட்டது.

சட்டமாகு வாசகமும் தலைப்பும் மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமென ஆணையிடப்பட்டது.

மசோதா திருத்தமின்றி ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டதாக அறிவிக்கப்பட்டது.

Clause 9 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

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

Bill reported with Amendment.

ගරු වන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

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

ප්‍රශ්නය සභාභිමුඛ කරන ලදී.

விஞ எடுத்தியம்பப்பெற்றது.

Question proposed.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I move to leave out the word " now ", and at the end of the Question to add the words " on the 30th June 1967 ".

I say the 30th of June for the specific reason that the World Bank consortium is to meet in the middle of April and it will be very interesting to see how much they are prepared to give between April and June, before this Bill is passed. Our information is that this is another of those conditions, one of the pressure moves, of which we have had several examples in the past, brought to bear upon this Government by the World Bank as part of its technique of forcing this Government into a tight corner and into very undesirable situations. We have already had a case before this, of the hon. Member for Yatiyantota reading a letter in relation to a document which to this date remains undenied. It relates to a promise made in 1965 to reduce the rice ration in 1966. We have also witnessed now the spectacle of a Minister being constrained to present laws with which he himself is obviously unhappy. We agree that he is placed in a difficult position, but at the same time, I think we must not succumb to this kind of pressure when we are told as a legislative body, " You must pass this law and come to us before a certain deadline date ". They have put off their consortium meeting *sine die* merely to create problems for the Government of Ceylon. Therefore I think it only fair that in deference

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

to our self-respect we too should defer this Bill till such time as we determine, and not according to the dictates of the World Bank.

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

I would normally have not pressed this amendment, but from what happened in the course of the Debate one is more than worried by the statements made by the Hon. Minister.

Take this Section dealing with the nominated representative of the Corporation, at page 2. It is quite clear that that condition has been laid down by the World Bank. Why? Are we not justified in pointing out the sinister interpretations of this whole Bill? Why is it that the World Bank has insisted on the right to have a nominee of the Development Finance Corporation in the various organizations that you are going to assist? Unless they are thinking in terms of using at some stage or other their influence on the whole economy of this country through this Bill, what is the purpose of laying down this condition?

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

To look after their investments.

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

That is precisely what I am saying. They want to look after their investments; and that looking after their investment is also political pressure—not merely economic pressure—in the end.

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

Nobody else will look after their investments.

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

That is also why the British came here—to look after their interests. That is how the gunboats came outside Ceylon during the early period. That is what they have been utilizing in Vietnam also, to look after their interests. That is precisely my point. And I think that our gravest suspicions are now confirmed by what happened in the course of the discussion and which we did not realize at the stage that we raised this question. At the stage we originally discussed this Bill, we did not understand the extent to which the World Bank has laid down the conditions upon the Government and the Government has succumbed completely to the blandishments of the World Bank. In these circumstances we cannot possibly give in to a Third Reading of the Bill without expressing our dissent.

අත් හැරීමට යෝජනා කරන ලද 'now' කියන වචනය ප්‍රශ්නයේ කොටසක් හැටියට තිබිය යුතුය" යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදී.

කටහඬවල් අනුව පක්ෂ මන්ත්‍රීන්ට ජය බව කථානායකතුමා විසින් ප්‍රකාශ කරන ලදී.

"இப்பொழுது" எனும் சொல் மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்குமாக எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பெற்றது.

குரல்களின்படி "ஆம்" என்பவர்களுக்கு வெற்றி யென சபாநாயகர் அவர்களால் பிரகடனப்படுத்தப் பட்டது.

Question, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question", put.

MR. SPEAKER, *having collected the Voices, declared that the "Ayes" had it.*

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

Divide!

මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය 48 වන ස්ථාවර නියෝගය යටතේ—පක්ෂව 40; විරුද්ධව 8; යනුවෙන්—බෙදුණේය.

சபை, 48 ஆம் நிலையற் கட்டளையின் கீழ் பிரிந்தது. சார்பாக 40; எதிராக 8.

The House divided (under Standing Order No. 48) : Ayes 40; Noes 8.

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

කල් තැබීම

"පනත් කෙටුම්පත, සංශෝධිතාකාරයෙන්, දැන් තුන්වන වර කියවිය යුතුය" යන මුල් ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදින්, සභාසම්මත විය.

කෙටුම්පත් පනත ඊට අනුකූලව තුන්වන වර කියවා සංශෝධිතාකාරයෙන් සම්මත කරන ලදී.

"மசோதா, திருத்தப்பட்டவாறு, இப்பொழுது மூன்றும் முறை மதிப்பிடப்படுமாக" எனும் பிரதான வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

மசோதா மூன்றும் முறை மதிப்பிடப்பெற்று திருத்தப்பெற்றவாறு நிறைவேறியது.

Main Question, "That the Bill, as amended, be now read the Third time", put, and agreed to.

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

කල් තැබීම
ஒத்திவைப்பு
ADJOURNMENT

එකල්හි වේලාව 1967 මාර්තු 22 වනදා පූ. භා. 12.22 වූයෙන්, නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා විසින් ප්‍රශ්නය නොවිමසා මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය කල් තබන ලදී.

කල් තැබීම

මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය ඊට අනුකූලව 1967 මාර්තු 22 වන බදාදා පූ. භා. 12.23 ට 1967 මාර්තු 21 වන දින සභාසම්මතිය අනුව, 1967 අප්‍රේල් 4 වන අඟහරුවාදා අ. භා. 2 වන තෙක් කල් යියේය.

அப்பொழுது நேரம் 1967 மாச் 22 மு.ப. 12.22 மணி ஆகிவிட்டமையால் உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள் வினாவின்றிச் சபையை ஒத்திவைத்தார்கள்.

இதன்படி 1967, மாச் 22 ஆம் தேதி புதன்கிழமை மு. ப. 12.23 க்கு சபை அதனது 1967 மாச் 21 ஆம் தேதிய தீர்மானத்திற்கிணங்க, 1967 ஏப்ரல் 4 ஆம் தேதி செவ்வாய்க்கிழமை பி.ப. 2 மணிவரை ஒத்திவைக்கப்பட்டது.

It being 12.22 A.M., on 22nd March 1967, MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned accordingly at 12.23 A.M. on Wednesday, 22nd March 1967, until 2 P.M. on Tuesday, 4th April 1967, pursuant to the Resolution of the House of 21st March 1967.

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

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

දැයක මුදල්: මුදල් ගෙවන දිනෙන් පසුව ඇරඹෙන මාසයේ සිට මාස 12ක් සඳහා රු. 32.00සි. අශෝධිත පිටපත් සඳහා නම් රු. 35.00සි. මාස 6කට ගාස්තුවෙන් අඩකි. පිටපතක් ශත 30සි. තැපෑලෙන් ශත 45සි. මුදල්, කොළඹ ගාලු මුවදොර, මහලේකම් කාර්යාලයේ රජයේ ප්‍රකාශන කාර්යාංශයේ අධිකාරී වෙත කලින් එවිය යුතුය.

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

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

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