



පාර්ලිමේන්තු විවාද

(ගැත්තාඩි)

නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ

නිල වාර්තාව

අත්තිකාරම් ප්‍රධාන කරුණු

නිවේදනය [නි. 1719]

සෞභාග්‍ය මන්ත්‍රීන් ඡන්දයෙන් තෝරා පත් කිරීම.

ප්‍රශ්නවලට වාචික පිළිතුරු [නි. 1720]

පිළිගන්නා ලද කෙටුම්පත් පනත [නි. 1758]

ක්ෂණික (පත් කිරීම වලංගු කිරීමේ) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

දේශීය ආදායම් (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත [නි. 1759]

දෙවන වර කියවා “ඒ” ස්ථාවර කරක සභාවට පවරන ලදී.

මුදල් විශේෂ (විධිවිධාන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත [1793]

දෙවන වර සහ තුන්වන වර කියවා සම්මත කරන ලදී.

වෛද්‍ය (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත [නි. 1855]

දෙවන වර කියවීම—විවාදය කල් තබන ලදී.

කල් තැබීමේ යෝජනාව [නි. 1891]

பாராளுமன்ற விவாதங்கள்

(ஹன்சார்ட்)

பிரதிநிதிகள் சபை

அதிகாரபூர்வமான அறிக்கை

பிரதான உள்ளடக்கம்

அறிவிப்பு [ப. 1719] :

செனெற்றர் தேர்வு

வினாக்களுக்கு வாய்மூல விடைகள் [ப. 1720]

காதிமார் (நியமனங்களை வலிமையாக்கல்) மசோதா [ப. 1758] :

முதன்முறை மதிப்பிடப்பட்டது

உள்நாட்டு இறைவரி (திருத்த) மசோதா [ப. 1759] :

இரண்டாம் முறை மதிப்பிடப்பட்டு நிலையற்குழு “ஏ” க்குச் சாட்டப்பட்டது

நிதி (விசேட ஏற்பாடுகள்) மசோதா [ப. 1793] :

இரண்டாம், மூன்றாம் முறை மதிப்பிடப்பட்டு நிறைவேறியது

மருத்துவம் (திருத்த) மசோதா [ப. 1855] :

இரண்டாம் மதிப்பு—விவாதம் ஒத்திவைக்கப்பட்டது

ஒத்திவைப்புப் பிரேரணை [ப. 1891]

Volume 63

No. 13

Wednesday,

20th October 1965

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OFFICIAL REPORT

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

ANNOUNCEMENT [Col. 1719] :

Election of Senators

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 1720]

QUAZIS (VALIDATION OF APPOINTMENTS) BILL [Col. 1758] :

Read the First time

INLAND REVENUE (AMENDMENT) BILL [Col. 1759] :

Read a Second time and allocated to Standing Committee “A”

FINANCE (SPECIAL PROVISIONS) BILL [Col. 1793] :

Read a Second and the Third time, and passed

MEDICAL (AMENDMENT) BILL [Col. 1855] :

Second Reading—Debate Adjourned

ADJOURNMENT MOTION [Col. 1891]

நிவேதனம்

வாசிக பிழிதூர்

நியோகித மன்றி மனவரெய்

பிரதிநிதிகள் சபை

House of Representatives

1965 ஓக்டோபர் 20 வன லுடூ

புதன்கிழமை, 20 ஓக்டோபர் 1965

Wednesday, 20th October 1965

அ. ஸா. 20 மன்றி மனவரெய் டீப் விச. கலா
நாயகனும் [ஆமெர் ஈர்ட்லெ லிஃ. டிரீஃ,
கே. லி. டீ.] இலாசனாரூக் விச.

சபை, பி. ப. 2 மணிக்குக் கூடியது. சபாநாயகர்
அவர்கள் [கௌரவ ஸ்ரீமான் அல்பட் எப். பீரிஸ்,
கே.பி.ஈ.] தலைமை தாங்கினார்கள்.

The House met at 2 P.M., MR. SPEAKER
[THE HON. SIR ALBERT F. PERIES, K.B.E.]
in the Chair.

நிவேதனம்

அறிவிப்பு

ANNOUNCEMENT

செனேதி மன்றித் தந்தையென் தோர்
பன் கிரிம

செனேற்றர் தேர்வு

ELECTION OF SENATORS

கலாநாயகனும்

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

செனேதி மன்றித் வலையென் தந்தை
யென் தோர் பன் கிரிம பிணீச மது
சுடலன் அபேக்ஷகதின் நதி கர் ஈநி
லெ டன்வது கலாநாயகனே:

1. நாராயண மூடியன்சலே அபுஹம் மனா,
லொஹலோக பார,
கூருனகலா.

2. ஜேம்ஸ் பீட்டர் ஓபெயசெகேர் மனா,
ஈக 19, ரேசுர்சுர் மாவன,
கொலம்பு 7.

3. சூப்ரமணியம் நாராஜா மனா,
நிநிஜ நான,
மலர்லாகதி.

4. ஈநார் ரேசுர்சுர்லி பேரேர் மனா,
ஈக 31, டு ஈபுந்ஈசுர்சுர் பார,
கொலம்பு 5.

5. சேமசாமி மொகமதி ஈசன் மஹ் மனா,
ஈக 10/1, குரேரி பார,
கொலம்பு 7.

நதி கர் ஈநி அபேக்ஷகதின்
சுஹலா, தந்தையென் தோர் பன் கலி யது
செனேதி மன்றித் தந்தையென் சுஹலா
சுமன லுவிந், தந்தையென் தோர்நு லுவி
செனேதி மன்றித் பஃ டேனானே ஈபு
காலா 1965 ஓக்டோபர் 16 வன டின
அவசன் விமென் கிஃபு ஈநி ஈசனவலெ,
ஈக 7 (4) ஈபுலர் நியோகல யல்தே
ஓகன சுடலன் அபேக்ஷகதின் செனேதி
மன்றிவரன் வலையென் நிஃ பரிடி தோர்
பன்கர்ந லு லெ மல ப்ரகாஹ கர்மி.

I desire to inform the House that
the following candidates have been
nominated for election as Senators :

1. Mr. Narayana Mudiyanseelage Appu-
hamy, Baudhaloka Para, Kurune-
gala.

2. Mr. James Peter Obeyesekere,
No. 19, Race Course Avenue,
Colombo 7.

3. Mr. Subramaniam Nadarajah, Proc-
tor, Mallakam.

4. Mr. Arthur Reginald Perera, No. 31,
De Fonseka Road, Colombo 5.

5. Mr. Semsami Mohamed Hassen
Mashoor, No. 10/1, Gregory's
Road, Colombo 7.

As the number of candidates nomi-
nated is equal to the number of
Senators to be elected, I declare these
candidates to be duly elected Sena-
tors under Standing Order No. 7 (4)
in place of the five elected Senators
whose seats became vacant on the
16th October 1965, upon the termina-
tion of their terms of office.

ப்ரதவலெ வாவிக பிழிதூர்

வினாக்களுக்கு வாய்மூல விடைகள்

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

கலாநாயகனும்

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

1 வன ப்ரதவலெ.

வாசக பிழை

வாசக பிழை

[உருவ வேலை மலர்.]

ஊக சிவ பூதேவியை கிண்டி பூசகவரர்
 சிவ விலாசம் லவ சிவமாதா தந்தவாடி?
 (அ) கிண்டிவரன்மே மென்ம லெய்தி
 கிண்டி பூசக விலாசம் லவ சிவமாதா தந்தவாடி?
 கிண்டி பூசக விலாசம் லவ சிவமாதா தந்தவாடி?
 கிண்டி பூசக விலாசம் லவ சிவமாதா தந்தவாடி?

உள்ளூராட்சி அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக்
 காரியதரிசியைக் கேட்ட வினா: (அ) கதிர்கா
 மப் புனித பகுதிக்குள்ளிருக்கும் செல்லக்
 கதிர்காமத்தில் பௌத்த ஆலயம் ஒன்று நிறுவு
 வதற்குப் பௌத்தர்கள் சிலர் முயற்சித்திருந்
 துங்கூட அரசாங்கமும், அப்பகுதியிலிருக்கும்
 சைவக் குருக்களும் அதனைத் தடுத்துள்ளனர்
 என்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஆ) இந்துக்
 களுக்கும் பௌத்தர்களுக்கும் புனித ஸ்தல
 மாகத் தற்பொழுது விளங்கும் செல்லக் கதிர்
 காமத்தில் பௌத்த ஆலயம் ஒன்று நிறுவு
 வதற்கெனக் காணியொன்று கொடுப்பதற்கு
 அவர் நடவடிக்கைகள் எடுப்பாரா?

asked the Parliamentary Secretary to
 the Minister of Local Government:
 (a) Is he aware that although certain
 Buddhists tried to construct a
 Buddhist Temple at Sellakataragama
 within the Kataragama Sacred Area,
 the Government and the Hindu
 clergy in that area prevented it? (b)
 Will he take action to alloctate a land
 for a Buddhist Temple at Sellakata-
 ragama which has become a sacred
 place for the Hindus as well as for
 the Buddhists?

செல்லக் கதிர்.

(திரு. பிரேமதாச)

(Mr. Premadasa)

(அ) கிண்டிவரன்மே மென்ம லெய்தி
 கிண்டி பூசக விலாசம் லவ சிவமாதா தந்தவாடி?
 கிண்டி பூசக விலாசம் லவ சிவமாதா தந்தவாடி?
 கிண்டி பூசக விலாசம் லவ சிவமாதா தந்தவாடி?
 கிண்டி பூசக விலாசம் லவ சிவமாதா தந்தவாடி?
 கிண்டி பூசக விலாசம் லவ சிவமாதா தந்தவாடி?

கிண்டி பூசக விலாசம் லவ சிவமாதா தந்தவாடி?
 கிண்டி பூசக விலாசம் லவ சிவமாதா தந்தவாடி?
 கிண்டி பூசக விலாசம் லவ சிவமாதா தந்தவாடி?
 கிண்டி பூசக விலாசம் லவ சிவமாதா தந்தவாடி?
 கிண்டி பூசக விலாசம் லவ சிவமாதா தந்தவாடி?

கிண்டி பூசக விலாசம் லவ சிவமாதா தந்தவாடி?

ஹல்லொலுவ தொங்கு பாலம், கண்டி.

HALLOLUWA SUSPENSION BRIDGE, KANDY

6. கிண்டி பூசக விலாசம் லவ சிவமாதா தந்தவாடி?
 கிண்டி பூசக விலாசம் லவ சிவமாதா தந்தவாடி?

(திரு. ஹேமச்சந்திர சிரிசேன—அக்குறணை
 முதலாம் அங்கத்தவர்)

(Mr. Hemachandra Sirisena—First
 Akurana)

கிண்டி பூசக விலாசம் லவ சிவமாதா தந்தவாடி?
 கிண்டி பூசக விலாசம் லவ சிவமாதா தந்தவாடி?
 கிண்டி பூசக விலாசம் லவ சிவமாதா தந்தவாடி?
 கிண்டி பூசக விலாசம் லவ சிவமாதா தந்தவாடி?
 கிண்டி பூசக விலாசம் லவ சிவமாதா தந்தவாடி?

அரசாங்கக் கட்டுவோலை, தபால், தந்திப்
 போக்குவரத்து அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா:
 (அ) கண்டி மாநகரசபை எல்லையையும் ஹல்
 லொலுவையையும் இணைக்கும் தொங்குபாலம்
 அண்மைக்காலத்தில் பழுதுபார்க்கப்படாது
 பழுதுற்ற நிலையில் உள்ளதென்பதை அவர்
 அறிவாரா? (ஆ) தினசரி இப்பாலத்தைக்
 கடந்து செல்லும் பாடசாலைச் சிறுவர்கள் உட்
 பட ஆயிரக்கணக்கான பாதசாரிகளுக்குப்
 பெரும் அசௌகரியங்கள் உண்டாகின்றன
 என்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (இ) ஆமெனில்,
 இவ்விடயத்தைக் கவனித்து அப்பாலத்தைத்
 திருத்துமாறு உடனடியாய் அவர் துணைக்களத்
 திற்குக் கட்டளையிடுவாரா?

මංචික පිළිතුරු

වෘත්ති පිළිතුරු

asked the Minister of Public Works, Posts and Telecommunications: (a) Is he aware that the suspension bridge joining the Kandy municipal limits and Halloluwa has not been repaired recently and is now in a state of disrepair? (b) Is he aware that much inconvenience is caused to thousands of pedestrians including school children who cross over this bridge daily? (c) If so, will he instruct the department immediately to look into this matter and repair this bridge?

විජයපාල මෙන් ඩිස් මය.

(திரு. விஜயபால மெண்டிஸ்)

(Mr. Wijayapala Mendis)

(අ) දැනට මෙම පාලම අළුත්වැඩියා නොකළ තත්ත්වයක නොපවතී. පසින් යාම සඳහා ලීවලින් තනා තිබෙන මෙම සංගිලි පාලමට යොදා ඇති තවුටු ලැලි දිරාපත්වන නිසාත් ඒවා බුරුල්වීමෙන් ගැලවී යාම නිසාත් ඒවා නැවතත් යෙදීමට සිදුවෙයි. මෙසේ කිරීමට අවශ්‍ය වන හාම අවස්ථාවකදීම මෙම දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව මගින් නිසි පරිදි එය කරගෙන යනු ලැබේ. (ආ) දැනට දුෂ්කරතාවක් ඇති නොවේ. (ඉ) පැන නොනගී.

සුද්ධ හමුදා ලුතිනන් ඔස්සා ජයවර්ධන
හාජේ තිබුණ මදල් තැනිවිම

இலங்கைத் தரைப்படையைச் சேர்ந்த லெபரினன்ட்
ஒஸ்கார் ஐயவர்த்தனவின் பொறுப்பிலிருந்த
பணம் காணாமற்போதல்

LOSS OF CASH IN POSSESSION OF LT. OSCAR
JAYEWARDENA, CEYLON ARMY

8. සී. එන්. මැතිව් මයා. (කොළොන්න)

(திரு. சீ. என். மதியூ—கொலன்ன)

(Mr. C. N. Mathew—Kolonna)

අග්‍රාමාත්‍ය සහ රාජ්‍යාරක්ෂක හා විදේශ කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමති සහ ක්‍රම සම්පාදක හා ආර්ථික කටයුතු ඇමතිගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය : (අ) 1963 නොවැම්බර් මස 8 වැනි දින පිස්තෝලයක් සහ රජයට හා සෙබලුන්ට අයත් මුදල් අඩංගු රුපියල් 2,384.53 ක මුදලක් ලුණින් ඔස්කාර් ජයවර්ධන සතුව තිබියදී අබිරහස් ලෙස නැතිවූ බව එතුමා දන්නවාද ?

(ආ) මෙම තැනිතීම ගැන අපරාධ පරීක්ෂණ දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව පරීක්ෂා කර බැලුවේද? (ඉ) ඔවුන්ගේ රපෝර්තුව කුමක්ද? (ඊ) මෙම තැනිතීම සම්බන්ධ යෙන් යුද්ධ හමුදා පරීක්ෂණ උසාවියක් විසින් විමර්ෂණය කරන ලද්දේද? (උ) එහි තීරණය කුමක්ද? (ඌ) උසාවියේ සාමාජිකයෝ කවරහුද? (එ) ද්‍රුතිතත් ජයවර්ධනට විරුද්ධව චෝදනා නගන ලද්දේද? (ඵ) නොඑසේ නම්, එ් මන්ද? (ඹ) චෝදනාවක් නොනඟා ඔහු නිර්දෝෂ කරන ලද්දේද? එසේ නම්, ඔහු නිර්දෝෂ කෙළේ කවුද? කාගේ නියෝග පිටද? (ඹ) ඔහු විශ්‍රාම ගැනීමට පෙර මුදල් තැනිතීම වෙනුවට අලාභ ගෙවන ලද්දේද? (ක) මෙම තැනිතීම මුදල ආපසු ගෙවීම සඳහා යුද්ධ හමුදා අරමුදල්වලින් ඔහුට ණය මුදලක් දෙන ලද්දේද? (ග) 1965 අගෝස්තු මස 1 වැනි දින සිට සම්පූර්ණ විශ්‍රාම වැටුප් අයිතිවාසිකම් සහිතව විශ්‍රාම ගැනීමට ඔහුට අවසර දෙන ලද්දේද?

பிரதம அமைச்சரையும், பாதுகாப்பு வெளிவிவகார அமைச்சரையும், திட்டமிடல், பொருளாதார விவகார அமைச்சரையும் கேட்ட வினா : (அ) லெப்ரினன்ட் ஒஸ்கார் ஜயவர்த்தனவிடம் பொறுப்பிலிருந்து கைத்துப்பாக்கியொன்றும் அரசாங்கத்துக்கும் போர் வீரர்களுக்கும் சொந்தமான 2,384 ரூபா 53 சதம் காசும் 1963 நவம்பர் 8 ஆம் தேதியன்று மாயமாய்க் காணாமற் போயின என்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஆ) காணாமற் போனதையிட்டு குற்றவியல் புலன்விசாரணைத் திணைக்களம் விசாரணை நடாத்தியதா? (இ) அவர்களுடைய அறிக்கையாது? (ஈ) இவை காணாமற்போனது சம்பந்தமாய் விசாரணைப் படை நீதிமன்றம் புலன்விசாரணை செய்ததா? (உ) அதன் முடிபுகள் யாவை? (ஊ) அந்நீதி மன்றத்தின் உறுப்பினர்கள் யாவர்? (எ) லெப்ரினன்ட் ஜயவர்த்தன மீது குற்றங்கள் சுமத்தப்பட்டனவா? (ஏ) இல்லையெனில், ஏன்? (ஐ) குற்றமொன்றும் சுமத்தப்படாமல் அவர் குற்றச்சாட்டுக்களினின்றும் விடுவிக்கப்பட்டாரா? ஆமெனில், அவரைக் குற்றத்தினின்றும் விடுவித்தவர யார்? யாருடைய உத்தரவின்பேரில் விடுவித்தார்? (ஒ) காணாமற் போன பணம் அவர் இளைப்பாறுவதற்கு முன் திருப்பிக்கொடுக்கப்பட்டதா? (ஓ) காணாமற்போன பணத்தை

වෘත්තික පිළිතුරු

වංචික පිළිතුරු

[මැතිව් මයා.]

திருப்பிக்கொடுப்பதற்கென படை நிதியினின்
றும் அவருக்குக் கடனொன்று வழங்கப்பட்
டதா? (ஒள) 1965 ஆகஸ்ட் 1 ஆம் தேதியன்றி
விருந்து முழு இளைப்பாற்றுச் சம்பள உரிமை
களுடன் இளைப்பாறுவதற்கு அவர் அனுமதிக்க
ப்பட்டாரா?

asked the Prime Minister and Minister of Defence & External Affairs and Minister of Planning & Economic Affairs: (a) Is he aware that on 8th November 1963 a pistol and cash to the value of Rs. 2,384.53 comprising money belonging to the Government and the soldiers were mysteriously lost while in the possession of Lt. Oscar Jayewardena? (b) Did the C.I.D. inquire into this loss? (c) What was their report? (d) Did a military court of inquiry investigate the loss? (e) What was its findings? (f) Who were the members of the court? (g) Were

(a) Yes. The amount involved is made up of:

(i) Imprest money	Rs.	66.79
-------------------	----	----	-----	-------

(ii) Cash deductions from other ranks on account of insurance payments, bank loans, and other regimental deductions Rs. 2,201.18

(iii) President Regimental Institute money	Rs. 116.55	Rs. 2,384.52
--	------------	--------------

(iv) .38 Pistol valued at	Rs. 570.32
---------------------------	----	----	------------

Rs. 2,954.84

(b) No ; but the civil police, under the directions of S. P., Colombo, made investigations into this loss. (c) The police have so far sent only an interim report. (d) Yes. (e) The court found that the second witness, Lieutenant (Quartermaster) O. C. Jayewardena, was to be blamed for the loss because (i) He was the imprest holder, President Regimental Institute and, above all the custodian of the safe keys of the Headquarters Company, Army Headquarters ; (ii) He was negligent to the extent of not taking adequate precautions regarding the security of the safe keys. The

charges framed against Lt. Jayewardena? (h) If not, why? (i) Was he exonerated without a charge being framed; if so, who exonerated him and on whose orders? (j) Was the loss of cash made good before he retired? (k) Was he given a loan from army funds to repay the loss? (l) Was he permitted to retire on 1st August 1965, with full pension rights?

ගරු ඩබ්ලිව් ජෝනානාසක (අග්‍රමාත්‍ය සහ
ආරක්ෂක හා විදේශ කටයුතු පිළිබඳ
ඇමති සහ ක්‍රම සම්පාදක හා ආර්ථික කට
යුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමති)

(கௌரவ டப்ளி சேனாநாயக்க—பிரதம அமைச்சரும் பாதுகாப்பு, வெளி விவகார அமைச்சரும் திட்ட அமைப்பு, பொருளாதார விவகார அமைச்சரும்)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake—Prime Minister, Minister of Defence and External Affairs, and Minister of Planning and Economic Affairs)

court was further of the opinion that Lieutenant (Quartermaster) O. C. Jayewardena had incurred debts but had not been pressed or embarrassed by his debtors for a settlement immediately prior to the loss of cash. Lieutenant (Quartermaster) O. C. Jayewardena had not settled any of his debtors immediately after the loss of cash was reported and has not settled any of his debtors up to the time this stage of the proceedings were recorded. This, however, did not absolve Lieutenant (Quartermaster) O. C. Jayewardena's responsibilities regarding the loss of cash

වෘත්තික පිළිතුරු

වෘත්ති පිළිතුරු

and the revolver as given by this court. (f) President: Major M. N. Ranawaka. Members: Captain (now Major) M. D. Fernando, C. A. C., Captain J. L. de S. Jayaratne, C. A. (g) No. (h) The question of framing charges against this officer was fully investigated, but action was not pursued in view of the inadequacy of evidence against him. He, however was ordered to make good the loss of cash and the value of the missing pistol. (i) He was not exonerated. (j) No. Rs. 816.79 had been recovered from him while he was in service. The balance due Rs. 2,138.05 will be recovered from the commuted pension due to him. (k) No. However, as some of the money lost represented instalments on insurance, bank loans, and other regimental deductions, the amount lost was advanced to the Officer Commanding, Headquarters Company, Army Headquarters, from the Welfare Fund to meet these payments. (l) Yes. In terms of Regulations 3(A) of the Army Pensions and Gratuities Code, 1961.

ලංකා සුද්ධ හමුදාවේ ලතින් ඔස්සා
ජයවර්ධන

இலங்கைத் தரைப்படையைச் சேர்ந்த லெப்டினன்ட்
ஓஸ்கார் ஜயவர்தன

LT. OSCAR JAYEWARDENA, CEYLON ARMY

9. **ଭୂନିଧି මନ୍ତ୍ର.**

(திரு. மதிபூ)

(Mr. Mathew)

අග්‍රාමාත්‍ය සහ රාජ්‍යාරක්ෂක හා විදේශ කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමති සහ ක්‍රම සම්පාදක හා ආර්ථික කටයුතු ඇමතිගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය: (අ) ලුතිනන් ඔස්කාර් ජයවර්ධන, ජාති විරෝධී කටයුතු හා ඉන්දියානු චතු කම්කරුවන්ට යුද්ධෝපකරණ විකිණීම සම්බන්ධයෙන් දියතලාවේ හමුදා කණ්ඩායමකට චෝදනා කෙළේද? (ආ) චෝදනා කිරීම ගැන පැවැත්වූ පරීක්ෂණයට ඉක්බිතිව යුද්ධාධිකරණයක් පවත්වන ලද්දේද? (ඉ) චෝදනා කිරීම ඔප්පු කරන ලද්දේද? (ඊ) ලුතිනන් ජයවර්ධන බොරු සාක්ෂි දීම පිළිබඳව යුද්ධාධිකරණයේදී වරදකරු වීද? (උ) ඔහුට දඬුවම් කරන ලද්දේද? නොඑසේ නම්, ඒ මන්

ද? (උ) ඔහු, යුද්ධ හමුදාවේ අවසරය නොමැතිව, දියතලාවේ යුද්ධ හමුදා අභ්‍යාස මධ්‍යස්ථානයෙන් යුද්ධෝපකරණ ඉවත් කර පිටස්තර පුද්ගලයින්ට භාර දුන්නේ ද? එසේ නම්, එ් කාටද? (එ) අවසර නැතිව යුද්ධෝපකරණ ඉවත් කිරීම ගැන ඔහුට විරුද්ධව චෝදනා නගන ලද්දේද? (ඒ) එවකට සිටි අගමැතිණියගේ උපදෙස් පිට යුද්ධ හමුදා සෙන්පති විසින් ඔහු නිර්දෝෂ කරන ලද්දේද?

பிரதம அமைச்சரையும், பாதுகாப்பு வெளிவிவகார அமைச்சரையும், திட்டமிடல், பொருளாதார விவகார அமைச்சரையும் கேட்ட வினா: (அ) தேச விரோத நடவடிக்கையில் ஈடுபடுவதாகவும், இந்தியத் தோட்டத் தொழிலாளருக்கு வெடிமருந்துப் பொருட்கள் விற்பதாகவும் தியத்தலாவையிலுள்ள தரைப்படைப் பிரிவொன்றை லெப்ரினன்ட் ஒஸ்கார் ஜயவர்த்தன குற்றஞ்சாட்டினாரா? (ஆ) இக்குற்றச்சாட்டின் மீது விசாரணை நடாத்திய பின்பு படைநீதிமன்றத்தில் வழக்கொன்று நடாத்தப்பட்டதா? (இ) அக்குற்றச்சாட்டு நிரூபிக்கப்பட்டதா? (ஈ) பொய்ச்சாட்சி சொல்லியமைக்காக லெப்ரினன்ட் ஜயவர்த்தன படை நீதிமன்றத்தால் குற்றவாளியாகக் காணப்பட்டாரா? (உ) அவர் தண்டிக்கப்பட்டாரா? இல்லையெனில் ஏன்? (ஊ) படைப் பகுதியின் அதிகாரமின்றி தியத்தலாவைத் தரைப்படைப் பயிற்சி நிலையத்திலிருந்து வெடிமருந்துப் பொருட்கள் எடுத்துச்சென்று வெளியிலுள்ளோருக்குக் கொடுத்தாரா? ஆமெனில் யாருக்கு? (எ) அதிகாரமின்றி வெடிமருந்துப் பொருட்களை எடுத்துச் சென்றமைக்காக அவர் மீது குற்றங்கள் சுமத்தப்பட்டனவா? (ஏ) முன்னாள் பிரதம அமைச்சரால் விடுக்கப்பட்ட கட்டளைகளின் பிரகாரம்தான் படைத் தளபதியால் அவர் குற்றச்சாட்டுக்களினின்றும் விடுவிக்கப்பட்டாரா?

asked the Prime Minister and Minister of Defence & External Affairs and Minister of Planning & Economic Affairs: (a) Did Lt. Oscar Jayewardena accuse an army unit in Diyatalawa of anti-national activity and selling ammunition to Indian estate labour? (b) Was a court martial held subsequent to the inquiry into the accusation? (c) Was the accusation proved? (d) Was Lt. Jayewardena found guilty of perjury at the court martial? (e) Was he punished and if not, why? (f) Did

වෘත්තික පිළිතුරු

වෘත්ති විප්‍රභූරු

[මැනිවි මයො.]

he without army authority remove ammunition from the Diyatalawa Army Training Centre and hand it over to outsiders ; if so to whom ? (g) Were charges framed against him for unauthorised removal of ammunition ? (h) Was he exonerated by the Army Commander on the instructions of the then Prime Minister ?

ගරු ඩබ්ලි ජෙප්තානායක

(கௌரவ டப்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

(a) Yes. He accused the Army Training Centre of disposing of ammunition to outsiders. (b) Yes. (c) No. (d) Lieutenant (Quartermaster) Jayewardena was not tried for or found guilty of perjury at the court martial. The Judge Advocate to the Forces however reported that Lieutenant (Quartermaster) Jayewardena's evidence was very unsatisfactory in that he contradicted a material witness and also that his evidence frequently differed from his earlier statements. The Judge Advocate also stated that at times the story of Lieutenant (Quartermaster) Jayewardena was highly improbable. (e) No. The Army Legal Advisers were of the opinion that the evidence did not reveal concrete offences against the Army Act to justify a Court Martial. (f) No. He did not remove ammunition from the Army Training Centre. He had, however, obtained one grenade from the possession of Sgt. Jones and produced it before the then Prime Minister. (g) No. (h) No. The then Prime Minister gave no instructions on this matter.

කළු නායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Question No. 10 ?

ගරු ඩබ්ලි ජෝනානාසක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I want further time to answer this Question.

ප්‍රශ්නය මතු දිනකදී ඉදිරිපත් කිරීමට නියෝග කරන ලදී.

வினாவை மற்றொரு தினத்துக்குச் சமர்ப்பிக்க ஆணை
யிடப்பட்டது.

Question ordered to stand down.

කො/ජයවර්ධනපුර මහා විද්‍යාලය

சீ/ஜயவர்தனபுர மகா வித்தியாலயம்

C/JAYAWARDENAPURA MAHA VIDYALAYA

11. චන්ද්‍ර කැණාරත්න මයා. (නාවල පිටිය)

(திரு. சந்திரா கருணாத்ன—நாவலப்
பிட்டி)

(Mr. Chandra Karunaratne—Nawalapitiya)

අධ්‍යාපන හා සංස්කෘතික කටයුතු ඇමති
ගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය : (අ) කො/ජයවර්ධන
පුර මහා විද්‍යාලයයේ උපාධිධාරී ගුරුවරුන්
කී දෙනෙක් සිටින්නද? (ආ) ඔවුන් උපා
ධිය සඳහා ගත් විෂයයන් මොනවාද? (ඉ)
මෙම පාසලේ මේ උපාධිධාරී ගුරුවරුන්
උගන්වන විෂයයන් හා උගන්වන පංති
මොනවාද? (ඊ) උපාධිධාරී නොවන ගුරු
වරු උසස් පාඨශාලා සහතික පත්‍ර පංති
වලට ඉගැන්වීමේ යෙදී සිටින්නද? (උ)
ඔවුන්ගේ සුදුසුකම් මොනවාද? (ඌ)
උපාධිධාරී ගුරුවරුන් විශාල සංඛ්‍යාවක්
මෙම පාසලේ සිටියදී ඉහළ පන්තිවල
ඉගැන්වීමට උපාධිධාරී නොවන ගුරුවරු
න්ට ඉඩදී ඇත්තේ මන්ද?

கல்வி, கலாசார விவகார அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா: (அ) C/ஜயவர்தனபுர மகா வித்தியாலயத்தில் உள்ள பட்டதாரி ஆசிரியர்கள் எத்தனை பேர்? (ஆ) அவர்களது பட்டதாரிப் பரீட்சைக்கு அவர்கள் எடுத்த பாடங்களெவை? (இ) இப்பட்டதாரி ஆசிரியர்களால் கற்பிக்கப்படும் பாடங்களும் அவர்கள் கற்பிக்கும் வகுப்புகளும் எவை? (ஈ) பட்டதாரிகளல்லாத ஆசிரியர்கள் உயர்தர பாடசாலைத் தராதரப்பத்திர வகுப்புகளிற் கற்பிக்

வாசிக பிழிதூர்

கின்றார்களா? (உ) அவர்களது கல்வித் தரத் தரங்கள் என்ன? (ஊ) இப்பாடசாலையில் பட்டதாரி ஆசிரியர்கள் பெருமளவில் இருக்கையில் பட்டதாரிகளல்லாத ஆசிரியர்கள் உயர் தர வகுப்புக்களில் கற்பிப்பதற்கு அனுமதிக்கப்பட்டதேன்?

asked the Minister of Education and Cultural Affairs: (a) How many Graduate teachers are there in the C/Jayawardanapura Maha Vidyalaya? (b) What are the subjects they have offered for their Degree? (c) What are the subjects taught by these Graduate teachers and the classes they take? (d) Are non-Graduate teachers engaged in teaching in Higher School Certificate classes? (e) What are their

வாசிக பிழிதூர்

qualifications? (f) Why have non-Graduate teachers been allowed to teach in higher classes when there are a large number of Graduate teachers in this school?

சுரு பிழிதூர்

(கௌரவ ஜயசூரிய)

(The Hon. Jayasuriya)

(அ) 18 தேனெகி. (ஆ) பிழிதூர் மெய் அழிணா அறி ருபுலேஷனேஷ் டி.கே. (ஓ) பிழிதூர் மெய் அழிணா அறி ருபுலேஷனேஷ் டி.கே. (ஈ) உபேஷ, உகேஷனெகி. (உ) இதுனே ஸ்டுடென்ட்ஸ் வுஷே ஸ்ரீ ரு.கா. விஷ்வி வித்யாலயேன் ருஷனே ஸி.கே. ஸி.பு.லேஷ். (ஈ) உம விஷயன் ஓஷன் விமே இது அவிஷ ஸ்டுடென்ட்ஸ் அறி ஸெகி.

වෘත්තික පිළිතුරු

වෘත්තික පිළිතුරු

කො/ශ්‍රී ජයවර්ධනපුර මහා විදුලයේ උපාධිධාරී ගුරුවරුන් පිළිබඳ විස්තරය

උගන්වන පංති

උගන්වන විෂයයන්

උපාධිය සඳහා ගත් විෂයයන්

නම

1. ඩබ්. ඩබ්. සෝමරත්න මයා	... ගණිතය, සිංහල, පාලි ගණිතය බුද්ධ ධර්මය	... පූර්ව ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ, ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය පූර්ව ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ, ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය
2. කේ. නායගම් මයා	... ජීව විද්‍යාව, උද්භිද විද්‍යාව	... ජීව විද්‍යාව උද්භිද විද්‍යාව ක්‍රියාකාරී ධර්මය	... අ.පො.ස. (උසස් පෙළ) ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය
3. ටී. ආරියරත්න මයා	... උද්භිද වි., ජීව වි., රසායන වි.	... උද්භිද වි. රසායන වි. දෙමල හා හින්දු ධර්මය	... ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය
4. ඊ. එම්. මුණසිංහ මිය	... ඉංග්‍රීසි, ඉතිහාසය, අර්ථ ශාස්ත්‍රය	... ඉංග්‍රීසි ඉතිහාසය ආණ්ඩුක්‍රමය ක්‍රියාකාරී ධර්මය	... අ.පො.ස. (උසස් පෙළ) ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය, පූර්ව ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය අ.පො.ස. (උසස් පෙළ) ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය, අ.පො.ස. (උසස් පෙළ)
5. ජේ. සී. එන්. ප්‍රනාන්දු මයා	... ශුද්ධ ගණිතය, ව්‍යවහාරික ගණිතය, ගණිතය, රසායන වි.	... ව්‍ය. ගණිතය රසායන වි.	... අ.පො.ස. (උසස් පෙළ) අ.පො.ස. (උසස් පෙළ), ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය, පූර්ව ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨය
6. ඇන්. සම්මන්තනන්දන් මයා	... ශුද්ධ ගණිතය, ව්‍ය. ගණිතය, රසායන වි. ශු. ගණිතය ව්‍ය. ගණිතය උසස් ගණිතය	... ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය, අ.පො.ස. (උසස් පෙළ) ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය
7. ඩබ්. ජේ. රේපාන්සේකා මයා	... ශුද්ධ ගණිතය, ව්‍ය. ගණිතය, භෞතික වි. ව්‍ය. ගණිතය භෞතික වි.	... ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය, අ.පො.ස. (උසස් පෙළ) ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය, අ.පො.ස. (උසස් පෙළ)
8. ඩබ්. කේ. පෙරේරා මයා.	... ශුද්ධ ගණිතය, ව්‍ය. ගණිතය, භෞතික වි. භෞතික වි. ශු. ගණිතය ව්‍ය. ගණිතය	... අ.පො.ස. (උසස් පෙළ), ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය අ.පො.ස. (උසස් පෙළ) අ.පො.ස. (උසස් පෙළ)
9. ඩබ්. අබේසූරිය මයා	... සිංහල, පාලි, සංස්කෘත	... සිංහල භාෂාව සිංහල සාහිත්‍යය බුද්ධ ධර්මය	... ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය, අ.පො.ස. (උසස් පෙළ) ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය

මාචික පිළිතුරු

මාචික පිළිතුරු

10. කේ. සේනානායක මිය සිංහල බෞද්ධ ශිෂ්ටාචාරය	... සිංහල සාහිත්‍ය බුද්ධ ධර්මය පාලි	... ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය අ.පො.ස. (උසස් පෙල), ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය
11. කේ. පණ්ඩිතරත්න මිය	... සිංහල, ඉතිහාසය, පාලි	... ඉන්දියානු ඉතිහාසය පාලි ඉංග්‍රීසි	අ.පො.ස. (උසස් පෙල) අ.පො.ස. (උසස් පෙල) අ.පො.ස. (උසස් පෙල). පූර්ව ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ
12. ඒ. ආර්. එම්. මනුෂ්‍යවල් මිය	... ඉංග්‍රීසි, ලතින්	... ඉංග්‍රීසි	අවටැනි ප්‍රමාණය, පූර්ව ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ, ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය අ.පො.ස. (උසස් පෙල)
13. එස්. පී. සුරේෂ් මිය	... ඉංග්‍රීසි, භූගෝලය, ඉතිහාසය	... ඉංග්‍රීසි භූගෝලය	පූර්ව ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය, අ.පො.ස. (උසස් පෙල)
14. වයි. එස්. ජයසිංහ මිය	... ඉතිහාසය, සිංහල, අර්ථ ශාස්ත්‍රය	... ආණ්ඩුක්‍රමය ඉතිහාසය සිංහල	අ.පො.ස. (උසස් පෙල) ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය, අ.පො.ස. (උසස් පෙල) පූර්ව ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ
15. පී. එස්. මිවැල්ල මෙනෙවිය	... ඉතිහාසය, සිංහල අර්ථ ශාස්ත්‍රය	... ආණ්ඩුක්‍රමය ඉතිහාසය ප්‍රජාචාරය ඉංග්‍රීසි	අ.පො.ස. (උසස් පෙල) ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය, අ.පො.ස. (උසස් පෙල) ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය
16. පී. ඩී. ගෝමස් මිය (මෙනෙක් උපාධිධාරී අපරදිග ඉතිහාසය, සිංහල, අර්ථ ශාස්ත්‍රය... යෙකුගේ වැටුප් නො ලබයි.)	... අපරදිග ඉතිහාසය, සිංහල, අර්ථ ශාස්ත්‍රය...	... ගණිතය බුද්ධ ධර්මය ප්‍රජාචාරය අර්ථ ශාස්ත්‍රය යුරෝපීය ඉතිහාසය	පූර්ව ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ පූර්ව ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය පූර්ව ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ, ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය
17. පී. ඒ. ඩී. ඩී. ඉන්ද්‍රවර්ධන මිය	... සිංහල, ලංකා ඉතිහාසය, අර්ථ ශාස්ත්‍රය	... සිංහල ප්‍රජාචාරය ඉතිහාසය බුද්ධ ධර්මය	පූර්ව ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ, ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය පූර්ව ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අ.පො.ස. (උසස් පෙල)
18. ඩී. එස්. කෝරගෙහිය මිය	... සිංහල, අර්ථ ශාස්ත්‍රය, භූගෝලය	... සිංහල භූගෝලය ප්‍රජාචාරය	ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය, පූර්ව ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවටැනි ප්‍රමාණය ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය, අ.පො.ස. (උසස් පෙල) ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ අවසානය

ව, වික පිළිතුරු

වංචික පිළිතුරු

කළු නායකත්වය

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Question No. 2.

වතු වල වැඩ කරන සිංහල කම්කරුවන් සහ
දිවිඩ කම්කරුවන්

தோட்டங்களிலுள்ள சிங்கள, தமிழ்த்தொழிலாளர்

SINHALA AND TAMIL WORKERS ON ESTATES

2. එම්. පී. ද සොයිසා සිටිවර්ධන මයා.
(මිත්‍රවන්ගොඩ—කෝ. වයි. එම්. විජේ
රත්න බණ්ඩා මයා.—සොරනාතොට—
වෙනුවට)

(திரு. எம். பீ. டி. சொய்சா சிறிவர்தன—
மினுவாங்கொட—திரு. கே. வை. எம். விஜே
ரத்ன பண்டா—சொரணத்தோட்டை—சார்
பாக)

(Mr. M. P. de Zoysa Siriwardena—
Minuwangoda—on behalf of Mr. K. Y. M.
Wijeratne Banda—Sorاناتوتا)

කම්කරු, රැකිරක්ෂා හා නිවාස ඇමති
ගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය : (අ) පහත සඳහන්
එක් එක් වත්තේ සේවයේ යොදවා
සිටින සිංහල කම්කරුවන්ගේ හා ද්‍රවිඩ
කම්කරුවන්ගේ සංඛ්‍යාව එතුමා සඳහන්
කරනවාද ?

1. සාර්තිය,
2. කිනකාලේ,
3. උච්චකාට්ටල,
4. කිත් රෝස්,
5. ශාන්ත ජේම්ස්,
6. උච්ච හයිලන්ඩ්ස්,
7. ඊදිපාන,
8. කෝබෝ,
9. නෙලුව,
10. දික් වැල්ල,
11. ඇටම්පිටිය,
12. සරත් ඩිබ්,
13. යෙල් වට්ටන්,
14. රෝක් නැන්ත,
15. ඔලියමන්ඩිය,
16. ක්වින්ස් ටවුන්,
17. තෝෆ්ට්ස්.

(ආ) මෙම චක්‍රවලින් අක්කර කීයක් වල් හෙලීම සඳහා සිංහල කම්කරුවන්ට කොන්ත්‍රාත් දී තිබේද? (ඉ) එක් එක් කම්කරුවාට අක්කර කීය බැගින් දී තිබේද? (ඊ) වතු සමාගම්වලින් අක්කරයකට

කිය බැගින් ගෙවනු ලැබේද? (උ) පසුගිය රජය විසින් සම්මත කරන ලද පනතක් අනුව සිංහල කම්කරුවන් සියයට 50ක් ගැනීමට මෙම රජය ක්‍රියා කරනවාද? නො එසේ නම්, ඒ මන්ද?

தொழில், தொழில் வசதி, வீடமைப்பு அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா: (அ) கீழ்க்காணப்படும் தோட்டங்கள் ஒவ்வொன்றிலும் வேலைக்கமர்த்தப்பட்டுள்ள சிங்கள, தமிழ் தொழிலாளர்களின் எண்ணிக்கையை அவர் கூறுவாரா?

1. சர்னியா 2. கினகெல்ல 3. ஊவா கெட்டவல்
4. கின்றோஸ் 5. சென்ற ஜேம்ஸ் 6. ஊவா
ஹைலன்ட்ஸ் 7. நிதிபான 8. கொபோ 9.
நெலுவா 10. டிக்வெல்ல 11. எத்தம்பிட்டிய 12.
சரண்டிப் 13. யெல்வற்றன் 14. ரெக்ரென்ஸூ
15. ஒலியாமந்திய 16. குயின்ஸ் ரவுண் 17.
நெய்வீர், (ஆ) இத்தோட்டங்களில் களை பிடுங்
குவதற்கென சிங்களத் தொழிலாளர்களிடம்
ஒப்பந்தத்தில் கொடுக்கப்பட்டுள்ள ஏக்கர் எத்
தனை? (இ) தொழிலாளர் ஒவ்வொருவருக்கும்
கொடுக்கப்பட்டுள்ள ஏக்கர் எத்தனை? (ஈ) கம்
பனித் தோட்டங்களில் ஏக்கர் ஒன்றுக்கு
கொடுக்கப்படும் கூலி எவ்வளவு? (உ) முன்
னாள் அரசாங்கத்தினால் நிறைவேற்றப்பட்ட
சட்டத்தின் நியதிகளுக்கமைய 50 சத வீதம்
சிங்களத் தொழிலாளர்களை வேலைக்கமர்த்துவ
தற்கு இவ்வரசாங்கம் நடவடிக்கை எடுக்குமா?
இல்லையெனில், ஏன்?

asked the Minister of Labour, Employment and Housing: (a) Will he state the number of Sinhalese workers and Tamil workers employed in each of the following estates:—

1. Sarniya,
2. Keenakelle,
3. Uva Ketawala,
4. Kinross,
5. St. James,
6. Uva Highlands,
7. Ridipana,
8. Kobo,
9. Neluwa,
10. Dickwella,
11. Etampitiya,
12. Sarandib,
13. Yelwatton,
14. Rocktenna,
15. Oliyamandiya,
16. Queen's Town,
17. Neifier.

මාසික පිළිතුරු

මාසික පිළිතුරු

(b) How many acres from these estates have been given on contract to the Sinhalese workers for weeding? (c) How many acres have been given to each worker? (d) How much is paid per acre by the Company Estates? (e) Will this Government take action to take in 50 per cent. Sinhalese workers in terms of an Act passed by the former Government and if not, why?

ගරු එම්. එම්. මොහමඩ් (කම්කරු, රැකියා හා නිවාස ඇමති)

(கௌரவ எம். எச். முகம்மது—தொழிற்
புற, வீடமைப்பு அமைச்சர்)

(The Hon. M. H. Mohamed—Minister
of Labour, Employment and Housing)

The Answer consists of a long list.
May I have your permission to table
it?

කළානායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Yes, it might be tabled.

සහ මේසය මත තබන ලද පිළිතුර මෙසේ යි :

சபாபீடத்தில் வைக்கப்பட்ட விடை வருமாறு :

The Answer tabled is as follows :

(අ)	වත්තේ නම	වැඩ කරන කම්කරුවන්ගේ ගණන	
		සිංහල	ද්විධ
1. සාර්තියා	...	74	1,496
2. කිනකැලේ	...	114	549
3. උච කැටවල	...	101	520
4. කින්රෝස්	...	31	260
5. ශාන්ත ජේම්ස්	...	71	785
6. උච හයිලන්ඩ්ස්	...	113	1,001
7. රිදීපාන	...	9	76
8. කෝබෝ	...	132	141
9. නෙළුව	...	75	573
10. දික්වැල්ල	...	126	835
11. ඇටැම්පිටිය	...	141	1,016
12. සරන්ඩිබ්	...	54	324
13. යෙල්වටන්	...	75	720
14. රොක්කැන්ත	...	286	1,961
15. ඔලියමන්ඩිය	...	6	101
16. ක්වින්ස්ටවුන්	...	65	588
17. නේපියර්	...	55	336

(ආ)	වත්තේ නම	සිංහල කම්කරුවන්ට දී ඇති වල් නෙලීමේ ප්‍රමාණය	
		අක්කර ප්‍රමාණය	කම්කරුවන් ගණන
1. සාර්තියා	...	115	45
2. කිනකැලේ	...	223½	89
3. උච කැටවල	...	82½	22
4. කින්රෝස්	...	96¼	27
5. ශාන්ත ජේම්ස්	...	198½	71
6. උච හයිලන්ඩ්ස්	...	258¾	52
7. රිදීපාන	...	2½	3
8. කෝබෝ	...	235½	87
9. නෙළුව	...	150¼	37
10. දික්වැල්ල	...	36	9
11. ඇටැම්පිටිය	...	277¼	59
12. සෙරන්ඩිබ්	...	164¼	43
13. යෙල්වටන්	...	49½	14
14. රොක්කැන්ත	...	487¾	193
15. ඔලියමන්ඩිය	...	—	—
16. ක්වින්ස්ටවුන්	...	201¼	44
17. නේපියර්	...	133½	49

(ඉ)	වත්තේ නම				වල් නෙලීම සඳහා එක් (සිංහල)	
					කම්කරුවෙකුට ලැබෙන සාමාන්‍ය අක්කර ප්‍රමාණය	
1. සාර්නියා	2½	පමණ
2. කිනකැලේ	2¼	,,
3. උච්ච කැටවල	3½	,,
4. කින්නරෝස්	3½	,,
5. ශාන්ත ජේම්ස්	3	,,
6. උච්ච හයිලන්ඩ්ස්	5	,,
7. රිදීපාන	1	,,
8. කොබෝ	3	,,
9. නෙළුව	4	,,
10. දික්වැල්ල	4	,,
11. ඇටැම්පිටිය	4½	,,
12. සෙරන්ඩිබ්	3¾	,,
13. යෙල්වටන්	3	,,
14. රොක්කැන්න	2¾	,,
15. ඔලියමන්ඩ්	—	
16. ක්වින්ස්ටන්	5	,,
17. තේපියර්	3½	,,

(ඊ)	වත්තේ නම				වල් නෙලීමේ සඳහා අක්කරයකට ගෙවන ප්‍රමාණය			
					උපරිම		අවම	
					රු.	ශ.	රු.	ශ.
1. සාර්නියා	10	20	7	65
2. කිනකැලේ	10	20	8	93
3. උච්ච කැටවල	8	91	8	91
4. කින්නරෝස්	8	75	8	75
5. ශාන්ත ජේම්ස්	8	50	8	50
6. උච්ච හයිලන්ඩ්ස්	8	50	8	50
7. රිදීපාන	8	0	8	0
8. කොබෝ	11	48	7	02
9. නෙළුව	10	45	7	30
10. දික්වැල්ල	11	75	9	25
11. ඇටැම්පිටිය	8	75	8	75
12. සෙරන්ඩිබ්	8	88	8	88
13. යෙල්වටන්	10	20	7	65
14. රොක්කැන්න	10	20	7	65
15. ඔලියමන්ඩ්	—		—	
16. ක්වින්ස්ටන්	10	0	8	33
17. තේපියර්	10	20	7	25

(උ) එවකට තිබුණු ආණ්ඩුව මගින් එවැනි පණතක් පනවා නොතිබුණු බැවින් ප්‍රශ්නයට පිළිතුරු පැන නොනගී.

வாசிக பிடிதூர்

வாசிக பிடிதூர்

(அ) தோட்டத்தின் பெயர்

தொழிலாளர்கள்
சிங்கனவர் தமிழர்

1. சர்னியா	74 ..	1,496
2. கினகெல்ல	114 ..	549
3. ஊவாகெரவல்	101 ..	520
4. கின்றேஸ்	31 ..	260
5. சென்ற ஜேம்ஸ்	71 ..	785
6. ஊவா ஹலன்ட்ஸ்	113 ..	1,001
7. நிதிபான	9 ..	76
8. கோபோ	132 ..	141
9. நெலுவா	75 ..	573
10. டிக்வேல்ல	126 ..	835
11. எத்தம்பிட்டிய	141 ..	1,016
12. சரண்டிப்	54 ..	324
13. யெல்வற்றன்	75 ..	720
14. ரெக்ரென்னு	286 ..	1,961
15. ஒலியாமந்திய	6 ..	101
16. குயின்ஸ் ரவுண்	65 ..	588
17. நெபியர்	55 ..	336

சிங்கனத் தொழிலாளர்களிடம் ஒம்
பந்தத்தில் கொடுக்கப்பட்டுள்ள
ஏக்கர் தொகை

(ஆ) தோட்டத்தின் பெயர்

தொழிலாளர்
ஏக்கர் தொகை

1. சர்னியா	115 ..	45
2. கினகெல்ல	223½ ..	89
3. ஊவாகெரவல்	82½ ..	22
4. கின்றேஸ்	96½ ..	27
5. சென்ற ஜேம்ஸ்	198½ ..	71
6. ஊவா ஹலன்ட்ஸ்	258½ ..	52
7. நிதிபான	2½ ..	3
8. கோபோ	235½ ..	87
9. நெலுவா	150½ ..	37
10. டிக்வேல்ல	36 ..	9
11. எத்தம்பிட்டிய	277½ ..	59
12. சரண்டிப்	164½ ..	43
13. யெல்வற்றன்	49½ ..	14
14. ரெக்ரென்னு	487½ ..	193
15. ஒலியாமந்திய	இல்லை ..	இல்லை
16. குயின்ஸ் ரவுண்	201½ ..	44
17. நெபியர்	133½ ..	49

வாசிக பிழைஞர்

வாசிக பிழைஞர்

(இ)

தோட்டத்தின் பெயர்

ஒவ்வொரு சிங்களத் தொழிலாளரும்
களைபிடுங்குவதற்காகப் பெறும் சரா
சரி ஏக்கர்

1. சர்னியா	சுமார் 2½
2. கீனகெல்ல	சுமார் 2½
3. ஊவாகெரவல	சுமார் 3½
4. கிள்ளேஸ்	சுமார் 3½
5. சென்ற ஜேம்ஸ்	சுமார் 3
6. ஊவா ஹைலன்ட்ஸ்	சுமார் 5
7. நிதிபான	சுமார் 1
8. கோபோ	சுமார் 3
9. நெலுவா	சுமார் 4
10. டிக்வேல்ல	சுமார் 4
11. எத்தம்பிட்டிய	சுமா 4½
12. சரண்டிப்	சுமார் 3½
13. யெல்வற்றன்	சுமார் 3
14. ரெக்ரென்ன	சுமார் 2½
15. ஒலியாமந்திய	—
16. குயின்ஸ் ரவுண்	சுமார் 5
17. நெபியர்	சுமார் 3½

(ஈ)

தோட்டத்தின் பெயர்

ஒரு ஏக்கர் வீதம் களைபிடுங்குவதற்
குக் கூலிகூடிய தொகை குறைந்த தொகை
ரூ. ச. ரூ. ச.

1. சர்னியா	10 20	..	7 65
2. கீனகெல்ல	10 20	..	8 93
3. ஊவாகெரவல	8 91	..	8 91
4. கிள்ளேஸ்	8 75	..	8 75
5. சென்ற ஜேம்ஸ்	8 50	..	8 50
6. ஊவா ஹைலன்ட்ஸ்	8 50	..	8 50
7. நிதிபான	8 00	..	8 00
8. கோபோ	11 48	..	7 02
9. நெலுவா	10 45	..	7 30
10. டிக்வேல்ல	11 75	..	9 25
11. எத்தம்பிட்டிய	8 75	..	—
12. சரண்டிப்	8 88	..	—
13. யெல்வற்றன்	10 20	..	7 65
14. ரெக்ரென்ன	10 20	..	7 65
15. ஒலியாமந்திய	—	..	—
16. குயின்ஸ் ரவுண்	10 00	..	8 33
17. நெபியர்	10 20	..	7 65

(உ) முன்னைய அரசாங்கத்தினால் இவ்வித சட்டம் எதுவும் நிறைவேற்றப்படாமையால் இது எழுவில்லை

මාමික පිළිතුරු		මාමික පිළිතුරු	
(a)	Name of Estate	No. of Workers Sinhalese Tamil	
1.	Sarnia 74	.. 1,498
2.	Keenakelle 114	.. 549
3.	Uva Ketawela 101	.. 520
4.	Kinross 31	.. 260
5.	St. James 71	.. 785
6.	Uva Highlands 113	.. 1,001
7.	Ridipane 9	.. 76
8.	Cobo 132	.. 141
9.	Neluwa 75	.. 573
10.	Dickwela 126	.. 835
11.	Ettampitiya 141	.. 1,016
12.	Serendib 54	.. 324
13.	Yelverton 75	.. 720
14.	Rocktenne 286	.. 1,961
15.	Oliyamandy 6	.. 191
16.	Queenstown 65	.. 588
17.	Napier 55	.. 336
(b)	Name of Estate	Acreage given to Sinhalese Labour for weeding Acreage No. of Workers	
1.	Sarnia 115	.. 45
2.	Keenakalle 223½	.. 89
3.	Uva Ketawela 82½	.. 22
4.	Kinross 96¼	.. 27
5.	St. James 198½	.. 71
6.	Uva Highlands 258¾	.. 52
7.	Ridipane 2½	.. 3
8.	Cobo 235½	.. 87
9.	Neluwa 150¼	.. 37
10.	Dickwela 36	.. 9
11.	Ettampitiya 277¼	.. 59
12.	Serendib 164¼	.. 43
13.	Yelverton 49½	.. 14
14.	Rocktenne 487¾	.. 193
15.	Oliyamandy Nil	.. Nil
16.	Queenstown 201¼	.. 44
17.	Napier 133½	.. 49
(c)	Name of Estate	Average acreage each Sinhalese worker gets for weeding	
1.	Sarnia About 2½
2.	Keenakelle About 2½
3.	Uva Ketawela About 3½
4.	Kinross About 3½
5.	St. James About 3
6.	Uva Highlands About 5
7.	Ridipane About 1
8.	Cobo About 3
9.	Neluwa About 4
10.	Dickwela About 4
11.	Ettampitiya About 4½

වංචික පිළිතුරු

කෙටුම්පත් පනත් පිළිගැන්වීම

[පර්සි වික්‍රමසිංහ මයෝ.]

பிரதம அமைச்சரையும் பாதுகாப்பு, வெளிவிவகார அமைச்சரையும் திட்டமிடல், பொருளாதார விவகார அமைச்சரையும் கேட்ட வினா: தனியார் துறையிலுள்ள வர்த்தக நிலையங்கள், கொம்பனிகள், வங்கிகள் அல்லது தோட்டங்களின் (i) சொந்தக்காரர்கள், அதிபதிகள் அல்லது பங்குதாரர்கள் அல்லது (ii) அவற்றில் கடமையாற்றும்பவர்கள் அல்லது தொழில் தேடுபவர்கள் ஆகிய இலங்கையரல்லாதாருக்கு விசா வழங்குவது அல்லது புதுப்பிப்பது சம்பந்தமான அரசாங்கத்தின் கொள்கை என்ன?

asked the Prime Minister and Minister of Defence & External Affairs and Minister of Planning & Economic Affairs : What is the policy of the Government in regard to the issue and renewal of visas to non-Ceylonese (i) who are owners, directors or partners ; or (ii) who are employed or seek employment in business houses, Companies, Banks, or plantations in the private sector ?

ගරු ඩබ්ලි ජෙප්තානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

There has been no change in policy in regard to the issue and renewal of visas to non-Ceylonese. (i) Resident owners and partners are issued visas, if they had a capital investment of Rs. 25,000 or Rs. 10,000 for each partner respectively on 31.3.58. (ii) Directors, executives and technical employees in business houses, companies and banks, are issued visas on a quota basis, depending on the number of Ceylonese employed in a particular category. The Managing Director or General Manager is issued a visa outside the quota. New immigrants are issued visas for employment in non-Ceylonese establishments, if they are coming as replacements and they are within the quota. Skilled employees are also issued visas on a quota basis, but no replacements from outside Ceylon are permitted. (iii) Planters already in Ceylon are issued visas to continue in employment. New immigrants are not issued visas to come for employment as planters.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා (යටියන්
තොට)

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா—யட்டியாற்
தோட்டை)

(Dr. N. M. Perera—Yatiyantota)

Have any foreign creepers been allowed to come here?

ගරු ඩබ්ලි ජෝනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

According to this reply, no.

ਭਾਵਿਰੰਗ ਚੰਨ. ਚੰਨ. ਪੋਥੋਰੰਗ

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I do not know, but when we do go to these areas we find some creepers there. I do not know how they crept in but they are there in some of these estates. I think some inquiry might be made in regard to whether any exemptions have been granted.

ගරු ඩබ්ලි ටෙස්තාමායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

This is the policy, and it is the same as that of the previous Government.

කෙටුම්පත් පතත් පිළිගැන්වීම

சுமர்ப்பிக்கப்பட்ட மசோதாக்கள்

BILLS PRESENTED

ක්‍රි.ව. ෧෪෫෪ (පන්තිරිම් වැනි කි.ව. ෧෪෫෪) පනත්
කෙටුම්පත

காதிமார் (நியுமனங்களை வலிமையாக்கல்) மசோதா

QUAZIS (VALIDATION OF APPOINTMENTS)
BILL

“To validate the appointments of Quazis or Boards of Quazis who or which had been appointed by the Minister under the provisions of the Muslim Marriage and Divorce Act and to make provision for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto”.

පිළිගත් වන ලද්දේ සවදේ ග ඇමති ගරු ආචාර්ය ඩබ්ලිව්. දහනායක විසිනි. 1965 ඔක්තෝබර් 21 වන බ්‍රහස්පතින්දා දෙවන වර කියවිය යුතුයයි ද එය මුද්‍රණය කළ යුතුයයිද නියෝග කරන ලදී.

தேசிய ஞாயிறு (சுனோவன) பதன் கெடுதல்கள்

உள்நாட்டு விவகார அமைச்சர் கௌரவ கலாநிதி டபிள்யூ. தகநாயக்க அவர்களால் சமர்ப்பிக்கப்பட்டது. 1965 ஓக்டோபர் 21, வியாழக்கிழமை இரண்டாம் முறையாக மதிப்பிடப்பட வேண்டுமெனவும் அச்சிடப்பட வேண்டுமெனவும் ஆணையிடப்பட்டது.

Presented by the Hon. Dr. W. Dahana-yake, Minister of Home Affairs; to be read a Second time upon Thursday, 21st October 1965 and to be printed.

தேசிய ஞாயிறு (சுனோவன) பதன் கெடுதல்கள்

உள்நாட்டு இறைவரி (திருத்த) மசோதா

INLAND REVENUE (AMENDMENT) BILL

கடல் கடனாக டே விலாசு கடன் தரவன் பதன்வது
பித்திசு கிணோசு கிணவன டே. பீவ டிபுலி பித்திசு
[இன்னைவரே 19.]

“கெடுதல்கள் பதன்வது டன் டேவன வர கிணவிலு
கிணவிலு.”—[கௌ. வன்னினாயக்க.]

பித்திசு கிணவிலு கிணவிலு கிணவிலு.

வினா மீதான ஒத்திவைக்கப்பெற்ற விவாதம் மீள
ஆரம்பிப்பதற்கான கட்டளை வாசிக்கப்பட்டது. [19,
ஓக்டோபர்]

“மசோதா இப்பொழுது இரண்டாம் முறை மதிப்
பிடப்படுமா” [கௌரவ வன்னினாயக்க].

வினா, மீண்டும் எடுத்தியம்பப்பெற்றது.

*Order read for resuming Adjourned
Debate on Question—[19th October].*

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

Question again proposed.

டி. ஐ. 2.20

ஞாயிறு பதன். பி. பி. பி. பி.

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

When we adjourned yesterday, I
was discussing the question of capital
gains tax. May I say this in general?

I was unfortunately not here when
my Colleague the hon. Joint Member
for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard
Soysa), made his contribution to
this Debate. I have since then read
his speech in so far as it appeared in
the papers and I am satisfied that
most of the important points have
been dealt with in an excellent
way. I do not think I need dwell
too much on some of the points he
dealt with.

—தேவன வர கிணவிலு

May I generally echo one statement
of his? If there is any evidence re-
quired of the undesirability of
legislation by reference, this is it.

I do not know whether any of the
new Members of this House have gone
through this Bill and tried to under-
stand it. This requires some wading.
I would challenge the Hon. Minister
to give me an explanation to this
section without any help from his
experts.

At page 8, beginning with (C)
there is “by the insertion, imme-
diately after sub-section (7) of that
section”. Of what Section is this
sub-section (7)? Can the Hon.
Minister please explain this without
any reference to his experts?

It is, apparently, sub-section (7)
of Section 10 of the principal Act. I
have Section 10 of the principal Act
with me, and there is no reference to
(k) in it.

You will find the Bill says: “of the
following new sub-section:—

“(7A) For the purpose of paragraph
(k) of sub-section (1)”.

and so on. There is no paragraph
(k) to sub-section (1). They have
assumed a paragraph (k). There is,
of course, a reference to a new
paragraph (k) at page 6 of the Bill.
This they have assumed is part of
their Bill already. It has yet to be
accepted but they refer to it as
paragraph (k).

All that I am saying is that when
we have complicated details, parti-
cularly in an Inland Revenue Bill,
it is best in the interests of all that
the full Bill be brought before this
House instead of this piecemeal legis-
lation by reference. It makes it very
difficult for hon. Members. It re-
quires hours and hours of careful
painstaking plodding to understand
the full implications of the Bill by
having a number of previous Acts
by your side. I would, therefore,
appeal to the Hon. Minister that
when he is making large scale
changes as he has made in this Bill,
to make it a comprehensive Bill.
You will find this Bill goes into
ninety-odd pages.

දේශීය ආදායම් (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

ශ්‍රී ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන (රාජ්‍ය ඇමති සහ අග්‍රාමාත්‍යතුමාගේත්, රාජ්‍යාරක්ෂක හා විදේශ කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමතිගේත් පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්)

(කෙළරාව ශ්‍රී. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන—මහාමාත්‍ය ආයතන අමාත්‍යවරයා පිළිබඳව අමාත්‍යවරයාගේ පාත්‍රකාප්පු බෙහෙවින්ව කාර්යාලයේ පැමිණිලි කරනු ලබන බවට පරීක්ෂණය කර ඇත)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene—Minister of State and Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and Minister of Defence and External Affairs)

This was drafted in your time.

ආමායම් එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාතිඨි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

But not by reference. I made a comprehensive Bill, but not this. The Bill I had ready was not a Bill by reference but a comprehensive Bill.

ශ්‍රී ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන

(කෙළරාව ශ්‍රී. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

Where is it?

ආමායම් එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාතිඨි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

It must be in the department.

This is a practice which is convenient for the Legal Draftsman or for other parties directly concerned with it, but not convenient for Members of Parliament and the public. In the case of the public it is worse. If we find it so difficult with the experience we have had, how much worse would ordinary persons outside find it when they have to refer to the various Acts that have been previously passed. I would, therefore, like the Hon. Minister to consider whether it is not wise to bring a comprehensive Bill embodying all the amendments so that reference would be made easy.

May I now refer to some of the points which have not been touched upon by my good Friend, the hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa) and also to some of the

points to which reference has already been made in order to give them a slightly different emphasis?

I was dealing yesterday with the question of capital gains tax. We on this side of the House are opposed to any change at all in the capital gains tax. But I did maintain yesterday and also in the Second Reading Debate on the Appropriation Bill that if it was desirable to make a change, the desirability extended only to purely speculative transactions, such as the purchase of property, shares and so on. If there are certain people who indulge in purely speculative transactions, such as the buying of stocks and shares and so on, they can well afford to pay 45 per cent by way of capital gains tax.

In the case of others, although it is true that the appreciation of the value of property is largely dependent on social factors, that the activities of the Government and society as a whole bring about an increase in the value of property, the 40 per cent capital gains tax is also justifiable; but I am prepared in such cases to concede a reduction if the Minister seriously urges that. But I certainly cannot understand this general reduction, irrespective of the purpose for which the property has been bought, that is sought to be introduced.

I also note that in this Bill most of the changes that are contemplated are retrospective, that is, they are effective as if the amendments had been made in 1963.

Take, for instance, the amendment in relation to the hospitals lottery. Clause 2 (2) (c), at page 4 of the Bill, states: "in so far as it relates to a prize won at any other sweep or lottery, be deemed to have come into force on October 1, 1963." Why should this exemption be given for a prize won in 1963? Clause 2 (2) (a) states: "in so far as it relates to a prize won at any hospitals lottery, be deemed to have come into force on May 2, 1963." One can understand, in the case of the Industrial Exhibition Sweep, the date being fixed as August

දේශීය ආදායම් (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

16, 1963, because there are now no Industrial Exhibition Sweeps. But in the case of the hospitals lottery, why is it May 2, 1963 ?

If you really want to go back, exempt all the people who won lotteries ; but why is the Minister giving a special *santhosam* to those who won prizes from May 2, 1963, as against those who won prizes before that date ? What is the justification for this ? As a matter of fact, I find that almost all the provisions in this Bill are retrospective.

Then I come to Clause 5. This is an important provision. This is an amendment that was introduced in the Standing Committee stage when the last Inland Revenue Bill was being discussed in this House. Since exemption from income tax was being granted to a number of industrial ventures, we insisted in the Standing Committee that every industrial venture must conform to two requirements : firstly, that the goods produced are up to standard or quality as required by the Department of Industries ; secondly, that the goods should be sold at a fair price.

In other words, if the State steps in to give the industrialists a substantial benefit by way of exemption from income tax, the least that we can expect from the industrialists is to see that they do not mulct the consumer, that they do not exploit him. What is happening is that this particular provision of the Inland Revenue Act was never observed, apparently, because the Inland Revenue Department wanted the Department of Industries to provide a certificate but they refused to give the required certificate because there was nobody competent or willing to decide whether a particular article was sold at a fair price or not.

Take electric bulbs, for instance. Hon. Members on both sides of the House said that the only thing that we did not import was the vacuum in the bulb. I must say in fairness that the position has improved. Every year the quality of the electric bulbs has slightly improved, and, perhaps, we also produce locally

some other parts that are required for their manufacture. But this requirement was never seriously observed by the Inland Revenue Department because they did not get the co-operation that was required in order to implement that.

Now, what does the Minister propose to do? I realize the difficulties, but what does the Minister propose to do? He says that under this Bill this provision will not be implemented until the proper authority is set up; he does not tell us when he intends to set up that authority; and, in the process, the poor consumer will have not only to pay more for an article but also get a shabby article.

Then take blades. Hon. Members know the quality of the local razor blades. You are lucky if you can get two shaves with a blade and then you will have to have your face massaged because of the scraping that has been done. Surely, the manufacture of these blades is not such a difficult process, there is nothing very recondite about the whole process of making these blades except to see that proper steel is used—I do not know the technical process—and that a good edge is provided. There are various types of razor blades you get from abroad. They are very expensive now because of the local blades. But even the local blades are selling at 10, 12, 15 and even 20 cents each. If you are going to grant them income tax remission for five years, surely, we must have some protection for the consumer. If the manufacturers are not prepared to co-operate, then the State must see that they do not get the benefit the State offers them. The whole purpose is not merely to produce the article but also see that we get a comparative article, an article of equally good quality, at a fairly reasonable price.

I am not very happy about this provision. If the Minister says that this will be only until the Bureau of Standards which the Minister of Industries contemplates setting up, is established, if that is so, I am prepared to agree, because, then you will

දෙයිය ආදියම් (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා]

have a specific authority for the purpose. But this is left vague, and we do not know what this means. Generally, the tendency is to adopt the path of least resistance and let things be. This is also retrospective in effect, as if it has been passed in 1963. I do not know why. Has anybody been caught under this provision that you want to exempt him?

My good Friend, the hon. Joint Member for Colombo South dealt with this question of travelling. But may I point out that with regard to travelling, if I remember right this is one of the headaches of the Inland Revenue Department, because it is not possible to find out exactly what is done by way of private travelling and what is done by way of travelling in the course of their normal business or vocation. And I do not believe that the staff of the Inland Revenue Department is competent to make this decision. They have not got the time, nor the personnel to carry out this task. The whole machinery that is being provided—it is defined at page 7—is very cumbersome. This is what it says:

“(i) in respect of expenses incurred in relation to a vehicle belonging to and maintained by him and used partly for the purposes of his trade, business, profession or vocation and partly for the domestic or private purposes of an executive officer in his employ unless such executive officer has reimbursed such person the expenses actually incurred by him in the use of such vehicle for the private or domestic purposes of such executive officer, or”

How is any officer to find out all this? He has merely to accept the statement made by the person making the declaration. Can he verify this? It is almost impossible for him to verify the statement. I think it is best to ask the hon. Appointed Member (Mr. R. Singleton-Salmon), because he has, I think, experienced all these difficulties. You should evolve a simpler method, a rule of thumb method, of determining what travelling allowances you are going to grant by way of exemption than this complicated process of finding out whether a

vehicle was used for private purposes, how many hours of the day it was used for private purposes, how many hours it was used for business purposes, and so on. It is impossible to find out all that information and this method is unworkable. I would ask the Hon. Minister to seriously consider re-wording that provision.

Lower down, on the same page, an amendment is being introduced the words of which are “constructing or renewing any building”. This refers to Section 10 of the original Act. In the ascertainment of profits or income certain exemptions are granted. Section 10 (1) (b) (ii) states:

“where such plant, machinery, or fixtures were only partly used or employed in such trade”

and so on. That amendment refers to sub-section (5) of that Section. This is a matter dealing with approved industries and unapproved industries. In the case of approved industries there is a 40 per cent rebate or deduction permitted in ascertaining the profits of any particular person or company. In the case of unapproved industries the rebate is 20 per cent. In the case of approved as well as unapproved industries you are bringing in new words “constructing or renewing a building”. In the anxiety of the Government to grant substantial concessions to the capitalist class they have introduced new words and widened the scope of exemptions that are being granted, which will make it absolutely and patently easy for these capitalists to run through this Bill and escape and evade the taxes they have to pay.

What is meant by “renewal of a building”? Does it mean any repairs to a building? And what is the extent of the repairs contemplated? How are you going to measure the extent of renewals? If you are thinking of a new building, then it is understandable! You then have a contractor; you know how much it will cost; you have your bills of quantities. That is easily understood. But if a company says, “We have renewed this building”? If the work

දේශීය ආදායම් (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

was carried out internally in the sense that no outside contract was given, how are you going to find out the extent of the renewal? There are good employers who submit true and accurate statements but there are a large number of people who are waiting for a chance to evade the taxes. You have introduced these new words “renewing a building” and you are giving a 40 per cent rebate in the case of an approved industry and 20 per cent rebate in the case of an unapproved industry; but how are you going to estimate the extent of this renewal? Will the Hon. Minister tell us? You will have to seriously consider this question in the Committee stage. I am not satisfied at all with this position. The Hon. Minister has been very anxious to grant all sorts of exemptions and relief to the capitalist class. In the end I do not think he will get any taxes at all.

Then, at page 8 of the Bill—I have already referred to page 8; it is almost difficult to locate the particular amendment—what is most important is that it says, “such sum as the Assessor considers to be the amount of the expenses so incurred shall be deemed to be the actual expenses so incurred.” In other words, in the case of travelling and the use of vehicles, the assessor’s decision is supposed to be the final determining factor with regard to the actual travelling expenses incurred. That could have been a simple definition instead of trying to confuse it by saying partly for the purposes of his trade, and so on, and partly for his domestic or private purposes, and so on. It is better to leave it to the assessor. Of course, it is more than this officer can do. Fix a lump sum if you like. It may be arbitrary and may cause hardship in some cases, but nevertheless, it will be easy from an administrative point of view.

This is also retrospective. Sub-section (2) says:

“The amendments made in section 10 of the principal Act by sub-section (1) of this section, other than the amendments made in the aforesaid section 10 by sub-paragraph (iv) of paragraph (A), and by

paragraph (C), of sub-section (1) of this section, shall be deemed to have come into force on the date of commencement of that Act.”

That is, 1963.

Who are these beneficiaries who are going to get these benefits from 1963? I do not understand the position the Hon. Minister is taking up. Can the Hon. Minister in his reply explain why this new exemption was brought in under Section 10?

Under Clause 7, amending Section 11 of the principal Act, sub-section (1) of the principal Act says:

“For the purpose of ascertaining the profits or income of any person from any source, no deduction shall be allowed in respect of—

- (a) domestic or private expenses, including the cost of travelling between residence and place of business or employment;
- (b) expenses incurred in connection with employment other than the expenses referred to in paragraphs (d), (e) and (g) of sub-section (1) of section 10;
- (c) any travelling expenditure incurred in connection with any trade, business . . .”

and so on. The original Act provides for all these as non-deductible for the purpose of ascertaining the income of any person.

Then they have brought, in addition to that, a further amendment—“by the substitution, for the expression ‘paragraphs (d) . . .’, which deals with entertainment expenses incurred by such person or his employee, and “(e) and (g) of sub-section (1) of section 10;’, of the expression ‘paragraphs (c), (d), (e), (f) and (g) of sub-section (1) of section 10;’, ”

You have brought in newly, (f), that is, “one quarter of such person’s cost of advertisement in connection with any trade, business, profession or vocation carried on or exercised by him.” I would like the Hon. Minister to explain to us precisely why he brought in these additional sections.

දේශීය ආදායම් (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ආවර්ජය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා]

The next point deals with travelling outside Ceylon, at page 9—

“by the insertion, immediately after paragraph (c) of that sub-section, of the following new paragraph:—

‘(cc) any expenditure incurred for any year of assessment commencing on or after April 1, 1965, in travelling outside Ceylon in connection with any trade, business, profession or vocation carried on or exercised in Ceylon by such person.’”

Am I to understand, therefore, that a certain amount of the expenditure incurred in travelling outside Ceylon is going to be exempted? If so, what are the limits? That is a new paragraph to be introduced after paragraph (c). And if you say “No”, that is, if the total expenditure incurred on travelling outside Ceylon will not be deductible, then that is understandable.

All along, the sections are retrospective. Page 10 again is retrospective. Almost this entire Bill is retrospective from the point of view of its effects as from 1963. Take page 12, page 13; every one of these sections is retrospective. Even pages 19, 21 and 22.

My good Friend dealt with the question of the reduction in the wealth tax so far as companies are concerned and I do not want to go over it; but, may I inquire why it is made retrospective? Sub-clause 2 of clause 19 reads as follows:

“The amendment made in section 29 of the principal Act by paragraph (b) sub-section (1) of this section shall, in so far as it relates to the year of assessment commencing on April 1, 1964, be deemed to have come into force on August 28, 1964, and accordingly any sum paid in excess of the amount of the tax which a non-resident company would have paid under the principal Act as amended by sub-section (1) of this section shall be refunded to that company.”

Why, may I ask? It is not only that you are reducing the wealth tax so far as non-resident companies are concerned, but you are making provision for the repayment of what has

already been paid. Why this extra fondness for non-resident companies? According to the law of the land they were obliged to pay and they have paid. Why are you giving it back to them? I do not understand. And, Sir, all the time they are talking of not having money; the Government has no money, they say. Even the Prime Minister gets on platforms and says the country is almost bankrupt, the exchequer is empty and so on, and they give back the money we have collected also to the foreign companies.

ශ්‍රී ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන

(කෙළරව ශ්‍රේ. ඥර. ඥයවර්තන)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

Companies do not pay wealth tax?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාතිථි ආණ්. ආණ්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Certainly. In lieu of that they paid 10 per cent on their profits. I fixed it at 10 per cent and now you have reduced it to 5 per cent. That is what I am objecting to. It is bad enough that you have reduced it from 10 per cent to 5 per cent; but you are now refunding the money they have already paid. On the basis of the wealth tax they are assessed, but the percentage levy is on their profits.

Can the Hon. Minister explain why the term “taxable wealth” has been removed and the expression “net wealth” brought in? What are the implications of that alteration? Not only on this occasion but right along I notice that the expression “taxable wealth” has been removed. Is that because of the 80 per cent tax? The removal of the 80 per cent upper limit which was brought in enabled them to get some exemption. Wealth tax is a deductible tax from the point of view of income tax. When it comes to dependants in the family who have independent incomes, what is concerned is not the taxable wealth but the net wealth. I would

දේශීය ආදායම් (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

like to know why these changes have been made and what the full implications thereof are. All these are operative from 1963. You find that on page 23.

The next point relates to Clause 23. The hon. Joint Member for Colombo South dealt with this question. May I also point out that this is one of the most dangerous provisions. This deals with the question of the exemption from tax in the case of those who have undertaken new agricultural ventures, including animal husbandry. Now, this is one of the most difficult things to assess. The actual amount of losses incurred cannot be assessed. Your department, which is already understaffed, will not be in a position to check and find out the accuracy of some of the statements that have been made.

It is not surprising that a large number of persons, particularly Indian merchants who have always been evading tax if they could help it, have been the first to rush in for these new ventures of producing subsidiary foodstuffs. It is not that they want to produce subsidiary foodstuffs, but they know the losses incurred in the process will be deductible from their income tax. And the Minister will find that a considerable number of these people will be paying less tax in the coming year. A good number will show substantial losses as a result of the agricultural ventures. The Hon. Minister's Inland Revenue Department will be powerless to prevent the inclusion of all those losses in their assessments.

Under this same heading the Hon. Minister has introduced a new provision with regard to exports. He is giving a 5 per cent rebate on income tax in the case of those who show that they have been able to export a certain quantum of goods. I think all hon. Members of this House will agree that those industrialists who have ventured into the field of exports must be encouraged, must be given every incentive to do so. The previous Government tried to work out a scheme ; I do not know whether

it has been completed, but I know it has been much talked about. I think all of us have agreed on it. But is this the best method that has been devised ?

Pakistan has a very satisfactory scheme of rebates for exports. What is required is not exemption from income tax or a rebate in income tax, but a scheme to provide these exporters cheaper and cheaper industrial raw materials they want or various other raw materials they require for the manufacture of their products for export. Grant them substantial rebates on all the various items they require for their manufactures. That is a much more satisfactory method of encouraging exports than anything that you can devise by way of any exemption of tax on profits. You are generally granting tax exemptions to individuals as most of these new industrialists may be individuals, particularly the Ceylonese, but you are not really encouraging them on that basis to increase exports. I think, the Hon. Minister of Finance, with the co-operation of the Hon. Minister of Industries, should get down to discuss this matter with potential exporters like Messrs. Maliban Biscuits and Hentley Garments. By the way, when I talk of Hentley Garments, I should like to ask the Hon. Minister of Industries, particularly because these people are being given substantial aid in order to maintain their exports, to see that labour is not exploited. Do you know that for the Russian order that they have got they are employing a hundred and fifty girls working from 5 p.m. to 2 a.m.? These girls are employed to do night work, which is against all labour laws that I know of. Secondly, how much are they paid for the work that they do at night? Hentleys pay them only Rs. 1.50 This is the worst kind of exploitation you can think of. The least that you can insist on when these exemptions, these rebates and various other benefits, are granted to the industrialists, is that the industrialists should not only give the consumer a decent article at a fair price

දේශීය ආදායම් (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා]

but that their employees are also given a fair wage, a wage on which they can live. It is inhuman to think that a firm like Hentleys should be exploiting the female labour that they employ.

I am sorry I have to ask the Hon. Minister to seriously reconsider this matter because this is not the best method of encouraging exports, that is, giving purely a rebate of 5 per cent. Here it says:

“Where a person during the year preceding any year of assessment commencing on or after April 1, 1965, exports from Ceylon any goods manufactured by him in Ceylon, such person shall be entitled to a set-off against the income tax payable by him in respect of that year of assessment of an amount equal to five per centum of the f.o.b. value of the goods so exported, if the Assessor is satisfied that the following conditions are fulfilled:—”

Now, the conditions are that such goods should be manufactured in Ceylon and so on. All these conditions, I can understand; I am prepared to accept them. But, may I suggest to the Hon. Minister to reconsider this matter because, I think, a study of the method adopted in Pakistan which has been very successful will be very useful here? There they have actually granted rebates in the case of either machinery that they require to produce more and more goods or to improve their own factories or industrial raw material that they require or even the ordinary raw material for the articles that they produce. It is much better to give them substantial concessions by way of customs duty than these rebates. The Hon. Minister will find that such concessions in Customs duty will serve as a much greater incentive in the process of furthering our exports.

Then Sir, I am passing on to the main question of approved savings. The Hon. Minister will remember that I pointed out in the course of the Second Reading Debate on the Appropriation Bill that the original statement of the Hon. Minister implied that any future loans will also be considered as an approved saving.

I notice that has been removed. Even now what are the approved savings? Any payment of any premia on any life insurance policy, or any money deposited in any special account in the Central Bank of Ceylon or in such other institution as may be approved by the Minister by Order on the recommendation of the Monetary Board of the Central Bank, or any money invested in any security of the Government of Ceylon, or any money paid or payable as wealth tax. Wealth tax becomes an approved saving, and you will get so much less on income tax. With regard to repayment of loans, no future loans will be covered. It states:

“any repayment of a loan taken, or debt incurred, prior to the ninth day of August, 1965,”

Why this ninth day? It must be a very auspicious day, this 9th day of August, 1965.

- “(e) any repayment of a loan taken, or debt incurred, prior to the ninth day of August, 1965, for the purchase of any property, or the repayment of any part of such loan or debt,
- (f) any repayment of a loan which was taken prior to the ninth day of August, 1965, on the hypothecation of any property, or the repayment of any part of such loan.”

In other words, if any person has incurred a debt, either by way of mortgage or through a bank or by other means, he is entitled to treat that as an approved saving to get certain benefits, irrespective of the purposes for which that loan was taken. I can understand the grant of this benefit if the loan is taken for the purpose of industrial development or for the purpose of investment, or for starting a new venture. Suppose the man has taken the loan purely from the point of view of extravagance, for current expenditure, to pay a dowry for his daughter, why should such a man be given exemption? What is it that he has done by way of increasing the wealth of this country, unless it is that getting a son-in-law means the increasing of wealth? Surely the Hon. Minister

දේශීය ආදායම් (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

should have at least said, when he introduced this provision, that it would apply to any loan or debt incurred for the purpose of some new venture, agricultural or industrial. There must be some purpose for which the loan was taken, some useful purpose. Any loan prior to 1965, irrespective of the time—it might have been obtained 50 years back—can be treated as an approved saving and granted certain benefits. I do not think that is justified. I should like the Hon. Minister to seriously reconsider this matter. If you are going to exempt these things, then it should be stated that it is for such and such a purpose, such as, for example, some industrial or agricultural venture, starting a poultry farm to produce eggs or to produce poultry for the table, which will be something new. They will be of some benefit to us. But treating loans raised for mere extravagance or wasteful expenditure as deserving of any exemption or rebate is something that cannot be tolerated.

Some of the points that I have raised on the question of taxation rates and so on have already been touched upon by the hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa). I do not want to go over that ground. I do want to say, however, that we have not been happy at all about the various proposals in this Bill such as granting income tax rebates and substantial benefits to the capitalist class. The Government said that they were giving the working class benefits to the extent of Rs. 18 million. Not one cent of that sum has gone towards benefiting them because the Government has failed to carry out its so-called intentions. Under this Bill you will be granting to the capitalist class of this country benefits which we compute at anything up to Rs. 70 million; it may be more. These are definite, certain, assured benefits. On the other hand, the benefits you proposed giving the poor people have not materialized. Apart from dhal, onions, and so on, the reduction of the price of kerosene oil was an

assured benefit which the poor people would have got had you worked your scheme satisfactorily. But that has not happened.

In view of all this, we cannot support this Bill.

අ. ආ. 3.04

ආර්. සිංග්ලටන්-සැලමන් මය. (පන් කරන ලද මන්ත්‍රී)

(திரு. ஆர். சிங்கல்டன்-சமன்—நியமன அங்கத்தவர்)

(Mr. R. Singleton-Salmon—Appointed Member)

When I made some notes about this amending Bill I was rather diffident about raising some of the points that struck me as they seemed more appropriate to the Committee stage. However, as the Second Member for Colombo South did speak—

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Who said he was the Second Member?

සිංග්ලටන්-සැලමන් මය.

(திரு. சிங்கல்டன்-சமன்)

(Mr. Singleton-Salmon)

He is neither First nor Second, so he is Joint Member, I suppose.

The Joint Member for Colombo South did mention things that, I thought, should be brought up more appropriately during the Committee stage, such as the question he asked: why certain words were in brackets when they were not in brackets previously?

The hon. Member for Dehiowita (Mr. Weerasekera) was very cunning in making a Budget speech about gem mining, which was allowed. So, I feel that the points that I had intended only to bring up in the Committee stage might be quite appropriately brought up now.

The hon. Member for Colombo South, joint, disjointed or whatever he is—

දේශීය ආදායම් (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා
(කලාநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)
Conjoint!

සිංගල්ටන්-සැමන් මයා.
(திரு. சிங்கல்டன்-சமன்)
(Mr. Singleton-Salmon)

—raised the question of travelling expenses in relation to Clause 2. In raising the question of “Rs. 100 for a month” being very different from “Rs. 100 per month” he missed, I think, one of the principal defects in this particular clause, that is, that, if the travelling expenses exceed Rs. 100 even by one rupee a month, then nothing is allowed. That is the wording of the clause:

“And provided further that.....any allowance granted for travelling.....

(c) does not exceed one hundred rupees for a month;”

It therefore follows that, if they do exceed it, then nothing is allowed. If it is Rs. 105, then they do not say, “We will allow the Rs. 100 and you must pay only Rs. 5.” They say, “No. You will have to pay on the whole Rs. 105.” I think that was not intended and I hope that in the Committee stage—

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

The discretion is granted to the assessor.

සිංගල්ටන්-සැමන් මයා.
(திரு. சிங்கல்டன்-சமன்)
(Mr. Singleton-Salmon)

Not in this particular clause. I think it is in Clause 6, which deals with the expenses incurred by an executive in travelling in a car which is allowed to him, that the assessor can assess the amount. Even in Clause 6 it would appear that if an executive does not reimburse the company, then nothing is allowed to the company. For instance, if the travelling expenses were Rs. 15,000 in the year and the amount that the

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

executive should have reimbursed the company was Rs. 2,000, then, if he does not reimburse that amount, by the wording of Clause 6, the company cannot even claim the other balance Rs. 13,000.

There is the point made by the hon. Joint Member with which I do agree and that is that there are quite a number of amendments—

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

This is badly drafted.

සිංගල්ටන්-සැමන් මයා.
(திரு. சிங்கல்டன்-சமன்)
(Mr. Singleton-Salmon)

Not bad drafting; possibly careless, possibly hasty drafting and inadvertence or advertence—I am not quite certain—[Interruption.]

Then there is a clause which allows the Commissioner of Inland Revenue to revoke an order he has made regarding accounting dates. Now, he has full authority to change these dates and make order that the accounting date for a particular company shall be such and such. This gives the Commissioner the authority to revoke it so that no company can tell at any time, if it had a different date from the ordinary fixed year or the ordinary income tax year—no company can say definitely—when it would be called upon to alter its date. Therefore it will not be able to provide for the possible danger of double taxation in overlapping years because of different dates of accounting years. That is merely, I think, possible by advertence and not inadvertence. I do not know why it has been put at all.

With regard to the clause dealing with dividend warrants—I think, it is Clause 18—it would appear to me that it would be desirable for the Commissioner of Inland Revenue to prescribe a definite form for dividend warrants and say what has to be put in it and what need not be put in.

දේශීය ආදායම් (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

The exemption of dividends from subsidiary companies wholly owned, and so on, which now have to be accounted as dividends received cannot be included. It would be far better to prescribe the form instead of letting everybody make up his own form. And, of course, to make that retrospective seems to me to be totally impracticable because you might make it retrospective to a date prior to the declaration of dividend by a particular company; and you are going to say "This is the form you have to use", when they have already set it out in the other form. This is another case where the retrospective effect does seem to be rather bad.

Relief is to be granted from income tax on account of goods manufactured in and exported from Ceylon from materials imported into Ceylon. In other words the manufacturer who gets his material from outside and manufactures his goods and then exports them is to be treated better than the man who uses our own indigenous products for manufacture and exports the goods so manufactured. I think it is an oversight. In other words, it looks as though you are rather encouraging people to import, manufacture here and then export, than to take what we have in Ceylon, manufacture from that and make our exports, because it is only the manufacturer who manufactures from imported raw materials who gets this relief under Clause 25.

Let me now deal with the question of approved savings. The hon. Member for Colombo South did rather go to town on this, and one particular point that he stressed was the fact that these approved savings are not logical because the whole trend of the Hon. Minister of Finance's speech, as has been pointed out by our Friends opposite, was mainly to encourage

and support the private sector. We will raise some definite points naturally. That can be taken for granted. But these approved savings nullify the whole of the good intentions, shall I say, that he had about the private sector, because apart from the very small amount that it is possible to invest in approved undertakings, there are very few such undertakings, and they have got to invest in shares of the original issue. Everything else has to be either invested or deposited with the Government. It will lead to a complete drying up of capital available to the private sector unless, of course, you are willing to pay the tax and treat it not as approved savings. You cannot put money back into your own business as an approved saving. It can only be put into Government or approved undertakings or into the Special Fund with the Central Bank which is similar to handing it over to the Government to look after. You cannot utilize it either for your own business or for the repayment of any loans taken in preceding years. Besides, education which differs considerably from, individual to individual, and expenditure on sickness, cannot be treated as an approved saving. None of that expenditure can be treated as an approved saving.

I am talking about the approved savings now for the purpose of the surtax of 20 per cent and 35 per cent. In other words, they fix a certain amount which they consider to be a reasonable expenditure for anybody, and say, over and above that, if you do not give it over to the Government, if you do not put it into the special account with the Central Bank, if you do not invest it in an approved saving, then it will be taxed at an extra 20 per cent then up to 65 per cent, and then up to 80 per cent.

දේශීය ආදායම් (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[සිංහල උත්-සාමන් මයා.]

Then, Sir it does not take in as the expenditure tax did, the varying expenditure for different classes of people. Let us take education for example. If you have a married couple with no children, education costs are nothing. But if there is a married couple with four children, they get a certain relief on account of income tax. But they get no relief on account of the expenditure for the education of those children.

Now, I am not saying that an education allowance should be made from the income tax angle, but it should be considered when you are considering the surtax. In other words, before you assess the possible savings, you should take into account the educational allowance and the sickness allowance because there again, as I know to my own cost when my wife was sick during the expenditure tax period, it costs one person quite a considerable amount not only in having to meet the expenditure, but in the tax that you have got to pay on that expenditure.

Then, as in this case, where you have heavy medical bills to meet, they preclude you from saving that amount and you have got to pay those bills and you do not get any allowance for not having saved because you cannot save if you have got medical bills. So that, I think, for the purpose of calculating the surtax at 65 per cent and 80 per cent some allowance should be made, in particular, for education and sickness.

Now deductions from approved savings must be the net cash received, that is, the gross amount less the tax paid. Now, why should they not deduct the gross amount paid to you? They will give you an allowance of the net amount, not taking into account the tax you paid on it.

Take a retiring gratuity. Clause 39 deals with penalties. Now the penalty clause in the Inland Revenue Act is rather rigid. Unless you pay within stipulated times you have to pay a

penalty of 5 per cent or, I think, 15 per cent or something like that, I am not quite certain. Anyway, I think, the reasons for not having paid that tax should be extended to cover periods of illness, absence from the Island, and so on. At the moment they do not. If you are absent from the Island when your assessment is sent, then you have to pay a penalty when you get back, or, say, you are in hospital. The assessment is sent and you cannot deal with it. A lot of these are details which I shall go into more fully during the Committee stage.

The two matters that I do really want to stress are these. The first is the question of the stultification or the gradual starvation of the private sector by not allowing any approved saving, except in the very limited sphere of Government investment—an account in the Central Bank or an investment in an approved company. I think that certainly should be extended to cover investments in one's own company and in the stocks and shares and securities of other companies.

As the hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa) stated yesterday, it is not consistent to allow an approved saving to one class of the private sector. Naturally, he argued that while he was not approving of any support being given to the private sector, it was not consistent to give support to the private sector which happens to be an approved company. The hon. Member argued that the Government was going outside the whole concept of channelling investments entirely through the Government, and he said it is not consistent to recognize the private sector to that limited extent without recognizing it all over. And I quite agree with the hon. Member for Colombo South, though not with his ideas about it, that it is not consistent to allow a certain very limited scope of investment, that is, in approved companies, and not allow investments in one's own company.

දේශීය ආදායම් (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

If you want to develop, if you want to plough back some of the money you make and you invest in your own company, that is not allowed as an approved saving. Particularly in these days when we are trying as hard as we can to Ceylonize trade, industry and commercial ventures, and when we are trying to encourage Ceylonese to invest in these companies that belong to them, you are going to say to them, "Although we want you to do that, we will not approve of it for the purposes of the Inland Revenue (Amendment) Act."

The whole idea is not consistent at all with the various policies of the Government. It is not consistent with the policy of the Government to encourage the private sector; it is not consistent with the policy of the Government to encourage Ceylonization of the private sector. The Government says to them, "If you want to invest in those companies to which you belong, that is not an approved investment for the purposes of the surtax. You can do it but you will have to pay the tax." Is that encouraging Ceylonese? Is that encouraging our own people to invest in the companies which they have joined? The whole policy is inconsistent.

The second matter which I do want to stress again is this question of the allowances that should be given when you are calculating the surtax from 45 to 65 and then to 80 per cent in particular for education and medical purposes.

There are other matters, comparatively smaller ones, which I shall bring up at the Committee stage.

අ. හා. 3.25

ටී. බී. සුබසිංහ මහා. (කටුගම්පොල)

(திரு. டி. பி. சுபசிங்க—கட்டுகம்பொள)

(Mr. T. B. Subasinghe—Katugampola)

Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Minister of Finance has been very, very generous with the private sector. Anybody studying this Bill would most certainly say that he is the one Finance Minister who has been most generous with the private sector in recent years.

ආදායම් එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

He is the darling of the private sector.

සුබසිංහ මහා.

(திரு. சுபசிங்க)

(Mr. Subasinghe)

But still you find the hon. Appointed Member (Mr. Singleton-Salmon) protesting most loudly that he has not done enough. That is why we say that with all the good intentions of the Minister of Finance that he is going to get the private sector to develop this country, he will not succeed.—[Interruption].

The hon. Joint Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa) and the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) have dealt with some of the details of this Bill, and I am very much in agreement with most of the criticisms they have made. Therefore, I am not going into the Bill itself clause by clause, because we will have an opportunity of raising some of these points in the course of the discussion in Committee. But I do want to make a few general remarks about the context in which this Bill has come and attempt, from our point of view, to place this Bill in the correct perspective.

Sir, you will remember that in the speech introducing the Budget the Hon. Minister of Finance blamed the previous Government for all the economic ills that are confronting this country today, and I think the hon. Member for Yatiyantota who was the last Finance Minister of the last Government came in for a lot of criticism. Now, the Hon. Minister assured us that under his leadership this country would be marching into a new era of economic prosperity with the help of the Appointed Member (Mr. Singleton-Salmon), and his private sector. He did everything possible to give, in the way of concessions, to the big interests in this

දේශීය ආදායම් (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[සුබසිංහ මයා.]

country in the hope that they would play their part; and those proposals are embodied in this Bill.

In the Budget proposals of the Hon. Minister of Finance in his desire to create this new era in Ceylon, he tried to attack the problem on three fronts. Financially, he said we shall give certain concessions to the poor consumers by reducing import duties on a number of articles and abolishing import duties on certain others. Then, he said: We shall also find finances to develop this country by getting foreign aid in large measure. Thirdly—the most important from his point of view, I believe—he said: We shall try to undo some of the restrictions placed on private enterprise by the previous Government ever since the year 1956. Those were the three fronts on which he was going to attack this problem of economic development in this country.

What have we come to today? He told us that he would get Rs. 250 million in foreign aid this year to help him to tide over the difficulties. I speak subject to correction. I believe up to date we have received a promise from Britain of up to Rs. 27 million. Is that right? From West Germany up to Rs. 36 million; from Japan up to Rs. 20 million; and from the World Bank Rs. 50 million. Is that right? That would bring up the total to Rs. 133 million. But still there is a gap although the Hon. Minister of State told us the other day in this House that the Hon. Prime Minister would be making a statement about the foreign aid we will be receiving. He told us we will be receiving Rs. 250 million this year, Rs. 500 million next year and Rs. 500 million more the following year, and so on and so forth. We are still awaiting that statement. But it seems to us today that the anticipations of the Finance Minister have misfired.

Then, on the other front, what has happened to the relief you proposed to give the consumer by the abolition and reduction of import duties? Take the question of kerosene oil.

Most hon. Members of this House laughed at us when we raised our doubts about the effectiveness of the reduction in the price of kerosene oil so far as the consumer was concerned. But what has happened today? Even kerosene oil cannot be supplied to the consumer regularly and at the price that the Government desired to sell.

Similarly, the benefits that the Finance Minister hoped to pass on to the consumer by reducing the duties on potatoes, onions and chillies, have not reached the consumer. It is not the consumer who is receiving the benefits. Actually, it has been admitted by hon. Members of the Government party themselves and also by the newspapers that the consumer is not receiving the benefits but that the big traders in Colombo are deliberately and purposely creating shortages in order to make use of the scarcities to enrich themselves. The other day, the newspapers reported that some of these importers were refusing even to clear the cargo from the port in order to create artificial scarcities, so that the prices may shoot up and they may reap the harvest. That being the position, who are the people who have received all the benefits that the Finance Minister proposed to give the people of this country, as he said, making no distinction between the various classes? Who are the beneficiaries? It is not the poor consumer. It is not the State by way of foreign exchange. It is really the big vested interests who are receiving the benefits, and those benefits are embodied in this Bill. And still, the hon. Appointed Member (Mr. Singleton-Salmon) complains that they are not enough!

I do not want to go into the details of the proposals but there are certain remarks that I want to make about some of the concessions that have been given, for instance, in agriculture. With regard to the tax concessions given to the people or companies who are going to clear land and grow subsidiary food crops, my criticism is that the Government has been over anxious to grant these tax

දේශීය ආදායම් (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

concessions to people who are just about to embark on a new venture. As we pointed out in the Second Reading Debate on the Appropriation Bill, this is a new venture that the Government is going to undertake. It is a kind of walking into the unknown; we are still not sure.

We have a suspicion that many of these people who have promised the Government to undertake a venture, such as the clearing of jungle, for the purpose of growing subsidiary food crops, will not only try to reap the harvest by the sale of timber available on those lands, by importing all the machinery required at concessionary rates and by making use of all other concessions granted by the Government, but we have also a fear that, without experience, by going into the unknown—unlike in permanent cultivations such as tea, rubber and coconut—and growing subsidiary food crops, they will be faced with many difficulties. Because of their lack of experience, at the end we would find that they have made use of all the benefits, including the tax concessions that the Finance Minister is giving, and at the same time, as we said before in the Second Reading Debate, we will have a sort of semi-desert in those jungle areas. Therefore, it is our definite view that the Finance Minister has been too hasty. He has been too hasty for this reason: previous Finance Ministers also have been giving all manner of concessions to private enterprise in the hope that they would invest in new fields of production and we have found to our cost that no amount of encouragement or incentive given has resulted in the contribution that this country expected.

Therefore, it is our view that the Hon. Minister of Finance has been hasty. He has been over-generous in spite of the protestations of members representing the business interests of this country.

Now, the other day, the Hon. Minister of State, I believe, made a statement somewhere in Kolonne, at the opening of a police station, that the policy of this Government is to

reduce taxation so as to enable private enterprise to develop this country. Judging from what is happening today, what the Hon. Minister of State stated seems to be quite true. The only hope of the present Government is to rely on private enterprise of this country to solve the economic problems facing us today. But, as I have said, in the past private enterprise has not made any significant contribution to the economic development of this country. Similarly, you find representatives of big private enterprises saying that the concessions that they have been granted already are inadequate. Does the Government really expect the major economic problems of this country to be solved by depending so much on private enterprise, as the Hon. Minister of State has stated? That is why we think that the taxation policy of the present Government is intended not so much to bring about the most rapid economic development of this country but to give assurances to the vested interests that the present Government is making a definite break with the policies of the past for the expansion of the State sector and is getting back to unlimited private enterprise. That is why, in spite of all the protestations of newspapers and representatives of business interests, we cannot accept the position that in the economic sphere the Government is following a policy of socialism. This Bill clearly proves that the policy of the Finance Minister and his Government is to be conciliatory as much as possible towards the private sector and to bring back the vested interests that had been brought under control in a limited way in the past. We are therefore, unable to support this Bill.

අ. සා. 3.38

ශ්‍රී ඩී. ඩී. වන්නිනායක (මුදල් ඇමති)
(කෙළරව ප්‍ර. පි. වන්නිනායක—නීති
අමාත්‍ය)

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

I should like, first of all, to thank the hon. Members of the Opposition who made contributions to this Debate.

දේශීය ආදායම් (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ශ්‍රී ලන්කීයයක]

Looking at the criticisms from a Second Reading point of view, I will say, there was one general tenor in all these speeches. In fact, three or four speakers from the Opposition emphasized the fact that these amendments are intended to give large concessions to one class of people, the richer class, of this country.

Well, after all, under an Income Tax Amendment Bill you can only give concessions—if you want to give concessions—to income taxpayers. It is not possible to give concessions to other people who do not pay income tax. In fact, this criticism in a way is not surprising, particularly when it comes from the L.S.S.P. section of the Opposition.

After all, we on the two sides of the House are arguing on two different premises. Really the Opposition, the L.S.S.P. section of the Opposition at least, do not believe in a private sector. They definitely said, quite openly, during the course of this Debate as well as during the course of previous Debates that whatever incentives you may give the private sector it will not deliver the goods.

In fact, my hon. Friend, the last speaker, emphasized that point by saying that whatever the incentives be that you give the private sector, it will never respond; it had not responded in the past, it is not responding now and it will never respond in the future. Therefore, they believe only in the public sector.

On the other hand, we on this side of the House who believe in a mixed economy, believe that the development of this country must be brought about under a mixed economy where the public sector has a definite role to play while, at the same time, allowing the private sector also to play a certain role. We believe that one should supplement the other. We believe that it is not possible for one sector alone to bring about the development of the country that we have in view.

In fact, in terms of our political philosophy, we believe that it is not possible to ensure to the masses the democratic freedoms which we have in view without a healthy private sector supplementing the efforts of the public sector. We believe that under the system advocated by some of my hon. Friends on the other side we will have in this country State capitalism instead of democratic socialism about which they are talking: everything will be owned by the State, everything will be decided by the State and the people will have to listen to and carry out the dictates of the State.

We do not envisage a state of affairs like that. We believe in democratic socialism where the people have a say in the affairs of the country, where the ownership should be in the hands of the people themselves—either individuals or corporations. The scheme advocated by the Opposition will naturally lead to State capitalism which we think is not the best form of government for this country.

Thus, we are arguing on different premises. They on the Opposition side are arguing on the premise that it is only the public sector that can deliver the goods; that the private sector will never deliver the goods whatever incentives you give them. We believe in a mixed economy where no one sector alone can deliver the goods; where both sectors must supplement each other's efforts if our object of economic development is to be achieved.

It is therefore natural that income tax proposals or whatever other tax proposals we bring forward in this House will not receive the approval of the hon. Members of the other side who believe only in a public sector. Therefore, I am not surprised at the criticisms that were levelled.

There were a number of criticisms made in regard to particular clauses of the Bill. In drafting an involved and complicated piece of legislation

இதில் (வினாக்கள்) பற்றி கருத்துரை

—தேவன் வர கியதி

இதில் (வினாக்கள்) பற்றி கருத்துரை

நிதி (வினாக்கள்) மசோதா

FINANCE (SPECIAL PROVISIONS) BILL

தேவன் வர கியதி தீர்மானம் கியதி செய்து.

இரண்டாம் மதிப்பிற்கான கட்டளை வாசிக்கப்பட்டது.

Order for Second Reading read.

பி.ஓ. 3.46

அ. வந்தியான

(கௌரவ வண்ணினாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I move,

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

This Bill provides for the abolition of the following taxes as stated in the Budget speech:

The Heavy Oil Motor Vehicles Tax;

The Banks Debits Tax;

The Temporary Residence Tax; and

The Foreign Exchange Tax.

With regard to the Heavy Oil Motor Vehicles Tax, as you are no doubt aware, the proposal to abolish it was first mooted by the previous Finance Minister in the Budget speech for 1964. In fact, he found fault with me for not mentioning it in my Budget speech. I am sorry I did not refer to that fact in the Budget speech and therefore I make a particular point of mentioning it here. The abolition will be with effect from 1.1.1966, and the revenue lost by this measure will be recouped by an appropriate increase in the import duty on automotive diesel. This tax also causes much hardship to lorry owners as it is levied irrespective of the income earned by a lorry. Further, some lorry owners avoid the payment of this tax by obtaining non-user certificates in respect of lorries which, however, continue to be on the road.

The Banks Debits Tax has encouraged the use of currency in business transactions and has been a

strong disincentive to the development of the banking habit. The Banks Debits Tax is borne by only those who are unable to avoid it and to that extent its incidence is not fair or equitable. The existence of this tax makes it difficult to insist that business firms should deposit their receipts in the bank.

The Visa Tax has proved to be a major irritant to foreign personnel residing in Ceylon on legitimate business. It is not based on any fundamental principle of taxation and amounts to nothing more than extortion of money from foreigners who have been issued visas for residence in Ceylon. It is not very different from a restrictive poll tax. It should be noted that visas are issued to non-citizens only on the basis of essentiality for purpose of employment, and the tax itself has no relevance in this respect. Wives of foreign personnel and even the foreign wives of Ceylonese have been called upon to pay this tax. There does not seem to be any rationale to this unless it is designed to discourage foreign personnel from having their wives in Ceylon.

The Foreign Exchange Tax too has been a cause of much hardship to many people without substantial benefits to Government revenue. It also involves a violation of the International Monetary Fund Articles of Agreement to which Ceylon has subscribed. It should be noted that the Foreign Exchange Tax in itself does not have an appreciable impact on the release of foreign exchange because of the presence of exchange controls.

The net loss to revenue from the removal of these taxes is as follows:

(a) Banks Debits Tax Rs. 6.6 million.

(b) Visa Tax Rs. 3.0 million.

(c) Foreign Exchange Tax Rs. 5.0 million.

මුදල් (විශේෂ විධිවිධාන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

I move the Second Reading of the Bill.

ප්‍රශ්නය සහාගිමුව කරන ලදී.

வினா எடுத்தியம்பப்பெற்றது.

Question proposed.

අ. ආ. 3.50

ଆପ୍ତ, ଶ୍ରୀ ପଦ୍ମ. ପଦ୍ମ. ପଦ୍ମ.

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

With regard to this Bill there are no vast general principles to discuss. There is one matter on which I can certainly agree, that is, the removal of the Heavy Oil Motor Vehicles Tax. This was originally tried out in order to see that only those vehicles which were on the road paid the tax. That was the basis on which it was originally brought in. But it was so easy to evade the tax. It was a bit of a nuisance to the lorry owner. He had to go to the kachcheri and make this payment. As the Hon. Minister of Finance pointed out, this has led to a considerable amount of abuse. He is quite right. I had contemplated abolishing this tax and now you are doing it. So far as that is concerned we are quite prepared to support you.

As regards the Banks Debits Tax, I would say that as a Minister I too contemplated removing this tax. I think, it was introduced by Mr. Stanley de Zoysa as Minister of Finance. There does not seem to be very much principled reason for this tax, except that it is a very convenient tax to collect. It is an easy tax that calls upon those who use cheque books not to use them. However, we earned Rs. 12 million by way of the debits tax. Now Rs. 12 million is not a small sum of money.

එෆ්. ආර්. බයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

The Hon. Minister says it is only Rs. 6 million.

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

He says that because we will get back some of those moneys.

රජ මන්ත්‍රිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

We will get a part of it.

શ્રીવાલ્મીકી ઇન્દ્ર. ઇતિ. પેરુદેદ્ર

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

If the Hon. Minister is removing the tax completely, cannot we find some other way by which we could get this sum of money ? The Government is always complaining of shortage of money. Surely, it cannot let Rs. 12 million go. I thought one way of doing this was to put an additional stamp duty on the cheques used—may be on the basis of denominations—if you like, on larger cheques. But then, that might lead to abuse.

It is a very desirable thing to encourage the banking habit in Ceylon. Instead of hoarding, it is a very desirable thing to do. But I am not quite certain that the Government is going to lose only Rs. 6 million. I do not know whether his anticipation with regard to the loss of income to the Government from the actual removal of the banks debits tax is correct.

With regard to the abolition of the Temporary Residence Tax, I am afraid it is something with which I cannot personally agree. Rightly or wrongly, the Hon. Minister of State once said that this is being removed in order to encourage tourism.

ගුරු ඔප්. ආර්. පියවර්ධන

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

A class of tourism.

මුදල් (විශේෂ විධිවිධාන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

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

He said that forgetting the fact that once the person comes in as a tourist he does not have to pay a tax at all. Secondly, most of them do not stay more than a month or two actually.

ශ්‍රී ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)
If they come twice?

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

These are taxes imposed on people who have been here for well over 6 months and have been employed in some way. Those people who come for the sake of visiting this place will not be called upon to pay a visa tax.

I admit there is a hardship in the case of those who are married to foreigners. That is a matter that could be set right administratively. There are a number of young men who are married to foreign young ladies, who might have been exempted by an administrative act.

ශ්‍රී ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)
8,000 have been exempted.

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

How many millions of rupees have you got? You have got Rs. 3 million.

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

Out of 16,000, 8,000 have already been exempted. Several more are to be exempted.

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

The Hon. Minister will find that the visa tax does enable us, in the

absence of identity cards, to pinpoint the people who are not permanent residents of this country. If you have a system of issuing identity cards, then perhaps you can say, "We do not want this any longer."

ලේස්ලි ගුනවර්ධන මය. (පානදුර)
(திரு. லெஸ்லி குணவர்தன—பாணந்துறை)
(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene—Panadura)
They have given up the idea about identity cards.

ශ්‍රී ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)
No. We are bringing a Bill.

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

I am not at all happy about that. The exchange tax was imposed on those people who were going on holiday, furlough, and joy rides abroad. They were asked to pay 15 per cent. on the exchange that they were taking out of this country. Was that so unfair? Anyhow, the companies did not have to pay this tax; it was only the individuals who had to pay this tax. Is it so unfair to impose such a tax in order to discourage people going abroad, apart from the money that you collect? The Hon. Minister will realize that the purpose of this tax was not merely to collect money but also to discourage people who just wanted to make joy rides, to make it a little more expensive for them. If you want to conserve your foreign exchange, why do you not continue to impose this tax, this disability, on the individuals concerned? By imposing this tax you can make it more expensive for them to go on various trips abroad. That I thought was the purpose of this tax more than the money that you were actually going to collect by way of taxation.

It is true that the people who originally thought of this tax gave fantastic figures, but the amount that they were able to collect was

இதில் (வினா வினாவின) பதவி கெடுப்பத

—தேவன வர கியதில்

actually about for to five million rupees. I believe the purpose of this tax was to a certain extent achieved because by imposing this tax we were able to restrict the number of people going abroad. I am not at all happy with the other three taxes quite apart from the first one, the removal of which has been very reasonable and necessary.

The Hon. Minister should consider whether the form of this legislation is the most desirable. It is the most curious form of legislation that he has introduced. In one Bill you get four Bills introduced. Instead of saying—

சிங்கல்டன்-சலமன் மொ.

(திரு. சிங்கல்டன்-சலமன்)

(Mr. Singleton-Salmon)

It was in the Finance Act.

அவரீசு உன். உம். பெரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I was not the Finance Minister then.

ஃபீ. ஃபீ. டியஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க மொ.

(திரு. எம். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I started it.

அவரீசு உன். உம். பெரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You said, my associates; is it?

This certainly is a very curious piece of legislation. A Member of this House who is in favour of abolishing the heavy oil Motor Vehicles tax but who wants to vote against this Bill cannot do so because all these matters are in one Bill. If I move an amendment to delete the other three taxes here, would that be in order? I do not know what is the principle of this Bill. What is the principle of this Finance (Special Provisions) Bill? A Bill must have one principle; but in this Bill there are four principles. [Interruption].

பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸ் மொ. (தெற்கு கொழும்பு)

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸ்—கொழும்புத் தெற்கு அங்கத்தவர்)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa—Colombo South)

It is an unprincipled Bill.

கலாநிதியுமே

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Do you really mean that a bad custom that has been introduced is being followed by the Hon. Minister of Finance?

அவரீசு உன். உம். பெரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Well, Sir, I thought that they were not going to do the bad things we did. I think they should withdraw this Bill and introduce four different Bills. You are in a difficulty, Sir. In point of fact, I do not see how you can rule out an amendment, which I may move, to delete the clause in regard to the Temporary Residence Act, for instance. Can you refuse to accept that amendment? I do not see how you, as Speaker, can refuse to accept an amendment to delete it. It is a clause. There are four clauses.

கலாநிதியுமே

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

That will be considered when the hon. Member moves the amendment.

அவரீசு உன். உம். பெரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You do not want to cross bridges before you come to them.

கலாநிதியுமே

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

The Sitting is suspended till 4.30 P.M. On resumption the Hon. Deputy Speaker will take the Chair.

4.30 மணிக்கு நிறுத்தப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. 4.30 மணிக்கு மீண்டும் ஆரம்பமாகிறது. உபசபாநாயகர் [திரு. சி. எஸ். ஷேரலி கொறியா] தலைமை தாங்கினார்.

இதன்படி அமர்வு பி. பி. 4.30 மணிவரை இடை நிறுத்தப்பட்டு மீண்டும் ஆரம்பமாகியுள்ளது. உபசபாநாயகர் [திரு. சி. எஸ். ஷேரலி கொறியா] தலைமை தாங்கினார்.

Sitting accordingly suspended till 4.30 P.M., and then resumed, MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER [MR. C. S. SHIRLEY COREA], in the Chair.

இருள் (வினாக்கள்) பதவி கெட்டுப்பத

—தேவன் வர கியதே

அந்தணி மோகியை மொ.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்சா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Finance (Special Provisions) Bill, which we are discussing, is not one in regard to which it is necessary to say anything very much. My principal comment in regard to this matter is that the Hon. Minister has got his terminology somewhat mixed up. This is not a Finance Bill. The conception of a Finance Bill would be something which is in the nature of an extension of a Bill of Ways and Means. When certain Budget proposals are made for the purpose of financing the policy of Government in regard to the following year, you have in this country an Appropriation Bill—a Bill of Ways and Means, as it is called in other places. A Finance Bill would, properly speaking, be an extension of a Bill of Ways and Means.

This Bill is intended to reduce Government finance in certain directions, and from that point of view this is not so much a Finance Bill as a de-financing Bill. The Hon. Minister has got his terminology somewhat mixed up. Every other Finance Bill that we have known, from the Finance Bills of the hon. Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike), was intended to collect more revenue. This one is for the purpose of removing certain revenue earning Acts. Whether it is right or wrong is another matter. What the Hon. Minister has really given us is not a Finance Bill but a de-financing Bill and it would have been more appropriately called by that name.

அந்தணி மோகியை மொ.

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

A form of financing.

அந்தணி மோகியை மொ.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்சா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

De-financing.

I hope the Hon. Minister will adopt the same interpretative procedure in regard to savings and dissavings

when he comes to interpreting the Inland Revenue Bill once it passes into law.

There are a number of matters in this Bill which we are entirely in agreement with. Clause 2 of this Bill seeks to repeal the Heavy Oil Motor Vehicles Taxation Ordinance.

அந்தணி மோகியை மொ.

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Are there clauses in this Bill? We do not know whether there are clauses or Bills.

அந்தணி மோகியை மொ.

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

We are following the tradition.

அந்தணி மோகியை மொ.

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

They are Bills, not clauses.

அந்தணி மோகியை மொ.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்சா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

I have to call them clauses in the sense that they happen to be numbered as such.

The Hon. Minister will remember that last year there was a promise made to the public that the heavy oil tax would be removed as it was a very unhappy one. I quote from the Budget speech of 1964-65 made by the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) when he was Minister of Finance last year. I have not got the reference to HANSARD. I am quoting from page 57 of the published speech :

"I have received numerous complaints that the heavy oil vehicles tax which was doubled in May 1963 is causing hardship to lorry owners. This tax is levied irrespective of the amount of income earned by a lorry. It is also known that some lorry owners avoid the payment of tax by obtaining non-user

මුදල් (විශේෂ විධිවිධාන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

certificates in respect of lorries which however continue to be used for transportation.

In these circumstances, I have decided with effect from 1st January 1965 to abolish the heavy oil motor vehicles tax. I cannot do that earlier because I have to make certain adjustments. The revenue lost from this source will be recouped by an appropriate increase in the import duty on automotive diesel. Arrangements will be made to alleviate any hardship that may be caused by this measure to fishermen who use mechanized boats by means of a tax rebate or a subsidy, or to any other persons who need some sort of rebate."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 30th July 1964; Vol. 56, c. 1671.]

This is an extract from the Budget speech of the hon. Member for Yatiyantota when he was Minister of Finance. Now, that Government did not last long enough to be able to give effect to the promise that was made. I am very glad that although in most respects this Government has done a complete "right-about-turn" in regard to policy matters which had been announced by the last Government, here, in this particular matter, at least they are taking over a proposal made in the Budget proposals of last year and which remains unimplemented.

The hon. Member for Yatiyantota points out the fact that the mere repeal of this Act alone is not enough. There are certain categories that will be adversely affected.

ශ්‍රී ලන්කා කොමිෂන්

(කෙළරා වැන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

We will provide for them—tractors owners and so on.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(තිரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்சா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

The next clause—Clause 3—relates to the Banks Debits Tax Act No. 42 of 1957. I remember that when this tax was imposed we opposed it.

ශ්‍රී ලන්කා කොමිෂන්

(කෙළරා වැන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Now you can support the repeal of it!

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(තිரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்சா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

We opposed it because it was a discouragement of banking. I have had just pointed out to me that there is another effect, namely, since this is an allowable deduction for the purpose of computing taxable income, the collection of this very small tax results in a loss in income tax as a result of the taxpayer coming into a lower income group. From that point of view Clause 3 alone may be regarded as a financing measure. Since we had opposed the imposition of this tax there is no reason why we should not support its repeal.

As regards the other two taxes, the hon. Member for Dompe is very anxious to speak about these matters—the temporary residence tax and the exchange tax. I only want to mention this: there is something in this Bill which we do not like and that is not a question of what is there so much as what is not there.—[Interruption]. As to which tax I would support the repeal of is a matter on which, I think, the hon. Appointed Member (Mr. Singleton-Salmon) and I are likely to disagree, and I am not likely to see eye to eye with him on this matter.

There are a number of taxes which, if the Hon. Minister was anxious to help the small man, he could have removed instead of concentrating upon these taxes, and it is the whole attitude of the Government in regard to the problem of tax reform that I am concerned with. We discussed yesterday and today the amendments to the Inland Revenue Act. The sum total of all these proposals is that, what he announced in his Budget Speech as a reform of the tax structure has been done without much thought being given to it. Instead of announcing so vast a compass as a reform of the tax structure if the Hon. Minister had said, "I want a certain sum of money. I believe the following taxes should be removed because we have had representations made that they

මුදල් (විශේෂ විධිවිධාන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මය.]

impinge very harshly upon the persons paying them", I would have understood his position. And if the Hon. Minister had said that he was prepared to appoint a commission—this Government is very fond of appointing commissions for various things—then, certainly, we would have asked him to appoint a commission that will really do some work instead of merely throwing mud on somebody or other or on the activities of the last Government. A real tax commission which will really go into the whole question of taxation in this country and from that point of view bring proposals for changing the tax structure in this country, would have been understandable. The Hon. Minister has not done that. He is introducing piecemeal reforms; and if we take the collective meaning of all these proposals, of the proposals to amend the Inland Revenue Act and the other proposals mentioned in the Budget, then there is a certain feature that is objectionable; and that is that it is intended or directed towards relieving or helping those who are not in need of relief. Taking all these proposals collectively that is the charge that I make.

As I said, I do not want to discuss the temporary residence tax which everybody supported including the Hon. Minister himself when it was imposed, and the exchange tax. The exchange tax has virtually been repealed already. It has not been operated on despite the fact that this Bill has not yet passed into law. The whole question of the exchange tax when it was imposed, as I remember, was thought of as not something which was going to bring extra revenue to the Government but as a means of discouraging the use of foreign exchange for certain purposes. I objected to it at the time on the basis that I considered it to be a kind of partial deal or evasion. However that may be, once the tax has been imposed and has been in operation for a period of time, when you get a collectivity of proposals like this where the Hon. Minister seeks to

repeal a large number of taxes while keeping a large number of other taxes going, then we have to ask, what does all this mean?

The Hon. Minister was very violent, as much as we were, over the turnover tax. He objected to the turnover tax, to the excise tax, and he objected to all those taxes when he was here in the Opposition. I grant that he has not had enough time to go into all these matters, but I would like to ask him, has he any intention of removing those taxes? Why is he rushing to remove these taxes? I am quite certain that he will not remove the turnover tax; he will not even think of it because it is bringing a considerable amount of revenue. That is one of the problems that he has to face as Minister of Finance. But the turnover tax was condemned by him when he was in the Opposition, as it was condemned by us—

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

He has turned over a new leaf!

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මය.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்சா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

—on the basis that the tax was likely to increase the cost of living by jacking up prices.

It is in that context that I want to consider this whole business. When the Hon. Minister does not remove those taxes which he objected to why is he removing these other taxes which also he objected to? Then we have to ask him what is the principle of selection he is adopting. What are the taxes he seeks to abolish when he announced such a grandiose scheme described in the phrase as, "a reform of the tax structure of this country"?

We have, therefore, a right to ask, what is the meaning of this? The meaning is, there is a definite attempt on the part of the Hon. Minister and his Government to grant relief to

මුදල් (විශේෂ විධිවිධාන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

certain interests in this country that are certainly not in need of any relief. Taken piecemeal, some of these proposals may be worthwhile; we could support them. But that is not the meaning we are trying to get at. What I am trying to say is if you take all these proposals that he has put forward in the context of what he is not doing, then, Sir, there is a definite slant in regard to policy with which we cannot agree.

These are the submissions which I have to make on this matter. As I said, it is not so much a Finance Act as a def financing Act and while on a piecemeal basis some of these matters are things with which we cannot agree, for instance, the total abolition that is adumbrated in all these proposals is not one which we can accept.

අ. හා. 4.47

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, my good Friend the hon. Joint Member for Colombo South said that he thought I was very anxious to speak on the Temporary Residence Tax and one or two of the other taxes with which I have had some association. I rather thought it would perhaps be unwise to speak at all after I saw the degree or the measure of agreement between my good Friend the hon. Member for Yatiyantota and the Hon. Minister of Finance.

The hon. Member for Yatiyantota said that he thought that a number of taxes which, in point of fact, the Hon. Minister of Finance has now adopted, were his proposals. I must say I do not find that I have the same degree of accord or agreement with the Hon. Minister of Finance and, to that extent, I do not agree with the hon. Member for Yatiyantota. But may I regretfully say that I also disagree with the hon. Member for Yatiyantota. So, if I may strike a note of discord in this happy association which seems to be developing between the Front Benches of both

sides, with mutual compliments and mutual admiration developing in regard to techniques and methods of taxation, I should like to say straightaway that I am in complete disagreement with the Finance Act and the statements in it whether they bear the stamp of approval of either the present Minister of Finance or his immediate predecessor, the hon. Member for Yatiyantota.

Now, first and foremost, if I may be permitted to speak generally, yesterday we debated the Inland Revenue Bill on which I did not speak at all, and I did not wish to say anything on it. It requires a great deal of study to make comments and I thought the contribution of the hon. Joint Member for Colombo South really covered much of the ground which we in the Opposition had to put forward. He has spoken on behalf of all sections in the Opposition and I really do not think it was possible for any one of us to improve or add very much to what he had said in this House.

Today, we have the Finance Act. These two Bills together, as I understand them, cover the whole ground of what the Hon. Minister of Finance described in his Budget speech as a reform of the tax structure pertaining to direct taxation, direct taxation as opposed to indirect taxation.

He has perhaps certain other ideas in mind like removing the surcharge on Customs duties and matters of that nature pertaining to indirect taxation, which are not covered by this Act. But as far as direct taxation is concerned, we would have thought that the Inland Revenue Bill covers all the amendments to the Income Tax laws whereas this Bill covers a group of heterogeneous Acts like the Banks Debts Tax Act, the Temporary Residence Tax Act, and what is described in Clause 5 as the Exchange Tax imposed by Mr. Ilangaratne when he was the Minister of Finance in 1963.

I should like first and foremost to raise a question which is pertinent, that is, one of the proposals in the

මුදල් (විශේෂ විධිවිධාන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

Budget speech pertaining to direct taxation is being dropped. I noticed one significant omission. There is no proposal here, I notice, to repeal the Finance Act of 1961. The Finance Act of 1961 was introduced in that year soon after the Budget for the purpose of providing that future accounts should not be opened in foreign exchange commercial banks. That is to say, Ceylonese depositors were not permitted to open new accounts by the Finance Act of 1961.

The Minister, in the course of his Budget speech this year, told us that he proposed to repeal those provisions—not to denationalize the Bank of Ceylon which was nationalized in that year but certainly to prevent Ceylonese depositors being subjected to this disability that they could not open new accounts in foreign banks. I notice that the Minister has not included—

බැ. මන්ත්‍රීනායක

(කෙළරාව වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Subject to a certain condition.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(තිரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Subject to whatever condition, it is certainly something which would require legislative change as far as the Finance Act of 1961 is concerned; and I am sure he will agree with me—I am not debating the rights and wrongs of his proposal as that has already been done—that it certainly requires legislative change. It is not provided for in this Finance (Special Provisions) Bill.

Under the Finance Act of 1961—I do not think I am subject to correction in this matter since I was responsible for it and I think I know what I am talking about—that provision in regard to the disability imposed on Ceylonese from opening new accounts in foreign banks was created by statute law, and it is illegal today for a Ceylonese to walk

into, say, National and Grindlays Bank or the State Bank of India or the Chartered Bank or the Habib Bank (Overseas) or the Indian Overseas Bank and speak to the Bank Manager and say that he wants to open a new account. It cannot be done under the provisions of the Finance Act of 1961.

That is a statutory provision and if it is the wish of the Finance Minister to go back on that provision, the first thing he has to do is to repeal that law. But this Finance (Special Provisions) Bill which seeks to repeal a number of things—by this Bill it is sought to repeal the Heavy Oil Motor Vehicles Taxation Ordinance, the Banks Debits Tax Act, the Temporary Residence Tax Act and the Exchange Laws of the Finance Act of 1963—there is no reference to the repeal of those provisions of the Finance Act of 1961 to which I have just referred.

The point I am making is this. If you are introducing a law which is meant to cover all the conceivable statutes which you are seeking to change by your Budget proposals, what is the reason, if any, for the non-inclusion in this Finance (Special Provisions) Bill of a clause to repeal the restrictions imposed on foreign banks by the Finance Act of 1961, because that is one of the proposals brought forward in the Budget speech? Is it just an oversight or a conscious decision on your part?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Perhaps he has changed his mind?

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

If the Minister has changed his mind, it is really a matter for congratulation that the Minister has at last seen light and the advantage of maintaining that provision in the Finance Act of 1961. Then, I, too, am prepared to join the mutual admiration society

මුදල් (විශේෂ විධිවිධාන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

as far as the Minister of Finance is concerned in this particular regard ; but if it is the intention of the Minister to repeal this provision, I submit that this is the legal place for it, subject to whatever the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) may have to say about the wisdom or unwisdom in seeking to repeal five or six laws by one law. My submission is that that provision can only be repealed by an amendment.

If, of course, the Minister of Finance has changed his mind and is not intending to proceed with his proposal, it is a practical victory for the Opposition in being able to convince a Finance Minister of the unwisdom of his own proposal.

Now I want to get on to the tax of different laws. If we have to talk at some length in regard to the details of a group of laws, it is the Finance Minister who is to blame, because, as the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) pointed out, there is not one principle in this Bill. The principle in this Bill, if at all, relates to the de-financing, as the hon. Joint Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa) says of a number of tax proposals enacted in the past with which this Government finds itself not in accord.

The hon. Member for Yatiyantota raised the question whether it will be permitted at the Committee stage to seek to change one of the clauses by moving the deletion of one of the clauses pertaining to any one of these laws. My respectful submission would be that it can be done, if the principle is, if it can be called a principle, that you can repeal a whole number of laws enacted by this House in this way. You, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have been presiding over the Standing Committees of this House—I think it is your good fortune to preside over the Standing Committees—therefore, I would like to say that it would be perfectly in order ; but it would not be in order for the Minister of Finance to move an amendment to add a sixth clause to this Bill.

ශ්‍රී ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

It would mean another Bill.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

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

It would mean another Bill to add a sixth clause to repeal, shall we say, the Finance Act of 1961, and it will have to be named the Finance (Special Provisions) Bill No. 2 if and when it comes up, that is if the Hon. Minister of Finance has not changed his mind.

On the repeal of the Heavy Oil Motor Vehicles Taxation Ordinance I propose to say nothing. It has been already commented on by the hon. Member for Yatiyantota and the hon. Joint Member for Colombo South, and I do not wish to add anything further. The Hon. Minister is probably aware that there are a number of anomalies in regard to this statute, one of which is that, by reason of judicial interpretation, there have been periods in which taxes have been collected and periods in which no taxes have been collected. By virtue of certain decisions taken by courts of law which held that this tax could not be legally charged, there are people who say that they are not liable now to pay this tax. All I can say is that if the Hon. Minister believes that the amounts involved are very small, that it does not matter to him in spite of the empty Treasury, that Rs. 6 million is a sum of money that he can afford to feed the birds with, if that is the situation, may I ask the Hon. Minister to be so kind as to consider some form of practical relief to persons in respect of whom claims of arrears had accumulated that it had become impracticable for them to meet their obligations under the law before they had a Minister of Finance so kind as the present Minister. Therefore I would appeal to the Minister to consider giving directions to the Government Agents who are the collecting authorities, in regard to giving some form of practical relief to those lorry owners who are

මුදල් (විශේෂ විධිවිධාන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

burdened with accumulated arrears through no fault of their own but through the result of an unfortunate judicial decision. They should be given an opportunity to have their unfortunate condition ameliorated.

With regard to the Banks Debits Tax, I would like to make this remark. The Hon. Minister gave us as his principal reason for repealing this Act that in his opinion it is a disincentive to the banking habit, and he was supported by the hon. Member for Yatiyantota who said that he was also thinking about it. I must say, that that argument does not convince me, and I do not know whether it convinces any other Member of this House. To say that people do not go to the bank because of the Banks Debits Tax is a highly theoretical and academic argument. The amount of taxation, in practice, is negligible—negligible in the sense that from the point of view of the ordinary man it works out to .01 per cent. If you are trying to tell me that it is the people in the villages who are going to rush to open accounts in banks the moment you take this tax off and reduce the liability by less than one-tenth of a cent on every hundred rupees, I find it hard to believe when you are talking of people with money stuck under their pillow cases and other places all over their village homes. If you are saying that all these people are going to rush to the banks the moment you remove this tax, and that it will be a great incentive to the development of the banking habit, I say you are living in a fool's paradise, because, as far as the banking habit is concerned, it is not going to be affected by this incentive. As far as big people, big capitalists, about whom the National Government knows much more than we do, are concerned they had the banking habit for years, and this tax is, no doubt, a nuisance to them. The hon. Appointed Member is happy that the tax is being removed. But I do not think that he or the constituents, whoever they may be, whom he is supposed to represent, would really have any objection to the continuation

of this Banks Debits Tax or are going to stop banking their money by virtue of the existence of this tax. In other words, the development of the banking habit does not depend upon the Banks Dibits Tax at all.

I join issue with both the present Finance Minister and his predecessor, the hon. Member for Yatiyantota, if they are trying to argue today that the Banks Debits Tax has discouraged people from going to the banks. The reason for people not going to the banks is something quite different. The principal reason why they do not want to go to the banks is a feeling—particularly on the part of businessmen or persons with property—that their accounts are subject to scrutiny by the Inland Revenue Department. So long as a man has got a small income which he does not disclose but is hidden away in a small box or suitcase—may be Rs. 1,000 or a few thousand rupees—he feels, “I am safe from any examination by the Inland Revenue Department; they will not be able to lay their hands on me. I will not be subjected to the nuisance of sending tax returns of my income and expenditure, high or low.”

If you want to encourage the banking habit, I am sorry to say that it is not these laws you have got to repeal but the Inland Revenue (Amendment) Bill which we debated yesterday. I agree with the hon. Member for Yatiyantota that the banking habit is a good thing, that it is necessary to encourage it if you want to develop our economy and harness savings. But this is not the way of doing that. You say Rs. 6 million is something which you could afford to lose! Rs. 6 million or Rs. 2 million, you can argue about the benefits you are going to gain by repealing the Banks Debits Tax—you may say you are going to set off that loss against the gain from wealth tax and so on.

You are sacrificing Rs. 6 million merely for the benefit of persons who hardly feel it today, namely, the rich businessmen whose turnover is large enough that 0.1 per cent is able to

මුදල් (විශේෂ විධිවිධාන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

yield a net revenue of Rs. 6 million. I say this is just another device of the National Government to give benefits to the capitalist classes of this country under cover of giving relief to the poor. There is no question of relief to the poor in this particular proposal. This is, if I may say so, a completely involute argument where the whole objective of the Finance Minister is really the objective of benefiting the substantial tea traders, the merchants, the purchasers and brokers at the Colombo Auctions, the large capitalist, mercantilist interests with a substantial turnover in bank accounts, who are called upon to subscribe to the major portion of this Rs. 6 million. To say that the people in the villages are being deprived of the opportunity of going to the banks by virtue of the existence of the Banks Debits Tax is sheer nonsense.

Let us be honest about this question. Theoretically, to a small extent, this tax is a disincentive to banking. But, in practice, the major financial operations cannot be conducted without banks and businessmen must operate bank accounts. We are living in a world of commerce where we have moved away from the barter system. Are we now thinking of operating on a system of currency as in the days of the Iron Age or the Stone Age?

Therefore, my submission is that the whole of this argument that the Banks Debits Tax discourages the banking habit is absolute nonsense. It is only calculated to achieve one purpose. The real purpose behind the Wanninayake Budget of 9th August 1965 is to give the benefits of his Budget to the classes and the class interests which helped to bring in what the U.N.P. has been pleased to describe euphemistically as the "National Government" but, in practice, is nothing but a rank capitalist Government representing the capitalist interests in this country.

Looked at from that point of view, I submit there is no case at all for the repeal of the Banks Debits Tax in the form in which the Finance

Minister does it, excepting that he wants it to benefit particular classes within our community. He himself admits that the tax has become a nuisance to foreigners and to foreign commercial enterprise. That is his opening statement. In other words—let us be honest—it is being removed to benefit the foreigners in this country.

I cannot say that my good Friend, the hon. Appointed Member, is a foreigner. He is a Ceylonese. But, sometimes, by the way he behaves in this House, one might almost mistake him for a foreigner. As far as his argument is concerned, my respectful submission is that from the point of view of Ceylonese, the little Ceylonese, the ordinary people who voted for the Government, who voted for us, who voted for both of us, why are we pretending that the Banks Debits Tax is going to benefit them? It cannot possibly benefit them.

I remember, when the Hon. Stanley de Zoysa, the first Finance Minister of the then S.L.F.P.-M.E.P. Government, introduced his first Budget—I think, it was his first Budget—he did not tune himself to the rhythms of the universe as my good Friend, the Hon. Minister of State did. Instead, he adopted a more homely simile. He talked about the functions of a Finance Minister as those of a bee gathering honey without damaging the flower from which it sucks the honey. I think he quoted it in Sinhala. I think, he made history by making the first quotation in Sinhala in the Budget.

ශ්‍රී ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන

(කෙළරව ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

I spoke in Pali.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මහ.

(ශ්‍රී. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I am sorry. My good Friend, the Hon. Minister of State says that he spoke in Pali. I know he has a passion for foreign languages. What is wrong with Sinhala, may I ask?

මුදල් (විශේෂ විධිවිධාන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

Mr. Stanley de Zoysa spoke in plain Sinhala; and speaking in Sinhala, what did he say? He said, "My object of taxation is a painless extraction," unlike the dentist who once put up an advertisement in the window of his consulting room, "Teeth extracted with great pain." In this instance, the Hon. Stanley de Zoysa seems to have thought that painless extraction under some form of anaesthesia was to prevail. He thought that the Banks Debts Tax was one such example. The hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) says he succeeded because it is a very easy and simple method of collection and has its advantages from that point of view. With that I entirely agree.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what happened? The money was collected, and the collection was intended to be painless. But the patients still squealed. Who were the patients who squealed in this House then against the Banks Debts Tax? The patient was the United National Party, which mustered all its forces in this House to scream in agony about the painful extraction of the Banks Debts Tax.

ශ්‍රී ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

We had only six Members.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I know, but these six made as much noise as they could, and those of you who were not here made as much noise as you could, outside.

The whole objective was in defence of a class interest, in defence of the very people who were subject to this tax, and for that purpose the Banks Debts Tax became a bad thing. I have no doubt that the Members of the Opposition then, who raised theoretical arguments, who talked in

terms of the banking habit, who thought it was a bad tax for theoretical reasons, in practice, have got accustomed to living with this tax.

Finance Ministers have come and Finance Ministers have gone, but the Banks Debts Tax has gone on collecting for the revenue of this country tons of money. One way of looking at it is that it has fetched Rs. 12 million a year on the average, and another way of looking at it is that we will be able to recover Rs. 6 million. And, when you next tell the country, Mr. Finance Minister, that you inherited a bankrupt Treasury, that you had no money in the kitty, and that the Sri Lanka Freedom Party emptied your pockets for you, please also remember to say that you are willing to help empty your pocket a little further in defence of the class interests which you represent and how you have helped to denude in the process even more.

As far as the Banks Debts Tax is concerned, if the Hon. Minister of Finance wants to be generous to those who were generous to him, we really cannot object. It is a question of returning hospitality, I suppose, in another form, and one cannot really object if the Hon. Minister of Finance chooses to be kind to those who were kind to him.

But, having accepted that proposition, may I say this? Would it not have been a good proposal, Mr. Finance Minister, if you consider seriously, on a differential basis, abolishing the Banks Debts Tax, if you want to abolish it? Would it have been a bad thing to keep this tax if you really and truly believed in the nationalized institutions which you are pledged not to denationalize? Would it not have been correct to waive the Banks Debts Tax in regard to particular banks which are national-owned and which constitute national enterprise? Would it not have been a good proposal to have done away with the Banks Debts Tax in regard to the two premier banking institutions in this

මුදල් (විශේෂ විධිවිධාන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

country, which are the Bank of Ceylon and the People's Bank, and thereby created incentives and included the foreign moguls in it, the capitalist moguls of the mixed economy in which you believe, so as to divert as much of their banking as possible and make it possible for them to put their resources into the hands of institutions over which you, as Finance Minister, have complete control; over which you will be in a position to direct policy, where you can get the Directorate of a Bank to direct investment policy, and be able to tell them, "All your reserves, your banking reserves, the money brought into the banking system, are now indirectly brought under the control of the Minister of Finance of the Government of Ceylon, where the Government of Ceylon has the power and the ability to ensure that those resources are diverted to the maximum use from the point of view of the economic development of this country?"

You have that power in your hands, and if the foreign interests are serious about grumbling about the Banks Debits Tax, and want to get out of paying it, the remedy lies in their own hands. You will be losing on the one side the Rs. 6 million or so, assuming that every single account holder were to come away from the foreign banks to us. But having done that what will follow? You will have at your disposal millions and millions of rupees—not your money, of course, Bank money—but money over which you will be in a position to direct investment, money over which you will have a far greater degree of effective control than the remote control of the Governor of the Central Bank who is expected to control monetary policy as far as exchange banks are concerned. That is essentially a very remote degree of control and, if I may say so from experience, an extremely negligible degree of control in practical terms within the framework of a capitalist economy.

If you want to make it effective, here is a suggestion. Why do you not accept an amendment from us and abolish the Banks Debits Tax as far as your banking institutions are concerned, as far as the Bank of Ceylon and the People's Bank are concerned, but leave it as far as foreign exchange banks are concerned and make it more attractive, particularly to our citizens and even the foreigners, to bank with us and make their money and their resources available to the banking system of our country, if you really and truly wish to make a proper contribution to the banking system in our land?

So, Mr. Finance Minister, my appeal to you is this: if you have already set your mind firmly upon the implementation of your Budget proposals—it is your Budget, not ours—you have every right to formulate your plans. You have got the confidence of the country for the time and we, as democrats, accept that verdict, and we are prepared to give all help and assistance to you to achieve your objective of national economic development.

You want to harness the maximum practical value out of the banking system to enable your colleague to develop agriculture and industry in this country. You certainly shall have our help. But, in order to do that, may I ask you not to make the mistake of returning to the empty *laissez faire* doctrine suitable to the 19th century and completely unsuited to a modern world where, I think, we have moved towards social service principles long, long ago. The 20th century development cannot now be carried back to the 19th century, although some of the capitalist theorists in our land still live in the 19th century and think in the 19th century. If you want to get maximum value—

இரவு (வினேஷ் விவிவிவிவி) பதன் கெடுபதன்

—தேவன் வர கியவி

செ. சே. சார். சுவரீதன்

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

Karl Marx was of the 19th century.

சி. சே. சார். சுவரீதன்

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Karl Marx was of the 19th century, I grant you, and that is why, I think, he has been completely rejected by practically everybody in this House including, I think, the parties that started their philosophy under him.

செ. சே. சார். சுவரீதன்

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

Question !

சி. சே. சார். சுவரீதன்

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

As far as that is concerned, I think, Karl Marx was a theoretical historian, but, I think, in practice, the doctrines of Lenin were of the 20th century, and you cannot carry them back to the 19th century even if you tried.

I do not know why the Hon. Minister of State is so concerned about preserving *laissez faire* doctrines even at the expense of poor Karl Marx. In order to defend the *laissez faire* system and get back to Adam Smith and the Wealth of Nations, he finds it necessary, even now, to behead Karl Marx if he can. That is the tragedy of it. When the Hon. Minister of State starts talking theoretical economics, he is trying to put forward feeble arguments in defence of an indefensible proposition put forward by the Hon. Minister of Finance. I do not think that the Hon. Minister of Finance really even thought about it. I think somebody suggested to him, "The Banks Debts Tax is a nuisance, shall we get rid of it?", and he agreed to get rid of it.

I have no doubt he was so inspired that, I think we can almost see the persons who inspired him seated right here—persons who deal in millions, persons who are concerned with the basic capitalist structure in our land. It is they who are paying this Rs. 6 million or a substantial part of it and, mind you, this represents less than .01 per cent of their turnover which passes through the banking system.

செ. சே. சார். சுவரீதன்

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

The hon. Member for Yatiyantota agrees.

சி. சே. சார். சுவரீதன்

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I know he does. That is precisely why I disagree with him. I told you so. You were not here. You think that everybody must necessarily disagree with the hon. Member for Yatiyantota, but you will find in this instance that your Finance Minister and the hon. Member for Yatiyantota are in agreement. If it is a bad thing to disagree with the hon. Member for Yatiyantota, please tell that to your Minister of Finance.

As far as the banking system is concerned, what have we actually got in our country? We had an attempt to create a truly national base for a banking structure and the beginning of that was set in 1961. It took two shapes and forms. One was the creation of a new bank—the People's Bank. It was no doubt intended to serve a particular purpose and a particular function. Some people may think that perhaps it can be improved, even now, and I am one of those. I believe that the People's Bank has not reached the maximum limits of its efficiency or capacity in serving the interests it was calculated to promote, including rural credit. There are some people who believe that the People's Bank should be just another commercial bank like any other competing with its own sister institution,

මුදල් (විශේෂ විධිවිධාන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

the Bank of Ceylon. But the fact remains today that you have got two institutions available to you—the Bank of Ceylon and the People's Bank—and it is up to you to direct their policies in such a way as to make the maximum use of both those institutions.

My respectful submission is, if you really and truly propose to go ahead with your proposal of repealing the provisions of the Finance Act of 1961 by which Ceylonese depositors were prohibited from opening new accounts in foreign commercial banks, you are taking the most retrograde step that you can to destroy the banking facilities and the banking services of this country. You will be virtually putting the Ceylonese depositors back at the mercy of the foreign bank managers.

I do not know whether hon. Members of this House have had the experience of knowing how difficult it was for Ceylonese persons to obtain bank credit facilities in the early days of the Bank of Ceylon and before that. The foreign merchant, the Nadars and the Borahs, found no difficulty in obtaining money against trust receipts not only from the Indian banks but even from the British banks in Ceylon. The shroff system as it existed those days was calculated for the benefit of a foreign capitalist mercantile section to exploit our country.

It was to meet that challenge that a group of Ceylonese in those early days got together and created the Bank of Ceylon under private enterprise, and that enterprise flourished in those days, from about 1938, for no reason other than that the late Mr. D. S. Senanayake, as then Chairman of the Board of Ministers in the State Council, decided to throw his full weight and that of all the Executive Committees under him behind the new Ceylonese venture. The Government departments were directed to keep their accounts with the new Bank of Ceylon. In those

early days, but for the Government's patronage and the Government's backing that the Bank of Ceylon received, it would have collapsed.

I think there were banks that collapsed in 1938 in those days. You, Mr. Deputy Speaker, might remember Mudaliyar Wijesekera in Waikkal. You will yourself remember the Bank of Colombo. I think that was the first bank crash that occurred of a Ceylonese banking venture.

But the Bank of Ceylon prospered and flourished. And, why did it prosper and flourish? For no other reason than that the Government of Ceylon at that stage threw its full weight behind the national banking sector in private hands. Today, you have got a national banking sector in your hands—in the hands of the Government of Ceylon—and what I ask you in plain language is, why are you not prepared to give the nationalized banking services, which you are pledged not to denationalize, the same kind of preferential support that the late Hon. D. S. Senanayake was prepared to give to the Bank of Ceylon in its early days? Why are you trying to reduce the preferential condition of our banks to levels of most unequal competition against the foreign commercial banks by repealing and changing laws quite unnecessarily now? I would appeal to the Hon. Minister of Finance, not to treat this as being destructive criticism; it is not. What I am trying to suggest to you is that when you are repealing the Banks Debts Tax, give everybody the benefit of it, but give it in a different way. Give our two nationalized banking institutions the benefit of it. Run our banking services in competition with the foreigners on our own soil. Create that preference and you will find that the banking services expand in such a practical form that you will be able to say, "As Minister of Finance I have done my country a signal service by the proposal I am putting forward". That is all I wish to say about the Banks Debts Tax.

මුදල (විශේෂ විධිවිධාන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

I now move on to the Temporary Residence Tax Act, No. 36 of 1961. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is the tax of which, I must confess, I am the author. Usually, it is not customary for authors to make comments in regard to their own work. It would be extremely unfortunate if I were to say that, I think, it is a very good tax. But I do think it is a very good tax and I am glad to say that. The reason for my saying that is not because I am the author, but because every single section of this House, excepting one, supported that tax completely. I would like to point out that, at that stage, that tax received the unqualified support, you may not believe, of the United National Party.

කෙනමත් මයා.

(තිரு. කෙනමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Enthusiastic support.

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(තිரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

The enthusiastic support of the United National Party. They are all looking down and pretending to be reading their books now, but, at that time, that was not the way they reacted. You were not here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, during that Parliament in 1961, but you will be surprised to learn that. The Minister of Finance now talks about how inequitable the tax is, how wrong the tax is and how vicious the tax is.

The Hon. Minister of State now talks about the poor tourists who cannot come because of this tax.

The Hon. Minister of Finance shed tears for the Ceylonese who have married foreign wives ; he shed tears for the foreign wives as well as for the Ceylonese ; he shed tears for those who are in employment and have to pay visa tax for their children who are being educated in Ceylon, who have to live with their parents ; he shed tears for the foreign

experts who might have come to Ceylon but for this visa tax. He shed tears for everybody concerned. But on the 25th of May, 1961, when the Bill was debated in this House these measures were carefully considered. The Bill was referred to a Committee of the Whole House and discussed in full detail. You will be surprised. I am going to read the speech in a moment. I want to place it on record to show how full of adulation the Members of the United National Party were about the Temporary Residence Tax Act.

If I had any criticism at that time, one such criticism was from my good Friend, the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central (Mr. Keuneman). But even he had no objection to the tax in principle. All he had to say was, "I am asking for an exemption for toddy tappers." He said there were a number of Indian toddy tappers who had to be brought to Ceylon, otherwise, the toddy industry could not be maintained. As a matter of fact, he was proved right soon after. When we found ourselves short of toddy tappers, my good Friend, the hon. Member for Minuwangoda (Mr. de Zoysa Siriwardena) had to try to start a school for training toddy tappers in Ceylon under the Labour Department. He actually did, but the response was somewhat poor for having our people trained to do a little tight rope walking between coconut trees in search of toddy. Ultimately, it became necessary to make arrangements to import a certain number of toddy tappers from India to enable the Excise Department to be fully supplied.

කෙනමත් මයා.

(තිரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

The hon. Member for Minuwangoda did not know tight rope walking either.

මුදල් (විශේෂ විධිවිධාන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

එල්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරයාගේ මහා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாசநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

The position is this, except for that one criticism from the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central, there was no objection at all either from the United National Party, the Communist Party or the Lanka Sama Samaja Party. Funnily, not even from the stormy petrel of those days, the hon. Member for Dambadeniya (Mr. R. G. Senanayake), the hon. Member for Welimada (Mr. Rajaratna) or even from the hon. Fair Member for Uva-Paranagama (Mrs. Kusuma Rajaratna).

ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

Not even from the Federal Party.

ඒප්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරයාගේ මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

The Federal Party, the other component partner of the present Coalition, supported it. But there was only one person in this whole House who objected to it, and that is the hon. Appointed Member (Mr. Thondaman). Mr. Thondaman, at that stage, was a Member of the then Government party; he was an Appointed Member of the S. L. F. P. Government of the time. He had very strong views about that matter and he made a strong attack against this tax. Now, the U. N. P. which criticized me on a multiplicity of taxes, criticized me on practically every single tax I proposed at different times, never said a word throughout the whole of their opposition to me—mind you, they opposed me very strongly and effectively—against this tax. But, today, if I find them singing a different tune altogether I cannot help but say that it is the voice of the hon. Appointed Member (Mr. Thondaman) and the influence he is wielding in the National Government at this particular time.—[Interruption]. I feel that it may be the hand of Wanninayake, but it certainly is the brain

and thinking and the soul of Mr. Thondaman that is behind the repealing of this Temporary Residence Tax. The *avathare* behind is Mr. Thondaman, and the U. N. P. here has now completely forgotten their protestations of the past. Many hon. Members are new to this House and they do not know what the history of this Bill is and what their leaders declared before. They today imagine that the Temporary Residence Tax must be something of the bad old S. L. F. P. days left over to be repealed by the U. N. P. which is now all good, all powerful, all knowing but, in actual fact, it is the other way round.

In this connection, first and foremost, I should like to read the speech made—the opening bars, if I may say so—by a Minister of the present Government, the hon. Member for Weligama (Mr. Montague Jayewickreme). I am quoting from Column 7114 of Volume 42, Part II, of the HANSARD of 25th May, 1961. It was on the Second Reading of the Temporary Residence Tax Bill. This was what he said :

“I think the Hon. Minister is aware—”, says the hon. Member for Weligama, the present Hon. Minister of Public Works, Posts and Telecommunications,

"—that our party is supporting these proposals which are before the House today. I would like to state briefly, for the Hon. Minister's consideration, one or two very important aspects which strike me . . ."

His party was supporting it, and what are the one or two important aspects that struck him? Firstly, the need to take effective measures to deport overstaying visa holders from India, who sometimes were loosely described as *kallathonis* by the hon. Member for Welimada. Actually, they are not illicit immigrants but over-staying visa holders, and the prescription of the hon. Member for Weligama was, "Let us have a national register." It was pointed out that the Government itself accepted the proposal and that we were working out a national register. The second proposal that

මුදල් (විශේෂ විධිවිධාන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

he made was that he would also like to support the request about toddy tappers made by the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central (Mr. Keuneman). These were two important proposals that he placed for our consideration at that time. It was even suggested by him—[Interruption]. It is a great pleasure to see my good Friend the hon. Member for Weligama present.

ලා මොන්ටේගු ජයවික්‍රම (රජයේ වැඩ,
තැපැල් හා විදුලි සන්නිවේදන දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව)

(කෙළරාව මොන්ටේගු ජයවික්‍රම—මුද්‍රා
සාහිත්‍ය කටයුතු, පොස්ට්, ටෙලිග්‍රෑෆ් හා ටෙලිෆෝන් දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව)

(The Hon. Montague Jayewickreme—
Minister of Public Works, Posts and
Telecommunications)

It is a great pleasure to listen to you.

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(තිරු. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

It gave me great pleasure that I had the support, this unqualified support on behalf of his party, in regard to the Temporary Residence Tax Bill at that time. He gave his unqualified support on behalf of his party. Then there was the speech made by the hon. member for Batticaloa (Mr. A. H. Macan Markar), who went so far as to completely support the tax and what is more, to debunk and to answer the arguments of Mr. Thondaman, the hon. Appointed Member. The then Member for Batticaloa gave an answer which was a more effective one than I could have given. At column 7107 he started by saying—

“I cannot see eye to eye with the standpoint taken by the hon. Appointed Member (Mr. Thondaman) in that this Temporary Residence Tax would cause undue hardship to foreigners who choose to remain in this country over the minimum period of three months.

Firstly, I believe that the tax does not apply to persons of Indian origin who have been resident in this country for a number of years, and as such no hardship is likely to be caused to the vast army of plantation workers in this country. However, if a foreigner feels that he should stay for a period exceeding the minimum period of three months the

implication is that he finds his stay so profitable that the burden of paying the tax of Rs. 400 that is to be imposed on him is something trifling. As such I cannot see any valid objection to the imposition of this tax, particularly so when there are large numbers of our own nationals who have been deprived of employment as a result of foreigners coming over here and taking up such employment.”

He went on to talk about the number of overstay cases. Further down he says :

“Furthermore, as was pointed out by the hon. Appointed Member (Mr. Thondaman), this tax is likely to encourage illicit immigration.....”

One of the arguments of the devil's advocate, so to say, at that stage was that the tax was likely to encourage illicit immigration. In other words, if you are charging Rs. 400 from an Indian who comes here for employment, how much better not to charge the tax ; he will get into a catamaran and go away !

“.....as such it would be very necessary to take measures to keep extra vigil specially along the Northern and North-Western coasts to prevent illicit immigration.”

He, too, supported the standpoint about the toddy tappers.

Then what happened ? The Bill was passed in all its stages without any division. The Second Reading was passed after my reply—at column 7130—and the House moved into Committee. At the Committee stage, all the amendments practically were introduced by the hon. Appointed Member (Mr. Thondaman), except for one amendment which was introduced by the then hon. Member for Welimada, who wanted the Bill to apply to stateless persons as well. He thought that stateless persons, if they were charged Rs. 400, would cease to be stateless and go back to India ! That was the naive idea of the then Member for Welimada, who is now a Member of this unhappy association in the National Government.

So, we find today a Government suddenly, without any reason, without any declared statement, discovering vices in a law in which they have hitherto found only virtue, and not telling the truth

මුදල් (විශේෂ විධිවිධාන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

to the people that there is no fundamental objection to the Visa Tax, and which there never was. They completely identified themselves with national aspirations until they formed the National Government. They were quite prepared to support the Visa Tax, to support the provision of employment for our nationals as against foreigners, to support every single national proposal, except for the fact that at that stage the hon. Appointed Member (Mr. Thondaman) saw in that Bill a danger to the interests which he represents or thinks he represents. When this Government, in the teeth of its own protestations, goes back on what it has already promised the people, goes back on the very arguments it adduced through very responsible men of the Front Bench, my respectful submission is that we are here confronted not merely with a change of policy but something much worse—with the definite attempt to betray what they themselves honestly believed to be the true interests of our country.

This Visa Tax was not imposed as a revenue measure for the sake of the three or four million rupees it was going to produce. To start with, nobody knew how much it would produce. How could anyone guess? A new tax by its very nature is incapable of assessment because you do not have the means of knowing it. The Hon. Minister says that it fetches only Rs. 3 million, which means then that only a small number of persons are paying it. Then why are you so anxious to exempt this small number? If the amount is small and if it means that to that extent there is control and there are opportunities for employment given to our people, Ceylonese, why are you then so concerned about removing it? You talk about the foreign wives of Ceylonese. There are many like that I know. But may I ask why are we so concerned about these foreign wives who do not care to acquire Ceylon citizenship? If one of our Ceylonese boys marries a foreign girl, do not blame him. It is a question of taste, I suppose, a question of liking. It is not for me to make any comments on that. If it

happens, why are we so considerate to people who do not even care to adopt Ceylon citizenship although they care to marry a Ceylonese husband?

There is every provision in this statute for a foreign wife to acquire Ceylon citizenship. Section 11 (a) of the Ceylon Citizenship Act enables such a spouse to acquire our nationality—

කෙනෙත් මයා.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Subject to the approval of the Prime Minister.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

You apply for it and you get it, as the Government is so concerned about and so sympathetic to the foreign wives of Ceylonese. I know of no single case where a Ceylonese married to a foreign wife in those circumstances encountered such a problem. There have been problems in the case of foreign husbands who come here for employment—Indians—whose visas expire. After the expiry of their visas they acquire a ready-made family by taking on a Ceylonese wife—whether she has already a few children or not by going through a form of marriage and then making an application for Ceylon citizenship on the basis of marriage to a Ceylonese woman. That class of case I know has been very carefully scrutinized in the days of the former Government because of the lack of *bona fides* in it. Where a young Ceylonese marries a foreign wife, to my knowledge not a single case has hitherto been refused although the hon. Appointed Member says quite rightly that under the law you can apply for citizenship.

So the Hon. Minister of Finance is now extending his courtesy and kindness to a class of women who do not care to be Ceylon citizens, people who prefer to maintain their own nationality. A Ceylonese husband may be good enough for them

මුදල් (විශේෂ විධිවිධාන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

[එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

but not Ceylonese citizenship. It is about that class of people that we are told, "Is it not a crime to charge Rs. 400?"

This new-found sympathy for foreign wives is something remarkable as far as the U.N.P. Government is concerned. I remember the case of Mr. and Mrs. Joe Silva which arose not so long ago—when Mr. Joe Silva married a foreign wife. He was at one time the private secretary of the Hon. Minister of Industries; so everyone may know who Mr. Joe Silva is. He is now, I believe, a director of Bonars Ltd. He married a foreign wife—Rhoda Miller. And how did the U. N. P. Government react at that time? She was deported before they could apply to the Supreme Court for a writ of *habeas corpus*! That was how the U. N. P. reacted in those days. Mr. Joe Silva was prevented from joining her. They were forcibly separated. And today they have consideration for a foreign wife who spurns our country!

What is the argument? I can understand if the Hon. Minister says that if a foreign wife has no opportunity to acquire Ceylon citizenship—

ශ්‍රී මොන්ටේගු ජයවික්‍රම

(කෙළරඹ මොන්ටේගු ඉයවික්‍රම)

(The Hon. Montague Jayewickreme)

We have moved a long way from the era of Rhoda Miller!

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(තිල. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Today, you have moved so far away from the era of Rhoda Miller that you are now concerned with extending those courtesies to foreign women who do not care to be Ceylonese—[Interruption.]

ශ්‍රී මොන්ටේගු ජයවික්‍රම

(කෙළරඹ මොන්ටේගු ඉයවික්‍රම)

(The Hon. Montague Jayewickreme)

To such a charming wife as yours we will not do that!

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(තිල. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

There are no problems as far as charming wives are concerned so long as the wife also becomes a Ceylonese. But if the charming wife does not agree to become a Ceylonese, however charming she may be, I do not know whether the Ceylon Government should extend their courtesy to such persons at the expense of the revenue of this country. It seems the most blameworthy form of logic for the Minister of Finance to engage in.

May I consider precisely what were the arguments of the hon. Appointed Member in opposing this Temporary Residence Tax law? His speech was the first speech made on this Bill immediately after it was introduced. He was the real opposition to this Bill, not the U. N. P. or anybody else. What did he say? He first of all talked about this being an inhuman Bill. Why was it inhuman? According to him, in no part of the Commonwealth at that stage was there any form of temporary residence tax except in Burma, and he argued that in Burma the law that was there limited the tax to Rs. 50, and so solemnly suggested that we should make it Rs. 25 in Ceylon.

Today, you will recall that every country has practically reached the stage of controlling immigration. This story of free travel to Commonwealth citizens, that we are all buddies under the skin of a different colour, that we are all today members of one Commonwealth, that any Commonwealth citizen is entitled to corresponding benefits by moving into the United Kingdom, is just sheer nonsense. Not only the Labour Party in power today but even the Conservative administration have accepted the fact that even they had come to regard England as no longer the mother country of the Commonwealth but as first and foremost the country for Englishmen and citizens of the United Kingdom. They demand work permits for people who are immigrants from foreign

මුදල් (විශේෂ විධිවිධාන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

countries ; there is a quota of immigrants ; there are restrictions. We in this country have no restrictions. We allow people to come in and then say, "however, we are giving you all the benefits of subsidies, rice ration books, free health services, we are giving you so many things available to our own citizens, treating you exactly in the same way, and is it unfair that, if you want to emigrate into this country for the purpose of earning money, of doing a job, to pay for it." Is this unreasonable?

I remember arguments were raised that this was going to cause hardship to foreign priests who come to minister to the religious needs of the people. May I say this? No priest who comes here to administer to the religious needs of anybody is charged a temporary residence tax under the law. Be they Catholic priests, Muslim *moulavis*, or Hindu priests all of them have come ; most of them come for short periods below three months and are therefore automatically exempt from the tax. But even those Catholic Fathers who serve the needs of their flock in Ceylon not for a remuneration, not for the purpose of doing a job, not for the purpose of taking employment out of the hands of Ceylonese as teachers or anything else, have never been charged a temporary residence tax under this particular law.

The United National Party now says, "We must repeal this law. It is wrong." And the most laughable argument of the lot is that of the Minister of State. He is so logical that he knows he cannot present illogical arguments. So when he knows that situation he puts forward a flippant argument by saying that this is to encourage tourism. I think too highly of my good Friend the Minister of State to believe that even he thinks that this is going to be an incentive to tourism. I do not know how long he wants to keep these tourists in Ceylon. Because he is the Minister in charge of Tourism he wants to keep them here permanently with him and hug the tourist to his

bosom so that he will have the tourist always with him. But I do not see how that can possibly help to pay the tax unless the tourists are here for a period exceeding four months under this law. And if he wants to keep his tourists here for a period exceeding four months, all I can say is that he will prove himself to be a bad Minister of Tourism because the whole principle of tourism must be to keep the tourists in circulation, to have a fresh lot in and keep them moving around so that we will have a new turnover of a larger and ever increasing number of tourists. The Hon. Minister of State, therefore, in trying to defend the indefensible, in trying to support what he knows is an insupportable proposition put forward by just one small section of the National Government which is holding the whole National Government to ransom, is in effect trying to find an argument to support what he knows cannot be supported. My respectful submission is, therefore, that this Government should re-think the Temporary Residence Act—not because it is my law or one of my proposals. I say in all sincerity that I am not ashamed of this law. There are many laws which I have introduced and I think I can say honestly and fairly that I have possibly a record for having admitted mistakes more than anyone else in this House. I think I am the only Minister of Finance who has withdrawn a proposal put forward by me and resigned from office. I say, therefore, that when I talk of this particular law and say that I am proud of it, I do so not because it is mine but because it commanded the entire support of the United National Party, of the Federal Party, and of all sections of the Opposition which used to be very critical of me those days excepting one Government Appointed Member (Mr. Thondaman). Today, have we reached the stage in this legislature when Mr. Thondaman can control our destinies? Has the National Government reduced us to this pass that today we are obliged for the sake of keeping Mr. Thondaman happy, to fall in line with his dictates against

මුදල (විශේෂ විධිවිධාන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

the declared policy of the United National Party? It came to us through the voice of the hon. Member for Weligama who told us that this Bill had the complete and unqualified support of his political party. He would never have said that without the support of his party.—[*Interruption*]. What is the *masalavadai* argument with regard to this? If you people are falling in line with *masalavadai* to sell our country to foreigners, do you blame us? If Mr. Thondaman's argument at that time appealed to the United National Party, why did you not support it? You are talking of *masalavadai* arguments. I am ashamed of it.

You talked of communalism. Just consider what you did. I am quoting to you what you said. I never said a single word about communal politics. What I am complaining about is in regard to the argument which, I think, appealed to one Member of the last Parliament, who is now in a position through this National Government to control the destinies of this House, to determine the legislation, whether we approve of it or not. The Government, if it must bow to Mr. Thondaman, must at least find some other less harmful proposal on which they can join issue with him and with us. I do not mind that. But do you really believe that this law is going to benefit people? Visualize for yourself the consequences that will flow. Foreigners are permitted to come to this country for a price of Rs. 400 to enjoy all the amenities available to us and to take the bread out of the mouths of our people.

You talk about foreign experts; you need them, of course. But may I say that every single foreign expert you bring to this country, whom you want for your purposes, can be exempted under this Act from the payment of the visa tax? Not a single one who comes here or was brought here whether in U. N. P. times or in S. L. F. P. times has been called upon to pay the visa tax, whether for himself or the members

of his family. Every single foreigner working either for the Government or for a Government corporation or for local government institutions is called upon to pay the visa tax under this law. So let us not repeal it under a wrong idea of what this law contains. This law contains nothing harmful except to the foreign wives who do not care to acquire Ceylonese nationality. I think, we must encourage those ladies to acquire Ceylon citizenship. The Hon. Prime Minister must surely do that. So my respectful submission is that, from every point of view, the repeal of the Temporary Residence Tax is a wrong act and I completely associate myself with the arguments advanced by the hon. Member for Yatiyantota and the other Members who spoke before me on this aspect of the matter.

One last word about the Exchange Tax. Now, this is not one of my laws and I have no personal involvement in it. But I would like to say that the action of the Hon. Minister is wrong and against the interests of the country. I have no doubt that he does not mean it. I have not the slightest doubt that he thinks it is in the interests of the country. But the fact remains that we have today in Ceylon a differential valuation for the pound sterling. If you are honest about it, you have got to admit it that those who want to acquire a little sterling for any purpose abroad and know the ways and means to get it, can acquire it; of course, they must know where to go and how to look for it. They can get it at prices ranging at different times from twenty-eight rupees a pound, which, I think, is the lowest, to about forty rupees a pound. Call it the blackmarket if you like, but the pound sterling is available for sale in Ceylon—[*Interruption*.] I do not know how much you are quoting or how much the hon. Member for Ja-Ela would quote, but I believe it is a well-known fact that any person who has studied it or who has handled any work connected with finance or defence and external affairs would consider it a reality.

මුදල් (විශේෂ විධිවිධාන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

If you have a differential price of Rs. 28 in the black market, taken at its lowest, and you are selling it at Rs. 13 in the Central Bank on foreign exchange permits, you are having two values on the pound sterling.

You are, in fact, accepting a situation whereby the reality is created of two values. If you have got two values, the simple question is, is it not logical to try and destroy your blackmarket and to eliminate malpractices and trafficking in exchange? After all, these foreign exchange leaks occur, and most of them occur through trading channels and various practices about which, I have no doubt, hon. Members who have studied the subject will know better. I refer particularly to the hon. Member for Wattala (Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe) who, I know, takes a great interest in these matters. He studies them with care and attention. He has discussed with me on more than one occasion these matters and given advice long ago as to how these problems should be solved. May I now return the compliment and tell him to apply his own advice to his own Minister and to help the Minister to understand the problem with which I know he is in sympathy.

If one has a differential valuation of foreign currency, how realistic is it to pretend that the official value, the rate of exchange for our currency, is the correct one? How realistic is it to say that the pound sterling for Ceylon on a par value with the rupee is Rs. 13.33? My respectful submission is that it is utterly artificial and false.

If you want to solve the problem you must eliminate that disparity by making it expensive for people, and making it possible for those who want exchange to get the benefit of it by paying a higher rate of exchange officially.

In effect, as I understood it, the object of the Finance Minister's law in 1963 was to enable persons, who

for not very essential purposes wanted to take a little money, for luxury holiday travel abroad and such purposes, to get foreign exchange at a higher price than the Rs. 13. A tax was charged. I think it was 20 per cent more expensive. In effect it came to a little under Rs. 20. So that if a person wanted foreign exchange, there was a legal method, when he was not entitled under the rules to obtain it, to get it by paying Rs. 20 a pound sterling officially through the Central Bank rather than by paying Rs. 28 to Rs. 40 from an outside illegal source.

If, in point of fact, there is no demand upon the blackmarket, immediately the differential price has to fall and the result is that you have a practical realistic valuation for your sterling. That was the objective with which this law was introduced.

I am aware that this kind of law is frowned upon, not by national governments, not by the government of any individual country, but it is frowned upon by the International Monetary Fund which does not like the recognition of differential rates of exchange within a country. One of the conditions for conforming to the rules of foreign institutions like the International Monetary Fund is that the Government should not adopt differential rates of exchange without their permission. In this particular instance, that permission was obtained. As far as this particular provision of the Finance Act of 1963 is concerned, I am personally aware that Mr. Illangaratne settled this matter with the International Monetary Fund and obtained their approval, because it was not the intention of the then Government to flout the views of the International Monetary Fund and to create problems for ourselves or for anybody else or for successor governments.

In these circumstances, much as you wish to please the International Monetary Fund, why are you setting a premium upon buying blackmarket foreign exchange? You know that by repealing this law with effect from October this year,

මුදල (විශේෂ විධිවිධාන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[එෆ්. ආර්. බයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

what you are in effect doing is to encourage trafficking in foreign exchange.

After the National Government came into power, we have heard of charter flights abroad and VC-10 inaugural flights. I ask the Hon. Minister, please tell us which of them received foreign exchange to go. Some of them did, I know that. Some of them did not ask for foreign exchange; they said, we will make our own arrangements. Some of them somehow managed to find sufficient funds in sterling to be able to pre-pay their tickets to go abroad. I could mention names, but it is embarrassing to do so and I shall refrain from mentioning names. Persons, their wives, persons in high positions, persons held in high esteem by the National Government, were able to acquire sufficient foreign exchange. Some people who went on a charter flight and were supposed to have got stuck there in London are still there. How they are maintaining themselves remains a mystery to all except perhaps the Minister of Finance who turns a blind eye. We can tell him how they maintain themselves by the device of acquiring foreign exchange at a price. If the Minister in 1963 took the step of introducing this law he did so on a very reasonable motive, the motive of telling those people: If you want to buy exchange at a higher price, rather than letting third parties steal money from the Central Bank and channel it through overloaded invoices and other business malpractices, we will sell it to you officially at a premium rate.

This exchange tax does not apply to all releases of exchange. If you release exchange for a patient for treatment abroad he is exempt from this tax; if a student wants exchange for study abroad on a government scholarship or for some other purpose which you have approved, he does not pay the tax; if you want to allow any government officer to travel abroad on government business he does not

pay the tax. This is to enable persons who are not strictly entitled to qualify according to whatever rules you have, without going to the blackmarket, to obtain exchange officially at a higher premium price. Was that a bad idea? Was that a bad proposal?

You say that it is not fetching any revenue. That is correct—for the simple reason that it was not put into operation even by the Sri Lanka Freedom Party from 1963 onwards. The foreign exchange position was so difficult that no allocations were made at the higher premium rate to any unauthorized parties or for purposes outside the strict regulations. It was only permitted according to the regulations from 1963 onwards, notwithstanding the Finance Act. There was a reason for that, and the reason was the difficult foreign exchange position. But is it a bad principle, especially now that you are allowing people to go abroad and buy exchange, with no questions asked, and to maintain themselves abroad without any special allocation? I refer particularly to the V. C. 10 flight and to other occasions when people with foreign exchange supplied to them are in a position to go abroad. Is it wrong? Rather than create a trade for black-marketeers, for racketeers, in foreign exchange, is it not a much better principle to regularize it, especially since you have the permission of the International Monetary Fund for this differential proposal?

So, Mr. Minister, I appeal to you to give your consideration to this. You yourself say that it does not involve new taxation. There is no real loss to revenue for the reason that it has never been implemented. When you decide to take a rule off the Statute Book give your mind to the question: Was it a bad rule? Maybe, you yourself do not want to implement it now. Maybe, a few months hence, a year hence, you will want to implement it. But if the law is there—administratively, you need not implement it—why do you want to remove it unless it is only in the interest of one category

මුදල් (විශේෂ විධිවිධාන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

of persons that this law requires repeal? And that is the interest of those who are running a lucrative business selling foreign exchange illegally within our country. It is not your purpose to protect that class of persons, and I am quite confident in my mind that you have no wish to look after them. That you are perfectly sincere and *bona fide*, I am quite confident, in wanting to eliminate this kind of malpractice just as every Government wants to eliminate them. Therefore, I appeal to you, do not merely say that somebody has introduced a law, so you, as the successors, must try to find something bad in everyone of their laws and that their laws must be repealed. I appreciate very much what you say: that you do not want State capitalism, that you want a mixed economy, that you want capitalism to exist side by side with socialism—with what you call socialism—and try to achieve what you have set out to achieve. But, if I may say so respectfully, neither State capitalism nor socialism enters into the picture so far as these proposals are concerned.

Speaking on the Inland Revenue (Amendment) Bill Debate yesterday, you made these points; but as far as this Bill is concerned, I do not see any argument based upon a political philosophy. Either these taxes are harmful or bad, and therefore require to be repealed, or, alternatively, you are repealing them for no other reason than that you merely wish to say as a successor-Government, “I must decide that every single thing done before me by my predecessor is bad.” Or, alternatively, you must say rather ingenuously, “I have no reason for repealing them excepting that there are basic interests behind me, the capitalist interests which I serve, which insist upon the repeal of these laws, and therefore for their satisfaction I am constrained to do this in the circumstances.”

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to conclude by stating that every one of these comments on these laws has been made by us in a spirit of being

helpful, and not for the purpose of developing a political argument, not for the purpose of saying that you are doing the wrong thing or that we did better than you. Certainly not!

I may submit, in summary form that I am glad to see that you have omitted the repeal of the Finance Act of 1961. I take it as a change of heart from your Budget of August 1965, and to that extent I should like to make my contribution of warm and heartfelt congratulations, if indeed you have changed your mind. On the other hand, if you have not changed your mind but that it is merely an oversight, then I am sorry for you because it will mean the enactment of Finance Act (Special Provisions) No. 2 of 1965.

The second point I made was this. So far as the Heavy Oil Tax was concerned, I appealed to you to seriously consider the question of giving administrative relief to those who have accumulated arrears through no fault of theirs but owing to legal interpretations of the Act itself.

The third point I made was that you should seriously consider the question of restricting the repeal of the Banks Debits Tax to the People's Bank and the Bank of Ceylon in order to give the premier nationalized banking institutions in this country a preferential treatment and thereby harness all the monies available in deposit in Ceylon for the purpose of national economic development.

The fourth point I made was in regard to the Temporary Residence Tax. Completely unconvincing arguments were put forward for its repeal. I am glad that the hon. Appointed Member (Mr. Annamalai) is here. He has had not much to say on the Temporary Residence Tax. I am sorry to see that this Government, without any good reason, is completely succumbing to the subtle and malevolent influences percolating from behind right up to the Front

මුදල් (විශේෂ විධිවිධාන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

Benches. I sincerely hope I am wrong. I sincerely hope that these malevolent influences will persuade the Government not to succumb to the repeal of this proposal. I think this House, bar one Member, accepted this proposal in 1961-62. The hon. Appointed Member knows perfectly well that the stateless people in this country have no problems under this particular law. I know he is very interested in their welfare.

වී. අන්නාමලෙයි මයා. (පත්කරන ලද මන්ත්‍රී)

(තිரு. ඩී. අண்ணාමලේ—නියමන අங்கුණ වර්)

Mr. V. Annamalai—Appointed Member)
Their wives ?

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(තිரு. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I was speaking about foreign wives generally and was dealing with the question as to how they can acquire citizenship in Ceylon, but I do not propose to re-start the argument because the hon. Appointed Member is now here. I was only summarizing my conclusions.

Last of all, I appeal to the Hon. Minister of Finance to leave the exchange control tax in, even if he does not implement it, because it is one of the most effective weapons to deal with a subtle, vicious, black-marketing exchange which has developed in our country and of which every one of us is aware although, perhaps, we do not know how to set about stopping it. Therefore, I appeal to him—even if it does not produce any revenue because it is not being implemented—not to abandon it and say that it is a bad tax, however much another hon. Appointed Member from behind may make noises asking for its urgent and pressing repeal.

Appointed Members in this House are here to fulfil a function but they are not here to guide the Government. They are not here to dictate

and control the policy of National Governments. They are here to represent particular interests so that the points of view represented by them can be taken into account. That is their constitutional purpose and function, but when we reach a stage when Government policy [Interruption].

ඒස්. තොන්ඩමන් මයා. (පත් කරන ලද මන්ත්‍රී)

(තිரு. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා)

(Mr. S. Thondaman—Appointed Member)

All hon. Members are equal.

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(තිரு. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Of course, they are equal. But my complaint is that some become more equal than others in the National Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would conclude by respectfully requesting the Hon. Minister of Finance to give heed to these suggestions made in a spirit of constructive criticism, to consider seriously the question of allowing certain changes to be made and not to regard this as a matter affecting prestige but to leave it open for discussion; not to harden his heart against these ideas but to be willing to discuss them rationally and, in a spirit of helpfulness, we shall extend our fullest co-operation to him.

අ. ඩය. 6.8

සිංග්ලන්-සැල්මන් මයා.

(තිரு. සිංග්ලන්-සැල්මන්)
(Mr. Singleton-Salmon)

On this question of repealing three Acts and part of another one in one Bill, the hon. Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike) has referred to the Finance Act of 1961. That Act itself tells us of the nationalization of a bank. Every institution that was nationalized was brought in under the terms of a

separate Corporation Bill, but not the nationalization of the bank. That was brought in under the Finance Act. Then there was what the hon. Member mentioned as the restriction on the opening of accounts.

Let us take the Finance Act of 1963. That starts off with the setting up of a National Lotteries Board. Part III deals with amendments to the Pawnbrokers Ordinance, the Money-Lending Ordinance, the Marriage Registration Ordinance, the Insurance Corporation Act, the Registration of Documents Ordinance—these are all in the form of one Act, the Finance Act. Then, there was, of course, the Business Turnover Tax which came up in that Amendment, and also the Estates Duty Ordinance which is an Ordinance on its own which was amended by this comprehensive omnibus Finance Act. Another Act which was amended was one about the acquisition by the People's Bank of certain premises. The amendments to the Stamps Ordinance—[*Interruption*—I know, but I am arguing on a different side now.

The fact is that this is not the first time that Acts have either been amended or repealed by one omnibus Act. This has been done several times in the past. The hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) mentioned the Heavy Oil Motor Vehicles Tax. That, as you know, has been on the Statute Book for many, many years, and it was brought in originally in order that lorries that were using the roads should pay something towards road maintenance. They, of course, had to be licensed, but they did not pay any duty on the fuel, like petrol duty. So, when 15 cents a gallon was imposed as the duty on diesel oil, then it became obvious that they were paying double tax and, as the hon. Member for Yatiyantota says, when he was Finance Minister, he had contemplated taking it off from the 1st of January this year.

Then, in regard to the Banks Debits Tax, we were promised, when that was imposed by the shark in shark-skin—I remember Mr. Stanley de Zoysa—that when the expenditure tax came in this would be repealed. At long last it has now been repealed and the Expenditure Tax itself has been removed but something substantial has been evolved although not exactly for the same purpose.

In regard to the Temporary Residence Tax the only grouse I have is not against the tax itself but against the interpretation of it due to faulty drafting. For instance, when the tax first came into force it was retrospective. I think, the Bill was passed in August and the tax was retrospective from the 1st of October of the previous year. As such, all the permit holders had to pay, before the 15th of September of the year in which it came into force, Rs. 400, and then, on the 2nd of September they had to pay another Rs. 400 for an extension, as we thought, for the next year. But it was found not to be so. The visas had to be renewed in December or January which was three or four months later. The authorities concerned said, "You pay another Rs. 400 for the renewal which will carry you on to the next year."

So it will be seen that in one financial year a lot of people paid three times the tax, namely, Rs. 1,200 for the husband, plus another Rs. 1,200 for the wife, and if they had any children they paid some more.

Then again, there is the question of the interpretation of this period of three months. A friend of mine, a commercial traveller, comes to Ceylon every few months for two or three weeks. He was informed on one occasion that on the next occasion he comes he would have to pay Rs. 400 because for the previous two and a half to three years on the occasions he had come to Ceylon the periods he spent here aggregated to three months. As the aggregate was

මුදල් (විශේෂ විධිවිධාන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[සිංගල්ටන්-සාමන් මයා.]

three months, although it was spread over three years he was told he would have to pay the visa tax.

So, my grouse is more with the administration and the interpretation of it, Sir, than the actual tax itself, except that I thought it rather harsh that the wives of people out here, of my community for example, who were not earning, not allowed to get a job, had to pay Rs. 400 for the privilege of being with their husbands.

Another case I would like to bring to your notice is the case of a girl out from school, going home, travelling on a separate passport and visa. Her boat was delayed so that she had overstayed her visa by three days. She had to pay Rs. 400 for those three days. It was the way in which the tax was administered more than the tax itself that I have my grouse against.

Those are the comments I have to make. I heartily support every clause in this Bill as is to be expected.

අ. ආ. 6.15

අන්නාමලෙයි මයා.

(திரு. அண்ணாமலை)

(Mr. Annamalay)

Sir, I would like to just clarify one point. The hon. Member for Dompe said that all the foreigners who were married to Ceylonese citizens had not applied for citizenship. I am aware of a number of cases where they had applied for citizenship but had been refused. In some cases they were kept in suspense for three or four years and their taxes were collected. And the pity of it is that the former Government even collected Rs. 400 as visa tax from plantation workers. Therefore, it is completely incorrect for the hon. Member for Dompe to mention here that they have not applied for citizenship. There are several hundreds of cases which I am aware of which are still on the waiting list. I suppose if they had applied, according to

the hon. Member for Dompe, the former Government would have given them citizenship. I suppose he has made the task easier for the National Government now by mentioning—if I remember correctly what he said—that he is not opposed to those who have applied for Ceylon citizenship if they were married.

අ. ආ. 6.17

ගරු වන්නිනායක

(கொரவு வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

The first observation I have to make is that the Debate has revealed certain differences of opinion in the ranks of the Opposition itself. We knew it was always there but this was the first occasion on which we had a public exhibition of the differences of opinion they have among the ranks of the Opposition.

I would like first of all to refer to the hon. Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike) who referred to the Finance Act of 1961 and said that I have not taken steps to repeal that. He argued on the basis that the ban on deposits in foreign banks by local people had already been removed. I must first of all say that that was not removed.

What I said in connection with the removal of the ban in my Budget speech—I think he has not grasped the full significance of it—was :

“I intend to have early discussions with the major foreign banks operating in Ceylon, on the question of the role they could play in Ceylon's economic development.”—

I have already had one discussion with the foreign banks when I was in London this time—

“The issues I wish to resolve in this connection include the contribution these banks could make towards strengthening Ceylon's external payments in the current situation, the more effective participation of these banks in the financing of economic activities, the training and employment of local personnel at various levels, and the institutional framework within which these banks might function

මුදල් (විශේෂ විධිවිධාන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

as useful elements of our financial system. I believe that there is scope for a greater degree of adaptation of the banking system to changing conditions, and when a suitable arrangement has been made, I intend to repeal the restrictions imposed on foreign banks by the 1961 Finance Act since these restrictions prevent these banks from playing a more effective role in economic development.” —[OFFICIAL REPORT, 9th August 1965; Vol. 61, c. 122.]

The ban has not yet been removed. The hon. Member for Dompe argued on the basis that the ban has been removed although I have not taken legislative measures to repeal the Act of 1961. The ban will be removed only on the fulfilment of certain conditions on the part of the foreign banks. Towards that end I have already taken one or two steps. I have already had preliminary discussions with the bankers in London, and after mutual arrangement only, the ban will be removed. So much for the Act of 1961.

To come to the diesel tax, the Opposition was talking of loss of revenue. The diesel tax will be abolished without any adverse effect on revenue because what we lose on the abolition of the diesel tax we hope to collect by increasing import duties on diesel. We know that certain hardships would be caused to certain sections and we are taking precautions to prevent those hardships occurring or falling on the shoulders of those people.

With regard to the Banks Debits Tax, there is disagreement in the Opposition itself. In however small a way, there is no doubt that this is a disincentive to banking. People prefer to avoid paying even the small amount they have to pay as debits tax by resorting to currency transactions rather than to cheque transactions. In that way, it is certainly a disincentive, however small, to the development of the banking habit. Even the hon. Member for Dompe had no objection to removing this in the case of local banks. Where the two local banks are concerned the removal of the tax would not do much harm. In view

of what he said now, if I succeed in making the foreign banks play the role they should play in the economy of our country, well, I suppose, he would not object to the removal of the debits tax in the case of those banks also. Therefore, even on his argument there is no harm in the removal of this tax.

The Temporary Residence Tax raised a lot of dust. I have got some literature to read on that subject, but I have no time. I find there is a large number of exemptions from the visa tax—about half have been exempted. It involved so many operations. Whether it is worthwhile continuing it is the question. A visa is issued to a person whose presence is considered essential in this country. If you consider the presence of a man or woman essential in this country and if you issue a visa, why tax him or her? Our idea is to prevent unnecessary personnel, those not required for employment in this country, from coming here, and that can be done by not issuing a visa, and not by selling these visas for a fee of Rs. 400.

If you go into actual statistics you will find that there are a large number of exemptions from this tax. Whether it is worth continuing the tax has to be considered seriously.

The hon. Appointed Member (Mr. Singleton-Salmon) gave an account of how this tax is worked, how in the same year sometimes the tax has to be paid three times over. If a person had been three times in this island on three occasions and if his stay aggregated to three months, he was liable to pay this tax. Taking into consideration all points of view, we thought the removal of this tax would not cause much harm to the economy of the country.

Then comes the Foreign Exchange Tax. The hon. Member said one of the conditions for entry into the I. M. F. really prevented our imposition of a foreign exchange tax but that they had got special permission from the I. M. F. to continue with

பிரேட் (வினேய விவிவின) பனத் கெடுபென

—காரக ஸ்தாலி

[ஓர் வந்தினாயக]

this tax. He said, "Why not give certain people foreign exchange at a higher rate?". Well, Sir, if foreign exchange deserves to be given to certain persons, why not give it? Why should some people get it at a higher rate than other people? We mean to exercise exchange control in such a way that it will not be possible for people to use unnecessary foreign exchange. But it is difficult to understand why some people should be allowed to buy foreign exchange at a higher rate than others. It causes a certain amount of hardship even in getting exemptions. You have to make representations, and those representations have to be considered and re-considered. I know certain cases that were brought to my notice. Where even educational allowances had to be sent to a foreign country, a tax was charged. I know in such cases tax exemption could be obtained, but again it is a long process. You have to make an application, you have to meet various people. Sometimes you have to meet the Minister in the final instance to get the exemption required. We thought, again taking all points of view into consideration, it is best to remove that tax.

In fact, the same argument was advanced in the course of the Budget Debate and it was replied to not only by me but also by my Colleagues on this side of the House. The argument has been repeated on this occasion.

I move, "That the Bill be now read a Second time."

புனிய விவன டேன், ஸ்தாலிமெ வி.

கெடுபென பனத் பீடு டிஜிடிடி டேவன வர கிடி வன டே.

வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு, ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

அதன்படி, மசோதா இரண்டாம் முறையாக மதிப்பிடப்பெற்றது.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a Second time.

மது படி வன ஸ்தாலி ஸ்தாலிமெ வி.

"கெடுபென பனத் பூரீன் மன்தி மனேவலெ காரக ஸ்தாலி புவலெ ஸ்தாலி."—[ஓர் வந்தினாயக]

பின்வரும் பிரேரணை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

"மசோதா முழுச்சபைக்குழுவுக்குச் சாட்டப்படுமா?"
—[கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க]

Resolved :

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

காரக ஸ்தாலிமெ டே.

[நிஷேஜித கிணாயகமே இலகனாயக வி.]

முழுச்சபைக் குழுவில் ஆராயப்பெற்றது.

[பிரதிச் சபாநாயகர் தலைமை தாங்கினார்.]

Considered in Committee.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair.]

1 வன வன்தினே டிடி 5 வன வன்தினே நேன் கெடுபென பன்தேன் கெடுபென் ஸ்தாலி நிவி ஸ்தாலி நிவி கரன டே.

புடிபீதி வன்தினே ஸ்தாலி நிவி கெடுபென பன்தேன் கெடுபென் ஸ்தாலி நிவி ஸ்தாலி நிவி கரன டே.

கெடுபென பன்தேன், ஸ்தாலி ரகிதவ, வந்தி கரன டே.

1 ஆம் வாசகத்திலிருந்து 5 ஆம் வாசகம் வரை மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமென ஆணையிடப்பட்டது.

சட்டமாக வாசகமும் தலைப்பும் மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமென ஆணையிடப்பட்டது.

மசோதா திருத்தமின்றி ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டதாக அறிவிக்கப்பட்டது.

Clauses 1 to 5 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

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

Bill reported without Amendment.

ஓர் வந்தினாயக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I move,

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

புனிய விவன டேன், ஸ்தாலிமெ வி.

வேட்க (ஃஸ்ட்) பதன் கெடுதல்

—தேவன் வர கியலி

கெடுதல் பதன் 3வது தடவை துவக்கம்
கியலி கியலி கியலி கியலி

the statement of legal effect in respect
of this amending Bill. In regard to
Clause 3, it says:—

“The effect of this clause will be to
enable a citizen of Ceylon who holds a
foreign degree or other qualification
which is recognized by the Medical
Council to be registered as a medical
practitioner under the Ordinance if he
passes an examination prescribed by the
Medical Council”.

On the face of it, it looks as if there
is no discrimination between foreign
degrees, that a person who possesses
a foreign degree will have to pass a
prescribed examination by the Medi-
cal Council of Ceylon. Under the
original section the people who are
entitled to be registered as medical
practitioners are those persons who
hold a degree of Bachelor of Medicine
of the University of Ceylon, or have
passed the examination necessary for
obtaining the degree of Bachelor of
Medicine but have not obtained that
degree owing to a delay on the part
that University in conferring that
degree on him, and those holding a
qualifying diploma within the mean-
ing of the Medical Acts but have
not acquired such experience as is
required to get themselves registered
under these Acts. So, Sir, a person
who holds a qualifying diploma with-
in the meaning of the Medical Acts
and a certificate granted by the Medi-
cal Council under Section 32, is auto-
matically registered as a medical
practitioner.

According to the original Act
“Medical Acts” mean the Medical
Act of the Parliament of the United
Kingdom. So, according to the defi-
nition of the Legal Draftsman, which
has been agreed to by this Govern-
ment, the United Kingdom is not a
foreign country to Ceylon. We have
gone back to the colonial days when
a Britisher did not consider himself
a foreigner in Ceylon. In fact, he was
better than a native in Ceylon. He
belonged to the ruling class. A
Britisher not only considered himself
to be no foreigner when he was in the
colonial countries, but when he went
to other independent countries he
resented being called a foreigner,
which he thought was a term of
abuse and insult.

வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

அதன்படி, மசோதா மூன்றாம் முறையாக மதிப்
பிடப்பெற்று நிறைவேற்றப்பெற்றது.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read the Third time,
and passed.

வேட்க (ஃஸ்ட்) பதன்

கெடுதல்

மருத்துவம் (திருத்த) மசோதா

MEDICAL (AMENDMENT) BILL

கல் தவிர டே விடைய தவிர தவிர பதன்
கியலி கியலி கியலி கியலி [ஓக்டோபர் 8.]

“கெடுதல் பதன் தவிர தேவன் வர கியலி
கியலி”—[தேவன் வர கியலி]

கியலி கியலி கியலி கியலி

வினா மீதான ஒத்திவைக்கப்பெற்ற விவாதம் மீள
ஆரம்பிப்பதற்கான கட்டளை வாசிக்கப்பட்டது. [அக். 8]

“மசோதா இப்பொழுது இரண்டாம் முறை மதிப்
பிடப்படுமா”

—[கெளரவ விமலா கன்னங்கர]

வினா மீண்டும் எடுத்தியம்பப்பெற்றது.

Order read for resuming Adjourned
Debate on Question—[8th October.]

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

Question again proposed.

டி. ஓ. 6.30

வேட்க (ஃஸ்ட்) பதன் தவிர தவிர
(அக்டோபர் 8)

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ—அக்கு
றஸ்ஸ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe—Akuressa)

With regard to the proposed Medi-
cal (Amendment) Bill, I wish to
make certain observations. I am
sorry to have to state that in regard
to the first Bill presented by the Hon.
Acting fair Minister we are unable
to give her our co-operation because
there are many elements involved in
this Bill which are of a very undesi-
rable nature. In the first instance, I
would like to draw your attention to

වෛද්‍ය (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

[වෛද්‍යවාර්ෂ එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ]

This interpretation of the word "foreigner" has crept into the mind of the Legal Draftsman who drafted this Bill. Otherwise, he would not have said in the explanation of the effects of this Bill that it will "enable a citizen of Ceylon who holds a foreign degree or other qualification which is recognized by the Medical Council to be registered as a medical practitioner under the Ordinance if he passes an examination prescribed by the Medical Council".

According to the original Act as well as the amending Bill, anybody registered under the Medical Acts is not subject to this special examination. So, there is a definite discrimination against any degree obtained from a university outside Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Whether the degrees have been obtained in the U. S. A., in any European country, or in any of the socialist countries, they are all not accepted. Those students who qualify in these countries have to submit themselves to a compulsory examination to be held by the Medical Council of Ceylon.

We must go into the question of the Ceylon Medical Council—its competency, whether it has discharged its duties in the past, whether it is capable of carrying out impartially this duty of testing the competency of medical graduates who hold foreign degrees. That whole question, I submit, has to be carefully investigated.

In the first place, I should like to ask the Hon. fair Minister the reason why the department did not advise her to present the amendment which was presented in the last Parliament and unanimously adopted by the House but which, unfortunately, due to prorogation and subsequent dissolution of Parliament, did not become law. It did not go to the Senate.

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

ශ්‍රී විමලා කන්නන්ගර (වැඩ බලන සෞඛ්‍ය ඇමති)

(කෙළරව විමලා කන්නන්ගර—පත්‍රීයේ සභා
පාලන මණ්ඩලය)

(The Hon. Wimala Kannangara—Acting Minister of Health)

Because it was opposed by the Medical Council.

වෛද්‍යවාර්ෂ එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(දොරාල් ග්‍රේ. ආ. වික්‍රමසිංහ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

Now some additional information has been forthcoming. An amending Bill had passed through three Readings in the last Parliament when the Coalition Government was in power. The Medical Council, the medical profession, had not the courage to come out in the open and state that they were opposed to that Bill. What was the principle that was accepted by the previous Government as being a fair solution to this problem of foreign degrees so that we could ensure that people holding foreign medical degrees would have a sufficient basic education in the medical sciences and so that they would not be a danger to the public of Ceylon if they practised medicine in Government service or in private practice?

ශ්‍රී විමලා කන්නන්ගර

(කෙළරව විමලා කන්නන්ගර)

(The Hon. Wimala Kannangara)

They had the courage. They had a consultation with the previous Prime Minister.

වෛද්‍යවාර්ෂ එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(දොරාල් ග්‍රේ. ආ. වික්‍රමසිංහ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

I should like to read the amendment that was unanimously and without division adopted in the last Parliament. Before I do so, I should like to read the speech of the then Minister of Health, Mr. Badiuddin Mahmud, when he introduced that amendment. That will give the House a clear idea of the problem and how satisfactorily it was solved in consultation with the medical profession and the Cabinet. This is what he states as reported in HANSARD of 20th August 1964, column 794:

වෛද්‍ය (සංකේධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

“We have sent a large number of students on scholarships to—”

Mark the words—

“We have sent”

which means that the Ceylon Government has sent.

“We have sent a large number of students on scholarships to obtain medical degrees from continental universities. Hitherto our Medical Council has been recognizing only Ceylon degrees and other degrees and diplomas recognized by the British Medical Council.”

This is typical. The Ceylon Medical Council still remains in the mediaeval days of colonialism. British medical degrees are identical with national degrees! Any other degrees are “foreign” degrees. British degrees are not foreign degrees.

“Many of the East European Universities are not recognized by the British Medical Council. It is therefore proposed to add a new sub-paragraph to Section 29 of the Medical Act to say that degrees recognized by the Inter-Universities Board of India, of which Ceylon is a member, may be accepted for registration in Ceylon. This board has no list of universities recognized by it, but it grants recognition on an *ad hoc* basis as each application is received. Using their investigations and experience, Ceylon will decide the degrees that should be given recognition.

I do not wish to state anything further.”—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 20th August 1965; Vol. 57, c. 792.]

This is the amendment:

“3. Section 29 of the principal enactment is hereby amended as follows:—

(1) in paragraph (b) of sub-section (1),—

(a) by the insertion, immediately after sub-paragraph (i), of the following new sub-paragraph:—

(ii) holds the degree of Bachelor of Medicine of any university of any country other than Ceylon, which is recognized by the Inter-University Board of India for the purposes of the Board, and a certificate granted by the Medical Council under section 32, or’;”

That meets with the problem of the need to ensure minimum standards of medical education of those who are qualified in foreign countries. The Inter-University Board of India performs this function not only for medical degrees but for other technical qualifications—engineering qualifications, veterinary qualifications and various other qualifications. This Inter-University Board of which the Ceylon University is a member discusses the whole question and decides whether the basic minimum standards are maintained in these universities in conformity with the needs of our country. If degrees from foreign universities satisfy our needs and conditions then we can recognize those degrees.

This is essential for two main reasons. We send out students to these countries for training. It is at our request that these scholarships are granted. Then we discriminate! Any degree from England comes under the British Medical Act; so it is automatically recognized. Any degree from any other country is not recognized.

From the way this Medical Council is performing its functions today in this country, it appears that it is not fit to clean the shoes of a genuine physician or surgeon. It is an archaic and antiquated body which should be immediately scrapped and reformed. A new constitution should be adopted for this body. The Ceylon Medical Council is a century behind the British Medical Council in its concepts and representation. This archaic body is now expected to hold an examination to judge the competence of students who have studied in countries which have the most advanced health organizations in the world. Everybody admits, whether he is a fascist, anti-socialist, anti-communist or pro-communist, that the most advanced Health Organization in the world is in the Soviet Union. The

වෛද්‍ය (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[වෛද්‍යවරයා එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ]

country that has achieved the most miraculous results in positive health within the last forty years is the Soviet Union. The medical men trained in that country are going to be judged on a discriminatory basis by the Ceylon Medical Council merely for the reason that they are getting an opportunity of doing so because we had invited the Soviet Union to give us a number of scholarships and train our students in medicine in that country. These men are earmarked to study medicine when they leave Ceylon.

I will now come to the question of the composition of the Medical Council. I will first read to you about the Ceylon Medical Council. The Ceylon Medical Council consists of 11 members, including the President and the Vice-President, to be appointed as follows: the President, nominated by the Minister. And the President of the Medical Council is the Director of Health Services—

ශ්‍රී විමල කන්නන්ගර

(கௌரவ விமலா கன்னங்கர)

(The Hon. Wimala Kannangara)

No. He is Sir Nicholas Attygalle.

වෛද්‍යවරයා එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்கம்)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

That is even worse. I thought it was the D. H. S. Now, according to the Hon. acting fair Minister, the Vice-Chancellor of the University is the President of the Ceylon Medical Council. I did not know it was so bad.

As I was saying, the President is nominated by the Minister. Then, one member is elected by the teachers of the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Ceylon. According to the law there is only one faculty of medicine in Ceylon although there are two medical colleges, one in Peradeniya and one in Colombo. Again, two members are elected by the medical practitioners who are registered under the Medical Acts. That is, those who are registered under the Medical Acts. That is, those who are registered in the Medical

Register in the United Kingdom can elect two representatives to the Ceylon Medical Council. Thus, medical men who have studied in England and who have registered themselves as medical practitioners in the British Medical Register are entitled to select two representatives. All the other medical practitioners, about a thousand—odd of them, Ceylon medical practitioners, can select only two members to the Ceylon Medical Council. Those who have the money to go abroad, pass the examination in England and register themselves in the British Medical Council, a few dozens of them, who pass less exacting and much easier examinations than those in Ceylon, are allowed to select two members.

I remember from my days, 80 per cent of the students who fail to qualify at the Ceylon Medical College, go to Edinburgh, get through what is called the triple qualification, and return to Ceylon having registered in the British Medical Register as British qualified doctors, and practice in Ceylon before their colleagues who had failed the same examination in Ceylon and had taken up the subsequent examination. In Ceylon there is one examination a year, or two, but in Edinburgh there is an examination every two months. It is a business for these external universities and it is a very lucrative way of earning income from examination fees. These people, the failures in Ceylon, who go for the triple qualification, who register in England are not only considered superior to the doctors qualified in Ceylon but are allowed to select two members to the Ceylon Medical Council, while all medical graduates of the Ceylon University can also only select two members. Can you imagine a greater insult to the nationals of this country? Can you imagine a greater subservience to British colonial domination in the sphere of professional matters than this Act? And you want this body to test the efficiency of doctors who come here from some of the most advanced countries of the world?

වෛද්‍ය (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

Then, one member is elected by the dentists ; four members nominated by the Minister, of whom at least two members shall not be in Government employ or in receipt of a pension from Government. No person shall be eligible to be a member of the Medical Council unless he is a medical practitioner or a dentist.

Now, Sir, I would like to repeat to you the composition of the British Medical Council. Before that I shall refer to Sir Nicholas Attygalle, who seems to have blind faith in the efficacy of British standards. The Ceylon medical profession is generally so obsessed by the supremacy of everything British that they are not even prepared to go by the progressive standards that are applicable in England.

The Medical Council in England comprises of 47 members. It may be said that the number in Ceylon should be small because we are a small country. Therefore, I will not comment on the number in our Medical Council.

Eight persons, including three laymen, are appointed by Her Majesty with the advice of the Privy Council and so there are three non-professional men, statesmen, who can safeguard the interests of the patients.

The function of the Medical Council is not to act as a narrow organization of private craftsmen to further the interests of the craft. The main purpose of the Medical Council is to safeguard the health of the population. So it is essential that there should be representation for non-professional men in the constitution of the Medical Council. It should be provided by statute. But in Ceylon, non-medical men are excluded altogether.

Sir Nicholas Attygalle who had the fortune of becoming the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Ceylon is a person who had no university education ; he was only trained. I am not mentioning this with any personal feelings of animosity towards him. He is a good friend of mine.

Professionally, I have the greatest respect for him. He was in the Ceylon Medical College which was not affiliated to a university ; it was only a medical school. Then he became a surgeon. In England, at one time, surgery was only a glorified craft. It was not a subject which had university status ; in the Victorian days, in the 18th century, the barber was the surgeon.

Then, came the time when you could become a surgeon by passing the F. R. C. S. examination in England without being associated with the academic advantages that are obtained in a university of which the medical faculty is an integrated part of the university.

So, we have this iniquitous position in Ceylon of a Vice-Chancellor of a university who has never associated himself with a university !

ශ්‍රී විමලා කන්නන්ගර

(கௌரவ விமலா கன்னங்கர)

(The Hon. Wimala Kannangara)

Appointed by the S. L. F. P. Minister of Health.

වෛද්‍යවෘද්ධි එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

He was made Vice-Chancellor of the University ?

ශ්‍රී විමලා කන්නන්ගර

(கௌரவ விமலா கன்னங்கர)

(The Hon. Wimala Kannangara)

No, to the Board.

වෛද්‍යවෘද්ධි එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

Who made him Vice-Chancellor of the University ? Who canvassed for him ?

ශ්‍රී විමලා කන්නන්ගර

(கௌரவ விமலா கன்னங்கர)

(The Hon. Wimala Kannangara)

You are speaking of the Medical Council.

වෛද්‍ය (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

I am speaking of the Vice-Chancellor of the University who is appointed, because of his position as Vice-Chancellor, as the President of the Medical Council. What is his other claim?—I would like to know. He was made Vice-Chancellor, then he was nominated as President of the Medical Council. That is the position I want you to understand. I shall go into that a little further.

It is necessary to understand the slavish attitude of our own medical council. They seem to be incapable of taking an objective attitude to this problem. We are now asked by the present Minister to entrust the Ceylon Medical Council with the task of judging medical men who hold degrees from any university other than a university in England by holding an examination to test their fitness. Any medical degree which is recognized by the British Medical Council automatically gets recognition here.

The Ceylon Medical Council has not been capable of organizing the necessary post-graduate training abroad.

Here, Sir, is a good example in regard to the training of surgeons. Take the cases of Sir Nicholas Attygalle and Dr. M. V. P. Peiris, Minister of Commerce and Trade and Member of the Senate. They were in London along with me. They were studying for the F. R. C. S. examination. They passed the examination after several years but they never walked into an operating theatre. They never put on surgical gloves. They were not allowed to. For the colonials who went to England and passed the F. R. C. S. specialist examination in surgery, it was only a feat of mental gymnastics or acrobatics. But the British students were given apprenticeship. They became medical registrars. They worked under eminent surgeons in the various hospitals in England, and after two or three years of assisting in and performing surgical operations themselves under

eminent surgeons, they have to pass a final test which is the least important requirement for the certificate given to a British surgeon who is qualified to operate.

This final test has been inflated into a general examination for foreign colonial students. Dr. Peiris passed out in Ceylon. Without any practice here he went to England. For many years he tried to enter a hospital to work under an eminent surgeon but they closed the door to him. He was not able to apprentice himself to a surgeon in a hospital. So he went to tutorial classes which were a lucrative source of income for impecunious unskilled surgeons in London. They hold F. R. C. S. tutorial classes and coach these students to sit for the F. R. C. S. examination. And one of the conditions that are necessary to qualify to sit for the F. R. C. S. examination is, not that you should have worked under a surgeon or operated on a living human being, but that you must have operated on a dead body. If they have operated on dead bodies, they can sit for the examination. To them "operative surgery" means operating on a dead body.

In every civilized country in the world a person is not certified as a surgeon until a surgeon gives a personal testimony to say that that person has worked three to four years under him and is capable of operating on a living human being successfully. For the Ceylon Medical Council, even now, the position is the same. Some doctors who go abroad sometimes get an opportunity of working in a hospital, but it is not obligatory for the F. R. C. S. degree that a person should produce evidence of having worked under the guidance of a surgeon and assisted at surgical operations. Still it is not a condition, and the Medical Council has, up to date, not had the general intelligence to understand the need to revise the medical training that is given to some of our doctors who go abroad. Very often, they are sent abroad for the F. R. C. S. examination to England

at State expense. But they do not satisfy themselves that they have worked under surgeons in that country.

I mentioned that in passing in order to show the utter incapability and inefficiency of the Ceylon Medical Council. This body has to be scrapped and re-constituted. In England, as I mentioned, every university appoints representatives. As I said, eight members are appointed by Her Majesty in Privy Council to the British Medical Council, of whom three are non-medical men and eleven elected by the profession. But they do not give us the right to appoint any members to the British Medical Council. We give the right to some people who are in the British Medical Register to nominate two members to our Medical Council, but they have not reciprocated that, and we have no right to appoint any representatives to the British Medical Council. As far as the medical profession is concerned, we are still colonials—[Interruption]. You only want to get the satisfaction that you can rule over more advanced professional men from Europe who get better training than in England. This slave mentality of subjugating themselves to British colonial standards gives them a certain amount of satisfaction in trying to sit over other countries which are more progressive and more advanced than even England. I do not say that in England the medical systems, their standards, are backward. But it is an accepted fact that the British standards over the last 30 years had assimilated, taken advantage of and had benefited by the experiences of the Soviet Union, the socialist countries, other European countries and the U.S.A. That is well known and it is accepted. But to Ceylon, modern medicine is identified with Britain only.

In England, as I said, 11 members are elected to the Council by the profession. The remaining 28 members represent the universities which grant medical degrees.

Then they have a disciplinary committee. The full membership of the committee is 19, including two laymen, but the majority of cases are heard by 9 members only. The committee normally sits in public. In the Ceylon Medical Council—I think, advisedly, because they are so ashamed of their own performances—the proceedings are private. The public have no access to the transactions of the Ceylon Medical Council. In England, unless it is specially decided, all the transactions of the British Medical Council are conducted in public. Sometimes, in certain matters pertaining to professional ethics or professional misconduct involving the personal life of a medical man or non-medical persons, the proceedings are conducted *in camera*. But generally their transactions are conducted in public. In Ceylon, under no circumstances are transactions of the Ceylon Medical Council conducted in public. Although I am myself a medical man and belong to the Ceylon Medical Association, I cannot obtain any information of the transactions that take place in the Ceylon Medical Council.

Your first task—the previous Government failed to do this—before you give them the additional responsibility of testing the efficiency of professional men qualified in universities of repute in other countries, is to reform this corrupt and inefficient body.

The disciplinary committee is the most important committee in any medical council, because it deals with the relations of medical men with the public. The people need special protection from misconduct and the violation of ethics on the part of medical men in the profession, and it ensures such protection by holding its sessions in public and by having in the committee even non-medical men. Now, Sir, none of these principles or safeguards are accepted or found in the Ceylon Medical Council.

If the Ceylon Medical Council is to be given this task of judging the efficiency of the training given to

වෛද්‍ය (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ]

medical graduates from other universities, we must at least first find out whether they are capable of understanding and grasping the problems of medical education, whether they are efficient in organizing the existing medical colleges in Ceylon. What is the standard and performance of the Medical Colleges in Ceylon? The Ceylon Medical Council has the responsibility of maintaining high standards at these institutions. Even the British Medical Council has not thrust upon itself the function of holding examinations. I may quote :

“The supervision of medical education is the primary task assigned by Parliament to the Council. Its duty is to ensure the maintenance of a standard of proficiency ‘such as sufficiently to guarantee the possession of the knowledge and skill requisite for the efficient practice of Medicine, Surgery and Midwifery’. For this purpose, the Council is empowered to ask Examining Bodies and Medical Schools for particulars of their courses of study and examinations (this is done annually) and to appoint Visitors of Medical Schools and Inspectors or Visitors of Examinations. The Council also issues Recommendations as to the Medical Curriculum which are revised from time to time in the light of changing conditions, including advances in knowledge.

The principal object of the Recommendations is to state the *minimum* standards of training and examinations which ought to be required of men and women obtaining primary medical qualifications. The curriculum is flexible, and Bodies and Schools are encouraged to experiment freely with courses and methods of teaching. Schools are visited and examinations inspected at intervals of about ten years.”

Even the Medical Council in England does not consider itself competent to hold examinations, but the present amending Bill seeks to empower the Ceylon Medical Council to hold examinations. In the British Medical Council there are medical men and university professors, both medical and non-medical. It is not laid down that they should be qualified medical men. There are men of high academic status. Here we have an anachronism, a person who had not had the opportunity of being associated in the course of his

education with the academic advantages of a university career as the Chairman of the Medical Council. He is going to judge the general standard of efficiency of doctors trained in universities of other countries.

Look at what has happened in the medical colleges of Colombo and Kandy? That will give an example of the danger of entrusting this Medical Council with this task. Before it is able to hold an examination, the Medical Council must do what is expected of it, that is, to organize the available clinical material, the available doctors for the training of students in medical schools.

One has only to visit the Colombo General Hospital to know the unbelievable chaos and inefficiency there. I gave you one glaring example.

Now, let us take plastic surgery. Plastic surgery does not mean the face-lifting of ageing women. Plastic surgery has become an essential part of correcting congenital deformity, deformity following burns and accidents, deformity after injuries to the joints, deformity after diseases of joints, and various forms of incapacitating conditions. Now, all these deformities can be remarkably corrected by plastic surgery and the people rehabilitated to be useful citizens, instead of being a liability to the State and also to themselves.

A plastic Surgeon was trained in Roehampton, England, in one of the biggest plastic surgery hospitals, perhaps one of the best in the world probably. He is an F.R.C.S. He is one of the exceptions who had obtained his F.R.C.S. while working in that hospital as the Surgical Registrar. He had about four or five years experience. He is Dr. Wijesinghe. He returned to Ceylon in 1962. But up to date he has not been given any beds and the facilities to do plastic surgery. He has been fighting for these for three years. He brought with him a large amount of equipment, and after he came he ordered

வேட்கு (கண்ணென) பதனீ கெடுதிலு

—தேவன வர கிலுதே

more equipment. These equipment are in crates stored in one of the wards that are meant to accommodate patients. The patients cannot be accommodated because the instruments are stored in this ward. This surgeon, very wisely, knowing from experience, has refused to allow these equipment to be taken into a godown. We also know that equipment worth millions of rupees have been stored in such a way that they have not only been attacked by white ants but they have also got rusty as a result of the rain beating in.

I would ask the Hon. fair Minister to look in at the five-storeyed block tomorrow morning and see for herself the condition of the plastic surgery unit in the hospital. She would immediately withdraw this Bill and say, "we need investigation into the functioning of the Medical Council" before entrusting it with this task of examining—[Interruption].

செ. விமலா கன்னங்கர

(கௌரவ விமலா கன்னங்கர)

(The Hon. Wimala Kannangara)

I shall surely visit the hospital. I will improve the Bill, but I will not withdraw it.

வேட்குலாபீச உசீ. பீ. விசுமசிங்

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

You can do it tomorrow morning. I am sure you will do something without any inducement from me when you know the conditions prevailing today. For the plastic surgeon is set apart the fifth floor, the best floor, in the hospital, where the air is not polluted, where the purest air in the hospital is found, as a ward for cases of burns. This has been done because the surgeon can, from the very start, treat the people who come with burns so that he could prevent any deformity. Even if there is a fear of any deformity the surgeon could tackle that very early.

In Ceylon, with its bottle-lamp menace, cases of burns as a result of accidental overturning of bottle-lamps, are very common. There is a large number of persons who come there with such burns, but the ward set apart for the treatment of those cases, is completely empty. The ward adjoining the ward set apart for the plastic surgeon is the neuro-surgical ward which also needs to be in a very hygienic condition. But this abandoned ward, quite apart from being empty, is accumulating filth and vermin.

Sir, this ward is in the new block of the General Hospital, the major medical teaching institution in Ceylon; but the biggest hornets' nest that I have ever seen in the world has been built in this abandoned ward. This is the biggest *debara kooduwa* I have seen and it is about ten feet long. I went there last week and two attendants came and dragged me away saying, "ஊதீயு, லுரேதீயு யதவடி?".

This is in our General Hospital, in the fifth floor of the new building in which three surgeons operate in the neuro-surgical section. Their lives are in danger.

நிசேபீச கலாநாயகரு,

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Is that why you are inviting the Hon. fair Minister to visit the hospital tomorrow?

வேட்குலாபீச உசீ. பீ. விசுமசிங்

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

An invitation is not necessary, Sir. I think the Hon. fair Minister will come. Will the Hon. fair Minister give me the privilege of accompanying her tomorrow?

செ. விமலா கன்னங்கர

(கௌரவ விமலா கன்னங்கர)

(The Hon. Wimala Kannangara)

I will inspect tomorrow morning and we will improve the Bill; we will not withdraw it.

වෛද්‍ය (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(දොக்டර් எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

The Ceylon Medical Council is one of the most corrupt rackets, Sir. I am ashamed and sorry to say this of my Colleagues with whom I have had professional as well as social contact. But I must state the true state of affairs before this House.

Now, Sir, the plastic surgical ward is in that state. The surgical instruments have not yet been taken out of their crates. The plastic surgeon's main task is to prevent the instruments rusting and deteriorating. It was only last month that he was given six beds for the first time.

ශ්‍රී විමලා කන්නන්ගර

(கௌரவ விமலா கன்னங்கரா)

(The Hon. Wimala Kannangara)

That was after three years, after this Government came into power.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(දොக்டර් எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

He got three beds for children and three for adults, and he has a waiting list of 450 patients.

ශ්‍රී විමලා කන්නන්ගර

(கௌரவ விமலா கன்னங்கரா)

(The Hon. Wimala Kannangara)

Whose fault is it?

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(දොக்டර් எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

I am not blaming anybody. The fault lies in the corruption of the Ceylon Medical Council which should look after the interests of medical education and general public health in the country. That, it has failed to do. It is an incompetent, corrupt body. Why I call it that is because the Ceylon Medical Council is the body that deals with professional ethics and unprofessional conduct.

Now, I ask, why has not this plastic surgeon been given his due? Why was not a ward allotted to him in the new block? There are three operating theatres in this new block, in this five-storeyed building. He can easily share one of the three operating theatres with the other surgeons?

But if he is to operate, he will have to get his instruments—whatever instruments he has—unpacked and keep in his office. He carries them about half a mile away to an operating theatre to operate and again carefully brings them back to store them in his office room because the surgeons operating in the same block would not agree to share one of the three operating theatres with this surgeon. The reason is obvious. The vested interest of certain medical men is the overriding factor. To protect the vested interests of certain unscrupulous surgeons and physicians is the main function of the Ceylon Medical Council.

There have been grave instances of unprofessional conduct by medical men of the top level as well as the bottom level, of treatment amounting to gross, scandalous cruelty to patients. These cases were reported to the Medical Council. They were heard in private, in camera, and in every instance, somehow or other some members succeeded in suppressing the evidence and preventing the due exposure of the unprofessional conduct of these medical men.

I am mentioning this not with a view to discredit my profession but to show the inefficiency and the corruptness of the Ceylon Medical Council.

Now, the other example. The Hon. fair Minister was not a Member of the last Parliament. It took me one year to expose outside the House and on the Floor of this House the question of installing the apparatus for the examination of the heart, which was gifted to Ceylon by Australia, costing thousands of pounds sterling. I forget the exact amount. It is an instrument whereby you pass a catheter through a blood vessel into the heart, so as to take a television picture of the catheter going through

the vein into the chamber of the heart, and it is reflected on the screen. It is a very delicate and effective instrument which will give to the surgeon a picture of the entire nature of the ailment with which the patient is suffering. The four chambers in the heart, the valves of the heart, the arteries going into the heart and coming out of the heart, the coronary arterial circulation—all these in succession can now be studied on the television screen by passing an instrument into the heart and pumping a dye into the chambers and directing the catheter with the help of the television screen.

Now, this delicate instrument was brought to Ceylon and kept in the wharf for eight months because one designing physician wanted to smuggle it into the Chest Hospital, Welisara, without sending it to the General Hospital. Finally, after eight months he managed to smuggle it to Welisara and instal it in the hospital there which is a hot-bed of infection. The Tuberculosis Hospital in Welisara probably has the most infected atmosphere in Ceylon because now, according to the policy of the Government and the Medical Department, you hospitalize at Welisara only the open infectious cases. Every other case is sent away. Those who do not infect others by coughing, breathing or with sputum, are treated in their homes now. They are given a special allowance and the medicines they have to take are given to them. Even injections are not necessary. So many tablets a day are given to them. Cases which infect other people are the cases that are admitted to Welisara, and also surgical cases. That means that the incidence of infection at Welisara is very heavy. It is dangerous for the people who work there. It is dangerous for the people who go there. They installed there this most sensitive instrument for examining heart patients. An operation can be performed on such patients only if there is not the slightest evidence of infection; otherwise it ends fatally. Those patients had to be carted from the General Hospital to Welisara. I had to fight nearly one year to expose this racket.

Finally the instruments were transferred and installed at the General Hospital. It is now functioning in the General Hospital. I would ask the Hon. Acting fair Minister to go to the Thoracic Unit in the General Hospital and ask the Thoracic Surgeon, Dr. A. T. S. Paul, to give her the whole history of the installation of this apparatus in the Thoracic Unit in the hospital.

The Ceylon Medical Council is the supreme body that has to consider the question of the standard of medical education and the proper training of medical practitioners. It is the principal body that advises the Medical College. Here the Medical College means the General Hospital. Clinical teaching is the main function of the Medical College. Most of the basic sciences are learned before entering the Medical College. Now, physics, chemistry, biology and mathematics are taught not in the Medical College but in the University or in the various colleges. It is the basic sciences like physiology, anatomy and pathology that they learn at the Medical College. But the main clinical teaching is done at the hospital. Clinical practice lasts three years. How can you do clinical teaching efficiently unless the Medical Council is efficient and shows capability of organization?

The essential medical appliances cannot be used unrelated to the needs of the population. You cannot go to a laboratory and try to demonstrate in an atmosphere divorced from reality. The medical appliances must be seen in their practical application—relieving the sick, relieving pain, saving human lives. These instruments have been so badly abused. They have been carted to Welisara when they should be installed in the General Hospital.

Every day the Plastic Surgeon has to look underneath the crates to see whether white ants are crawling in. If he goes to the fifth floor he has to see whether any new effort is being made to clean the abandoned ward. At first he has to protect himself from hornets. This inefficient, corrupt body is going to—[Interruption]

වෛද්‍ය (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

ශ්‍රී විමලා කන්නන්ගර

(කෙළරාව විමලා කන්නන්ගර)

(The Hon. Wimala Kannangara)

The Medical Council does not clean wards; it is the matron who does that.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(දොරාදර් ගේ. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

Now, Sir, I have to teach the Hon. Acting Minister her elementary duties. I do not want to be hard on her.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාභිති ගේ. එම්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

The labourers do the cleaning, the responsibility lies with somebody higher up.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(දොරාදර් ගේ. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

The main responsibility for the re-organization and the utilization of the existing medical talent in order to relieve the suffering of the people, and for teaching the students who are qualifying to be doctors, lies with the Ceylon Medical Council. They should set an example by frequent inspection, by going and seeing to the efficient performance of the clinics of the General Hospital.

How can they satisfy themselves that the students are trained in clinical medicine, in clinical surgery, in paediatrics, in diseases of children and in various other branches of medical science unless they see to it that the available talent is utilized to the full? Now can you understand the significance of the statement that if the wards are full of hornets nests the Medical Council also has a responsibility?

ශ්‍රී විමලා කන්නන්ගර

(කෙළරාව විමලා කන්නන්ගර)

(The Hon. Wimala Kannangara)

The responsibility of cleaning the wards is on the matron and the doctor in charge.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(දොරාදර් ගේ. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

Do not be hard on females. I know it is a general failing of women to be hard on the females. This has nothing to do with the matron. Sir, if the whole wing of the hospital is abandoned, it is not used, and hornets' nests are being built can you expect the poor matron to expose herself to this danger? I did not go into this ward.

ශ්‍රී විමලා කන්නන්ගර

(කෙළරාව විමලා කන්නන්ගර)

(The Hon. Wimala Kannangara)

The labourers are responsible for that.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(දොරාදර් ගේ. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

I think, Sir, the fair Acting Minister is as stubborn as the Medical Council. I hope that there will be some change.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා

(උප සභාපාලක ජනරාල්)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

You might be able to convince her tomorrow morning.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(දොරාදර් ගේ. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

After the visit?

I would also like to inform the fair Acting Minister that instead of having a medical examination they must conform to what is now internationally accepted as a fair method of dealing with these problems. Everybody will admit that we must ensure that a person is given a licence not to kill but to cure and that such a person must have sufficient training in the fundamentals of medical treatment in accordance with modern science. Now, this problem has been approached by no less a body than the World Health Organization. The

World Health Organization has published in their series one text "Technical Report Series No. 239 of 1962". The title of this report is "Internationally acceptable minimum standards for Medical Education". This is a report of a study group, and the report contains the views of some internationally recognized experts. They had written to about fifty experts in various countries, people who are renowned on problems of medical education, who have made a report regarding the need to find ways and means of ensuring a minimum standard of medical education in most civilized countries. This has been done for two reasons: one is to see that doctors have a minimum standard of education. This is not done by holding examinations but by investigation, inspection and advising various medical institutions in the world to agree on a common standard.

Now, I know on this question what the Hon. Acting Minister has in mind. This misinformation has been fed to her by the Vice-Chancellor and the Dean of the Medical Faculty, who is the echo of the Vice-Chancellor. They have two criticisms which they know are untrue. That is why I cannot forgive them. One is that those students who are now receiving their training outside the United Kingdom will have to face the problem frankly. It is mainly in connection with the training in the Soviet Union. I do not know whether they have many students in socialist countries. There are a few in Yugoslavia. Most of these students are in Lumumba University in the Soviet Union. This University functions in close co-operation with the Ministry of Education. The justification for this examination, they say, is the fact that the Soviet principles of medical education differ from those adopted in Ceylon, India, and many other countries. In the Soviet Union they have come to a stage when specialization takes place early. In the third year one section studies preventive medicine, another section paediatrics—the

treatment of children's diseases—and the third section general medicine. They have found the importance of preventive medicine and paediatrics, that safeguarding the health of children requires a type of social medicine, that real preventive medicine means treatment of human beings when they are young. Although all students in these three branches are given a general medical training, they are made to specialize from the third year. Those who are trained in paediatrics are attached to institutions for children. Those who are trained in preventive medicine are given charge of public health organizations, sanatoria, management of hospitals, and various public health institutions. Those who do general medicine, after specialization, practise surgery, obstetrics E. N. T., cardiac surgery, and various other specialities.

The Dean and the Vice-Chancellor have brought forward the argument that, inasmuch as the training in the Soviet Union is not adapted to Ceylon conditions and a medical officer is not interchangeable between these three branches—paediatrics, general medicine, and preventive medicine—his degree is not acceptable. What they have failed to understand is that before the Soviet Union accepted students for training they studied the problem of health in Ceylon and consulted the W. H. O. Students from Ceylon as well as from several of the under-developed countries, especially African countries are given the general training of an all-purpose practitioner at the end of the five years. Unlike the normal training given to the Russian students, students from Ceylon and many other countries are given a special training as is given in Ceylon, unless they definitely say that they wish to specialize as the Russian students do. I have seen the syllabus and the curriculum. The principles are the same as in Ceylon but more efficient and exhaustive. They have introduced sociology, the study of the impact of economic problems on health, and mathematics for actuarial calculations, statistics, etc.

වෛද්‍ය (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[වෛද්‍යවාර්ෂ එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ]

In that sense, the students there receive a fuller education than what the Ceylon doctor gets here.

I do not know whether the Vice-Chancellor is allergic to medical institutions in socialist countries. The Dean of the Faculty has visited the Soviet Union and he knows that the training given there is a comprehensive one and not the training given to the Soviet doctors. In a country which has the lowest incidence of disease and the lowest death rate, where the achievements of positive health are far superior to those of any other country in the world, the need for prophylactic medicine and child welfare is paramount. In the Soviet Union they have now eradicated most of the common diseases. Naturally, they have to train doctors for their needs. From the point of view of both quality and quantity, they calculate how many doctors they need for the next so many years and they recruit only that number for training. They want one doctor for about 450 people, while in Ceylon we have one doctor for about 6,000. Now not more than one-third of the number who apply are selected for training. They have a planned programme, intelligently applied to serve the needs of the people and they have organized a special course of training for countries which have indicated that they want their students to be trained in Medicine, Engineering and various other scientific and humanitarian subjects. This is one of the arguments that these people have been bringing forward which is quite untenable.

There is another argument, that is, that they do not insist on a proper secondary education. This is another falsehood, another untenable argument. They base this argument on one factor. Certain universities undertook to train students from under-developed countries, specially countries that became independent recently. They wanted to help these

countries which were not able to train their youth. They selected students in two ways. One was to take in students who were fit to enter universities as under-graduates. They also selected some youths who, because of economic circumstances, were unable to get the benefit of a proper secondary education in their own countries. A small number of those who had no proper secondary education were also selected and they were given four years of secondary education before they were made under-graduates. So the argument that is trotted out that in the Soviet Union for training of medical men they do not insist on a secondary education has no basis. They were attempting to train not only those who had the benefit of a secondary education but those who did not have such an education.

The Ceylon Government intervened in this matter and said, "We will select the boys and send them" and the Soviet Union agreed. The Ceylon Government selected students from the third year—those who had "credits" and "distinctions" in the S. S. C.—and sent them.

They had another spurious argument which they brought forward without going into the fundamentals of the problem. Some countries said that a student needs 12 years of education before he entered the "Pre-Medical" class. In the Soviet Union, on paper, 11 years education was necessary. But the 11 years started from the age of 7 years. Students in the Soviet Union entered the primary school at 7 years of age. If you add 11 years to this you get 18 years. But what is the problem? In the Soviet Union the school-week is a six-day week. You must add up the one day a week extra for the 11 years of schooling of children who start at the age of 7.

Every teacher in the Soviet Union is a trained graduate. You cannot be a teacher if you do not have five years of pedagogical training. So can you compare the general education of students who have been

taught for 11 years by such trained graduates with that of students who have been educated in our country often by unqualified and uncertified teachers? So when you try to compare you must try to understand the underlying factors. You will therefore see that the arguments that these people bring forward are only to cover their real purpose.

I make bold to say that, without giving any proper explanation why the previous amendment brought by the previous Government was shelved, the reason for bringing forward this new amendment is not because they do not have any concern for medical education or for maintaining high standards of professional practice in this country. If that was the reason, they would have paid attention to the reform of the Medical Council. They know that this Government is hostile to the socialist countries. They know the Government's open policy. Sir Nicholas Attygalle, Vice-Chancellor, wants to be the Governor-General. There is one method by which he can beat the socialist countries once he is given the stick. He can then hold an examination to see whether their medical degrees are up to his standard. If he can create a Chinese wall between Ceylon and the Soviet Union he can walk straight into Queen's House. And when he goes into Queen's House, the Dean of the Medical Faculty becomes Vice-Chancellor. It is considerations as low as these that go to determine the policy of medical and other university education in Ceylon.

The Hon. Minister appears to treat my remarks with contempt. She will learn her mistake sooner than she imagines. Now there is a big campaign going on in Colombo among the Colombo-wallahs that the Peradeniya Medical School is inefficient, that the medical students trained and qualified at Peradeniya will not be recognized. They are now threatening to get down a team from the British Medical Council to inspect the medical school at Peradeniya.

Do you know that the standard of training in Peradeniya is much higher than that in Colombo? What is the reason? In Colombo, the vested interests prevent the training of medical students. Most of the physicians and surgeons are concerned with the channelled practice which they are channelling today. Their clinics are overcrowded. Now take the Professor of Surgery. He is doing a full-time job and he is doing his work well. But he has over fifty students in his surgical clinic. I ask you to imagine the fate of a patient if he is dug by fifty men and women students in turn. Can he survive? The maximum number of students that you can have is about 8 or 12. The student-teacher ratio is the guiding principle for clinical training in medicine, surgery and midwifery. What is the problem in Colombo? The surgeons and physicians have a tradition of having an enormous number of beds in the hospital. Then they have their work in private nursing homes. They spend the minimum time in the hospital and then rush to attend to their private practice even after private practice has been abolished. But there are many assistant physicians and surgeons who could be made resident physicians and surgeons. Giving them responsibility as physicians and surgeons will discourage private vested interests of the senior experts. If the medical teaching is entrusted to a maximum number of resident physicians and surgeons, the numbers in the clinical classes can be halved and there will be a reasonable student-patient ratio, leave alone student-teacher ratio.

Fortunately in Peradeniya this tradition of a swollen private practice has not crept in. I found hardly any difference between the visiting physician or surgeon and the professor of medicine or surgery. They are all concerned with the hospital clinics first and also with the teaching of students. There is an atmosphere of academic education of a university. They consider the medical school as an integrated part of university

වෛද්‍ය (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[වෛද්‍යවාරිය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ]

teaching. You would not get the anti-social, the criminal outbursts of youthful energy, this ragging business if those who should set the example do not consider private interests as of paramount and overriding importance. As things are, naturally, the students feel the atmosphere and they try to ward off the public from the medical profession by ragging, and they are training students to be as crude as their predecessors had been to them.

Sir, imagine a Medical Council which now has to contend with the University at Colombo where teaching has to be done by megaphones and amplifiers! Three thousand students are being instructed by one teacher! This is unlike anything that is happening in the other universities in the world. In Lumumba University in Moscow, the teacher/student ratio is one to eight. In Ceylon, it is about one to a hundred. There are five thousand students in the Lumumba University, and there is one teacher for eight students.

A proper student/teacher ratio is an essential pre-requisite for correct guidance and training of students. In the Colombo grandstand it is 3000 : 1; he must be a super human being.

Our problems are so vast and our teaching is so inefficient; our clinical facilities in the hospitals for clinical teaching are so inadequate, all because of vested interests being paramount from the Medical Council to the ordinary practitioner. These remain yet to be tackled. You see the contrast between Colombo and Kandy.

The Hon. Acting fair Minister mentioned that it is the duty of the matron to clean the hornets' nest. I found the difference when I went to Kandy. The Medical Superintendent of the Kandy hospital, I noticed when I went there, had removed his shoes, tucked up his trousers, and was trying to clean the silt from the drains to prevent the hospital flooding. But will you find a visiting professor or a medical man

attached to the Medical Council doing this in Colombo? Hornets' nests are being built on the fifth floor. The Hon. fair Minister blames the matron. What is the Medical Superintendent there for? What is the Superintendent of the Colombo Group of Hospitals there for? What is the Professor of Medicine there for? Have they no responsibilities? Is it only this poor woman who is responsible?

ශ්‍රී විමලා කන්නන්ගර

(கௌரவ விமலா கன்னங்கர)

(The Hon. Wimala Kannangara)

I mentioned the Medical Superintendent as well. Will you be finishing now?

වෛද්‍යවාරිය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickrmeasinghe)

You want to pass this Bill? I appeal to you to see the hornets' nest first, to go to the hospital and acquaint yourself with the activities of the Medical Council—[Interruption]. Are you agreeable to the Medical Council holding examinations of the type envisaged? The British Medical Council which is considered to be the god of the Ceylon Medical Council do not consider themselves competent to hold medical examinations. They are matters for the universities, the teaching institutions; it is their business. What the Medical Council should have done is to have visited and inspected the training institutions in the Soviet Union. In fact, they were invited. Is there any report published by the Dean of the Medical Faculty on the facilities available for training of Ceylon students in the Soviet Union? Has such a report been submitted to Parliament? You are offering a gratuitous insult to another friendly country just because they try to co-operate with us.

Five years ago there was a great clamour about the shortage of doctors in this country and about our being unable to start the second Medical

College in Kandy. The Government wanted more doctors to be trained and even suggested the temporary employment of foreign doctors. Appeals were made to foreign doctors to take up temporary appointments here, and now you offer this gratuitous insult. This is discrimination against some of these medical universities that are training medical men for Ceylon. They have to undergo the indignity of submitting the men trained there to an examination here conducted by a body which, by its own performances and corrupt acts, stands condemned.

The Ceylon Medical Association, which is a very representative organization, is revolting against this Ceylon Medical Council. The Ceylon Medical Association is a very representative body. The best medical men are in the Ceylon Medical Association. It is a voluntary organization. It is not a legally constituted body under a statute, but it has some of the best professional men in Ceylon, and they recently resented by resolution the attempt by the Medical Council to influence them in the selection of their officials.

That is a body which you can consult. Discuss with them this problem of how to ensure minimum standards for medical men qualified in various countries.

One satisfactory solution is the amendment proposed by the previous Government. There is a body known as the Inter-University Board composed of representatives of the universities in India. I do not think we run down the Indian Medical Colleges. There are many of our students there, girl students especially. I met two or three in one medical college. They have very high standards there. The medical colleges in India have very high standards. High standards are also required to obtain qualifications in engineering.

The Ceylon University is a Member of this Inter-University Board. They can decide by sending people to see the standard of education that is set there.

Are you obsessed by this question of examinations? That is because of the standards set in the colonial days. To be a surgeon you must be an F.R.C.S. Tell me whether there is any other country where you have to get a qualification like that to be a specialist in surgery? Take France, Germany, Holland, U.S.A. After the general qualification, those who have ability in surgery are attached to a surgical unit and are selected to work under a surgeon and after a number of years they are given a certificate of competence. Actually, that is what is happening in England. But in Ceylon, without this experience, without this competence, you have to sit only for the examination. It is a refutation of the very purpose for which the examination is held in England. Our medical men are obsessed by this question of examinations.

What is more important is that, under the existing law, a person after he gets a degree in medicine or a diploma, a qualification in Ceylon or any other country, has to undergo one year's internment and to work in one of the recognized hospitals under medical supervision, and then be certified as being fit and competent to perform those duties. He has to be certified as having performed those duties competently. There is that safeguard. That is the main safeguard: for one year you supervise and see whether he has the basic qualification. That is compulsory and essential especially in the case of people who are trained abroad. You cannot reproduce the environment of Ceylon in the Soviet Union or in any other country. You cannot supplant filaria into other countries where the health services are more advanced. So, students trained in England or the Soviet Union will not have much experience in filaria. Therefore, it is essential that they should have the internship, and that is provided for in the existing Ordinance.

You have to be an internee for one year before you are qualified to be a doctor. You have to be professionally

වෛද්‍ය (සංශෝධන) පනත් කෙටුම්පත

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[වෛද්‍යවාරිය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ]

qualified to serve as an internee in a hospital. According to this amendment you not only need a professional qualification to be an internee, but also you have to pass an examination. This is most iniquitous and meaningless. Instead, you can make this test of competency at the end of the internship more elaborate not by holding an examination, but by entrusting the various visiting surgeons and physicians to exercise special supervision of students trained abroad, whose competence we are not fully acquainted with, because the conditions under which they are trained are necessarily different from the conditions prevailing here.

Therefore, there is already provision and a safeguard. Whether it is a person trained in Ceylon or in any other country, internship is the main test of the efficiency of a medical practitioner. The Hon. Acting Minister, I must say, deliberately or unintentionally, kept away certain relevant facts from this House. Now she comes out with the fact that the Medical Council or the medical profession—

ශ්‍රී විමලා කන්නන්ගර

(කෙළරාව විමලා කන්නන්ගර)

(The Hon. Wimala Kannangara)

I never replied.

වෛද්‍යවාරිය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(දොக்டර් எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

You interjected and mentioned to me while I was speaking, that objections were raised to the original amendment that was passed unanimously by this House—[Interruption]. When you introduced the new amendment you should have given an explanation why the original amendment was not proceeded with. Then we could have had a debate on the relative merits of the two amendments. You suppressed the original amendment, and most of the Members did not know there was that original amendment which was passed without a division.

ශ්‍රී විමලා කන්නන්ගර

(කෙළරාව විමලා කන්නන්ගර)

(The Hon. Wimala Kannangara)

Later, the Prime Minister had discussions and—[Interruption].

වෛද්‍යවාරිය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(දොக்டර් எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

You should have given the history and the background of the whole thing. Then we could have had a profitable discussion. Now we will have to go fully into this question after we adjourn at 8 o'clock, and go and individually find out what their objections were and meet their objections.

I think, I have effectively met those two objections, that is, on the question of the training in the Soviet Union and on the question of secondary education. Both those objections do not stand scrutiny. They have both been deliberately raised in order to mislead the House. Therefore, I ask the Hon. Acting Minister to withdraw this amendment and re-introduce the original one which lapsed because of the dissolution of Parliament. I think, the Government agrees that friendly relations with the socialist countries, however much they may disagree with their political philosophy, should be maintained.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Are you finishing now ?

වෛද්‍යවාරිය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(දොக்டර් எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

No.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Business is interrupted. Will the Hon. Leader of the House move the Adjournment ?

கல் துணி

එකේනි වෙලාව අ. හා. 8 වැනේ කටයුතු අත්
සිටුවා විවාදය කල් තබන ලදී.

එහින් සිට විවාදය 1965 இன்தேவர்த் 21 வன
இயல்பதின், பவ்வந்து லேன.

அப்பொழுது பி. ப. 8 மணியாகிவிடவே சபையின்
நடவடிக்கைகள் இடை நிறுத்தப்பட்டு, விவாதம் ஒத்தி
வைக்கப்பெற்றது.

1965, ஒக்டோபர் 21 வியாழக்கிழமை விவாதம்
மீளத் தொடங்கும்.

*It being 8 p.m., Business was inter-
rupted, and the Debate stood adjourned.*

*Debate to be resumed on Thursday,
21st October 1965.*

கல் துணி

ஒத்திவைப்பு

ADJOURNMENT

සේෂතාව ඉදිරිපත් කරන ලදීන් ප්‍රශ්නය සහතිමුව
කරන ලදී :

“මන්ත්‍රි මණ්ඩලය දැන් කල් තැබිය යුතුය.”—
[ලැ. සී. පී. ද සිල්වා]

“சபை இப்பொழுது ஒத்திவைக்கப்பெறுமாக ” எனும்
பிரேரணை பிரேரிக்கப்பட்டு, வினா எடுத்தியம்பப்பெற்றது.
—[கௌரவ சீ. பீ. டி. சில்வா]

Motion made, and Question proposed,

“That the House do now adjourn”.—
[The Hon. C. P. de Silva.]

කේ. බී. රත්නායක මය. (අනුරාධපුර)

(திரு. கே. பி. ரத்னாயக்க—அனுராதபுரம்)

(Mr. K. B. Ratnayake—Anuradhapura)

I wish to bring to the notice of the Hon. Minister of Health one particular matter regarding the emergency nurses in the Ministry of Health. The previous Government had a scheme whereby these emergency nurses who had put in a minimum of five years' service were given a refresher course lasting one year; thereafter, they sat for a qualifying examination and were issued certificates. I remember, in 1963 when the last batch of emergency nurses were trained, there was a qualifying examination in March 1964. Normally, one or two months after such a qualifying examination these nurses are issued their certificates, but the last batch have not received their certificates as yet. I

கல் துணி

would therefore request the Hon. Minister to see that these certificates are issued early.

අ. හා. 8.2

කේ. කබ්ලිවි. දේවනායගම් මය.
(කල්කුඩා)

(திரு. கே. டபிள்யூ தேவநாயகம்—
கற்குடா)

(Mr. K. W. Devanayagam—Kalkudah)

It has been the practice to hold Supreme Court sessions at Batticaloa twice a year, in February and in July. This practice is not being followed now, and sessions are held only once a year. But this year even that has not been done, and the sessions have been held in Trincomalee. Under Section 26 of the Courts Ordinance “Criminal sessions of the Supreme Court shall be holden by one of the Judges thereof, or by a Commissioner of Assize duly appointed under the provisions of this Ordinance, for each of the circuits, for the hearing, trying, and determining all prosecutions which shall be commenced against any person for or in respect of any crime or offence, or alleged crime or offence—“and it goes on to enumerate the circuits—the Wesern Circuit, the Midland Circuit, Northern Circuit, the Southern Circuit and the Eastern Circuit.

With regard to the Eastern Circuit, it states :

“for the Eastern Circuit, twice at least at Batticaloa and such other places in such circuit as the Chief Justice, after previous consultation with the Puisne Justices, shall appoint, such sessions commencing at Batticaloa in the month of February and the month of July in every year.”

So the holding of the sessions this year in Trincomalee may give rise to the question whether the judge sitting there has jurisdiction even to try the cases, because Section 26 is imperative; it states, “Supreme Court shall be holden.” If the sessions are not held at least once a year, I do not think the judge will have the jurisdiction to try the cases in Trincomalee.

කල් තැබීම

කල් තැබීම

[දේවනායගම් මයා.]

Perhaps, they may have the excuse that the court-house is under repairs. But in Trincomalee there is no court-house; the sessions are held in the urban council hall and an expenditure of about Rs. 3,000 has to be incurred to convert that hall into a court-house. On the other hand, the Batticaloa Urban Council has a hall which is much better than the Trincomalee Urban Council hall, and it can be utilized for the same purpose.

The other excuse may be that there is no bungalow for the judge. It is so, because the "Residency" has been now rented out to the Education Department. But the Education Department can be asked to move out and the "Residency" restored, because the sessions at Trincomalee costs the Government about Rs. 20,000 whereas in Batticaloa it costs only about Rs. 5,000. That Rs. 20,000 could be profitably spent to restore the "Residency" and the Supreme Court Judge could occupy a portion of it. At the co-ordinating committee meeting held recently in Batticaloa, the Superintending Engineer said that the "Residency" could be restored and half of that building could be occupied by the Government Agent or by the Supreme Court Judge or any other high official just as the "Residency" in Jaffna or Galle. The majority of the cases are from Batticaloa. This is a matter of some importance and I hope the Minister of Justice will look into it and see that something is done to hold the sessions in Batticaloa.

අ. භා. 8.6

පී. බී. තෙන්නකෝන් මයා. (දඹුල්ල)
(திரு. பி. பி. தென்னகோன்—தம்புலை)
(Mr. T. B. Tennekoon—Dambulla)

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමානි, වැඩ බලන ගරු අධ්‍යාපන ඇමතිතුමාට එක් තරු කාරණයක් දැනුම් දීමට තිබෙනවා. එතුමා දැනට ගරු සභාවේ නැහැ. සභා නායකතුමා හෝ වෙන වගකිවයුතු ඇමති වරයකු හෝ අපට මේ කාරණය ගැන පිළි

තුරක් සපයනවා ඇතැයි අපි බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. 1966 සිට සාධාරණ ගුරු මාරු ක්‍රමයක් ඇති කිරීමට, ඒ ගුරු මාරු ක්‍රමය පිළිබඳ කෙටුම්පතක් අප වෙත එවා තිබෙනවා. ඒ ගැන මම පළමු කොටම ස්තූති කරනවා. සියළුම මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්ට යවා ඇති ඒ කෙටුම්පතේ පිටපතක් මගේ ලැබී තිබෙනවා.

“සාධාරණ ගුරු මාරු ක්‍රමයක් 1966 ජනවාරි මස 1 වැනිදා සිට ක්‍රියාත්මක කිරීමට අවශ්‍ය පියවර මා විසින් දැනටමත් ගෙන ඇත.” කියා මෙහි කියා තිබෙනවා. මේ ගුරු මාරු ක්‍රමය පිළිබඳව ලක්ෂණ වචන යොදා හොඳ දේවල් මේකේ කියා තිබෙනවා. මෙහි මේ පිළිවෙලට කියා තිබෙනවා:

“කිසියම් ගුරුවරයකුට ස්ථාන මාරුවක් සම්බන්ධ යෙන් යම්කිසි දුක්ගැනවිල්ලක් ඇත්නම් එම ගුරුවරයාට අභියාචනයක් ඉදිරිපත් කිරීම පිණිස අභියාචනා මණ්ඩල අධ්‍යාපන දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවේ ප්‍රධාන කාර්යාලයෙන් පිහිටුවනු ඇත.”

තවත් තැනක මේ පිළිවෙලට කියා තිබෙනවා:

“ගුරුවරයකුට අයුක්තියක් හෝ වරදක් හෝ සිදු වී ඇතැයි ඔබ සැහීමට පත් වේ නම් එම ගුරුවරයා සම්බන්ධ තොරතුරු ගුරු මාරු මණ්ඩලයට ඉදිරිපත් කරන ලෙස කරුණාවෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටිමි. ඔබ විසින් ඉදිරිපත් කරනු ලබන කරුණු ගැන පරීක්ෂා කොට බලා යුක්තියත්, සාධාරණයත් ඉටු කිරීමට අවශ්‍ය කටයුතු කරනු ඇත. ගුරු මාරු ප්‍රශ්නය විසඳීම සඳහා මා විසින් ගෙන ඇති මෙවැනි පියවර සාර්ථක කර ගැනීම සඳහා ඔබගෙන් ලැබෙන සහයෝගය ඉතා අගය කොට සලකන බවද මෙහිලා සඳහන් කරමි.”

මේ අන්දමට මේ කෙටුම්පතේ ඉතාම ලක්ෂණ වචන, යෙදුම් ඇතුළත් කර තිබෙනවා. පසුගිය දවස්වල ගුරුවරුන්ට ඉතාම නොසැහෙන අන්දමින් කරදර හිරිහැර කළ, ඒ ගුරුවරුන්ට විරුද්ධව අසාධාරණ ක්‍රියා, අයුක්ති සහගත ක්‍රියා, අම්නෝඥ ක්‍රියා, අවිචාර ක්‍රියා, අගතිගාමී ක්‍රියා කළ අධ්‍යාපන ඇමතිවරයා මේ පිළිවෙලට සාධාරණයක් කරන්න යනවය කියන්නේ ඒ ගුරුවරුන්ට කලින් කර තිබෙන දේ ගැන යම්කිසි සහනයක් දීමෙන් පසුවද කියා මම දැන ගන්නට කැමතියි. එසේ නැතිව ගුරුවරුන්ට කර තිබෙන ඒ වද හිංසා, වැඩ තහනම් කිරීම්; ස්ත්‍රීන් එක තැනකත්, පුරුෂයන් වෙනත් තැනකත් සිටින පිළිවෙලට කර ඇති මාරු

කල් තැබීම

කිරීම් ආදිය සම්පයකට පත් කරලද, 1966 දී මේ සාධාරණ වැඩ පිළිවෙළ ඇති කරන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ කියා මම දැන ගන්නට කැමතියි. ගරු වැඩ බලන අධ්‍යක්ෂ ජනරාල් ඇමතිතුමා වෙනුවෙන් සහායකතුමා මේ ප්‍රශ්නයට පිළිතුරක් දෙනවා ඇතැයි මම බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා.

අ. හා. 8.10

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එම්. එම්. සද්ධසේන
(අම්බලංගොඩ)

(வைத்திய கலாநிதி எம். எச். சத்தாசேன
—அம்பலாங்கொடை)

(Dr. M. H. Saddhasena—Ambalangoda)

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, පිහත් බඩු බෙදා හැරීම සම්බන්ධයෙන් බලවත් අක්‍රමිකතා සිදු වෙනවා. හැම පළාතකම පිහත් බඩු බෙදා හරින්නේ සහොසේ ශාඛාවලින්. ඒ ඒ පළාත්වල වෙළඳ මහතුන් තමන්ගේ තැරැව් කාරයන් පෝලී මට ඇතුළු කරවා ඔවුන් මගින් මේ බඩු ලබා ගන්නා නිසා පාරිභෝගිකයන්ට නියම මිලට මේ පිහත් බඩු ලබා ගැනීමට පුළුවන්කමක් නැති බව රජපේරිතු කර තිබෙනවා. ඒ නිසා පිහත් බඩු හාල් පොත් අනුව බෙදා දීමට ක්‍රමයක් ඇති කරන ලෙස ඒ කටයුත්ත භාර ගරු ඇමතිතුමා ගෙන් මම ඉතා කරුණාවෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටි සිටිනවා.

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

කොයි ඇමතිතුමාගෙන්ද ප්‍රශ්නය අහන්නේ?

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය සද්ධසේන

(வைத்திய கலாநிதி சத்தாசேன)

(Dr. Saddhasena)

සමහරු කියනවා, ඒක කමින්න හා ඩිවර කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමතිතුමාගේ අංශයේ වැඩක් කියලා. තවත් සමහරු කිය

කල් තැබීම

නවා, ඒක වෙළඳ ඇමතිතුමාගේ අංශයේ වැඩක් කියලා. ඒ නිසා මේ වැඩය කොයි ඇමතිතුමාට අයිති එකක්ද කියා මට තෝරාගන්න බැහැ.

අ. හා. 8.11

ගරු වන්නායක

(கௌரவ வன்னினாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

On behalf of the Hon. Minister of Health I should like to give the following reply to the hon. Member for Anuradhapura (Mr. Ratnayake).

There has been a certain amount of delay in the issue of some of the certificates to emergency nurses who followed a refresher course in 1963 and who passed out in March 1964. The delay is chiefly due to procedural reasons. Steps have already been taken to obtain all the particulars from the various training schools and to issue these certificates as early as possible. It is hoped to issue all outstanding certificates before the end of this year. The delay in the issue of these certificates has not handicapped these nurses in any way as they have been given appointments as Staff Nurses as soon as they passed out.

එම්. එම්. එම්. නයිනා මරික්කාර් මයා.
(අධිකරණ ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්)

(ஜனாப் எம். எச். எம். நயினா மரிக்கார்—
நீதி அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரிய
தரிசி)

(Mr. M. H. M. Naina Marikkar—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice)

I am thankful to the hon. Member for Kalkuda (Mr. Devanayagam) for having raised this important question. I find that he is not here now—he has gone away—but nevertheless, I think, this is a very important question. This is a matter that requires not only very careful consideration but also requires that something should be done. I do not know the reasons as to why the sessions are being held in

දශක මුදල් : මුදල් ගෙවන දිනෙන් පසුව ආරමිභ මාසයේ සිට මාස 12ක් සඳහා රු. 32.00යි. අශෝධිත පිටපත් සඳහා නම් රු. 35.00යි. මාස 6 කට ගාස්තුවෙන් අඩකි. පිටපතක් ශත 30යි. තැපෑලෙන් ශත 45යි. මුදල්, කොළඹ ගාලු මුවදොර, මහලේකම් කාර්යාලයේ රජයේ ප්‍රකාශන කාර්යාංශයේ අධිකාරී වෙත කලින් එමිය 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 அத்தியட்சரிடம் (த. பெ. 500, அரசாங்க கருமகம், கொழும்பு 1) செலுத்தலாம்.

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