



පාර්ලිමේන්තු විවාද

(හැන්සාඩ්)

නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ

නිල වාර්තාව

අත්තිහිත ප්‍රධාන කරුණු

ප්‍රශ්නවලට වාචික පිළිතුරු [නි. 2137]

පළමුවන වර කියවන ලද කෙටුම්පත් පණත [නි. 2161]

Temporary Residence Tax (Amendment) Bill

පොද්ගලික මන්ත්‍රීන්ගේ යෝජනාව [නි. 2168] :

ප්‍රවණ් පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

ප්‍රශ්නවලට ලිඛිත පිළිතුරු [නි. 2319]

பாராளுமன்ற விவாதங்கள்

(ஹன்சார்ட்)

பிரதிநிதிகள் சபை

அதிகாரபூர்வமான அறிக்கை

பிரதான உள்ளடக்கம்

வினாக்களுக்கு வாய்மூல விடைகள் [ப. 2137]

முதன்முறை மதிப்பிடப் பெற்ற மசோதா [ப. 2167] :

Temporary Residence Tax (Amendment) Bill

தனியங்கத்தவர் பிரேரணை [ப. 2168] :

பத்திரிகைகள் மீதான விசாரணைக்குழு

வினாக்களுக்கு எழுத்துமூல விடைகள் [ப. 2319]

Volume 54

No. 16

Wednesday,

6th November, 1963

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OFFICIAL REPORT

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [c. 2137]

BILL READ THE FIRST TIME [c. 2161] :

Temporary Residence Tax (Amendment) Bill

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTION [c. 2168] :

Commission of Inquiry on Press

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [c. 2319]

වෘත්ති විලිඳුරු

වෘත්තික පිළිතුරු

නියෝජන මතති මණ්ඩලය

1963 නොවැම්බර් 6 වන බදාදා

අ. හා. 2 ට මෙන්ම මණ්ඩලය රැස් විය.
කථානායකතුමා (ආර්. එස්. පැල්පොල)
මූලාසනාරූපි විය.

ප්‍රශ්නවලට වාචික පිළිතුරු

வினாக்களுக்கு வாய்மூல விடைகள்

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

ගරු ටී. බී. ඉලංගරත්න (මුදල් ඇමති)

(கௌரவ ரி. பி. இலங்கரத்தன—நிதியமைச்சர்)

(The Hon. T. B. Ilangaratne—Minister of Finance)

ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, 1 වැනි ප්‍රශ්නයට පිළිතුරු සැපයීමට කල් වුවමනා කරනවා.

ප්‍රශ්නය මතු දිනකදී ඉදිරිපත් කිරීමට නියෝග කරන ලදී.

ආරෝග්‍යශාලා ලෝතරැසි අරමුදල

ஆசுப்பத்திரி லொத்தர்ச் சீட்டு

HOSPITAL LOTTERIES SWEEP

2. එම්. ඊ. එච්. මොහමඩ් අලි මයා.
(මුතුර් පළමුවන මහත්ත්ව)

(ஜனாப் எம். ஈ. எச். முகம்மது அலி—
மூதூர் முதல் அங்கத்தவர்)

(Mr. M. E. H. Mohamed Ali—First Mutur)

සෞඛ්‍ය හා නිවාස කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමති
ගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය : (අ) ආරෝග්‍යශාලා
ලොතරැසි අරමුදලට මෙතෙක් කොපමණ
මුදලක් එකතු වී තිබේද? ආරෝග්‍යශාලා
හා දිස්පෙන්සරි සංවර්ධන කටයුතු සඳහා
කොපමණ මුදලක් මෙතෙක් වියදම් කර
තිබේද? (ආ) දැනට කොපමණ මුදලක්
ඉතිරිව තිබේද? එම මුදල් කුමන කායාර්
යන් සඳහා යොදවනු ලැබේද? (ඉ) මුදල්
වෙන් කරන ලද්දේ ජන්දදායක කොට
යාග අනුවද? එසේ නම්, මෙතෙක් එක්
එක් ජන්දදායක කොට්ඨාශය වෙනුවෙන්
ප්‍රතිපාදන මුදලක් වියදම් කර තිබේද?
(ඊ) මෙම අරමුදල මගින් රැස්කරන ලද
මුදල් වෛද්‍ය හා සෞඛ්‍ය කටයුතු හැර
වෙන කිසියම් කායාර්‍යයන් සඳහා යොදවන
ලද්දේද?

சுகாதார, வீடமைப்பு அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா: (அ) ஆசுப்பத்திரி லொத்தர்ச் சீட்டு மூலம் இதுவரை சேர்க்கப்பட்டுள்ள பணம் எவ்வளவு? வைத்தியசாலைகள், மருந்துச்சாலைகள் ஆகியவற்றின் அபிவிருத்திக்கென இதுவரை செலவிடப்பட்டுள்ள பணம் எவ்வளவு? (ஆ) தற்போது எஞ்சியுள்ள பணமெவ்வளவு? எத்தேவைகளுக்காக இப்பணம் பயன்படுத்தப்படும்? (இ) தேர்தற் றொகுதி வாரியாகத் தான் பணம் பங்கிடப்பட்டதா? அவ்வாறாயின் தேர்தற் றொகுதி யொவ்வொன்றுக்கும் இதுவரை செலவிடப்பட்டுள்ள பணமெவ்வளவு? (ஈ) இந்த லொத்தரின் மூலம் சேர்க்கப்பட்ட பணம் வைத்திய, சுகாதார தேவைகளைத் தவிர்த்த வேறு ஏதாவது தேவைகளுக்குப் பயன்படுத்தப்பட்டதா?

asked the Minister of Health and Housing: (a) How much money has been collected so far in the Hospital Lotteries Sweep and how much has been spent so far on the development of hospitals and dispensaries? (b) How much money is left at the moment and for what purposes will the money be utilized? (c) Was money allocated on an electoral basis, and if so, how much money has been spent on each electorate so far? (d) Was the money collected by this Sweep utilized for any purposes other than medical and health purposes?

පේ. පී. ඔබ්බෙස්කර මයා. (සෞඛ්‍ය හා
නිවාස කටයුතු පිළිබඳ පාර්ලිමේන්තු
ලේකම්)

(திரு. ஜே. பி. ஒபயசேக்கர—சுகாதார, வீடமைப்பு அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி)

(Mr. J. P. Obeyesekere—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and Housing)

(a) A sum of Rs. 18,946,565.54 has been credited to the Hospital Lotteries Fund up to August 8, 1963. Of this a total sum of Rs. 1,962,082.99 has actually been spent up to the end of June, 1963. (b) The total sum

வாசிவக பிழிதர்

வாசிவக பிழிதர்

posts in the Government Service to join as village headmen and who failed the Grama Sevaka Examination, would be given preference in joining their former departments when vacancies occur in such departments? (b) Is he aware that such an undertaking was given because it was the accepted policy of the Government? (c) What action has he taken to implement this policy?

விலிபி. பி. பி. அரியதாச மலா. (பலாந் பாலந ஸா ஸவதேல கபலுது பிழிபத பாபீலி தோந்நு லேகலி)

(திரா. டப்ளியு. பி. ஜி. ஆரியதாச—உள்ளு ராட்சி, உள்நாட்டு விவகார அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி)

(Mr. W. P. G. Ariyadasa—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Local Government and Home Affairs)

(அ) இலி. (அ) இலி. (ஆ) பிலிநி அலபலிந் விசினு கலிந் கர அலி ரபலே ரக்தலிந் ஓலேலா பிலுநு லலந ஓலேலி பந், ஓலிநிந் டுக்லேல (அ) தோடலேலி ஸடலிந் ஸலபி பலுலே அலுலுந் கலிநிபி திரலல அலுலு பில ஓலேலி கலிலாந்லக கரந லேலபி இலுந் ஸேலலே லேடி ஸிபி டேலார்தலோந்நு அலந் அலாநலாஂலலலல ஓடிபலிந் கரநு லேலி.

லா஡ ஸேலக விலாலலேந் அலலந் லு, கலிந் ரபலே ஸேலலே ஸிபி, லலிபுலாடலிந் பிழிபத விஸ்தர

கிராம ஸேலகர் ஸோதலேலி தலலிப, அர ஸாங்க ஸேலலிலிருந்நு விலகல கிராமத் தலேலைக்காரர் விபரம்

PARTICULARS OF EX-GOVERNMENT SERVANT VILLAGE HEADMEN WHO FAILED THE GRAMA SEVAKA EXAMINATION

8. விலிபி. டலநலாலக மலா.

(திரா. டப்ளியு. தகலாலக்க)

(Mr. W. Dahanayake)

பலாந் பாலந ஸா ஸவதேல கபலுது பிழி பத அலநிளே பாபீலிதோந்நு லேகலிளேந் அலு ப்லலலல: (அ) ரபலே டேலார்த

தோந்நுலல இலுந் டுலா தலதலா அலலா லலிபுலாடலிந் லலலேந் ஸேலலபி லுடலு கி டேலேக் லா஡ ஸேலக விலாலலேந் அல ஡ந் வி ஸிபிந்? (அ) இலுந்ளே தலி லோலலா? (ஆ) லலிபுலாடலிந் லலலேந் ஸேலலபி லுடி஡ப லேல அலலால தேலார்தல தோந்நுலே லுலலுலந் லலலேந் ஸேலல கல, லா஡ ஸேலக விலாலலேந் அலலந் லு லலிபுலாடலிபலுந் கலலலு? (பி) இலுந் தலலந் லுலலுலந் லலலேந் பந் கரநு லேலி? தோ பிலே தலி, பி ஡ந்?

உள்ளுராட்சி, உள்நாட்டு விவகார அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசியைக் கேட்ட வினா: (அ) ஏலேல அரலாங்கத் திலேக்கலங் கலில் தலம் வகித்த பதலிகலிலிருந்நு விலகி கிராமத்தலேலைக்காரர்களாக ஸேர்ந்த, எத் தலே லேர் கிராம ஸேலலலாளர் பரீட்சலிற் ஸித்தலலடலத் தலலினர்? (ஆ) அலர்களின் பபலர்களேந்? (இ) கிராமத் தலேலைக் காரர்களாக ஸேர்வதற்கு ஡ுன்னர் கல்வித் திலேக்கலத்தில் ஆலிரலர்களாக கலலை ஡ாற்றலலவர்களும், கிராம ஸேலலலாளர் பரீட்சலிற் ஸித்தலலடலாதோலுலான கிராமத் தலேலைக்காரர்கள் எத்தலே லேர்? (பி) அலர்கள் ஡ீண்டும் ஆலிரலர்களாக தலலலிக்கப் பலலார்களா? அன்றேல், ஏந்?

asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Local Government and Home Affairs: (a) How many persons who left their posts in other Government departments and joined as village headmen have failed the Grama Sevaka Examination? (b) What are their names? (c) Who were the village headmen who, before joining the service as village headmen, were teachers in the Education Department and failed the Grama Sevaka Examination? (d) Will they be re-appointed as teachers and, if not, why?

වාචික පිළිතුරු

වාචික පිළිතුරු

ආරියදාස මයා.

(திரு. ஆரியதாச)

(Mr. Ariyadasa)

ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, 8 වැනි ප්‍රශ්නයට පිළිතුරු වශයෙන් නියෝජිතෙ දිග ලැයිස්තුවක්. එය කියවන්නට ගියොත්, කාලය හුඟක් ගත වෙන නිසා මම එම ලැයිස්තුව සභාවට ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නම්.

ඉදිරිපත් කරන ලද ලැයිස්තුව

(අ)	දිස්ත්‍රික්කය	හිටපු	ගම්මුලාදානින් ගේ ගණන
1.	කොළඹ	...	29
2.	කළුතර	...	3
3.	මහනුවර	...	17
4.	මාතලේ	...	3
5.	නුවරඑළිය	...	7
6.	ගාල්ල	...	18
7.	මාතර	...	15
8.	හම්බන්තොට	...	3
9.	යාපනය	...	3
10.	මන්නාරම	...	1
11.	වවුනියාව	...	1
12.	මඩකලපුව	...	4
13.	අම්පාරේ	...	3
14.	ත්‍රිකුණාමලේ	...	1
15.	කුරුණෑගල	...	8
16.	පුත්තලම	...	10
17.	අනුරාධපුර	...	3
18.	පොලොන්නරුව	...	නැත
19.	බදුල්ල	...	12
20.	මොණරාගල	...	1
21.	රත්නපුරය	...	8
22.	කෑගල්ල	...	20
			—
			170
			—

කොළඹ පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

1. ටී. පී. වනිගරත්නම්	16. ඒ. ඒ. ඩී. ඩබ්ලිව්. එස්. විජයසුන්දර
2. ඩී. සුබසිංහ	17. කේ. ටී. ඒ. ධර්මසේන
3. ඩබ්ලිව්. ඒ. ජේ. විජේසූරිය	18. ජේ. ඒ. කරුණාරත්න
4. ඩී. එස්. ආර්. විජේවර්ධන	19. ඩී. පී. සෝමතිලක
5. ඩබ්ලිව්. කේ. ප්‍රනාන්දු	20. කේ. ඩී. ජේ. අබේසේකර
6. එස්. ද එස්. හොරගොල්ල	21. කේ. ඩී. ධර්මදාස
7. එස්. ඩී. ජී. ජයවර්ධන	22. ඩී. ඒ. ඩී. එම්. ජයතිලක
8. ජේ. ඒ. පබ්ලිස් සිංඤ්ඤා	23. ඩී. පී. එස්. වික්‍රමසිංහ
9. ආර්. ජේ. බී. කේ. පෙරේරා	24. ආර්. පී. ප්‍රේමතිලක
10. ඩබ්ලිව්. ආර්. ඒ. ටී. පී. රත්නායක	25. කේ. ඩී. දයානන්ද
11. කේ. පී. ඩී. ඒබ්‍රහම්	26. ජේ. ඩී. ඒ. ධර්මසේන
12. ඩී. ජේ. එම්. ප්‍රනාන්දු	27. ඩී. ඊ. එස්. ජයසිංහ
13. එච්. ඒ. ඩබ්ලිව්. ඩී. ජයසුන්දර	28. කේ. ඩී. සී. විජේසේකර
14. ජේ. පී. කරුණාසේන	29. ඩී. ඩබ්ලිව්. අබේසේකර
15. ඒ. ඒ. මාටින් සිංඤ්ඤා	

කළුතර පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

30. ඇල්. ඩී. මාටින්	32. ඩී. ඒ. ගුණසේකර
31. ජේ. කේ. පී. ඇන්. ජයනෙත්ති	

වෘත්තික පිළිතුරු

වෘත්තික පිළිතුරු

මහනුවර පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

33. කේ. එම්. ටී. බණ්ඩා
34. ඩබ්ලිව්. ඒ. එම්. අප්පුහාමි
35. එච්. එම්. කරුණාරත්න
36. ඇන්. ඩී. කරුණාදස
37. ඇල්. බී. සන්දිගම
38. කේ. බී. බස්නායක
39. කේ. ඇම්. සෙනෙවිරත්න
40. එච්. ඇම්. ලොකුබණ්ඩා
41. ආර්. බී. ගන්නෝරුව

42. ජී. ජී. සුමනදස
43. ඊ. එස්. බී. හත්තාගොඩ
44. පී. බී. සමරනායක
45. ඇස්. එම්. ටී. බී. සමරකෝන්
46. ජේ. එම්. රත්බණ්ඩා
47. ඩබ්ලිව්. ජිනදස
48. පී. ඒ. බී. විරසේකර
49. ඒ. ජී. තෙන්නකෝන්

මාතලේ පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

50. බී. පී. ඩිංගිරිබණ්ඩා
51. කේ. එම්. එස්. සමරනායක

52. එම්. ඩී. ජේ. විජේරත්න

නුවරඑළිය පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

53. ඩබ්ලිව්. ආරියදස
54. පී. ඒ. විලියම් සිංකෝ
55. ආර්. එම්. පී. බී. රත්නායක
56. අයි. කේ. පර්සි බණ්ඩා

57. පී. බී. දිසානායක
58. එච්. ඒ. වික්‍රමගෙදර
59. එම්. පී. එන්. දයාරත්න

ගාල්ල පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

60. ඩබ්ලිව්. ඩබ්ලිව්. ගුණරත්න
61. සී. ඊ. විතාන
62. පී. හෙට්ටිආරච්චි
63. ආර්. ඩී. ඩයස්
64. ඩී. එල්. බදුගේ
65. ඒ. ද එස්. හෙට්ටිආරච්චි
66. එම්. ජී. සිරිසේන
67. ඩී. කරුණාවර්ධන
68. ඒ. එම්. සී. බණ්ඩා

69. එච්. ඒ. එල්. නානායක්කාර
70. ජේ. ඩී. නින්නගල්ල
71. ඩී. එම්. ඩබ්ලිව්. කුමාරසේන
72. ටී. එච්. ගිල්බට් ද සිල්වා
73. ජී. එල්. ඩී. එස්. ගුණවර්ධන
74. ටී. ලියනගේ
75. ඒ. ජී. සිරිසේන
76. ඒ. ඩී. ඒ. ගුණසේකර
77. යූ. ජී. එල්. සමරසේන

මාතර පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

78. එච්. කරුණාරත්න
79. ඊ. ඒ. රණවක
80. කේ. ඒ. ඒ. අබේකෝන්
81. ජේ. එච්. ප්‍රවීසිංකෝ
82. පී. විරසිංහ
83. ඩබ්ලිව්. ඩබ්ලිව්. ජයසූරිය
84. ඩබ්ලිව්. හෙට්ටිආරච්චි
85. පී. එම්. විජේසිංහ

86. කේ. ඒ. ආරියවන්ස
87. ජී. අමාරිස්
88. එච්. එන්. ප්‍රාන්සිස්
89. වයි. කේ. ඩී. යසපාල
90. ඩබ්ලිව්. එම්. පී. දෙත්තකරෝලිස්
91. සී. රාජපක්ෂ
92. ඩබ්ලිව්. ජී. ජෙත්තිස් ඩයස්

හම්බන්තොට පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

93. ඊ. එස්. දිසානායක
94. ඩබ්ලිව්. ඩබ්ලිව්. ඩී. හෙන්ද්‍රික්

95. ආර්. ඩබ්ලිව්. රාජපක්ෂ

යාපනේ පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

96. ඇන්. තිරුණාචුකරසූ
97. කේ. සුබ්‍රමනියම්

98. ඒ. ඇස්. නඩරාජා

මන්නාරම් පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

99. ඇන්. ජෙගසෝනි

වෘත්තික පිළිතුරු

වෘත්තික පිළිතුරු

වවුනියා පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

100. එම්. රාමසාමි

මඩකලපු පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

101. කේ. කුරුකුලසිංහම්

103. ටී. සිවරාජා

102. ටී. මුරුගේපු පිල්ලෙයි

104. කේ. පුනිසිගාමනි

අම්පාරේ පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

105. ටී. කේ. කනගරත්නම්

107. ඊ. කනගසබේ

106. කේ. ජී. අරසරත්නම්

ත්‍රිකුණාමලේ පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

108. එස්. ඒ. කොරෙයිරා

කුරුණෑගල පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

109. ඒ. එම්. රත්නාම්

113. ඩබ්ලිව්. එම්. වන්නිභාම්

110. ඒ. කේ. යහපත්භාම්

114. කේ. එම්. කේ. බී. ජයසුන්දර

111. එම්. එම්. කිරිබණ්ඩා

115. ජී. අප්පුභාම්

112. ඩී. එම්. මුදියන්සේ

116. ටී. එම්. තෙන්නකෝන් බණ්ඩා

පුත්තලම් පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

117. පී. ඒ. විරක්කොඩි

122. ටී. වික්‍රමනායක

118. ඒ. එම්. ධර්මසේන

123. ඩබ්ලිව්. එම්. ජේ. ප්‍රනාන්දු

119. ජේ. පී. දිසානායක

124. එම්. ඒ. එම්. ඉසාඩ්. ප්‍රනාන්දු

120. එස්. පී. එම්. ජයතිස්ස

125. කේ. ඒ. පෙරේරා

121. ඒ. එෆ්. ඒ. ප්‍රනාන්දු

126. එම්. ටී. ඊ. පිරිස්

අනුරාධපුර පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

127. ඒ. ඇම්. ඒ. විකිරි බණ්ඩා

129. එස්. අප්පුභාම්

128. ඩී. බී. දිසානායක

බදුල්ල පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

130. ඒ. එදිරිසූරිය

136. ආර්. එම්. කිරිවත්තේ

131. එම්. බී. රාජපක්ෂ

137. කේ. එම්. පුංචිබණ්ඩා

132. බී. එච්. එම්. අප්පුභාම්

138. ජේ. එම්. මුතුබණ්ඩා

133. කේ. එච්. සර්නේලිස් අප්පු

139. එස්. බී. අමරකෝන්

134. ඩී. එම්. අප්පුභාම්

140. ඒ. ජේ. එම්. සෙනෙවිරත්න

135. ඩී. බී. මැදවෙල

141. ජී. ආර්. එම්. සුද්ධබණ්ඩා

මොනරාගල පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

142. ඒ. එම්. කිරිබණ්ඩා

රත්නපුර පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

143. එම්. ජී. රත්නසේකර

147. එස්. ආර්. ඩී. පියසේන

144. ඇල්. ඩී. ගලතුරේ

148. ඒ. පී. රාමනායක

145. ජී. ඒ. එම්. කිරිබණ්ඩාර

149. ඩබ්ලිව්. වන්දිසේන

146. ජී. ඩාර්ලිස්

150. ටී. එම්. ජී. ජයසේන

වෘත්ති විද්වතු

වෘත්ති පිළිතුරු

කෑගල්ල පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 151. පී. ඇම්. කුලරත්න | 161. කේ. ඒ. ජයවර්ධන |
| 152. ඩී. ඩබ්ලිව්. ගුණදස | 162. කේ. ඊ. එම්. ජයතිලක |
| 153. එල්. බී. මිසිටිය | 163. ඩබ්ලිව්. ඇම්. කරුණාසේන |
| 154. ඩී. බී. බොරළුව | 164. ආර්. කරුණාදස |
| 155. පී. බී. කුමාරසිංහ | 165. ආර්. එච්. එම්. විජය බණ්ඩා |
| 156. වයි. බී. එම්. සෙනෙවිරත්න බණ්ඩා | 166. පී. බී. හේනේගෙම |
| 157. එන්. ඒ. පබ්ලිස් සිංකෙරු | 167. ඩබ්ලිව්. ඒ. ජයසේන |
| 158. පී. ඒ. සිරිසේන | 168. එන්. පී. රත්නසේන |
| 159. ඊ. ජුලියස් | 169. ඒ. එම්. විරසේන |
| 160. එම්. ඩී. ටිකිරිබණ්ඩා | 170. ඩබ්ලිව්. ඒ. සෝමරත්න |

(9)

කොළඹ පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

1. ආර්. ජේ.වී. කේ. පෙරේරා

මහනුවර පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

3. එස්. එම්. ටී. බී. සමරකෝන්

නුවරඑළිය පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

4. ඩබ්ලිවු. ආරියදස
5. පී. ඒ. විලියම් සිංහසේන
6. ආර්. ඇම්. පී. බී. රත්නායක
7. එච්. ඒ. වික්‍රමගෙදර
8. එම්. පී. එන්. දයාරත්න

ගාල්ල පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

- | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| 9. ඩබ්ලිව්. ඩබ්ලිව්. ගුණරත්න | 13. ටී. ලියනගේ |
| 10. පී. හෙට්ටිආරච්චි | 14. ඒ. ඩී. ඒ. ගුණසේකර |
| 11. ඩී. ඩබ්ලිව්. එච්. කුමාරසේන | 15. ඩී. ඒ. එල්. සමරසේන |
| 12. ජී. එල්. ඩී. එස්. ගුණවර්ධන | |

මාතර පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

- | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 16. ජේ. එච්. පුංචි සිංකෙස් | 19. ඩබ්ලිව්. එම්. පී. දෙත් කරෝලිස් |
| 17. කේ. ඒ. ආරියවන්ස | 20. ඊ. ඒ. රණවක |
| 18. වයි. කේ. ඩී. යසපාල | |

හම්බන්තොට පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

21. ඩබ්ලිව්. ඩබ්ලිව්. ඩී. හෙන්රික් 22. ආර්. ඩබ්ලිව්. රාජපක්ෂ

ත්‍රිකුණාමලේ පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

23. **එස්. ඒ. කොරෙයි**

පුත්තලම පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

24. ජේ. පී. දිසානායක

අනුරාධපුර පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

26. ඩී. ඩී. දිසානායක

බදුල්ල පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

- | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 28. කේ. එම්. පූව්වන්ඩා | 31. ඒ. ජේ. එම්. සෙනෙවිරත්න |
| 29. ජේ. එම්. මුතුබණ්ඩා | 32. ජී. ආර්. එම්. සුද්ධන්ඩා |
| 30. එස්. ඩී. අමරකෝන් | |

රත්නපුර පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

- | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| 33. එම්. ජී. රත්නසේකර | 37. එස්. ආර්. ඩී. පියසේන |
| 34. ඇල්. ඩී. ගලතුරේ | 38. ඒ. පී. රාමනායක |
| 35. ජී. ඒ. එම්. කිරිඳිසේන | 39. ඩබ්ලිව්. බණ්ඩාර |
| 36. ජී. වාර්ඩ් | 40. ටී. එම්. පී. පියසේන |

කූගල්ල පාලන දිස්ත්‍රික්කය

41. පී. ඒ. සිරිසේන

43. එම්. වි. විකිරිමණ්ඩා

42. ဝိ. ဗုဒ္ဓိယဏိ

44. ඩබ්ලිව්. එම්. කරුණාසේන

(රී) ග්‍රාම සේවකයන් බඳවා ගැනීමේ පරිපාටිය ප්‍රසිද්ධ කරන ලද 1961 මැයි මස 20 වෙනි දින ගැසට් පත්‍රයෙහි පලවූ නිවේදනයට අනුකූලව තිටපු ගම්මුලාදානින් විසින් ඔවුන් අධ්‍යාපන දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවේ කලින් දරන ලද තනතුරු ලබා ගැනීම සඳහා එවනු ලබන ඉල්ලුම්පත් අවශ්‍ය කටයුතු කිරීම සඳහා අධ්‍යාපන හා සංස්කෘතික කටයුතු පිළිබඳ අමාත්‍යාංශයට ඉදිරිපත් කරනු ලැබේ.

මාර්/බමුණුගම විද්‍යාලයයේ සිට මියගිය
ශිෂ්‍යයෙකු වූ පී. කේ. බණ්ඩාරය

ටී. ඩී. තෙන්නකෝන් මයා. (අධ්‍යාපන හා සංස්කෘතික කටයුතු පිළිබඳ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්)

எம் ஆர்./பழனும வித்தியாலயத்தைச்
சேர்ந்த காலஞ்சென்ற மாணவன்
பி. கே. தனன்சய

(திரு. ரி. பி. தென்னகோன்—கல்வி, கலாச் சார விவகார அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி)

DECEASED PUPIL P. K. DHANANJAYA OF
MR./BAMUNUGAMA VIDYALAYA

(Mr. T. B. Tennekoon—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education and Cultural Affairs)

9. ඩබ්ලිව්. දහනායක මයා.

(திரு. டப்ளியு. தகனாயக்க)

(Mr. W. Dahanayake)

අධ්‍යාපන හා සංස්කෘතික කටයුතු පිළි
බඳ ඇමතිගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය: (අ)
මාර/බමුණුගම විද්‍යාලයයේ, සත් අවුරුද්
දක් වයසැති ශිෂ්‍යයෙකු වූ පී. කේ. ධනං
ජය, පාසැලේ ලීඳට වැටී මිය ගිය බවත්,
මේ සම්බන්ධයෙන් ගුරුවරුන් ගණනා
වක් නොසැලකිල්ල ගැන වරදකරුවන් වූ
බවත් එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ආ) එවැනි
එක් එක් ගුරුවරයාට දෙන ලද දඩුවම
කමක්ද? ඔවුන්ගේ නම් මොනවාද?

(අ) ඔව්, පාසල් භූමියේ තිබුණු ආවරණය නොකළ ලීදැකට හදිසියෙන් වැටීමෙන් මේ ළමයාගේ මරණය සිදු වී ඇත. (1) තාප්පයක් හෝ වැටක් බැඳීමෙන් මෙම ලීද ආවරණය කිරීමට මුල්ගුරු මහතා ක්‍රියා කළා නම් හා (2) මෙම බෙදවාචකය සිදු වූ දින මුල්ගුරු මහතා වෙනුවට වැඩ බැලූ ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ උපගුරු මහතා ගුරුවරුන් දෙදෙනෙක් පාසලට නොපැමිණීමේ හේතුව උඩ නොනිසි අන්දමින් 2 වැනි ප්‍රමාණය 11.15 ට (නියමිත වේලාවට පැයකට කලින්) නොඇරියා නම් මේ අනතුර සිදුනොවීමට ඉඩ තිබුණු බව කරන ලද පරීක්ෂණවලදී හෙළි වී ඇත. කලින් ඇරීම නිසා මේ අවාසනාවන්ත ශිෂ්‍යයා උසස් පන්තියක සිටි තමාගේ වැඩිමහල් සොහොයුරු ඇරෙනතුරු ලීද ළඟ නිකරුනේ එහා මෙහා යමින් සිට ඇති බව පෙනේ. (ආ) මේ දුර්වලකම් සම්බන්ධයෙන් එම ගුරුවරුන් දෙදෙනාට අවවාද කර ඇත. ඔවුන්ගේ නම්:— වී. ඩී. ඒ. ප්‍රේමවර්ධන මහතා මුල්ගුරු (දැනට ශා/පනාගමුව විද්‍යාලය) ඩී. ඒ. කෝදුගොඩ මහතා, උපගුරු (දැනට විද්‍යාදය විශ්ව විද්‍යාලය)

கல்வி, கலாச்சார விவகார அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா : (அ) எம். ஆர்/பமுனுசுலாசா வித்தியாலயவைச் சேர்ந்த ஏழு வயதுடைய பி. கே. தனன்சய என்னும் மாணவன் பாடசாலைக்கிணற்றுக்குள் விழுந்து இறந்தாரென்பதையும், இவ்விடயத்தில் அநேக ஆசிரியர்கள் கவனயீனமாக இருந்தமை கண்டுபிடிக்கப்பட்டதென்பதையும் அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஆ) அத்தகைய ஆசிரியரொவ்வொருவருக்கும் என்ன தண்டனை வழங்கப்பட்டது? அவர்களின் பெயர்களென்ன?

asked the Minister of Education and Cultural Affairs :—(a) Is he aware that a seven-year old pupil, P. K. Dhananjaya, of MR/Bamunugama Vidyalaya fell into the school well and died, and a number of teachers were found to have been guilty of negligence in that connection? (b) What is the punishment given to each of such teachers? What are their names?

බබ්ලිවි. දහනායක මයා.

(திரு. டப்ளியு. தகனாயக்க)

(Mr. W. Dahanayake)

මේ මියගිය ශිෂ්‍යයාගේ දෙමාපියන් පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමාගෙන් අහනවා, නොසැලකිලිමත්ව ක්‍රියා කර මරණයක් සිදු කිරීමේ වරදට සුදුසු දඬුවම් අවවාද කිරීමද කියා. ඒ ප්‍රශ්නය මමත් අනුමත

ව්‍යවික පිළිතුරු

පී. බී. තෙන්නකෝන් මයා.

(திரு. ரி. பி. தென்னகோன்)

(Mr. T. B. Tennekoon)

ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, ඒ කතාශාල
දායක සිදුවීම යම්කිසි චේතනාවක් ඇතිව
වුවමනාවෙන්ම කළ එකක් නම් මීට වඩා
බරපතළ දඬුවම් දිය යුතු බව අප කවුරුත්
පිළිගන්නව. ඒ නිසා දැනට නිබේන
රෙගුලාසි අනුව ඊට වඩා දඬුවමක් දෙන්න
ඉඩ නිබේනව නම් අපි බොහොම කැමැත්
තෙන් ඒ දඬුවම නියම කරනව.

ඛනිලිවි. දහනායක මයා.

(திரு. டப்ளியு. தகனாயக்க)

(Mr. W. Dahanayake)

තමුත්තාන්සෙ මේ වගේ පුශ්න
උද්ගත වීම සියයට සියයක්ම නවතින
පිළිවෙළට පාසල් භූමිවල තිබෙන සියලුම
ළිං ආවරණය කර ආරක්ෂා සහිතව
තැබීමට වහම විධිවිධාන යොදනවද?
එසේ කළොත් මේ පොඩි ළමයගෙ මරණ
යෙන් රටට ලොකු යහපතක් සිදු වෙනව.

පී. බී. තෙන්නකෝන් මයා.

(திரு. ரி. பி. தென்னகோன்)

(Mr. T. B. Tennekoon)

ඔවැනි අවාසනාවන්ත සිද්ධිත් ඇති
නොවීමට අපි මිට කලින් ගුරුවරුන්ට
අවවාද කර තිබෙනවා. ළමයින් පරෙස්සම්
කිරීමට, මේ සම්බන්ධයෙන් තව දුරටත්
එකු ලේඛන යවන ලෙස ගුරු ඇමති
තුමාට දන්වා සිටිනවා.

බිඳිලිවි. දහනායක මයා.

(திரு. டப்ளியு. தகனையக்க)

(Mr. W. Dahanayake)

ඒ දෙමව්පියන්ට සුදුසු වන්දියක්
දීමට නමුත් නාත්සෙ කල්පනා කර
බලනවද ?

පී. බී. තෙන්නකෝන් මයා.

(திரு. ரி. பி. தென்னகோன்)

(Mr. T. B. Tennekoon)

ඒ ගැන කල්පනා කිරීම ගැන ඇමති
හමාට් භාර කරනවා.

මාළික පිළිතුරු

ලංකා ගුවන් සේවයේ සිට අස් කරනු
ලැබූ කම්කරුවන්

“எயார் சிலோனல்” வேலைநீக்கம் செய்யப்
பட்ட ஊழியர்

EMPLOYEES DISCONTINUED BY AIR CEYLON

10. සිරිල් මැතිව් මයො. (කොළොන්න)

(திரு. சிரில் மதியூ—கொலன்ன)

(Mr. Cyril Mathew—Kolonna)

ප්‍රවාහණ කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමතිගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය : (අ) (i) 1961 දී හා 1962 දී ලංකා ගුවන් සේවයේ සේවකයින්ට අස් කිරීමේ ලියවිලි භාර දෙන ලද බවත්, ඔවුන්ගෙන් 70 දෙනෙකු කාර්යාල කාර්ය මණ්ඩල සේවකයින් බවත් ; (ii) මෙම 70 දෙනාට භාර දෙන ලද ලියවිලි පසුව ඉල්ලා අස්කර ගන්නා / ලද අතර සුළු සේවකයින් පමණක් අස් කරන ලද බවත් ; (iii) රජයේ දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවල ඇතිවන පුරප්පාඩු පිරවීමේදී මෙම සේවකයින්ට වැඩි සැලකිල්ලක් දැක්විය යුතු බව 1961.10.12 වැනි දින අංක සීපී. 554/6 දරණ කැබිනට් මණ්ඩලයේ නියෝගයකින් උපදෙස් දෙන ලද බවත් ; (iv) ඔවුන්ගෙන් වැඩි සංඛ්‍යාවක් ලංකා ගුවන් සේවයේ ඔවුන් ලැබූ වැටුපට අඩු වැටුපක් මත ලංකා දුම්රිය වැඩ පලේ නුපුහුණු කම්කරුවන් වශයෙන් සේවය කරන බවත් එතුමා දන්නවාද ? (ආ) ලංකා ගුවන් සේවයේ ඔවුන් කළ සේවය වෙනුවෙන් මෙම කම්කරුවන්ට කිසිදු පාරිතෝෂිකයක් දී නැති බැවින් ලංකා ගුවන් සේවයේ ඔවුන් ලැබූ වැටුපට සමාන වැටුප් ගෙවීමට එතුමා නියෝග කරනවාද ?

போக்குவரத்து அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா :
(அ) (i) 1961 ஆம் ஆண்டில் “எயார் கிலோனை” ச் சேர்ந்த 92 ஊழியர்களுக்கு வேலைநீக்க அறிவித்தல்கள் கொடுக்கப்பட்டன வென்பதையும் அவர்களுள் 70 பேர் அலுவலக உத்தியோகத்தார்களென்பதையும், (ii) அவ்வெழுபது பேரது வேலைநீக்க அறிவித்தல்களும் பின்னர் வாபஸ் பெறப்பட்டு கீழ்த்தர ஊழியர்கள் மாத்திரம் குறைக்கப்பட்டன ரென்பதையும், (iii) அரசாங்கத் திணைக்களங்களில் வெற்றிடங்கள் நிரப்பப்படும்போது அவ்ஊழியர்களுக்கு முன்னுரிமையளிக்கப்பட வேண்டுமென 12.10.61 ஆம் தேதிய CP. 554/6 ஆம் இலக்க அமைச்சரவைக் கட்டளை

வாசிக பிழிதூர்

வாசிக பிழிதூர்

**வாடிம அமியபத மலாசபாநவர ஓவ
மடகம**

முதிர்ந்தோர் கல்வி நிலையங்கள் : இடவசதி

ADULT EDUCATION CENTRES :
ACCOMMODATION

5. ஸ்வாசீச சிந். சி. பரேரா (யதியன்
தோ—சிமிதன் சி சமரக்கோடி மலா.
வெறுவ)

(டொக்டர் என். எம். பெரேரா—யட்டியாந்
தோட்டை—திரு. எட்மன் சமரக்கோடி
சார்பாக)

(Dr. N. M. Perera—Yatiantota—on
behalf of Mr. Edmund Samarakkody)

அமியபத ஸா சஃகாநிக கடுயுது பிழிமடி
அமநிதென் அபு பூநய: (அ) கிமி
ஸாந், சஃகித ஸாந், ஸா பூநிகா
போந் ஸாடிச வாடிம அமியபத மலாசபாந
வரவ சபயந நம்திந் சிவா சூரகிதவ
நாநிம சடிஸா அல்தாரி தோ வெநந் சூடி
லி மடி லாடி நானி மவ சிவாடி தந்நவாடி?
(ஸா) சிசே நதி, சிவாடி சூடி லி மடி லா
டிமவ சிவாடி ஓக்திதென் கடுயுது கரந
வாடி?

கல்வி, கலாச்சார விவகார அமைச்சரைக்
கேட்ட வினா: (அ) முதிர்ந்தோர் கல்வி நிலையங்
களுக்கு விளையாட்டுப் பொருட்கள், சங்கீதக்
கருவிகள், நூல்நிலையப் புத்தகங்கள் முதலியன
விநியோகிக்கப்பட்டபோதிலும் அவற்றைப்
பாதுகாப்பாய் வைப்பதற்கேற்ற அலுவலரி
களோ அல்லது தகுந்த தளபாடங்களெது
வுமோ வழங்கப்படவில்லையென்பதை அவர்
அறிவாரா? (ஆ) ஆமெனில், அத்தகைய
தகுந்த தளபாடங்களை அளிப்பதற்கு அவர்
விரைவில் நடவடிக்கையெடுப்பாரா?

asked the Minister of Education
and Cultural Affairs:—(a) Is he
aware that although sports materials,
musical instruments, library books,
etc., are supplied to adult educa-
tion centres, no almirahs or any
other suitable furniture are pro-
vided to keep them safe? (b) If so,
will he take early action to provide
such suitable furniture?

சி. சி. தெந்நகோன் மலா.

(திரு. ரி. பி. தென்னகோன்)

(Mr. T. B. Tennekoon)

(அ) ரசீசே பாய்ஸாலவர பவந்ந
லாந வாடிம அமியபத மலாசபாநவர
அயந் லபகரந் மலா கிரிமவ பகசு
சபய நலி. (ஸா) லடித நலி.

ஸ்வாசீச சிந். சி. பரேரா

(டொக்டர் என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

சபய நலிதவ நதி தி பூநய
அதந்ந நலா தி. சபய நானி நிக
தி பூநய அஸா நலிதந்ந. மலா
லந்நர லி மலா தி யந்ந நலா. சம
லி அலாதி சிவாநவரவ சபய அலி. ந
சபய நானி சிவாந் நலித நிக, தி
பூநய அஸா நலிதந்ந. சிசே நானி
நிகதி பூநயக்த அதந்ந நலா. சி
நிகா கரந்ந கர நலா சி ஸா பரி
கர மலா லா மல லா சிவா.

சி. சி. தெந்நகோன் மலா.

(திரு. ரி. பி. தென்னகோன்)

(Mr. T. B. Tennekoon)

சபய நானி சிவாந ஸா சோஸா
மலா அபி பிழிவெலக்த யோடிதவ.

கலாநாயகமலா

(சபாநாயகர்)

(Mr. Speaker)

6 வந பூநய

சி. சி. தெந்நகோன் மலா.

(திரு. ரி. பி. தென்னகோன்)

(Mr. T. B. Tennekoon)

லா கலாநாயகமலி, 'சி பூநய
பிழிதூர் சபகித சடிஸா கலி லா
சிவா.

பூநய மலா திகடி லாசுத கிரிமவ
நலி.

මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ කටයුතු

මහ'නි මණ'ඩලයේ කටයුතු

කෙටුම්පත් පණත් පිළිගැනවීම

சமர்ப்பிக்கப்பட்ட மசோதாக்கள்

BILLS PRESENTED

Temporary Residence Tax (Amendment) Bill

“to amend the Temporary Residence Tax Act, No. 36 of 1961”.

පිළිගත් වන ලද්දේ රාජ්‍යරක්ෂක හා විදේශ කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමතියේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම් ගරු එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක විසිනි. 1963 නොවැම්බර් 7 වන බ්‍රහස්පතින් දා දෙවන වර කියවිය යුතුයයිද, එය මුද්‍රණය කළ යුතු යයිද, නියෝග කරන ලදී.

මත්ති මණ්ඩලයේ කටයුතු

சபை அலுவல்

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

ഒരു ഭൂതം-ഒരമ്പലം

(கௌரவ இலங்கரத்ன)

(The Hon. Ilangaratne)

මෙම යෝජනාව මම ඉදිරිපත් කරමි.

“ අංක 21(7) දරණ ස්ථාවර නියෝගයේ
කුමක් සඳහන් වී තිබුණද, අද දින න්‍යාය
පත්‍රයේ ප්‍රධාන කටයුතුවල අංක 31 දරණ
විෂයයට පමණක් විය යුතුය ”

ප්‍රශ්නය සහාතිමුඛ කරන ලදී.

අ. භා. 2.16

ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන මයා. (අවිස්සා
වේල්ල)

(திரு. டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன—அவிசா
வலை)

(Mr. D. P. R. Gunawardena—Avis-
wella)

As a matter of fact, we agreed to this arrangement on the understanding that some of us would have an opportunity of speaking on this Motion, and at a meeting of leaders of parties last evening presided over by you it was agreed that we should sit at least till 9 p.m. You have the right to allow the House to sit as long as it wants if there is no disagreement. You promised it. You do not need to change Standing Orders for that purpose. You have the power to see that this Motion is debated to a conclusion.

കർമ്മാടകനാഥ

(சபாநாயகர்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please!

ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. ம. பீ. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

(Mr. D. P. R. Gunawardena)

There is something more that I have to say. It was also understood at that meeting that as it was very difficult for me to be present in the House after 3 o'clock, I would be given the opportunity of moving the Motion so that I may get a chance of speaking. You were present at that meeting and you heard the arrangement that was made. It was known to you. I do not know what has happened in the meantime.

കലാനിഷക്കുമുഖം

(சபாநாயகர்)

(Mr. Speaker)

I never knew what you were talking about.

ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

(Mr. D. P. R. Gunawardena)

You should know what we were talking. You are expected to know.

කළානායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர்)

(Mr. Speaker)

I know they wanted you to move an amendment but I did not know who was going to speak. One of the movers must move the Motion and it is only then that you can speak. Anyhow, one of them must move the Motion and then you can speak.

බී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

(Mr. D. P. R. Gunawardena)

I do not mind one of them moving the Motion because I am not one of the signatories to it, but it was agreed——

மன்தி மனெவரெய கவையு

மன்தி மனெவரெய கவையு

சே. ஃபர். பீயவர்டென மெ. (தென்னு
கொலம்பு பிலிப்பை மன்தி)

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன—கொழும்புத்
தெற்கு முதலாம் அங்கத்தவர்)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene—First Colombo
South)

We are accepting the amendment
and he is a signatory to the amend-
ment.

கலாநாயகருமே

(சபாநாயகர்)

(Mr. Speaker)

But you must move the Motion
first and get in the amendment
later. Will you then move the
Motion?

சே. ஃபர். பீயவர்டென மெ.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

Yes.

விலிபி. தபநாயக மெ.

(திரு. டப்ளியு. தகனாயக்க)

(Mr. W. Dahanayake)

No, Sir, I want to speak on this
Motion No. 2 before the House.

I am very sorry that I was not
present at the meeting of the
Leaders. There is one set of hon.
Members who say that proceedings
will end at 8.30 P.M. The hon.
Member for Avissawella (Mr. D. P. R.
Gunawardena) says that we should
proceed until 9 P.M. May I say that
there are quite a number of back-
benchers who wish to speak on this
Motion. In fact this afternoon I
listened to the hon. Member for
Kotmale (Mr. J. D. Weerasekera)
the ex-Chief Whip, who insists on
being permitted to speak on this
Motion. There may be other hon.
Members who may not give in to the
wishes of the party leaders that they
should limit the time of the speeches.
Therefore I suggest, in view of the
importance of the subject of the
Motion that we continue the Debate
till 11 P.M.

As has already been pointed out,
the whole matter rests with you.
Other hon. Members might suggest
other times. Whatever it is, I think

that all those who wish to speak
should be given an opportunity to
do so and they will have such an
opportunity if we go on till 11 P.M.
Is it too much, Sir, to have a Debate
till 11 P.M. on one of the most im-
portant subjects that you can think
of?

கலாநாயகருமே

(சபாநாயகர்)

(Mr. Speaker)

There is no Motion to continue
after the normal hours. The Motion
before the House is to give pre-
cedence to Item No. 31 on the Order
Paper.

விலிபி. தபநாயக மெ.

(திரு. டப்ளியு. தகனாயக்க)

(Mr. W. Dahanayake)

No Motion is necessary.

சி. பி. ஃபர். குணவர்தன மெ.

(திரு. டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

(Mr. D. P. R. Gunawardena)

I submit that no Motion is
necessary.

கலாநாயகருமே

(சபாநாயகர்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please!

சி. பி. ஃபர். குணவர்தன மெ.

(திரு. டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

(Mr. D. P. R. Gunawardena)

Purely for your information I sub-
mit that no Motion is necessary.

விலிபி. தபநாயக மெ.

(திரு. டப்ளியு. தகனாயக்க)

(Mr. W. Dahanayake)

We must know up to what time we
are going on.

கலாநாயகருமே

(சபாநாயகர்)

(Mr. Speaker)

8.30 P.M. is the usual time.

தென் தி. தென் தி. கருத்து

தென் தி. தென் தி. கருத்து

பெரிசு. தி. தி. தி.

(திரு. டப்ளியு. தகனாயக்க)

(Mr. W. Dahanayake)

We will ask the Hon. Leader of the House. This matter must be mutually agreed upon.

பெரிசு தி. தி. தி.

(டாக்டர் என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

It is true that we agreed to terminate this Debate at 8.30 P.M., the normal time that the House adjourns. But as a number of hon. Members feel that they would like to participate in this Debate, I think the Government should consider exceeding the normal hours.

தி. தி. தி.

(சபாநாயகர்)

(Mr. Speaker)

That position is more correct; it is not I but the Government and the House that must agree.

தி. தி. தி. தி.

(திரு. டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

(Mr. D. P. R. Gunawardena)

That is what I tried to suggest.

பெரிசு தி. தி. தி.

(டாக்டர் என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

It was also agreed that we dispense with the interval for tea in order to save time. May I also point out that it was generally understood that we should try to finish this Debate today. So I think the Government should indicate to this House whether it will be agreeable to continue this Debate till 11 P.M. I understand that originally only three Members from the Government and one Member from each Opposition party were expected to speak. That was the understanding; but if there are more hon. Members on the Government side who wish to speak—there are one or two other hon. Members who want to speak on this side—we might consider the question of going on till 11 P.M.

பெரிசு தி. தி. தி.

(கௌரவ இலங்கரத்ன)

(The Hon. Ilangaratne)

All that I can say is that the leaders of parties had agreed upon a certain procedure and the time at which the Debate will be terminated. We have accordingly communicated with our party Members and informed them that a Vote will be taken at a specific time. The Chief Whip has made all arrangements on the basis of this agreement. Therefore we request you to carry out that agreement. As far as we are concerned we will conform to the agreement with regard to the number of speeches and the time.

தி. தி. தி. தி.

(திரு. ஏ. ரத்னாயக்க—வத்தேகம)

(Mr. A. Ratnayake—Wattegama)

We are having a Debate on the question of the freedom of the press. Now it looks as if the freedom of speech in Parliament is being contained.

பெரிசு. தி. தி. தி.

(திரு. டப்ளியு. தகனாயக்க)

(Mr. W. Dahanayake)

It is a denial of the freedom of speech!

தி. தி. தி. தி.

(திரு. ஏ. ரத்னாயக்க)

(Mr. Ratnayake)

It is grossly unfair. I would ask the Hon. Acting Leader of the House to reconsider the matter.

தி. தி. தி.

(சபாநாயகர்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Does the House agree to this Motion?

பெரிசு. தி. தி. தி.

(திரு. டப்ளியு. தகனாயக்க)

(Mr. W. Dahanayake)

We want an answer.

தி. தி. தி.

(சபாநாயகர்)

(Mr. Speaker)

The answer was given.

மனத்ரி மனேவரே கடுவது

புலவர் பரீக்ஷை கைமேசம்

சுரு ஓல்கரத்ன

(கௌரவ இலங்கரத்ன)

(The Hon. Ilangaratne)

If we have come to some agreement it is nothing but fair that we conform to it.

பி. பி. ஸார். குனவர்தன மஹ.

(திரு. பி. பி. ஸார். குனவர்தன)

(Mr. D. P. R. Gunawardena)

We came to an agreement on the understanding that the House would agree, but if the House wants more time, surely there is nothing to prevent us from coming to such a decision.

சே. ஸார். ஜயவர்தன மஹ.

(திரு. ஜே. ஸார். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

Can I formally move the Motion and speak next?

கலாநாயகர்

(சபாநாயகர்)

(Mr. Speaker)

No.

டாக்டர் என். எம். பெரேரா

(டாக்டர் என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I have a petition to present.

கலாநாயகர்

(சபாநாயகர்)

(Mr. Speaker)

You are too late.

பி. பி. ஸார். குனவர்தன மஹ.

(திரு. பி. பி. ஸார். குனவர்தன)

(Mr. W. Dahanayake)

What is the decision now?

சுரு மனேவரே

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தினர்கள்)

(Hon. Members)

To go on till 8.30 P.M.

பி. பி. ஸார். குனவர்தன மஹ.

(திரு. பி. பி. ஸார். குனவர்தன)

(Mr. W. Dahanayake)

Sir, if you suggest that we wait till the Acting Leader of the House comes, we can suspend a decision on this matter.

கலாநாயகர்

(சபாநாயகர்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Does the House agree to the suggestion to suspend a decision?

சுரு மனேவரே

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தினர்கள்)

(Hon. Members)

Aye.

“அங்க 21 (7) டீரன் ஸ்பீக்கர் நியோஜே கடுவது ஸ்பீக்கர் வி கடுவது, அடி டீரன் நியோஜே கடுவது கடுவதுவரு அங்க 31 டீரன் விசயம் கடுவதுவரு டீரன் கடுவது” கடுவது

புலவர் விசயம் டீரன் கடுவதுவரு விசயம்.

புலவர் பரீக்ஷை கைமேசம்

பத்திரிகைகள் சம்பந்தமான விசாரணை

குழு

COMMISSION OF INQUIRY ON PRESS

மது கடுவது விசயம் நியோஜே கடுவது கடுவது:

“That this House disapproves of the Commission of Inquiry on the Press as proclaimed in the Ceylon Gazette dated 25th September, 1963, which Commission is a departure from the original purpose of the Government announced in the Throne Speech of August, 1960, viz., to introduce legislation to ensure the democratic character of newspapers in this country and prevent abuse by the formation of unhealthy monopolies.”

அ. க. 2.26

சே. ஸார். ஜயவர்தன மஹ.

(திரு. ஜே. ஸார். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

I move the Motion standing in my name. To save time I will not read the Motion. I would like to say that we are accepting the amendment to the Motion moved by certain other Members and we can consider the Motion and the amendment as one.

The Motion seeks to condemn the Press Commission appointed on the 25th September 1963, as stated in the Government Gazette of that day. This, I think, is the first occasion on which a commission of this nature,

appointed by the Government, is being condemned by a Motion in a legislative assembly, whether it be Legislative Council, State Council or Parliament. Not only the terms of reference but also some of the commissioners are objected to by the unanimous Opposition. I can remember decisions of commissions being canvassed in this House but I cannot remember a single occasion on which there has been opposition of this nature to a commission which is sitting. And, not only is this unique in that respect, but the opposition is by the entire Opposition group. Members of various parties with diverse political opinions have all combined to give expression to their disapproval of the terms of reference and some of the commissioners appointed.

There must be some reason why this particular commission has met with this disapproval, specially because the original decision of this Government to destroy the monopoly enjoyed by certain presses in this country, I think, was welcomed by every shade of public opinion in this House. Our party too said that we were not in favour of monopolies, whether it is by the press or by any other institution. We said that publicly and we are subscribing to the amendment which says it quite clearly. It is for those who wish to read, to read.

The reason why we are all combined is something which I would like to explain to this House. Not only the Opposition, but I understand from conversation that there are many Members on the Government side too who are opposed to this commission, and, if given an opportunity, will say so publicly in this House. [*Interruption*]. I think I spoke in very clear English: I said we were opposed to the terms of reference as well as to some of the commissioners.

Let me go back to the first Throne Speech of this Government in 1960 so that we may understand the changes that have taken place in Government thinking. In HANSARD of 12th August,

1960, which contains the Throne Speech of that year, we find the Government saying:

"A commission will be appointed to inquire into the functions of the press in connection with the general elections held in March and July this year, and the abuse of power or authority by the Caretaker Government and government officials during that election."

This is reported at column 56. Then the second paragraph states:

"My Government will introduce legislation to take over the newspapers controlled by the Associated Newspapers of Ceylon Limited and the Times of Ceylon Limited and to vest such newspapers in statutory public corporations with unlimited share capital in which individual holdings will be restricted so as to ensure a broadbased ownership. This legislation will ensure the democratic character of newspapers in this country and prevent abuse by the formation of unhealthy monopolies."

There were two policies indicated there: one, a commission to inquire into the functioning of the press in connection with the general elections held in March and July 1960, and of course the alleged abuse of power by the Caretaker Government; two, to take over the Associated Newspapers of Ceylon Ltd. and the Times of Ceylon Ltd., and thus break up what they thought was a monopoly, and to create a broadbased ownership of the press. I do not think in any other Throne Speech this matter of the press commission was mentioned, but certain draft Bills were brought before the Cabinet and also before the Government Parliamentary Group. We have some indication of what those Bills were because the press, I think, published some of the documents.

One draft Bill which was submitted by the then Minister of Justice, Mr. S. P. C. Fernando, in August 1960, was rejected by the Government Parliamentary Group, and the then Minister of Finance, the Hon. Felix Dias Bandaranaike, introduced his own draft. This new draft not only sought to prevent monopoly control of the newspapers but, in our opinion, sought to concentrate tremendous powers in the hands of the Minister

[ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මයා.]

himself, with a new type of monopoly, and the Minister was to become a "Press Czar". He was to have power to make provisions as to how newspapers should be run, power to prohibit the publication of news, power to impose fines, power to run daily and weekly papers and so on, and various other draconian legislative measures were sought to be introduced by the then Minister of Finance. But fortunately his Parliamentary Party rejected that also. Then everything went into cold storage, and no more was heard on the press commission or of a press council or of the taking over of the national dailies of this country.

Suddenly, on the 30th August 1963, it was announced in the Gazette that a press commission was to be appointed. I will read some of the terms of reference of the commission in a moment. Three commissioners were appointed—Mr. K. D. de Silva, Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana and Mr. S. W. Walpita. I had occasion during the Budget Debate on the Votes of the Minister of Justice—because it is under the Minister of Justice that the question of the press is handled—to refer to this commission and to make come criticisms of the Press Commissioners, Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana and Mr. S. W. Walpita. One would see in HANSARD of 3rd September, 1963, columns 1526 etc., the comments which I made under the Votes of the Minister of Justice ; and in my concluding remarks I said this :

"There is another disqualification. She was also"—

That is Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana—

—"either the editor, proprietor or co-shareholder of a weekly newspaper called "Trine". It was as a result of that newspaper's activities that she had to stand a trial-at-bar. Here is a person who was possibly the editor, shareholder or proprietress of a weekly political newspaper who took an active part in the elections of 1956. When you are going to conduct an inquiry into a newspaper of which she herself was a part owner, or editor, or shareholder you are making her a member of this commission."

That seemed to me to be valid criticism of Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana's capacity to act as a commissioner to inquire into the conduct of newspapers in the elections of 1956.

These are the terms of reference published in the Gazette of August 30, 1963, under the hand of the Governor-General, also appointing Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana and Mr. S. W. Walpita as commissioners. I am referring to page 1512 of the Gazette. I will not read all the terms of reference, nor the other parts of this Gazette. I am sure other hon. Members will do so. I am dealing particularly with two clauses, namely (k) and (l).

The Gazette of August 30, 1963, said,

"(k) the extent to which and the manner in which newspapers sought to exercise undue influence on voters in the exercise of their franchise at the Parliamentary Elections held in 1956 and 1960, and the steps that should be taken to prevent a repetition of such conduct on the part of any newspaper or newspaper group.

(1) the conduct of newspapers since April, 1956, in regard to any attempts to obstruct the policies of the Government or the implementation of its programme of work and the steps that should be taken to prevent a repetition of such conduct in the future."

You would see, therefore, that in the original terms of reference of August 30, 1963, the conduct of all newspapers *vis-a-vis* their using undue influence on the voters at the Parliamentary Elections held in 1956 and 1960, was to be investigated, and the conduct of all newspapers since April 1956, in regard to any attempt to obstruct the policies of the Government. So my criticism as well as the criticism of other hon Members in the House in September, 1963, on the Votes of the Minister of Justice referred to the fact that Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana was either the editor or owner of a paper which took an active part in the elections of 1960 and the elections of 1956, particularly 1956. Therefore, how could she be a commissioner judging her own publication ?

What happened ? The terms of reference were then changed and new terms of reference were published in

the Gazette of September 25, 1963. I understand that Mr. K. D. de Silva objected to Mrs. Gunawardhana serving on this commission.

பி. பி. விக்கிரமசுரீயா மஹோ. (அமைச்சர் கமிஷன்)
சுற்று சிபிசிடி பார்க்கிங் டிஸ்ட்ரிக்ட்

(திரு. பி. பி. விக்ரமசுரீயா—நீதியமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி)

(Mr. P. P. Wickramasuriya—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice)

May I interrupt? That is not a correct statement.

சே. டி. சீவசேனா மஹோ.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

If he did not object, he should have objected.

விக்கிரமசுரீயா மஹோ.

(திரு. விக்ரமசுரீயா)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

That is a different matter. Say so. That is your opinion. You need not take the responsibility on yourself—

கலாநாயகர்

(சபாநாயகர்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please! There is no need to interrupt. There is hardly any time.

விக்கிரமசுரீயா மஹோ.

(திரு. விக்ரமசுரீயா)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

A false statement was made. For my hon. Friend to say that Mr. K. D. de Silva objected to Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana being on the commission, he should have told him.

சே. டி. சீவசேனா மஹோ.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

No. Why should he tell me?

பி. பி. விக்கிரமசுரீயா மஹோ. (அமைச்சர் கமிஷன்)
சுற்று சிபிசிடி பார்க்கிங் டிஸ்ட்ரிக்ட்

(திரு. பி. பி. விக்ரமசுரீயா—நீதியமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி)

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

Did not Mr. K. D. de Silva go to the Governor-General? Is it not the fact? Do you deny that? Did he not make certain representations? Do you deny that?

சே. டி. சீவசேனா மஹோ.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

Mr. K. D. de Silva did not tell me anything. Mr. K. D. de Silva, I am saying again, objected to her serving on the commission. He had to object. His objection was valid—

விக்கிரமசுரீயா மஹோ.

(திரு. விக்ரமசுரீயா)

(Mr. Keuneman)

That is why they changed the terms of reference.

சே. டி. சீவசேனா மஹோ.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

—because Mrs. Gunawardhana and her paper were the subject of investigation and because she took part in the elections of 1956. Then on September 25, 1963, those two clauses I read were changed and the commission was reappointed under the hand of the Governor-General. For the information of the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice, this was done by Ceylon Government Gazette Extraordinary, No. 13,768 of Wednesday, September 25, 1963, pages 1655 and 1656. Clauses (k) and (l) were altered.

The original clause (k) referred to the manner in which all newspapers sought to exercise undue influence on voters in the elections of 1956 and 1960. The new clause (k) says “the extent to which and the manner in which newspapers owned or published by the Associated Newspapers of Ceylon Ltd., The Times of

ප්‍රවෘත්ති පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

ප්‍රවෘත්ති පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

[ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මයා.]

Ceylon Ltd., or the Virakesari Ltd. sought to exercise undue influence on voters in the exercise of their franchise at the Parliamentary Elections held in 1956 and 1960, and the steps that should be taken to prevent such conduct on the part of any newspaper or newspaper group in the future". All newspapers other than newspapers under the control of these three groups, Lake House, Times and Virakesari, were excluded from the scope of the inquiry with regard to their using undue influence on voters in the elections of 1956 and 1960. Therefore, the paper owned by Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana, one of the original commissioners, is now excluded from that inquiry. Who gave that advice to the Governor-General? Was it the Hon. Minister of Justice?

Then, I come to clause (l). The original clause related to the conduct of newspapers since April, 1956, which would have included Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana's "Trine", but the new clause (l) relates to the conduct of newspapers since 1st January, 1957. Again, Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana is excluded. Is that correct? We should like to know who gave that information and who advised the Governor-General? Why did the Governor-General change these clauses from their original form? Those are questions that are disturbing the Opposition. Evidently it does not disturb the Government, but it disturbs the Opposition and the impartial public. Why on earth have you excluded the newspapers owned by Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana from the conduct of newspapers with regard to the elections of 1956?

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(ති.රු. වික්‍රමසූරිය)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

Is not the "Siyarata" also excluded by it?

ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මයා.

(ති.රු. ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

We did not ask you to exclude it.

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(ති.රු. වික්‍රමසූරිය)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

I am asking you.

ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මයා.

(ති.රු. ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

It is excluded, but we are not commissioners. Here is a commission one of whose commissioners' paper was included in the terms of reference, and is now being excluded from the scope of this inquiry. You had to do one of two things. You had either to exclude the commissioner, which was the request made in this House, or you had to exclude her newspaper; but, instead of doing the former, you excluded her newspaper.

Now let us see why that was done. There are reasons for this. We are not unaware of these, and I do not know whether the Government is aware of them, whether the Front Benchers are aware of them, or whether the backbenchers are aware of them. Why is this being done? We are aware both from private documents and from public documents, from what has happened since 1956, why it was necessary to exclude Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana's newspaper from the scope of this inquiry and why it was necessary to include Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana in the commissioners' panel.

Now, Sir, I have already referred to the terms of reference and I do not wish to go any further into them. I am sure hon. Members who are to speak from this side of the House will show that all newspapers are covered by the terms of reference, such as political newspapers and party papers. The party papers of the Opposition have the right to criticize the Government throughout its lifetime. All these matters come under the subject of investigation and we do not know what decisions the Press Commission will make and recommend. I am leaving that to be dealt with by other hon. Members of the Opposition.

Now I will come to the commissioners. I have already referred to Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana before

ප්‍රචන්දන පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

this, but I want to refer to certain other matters *vis-a-vis* Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana and Mr. and Mrs. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike. In May, 1953, Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike was keen to enter into a business alliance with Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana and her free press. For a long time Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike had known Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana and for a longer time Mrs. Bandaranaike had known Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana. For about one year this association continued—Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike's 'Sinhale' paper and Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana's 'Free Press' worked together under a sort of panel of directors.

Then on 11th February, 1954, Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana who was in charge of the publication, started writing a series of articles of a communist nature and Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike thought this was the last straw. He could not any further see his paper 'Sinhale' publishing communist literature because the communist papers have their own way of publishing literature about Communism. He thought, therefore, why should his paper publish communist literature, and they fell out. He not only objected to Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana publishing communist scripts in his paper but she was also prone to publish personal scandal which Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike did not want his paper to indulge in.

I will quote his actual words as given in evidence in the "Trine" case before a panel of three judges. He said "I do not want my paper to indulge in this scandal". He said it was the last straw, the publication of a communist type of articles in his paper, and he insisted that Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana should follow his own policy. She refused and they fell out.

There was a case against Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana for publishing a libellous statement on the Governor-General, Sir Oliver Goonetilleke, and it was heard before a Bench of three judges. Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike who was an erstwhile friend of Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana gave evidence for the prosecution.

ප්‍රචන්දන පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

He was summoned.

ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

Every witness is summoned. Surely, you know that as a proctor. He gave evidence for the prosecution. Mr. Pritt appeared for the defence and he severely cross-examined Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike and asked him why he did not know Sinhalese—the man who wanted Sinhalese in 24 hours could not read a document. In the course of evidence Mr. Pritt asked Mr. Bandaranaike, "When you invited Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana to join your press, it was like the spider and the fly?". Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike said that she was the spider. You will see this reported in the Ceylon "Daily News" of 19th November, 1954. I have got all the photostat copies with me and the originals are in the Library of the House which any hon. Member can see.

What is important, Sir, is the fact that Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana and Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike had fallen out. Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike said that he felt that the policy followed by this paper was of a communist nature and it was more or less the organ of the Communist Party. The last issue of the "Trine" of 11th February, 1954, had contained four articles which were of a communist nature. You will find this in the Ceylon "Daily News" of 17th November 1954. Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike added that he thought it was taken for granted when he joined the free press company, that the "Trine" would follow the policy of his party, but Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana was of the view that it should continue as an independent paper. He submitted that he expected that the policy and the political philosophy of the paper would be that of the S. L. F. P. The evidence continued for some days.

ප්‍රචන්දන පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

ප්‍රචන්දන පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

[පේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මයා.]

On another day Mr. Pritt at the end of the re-examination moved for permission to cross-examine the witness. He wished to cross-examine Mr. Bandaranaike on the issue of the "Sinhale" to show that he was opposed to Mrs. Gunawardhana.

Mr. Bandaranaike was shown two cheque counterfoils, one of them for Rs. 290 in favour of S. P. Amerasingham for feature articles in the "Trine", both cheques initialled by Mrs. Gunawardhana. Payment had been stopped on both cheques.

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(කෙළරාව අங்கත්තවර් ඉරුවර්)

(An hon. Member)

By whom?

පේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මයා.

(තිරු. ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

By the bank. This was on the 20th September.

"Mr. Pritt: When you invited her you were like the spider inviting the fly into the parlour to live amicably?"

Mr. Bandaranaike: She was a spider herself."

Then Mr. Bandaranaike said that he had known Mrs. Gunawardhana for some time. Mrs. Gunawardhana and his wife, the present Prime Minister, were original members of the Lanka Mahila Samitiya, and she had known Mrs. Bandaranaike for a long time. So, in 1954, the late Mr. Bandaranaike and Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana fell out.

What happened in the elections of 1956? The "Trine" conducted a campaign against Mr. Bandaranaike's party as well as other parties.

This is the editorial of the "Trine" of Thursday, April 19th, 1956, just after the elections:

"DETACHED ASSESSMENT"

The Premier's first statement that the number of portfolios would be reduced has already gone by the board in the face of pressure moves to which he succumbed with his fatal *penchant* for going back on his word.....

Two weeks ago we editorially requested that the new Premier would assign positions of responsibility only to

those of the highest integrity. But although his Cabinet and Junior Ministerships are filled with many more honest men than there were in the U.N.P. Cabinets, yet Mr. Bandaranaike has failed to live up to the expectations of the people who gave his party such tremendous *carte blanche* for building an honest new world..... As long as there are such men in positions of trust, we foretell that the downfall of the M. E. P. would be even quicker and more inglorious and ignominious than that of the power-drunk U. N. P. by virtue of the fact that an overwhelming mandate was given by trusting people to the M.E.P. to guide their destiny. One of the Premier's nominations to the Senate has justifiably evoked strong criticism, for it has firstly proved that anyone can buy anything from the M.E.P. Government as well, thus demonstrating invertebrate tendencies of the Premier, and consequently of his being unable to inspire in others the joy of giving a gift for its own sake, accepting no reward in return."

Then, on Thursday, May 10th, 1956, this is what appeared in the "Trine":

"The Premier seems to be retreating from the firm stand he proposed to take and which the country expected him to take..... This uneasiness is strengthened by the disconcerting news that one after another of discredited public servants, persons holding high positions of responsibility and specially marked public officers who violated all the fundamental and honourable ethics that underlie good Government specially during the elections are making a trek to the Premier's residence for the performance of 'pooja' and have obtained invariably, complete absolution with a pat on the back."

Then, this is what the "Trine" stated on Thursday, May 17th, 1956:

"CONSPIRACY OF A COTERIE THE GREAT PLAN"

Now the whole plan is clear. A certain Minister has whispered into the Premier's ear"

—I can guess who that Minister is—

"that a local revolution is round the corner and that it is of fundamental importance that an 'exceptionally strong man' should be in charge of the Police Force to teach our people the value of social democracy. The Premier has a fatal *penchant* (cleverly and ruthlessly exploited by others) for getting stampeded into funk situations instead of trusting in the sanity of our peace-loving people."

ප්‍රචන්දන් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

ප්‍රචන්දන් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

“Trine”—June 21, 1956 :

“PREMIER PROVES HIS PERMANENT
SECRETARY A LIAR: SO
TELEPHONES ARE TAPPED

What may be termed the fine art of his characteristic prevarication was broadcast by the Prime Minister at last Wednesday's 'Kiribath' almsgiving to the Press.

Asked by the Press whether he used the telephone tapping apparatus, being unable to say 'yes' or 'no' frankly, the Premier hedged about by saying: 'All I can say is that if any such step as tapping telephones should take place, it would be under the compulsion of the security of the State.....such action will cease if resorted to, as soon as the position of stress ceases.....'

Then it refers to the Minister of Defence and External Affairs :

“His chief lacks the backbone to say 'yes I do it' but indirectly says 'yes' and the Permanent Secretary has the brass to say 'he does not do it'.

We must condemn this highhanded act to the Premier as a violation of the law and his M.E.P. speeches which are daily proving to be mere election vote catching shiboleths.

Editorially we commented recently that the Police Department must be under another Minister and not under the Prime Minister who can resort to autocratic use of power. And we stand proved”.

So, Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana in her “Trine” during the elections of 1956 and soon after was a virulent critic, as I have shown from the extracts of this paper “Trine” of April 19, May 10, May 17, and so on, of Mr. Bandaranaike, and that is why in the amended terms of reference you are excluding Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana's newspaper from the subject of this inquiry because you do not wish to exclude her from the panel of commissioners.

Now I am trying to show why you do not want to exclude her from the panel of commissioners. I have shown why you have excluded her newspaper.

I have already given you a piece of Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana's history. I am sorry I have to do this. I do not think it is necessary that

this House and the country should be bothered by the private life of any person but she is not an ordinary person. She is a commissioner and she would be sitting in judgment on the future of the free press, of all papers—not only of monopolistic papers, party papers but all papers—and the way they conduct themselves *vis-a-vis* your Government, a democratic Government; and you are putting her in this position with this background which I am now going to relate to you.

She has two children now. At the expense of the Chinese Government they are being educated in China. One is Shanthini, who was married to the Hon. Minister of Industries, Mr. Maithripala Senanayake's nephew. She has left her child and husband behind and she is now in China. Her son, Mohansiri, is also in China being educated at the expense of the Chinese Government.

In 1962 she issued a cheque which bounced and the money was paid by the Chinese Government representative in Ceylon.

In August 1963 she attended the Ninth Conference on Nuclear Weapons in Hiroshima, Japan. All her expenses were paid by the Chinese Government.

She issued a cheque in 1962 which bounced because she had no funds in the bank.

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයො.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

For how much was that ?

ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මයො.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

I do not know. Immediately her debts were paid by a representative of the Chinese Government in Ceylon. She was also given the money for her income tax. If you go and look up the police files you will find all this.

புவன்பன் பரிணை கைமேசம்

வினாபுரீசை மை.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

You looked them up ?

சே. டார். பீயவர்தன மை.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

I have got the information. If they are wrong, I will withdraw them. I will withdraw them if you kindly refer up your police files and find that it is not correct that her cheque bounced and the money was paid by the Chinese Government and her income tax was paid by the Chinese Government.

In August 1963 she attended the Ninth Conference on Nuclear Weapons in Hiroshima, Japan. All her expenses were paid by the Chinese Government. In fact, in Hong Kong, the Chinese Government's agents gave her \$500.00 (Hong Kong) for use in Hong Kong and U.S. \$1,000.00 for use in Japan.

She was offered the Lenin Peace Prize by the Russian Government but she refused it at the instigation of the Chinese Government. That valuable prize was worth a lakh of rupees. That was in 1961.

In 1963 she visited Albania as a State guest. It was well known that Albania was a supporter of the Chinese position. She had gone for a conference in Moshi where she made an exhibition of herself by supporting China against India. Mr. Walpita the other commissioner also attended this conference.

Look at the list of countries she has visited since the General Election of 1960. A poor man who wants to go abroad even for health reasons, who wants to take his children across to India, is hemmed in by restrictions. Since July 1960 she has paid ten visits abroad. Where has she gone? These are the details of her trips abroad :

July, 1960—Meeting of Organizational Bureau, World Peace Council, Stockholm.

புவன்பன் பரிணை கைமேசம்

July, 1960—World Peace Council, Tokyo.

December, 1960—Women's Congress, Cairo.

April, 1961—Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee, Djakarta.

August, 1961—Conference on Nuclear Weapons in Hiroshima, Japan.

When she left Ceylon she had a ticket only for New Delhi. But once she went to India she was financed to go to the Hiroshima Conference.

July, 1962—Disarmament Congress, Moscow.

March, 1963—Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference, Moshi.

She went to this conference with Mr. Walpita.

July, 1963—Peking.

August, 1963—Conference on Nuclear Weapons, Japan.

September, 1963—Afro-Asian Solidarity Convention, Nicosia.

Here she expounded the "Chinese line".

Are these facts correct or not ?

வினாபுரீசை மை.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

Carry on.

சே. டார். பீயவர்தன மை.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

In the Court of Appeal, Sir, when the judge is convinced by an argument he usually says: "Carry on, carry on" !

In keeping with Exchange Control Regulations her travel expenses on most of these trips were provided from abroad, generally on cheques drawn on Hong Kong Banks by the host organizations. When hon. Members ask Questions with regard to the exchange granted to Mrs. Gunawardhana we are told of the paltry sums of £10 or £15. Her habit is to leave this country only with a ticket and somebody abroad

ප්‍රවෘත්ති පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

provides the spending money generally by means of cheques drawn on the Hong Kong Bank by the host organizations. Presumably spending money was also made available to her through foreign sources when no permits were granted locally.

Mrs. Gunawardhana has served as a one-man reception committee—

ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක මය. (දැදිගම)
(திரு. டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க—டெடி கம்)
(Mr. Dudley Senanayake—Dedigama)
One woman!

ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මය.
(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

—one-woman reception committee to visiting Chinese. Her varied activities made me think that she was a man. She has taken visiting Chinese round the Island and has on some occasions paid their hotel bills. She has also paid the bills for expenses in connection with the Afro-Asian Economic Seminar and the Afro-Asian Writers' Conference.

She is the author of at least four books which openly flaunt Chinese interpretations of current affairs. These are:

“Khrushchevism”.

“Whither India-China relations?”.

“Cuba”.

“Never Again Wills Japan”.

The last three named of these books have been sold by supporters of the “China Line” in Africa.

Mrs. Gunawardhana speaks Chinese fluently.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා
(டொக்டர் என். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)
No!

ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මය.
(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

Hon. Members are very unkind to her.

ප්‍රවෘත්ති පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

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

She ought to have been given Chinese citizenship.

ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මය.
(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

The whole world knows that she is a lobby in this country of the Chinese foreign policy. There are articles about this in the “Link” of October 28, 1962. I read some passages from another paper published on the 17th February, 1963, which showed that at Moshi she expounded the “Chinese Line” and as to how the Indian delegation left the conference, how she sought to send books surreptitiously to Russia and how they were taken into custody. So, the whole world knows that she is—I am not using the word in any bad way—an agent of the Chinese Government in this country, publishing books on their behalf, doing propaganda on their behalf, attending conferences on their behalf, visiting China at China's expense, educating her children at China's expense. In other words, only in costume possibly she is not a Chinese, but in every other way she is a Chinese!

It is this lady whom we have appointed as one of the commissioners.

Mr. Walpita is a man who follows her in her political and international thinking, who has attended one or two conferences with her and who is well known to hold the same political views.

ඩඩ්ලි. දහනායක මය.
(திரு. டப்ளியு. தகநாயக்க)
(Mr. W. Dahanayake)
Theja and her little lamb.

ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මය.
(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

As the hon. Member for Galle says: “Theja and her little lamb.”

ප්‍රචන්ද්‍රන් පරික්ෂණ කොමිෂම

ප්‍රචන්ද්‍රන් පරික්ෂණ කොමිෂම

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

How do you know ?

ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

I do not wish to take any more time. I would like the hon. Member for Avissawella (Mr. D. P. R. Gunawardena) to conclude his speech before I go. I am sure that the terms of reference have been amended to suit Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana's newspaper and keep it out of the terms of reference of this commission, so that it would not be subject to inquiry. I have shown that Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana is so pro-Chinese that it is dangerous to have such a person on this commission. I have shown that she was antagonistic to Mr. Bandaranaike before 1956 and soon after, in 1956, when he formed his Government. Therefore, this commission does not tally with your original conception of taking over or breaking the monopolistic press, with which we all agree. We do not say that Lake House should be taken over, or the "Times" should be taken over, but you can break the monopoly by giving help to other papers to rise up. We as a party welcome that new papers like "Davasa" and "Savasa" and "Sinhale", "Maubima" and "Siya Rata" are all able somehow to exist and put their views before the public.

We are against monopolies, whether it is of the press or of any other concern, but you are not seeking to do that. Instead, you have appointed a person who has absolutely dictatorial views, a propagandist of the Chinese foreign policy. Therefore, in our opinion, this commission, both the terms of reference as well as the commissioners—if we consider all those aspects—is mischievously conceived, ill-composed and, therefore, dangerous to the future of the democratic freedoms that we so much love.

ඩබ්ලිව්. දහනායක මයා.

(திரு. டப்ளியு. தகநாயக்க)

(Mr. W. Dahanayake)

විසින් සිර කරන ලදී.

අ. හා. 3.8

ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

(Mr. D. P. R. Gunawardena)

Sir, I propose to speak a few words on this Motion as I do not want to take very much time. Before I do that I wish to move the amendment to this Motion, to add immediately after the words "unhealthy monopolies":

"and states that its terms of reference disclose the fact that the Government is lacking in any desire to break the monopoly of the Press held by private capitalist concerns which is the real obstacle to the freedom of the Press in Ceylon, but instead aims at devising means to extend its control over all newspapers, thereby reducing still further even such freedom of the Press as exists in Ceylon at present."

We have always, since the progressive movement in this country, the socialist movement in this country started in the early 30s, fought for the freedom of association, speech and the press. But, of course, my conception of the freedom of the press is a little different from the conception of the hon. First Member for Colombo South, (Mr. J. R. Jayewardene). Under a system of this type, a system in which there are exploiting classes and exploited classes, you can never have complete freedom of the press because the press inevitably, invariably, becomes a monopoly ownership of newspapers, falling into the hands of big business.

I remember the time when the "Ceylonese", the forerunner of the "Ceylon Daily News", functioned as a newspaper which exercised what is known as the "freedom of the press", guiding public opinion properly and placing important facts before the country which enabled it to come to correct decisions and conclusions. The "Ceylonese" later came under the ownership of the Wijewardene family and took the

පුවත්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

name of "Ceylon Daily News", becoming part of the newspaper monopoly of Lake House—"Beira Gedera". From the time this happened it became a prop of big business and ceased to be a newspaper which gave a truthful account of what took place in the country and outside.

I do not need to go very far. You only have to open the pages of today's "Daily News" to get some idea of what I mean. As you know, a good many Members of this House spoke yesterday on the Vote of Condolence on the sad and untimely death of the former Member for Borella (Dr. W. D. de Silva), and I too spoke on that Motion. This is how the "Ceylon Daily News" reports my speech :

"Mr. Philip Gunawardena (M. E. P.—Avissawella) said that Dr. de Silva had a brilliant career at Ananda College and in the University. He passed out as a doctor but later had felt that he should make use of the medical profession to make money."

That is exactly the opposite of what I said. I said that he did *not* make use of his profession for making money, but the "Daily News" reports the very opposite of it. Daily this type of thing is being done by the monopoly press of this country.

ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

We also suffer from that type of thing.

ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

(Mr. D. P. R. Gunawardena)

But not to the extent that they do it to us. For instance, I know very well that even undelivered speeches of the hon. Leader of the Opposition are published in the "Daily News"; may be these are speeches that are delivered in his house!

ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක මයා.

(திரு. டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(Mr. Dudley Senanayake)

That is my complaint too.

පුවත්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

(Mr. D. P. R. Gunawardena)

In any case, I have listened to some of his speeches, but he never made the speeches that the newspapers have reported as having been made by him. [Interruption]. Of course, I am not blaming my Friend. Let us admit the fact that the Lake House press and the Times press are interested in defending vested interests, and that those who defend vested interests are given the fullest publicity by them.

This is nothing new. We said this in the old State Council when the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera), who was then Member for Ruwanwella, and myself were putting up a lone fight against the press—a twin fight rather than a lone fight—against this same monopolist concern, the Lake House Press. At that time when the Governor-General made his Speech in opening Parliament in 1960, we had two monopolistic groups of the press. Today we have three groups. At that time we had the "Lake House" Group and the "Times-Lanka Deepa" Group; but today we have also the "Dawasa" and the "Hawasa", owned by a man who has made money on the sale of books largely at the expense of small children who go to school—Gunasena. And I know that people who write books, the authors, do not get anything worthwhile. An author gets a hundred or two-hundred rupees for his manuscript, and Gunasena the publisher makes lakhs of rupees after the publication of that manuscript in book form.

I am sorry the Hon. Ministers are not here. They do not think it is worthwhile listening to speeches of hon. Members in this House. There is not a single Hon. Minister in the Front Benches today; we have a junior Minister and the new Whip.

During the Committee stage of the Appropriation Bill when we were discussing the votes under the Ministry of Defence and External Affairs

ප්‍රචන්දන පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

ප්‍රචන්දන පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

[ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන මයා.]

I asked several pointed questions from the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Defence and External Affairs. He is not here. I asked him whether he knew of a Mr. Dodd—

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය ඊ. එම්. ඩී. නාගනාදන්
(නල්ලූර්)

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

(Dr. E. M. V. Naganathan—Nallur)

Who? Mr. Dodge!

ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

(Mr. D. P. R. Gunawardena)

—Well, he has dodged now—Mr. Dodd, who was formerly in charge of the Commercial Section of Radio Ceylon, for whose dismissal I am told the hon. First Member for Colombo South (Mr. J. R. Jayewardene) was responsible. I am very glad. That is at least one instance where he has my approval of the action taken by him. Now Mr. Dodd lived in this country for a number of years without a T. R. P. He was given recently employment in the “Dawasa”. Mr. Dodd has very wide ramifications in the field of advertising. It is correct to say that he controls to a large extent a fairly large number of advertising firms. And you know that newspaper concerns do not depend for their income on the sale of the newspapers. It is largely the advertising that you find in the various pages of the newspapers that accounts for the enormous profits they make.

Mr. Dodd was appointed recently to a very high executive position in the “Dawasa”. And the sub-editor of the paper, who was virtually the editor—because everybody knows that the managing editor Mr. Dhana-pala cannot write in Sinhala and that all the important editorials were written by Mr. Piyal Wickremasinghe who was the sub-editor—in one of his articles in the newspaper wrote about the activities of certain *kallathonis* in this country, of men like Mr. Dodd, and within a few days he was called by the management of the

newspaper and asked to leave. He was asked either to apologize to Mr. Dodd or write another article repudiating what he had written earlier. Mr. Piyal Wickremasinghe was not ready to withdraw what he had said. He said “I have used facts which I can prove and I think the article is a very truthful article”. He was asked to leave. He is no longer on the editorial staff of the “Davasa”. The “Davasa” which was started only 2½ to 3 years ago has become one of the biggest businesses in this country today. Gunasena’s “Davasa” has become very important. There is no freedom of the press there. Journalists are not permitted to use facts. They have to write to please the bosses of the “Davasa” just as the scribblers at Lake House and at the “Times” have to please the bosses in those two places. We know, if we look over the past 20 years, how many people of intelligent views had to leave those newspaper offices because they were not ready to be stooges.

In a capitalist society of this type, if you permit the private ownership of newspapers, its development is inevitable. Of course, in a big country such as India or big countries of that type, you find such a large number of newspapers that one newspaper group counteracts the propaganda of other newspapers. But we in Ceylon, living in this small isle, where newspapers wield a tremendous influence, cannot continue to support the existence of monopolies of this type. Some control is necessary. We have to break these monopolies. But we do not want to take them over. When we move towards a socialist society, it is possible to take them over, and doubtless people who live during that time will see to that because there will be no private companies to run newspapers at that time. But, living as we do in a capitalist society, where you find exploiters, where you find large groups who own these concerns, I think it is necessary that the Government should take some steps to break these monopolies.

ප්‍රවත්තන් පරික්ෂණ කොමිෂම

ප්‍රවත්තන් පරික්ෂණ කොමිෂම

Speaking on the Address of Thanks to the Throne Speech in 1960, we expressed our views on this matter. I should like to read a passage, a short one, from the Debate on the 28th of August, 1960 :

“නව කාරණයක් පිළිබඳව—අපේ අතුරු යෝජනාවේ සඳහන් නොවූවත්—වචන දෙක තුනක් ප්‍රකාශ කිරීම මගේ යුතුකමක්. මමවත් මහජන එක්සත් පෙරමුණවත් කවදාවත් පත්‍රකාරයින්ගේ ආධාර පැතුටේ නැහැ. ලැබුවෙත් නැහැ. මා දේශ පාලන භූමියට අඩිය තැබූ දා සිට පත්‍රකාරයින් සමඟ සටන් කර තිබෙනවා. ඒ වාගේම පත්‍රවල ප්‍රහාරවලටත් මා ලක් වී තිබෙනවා, 1932 සිට. කිසි අවස්ථාවක අපි පත්‍රකාරයින් පස්සේ ගියේ නැහැ. ඔවුන්ට ආවැඩුවෙත් නැහැ. පත්‍රකාරයින්ට කරන්න පුළුවන් සියලුම අවහිරකම් සියලුම විරෝධකම් අපට කර තිබෙනවා. බේරේ ගෙදර පත්‍රත් ටයිම්ස් හා ලංකාදීම පත්‍රත් අපට නොයෙකුත් විරෝධකම් හා අවහිරකම් කර තිබෙනවා. නමුත් මට පිළිගන්න අමාරුයි, මේ පත්‍ර ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයේ අත් අඩංගුවට ගෙන රටේ සමාජවාදී වැඩක් කිරීමට පුළුවන්ය කියා. මේ ආණ්ඩුව සමාජවාදී ආණ්ඩුවක් නම් එයත් පිළිගන්නට මම කැමතියි. ආධාර කරන්නට කැමතියි. නමුත් මා පිළිගන්නේ නැහැ, මෙය සමාජවාදී ආණ්ඩුවක්ය කියා. මේක බනපති ආණ්ඩුවක් ය කියා මා ඉස්සෙල්ලා කියා සිටියා ඒ නිසා රදල බනපති ආණ්ඩුවකට රටේ පත්‍ර පළකිරීමේ නිදහස නැති කිරීමට බලතල පැවරීමට මම ලැස්ති නැති බව—මහජන එක්සත් පෙරමුණ ලැස්ති නැති බව—කියන්නට කැමතියි. විකට චිත්‍රයක් පළවෙව්ව පලියට අපි ඒක ගැන ඒ තරම් කේන්ත්‍රී වෙන් නට වුවමනා නැහැ. පිටරටින් ආ සඟරාවක් තමන් කියවන විට තමන් කැමති නැති වචන හතරක් පහක් ඒකේ පෙනුණු පලියට එය තහනම් කරන්නට වුවමනා නැහැ.” [නිල වාර්තාව, 1960 අගෝස්තු 23; කා. 39, නි. 176.]

We have never sought the assistance of the newspapers for our working class movement. We had always to fight from 1932 onwards on behalf of the socialistic movement, the progressive movement, in this country against every possible obstacle put forward by the capitalist press in Ceylon. I wish to read a small passage from the speech I made on 24th August 1938, HANSARD Volume 2, Column 2318 :

“Most Members are aware that the ‘Ceylon Daily News’, one of the most venal newspapers on the terrestrial globe, and its allied newspapers give daily lectures to the masses of this country on loyalty, on patriotism, on morality, and on altruism. Meanwhile, it is a secret to nobody that the altruism of the ‘Daily News’ itself is on the market at fixed international rates.

Sir, time was when that paper was a power in the land; time was when the ‘Daily News’ and its predecessor, the ‘Ceylonese’, moulded public opinion in this country; time was when it fearlessly exposed injustice and foul-play in even the highest places in the land; time was when the sheer literary brilliance of its editorials was an inspiration to even students of literature. But, Sir, that day has gone. Today the ‘Daily News’ stands a monument to the acquisitive instinct of its proprietors. There is no journalism at Lake House. There is only Big Business. Even the insipid and anaemic literary flowers that appear once a week on its blue pages are of a very infantile order. And, Sir, it is not only the staff, the editorial scribblers and others on this paper, but even eminent K. Cs, who in their spare hours become students of politics, who have begun to attack the Hon. Minister of Labour, Industry and Commerce . . .”—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 24th August 1938; Vol. 2, c. 2318].

Even an eminent K. C. has risen to greater eminence not only in the field of law which he practices but even in the field of politics and management of economic affairs. I do not want to say anything more than that because I have to leave the House to be present at a certain place at 4 o’clock.

Sir, it is necessary; we want a commission, but a proper commission. My own feeling is that this commission will not be able to do the work that it has been asked to do; it has been prevented from doing the work that it was asked to do. I have nothing against the Chairman of the Commission, Mr. K. D. de Silva, an ex-Supreme Court Judge, who is very competent. He was the Chairman of the Naval Commission; a readable report was published by him. I have not the slightest doubt that if there is a commission of one person consisting of Mr. K. D. de Silva, he will produce a worthwhile report. I certainly do not think that it was wise on the part of the Government to have included Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana as a member of this commission; because of her decided views you cannot expect impartiality from a person of that kind who has lent her name to the book on Khrushchevism. I do not know whether Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana

[ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන මය.]

is such a learned and eminent Marxist as to make pronouncements of that nature, on the philosophy, doctrine, principles and other things that guide the Soviet Union today. My own feeling is that after studying for 30 to 40 years we find it somewhat difficult to make pronouncements of the nature she makes in that book.

Mrs. Gunawardhana is a person who has taken the side of another power against the Soviet Union, and we all know that there is an ideological conflict going on between two powers. I do not think it was wise of the Government to have appointed her to the commission. I do not want to say anything more than that.

There is the Press Commission report of the United Kingdom in 1947 or 1949. It is a valuable report. There is also the Indian Press Commission Report in 1954. These reports give all the necessary facts about newspaper monopolies and how they operate.

It is necessary to safeguard the freedom of the press and to prevent the press from becoming the organ of vested interests, of big business; and it is the duty of the Government to probe fully into this with a view to breaking the monopoly that exists in this country. If the press is to be owned privately, it must not become a monopoly.

I have placed an amendment to the Motion before the House and I would ask all hon. Members who value freedom of association, freedom of speech and freedom of the press—I do not think they are only in the Opposition benches—to support it. I have no doubt that hon. Members would like to have a press that is really free and not controlled by big business interests, by big combines as it is in Ceylon today. That does not promote or create healthy public opinion. We have to break the monopoly of the press.

I do not support the present commission. I do not think it will do any good. But I am in favour of a

competent Commission which will go into this question impartially and arrive at its findings.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(டொக்டர் என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

විසින් ස්ථිර කරන ලදී.

අ. භා. 3.35

ඩබ්ලිව්. දහනායක මය.

(திரு. டப்ளியு. தகனாயக்க)

(Mr. W. Dahanayake)

There are three chief reasons why I am totally opposed to the Press Commission that has been given us. Firstly, the terms of reference of the Press Commission are incomplete, tainted and prejudiced. The omission of the period prior to the elections of 1956 from the scope of the inquiry is prejudicial. Reference has already been made to the exclusion of the "Trine" from the scope of the inquiry. Also the terms of reference do not contain even a mention of the freedom of the press.

In this connection it is illuminating to read the terms of reference of the Press Commission that was appointed in India in 1954. One of these terms reads as follows:

"The Press Commission shall enquire into the state of the Press in India, its present and future lines of development and shall in particular examine:

(vii) freedom of the press and repeal or amendment of laws not consonant with it."

Thus, it seems to me that this Press Commission cannot ensure for us in this country the continuity of the freedom of the press even as we have known it in the past.

Two hundred years ago, one of the best known fighters for the freedom of the press, Junius, wrote as follows:

"Let it be impressed upon your minds, let it be instilled into your children that the liberty of the press is the palladium of our civil, political and religious

ප්‍රචන්දන පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

ප්‍රචන්දන පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

I am afraid the Press Commission that has been appointed in this country will not assure for us that that palladium of our liberties will be preserved.

Secondly, the aim of this Government seems to me to be to create a stooge press for itself from now onwards.

When the Royal Commission on the Press in England asked the proprietor of the "Daily Express", Lord Beaverbrook, what his main interest as a newspaper proprietor was, he replied :

"I run my paper purely for the purpose of making propaganda and with no other motives".

The aim of this Government is very much similar to the aim of Lord Beaverbrook. What this Government hungers and thirsts after is power—financial power, social power, personal power and above all political power—and this Government seeks to achieve that aim through the press.

Thirdly, I oppose this Press Commission because it is quite plain that the Government has no desire whatsoever to hold an impartial inquiry. Two members of the commission are suspect and they have not been removed. In fact, it is with some pain of mind that I wish to refer in some detail to one member of the commission against whom I have nothing personal.

Only a few days ago, on Saturday, October 26, India's greatest weekly "The Blitz" carried very prominently its first page leader dealing with the Press Commission of Ceylon and the personality of one of the commissioners. Allow me to read that article to you.

This is the banner headline : "LET INDIA BEWARE OF THIS PETTICOAT AGENT OF PEKING!" The article reads as follows :
"BLITZ Exclusive.

Colombo.

Peking has not lost much time in degenerating from the glorious capital of the Chinese revolution into the world's most poisonous snakepit of Trotskyite international subversion.

Of the several foreign agents China has engaged for this ugly mission, the most notorious as indeed the most effective is Theja Gunawardhana, familiarly known in newspaper circles here as the "Mata Hari"—or "Mata Ugly"—of Ceylon.

Since the Chinese attack on India a year ago, this woman has acted as carrier of Chinese filth and slander against India and, particularly, Prime Minister Nehru, from Peking to the farthest corners of Asia and Africa. And yet, strangely enough, she is able to make the boastful claim that she has free access whenever she wants to carry Chinese sedition into India itself.

In fact, it is well known that on the way back from her last visit abroad on an anti-Nehru, anti-India mission on behalf of China, in September, she broke journey in Bombay and spent a night there under her maiden name of T. PIYADASA. How she got there and for what purpose and where she stayed are mysterious for the India Intelligence to uncover : for India has no more vicious enemy than Theja Gunawardhana.

Beginning her career as a mediocre journalist, Theja won the sympathy of the late Solomon Bandaranaike, former Prime Minister of Ceylon, who allowed her to contribute some articles to one of the newspapers published by him. She used this opportunity to earn publicity for herself and the sympathy of the present Government.

PETTICOAT OF PEKING PINDARIS

However, after Bandaranaike's death by assassination, instead of serving the noble cause of peace for which the late Premier stood, she decided to become a paid agent of Mao's China.

By hook or by crook, she wangled trips abroad as a delegate from Ceylon and took part in international forums at Moshi, Hiroshima and Nicosia, punctuated by regular visits to Peking.

Misusing the trust reposed in her by different organizations which sent her abroad, and disregarding instructions given to her, she started toeing the Peking line on almost every issue and hit the headlines in the foreign press in connection with her scandalous and slanderous activities at these international forums.

Owing to the obvious tone of her public statements and writings, the mask was torn off her ugly face, and Theja stood exposed as a stooge of the Peking pindaris.

Her championng of the Peking thugs and her numerous trips to the Chinese capital, have paid her rich dividends.

ප්‍රචන්දන පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

ප්‍රචන්දන පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

[ඛනිජ. දහනායක මයා.]

Two of her children are being educated in China under what is euphemistically called Chinese scholarships. On the pretext of meeting her children, she has been allowed to make numerous trips to Peking.

FORTUNE FROM TREACHERY

These trips, as well as her mission abroad, are paid for by China. When in China, she is given free medical treatment by some of the most eminent Chinese doctors. Not only this, but today Theja who was a person of no means only a few years ago, seems to be in possession of considerable sums of money. She has built for herself a costly modern house here. She owns book shops and printing presses. With the help of these presses and the book shops she has been able to churn out pro-Peking propaganda. In defiance of the express will of the people of Ceylon and disregarding the wishes of the masses of the Asian nations, she savagely attacked the recent Nuclear Test Ban Treaty to which the Ceylonese Government is one of the signatories.

Through numerous articles and booklets, mostly printed in her own press and published by her book shops, she launched vicious attacks on India and Prime Minister Nehru in an attempt to undermine the goodwill and friendly relations existing between India and this country.

She has also published some pamphlets attacking the Soviet Union. Prime Ministers Nehru and Krushchev seem to be the twin targets of her poisoned pen. Obviously she is piping the tune of her Peking paymasters.

'Khrushchevism', one of her recently published books, was dedicated to 'the struggle of the great Soviet people' in the following crude words :

'This book is dedicated to the struggle of the great Soviet people who are fighting bravely that their leadership will not turn the fruits of their revolution into dead sea fruit, by turning towards the marsh, to lead humanity out of which, they pioneered the first victory of socialism with sacrifice and heroism.'

NEHRU ATTACKED A LA CHINA

She has attacked Prime Minister Nehru and the friendly neighbour of India in the same language of Mao and Chou :

'The Nehru Government incarcerated nearly 1,000 members of the Communist Party all over India. Their grave crime was not even an act, by only of remaining at large which was prejudicial to the defence of India! And this after China had unilaterally called a cease-fire and appealed for negotiations after the unprovoked acts of Indian border aggression.'

CATHOLIC CONVENT TO CHINESE COMMUNISM

There is no possible explanation for these uncalled for attacks on Ceylon's friends and neighbours except that she has to justify her existence to her paymasters in Peking.

Apart from this, there is another reason which can explain to a certain degree only, her unpatriotic and abnormal conduct. Mrs. Gunawardhana is an acute case of schizophrenia (split personality). It is an irony of fate that a woman who champions the Chinese brand of Communism has to rush and lock herself in a Catholic convent here during attacks of this disease.

ON COMMISSION OF PRESS AFFAIRS

The indignation and resentment of the Ceylon public as well as Parliament touched a high watermark when recently she was appointed one of the members of the Commission of Press Affairs, thanks to the recommendation of another Chinese paid agent, late Minister of Justice, Mr. A. B. Perera, who insisted upon her appointment.

Mr. Perera, one need not be reminded, was Ceylon's Ambassador to Peking, who created a diplomatic uproar and almost brought about a rift in Indo-Ceylon relations a couple of months back by his mischievous statement that the Indian reports of Chinese troops concentrations on the Sino-Indian border were 'a big lie'. This was immediately nailed both by the Indian Prime Minister and the vigilant Indian press, as well as Ceylon's papers like the 'Ceylon Observer', which called upon Mr. Perera to 'plead guilty on both the counts of highly unprofessional and undiplomatic conduct.'

LET INDIA BEWARE !

The purpose of the Commission is to investigate the ownership, structure and power control in Ceylon's Fourth Estate. People here have expressed grave doubts as to how the Commission, which includes a Chinese agent and foreign-subsidized press owner in the person of Mrs. Gunawardhana, would be able to give a fair and accurate report on the working of the Press in Ceylon.

Let India beware of this notorious Peking petticoat agent !"

So much, Mr. Speaker, for this dragon lady of Ceylon. I would like to point out that quite apart from the reasons that I have stated, there are other weightier reasons which prompt us on this occasion to stand up for the freedom of the press. The development of the press is a part of the history of our national

புலவர் பரிணாம காலம்

development, and you will forgive me if I, on this occasion, very briefly go into the history of our national development in so far as the press is concerned.

The earliest efforts in Ceylon of a Sinhalese newspaper were in Galle where the Sinhalese newspaper "Kankaloka" was printed in 1864. The late Ven. Hikkaduwe Sri Suman-gala Nayaka Thero who was in Galle from 1858 to 1870 took a leading part in the publication of this paper. He was also the founder of the Vidyodaya Privena in 1873. The Vidyodaya Privena along with the Vidyalandara Privena have played a great and significant part in the national and cultural renaissance in Lanka. The English press in Ceylon was led 130 years ago by the "Observer". It was edited by such lovers of freedom as the Fergusons, and it always proved itself a mighty sword in the hands of those who fought old and new tyrannies. It always played a prominent part on public questions of the day.

What may be termed a modern newspaper in Ceylon arose with the ascendancy of D. R. Wijewardena in our newspaper world. He came into the scene over the riots of 1915. He was a born organizer. His press became a moulder of public opinion in Ceylon between 1920 and 1948 when we attained independence. The "Daily News" and the "Dinamina" played a no mean part in the achievement of our freedom, and the father of our freedom, the late Mr. D. S. Senanayake, would not have achieved the success and fame he did without the assistance of the Wijewardene press. That briefly is the part the newspapers have played in the history of Ceylon's national development.

வினாக்கள் கேள்வி.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

What is the part they played when you were Prime Minister?

புலவர் பரிணாம காலம்

வினாக்கள் கேள்வி.

(திரு. டப்ளியு. தகராசுக்க)

(Mr. W. Dahanayake)

You ought to know best because I am the man who gave you a long hand and pulled you up when I was Prime Minister.

Nearly 200 years ago Thomas Jefferson expressed what he believed to be the fundamental truth in the democratic principle in the following words :

"The basis of our Government being the opinion of the people, our very first objective should be to keep that opinion right; and were it left to me to decide whether we should have a Government without newspapers or newspapers without a Government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter."

How many newspapers do we have in Ceylon to keep our opinion right? I think the development of our newspapers has not been adequate in terms of our growing population and our varying political, economic and social interests. A comparison with other countries may not be out of place. The Indian Press Commission gave the figures. In the U. S. A. in 1949, they had 12 newspapers for every million of population; in the U. K., where the population is distributed over a much more complicated and compact area, there were 3 newspapers for every million of population; in Ceylon, if we take the newspapers published in all languages, we have about one newspaper for every million of population. But if we reckon only the Sinhala language the number of newspapers we have is most inadequate for our readers. In order to bring the total number of newspapers to an adequate figure and in order to tap areas and classes of readership not reached now it is essential that more newspapers should be started. But there are major problems that face us. We have the same problems as India had ten years ago. And the Indian Press Commission of 1954 listed the following four difficulties of starting new newspapers :

- [ඔබ්බව. දහනායක මයා.]
- (1) Heavy initial capital expenditure required for starting a newspaper.
 - (2) Generally inadequate supply of finances.
 - (3) Competition from existing papers.
 - (4) Low purchasing power of the people.

Thus it should be the duty of the Press Commission to report as to how it would be possible to start more newspapers rather than to curb or control the existing ones. That is the problem that we in Ceylon have to face.

The part that the press should play in the life of a nation was described very eloquently by C. P. Scott, one of the greatest journalists of England. Scott edited the "Guardian" from 1872 to 1929. In a famous leading article on the "Guardian Centenary" in May 1921, Scott wrote :

"The newspaper's primary office is the gathering of news. At the peril of its soul it must see that the supply is not tainted ; neither in what it gives nor in what it does not give nor in the matter of presentation must the unclouded face of truth suffer wrong. Comment is free but facts are sacred."

These are words that will be heard across the centuries—"The unclouded face of truth must not suffer wrong. Comment is free but facts are sacred".

Surely these cannot be achieved if the press is to be curbed, controlled or fettered ? The Royal Commission on the Press of 1947-1949, expressed the view very strongly that free enterprise in the production of newspapers is a prerequisite of a free press. I would like to read that paragraph of the Royal Commission on the Press, and with that I shall conclude my speech. Paragraph 578 reads as follows :

"To forbid any individual or group of individuals to publish a newspaper would, in our view, be an unwarrantable interference with the liberty of the

individual and the freedom of the Press ; and we see no reason to think that newspapers attached to the interests of political parties, trade unions, or other organizations would be better newspapers, or have greater regard for truth and fairness, than newspapers published by private undertakings. In our view free enterprise in the production of newspapers is a pre-requisite of a free Press, and free enterprise will generally mean commercially profitable enterprise in the case of newspapers of any considerable size and circulation."

I do not want to take any further time of the House but all that I wish to say in conclusion is that not one of the aims that a proper commission should have in view can be achieved by the present Press Commission.

අ. හා. 4

පී. ආර්. රත්නායක මයා. (මාවනැල්ල)
(திரு. பி. ஆர். ரத்னாயக்க—மாவனல்லை)
(Mr. P. R. Ratnayake—Mawanella)

ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, ප්‍රචන්දන පත්‍ර පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම සම්බන්ධයෙන් ඇති වූ මේ විවාදයට සහභාගි වෙමින් මගේ අදහස් සලසායක් ප්‍රවූයින් ඉදිරිපත් කිරීමට මේ අවස්ථාවේ මා අදහස් කරන්නවා.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය නාගනාතන්
(டொக்டர் நாகநாதன்)
(Dr. Naganathan)

Are you expressing your views or the views of the Government ?

පී. ආර්. රත්නායක මයා.
(திரு. பி. ஆர். ரத்னாயக்க)
(Mr. P. R. Patnayake)

ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, මා ප්‍රකාශ කරන්න බලාපොරොත්තු වෙන්නේ මගේ අදහස් බව නල්දුර්ගි ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාගේ දැන ගැනීම පිණිස කියන්න කැමතියි. ප්‍රචන්දන පත්‍ර පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම ගැන ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙන යෝජනාව පිළිබඳව දකුණු කොළඹ පළමුවන ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මයා.) විසින් ඒ වගේම අතුරු යෝජනාව පිළිබඳව අවිස්සා වේල්ලේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන මයා.) විසින් කරන්නට යෙදුණු කථාවලට ඇහුම්කන් දෙන්න මට ප්‍රචන්දන

ප්‍රචන්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

ප්‍රචන්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

කථානායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர்)

(Mr. Speaker)

කරුණා කර නිශ්ශබ්ද වන්න. කාරක සභා නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමා දැන් මූලාසනය ගන්නවා ඇති.

අනතුරුව කථානායකතුමා මූලාසනයෙන් ඉවත් වූයෙන්, කාරක සභා නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමා මූලාසනාරූප විය

පී. ආර්. රත්නායක මයා.

(திரு. பி. ஆர். ரத்னாயக்க)

(Mr. P. R. Ratnayake)

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමනි, ඒ කථා දෙකගැන කල්පනා කර බැලූ මට තේරුම් ගියේ දකුණු කොළඹ පළමුවන ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා කළ කථාවට නිසි පිළිතුරු අවිස්සා වේල්ලේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා කළ කථාවෙන් පැහැදිලි ලෙස ලැබුණාය කියන එකයි. අවිස්සාවේල්ලේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා එතුමගේ කථාව කරද්දී දකුණු කොළඹ පළමුවන ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා කළ කථාව ගැන සඳහන් කළ කොටස බොහොම ආසාවෙන් මා අහගෙන හිටිය. එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂය මේ ප්‍රචන්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම ගැන රටේ ගෙන යන ප්‍රචාරක ක්‍රියා මාර්ගයන් පිළිබඳව පත්‍රවලින් අනාවරණය කරන ලද ඇතැම් කොටස් දුටු මා, එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂය වෙනුවෙන් දකුණු කොළඹ පළමුවන ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා මෙහිදී කථා කරන විට අපට පැහැදිලි විස්තරයක් ලැබේය යන දැඩි විශ්වාසය ඇතිව එතුමගේ කථාවට ඇහුම්කන් දුන්නේ විශාල උනන්දුවකින්. එහෙත් මා තුළ තිබුණු ඒ බලාපොරොත්තුව සුතේ සුන්වෙලා ගිය බවයි කියන්න තිබෙන්නේ. මා කල්පනා කරන හැටියට නම් දකුණු කොළඹ පළමුවන ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය තුළදී කළ කථාවලින් ඉතාම දියුරු කථාව තමයි එතුමා අද කළේ. එතුමගේ කථාව ගැන මට සඳහන් කරන්න තිබෙන්නේ ඒ ආකාරයටයි. වෙනත් විධියකින් කියතොත් කිසිම වටිනාකමක් නැති, කිසිම වැදගැම්මක් නැති, කිසිම හරයක් නැති කථාවක් හැටියටයි ඒ කථාව හඳුන්වා දෙන්න තිබෙන්නේ. ලංකාණ්ඩුවේ ගැසට් නිවේදනයක මාර්ගයෙන් ප්‍රචන්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂමක් පත් කරන්න යෙදුනේ උචිත පරිදි පරීක්ෂණ පවත්වා, කරුණු සොයා

බලා, ඉදිරිපත් කරනු ලබන යම්කිසි වාතීවක් ලබා ගැනීමේ බලාපොරොත්තුවෙනුයි. ගැසට් නිවේදනයේ සඳහන් එකම කරුණක් පිළිබඳවත් එතුමගේ කථාවෙහි එතුමා සඳහන් කළේ නැහැ. ඒ වෙනුවට එතුමා මොකක්ද කළේ? දකුණු කොළඹ පළමුවන ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා කළේ තේජා ගුණවර්ධන මහත්මිය පිළිබඳව—එතුමියගේ පෞද්ගලික චරිතය පිළිබඳව—විවේචනයක් කිරීම පමණයි. ඊට වඩා බොහොම වෙනස් ආකාරයටයි අවිස්සාවේල්ලේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා කථා කළේ. එතුමා බොහොම හොඳට කරුණු පැහැදිලි කර දුන්නා. එතුමා ප්‍රචන්පත් කොමිෂමට විරුද්ධ නැහැ. මේ රටේ තිබෙන ප්‍රචාරක පත්‍ර ඒකාධිකාරය බිඳ දැමීම සාධාරණ දෙයක්ය යන්න එතුමා පිළිගන්න බව එතුමගේ කථාවෙන් පැහැදිලි ලෙස පෙන්වා දුන්නා. මේ කොමිෂන් සභාවෙන් එම පරමාර්ථය ඉෂ්ට වන්නේ නැත යන හැඟීමක් එතුමා තුළ තිබෙන බවත් එතුමා කියා සිටියා. කොමිෂන් සභාව ගැන තමන් දරණ මතය මේ ගරු සභාවෙහි එතුමා සඳහන් කළා. එහෙත් දකුණු කොළඹ පළමුවන ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම එතුමගේ කථාවෙන් උත්සාහ කළේ එම පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂන් සභාව මගින් ඉදිරිපත් කරනු ලබන, එහෙම නැත්නම් ඉදිරිපත් කරනු ලබිය හැකි, වාර්තාව ගැන කියන්නයි. ප්‍රචන්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂන් සභාව සාකච්ඡා කර යම්කිසි වාර්තාවක් ගරුතර අමුණකාරකුමා වෙත ඉදිරිපත් කරනවා ඇති. එසේ ඉදිරිපත් කරනු ලබන වාර්තාව මේ විධියේ එකක් වනු ඇත යන්නයි දකුණු කොළඹ පළමුවන ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා එතුමගේ කථාවෙහි සඳහන් කළේ.

ප්‍රචන්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම ගැන අපට පැහැදිලිව වාද කිරීමටත්, ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් තීරණයක් ගැනීමටත් ප්‍රථමත් වන්නේ ඒ කොමිෂන් සභාවේ වාර්තාව ඉදිරිපත් කළාට පසුවයි. මෙයින් ප්‍රචාරක පත්‍ර ඒකාධිකාරය නැති වෙනවාද, මෙයින් ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදයට හානියක් නැත්නම් පළද්දක් ඇති වෙනවාද, මෙයින් මහජන නිදහසට බාධාවක් ඇති වෙනවාද යනාදී කරුණු ගැන අපට සාකච්ඡා කරන්න ප්‍රථමත්කමක් ලැබෙන්නේ ඒ කොමිෂන් සභාවේ වාර්තාව ඉදිරිපත් වුණායින් පසුවයි.

ප්‍රචන්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

ප්‍රචන්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

[පී. ආර්. රත්නායක මයා.]

දකුණු කොළඹ පළමුවැනි මන්ත්‍රීතුමා දැන් කථා කරමින් ඉදිරිපත් කළේ එක් සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ අදහසයි. එතුමා බෙහෙස් දුරට උත්සාහ කළේ මේ ප්‍රචන්පත් කොමිෂමට පත් වී සිටින පුද්ගලයින් පිළිබඳව විවේචනය කිරීමටයි. එතුමන්ලාගේ පක්ෂය මේ රටේ ප්‍රචාන්ති පත්‍ර එකාධිකාරය නැති කිරීමට පක්ෂය කියා එතුමා පළමුවෙන්ම කීවා. නමුත් එතුමන්ලා මේ එකාධිකාරය නැති කරන ක්‍රමයක් ගැන කියන්නේ නැහැ. කවින් පක්ෂය කියා කීව් වත් ක්‍රියාවෙන් අවහිර කරන බව එයින් අපට පැහැදිලිව පෙනෙනවා. ඒ නිසා රැස් වීම් තබා ප්‍රචාරය කරමින් එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂය මෙවැනි කොමිෂන් සභාවක් සම්බන්ධයෙන් චෝදනා ඉදිරිපත් කිරීම පුදුමයක් නොවෙයි. එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයය කියා එකක් අද මේ රටේ තිබෙනවා නම් තිබෙන්නේ ඒ මේ එකාධිකාරී ප්‍රචාන්ති පත්‍ර නිසා බව මට කියන්නට පුළුවන්. මේ රටේ ප්‍රචාන්ති පත්‍ර එකාධිකාරය නැති කිරීමෙන් එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂය ඒ ගෙන යන අධිරාජ්‍යවාදී, ධනපති රදළ ක්‍රමය තව දුරටත් මේ රටේ ගෙන යන්නට බැරි බව එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂය දන්නවා. අන්න ඒ නිසා තමයි මේ අවසථාවේදී එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂය නොයෙක් විධියෙන් මේ රටේ මහජනතාව නොමග යවා, මහජන මතය වෙනත් අතකට යොමු කිරීමට උත්සාහ කරන්නේ.

ඒවගේම දකුණු කොළඹ පළමුවැනි ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා ප්‍රචන්පත් කොමිෂමට පත් කර සිටින තේජා ගුණවර්ධන මහත්මිය ගැන දීර්ඝ ලෙස විවේචනය කළා. ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම මට නම් තේජා ගුණවර්ධන මහත්මියගේ පෞද්ගලික චරිතය ගැන, පෞද්ගලික ජීවිතය ගැන කිසිම දැනීමක් නැහැ. මේ ඉදිරිපත් කළ කරුණු ඇත්තද කියා මා දන්නේ නැහැ. දකුණු කොළඹ පළමුවැනි ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා දීර්ඝ වශයෙන් යම් යම් වාර්තා ඉදිරිපත් කළා. බණ්ඩාර නායක අගමැතිතුමා යම් යම් අවස්ථාවලදී තේජා ගුණවර්ධන මහත්මිය විවේචනය කර තිබෙනවාය, චිත්‍ර රටේ මුදලින් ඒ මහත්මිය චිත්‍රයේ සංචාරය කළාය යනාදී නොයෙක් චෝදනා අපට අසන්නට ලැබුණා. යම් යම් අවස්ථාවලදී යම් යම් ප්‍රශ්න පිළිබඳව අප කා අතරත් නොයෙක් මත හේද

තිබෙනවා. කෙනෙකුගේ පෞද්ගලික කථාවක් නිසා, පෞද්ගලික ප්‍රශ්නයක් නිසා, යම් යම් කරුණු අහක දමන්නට පුළුවන් කමක් නැති බව මා දකුණු කොළඹ පළමුවැනි ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාට මතක් කරන්නට සතුටුයි. කණ්ඩායමකට යම් වැඩක් භාර දී තිබෙනවා. ඒ භාර දුන් වැඩය, නැත්නම් කායඝීය, ඒ කණ්ඩායම විසින් හරියාකාර ඉෂ්ට කරනවාද? නැත්නම්, ඒ අය ඉදිරිපත් කරන වැඩ පිළිවෙළ ගැනයි අප සාකච්ඡා කළයුතුව තිබෙන්නේ. එකී හේතු නිසාම මේ කොමිෂන් සභාවෙන් කිසිම සේවයක් නොවෙනවාය කියා දකුණු කොළඹ පළමුවැනි ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා කියනවා නම් මා එතුමාගෙන් ප්‍රශ්නයක් අසන්නට කැමතියි. අප ප්‍රචාන්ති පත්‍රවලින් දැක්කා, එතුමාටත් මතක ඇති, එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ හිටපු නායක කොතලාවල මහත්මිය එක්තරා අවස්ථාවක දකුණු කොළඹ පළමුවැනි මන්ත්‍රීතුමාට විරුද්ධව පොතක් මුද්‍රණය කළා. ඒ පොතෙන් දකුණු කොළඹ පළමුවැනි ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා 'තණ යට සිටින පොළගෙකු' හැටියට හඳුන්වාදී තිබුණා. එහෙම නම් කොතලාවල මහත්මියගේ නායකත්වය යටතේ ඊට පසුව ඇතිවූ එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ ආණ්ඩුවේ සභානායක හැටියට දකුණු කොළඹ පළමුවන ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා කටයුතු කළේ කෙසේද කියා මා ප්‍රශ්න කරන්නට සතුටුයි. එපමණක් නොවෙයි, අපට හොඳට මතකයි, 1956 මහ මැතිවරණ අවස්ථාවේදී එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ දැන් සිටින නායකයා ඒ කාලයේ එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයට විරුද්ධව වැඩ කළ බව. ප්‍රසිද්ධ වේදිකාවලදී නූතන් නොයෙකුත් තැන්වලදී එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ නායකතුමාත් දකුණු කොළඹ පළමුවන ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාත් අතර මතභේද ඇති වී තිබෙනවා. නමුත් එම දෙපොළ අදත් ඉතා කිට්ටුවෙන් තමන්ගේ දේශපාලන කටයුතු කරගෙන යනවා. පුද්ගලික මතභේද නිසා යම් කටයුත්තක් සම්බන්ධයෙන් තිබෙන වගකීම හරියාකාර ඉටු කරන්න බැරි වේය යන අදහස අපට පිළිගන්න බැහැ.

තේජා ගුණවර්ධන මහත්මිය පිළිබඳව කී කරුණු ඇත්තද නැත්තද කියන්න මා දන්නේ නැහැ. මට පෙනෙන හැටියට ප්‍රචාන්ති පත්‍ර පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂන් සභාව තියම ලෙස යම් වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් ඇති කර

ප්‍රචන්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

ප්‍රචන්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

නව නම් ඒ මගින් අප රටට විශාල ප්‍රයෝජනයක් ඇති වෙන බව කියන්න පුළුවනි. විශේෂයෙන් 1960 මහ මැතිවරණය කාලයේදීත් අපේ රටේ මහජනතාව මෙවැන් නක් බලාපොරොත්තු වුණා. ආණ්ඩු පක්ෂයේ මන්ත්‍රීවරයකු වශයෙන් මා ආණ්ඩුවට චෝදනා කරනවා, මෙවැනි වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් ඉදිරිපත් කරන්න මෙතෙක් ප්‍රමාද කිරීම ගැන. මෙම කාරණය මෙරට මහජනයා එකහෙළා අනුමත කරන දෙයක් බව කියන්න කැමතියි. අපට 1960 ජූලි මැතිවරණය ගැන මතකයි. එදා සෑම රැස් විමකදීම වාගේ ප්‍රකාශ කළා මේ රටේ ප්‍රචාන්ති පත්‍ර ඒකාධිකාරය නැති කරන වාය කියා. මේ රටේ වැඩි දෙනාගේ මතය වන්නේ, මෙරට තිබෙන ප්‍රචාන්ති පත්‍ර ඒකාධිකාරය ඉතා ඉක්මණින් අවසන් කළ යුතුය යන්නයි. එම මතය සනාථ කිරීමේදී, එම අදහස සාර්ථක කිරීමේදී, යම් යම් දුර්වලකම් ඇති වී තිබෙනවා නම් ඒවා නිසා මීට සහයෝගය නොදී සිටීම වැරදියි. එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂය කියන හැම දේම මා පිළිගන්නේ නැහැ. ඊට පසුව කතා කළ අවිස්සාවේල්ලේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (සී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන මයා.) ගාල්ලේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ඩබ්ලිව්. දහනායක මයා.) එහෙම සඳහන් කළා ප්‍රචාන්ති පත්‍ර ඒකාධිකාරය නැති කළ යුතුය යන්න සම්පූර්ණ වශයෙන් අනුමත කරනවාය; නමුත් මෙම කොමිෂන් සභාවට එය කරන්න පුළුවන් වෙයිද යන්න සැකයක් වී තිබෙනවාය යනාදී පිළිවෙළට. එම පුද්ගලයන්ට මෙය කරන්න පුළුවන් වෙයිද යන්න ගැන එතුමන්ලා සැක කළා. ඒ විධියේ සුළු දුර්වලකම් තිබෙනවා නම්—මේ රටේ ප්‍රචාන්ති පත්‍ර ඒකාධිකාරය නැති කිරීමේ මාර්ගයෙහි ඒ විධියේ යම් යම් සුළු දුර්වලකම් තිබෙනවා නම්—ඒවා නිසාම මේ කරන්න බලාපොරොත්තු වන කායභීය සාර්ථක කරගන්න ආධාර නොදී අසින්ට් සිටීම යුතුකමක් කියලා මා සිතන්නේ නැහැ. මෙවැනි අවස්ථාවක ඊට ආධාර දීමයි, ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම ඒ අයගේ යුතු කම වන්නේ.

මේ ප්‍රචාන්ති පත්‍ර ඒකාධිකාරය නැති කළ යුත්තේ කුමන කුමන හේතූන් නිසාද යන්න ගැන මීට ඉහත රාජාසන කථා විවාද වලදීත් වෙනත් නොයෙකුත් අවස්ථාවලදීත් අපි සාකච්ඡා කර තිබෙනවා. ප්‍රචාන්ති

පත්‍ර ඒකාධිකාරය නැති කිරීමට විරුද්ධව විශේෂයෙන්ම කතා කරන්නේ ධනපති පත්තියයි. ඒ අය සෑම රැස්වීමකදීම ප්‍රකාශ කරන්නේ මහජන නිදහස, ඒ කියන්නේ කියවීමේ නිදහස, ලිවීමේ නිදහස එහෙම නැති කරන්න යනවය කියලයි. විශේෂයෙන් එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂය එසේ චෝදනා කරනවා. මින් පසුව මේ සම්බන්ධව එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයෙන් කතා කරන්න සිටින අයගෙන් හෝ මා පුශ්න කරන්න කැමතියි, බේරෙගෙදර පත්‍රවලින් හරි, ටයිම්ස් පත්‍රවලින් හරි, වෙනත් පත්‍රවලින් හරි මේ රටේ මහජනතාවගේ නිදහස නිසියාකාර ආරක්ෂා කර දෙනවාද, නැති නම් මහජනතාවගේ නිදහසට බාධා සිදු වන විධියට, මහජන සිතූම් පැතූම් නොමග යවන විධියට, මේ රටේ දියුණුව කඩාකප්පල් වී යන විධියට කටයුතු සැලසී තිබෙනවාද යන්න. එමෙන්ම මේ රටේ ඇති වූ ජාතික පුශ්නවලදී මේ රටේ තිබෙන එකම ප්‍රචාන්ති පත්‍රයක් වත් මේ රටේ මහජනතාවගේ අදහස් උදහස් අනුව කටයුතු කර තිබෙනවාද කියා ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදය ගැන ලොකුවට කථා කරන එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයෙන් අහන්නට කැමතියි.

නොයෙකුත් අවස්ථාවලදී මේ රටේ ප්‍රචාන්ති පත්‍ර ප්‍රකාශ කළ අදහස් සොයා ගැනීමට උදේ සිට මා මහන්සි ගන්නා. ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමනි, අවාසනාවකට වගේ මට ඒවා සොයා ගන්නට බැරි වුණා. එමෙන්ම හැන්සාඩ් එකක් සොයා ගන්නත් වුවමනා වුණා; එයත් වෙනත් මන්ත්‍රීවරයකු විසින් ලබා ගෙන ඇති නිසා මට ලබා ගන්නට බැරි වුණා. මට මතක හැටියට අපේ රටේ ප්‍රථමයෙන්ම නිදහස් අධ්‍යාපන ක්‍රමයක් ඇති වූ අවස්ථාවේදී මේ රටේ තිබුණු ප්‍රචාන්ති පත්‍ර ලිපි පළ කළේ එයට විරුද්ධවයි. එමෙන්ම, එයට විරුද්ධව කතෘ වාක්‍ය පවා පළ කළා. එමෙන්ම සිංහලය රාජ්‍ය භාෂාව කිරීමේ පුශ්නය ඇති වූ අවස්ථාවේදීත් මේ රටේ ප්‍රචාන්ති පත්‍ර සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම එයට විරුද්ධව කටයුතු කළා. එමෙන්ම, සමාජවාදී වැඩ පිළිවෙළවල් ඇතිවූ අවස්ථාවලදී ඒවාට විරුද්ධව “ලේක් හවුස්” ප්‍රචාන්ති පත්‍රවල කතෘ වාක්‍ය පවා පළ කළා. එවැනි හැම අවස්ථාවකදීම මේ රටේ ප්‍රචාන්ති පත්‍ර කටයුතු කළේ මහජන මතය අනුව නොවෙයි, පත්‍ර අයිතිකරුවන්ගේ අදහස්

ප්‍රචන්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිසම

ප්‍රචන්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිසම

[පී. ආර්. රත්නායක මයා.]
 තහවුරු වන අත්දමටයි. එහෙම නම් මේ ප්‍රචාන්ති පත ඒකාධිකාරය කඩා දැමීමට, එය නැති කිරීමට, වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් ඇති කිරීම මේ රටේ සාමාන්‍ය මහජනතාව අනුමත කරනවාට කිසිම සැකයක් නැහැ.

දේශපාලන නිදහස අනව. කළා කිරීමේ නිදහස අනව. ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදී නිදහස අනව. ඕනෑම දෙයක් පනවලට ලියන්නට පළවත්ය කියා තවත් කෙනෙකට කියන්නට පෑවහි. ඕනෑම කෙනෙකට පහර වදින අත්දමින් වචන් ප්‍රචාන්ති පළ කළාට චෝදනා කරන්නට පළවන්නෙක් නැහැ. එහෙත්, සමහර පුද්ගලයින් හා සමහර දේශපාලන පක්ෂ අසාධාරණ අත්දමින් විවේචනය කර මහජනතාව නොමග යාව අවස්ථා අපට දැනගන්නට ලැබුණා. 1956 දී මහජනයා නොමග යාවීමට කොයි තරම් උත්සාහ කළාද? නමත් මේ රටේ ධනේශ්වර කමය සහ විසූ කර මහජන නිදහස ආරක්ෂා කරන ආණ්ඩවක් ඇති කිරීමට මහජනතාවට අවශ්‍ය වුණා. එහෙත්, ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදී නිදහස ආරක්ෂා කරනවාය කියන මේ රටේ ප්‍රචාන්ති පත ඒ මහජන මතයට විරුද්ධව හැම දෙයක්ම කළා. නමත් මේ රටේ මහජනතාව සිහි බද්ධියෙන් යනව කටයුතු කළ නිසා ඒ ප්‍රචාන්ති පතවලට අවශ්‍ය ව විධියට මේ රටේ මහජනතාව හැඩ ගස්වීමට පළවන් වුණේ නැහැ.

මේ “බේරේ ගෙර” තැන්නම් “ලේක් හවස්” ප්‍රචාන්ති පතවලින් පහර නොකෑ එකම පක්ෂය එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂය බව අපට හෙතෙයි. 1947 සිට 1956 වන තරු මේ රටේ තිබුණේ එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ ආණ්ඩවයි. මට නම් මතකත් නැහැ. මා පැරණි දේශපාලනඥයෙක් නොවෙයි. දේශපාලනය ගැන වැඩි දැනීමක් ඇති කෙනෙකන් නොවෙයි. එහෙත් මා එකක් කියන්න කැමතියි. එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ ආණ්ඩව තිබුණ ඒ කාලය තළ කිසිම කාරණයක් ගැන මේ ප්‍රචාන්ති පත මගින් ඒ ආණ්ඩව විවේචනය කළේ නැහැ. කොයි යම් වැඩක් කළත් එයට පක්ෂව මිස විපක්ෂව මේ ප්‍රචාන්ති පත කතෘ වාක්‍යයන් පළ කළේ නැහැ.

කුඹුරු පණත ඇති වූ අවස්ථාවේදී ප්‍රගතිය කරා ගමන් කිරීමට කොයි තරම් අවහිර කළාද කියා බලන්න. ඒ කුඹුරු

පණත ඇති කළ අවස්ථාවේදී ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදී නිදහස තිබෙනවාය කියාගෙන ඒ පණතේ අදහස් නොවෙයි. සම්පර්ණයෙන්ම ඊට පිටස්තර දේවල් ප්‍රචාරය කිරීමයි, මේ රටේ ප්‍රචාන්ති පත කළේ; දිනමිණ පත්‍රය කළේ. ඒකාධිකාරී ප්‍රචන්පත්වල ක්‍රියා නිසා මේ රටේ බොහෝ වැඩ වලට බාධා ඇති වුණා. මේ ප්‍රචන්පත්වල අධිපතින්ගේ අදහස්වලට වෙනස් අදහස් ඇති දේශපාලන පක්ෂවලට මේ ප්‍රචන්පත් මගින් පළවන් තරම් පහර ගසන්නට යෙදුණා. මේ ප්‍රචන්පත් අයිතිකරුවන්ගේ අදහස් අනවයි, මහජන මතය හැඩ ගස්වන්නට උත්සාහ කෙළේ. මේ පිළිබඳව මම එක නිදර්ශනයක් පෙන්වන්නම්. එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයෙන් අස් ව බණ්ඩාරනායක මහතා 1951 අග හරියේදී කල්මණේ දී පැවැත්වුණ පසිඳ්ව රැස්වීමකදී කළ කළා වක් වැරදි විධියට ලේක් හවස් පතවල පළ කර තිබුණා. බණ්ඩාරනායක මහතා කිසි දිනක සිංහලය රාජ්‍යභාෂාව කිරීමට එකඟ නැති බවත්, බද්ධාගම රාජ්‍යාගම නොකරන බවත් කල්මණේ රැස්වීමකදී ඒ මහතා ප්‍රකාශ කළ බව දිනමිණ පත්‍රයේ ප්‍රචාන්තියක් වශයෙන් පළ වී තිබුණා. මේ ප්‍රචාන්තිය අනුව බණ්ඩාරනායක මහතාගේ වපලකම පෙන්වීම සඳහා දිනමිණ පත්‍රයෙහි කතෘ වාක්‍යයකුත් පළ කර තිබුණා. ඒ කර්තෘ වාක්‍යයෙන් කියැවුණේ බණ්ඩාරනායක මහතා සිංහල ප්‍රදේශවලට ගොස් සිංහලය රාජ්‍යභාෂාව කරන බවත්, බද්ධාගමට නිසි තැන දෙන බවත් ප්‍රකාශ කරන නමුත් මුස්ලිම්වරුන් වෙසෙන කල්මණේ දී කියා තිබෙන්නේ සිංහලය රාජ්‍යභාෂාව කිරීමට එකඟ නැති බව සහ බද්ධාගමට නිසි තැන දීමට එකඟ නැති බවයි. මෙය කොයි තරම් දුරට මිනිසුන් නොමග යවන ක්‍රියාවක්ද? ඇත්තෙන්ම මේ ප්‍රචාන්ති පත මහජනයා නොමග යාවීමට ක්‍රියා කළ බව කිව යුතුයි. මේ ප්‍රචාන්ති පතවල මේ වැනි ක්‍රියා නිසා ඇත්තෙන්ම මහජනයා තුළ වැරදි වැටහීම් ඇති වුණු බවටත් සැකයක් නැහැ. බණ්ඩාරනායක මහත්මයා සිංහල භාෂාව හා බද්ධාගම ගැන යම් ප්‍රකාශයක් කළා නම් එසේ කළේ සිංහල මහා සභාවේදී සම්මත වුණු යෝජනා අනුවයි. නමුත් සුළු ජාතීන්ගේ භාෂා විනාශ කර සිංහලය රාජ්‍යභාෂාව කරන බව හෝ

පුවත්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිසම

පුවත්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිසම

අනික් ආගම් විනාශ කර බුද්ධාගමට නිසි තැන දෙන බව හෝ ගරු බණ්ඩාරත්නායක මහත්මයා කියා නැහැ. දිනමිණ පත්‍රයේ පළ වූ ප්‍රවෘත්තිය අනුව අප එතුමාගෙන් ඒ ගැන ප්‍රශ්න කළ විටත් එතුමා කියා සිටියේ ඒ කාරණයයි. සිංහල භාෂාව රාජ්‍ය භාෂාව කරන විට අනික් භාෂා විනාශ කරන බවක් හෝ බුද්ධාගමට නිසි තැන දෙන විට අනික් ආගම්වලට අසාධාරණයක් කරන බවක් හෝ එතුමා කවරදැකවත් කියා නැහැ. නමුත් දිනමිණ කර්තෘ වාක්‍යයෙන් ප්‍රකාශ වුණේ බණ්ඩාරත්නායක මහතා සුළු ජාතීන්ට එක වචනයකුත් මහ ජාතියට තව වචනයකුත් කියන බවයි. ඇත්තෙන්ම ඒ විධියේ කර්තෘ වාක්‍ය ලියමින් බණ්ඩාරත්නායක මහතා කොන්ද පණ නැති වපල යකු හැටියට හුවා දැක්වීමට උත්සාහයක් ගෙන තිබුණු බව අපට පෙනී ගියා. මේ ආකාරයට මේ රටේ ප්‍රවෘත්ති පත්‍ර මහජනයාට විරුද්ධව, මහජන මතයට විරුද්ධව, යම් යම් දේශපාලන පක්ෂවලට විරුද්ධව ක්‍රියා කළ අතර, පත්තර අයිතිකාරයන්ගේ අදහස් සාර්ථක කර ගැනීම සඳහා වෙනෙ සුණු බව පැහැදිලිව පෙනී යන කාරණයක්.

ඇත්තෙන්ම ප්‍රවෘත්ති පත්‍ර ඒකාධිකාරය කැඩී ය යුතුයි. ඒ පිළිබඳ ප්‍රශ්නයක් නැහැ. කවුරුනුත් ඒක පිළිගන්නවා. නමුත් එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂය පමණක් ඒ කාරණයේදී ඒ තරම් පැහැදිලි ප්‍රකාශයක් කරන්නේ නැහැ. ප්‍රවෘත්ති පත්‍ර ඒකාධිකාරයට විරුද්ධ බව ඒ පක්ෂය එකම වචනයකින් පමණක් ප්‍රකාශ කරනවා. එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂය වැඩි පුරම විරුද්ධ වී තිබෙන්නේ තේජා ගුණවර්ධන මැතිනිය පුවත්පත් කොමිසමට පත් කර සිටීම ගැනයි. ඒ බව ඒ පක්ෂයේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්ගේ කථාවලින් පැහැදිලිව පෙනී ගියා. මොන මොන අදහස් උඩ මොන මොන කාරණා ගැන සොයා බැලීම සඳහා පුවත්පත් කොමිසම පත් කර තිබෙනවාද කියා ඒ පිළිබඳ ගැසට් නිවේදනය කියවීමෙන් පෙනී යනවා ඇති. අද බොහෝ දෙනෙක් තර්ක කරන්නේ කොමිෂන් සභාවේ තීරණ වාර්තා ආදිය ගැනයි. තවම ඒ කොමිසම හරිහැටි එකතුවෙලා වැඩ කරන්නට පටන් ගත්තේ නැහැ. එහෙත් අද මේ ගරු සභාවේ කෙරුණේ කොමිෂන් සභා

වාර්තාව ගැන කරන විවාදයක් වැනි විවාදයකුයි. ආණ්ඩු පක්ෂයේ සාමාන්‍ය මන්ත්‍රී වරයෙකු හැටියට මා මතක් කරන්නට කැමතියි, විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රී වරුන් මතක් කළා වගේම, මේ රටේ ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදී නිදහස නැති වන විධියේ, කියවීමේ, ලිවීමේ හා අදහස් දැක්වීමේ නිදහස නැති වන විධියේ, වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් මේ කොමිෂන් සභාවෙන් ඉදිරිපත් වෙනවා නම් අපිත් සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම ඊට විරුද්ධ වන බව. මේ කොමිෂන් සභාව පත් කළේ එවැනි අදහසක් ඇතිව නොවෙයි. ගැසට් නිවේදනයේ සඳහන් කර තිබෙනව, ලිවීමේ කියවීමේ නිදහස හරියා කර ලබා දෙන බව. අද ප්‍රවෘත්ති පත්‍ර ලේඛකයන් කටයුතු කරන්නේ ලිවීමේ නිදහස ඇතිව නොවෙයි. අද පත්‍රවල පළ වන්නේ ලේඛකයන්ගේ අදහස් නොවෙයි. පත්‍ර අයිතිකාරයින්ට වුවමනා විධියටයි ලිපි සකස් කරන්නේ. ප්‍රවෘත්ති පත්‍රයක කර්තෘවරයෙකු වශයෙන් හෝ වෙළා, ප්‍රවෘත්ති පත්‍රයක නියෝජිතයකු වශයෙන් හෝ වෙළා, කොඳු තරම දකුණ දෙශප්‍රම ලේඛකයකු සෙවය කළත්, පත්‍රවල පළ වන්නේ ඔවුන්ගේ අදහස් අනුව ලියැවුණු ලිපි නොවෙයි. ප්‍රවෘත්ති පත්‍රවල පළ වන්නේ ප්‍රවෘත්ති පත්‍ර අයත් කාර්යාලයන්ගේ අදහස්. සමහරවට අපේ රටේ ප්‍රවෘත්ති පත්‍ර අයත්කරුවන්ගේ අදහස් නොවෙයි, විදේශය අධිරාජ්‍ය වාදයන්ගේ අදහස් තමයි, මේ රටේ ප්‍රවෘත්ති පත්‍රවල පළ වන්නේ. ඒ නිසා අපේ ජනතාවට නොයෙක් කරදරවලට මුහුණ පානට සිදු වුණා. ඒ වගේම අපේ සංවර්ධනයටත් ඒ නිසා නොයෙක් බාධා පැමිණුණා. අන්න ඒ නිසා විශේෂයෙන්ම අපට අවශ්‍ය වී තිබෙනව, ප්‍රවෘත්ති පත්‍ර ඒකාධිකාරය නැති කර නියම ප්‍රවෘත්ති පත්‍රවල ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදී නිදහස ආරක්ෂා වන අන්දමටත් ලේඛකයන්ගේ නිදහස ආරක්ෂා වන අන්දමටත් යම්කිසි වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් ඇති කිරීමට. ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයේ ආණ්ඩුවේ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය එය බව මතක් කරමින් මගේ වචන ස්වල්පය මෙයින් අවසාන කරනව.

ප්‍රචන් පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

ප්‍රචන් පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

අ. භා. 4.27

ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා
(දෙහිවල-ගල්කිස්ස)

(දොරාදර් කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා—
දෙහිවල-ගල්කිස්ස)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva—Dehiwala-Mt. Lavinia)

Mr. Deputy Chairman, permit me to say, first of all, since I follow upon the hon. Member for Mawanela (Mr. P. R. Ratnayake) that, even from a Government speaker, we are entitled to an occasional relevance. The hon. Member's speech, with all respect to him, is one of the supremest examples of irrelevancy in a debate to which I have had the misfortune to listen.

The question at issue is the appointment of this particular Press Commission at this particular juncture for the particular purpose set out in the terms of reference. I have no doubt that it is a matter of great pleasure to tilt at familiar opponents in familiar ways, and were it in some other debate, I would have been glad to cheer him vigorously on the points. But when he repeats a speech made in some other debate in relation to the debate that exists, all that happens is that he leaves the suspicion that the Government has put up the speaker in order precisely to prevent the point of the debate becoming clear.

Sir, let us remind ourselves of the object of debate. First of all, there is the principal resolution disapproving the appointment of the commission of inquiry because it is a departure from the original purpose of the Government. I notice that the hon. Member for Mawanela was supremely indifferent to that question because he knows that that is a facing of his present with his past, and that the mirror does not mirror him then even if it mirrors him now. It is a departure from the original purpose of the Government announced in the Throne Speech of August 1960. It might have been useful to us if the hon. Member who has been asked to be her master's voice or his—beg your pardon, his

mistress' voice—had read the relevant extract from that 1960 Throne Speech, an extract that might have evoked even today in this House the same applause that it evoked from the mass crowd that was present at Independence Square on that day.

පී. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මයා.

(තිරු. ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

I read it for him.

ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා

(දොරාදර් කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

I know my hon. Friend the First Member for Colombo South (Mr. J. R. Jayewardene) read it earlier.

There is then an amendment which has been accepted in the form of an addition, namely, that the terms of reference of the commission disclose the fact that the Government is lacking in any desire to break the monopoly of the press. My hon. Friend might have shown us a few examples of that desire. Three and a quarter years or more ago, the hon. Member's Government promised not commissions, but legislative action. Three and a quarter years afterwards we have a commission, which is known to be the classic device on the part of governments which wish to avoid legislation. Now, that is the truth. And since the hon. Member has pleaded with the known liars, with the newspapers, for a little truth, may I plead with him not to fall into the same company? May I urge further that the Government is lacking in any desire to break the monopoly of the press held by the private capitalist concerns, which is the real obstacle to the freedom of the press in Ceylon, but instead aims at devising means to extend its control over all the newspapers thereby reducing still further even such freedom of the press as exists in Ceylon at present.

I would have been delighted to hear from this official back-bench spokesman of the Government something in answer to those two points

புலிபுத்தூர் பரிசுரை கவிதை

and in particular to see him demonstrate through the terms of reference what it is not possible to infer from the intention or the aim of devising of means to extend the Government's control over all the newspapers in Ceylon. Now, Sir, I, for my part, propose to demonstrate it not by generality but from the terms of reference. I have that important Gazette notice, the second Gazette notice which departed from the first Gazette notice in order to manifest that Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana will not have to sit in judgment upon the behaviour of the paper once known as "Trine". I say so without fear of contradiction. It is fortunate that there has been appointed as chairman to the commission a gentleman of such proved probity and independence, that he was able, immediately upon his notice being drawn to the facts concerned in relation to "Trine", to state to the Governor-General himself that if that fact was correct then rather than sit on the commission along with Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana who ran the "Trine", he was tendering his resignation—[*Interruption*].

சே. அர். பிச்சைநா மன.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

Do you deny it?

அவர்கள் கொல்வின் அர். டி. சில்வா

(டாக்டர் கொல்வின் அர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

If the Junior Minister of Justice denies it I state it again without fear of contradiction. I challenge him to get a denial from the Chairman of the Commission—[*Interruption*].

சே. அர். பிச்சைநா மன.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

When I said that, you said that it was false. Why do you not get up and say it is false?—[*Interruption*].

வினாக்கள் மன.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

I did not want to take the trouble

அவர்கள் கொல்வின் அர். டி. சில்வா

(டாக்டர் கொல்வின் அர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

I beg of the Government and the Parliamentary Secretary not to fall into the company of liars who deny. I do not want you to undermine a man's integrity by such denials in this House.

சே. அர். பிச்சைநா மன.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

What do you say?

வினாக்கள் மன.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

I have not taken the trouble to speak to Mr. K. D. de Silva. It was not proper for me to speak to Mr. de Silva. I have not spoken to a single member of the commission. You spoke as if Mr. K. D. de Silva had told you.

சே. அர். பிச்சைநா மன.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

I did not say that. If I did not say that, will you withdraw it?

அவர்கள் கொல்வின் அர். டி. சில்வா

(டாக்டர் கொல்வின் அர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

The Government has become so petty on this subject that it cannot even take credit on to itself for a most credit-worthy act of a member of the commission. That is enough proof that this resolution is deserved and correct.

How do you solve this? By absolving Mrs. Gunawardhana instead of helping the chairman.

ප්‍රචන් පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

ප්‍රචන් පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

[ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා]

Let me come back. I said I will demonstrate from the terms of reference of the commission that its true aim is not the break-up of the private monopoly of the press but the devising of means to extend the government's control over all newspapers.

The first point is this. This commission covers by its terms of reference, not only the monopoly groupings that have been expressly referred to in this House a hundred times in once, but every single newspaper right down to the political sheets of the humbler political parties. [interruption]. As my non-friend the Second Member for Colombo Central (Mr. Keuneman) says, those are the only places where there is real freedom of the press—the little weekly press, especially of the Left parties, wherein the raisity of official policies are not merely analyzed and exposed but even dissected.

Now, Sir, the terms of reference I would suggest fall into three or four groups. There are fifteen points of reference under the letters (a) to (o). Of these (a) to (f) may be said to some degree to concern some questions pertaining to the monopoly press, because they concern among other things the structure, ownership and control of undertakings publishing newspapers and periodicals and so on. In that respect, no commission was necessary, for everybody knows that structure. You do not need a commission for that. Get a normal company handbook and even a government nitwit can work out the structure. Forgive me for saying this. This is like trying to use a sledge-hammer to kill flies. You do not need a gentleman of the eminence and ability of Mr. K. D. de Silva to tell us the structure of this business.

If you like, I will tell you a little about the structure of one of them in a way it will interest you much more than you have imagined.

I have, because of a well-known court case, some good information, for instance, about the situation of the share ownership and control of the "Times of Ceylon" group. 223,000 shares of the "Times of Ceylon" group, i.e., nearly half of the shares of that paper or group, were owned by the late Mr. Sangarapillai and his wife. Both these people are now dead. In accordance with that old custom, they left a joint will and, in terms of that will, there were appointed three very interesting trustees. One was Mr. N. S. O. Mendis, a gentleman who I believe today does his major operations from abroad, but he was obviously born under a lucky star or under a beneficent patronage as I shall show you in a minute. The other was Mr. C. X. Martyn, a dear old friend of mine, who has parted company with this business. The third is Mr. P. Navaratnarajah, also a very good colleague of mine at the Bar. But with all respect to all these dear friends of mine—and please do not tell me afterwards that that is the kind of friend I have—Mr. N. S. O. Mendis is the colossus that bestrides their world in these matters.

What happened? There was a clause in this will that called upon the trustees to hold these shares for the benefit of the children, to preserve them if possible. So what has happened? I am making no comment, I am not discussing the rights or wrongs of the next part of what I am saying. The trustees have proceeded to sell much of the real property belonging to the estate while holding the shares and now at least one of the heirs or heiresses has gone to court to fight this policy. Pardon my saying again, on that matter it is improper for me to make a comment and I am no partisan in that matter. The trustees may be right, the heirs may be right, or both may be wrong because both cannot be right.

But now we come to the next thing. These shares have caused the trustees to come on the board of management and one essential person there, the key man, is Mr. N. S. O. Mendis.

புலிபுத்தூர் பரிசுரை கவிஞர்

வேலுநாதன்

(டாக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

How many shares has he got ?

புலிபுத்தூர் கவிஞர் டாக்டர். டி. சில்வா

(டாக்டர் கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

It is a very good question that he has asked. Very rarely has he helped me in my argument but on this occasion he has valiantly come to my help.

Mr. N. S. O. Mendis, as I told you, is born under an exceptionally lucky star or under a beneficent patronage. For all I know, he enjoys both. Mr. N. S. O. Mendis, without owning a single share of the "Times", controls the "Times" in terms of this document. Here is a Government for 3½ years considering what to do about a monopoly. Here is a gentleman who, by simple legal process, has become a newspaper king without owning a share. And mind you, he was the proctor of Mr. Sangarapillai. Do you want a commission on such questions? I will say this further: certain reactionary forces—I do not want to name them unnecessarily—today control the "Times" group of newspapers entirely through this position.

சே. டாக்டர். சீவசுந்தரன்

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

Mr. Weerasooriya ?

புலிபுத்தூர் கவிஞர் டாக்டர். டி. சில்வா

(டாக்டர் கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

I name no names. I did not wish to mention Mr. N. S. O. Mendis, but I could not state the facts without naming him.

சே. டாக்டர். சீவசுந்தரன்

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

Mr. N. E. Weerasooriya is the acting chairman.

புலிபுத்தூர் பரிசுரை கவிஞர்

டாக்டர் ராஜபக்சே (ஹக்மனா)

(திரு. ரோய் ராஜபக்சே—ஹக்மனா)

(Mr. Roy Rajapakse—Hakmana)

Mr. Donald Ranaweera.

புலிபுத்தூர் கவிஞர் டாக்டர். டி. சில்வா

(டாக்டர் கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

Mr. Donald Ranaweera, the prospective U. N. P. candidate for Maskeliya—

டாக்டர் டுடலி சேனநாயக்க

(திரு. டுடலி சேனநாயக்க)

(Mr. Dudley Senanayake)

The former candidate.

புலிபுத்தூர் கவிஞர் டாக்டர். டி. சில்வா

(டாக்டர் கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

—the celebrated public speaker on newspaper freedom, is a nineteen-share-owner and now is a member of the board of directors.

சே. டாக்டர். சீவசுந்தரன்

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

The chairman is Mr. Weerasooriya.

புலிபுத்தூர் கவிஞர் டாக்டர். டி. சில்வா

(டாக்டர் கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

Yes, Mr. Weerasooriya is the chairman.

சே. டாக்டர். சீவசுந்தரன்

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

He is an S. L. F. P. man.

புலிபுத்தூர் கவிஞர் டாக்டர். டி. சில்வா

(டாக்டர் கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

I am willing to say of him that there is no Government that has come into being or will come into being that will fail to commandeer his services.

ප්‍රචන්ද්‍ර පරික්ෂණ කොමිෂම

ප්‍රචන්ද්‍ර පරික්ෂණ කොමිෂම

ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මයා.

(තිරු. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

Including yours ?

ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා

(டொக்டர் கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

When we come to power, as we shall come to power, I am sure that we will have tasks for Mr. Weerasooriya.

Monopoly is not difficult to prove. The thing is so wellknown that it is a waste of time for the Government to ask a gentleman of the calibre of Mr. K. D. de Silva to report on what is known unless it be that the Government has been totally ignorant for 3½ years and was alleging things of which it knew nothing. Well, that is also possible.

There is an old saying that the sting is in the tail. I believe it applies to scorpions. I hope I will be forgiven if I say that the Government has shown a scorpion-like structure in regard to the terms of reference of the commission. In my view there are only four real terms of reference. I propose to read them. Why? I shall show that there is no announcement of policy by the Government on any occasion at any time that covers those terms of reference and their sinister import will be clear from a mere reading of them. Those four terms are items (i), (k), (l) and (o). (i) says that the commission shall report on the measures that should be adopted to prevent the publication in newspapers and periodicals of news reports, pictures, cartoons, articles or stories which tend to incite disaffection among the people against the Government or which are calculated to subvert the lawfully constituted Government. There is much more, but the remainder is not important.

I must say, first of all, that our everyday criminal law completely covers this point; and, as if it were

not sufficient, we had supplementary measures in the so-called "coup legislation". These measures cover the position entirely. What are you asking from the commission? Some drastic proposal or recommendation which will enable you to cover your own sinister plans?

Now read (j) in relation to (k).

"(k) the extent to which and the manner in which newspapers owned or published by the Associated Newspapers of Ceylon, Ltd., the Times of Ceylon Ltd., or the Virakesari, Ltd., sought to exercise undue influence on voters in the exercise of their franchise at the Parliamentary Elections held in 1956 and 1960, and the steps that should be taken to prevent such conduct on the part of any newspaper or newspaper group in the future;"

Now, the key-word there is "any newspaper". With regard to what the "Virakesari" did, or the Associated Newspapers did or the "Times" did, you claimed already to have the knowledge when you proposed 3½ years ago that you would legislate to break the monopoly. You do not need a commission for that. If necessary, I can cite a most startling thing, but I do not want to waste my time, save with one example. The "Times of Ceylon" once carried an authentic report of a central committee meeting of the Lanka Sama Samaja Party which had never taken place—an authentic report. It even purported to give the resolutions passed! The only problem was that the central committee never met on that occasion. I can show you where this comes in.

Now, you say, "We want the right to control any newspaper in respect of its efforts to influence public opinion." Oh! you say, "We want them only to tell the truth." What you mean is, "We want them only to tell what in our view is the truth." And, what in your view is the truth is normally the untruth!

Sir, what I seek to say is this: You will never get a totally truthful press in any country. But you can get a press which is not a monopolistic

உலர் பன் பரிணை கைமேல

group in any country if the Government of the day wishes. I will show you that matter in a moment.

Then it goes on :

“(1) The conduct of newspapers since 1st January, 1957”

—all newspapers—

“in regard to any attempts to obstruct the policies of the Government or the implementation of its programme of work and the steps that should be taken to prevent a repetition of such conduct in the future.”

For my part, I say it is a necessary attribute to freedom, which I and my party will certainly exercise, to obstruct you in every way when you go wrong. Governments are not automatic producers of correct policies. Then, why do you need an Opposition? The truth is that you do not want an Opposition and you dare to come and say that to us when you cannot control the opposition inside your own party. A Government party that cannot get its official candidate elected to the Senate wants to control our right to say, “Who the devil are they?”

These are the things that must be understood. Let me read the next :

“(o) The measures that should be adopted and the measures required to establish and maintain”

—please listen—

“proper liaison between the Government and the press so as to ensure that the policies and actions of the Government are adequately and objectively presented to the public without bias or distortion.”

I said this was a scorpion-like term of reference. This is the last term of reference and the sting is in the tail.

We have a Government which, even while it speaks in the name of the late Mr. Bandaranaike, cannot come to a decision as to whether Mr. Bandaranaike was a god or a man, which it does not want the newspapers to call him. You have controversies as to whether he went to heaven or whether he is still on the road to heaven. Which do you want us to state? You say you are a socialist Government and you advance capitalist policies. Which do you want us to say?

உலர் பன் பரிணை கைமேல

பி. சிவசிதம்பரம் மன. (உடுப்பிட்டி)

(திரு. எம். சிவசிதம்பரம்—உடுப்பிட்டி)
(Mr. M. Sivasithamparam—Uduppidi)

Dompe or Tumpane socialism?

அவரின் கைமேல அர் & சிலா

(டாக்டர் கொல்வின் ஆர். டி சிலா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

My Friend here asks, “Do we have Dompe or Tumpane socialism or neither or both?” What I am seeking to say is this. This commission is directed to report on how to establish and maintain proper liaison—lovely word!—between the Government and the press, for a particular purpose, as if that liaison is not already there. You have a solemn Information Department to make your official handouts every day, every hour, every minute, if necessary. Every time you have a row inside your Cabinet you have one section in liaison with the “Dawasa” and another section in liaison with the “Dinamina”. So you do not lack this liaison. What you say is this: “Liaison between the Government and the press in order to ensure that the policies and the actions of the Government are adequately and objectively presented to the public without bias or distortion . . .”. Pardon me, but who is to judge? Therein lies the crux of the matter. You are to be your own judges, your own jury and your own punitive organization.

If hon. Members will forgive me, there is a very old fable of two knights errant who came from two opposite sides to a statue of a dead knight who was holding a shield, and the knight who came from the north said, “The shield is red,” while the knight who came from the south said, “The shield is blue.” So this man said “red” and the other man said “blue”, and being knights errant they did not do the one thing that had to be done but acted in terms of their own rules: they couched their lances to rest and they charged at each other effectively, knocked each other down, heavily injured; only, as it happened, each

[ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා]

Right now fell on opposite sides of the statute, and each found indeed that the other side was red and the other was blue!

Now, looked at from our point of view, your policies are destroying this country. How do we present that adequately, objectively? From your point of view your policies are leading the country to destruction; yes, because your Finance Ministers come and tell us how fast we go down the slope until another Finance Minister comes and says we are only going a little slower down the slope. How do we present this objectively and adequately?

These four items together are items which enable the Government of the day to intimidate and to bully the press, and make of it a partisan agency for its own policies and purposes. And why only the Government? If you have suffered from the press, I say to you that we have suffered a hundred thousand times more. We have been suffering from this monopolist press before not only your party, but even before some of you Members were born. If anyone knows what misrepresentation, lying and suffering at the hands of a corrupt press means, we of the United Left Front are the best witnesses of that fact. They have buried us every morning, re-buried us the next morning and found us like Antaeus of old risen in new strength the following morning. Therefore, they added lie upon lie and piled them like a pillion upon us; and yet, carrying the burden of their falsehood upon our shoulders we have not only survived despite all falsehood of the Government, we have also grown in strength.

Why, if you are honest and if you claim impartiality, do not these terms of reference speak of how to protect us from you, how to protect us from the liars, the newspapers? That lie you also like; that lie you also support; what you want is what every

Government wants, that the newspapers shall lie on the Government's behalf and never against the Government.

We want a newspaper system which is reasonably guaranteed against systematic lying. That is our position. And we say this commission will not give it. This commission if it honestly implements its terms of reference, will have to be the instrument of recommendation to you of how you shall convert the press of this country into a press-check by the S.L.F.P. Government. Apparently the "Sinhale" is not an adequate mistress to satisfy your needs. That is why you want to hold us. How can we trust you to stop lying in the press when you are the principal weekly purveyor of "Sinhale" lies?

These are matters that pertain to this question. This commission is aimed at trying to get material and a respectable cover for the Government to make the press of this country a mere vehicle of its own propaganda. We shall fight that and we must fight that.

I want to say before I sit down that it is not as if what we want cannot be achieved by appropriate legislation. Before I come to that I want to say one other thing I know. In the last three years the appropriate Minister who had been entrusted with the task, namely, the predecessor of the present Minister of Justice, a gentleman in respect of whose days I have a resolution in this House, which I am afraid the Government will see to it will never be discussed, had presented three, to my knowledge, successive separate drafts for a Press Bill, not for a commission, but for legislation, to the Government party. Let nobody on the Government party say no, for I have seen each of the drafts. And all I noted about the drafts was this. The first draft had the first part referring to the question of a take-over or a break-up of the monopoly of the press. What the Government there proposed in that draft was that the Government should become the

உறுப்பினர் பதிலுரைக்கிறார்

உறுப்பினர் பதிலுரைக்கிறார்

monopolist of the press. But curiously enough, there was a second part and a third part where, under cover of appointing a press commission, powers were taken to Government to convert the press into its own vehicle of propaganda. Let it be said to the credit of a considerable group of back-benchers in the Government party that each of these drafts was rejected by reason of their opposition. There are some in your ranks who have a future for that reason. There were three successive drafts, each of which was worse than the other, and by the time the third draft came—I saw it and I know it—the question of monopoly had disappeared from the draft. In between, to my knowledge, I say, backdoor negotiations were going forward between certain personalities on the Government side—

சென்னை மன்றத்தினர்

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

Shame ! Shame !

பொருளியல் கொள்கை அமைச்சர் அ. சி. சிவசாமி

(டாக்டர் கொல்லின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

—and these very monopolist newspapers, for a marriage of convenience. That may be why they chose the word “liaison” for use in the terms of reference.

சென்னை மன்றத்தினர்

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

What about the dinner ?

பொருளியல் கொள்கை அமைச்சர் அ. சி. சிவசாமி

(டாக்டர் கொல்லின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

We know about the dinners and the coffee breaks and everything. So, Sir, here, now, through the commission they seek to outflank their own critics inside their own ranks. What we require is, what is manifestly required is, the breaking up of these

monopolies—there are two big monopolies, and a third monopoly is growing under the patronage of your own Government. We are not people to be persuaded that Messrs M. D. Gunasena and Co. are democrats by accident even. We do not believe that because the “Davasa” sufficiently supports the Government that it ceases to be itself a budding monopolist concern. We have already noticed how the arrangements between the “Times” and the Associated Newspapers for common policy in certain matters have begun to bring the “Davasa” group also in. Monopoly breeds monopoly. Monopoly has many means of sustaining itself.

The only way of ensuring some reasonable freedom of the press in this country—there is no such freedom as absolute freedom ; that is one of the dreams of the idealist philosophers—is by appropriate legislative and other arrangements, by an appropriate legislative framework of the conditions that would enable the press not to be monopolistic and thus to create the opportunity for true competition in the presentation of news. That is not all. We want further to ensure that the power of public opinion, the needs of the common people, are reflected in the press by ensuring that they come in an appropriate way as proprietors of newspapers. These are two principles we of the Lanka Sama Samajist Party enshrined in concrete proposals, which we placed before this very Government for consideration, and which we have circulated and published.

We say the first thing is to distribute the ownership, break it up, but not by widening the share basis of monopolists. Only nitwits who do not understand how the modern company system works can fail for the kind of false propaganda coming particularly from the United States, that by broadening the base of share ownership, you will some way or other democratize capitalism. I do not intend to give this House a lecture on that. It is not appropriate.

ප්‍රවෘත්ති පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

ප්‍රවෘත්ති පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

[ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා]

But it has been admitted by those who are competent researchers in that field that the wider the base of your share ownership the narrower the actual control of the company.

So, we have to ensure the break-up. Why should the same monopolist organization have a different organ of expression. I give two examples. Why cannot we take away the monopoly of the Associated Group of Newspapers, the "Lanka Dipa", the "Times of Ceylon", and separate them from that monopoly group and give them to other ownership; and in order to ensure that the other ownership does not go the monopolist way and in order to ensure that the other ownership control reflects the trend of mass opinion and the development of mass control, why not hand them over to people's organizations such as the co-operatives, trade unions and the like? These are simple proposals. Start with these two papers; start with them. If you cannot hand them over direct to the proper organizations, I do not mind your handing them over to the S. L. F. P. trade unions—let them misuse the paper—to take it out of this monopoly.

I was confronted once when I discussed that proposal at certain governmental quarters with this fashionable phrase "Is not the trade union movement divided?", and I asked, "Is it not that our whole political system is based on division; is it not that the Government itself is divided?" That is not the question; we can show what democracy means by getting, for instance, the trade union movement to be the owner of a newspaper; you can provide by taking over the newspapers and handing them over in the following way: that any trade union is entitled to get a certain number of shares at a certain price, no trade union to be entitled to anything more than a certain number of shares and the board that runs it to be elected in terms of ownership of the shares by the various trade unions with certain limitations. And you will have a far more democratic management that

reflects public opinion which is not interested in manufacturing lies than you have today. That is the type we can have.

Take the trade union movement. I choose the trade unions as an example because I am familiar with the trade union movement. Why cannot you bring legislation for that? We gave you an actual and concrete proposal and nobody has shown us that it is not workable. That is a fact. I mention this for this reason, not for party advantage, because sometimes there are heard half-muted voices of criticism which say that there are no concrete and constructive proposals which do not themselves create a monopoly. That is false; here are the proposals and it is in the light of these considerations and these criticisms that we have added our amendment to the original motion.

I very seriously submit to this honourable House that through the method adopted by the Government, far from travelling towards a free press in a free country, we shall, on the one hand, be postponing action regarding an urgent problem and, on the other hand, we shall be seeking material to enable the Government to follow not merely an incorrect but an utterly dangerous policy.

For these reasons, we invite this honourable House, including hon. Members of the Government, to vote for this resolution and thus open the road to a freer, non-monopolist press in Ceylon.

Thank you.

අ. හා. 5.18

දෛද්‍යාචාර්ය නාගනාතන්

(டொக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

Mr. Deputy Chairman, may I congratulate the last speaker.

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice is running away.

වික්‍රමසූරිය මහා.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

I will come back.

புலவர் பதினாறு மூலம்

புலவர் பதினாறு மூலம்

வேலையாடல் நானாநன்

(டாக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan.)

I must congratulate the last speaker on one of the best speeches he has made on the Floor of this House, because today he did not use a single cliché or slogan but based his speech on logic and argument only.

The first question we must ask is, what should be the qualification of a commissioner who sits on a commission of the nature and importance of a press commission?

There have been two or three press commissions in England. An examination of the qualifications of the personnel of those commissions would be a study on how commissioners are to be selected and would show how seriously the authorities took the matter of the appointment of personnel to press commissions. Men of great learning and integrity, men respected by the people in all spheres of life, were appointed to those commissions.

In India too they had a press commission not too long ago. The commissioners were a select group of men—public men of eminence and integrity, professors and scientists, and foremost men in international politics and journalism.

சென்னை ராஜபக்சே மலர்.

(திரு. ராய் ராஜபக்சே)

(Mr. Roy Rajapakse)

Any doctors?

வேலையாடல் நானாநன்

(டாக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

The personnel appointed to the press commissions in England and in India show that the Government of England and the Government of India were serious about the press commissions they appointed. They knew and appreciated the important role played by the press in the public life of a democratic country.

What has this Government done? One can see the regard or the disregard the Government has for this important matter by the absence of Ministers in this very important

debate. How many Ministers are present? How many Junior Ministers are present? How many of them are here to make their contribution to this debate or at least to listen to what we have got to say on this matter? The Government is only interested in strengthening its position by acquiring a control of the press; the Government is not interested in a free press for the purpose of building up a great nation. The Government is not interested in freedom of the press; it is interested in getting for itself more power and destroying democracy. That is why there is no one here now in the first or the second row of benches on the Government side.

The first question is the qualification of the commissioners. The hon. Member for Mawanella (Mr. P. R. Ratnayake) asked whether the three persons who have been appointed to the commission cannot carry out the job entrusted to them. Any three asses can do anything. But the point is whether the members of the commission are competent. Are they the best persons we can think of? That is the question, not "Can they carry it out"? Any person can carry it out. We had the National Education Commission and so many other commissions. Any Tom, Dick or Harry who can bootlick the Government or a Minister of the Government can find a place there. For instance, there is T. U. de Silva, who was on the National Education Commission. I knew him as a little boy. What was he? He was a carpentry instructor at the Training College. I know his capacity, I know his knowledge. As a little boy I used to laugh at the old fellow. He murdered the Queen with every sentence that he spoke although he now writes very learned articles by some ghost writers under his name. He knows nothing. He has very little knowledge of life, of any country, of any science or any philosophy. He was a carpentry instructor and nothing more. That is the type of person this Government chooses because he will say what they want. They get people of that calibre, or rather, lack of

ප්‍රචන් පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

ප්‍රචන් පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

[වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය නාගනාතන්]

The Government has never thought of appointing people of some reasonable stature, people of unquestionable character and people with knowledge. It does not matter whether they belong to the U. N. P. or the Leftist parties or whether they are Tamils or Muslims. What the Government must consider is, are they patriots, are they people who love the country, have they any devotion, any idealism, any knowledge?

Therefore, on the question of personnel, I should like to state that I am disappointed.

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

Are you in favour of the appointment of the commission?

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය නාගනාතන්

(டொக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

I am in favour of getting a good doctor to treat a case, not a quack to kill him. What I am telling you is—my Friend was not here—when you study and see the type of people who were appointed by the Governments of India and Great Britain to their press commissions, when you study their names, their qualifications, their status, their stature and knowledge and compare them with the puny people you have appointed as being competent to formulate the future press policy of this country, one sees what little care you have, what little ideals you have and what love of the country you have.

Much has been spoken of—I do not know who the gentleman is—Mr. K. D. de Silva. He is a very good chairman I am told. When he found that the terms of reference referred to Mrs Theja Gunawardhana's paper, "Trine", he went straightway to the Governor-General and said that they must be altered; either Theja must go or the terms of reference should be altered and the "Trine" should be excluded! "What a great man", say his admirers, but did he not see in the terms of that reference with the sting in the tail that this

Government had no other purpose but to create an organ for its own vested interests by utilizing all the presses and journals in the country?

The hon. Member for Mawanella (Mr. P. R. Ratnayake) said that if the report of the Press Commission is against freedom of the people, "We will oppose it", but what about the terms of references of this commission? Is it to foster the freedom of the press or still further muzzle the freedom of the press? The terms of reference were enumerated by the previous speaker. He gave the four terms of reference (j), (k), (l) and (o) and everyone of them is meant to still further muzzle the freedom of the press and make the press a stooge and creature of the Government in power.

Are these terms of reference intended to break the monopoly of the press or are you trying to create a super, monolithic monopoly for the Government? Surely, the chairman of this commission besides noticing the case of Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana could have noticed the terms of reference and said that he could not serve on a commission with these terms of reference? Since he has consented to serve on this commission with these terms of reference I do not think that he can be so very honest or so very great or independent as stated by the hon. Member for Dehiwala-Mount Lavinia (Dr. Colvin R. de Silva). Would any man, not to speak of a judge, or any individual with independent views ever consent to serve on such a commission with these terms of reference?

Take the case of any one of those gentlemen mentioned by the hon. Member for Galle (Mr. W. Dahanayake) as having been members of the British Press Commission or the Indian Press Commission. Would they not have said that it was undignified and an insult to them to be asked to serve on a commission with these terms of reference? Some appalling remarks made by Mr. K. D. de Silva are on record in the Navy Commission

புலவர் பதினாறு கோவை

புலவர் பதினாறு கோவை

report. For instance, he has stated that the rules of natural justice cannot be observed by a commission of inquiry.

The rules of natural justice apply to us in all walks of life. It applies to us here in this House, in the canteen and on the road. The concept of natural justice is fundamental to our law. A gentleman who says that the rules of natural justice need not be followed by commissions of inquiry would be the only type of person who will accept the chairmanship of this type of commission with these terms of reference. I ask you: would any person of character, independence or understanding have enunciated such a principle—that natural justice need not be considered by a commission of inquiry?

வினாக்கள் இல்லை.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசுரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

Is it your position that no one in Ceylon should sit on this commission?

வேலையாட்சி நானைன்

(டாக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

Nobody in Ceylon of any character, independence, knowledge and understanding will sit on a commission having these terms of reference. My hon. Friend cannot comprehend this straightforward and logical argument.

ரோய் ராஜபக்ஷ இல்லை.

(திரு. ரோய் ராஜபக்ஷ)

(Mr. Roy Rajapakse)

You know only to perform illegal operations.

வேலையாட்சி நானைன்

(டாக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

I only performed one illegal operation. That was on my Friend the hon. Member for Hakmana (Mr. Roy Rajapakse). I castrated him against his wishes.

The hon. Member for Mawanella has been the only spokesman of the Government. By that fact you can gauge the importance that the Government attaches to this very important Debate. He referred to a speech made by Mr. Bandaranaike at Kalmunai which was misreported in the press. We all know that many politicians deny reports of their speeches when they appear in the press. That is a well-known Ceylon tactic. It is a well-known propensity of certain Government Members and Ceylon politicians to say one thing today and deny it tomorrow when they find it not very suitable for them, because, sometimes a man says something in Kalmunai which he does not want the people at Anuradhapura to know, or he might say something in Jaffna which he does not want the people at Kandy to know. Unfortunately, it is so. But we in our party are not afraid to tell the truth and always the truth, anywhere and everywhere if necessary.

We in our party, more than anybody else, can claim to have had the most unfavourable press that any party in Ceylon has had. It is stated, and very correctly too, that the Lake House, the Times Group and other monopolist papers put forward the point of view of vested interests, that they had become the organs of the vested interests. Today, the biggest vested interest which all are afraid of is Buddha and Sinhala! Therefore, these monopolist presses had taken it upon themselves in a conjoined and conspiratorial manner to try and say nothing of what we say and try to suppress us or to compress what we say so as to make the people not understand what we say, either by compression or by suppression or by distortion. We have been having the worst press in this country, so that we have legitimately a tremendous amount of complaints against the monopolist press. For instance, in this very House I know the "Daily News" lobby correspondent will not say a word of what I say, or, if he says anything he will say something derogatory and against me. That is well

ප්‍රචන් පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

ප්‍රචන් පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

[වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය නාගනාතන්]

known. We do not complain. But, what I want to say is this: that the press, the present monopolist press, has been working very unfairly against us, has been creating a kind of vacuum of what we want the people to know and stating the most untrue and unpleasant things that they want the people to know about us, which is not correct either.

We say the remedy for this disease is not what the Government proposes. Their remedy is much worse than the disease. We want a free press. And I know today, that to start a daily paper would want a tremendous amount of capital. It will not be possible, for instance, for a trade union to run a press, because, I do not think they will be able to get all the capital that they want, because, any one who has had experience of running a newspaper will know, the life of the press depends on the advertisements that it gets.

I know this, because my beloved chief is the boss of our little party paper, the "Sutantiran". Sometime back it was a daily paper. In fact, there was such a tremendous demand from the people for our paper that in a few months' time we were beating out the daily circulation of "Thinakaran" and "Veerakesari". We had topped a circulation of 30,000 when "Veerakesari" was about 20,000 and "Thinakaran" was about 15,000. But we lost heavily. Why? We were not getting enough advertisements. At that time Sir John was the Prime Minister. He was a strong man and he threatened the various advertisers. I am telling you the honest fact. And, taking a line from Sir John the canvassers for advertisements for the other newspapers also went and threatened our advertisers by saying, "I say, you are giving advertisements to 'Sudandaram'. You see what Sir John is going to do to you. He will stop you permits, he will cancel your licences and recall your quotas." The result was that even with greater circulation, the greater was our loss. That was our position.

We have in this country fought against very heavy odds and I say that there must be some system by which a fair chance is given, not merely to see that monopolist presses are not allowed to flourish but to see that the other presses are not suppressed by every possible means fair, foul and still fouler. That is the position and I do say that it is not possible for a co-operative concern or a trade union to run a paper successfully, because, if one knows the working of a newspaper, it is like a little empire which has to be controlled from various directions, on the business side, on the advertisements side, on the news side, on the reporting side, on the research side, and so on. So many things contribute to make a newspaper, and amateurs cannot do it. It has to be done by specialists who have the funds to do it or who can get other specialists to do it.

I can suggest a simpler way in which the press can be made to serve the needs of the people. I told you our experience with the "Sutantiran": the people wanted the paper, but we were unable to supply it because we became more and more bankrupt every month the more we printed it. So I say that the "Daily News" or the "Times of Ceylon" or the "Dawasa" or the "Lankadeepa" should by law be made to give full and fair publicity at least once a week in some specially reserved part of the paper, whether it be in one column or two or more or even in a whole page, to the various parties in proportion to their representation in Parliament, so that their propaganda and statements may appear side by side without any blacking out or misrepresentation.

Recently in the north we organized a procession on foot from house to house, village to village, informing the people of the great difficulties that face the Tamil people, the terrible dangers that are imminent and the ways by which we may be able to save ourselves by our ownself help.

Now this campaign has done a lot of good work in our areas, but somehow, by common consent, all the newspapers blacked out all news

ප්‍රචන්ද්‍ර පරික්‍ෂණ කොමිෂම

ප්‍රචන්ද්‍ර පරික්‍ෂණ කොමිෂම

about it and not a single speech was reported. The other day, however, there was a big headline in one of the papers which said "Federalists heckled", without a word about the big crowds that attended our meetings. This paper was only interested in the heckling. The truth is that one man asked a question at one of the meetings. We had earlier gone to a famous temple and opened its doors to the so-called depressed classes; then the so-called depressed classes and the higher classes had a meal together and held a meeting in the evening; as the meeting progressed, one man from the crowd asked the question: "Will Mr. Chelvanayakam's son marry the daughter of a pariah woman?" He was told that marriage being an individual matter, if two persons wanted to marry and were keen on it, nobody in the world could stop it.

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

Can he say why his daughter studied Sinhala and passed an examination?

දොක්ටර් නාගනාතන්

(டாக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

My Friend is trying to avoid the issue by drawing a red herring across the track. I am prepared to answer the question; I have done it before. I will not take time to answer it now because we have to keep to a time schedule.

I was saying that the only news of our campaign given in the press was a stupid question asked by a man who attended the meeting and who later ran away, and I was suggesting a way in which you can by legislation ensure that information is fairly and truly given to the people of the country.

In the March 1960 election campaign, under the Caretaker Prime Minister, the hon. Member for Galle, we had fair reporting by the press.

Although he is a very irresponsible free lance parliamentarian today. I say without fear of contradiction that he was one of the best Prime Ministers Ceylon ever had, and under him we had the fairest election. This Gentleman gave time over Radio Ceylon to every party of any consequence to broadcast about three or four talks of 15 minutes duration before the elections. But when our Friends of the U. N. P. came in for a stay of three months and formed a temporary Government they refused to give time over Radio Ceylon. And my Friends the S. L. F. P. are still worse because the Radio is being used by them as a vehicle for the conveyance of only the Government's point of view and of Government news of what is happening in Parliament. What we speak will not be reported or, if reported, it will perhaps be condensed to be of no consequence. What is spoken by the hon. Member for Mawanella (Mr. P. R. Ratnayake) or the hon. Member for Hakmana (Mr. Roy Rajapakse) will be put over the radio with a big noise.

What I wish to say is this. We do not like the personnel of the commission. I do not want to speak about Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana as her appointment has been sufficiently discussed in this House. I do not know how any Government can appoint a commission with a person like Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana on it. With regard to Mr. S. W. Walpita—I do not know this gentleman—he is an unknown person or very little known. I understand he is a lawyer. The stature of the members of your commission should be such that people would understand and respect them for their stature, knowledge and service for the commonwealth.

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

You do not even respect Mr. K. D. de Silva—[Interruption.]

පුවත්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

පුවත්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිසම

වෛද්‍යාවාදීය නාගනානන්

(டொக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

Mr. K. D. de Silva has said from his own mouth in giving a judgment that natural justice does not apply in the case of a commission. A person who is of that view is not fit to serve on any commission. He is the person who ran to the Governor-General's Office because he wanted to eliminate the "Trine" from the purview of the commission as Mrs. Theia Guna-wardhana was on the commission. I do not know him. He may be a very admirable gentleman, but such a person should not undertake to be the chairman or a member of the commission with these terms of reference. If he was particular about the little mote in the eye with regard to the "Trine" what about the great beam in the terms of reference (j), (k), (l), (m), (n) and (o) ?

When the Government wants to control the press, to muzzle it and to use it purely as a subservient creature and as a stooge of the Government, all the party newspapers and the various other publications will be prohibited from criticizing the Government. They will be accused of obstructing the policy of the Government. They cannot criticize the Government. Every criticism will be considered obstruction of the policy of the Government and penalized.

Any gentleman, be he a judge of the Supreme Court or any other court, if he is prepared to serve as a member on such a commission as is contemplated or be the chairman of such a commission, I say that I have no personal regard for him. I do not know Mr. K. D. de Silva. I only go on your terms of reference and on the fact that this gentleman did take objection to the inclusion of "Trine" in this inquiry. But that is a very minor point compared with the malignant nature of the terms of reference.

I have nothing more to say because nothing has been said on behalf of the Government. I do not want to repeat what others have said. I would only

say this. If there is a stooge press, if there is a suppressed press, there is no freedom and no democracy. There will be no use of the parliamentary process because it will be an absolute mockery. Freedom of the press should not be destroyed. Even the present press is not free. It is very unfair, and we are the people who are bearing the worst brunt of it. But the remedy proposed by you is far worse than the disease and we will resist it to the very end.

අ. හා. 5.47

කෝ. එම්. පී. රාජරත්න මයා. (වැලිමඩ)

(திரு. கே. எம். பி. ராஜரத்ன—வெளி
மடை)

(Mr. K. M. P. Rajaratna—Welimada)

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමනි, මේ රජය විසින් ප්‍රකාශයට පත් කර තිබෙන ප්‍රවෘත්ති පත්‍ර කොමිෂන් සභාව සම්බන්ධ යෙදුන්, එම කොමිෂන් සභාවට අදාළ විභාග විෂය සම්බන්ධයෙනුත්, රජය මීට ප්‍රථමයෙන් ප්‍රකාශයට පත් කළ අදහසට පටහැණිව කටයුතු කරමින් මේ පවත් පත් කොමිසමේ මුද්‍රාවෙන් පවත්පත් රජයේ පාලනයට ගැනීමට උත්සාහ කිරීම සම්බන්ධයෙනුත් විරුද්ධත්වය ප්‍රකාශ කරන මේ යෝජනාවට අපත් අත්සන් තබා තිබෙනවා. මම පළමුවෙන්ම කියන්න කැමතියි, ගැසට් පත්‍රයේ ප්‍රකාශ කර තිබෙන මෙම කොමිසමේ විභාග විෂය අනුව පවත් පත් පිළිබඳව පරීක්ෂණයක් පැවැත්වීමෙන් මේ රටේ පොදු ජනතාවට සැහෙන ප්‍රතිඵලයක් නොලැබෙන බව.

මෙම පුවත්පත් කොමිසමට පරීක්ෂා කර බැලීමට නිව්දේශ කර ඇති කරුණු දෙස බලන විට අපට පෙනී යනවා, මේ රජය උත්සාහ දරන්නේ තමන්ගේ අත්තනෝමතික වැඩ පිළිවෙල තව දුරටත් ක්‍රියාත්මක කිරීම පිණිස බව. ඒ වැඩ පිළිවෙල මහජනයා කොයි තරම් පිළිකුල් කළත්, ඉන් මහජනයාට පහර වැදුනත්, මහජනයා ඊට සහයෝගය නුදුන්නත්, එම වැඩ පිළිවෙලට විරුද්ධව ගෙන යන ප්‍රචාරයන් මහජනයාට දැනගන්නට නොදී ඒකාධිපති ක්‍රමයකට කටයුතු කරන්නයි, මේ කොමිසම පත් කිරීමෙන් රජය උත්සාහ දැරූ තිබෙන්නේ.

පුවත්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

පුවත්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

රජය විසින් පුවත්පත් පාලනය කිරීම සඳහා කර ඇති සෑම යෝජනාවකටම අපි අපේ විරුද්ධත්වය ප්‍රකාශ කර තිබෙනවා. පුවත්පත් පාලනය කිරීම සම්බන්ධයෙන් මේ රජය 1960 දී ආරම්භ වූ දෘෂ්ටිකෝණයක් ලැබේ යයි අපට කියන්න පුළුවන් කමක් ඇත්තේ නැහැ. ඒ හැම යෝජනාවකින්ම රජය බලාපොරොත්තු වූයේ, තමන්ට අවනත, කීකරු, තමන්ගේ අදහස් පමණක් පිළිගන්නා, ඒවා මුද්‍රත්පත් කිරීමට උදව් දෙන, ප්‍රතිවිරුද්ධවාදීන්ගේ අදහස් මහජනයාට ලබීමට ඉඩ නොදෙන පුවත්පත් සේවයක් ඇති කිරීමයි. ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදය අනුව ආණ්ඩුවට විරුද්ධ අයගේ අදහස්ද මහජනයාට දැනගැනීමට ඉඩ සැලැස්විය යුතුයි. ඒ නිසාමයි, ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදී ආණ්ඩුක්‍රම යටතේ විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයක් ඇත්තේ. ඒ නිසාම මුල පටන්ම අපේ විරුද්ධත්වය ප්‍රකාශ කර තිබෙන්නේ. මේ කොමිෂන් සභාවටත් අපේ විරුද්ධත්වය ප්‍රකාශ කර මේ යෝජනාවට අපේ සහයෝගය දීම නියෝජනයෙන් ඒ නිසයි.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමනි, ලංකාවේ තිබෙන පුවත්පත් පාලනය කිරීමට ගන්නා මේ පියවරේදී අප විරුද්ධ වන්නේ අද ලංකාවේ තිබෙන පුවත්පත් සියයට සියයක් සර්ව සම්පූර්ණවම ගෙන යන නිසා නොවෙයි. අපින් පුවත්පත්වලින් බැට කැට දවිය ; අදත් බැට කන උදවිය. අප කියන දෙයක්, කරන දෙයක් සාධාරණ ලෙස එකම පුවත්පතකටත් පළ කරවා ගැනීම අද ඉතා දුෂ්කර කාරණයක්. ඒ ලොකු අඩුපාඩු ව එසේ තිබුණත්, මේ රජය උත්සාහ කරන අන්දමට පුවත්පත් තමන්ගේ පාලනය යටතට ගෙන පවත්වා ගෙන යාමට ඉඩ දීමට අපට කිසිසේත් එකඟ වන්නට පුළුවන් කමක් නැහැ. ඒ ඇයි? රජය අද යොදන්නට උත්සාහ කරන පිළියම මේ අඩුපාඩුවට වඩා හයානකයි. ඒ නිසයි, අපේ සම්පූර්ණ විරෝධය පළ කරන්නේ. ඒ බව අපි මුලින්ම කියන්නට කැමතියි. මට ප්‍රථම කථා කළ සමහර ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරු කොමිෂන් සභාවේ සිටින පුද්ගලයන් සම්බන්ධව විවේචනය කළා. ඒ පුද්ගලයන් සම්බන්ධ විවේචනවලට සම්බන්ධ වීමට අපි කැමැත්තක් දක්වන්නේ නැහැ. පුද්ගලයන් කවරුන් හෝ වේවා, මේ කොමිෂන් සභාවට අපි විරුද්ධයි. දැනට මේ

කොමිෂන් සභාවට පත් කර තිබෙන හිටපු විනිශ්චයකාර සිල්වා මහත්මයාන්, තේජා ගුණවර්ධන මහත්මියන්, වල්පිට මහත්මයාන් යන මේ තුන් දෙනා හිටියත්, වෙන පිරිසක් හිටියත් මේ වැඩ පිළිවෙලට අපේ විරුද්ධත්වය පළ කරනවා. කෙසේ වෙතත් මේ පුද්ගලයන් සම්බන්ධව පළ කළ විරුද්ධත්වය සම්බන්ධයෙන් කරුණක් දෙකක් කියන්නට කැමතියි.

අද පමණක් නොවෙයි, මීට ප්‍රථමයෙන්ම මේ සම්බන්ධව කළ කථාවලින් විශේෂයෙන්ම තේජා ගුණවර්ධන මහත්මිය මේ කොමිෂන් සභාවේ සාමාජිකාවක් හැටියට පත් කිරීම සුදුසු නැත කියායි කරුණු ඉදිරිපත් කළේ. ඒ මහත්මිය විනයට හිතවත් නැතැත්තියක් හැටියට වැඩ කරනවාය කියා, ඒ හිතවත්කම තිබීම මේ කාරණයට ඉදිරිපත් වීමට නුසුදුසු කමක් හැටියට ඉදිරිපත් කරලයි සමහර ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරු කථා කළේ. එසේම වල්පිට මහත්මයාන් ඒ චෝදනාවලින් කොටසක් ඵල්ල වුණා. මම මේ ගැන කරුණු දෙක තුනක් කියන්නට කැමතියි. තේජා ගුණවර්ධන මහත්මිය සමග මගේ කිසිම පෞද්ගලික සම්බන්ධකමක් නැහැ. මම ඒ මහත්මිය සමග වචන දහයකට දෙළහකට වඩා කථා කරලා නැහැ. නමුත් යම් යම් හේතූන් නිසා මම ඒ මහත්මියට ගරු කරනවා. 1956ට ප්‍රථම යුගයේදී දිවංගත බණ්ඩාරනායක මහත්මයාන් සමග ඒ මහත්මියගේ සම්බන්ධකමක් තිබුණ. වැඩි කාලයක් යන්න කලින් ඒ සම්බන්ධකම කැඩුණු බවත් අපි දන්නවා. ඒ සම්බන්ධකම ඇති වන්නට ප්‍රථම එදා තිබුණු එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ ආණ්ඩුවේ වැරදි වැඩ පිළිවෙලට විරුද්ධව ලොකු සටනක් ගෙන ගිය මහත්මිය ක හැටියට ඒ මහත්මිය මම මේ අවස්ථාවේදී මතක් කරන්න කැමතියි. ඒ ගැන ප්‍රශංසා කරන්න කැමතියි. ඒකත් අමතක නොකළ යුතු කාරණයක්. තනි ශක්තියෙන් ලොකු සටනක් ගෙන ගියේ ඒ මහත්මියයි. 1956 ජයග්‍රහණයට ඒ මහත්මියගේ හවුල්කාරියක හැටියට ක්‍රියා කළ බව කිසිම සැකයක් නැතිව මට කියන්න පුළුවනි.

මෙතෙක් පුවත්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම ගැන කරන ලද සමහර තථ්‍යවලට ඇහුම්කන් දෙන විට මට වැටහෙන්නේ මෙතන වැරදිකාරිය තේජා ගුණවර්ධන

ප්‍රචන්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිසම

[කේ. එම්. පී. රාජරත්න මයා.]

මහත්මිය නොව චිත්‍රය යන්නයි. චිත්‍ර ආණ්ඩුව වැරදිකාරයකු හැටියට මෙහිදී පෙනී ගියා. හැබැයි, තේජා ගුණවර්ධන මහත්මිය චිත්‍රයට හිතවත්කමක් දක්වන්නේ නැතුව කෙනෙකිට හෝ කෘෂේප්ට හෝ හිතවත්කමක් දැක්වුවා නම් මේ තරම් අපවාදවලට භාජන නෙවී ඉන්න ඇයට පුළුවන්කම තිබුණා වෙන්න පුළුවනි. එහෙම නම් මෙවැනි කොමිසමක සිටීම ගැන මේ තරම් තද පහරක් කන්න සිදු නොවෙන්න තිබුණා. මේ තරමට පෞද්ගලිකව චෝදනා කරනු නොලබන්නත් ඉඩ තිබුණා. මේ කොමිසමට තේජා ගුණවර්ධන මහත්මිය හිටියත් එකයි, නොහිටියත් එකයි. ඒ ගැන මට ප්‍රශ්නයක් නැහැ; අපට ප්‍රශ්නයක් නැහැ; අපේ පක්ෂයට ප්‍රශ්නයක් නැහැ. තේජා ගුණවර්ධන මහත්මිය මෙයින් අයින් කර ඒ වෙනුවට වෙනත් කෙනකු පත් කළත් අපට වෙනසක් නැහැ. ආණ්ඩුව කරන්න යන්නෙ මොකක්ද කියා අපි දන්නවා. ඒ නිසා මේ අවස්ථාවේ මේ යෝජනාව ගැන කථා කරමින් පෞද්ගලික වශයෙන් කරන ලද චෝදනාවලට අපේ කිසිම සම්බන්ධකමක් නැති බව පැහැදිලිවම කියන්න කැමතියි. තේජා ගුණවර්ධන මහත්මියටත් අද දේශාන්තර තත්ත්වය ගැන හොඳ වැටහීමක් ඇතුවට කිසිම සැකයක් නැහැ. තමන් හිතන හැටියට, තමන්ට පෙනෙන හැටියට, තමන්ට පුළුවන් වන හැටියද අද ලෝකයේ තත්ත්වය ගැන සලකා බලා නිවැරදි ක්‍රියා මාර්ගයක් අනුගමනය කරන්නේ චිත්‍රය යන නිගමනය ඇ බැස සිටිනවා වෙන්න පුළුවනි. කිසිම පාවා දීමක් නොකර, අධිරාජ්‍යවාදීන්ට විරුද්ධව සමාජවාදය කරා ගමන් කිරීම සඳහා කෙරෙන සටන ගැන ඇයට පැහැදිලි අවබෝධයක් තිබෙන නිසා එම සමාජවාදී සටන දෙස, එම ජාතික විමුක්ති සටන දෙස, ආසියාව සහ අප්‍රිකාවත්, ලතින් අමෙරිකාවත් ගෙන යන ජාතික විමුක්ති සටන දෙස බලා ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් නිවැරදි ක්‍රියා මාර්ගයක් අනුගමනය කරන්නේ චිත්‍රය බව තේරුම් ගෙන ඇය චිත්‍රයට හිතවත්කමක් දක්වනවා වෙන්න පුළුවනි. ඒ නිසා චිත්‍රය හොඳය කියනවා විය හැකියි.

ප්‍රචන්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිසම

ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම චිත්‍රය ගැන සලකා බලනවිට ලංකාවටත් වඩා ප්‍රචන්පත් සම්බන්ධයෙන් නිදහසක් ඒ රටේ තිබෙනවය කියන්න පුළුවනි. අපට වඩා නිදහසක් ඒ රටේ තිබෙන බව තමුත්තාත්සෙන් දන්නව ඇති. චිත්‍රයත් රුසියාවත් අතරේ අද න්‍යාය වශයෙන් ලොකු අරගලයක් හෙවත් මතභේදයක් තිබෙන බව ඔබතුමා දන්නවා. චිත්‍රයට පහර ගහපු හැම ලිදියක්ම පැහේ චිත්‍රයේ ප්‍රචන්පත්වල පළ කරන්න ඉඩ දීලයි චිත්‍රය ක්‍රියා කර තිබෙන්නේ. ඒ අනුව තමන්ගේ අදහස් ප්‍රකාශ කරන්න චිත්‍රය නිදහස දී තිබෙන බව පෙනෙනව. ප්‍රශ්නයකට දෙපැත්තක් තිබෙනව. ඒ දෙපැත්තම සාකච්ඡාවට භාජන වුණාට වැරද්දක් නැහැ. එහෙම කරන්න ඉඩක් නොලැබෙනව නම් එය නිදහස නැති කිරීමක්ය කියන්න පුළුවනි. කෘෂේප්වාදයට පහර වදින ලියුම්වලට රුසියාවේ ඉඩ නැහැ. ඒ කියන්නේ එක් මතයකට පමණයි ඉඩ ලැබෙන්නේ කියන එකයි. ඒ අන්දමට ජනතාව එක් පිළිවෙළකට පමණක් සංවිධානය කරන වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් රුසියාවේ කෘෂේප් යටතේ තිබෙන තමුත් චිත්‍රයේ එසේ නොවන බව තමුත්තාත්සෙ පිළිගන්නව ඇති. චිත්‍රයෙන් යවන ලද එක් ලියමනක් පමණයි ඒ රටේ පළ කර තිබෙන්නේ. අනෙක් ඒවා පළ කර නැහැ. තමන්ට වුවමනා ඒවා පමණයි පළ කරන්න ඒ රටේ නිදහස තිබෙන්නේ. ඒ නිසා තේජා ගුණවර්ධන මහත්මියගේ ප්‍රතිපත්තියේ කිසිම වැරද්දක් නැහැ. කොහොම වෙතත් මෙය ඇගේ නුසුදුසුකමක්ය කියන එක මට නම් පිළිගන්න බැහැ.

වල්පිට මහත්මයා ගැන මම දන්නව. ඒ මහත්මයා ගැන මට කියන්න පුළුවනි. දේශපාලනය අතින් කිසිම පැත්තක අත කොළුවක් වෙලා ඉන්න මහත්මියගේ නොවෙයි වල්පිට මහත්මයා. ඒ මහත්මයා මධ්‍යස්ථ මතධාරියෙක්. ඒ මහත්මයා තේජා ගුණවර්ධන මහත්මිය නියෝජිත වරියක හැටියට පෙනී සිටි ආසියා-අප්‍රිකා සම්බන්ධතා සම්මේලනයක නියෝජිතයකු ලෙස සිටීම නුසුදුසුකමක් නොවෙයි. අධිරාජ්‍ය විරෝධී සටනකට මෙහි සිට ගිය නියෝජිතයකු ලෙස කථා කිරීම අපරාධයක්ද? එහෙම කියනවා නම් වැරදියි. ඒකට

පුවත්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

පුවත්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

නම් අපි හවුල් නැහැ. කවුරු හෝ වේවා අධිරාජ්‍ය විරෝධී සටනට සහයෝගය දෙනව නම් ඒ තැනැත්තා හරි වැඩක් කරනවය කියන්න අපි හය නැහැ. වල්පිට මහත්මයා මධ්‍යස්ථ මතධාරියකු හැටියට ඕනෑම පුවත්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂමක ඉන්න පුළුවන් කෙනකු බව මට කියන්න පුළුවනි. ඒ ගැන මට කිසිම සැකයක් නැහැ. ඒ කොයි හැටි වෙන්නේ මේ කොමිෂන් සභාව පත් කරනු ලබ තිබෙන ආකාරය ගැන නම් අපේ කිසිම විශ්වාසයක් නැහැ. කොයි තරම් සුදුස්සන් සිටියත් මේ කොමිෂම කෙරෙහි අපේ කිසිම විශ්වාසයක් නැහැ. මේ ගැසට් නිවේදනවල පළ වී තිබෙන මෙම වගන්ති දෙස බලන විට විශේෂයෙන් සැප්තැම්බර් 25 වන දා ගැසට් නිවේදනයේ එ, ඒ සහ ඔ යන වගන්ති දෙස බලන විට පෙනී යනව, ආණ්ඩුවට වුවමනා කරන්නේ තමන් ගැන කිසි විවේචනයක් ඇති නොවන ආකාරයට ක්‍රියා කිරීමට බව. හැම අවස්ථාව වේදීම ආවැඩීමේ වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් යොදනව මිස තමන් විවේචනය කෙරෙන වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් යොදන්නේ නැතුව වැඩ කට යුතු ගෙන යාමයි ආණ්ඩුවේ අදහස. එම නිසයි දැන්වීම් දීම ගැන ඊයේ ප්‍රශ්නයක් අසා තිබුණේ. ආණ්ඩුව අප්‍රසාදයට ලක්වීම ගැන කී විට ඒව විනිශ්චය කරන්නේ ආණ්ඩුව විසින්මයි. අපි කියන දේවලින් ආණ්ඩුව අප්‍රසාදයට ලක් වෙනව. ආණ්ඩුව කියන්නේ ඒව ඔක්කොම වැරදි දේවල් කියලයි.

“ට්‍රිබියුනල්” පත්‍රය අලෙවි වෙන්නේ නැහැ, 4,000 කට වඩා; නමුත් දැන්වීම් වලින් මාසයකට රුපියල් 5,000 කට වඩා ලැබීලා තියෙනවා [බාධා කිරීමක්] දැන්වීම් ගාස්තු. ඇයි ඒකට ආණ්ඩුවේ දැන්වීම් දෙන්නේ? ඒ පත්‍රයෙන් ආණ්ඩුවට ආවඩන තිසයි. ආණ්ඩුව මොනව කළත්, ආණ්ඩුව පටන් ගත් දා සිටම ආණ්ඩුවට ආවඩනව. ඒ මගින් ඇමතිවරු ප්‍රංසාවට ලක් කරනව. එම නිසා දැන්වීම් දෙන්න ඒ පත්‍රය සුදුසුයි. ආණ්ඩුවෙන් ඒ විධියට නඩත්තු ලබා ගැනීමට එම පත්‍රය සුදුසුයි. ඒක වැරදි ප්‍රති පත්තියක් බව කියන්න කැමතියි. මේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ක්‍රමයත් නැති කරල, විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයත් නැති කරල, විවේචනය කිරීමත් නැති කරල, තමන්ට

ආණ්ඩුව ගෙනියන්න පුළුවන්කම තියෙනව නම් ආණ්ඩුව ඒකට බොහොම කැමති වෙයි. මේ රටේ පැවති ආණ්ඩුවලින් වැඩි කලක් හදිසි තත්ත්වය පවත්වාගෙන ගියේ මෙම ආණ්ඩුවයි. මේ ආණ්ඩුව පුවත් පත් පාලනය කරගෙන අවුරුදු එකහමාරක පමණ කලක් හදිසි තත්ත්වය තබාගෙන හිටිය. තමන්ට විරුද්ධව මහජන සංවිධානවලින් ඉදිරිපත් වන එකම දෙයක්වත් පුවත්පත්වල පළ වීම නවත්වන්න හැම උත්සාහයක්ම දැරුව, මේ ආණ්ඩුව.

මා උපවාසයෙහි යෙදී සිටි විට මෙම ගරු සභාව තුළ කතා වෙච්ච දේවල් පවා පුවත් පත්වල පළ වන්න ඉඩ නොදෙන්න මේ ආණ්ඩුව උත්සාහ ගත්ත. නමුත් පාර්ලිමේන්තු ගෞරවය රැක ගැනීම සඳහා, පාර්ලිමේන්තුවේ අයිතිය ලබා ගැනීම සඳහා, එදා විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වය කෙළින් වැඩ කළ නිසා ඒ ආරංචි පුවත් පත්වල පළ වන්න ඉඩ දෙන්න ආණ්ඩුවට සිදු වුණා. අද ලංකා ගුවන් විදුලි සේවයේ තියෙන්නේ මොන තත්ත්වයක්ද? මෙම සභාවේ කෙරෙන එකම සාකච්ඡාවක් ගැනවත් හරියාකාර ලංකා ගුවන් විදුලි සේවයෙන් ප්‍රචාරය කෙරෙනවද? මෙම සභාවේ කෙරෙන එකම එක සාකච්ඡාවක්වත් සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම ඒ කෙරෙන ආකාරයට ගුවන් විදුලි සේවයෙන් අද වන තුරු ප්‍රසිඩ වෙලා නැහැ. පුවත්පත්ද එවැනි තත්ත්වයකට ගෙනෙන්නයි, මේ ආණ්ඩුවට වුව මනා කරන්නේ.

ජන්ද කාලයෙදී මේ රටේ ප්‍රධාන පුවත් පත් මොන වැඩ පිළිවෙළක්ද ගෙනිච්චේ? “ලේක් හවුස්” පුවත්පත් සහ “ටයිම්ස්” පුවත්පත් එදා අනුගමනය කළ වැඩ පිළිවෙළ ගැන කවුරුත් දන්නව. නමුත් සිදු වුණේ මොකක්ද? 1956 දීත් ඊට පසුවත් පැවැත්වුණු මැතිවරණවලදී පුළුවන් තරම් උත්සාහ දැරුව මහජනයා නොමග යවන්න. ඇතැම් අවස්ථාවලදී බොරු, වැරදි ප්‍රචාරණි පළ කරල මහජන සිත් කලකිරීම්මට උත්සාහ ගත්ත. විකට චිත්‍ර ආදියෙන් පවා එවැනි හැඟීම් ඇති කොට පුවත්පත්වලට වුවමනා හැටියට ආණ්ඩුවක් පිහිටුවන්න උත්සාහ දැරුව. මේ රටේ මහජනතාව ඒව ශත 5 කටවත් ගණන් ගත්තේ නැහැ. එම නිසයි මේ පිරිස අද ආණ්ඩු බලයේ සිටින්නේ.

ප්‍රචන්ද්‍ර පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

ප්‍රචන්ද්‍ර පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

[කේ. එම්. පී. රාජරත්න මයා.]

මේක ඉතාමත් භයානක දෙයක්. අනෙක් වැදගත් ප්‍රශ්න සියල්ලම අමතක කර මේ ප්‍රශ්නය විසඳීමට ආණ්ඩුව උත්සාහ කළත් ඒ අයම දන්නවා තමන් එදා කියූ දේවල් මහජනතාව නොපිළිගත් බව. තමන්ගේ ආණ්ඩුවේ වැඩ පිළිවෙළ ක්‍රියාත්මක කිරීමට බාධා කිරීම් ආදී දේවල් තිබෙන බව ආණ්ඩුව කියනවා. ඒ තර්කයට අපි සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම විරුද්ධයි. ආණ්ඩුවේ වැඩ පිළිවෙළ ගැන නොයෙකුත් අදහස් මහජනතාව තුළ තිබෙනවා. ආණ්ඩුවේ වැඩ පිළිවෙළ කුමක්ද කියා අපි දන්නවා. ආණ්ඩුව මහජනතාවට එකක් කියා වෙනත් එකක් ක්‍රියාවේ යොදනවා. ආණ්ඩුව මහජනතාවට බොරු පොරොන්දු දී මහජනතාව රවටනවා. ආණ්ඩුව මහජනතාවට දුන් පොරොන්දු ක්‍රියාවේ නොයොදා ඊට ඉදුරාම වෙනස් වැඩ පිළිවෙළක්, කුමන්ත්‍රණකාරී වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් යටින් ගෙන යනවා. ආණ්ඩුව නොයෙක් නොයෙක් පාචාදීම් කරනවා. විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයේ මන්ත්‍රීන්ගේ කථා මාගීයෙන් හෝ වෙනත් විධිවිධන් ඒවා පත්‍රවල පළවීම ආණ්ඩුවට ලොකු හිසරදයක්. තමන්ගේ රහසිගත පාචාදීම් මහජනයාගේ දැන ගැනීම පිණිස හෙළි දරව් කිරීම ආණ්ඩුවට ලොකු අමාරුවක්. මේ ආණ්ඩුවට කරන්නේ තිබෙන්නේ මේක නොවෙයි. මේ ආණ්ඩුව නිර්දෝෂී ආණ්ඩුවක් නම්, වැඩ කරන ආණ්ඩුවක් නම්, මහජන මතය අනුගමනය කරන ආණ්ඩුවක් නම්, මහජන යහපත උදෙසා මහජන සැපතට වැඩ කරන ආණ්ඩුවක් නම් ප්‍රචන්ද්‍ර පත් මොනවා කිව්වත් තමන්ට වැඩක් නැහැ. අද රටේ මහජනතාව ලෙහෙසියෙන් මුලා කරන්නට බැහැ. අද අපේ රටේ මහජනතාව යම් යම් කරුණු ගැන හොඳට සලකා බලනවා. විශේෂයෙන්ම මේ පසුගිය අවුරුදු කීපය ඇතුළත, 1956 වෑමයෙන් පසුව, මේ රටේ ප්‍රචන්ද්‍ර පත් අලෙවිය වැඩි වී තිබෙන බව ආණ්ඩුවේ මැතිඇමති වරුන් දන්නවා ඇති. මේ කාලය ඇතුළත ප්‍රචන්ද්‍ර පත් කියවන අයගේ සංඛ්‍යාව වැඩි වී තිබෙනවා. මැති ඇමතිවරුන් වගේ නොවෙයි, ඒ උදවිය, ඒ ගමේ ගොඩේ ජනතාව ප්‍රචන්ද්‍ර පත්වල ලොකු අකුරු පමණක් නොවෙයි, පත්‍රවල පළවන සෑම දෙයක්ම හොඳින් කියවනවා. එපමණක් නොවෙයි, ඒ ඒ කරුණු සම්බන්ධයෙන් තර්ක කර

සාකච්ඡා කරමින් තමන් හරි යයි සිතන තීරණවලට බසිනවා. ඒ නිසා තමන් හරියට වැඩ කරනවා නම් බය වෙන්න දෙයක් නැහැ. නමුත් ආණ්ඩුව හරි වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් අනුගමනය නොකරන නිසා, රහසිගත පාචාදීම් කරන නිසා, මහජනයාට එකක් කියා වෙනත් දෙයක් ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන නිසා, මහජනතාවට ඒ කරුණු අමතක වෙන්නත් ප්‍රථමයෙන් දුන් පොරොන්දු කඩා දමා පාචාදීම් කරන නිසා, ප්‍රචන්ද්‍ර පත් මාගීයෙන් ඒවා එළිදරව්වීම තරකය කියා කල්පනා කරනවා. මේ පාචාදීම් එළිදරව්වීම ආණ්ඩුවට ලොකු කැක්කමක්; හිසරදයක්, නමුත් අපට ඒවාට ඉඩ දෙන්න බැහැ.

තවත් ගරු මන්ත්‍රීන් කීප දෙනෙක් ම කථා කරන්නට සිටින නිසා මා මීට වැඩියමක් කියන්නට අදහස් කරන්නෙ නැහැ. මේ යෝජනාවට අපේ සහයෝගය පළ කරන අතර ආණ්ඩුව මගින් කළයුතු මීට වඩා වැදගත් වැඩ තිබෙන බව මා මතක් කරන්නට සතුටුයි. ජාතියේ පැවැත්ම සම්බන්ධයෙන් විසඳිය යුතු මීට වඩා වැදගත් ඉතා බරපතළ ප්‍රශ්න තිබෙනවා. ඒවා විසඳන්නට මහන්සි ගන්න. ඒ අති භයානක ප්‍රශ්න විසඳන්නට වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් සකස් කිරීම ගැන සිතා, කල්පනා, ශක්තිය ආදී ගැම දෙයක්ම යොදවන්න. අවසාන වශයෙන් මේ විධියට තමන්ගේ ඒකාධිපති බලය නැත්තම් වැඩ පිළිවෙළ කිසිම විධියකින්වත් විවේචනයට භාජන නොවීමට කරන මේ ඒකාධිපති වැඩ පිළිවෙළ අත්හැර දමන මෙන් ඉල්ලමින් මගේ වචන සවලපය මෙයින් අවසන් කරනවා.

අ. භා. 6.10

මොන්ටේගු ජයවික්‍රම මයා. (වැලිගම)

(திரு. மொண்டேகு ஜயவிக்ரம—வெலிகம)
(Mr. Montague Jayewickreme—Weligama)

Before I make a brief contribution this afternoon, I should like to read an extract from the Royal Commission on the Press, 1947-1949, of the United Kingdom. This is what it says :

“The Press is not purely an agency for the political education of the public, much though democratic society may need such an agency. On the other hand,

it cannot be considered purely as an industry: the inescapable fact that it is the main source of information, discussion and advocacy”

Now the reason why I read out from the report is to show that there have been press commissions both in Britain and in India and certain standards were applied, and the commissioners were told specifically the importance of probing the press under certain principles laid down by the Government. We, as a democratic country, know that the press is important as a source of information. It is important from the aspect of criticism of all actions both of the Government and of the Opposition, and maybe of certain other quarters. It is interesting to find out how many sat on this press commission. This press commission report has an elaborate list of fifteen commissioners all drawn from various aspects that can deal with a press commission of this nature.

The criticism that I am making about the commission is that it is not sufficiently broad-based. The commission appointed by Government is restricted to three. It does not form a commission that will satisfy the public of this country. When you appoint a commission you must win public confidence, and the public must be able to accept the report with confidence. And when there is strong criticism against certain commissioners I think the Government should take cognizance of such criticism. If the Government rides rough-shod on the views expressed in this House by Members of Parliament—and we speak for the people of this country—then, Sir, I do not think the report that this press commission would finally submit would have the backing and the support of this country.

Now, the main criticism has been about one commissioner. By and large, the most virulent criticism against the commission has been particularly against one commissioner and that commissioner is no other than Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana. Everybody on this side of

the House, my good Friend the hon. Member for Avissawella (Mr. D. P. R. Gunawardena), and I believe the Members of the Lanka Sama Samaja Party, the Federal Party and most members of the Opposition feel that this particular commissioner is not going to submit an impartial view in the final deliberations. It is also interesting to ask the Government why it changed the period that the commission was going to inquire into. The hon. Member for Welimada, made a rather strong statement about Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana. He had no objections to Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana being on this commission, nor had he any objection to Mr. Walpita being on this commission. I can particularly mention to this honourable House why Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana should not be on this commission, and it is very pertinent at this stage to ask the Government this question, and I hope the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice will give a forthright reply to this one point.

The original commission was to inquire into the national press and all weekly political newspapers from 1956. Why is it that the terms of reference of this commission which is going to probe into the national press from 1956 and the weeklies, political weeklies from 1957, have been amended? Now, there must be some reason why this Government thought it fit and proper to omit the political weeklies of the year 1956—[Interruption]. Please probe into the “Siyarata”. Why did you omit the political weeklies of 1956? Is it because of Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana, the editress of the ‘Trine’ Magazine? Is it the reason? You felt by appointing as a commissioner the editress of the ‘Trine’ Magazine, she was going to be in an extremely weak position, and therefore you withdrew the year 1956. No, Sir, I think the country will not accept that position at all to exclude the political weeklies of 1956, which were originally included. I thought it was the late Mr. A. B. Perera who brought Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana in, but I

ප්‍රචන්ද්‍ර පරික්‍ෂණ කොමිෂම

ප්‍රචන්ද්‍ර පරික්‍ෂණ කොමිෂම

[ජයවික්‍රම මයා.]

am glad that Mr. A. B. Perera, who was the Minister of Justice, was not a party to this. But, there must be someone who is a party to this. Surely, Sir, this Parliament has the right on matters of this importance to make its position felt in the country, and as such the hon. Leader of the Opposition a few days ago addressed a gigantic meeting of the people of this country, who came by the thousands for one purpose only, and that was really to defend the freedom of the press.

Now, Sir, we know what the world press is doing in certain democratic countries, for instance, England. Despite all the criticism by the national press of the Conservative Government which was in power, including the conservative "Daily Express" and certain other national papers, despite virulent attacks on Mr. Macmillan, did the British Government penalize the national press? What did Mr. Macmillan say? I remember, Sir, reading what Mr. Macmillan said when virulent criticism against his Government was going on during the Profumo incident. He said that the Government will not fall because of two tongues. That was the view of a democratic Prime Minister. It was quite possible for Mr. Macmillan to have penalized the national press of Britain because, in fact, to a good extent Mr. Macmillan's retirement was due to the tremendous criticism by his own newspapers.

Let us turn to the world press; you get a democratic press in Britain, you get a democratic press in the United States, in Australia, in New Zealand, in Ceylon up to now, and in India. I was listening to the hon. Member for Dehiwala-Mt. Lavinia (Dr. Colvin R. de Silva), when he attacked the monopoly of the Ceylon press and so forth but he did not mention the national press in the Iron Curtain countries, where the national press is dominated by totalitarian dictatorship. He also forgot the fact that the Deputy Prime Minister of Yugoslavia, Djilas, was

imprisoned because he wrote a book on the new era. It was convenient for him to forget that in totalitarian states the monopoly is entirely with the dictator. Ours is a democratic country and the hon. Members who sit in front of us are wedded to democratic ideals.

අ. හා. 6.20

කාරකසභා නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපති

(குழுக்களின் பிரதி அக்கிராசனார்)

(The Deputy-Chairman of Committees)

Order, please! Mr. Speaker will now take the Chair.

අනතුරුව කාරකසභා නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමා මූලාසනයෙන් ඉවත් වූයෙන්, කථානායකතුමා මූලාසනාරූඪ විය.

ජයවික්‍රම මයා.

(திரு. ஜயவிக்ரம)

(Mr. Jayewickreme)

Mr. Speaker, I was just saying that this country by and large has stood for democracy. We accept that the Government is a democratic Government. We feel that this Government has a right, conferred on it by the people of this country, to safeguard democracy and not to toe the totalitarian line.

We have had for two years a taste of totalitarianism—the muzzling of the press. I am referring to the Emergency. For two years the people of this country could not read all the news; for two years the Government curbed the freedom of the press; and we will resent any action on the part of any government whatsoever to curb or stop the right of the people of this country to know what is happening in the country; we will resent any attempt to curb or stifle the right of any political party to publish its weekly paper.

I am very disappointed in Mr. K. D. de Silva for having agreed to sit on the commission with a person like Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana.

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

On the last occasion you said he was too old.

ප්‍රචන්දන් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

ජයවික්‍රම මයා.

(திரு. ஜயவிக்ரம)

(Mr. Jayewickreme)

I yet say it, but I am now particularly saying that I am disappointed that Mr. K D. de Silva should have consented to sit as chairman of a commission on which there is a member whose appointment is opposed by all the Opposition parties. I am frankly disappointed because he is himself aware that she will not be able to deliver the goods fairly and squarely. That is my view, and I am sure that that is also the view held by a large majority of people in this country. I am sure that no one would like to be associated with any person whose name has been mentioned in public debate in this way, and allegations of partisanship have been made against a particular commissioner. I do not think any judge, particularly an ex-judge of the Supreme Court, should permit himself to be associated with a person like Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary cannot nod his head till doomsday, but I have a little more to say.

කපාතායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர்)

(Mr. Speaker)

We are running out of time. Try to be short.

ජයවික්‍රම මයා.

(திரு. ஜயவிக்ரம)

(Mr. Jayewickreme)

We have also had a taste of totalitarianism over Radio Ceylon. We know how Radio Ceylon has time and again distorted the speeches of Members of Parliament on this side and how it has put across Government propaganda. We are totally opposed to that type of attitude and we certainly resent the press being made the tool of a Government that is getting daily unpopular, as every hon. Member knows.

In deference to your wishes and because there are many other speakers, I would only like to state once more that this the most important commission that has been appointed by this Government and it is

ප්‍රචන්දන් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

important for this Government to get the confidence of the people of this country. Otherwise, there is a catastrophe ahead of them.

අ. ආ. 6.25

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

I am grateful to this House for the standard of the Debate and I must say that almost all hon. Members who have spoken have been quite relevant except my good Friend and kinsman, the last speaker, the hon. Member for Weligama.

When I came to the House for this Debate I expected emotional and passionate speeches to be made, the type of speech broadcast at Hyde Park the other day, where not only colourful phrases had been used that the lamps of freedom were being dimmed but where even the Leader of the Opposition had threatened to lay down his life for the people of this country. Emotional statements were made. I am grateful that in this House all hon. Members except my good Friend have been confining themselves to the subject, namely, to the terms of reference and to the composition of the commission, including the hon. Member for Mawanella (Mr. P. R. Ratnayake).

Now, let us take the present law which relates to the press in this country. Somewhere in 1840, more than a century ago, an ordinance was promulgated by the then British Government called the Newspapers Registration Ordinance; and I may say that barring the general law of the country, that is the only enactment, even after a century or over a century, that stands on the statute book of our country. What does this Registration of Newspapers Ordinance say? It only deals with the registration aspect. It says that two certified copies of a newspaper must be submitted to a certain place, that the name of the editor and manager and so forth must be furnished, and all actions against a newspaper have to be filed within the jurisdiction of a court of which they have given the

ප්‍රචන් පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

ප්‍රචන් පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

[වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.]

address, very often Colombo. If a man from Jaffna has been brutally defamed, he must come to a Colombo court, even though he may be a poor man, to file an action. That is the situation we are faced with today. This is not a problem which only we are faced with.

In 1947, in England—I take it to be the land of democracy—a Royal Commission was appointed with certain terms of reference and I can point out in a minute that there are very similar terms in our terms of reference. Even in 1961 another Royal Commission was appointed in England to go into the workings of the press, the monopolistic nature, and to suggest remedies. As usual, even in England, there was an outcry in the press, about the freedom of the press being tampered with, of democracy being in danger and of a dictatorship being set up.

I shall now read to you the terms of reference of the British Commission of 1947 and I will ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition to reply to me whether there are not similar terms in our terms of reference.

“Whereas we have deemed it expedient that a commission should forthwith issue with the object of furthering the free expression of opinion through the press, and the greatest practicable accuracy in the presentation of news, to inquire into the control, management and ownership of the newspaper and periodical press and news agencies including the financial structure and the monopolist tendencies in control”

There are several terms of reference. There are terms which deal with the problem of the monopolist nature of the press, the question of the accurate presentation of news, the financial aspect and so on.

ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

Why did you go beyond that?

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசுரீய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

I will come to that.

In 1961 there was another commission appointed and here are its terms of reference :

“Whereas we have deemed it expedient that a commission should forthwith issue to examine the economic and financial factors affecting the production and sale of newspapers, magazines and other periodicals in the United Kingdom including—

(a) the manufacturing, printing, distribution and other costs ;

(b) efficiency of production ;

(c) advertising and other revenue including any revenue derived from interests in television ;

to consider whether these factors tend to diminish diversity of ownership and control or the number or variety of such publications, having regard to their importance, in the public interest, of the accurate presentation of news and the free expression of opinion.”

After that commission sat various recommendations were made and one of the recommendations of the commission of 1961 was to have a press council. I do not wish to deal at length with the recommendations of the commission.

It is not for me to pre-judge the commission we have set up. It is not for me in any way to say that such and such are the recommendations we expect.

After India attained independence this same problem arose. The Indian Government of Mr. Nehru was faced with the same problem of making provision for the free expression of opinion and the problem of seeing that the press which should safeguard freedom did not become a monster which would destroy freedom. I will read the terms of reference of the Indian Press Commission. I want to make this quite clear : the freedom of the press is not the same as the licence of the press.

புலவர் பதிக்கைக் கொடுக்க

புலவர் பதிக்கைக் கொடுக்க

வேலையாடல் நானாடன்

(டாக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

The freedom of the press means also the freedom from Government control.

வினாக்கள் மூலம்.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

There are seven items in that terms of reference of the Indian Press Commission. We have taken six of those items on to our terms of reference almost verbatim. They are as follows :

"The Press Commission shall inquire into the state of the press in India, the present and future lines of development and shall in particular examine :

(1) the control, management, ownership and financial structure of newspapers, large and small, the periodical press and news agencies and feature syndicates ;

(2) the working of monopolies and chains and their effect on the presentation of accurate news and fair views ;

(3) the effect of holding companies ;

We have got that almost verbatim.

வேலையாடல் நானாடன்

(டாக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

Very clever boy !

வினாக்கள் மூலம்.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

"....the distribution of advertisement and such other forms of external influence as may have a bearing on the development of healthy journalism.

(4) the method of recruitment, training, scales of remuneration, benefits and other conditions of employment of working journalists, settlement of disputes affecting them and factors which influence the establishment and maintenance of high professional standards ;

(5) the adequacy of newsprint supplies and their distribution among all classes of newspapers and the possibilities of promoting indigenous manufacture of (i) newsprint ; and (ii) printing and composing machinery ;"

The next one is something over which the hon. Member for Dehiwala-Mt. Lavinia and my good Friend for Nallur made a fuss and it is similar to ours :

" (6) machinery for (a) ensuring high standard of journalism ; and (b) liaison between Government and the Press ; the functioning of Press Advisory Committees and organizations of editors and working journalists, etc."

Now with regard to liaison between the Government and the press, it may be that we may have put it in different language, but the idea is the same, almost verbatim.

வேலையாடல் நானாடன்

(டாக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

No.

வினாக்கள் மூலம்.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

You did not know this till I told you now.

வேலையாடல் நானாடன்

(டாக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

Read it again.

வினாக்கள் மூலம்.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

" (6) machinery for (a) ensuring high standards of journalism ; and (b) liaison between Government and the Press ; the functioning of Press Advisory Committees and organizations of editors and working journalists, etc."

You read yours.

வேலையாடல் நானாடன்

(டாக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

I am reading it. I give a challenge.

පුවත් පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය නාගනාදන්

(டொக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

You must get more Chinese news.

විකෘතිකරණය මගේ.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

“(f) the extent to which preferential treatment is given by newspapers or newspaper syndicates to particular news sources and news agencies, and the measures that should be adopted to secure that news reports from all news sources and news agencies (both local and foreign) are utilized without discrimination or partiality so as to enable the public to obtain a comprehensive and objective understanding of both national and international affairs;”

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය නාගනාදන්

(டொக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

Very good.

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

" (g) (i) the measures that should be adopted to secure that news is published without bias, distortion or disregard of truth,

(ii) the relief that should be afforded to any person who has or body of persons who have suffered by reason of such bias, distortion or disregard of truth, and

(iii) the punishment that should be meted out to any offender in respect of any such publication;

(h) the extent to which the existing law should be amended—

(i) to enable any person or body of persons in respect of whom a defamatory, untrue or inaccurate publication has been made in any newspaper, to obtain relief or adequate amends expeditiously, without being defeated or hindered by technical or procedural requirements, and

(ii) to mete out deterrent punishment to such offenders ;

ප්‍රචන්දන පරික්ෂණ කොමිෂම

(i) the extent to which the Official Secrets Act or any other written law should be amended to prevent the unauthorized publication in newspapers and periodicals of information relating to official matters of a secret or confidential nature;

(j) the measures that should be adopted to prevent the publication in newspapers and periodicals—

(i) of news reports, pictures, cartoons, articles or stories (a) which tend to incite disaffection among the people against the Government; or (b) which are calculated to subvert the lawfully constituted Government;

(ii) of news reports, pictures, cartoons, articles or stories which, by reason of their obscenity or filthiness, are injurious to public morality or harmful to the young;

(iii) of news reports, pictures, cartoons, articles or stories of an anti-social or anti-national character;

(iv) of news reports of suicides and suicide-pacts."

This is something peculiar to Ceylon—

"(v) of advertisements which, though ostensibly harmless, are in fact calculated to further any illegal or immoral objectives;"

Now I come to (k) and (l) which are not to be found in the British or Indian terms of reference.

ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක මයා.

(திரு. டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(Mr. Dudley Senanayake)

Nor anywhere in the world.

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

There is no "Times of Ceylon" or "Virakesari" anywhere in the world. Let me read:

"(k) the extent to which and the manner in which newspapers owned or published by the Associated Newspapers of Ceylon, Ltd., the Times of Ceylon, Ltd., or the Virakesari, Ltd., sought to exercise undue influence on voters in the exercise of their franchise at the Parliamentary Elections held in 1956 and 1960, and the steps that should be taken to prevent such conduct on the part of any newspaper or newspaper group in the future;

ප්‍රචන්දන පරික්ෂණ කොමිෂම

(l) the conduct of newspapers since 1st January 1957, in regard to any attempts to obstruct the policies of the Government, or the implementation of its programme of work and the steps that should be taken to prevent a repetition of such conduct in the future."

Then (m) deals with methods of recruitment, training, scales of pay and so on of members of the staffs of newspapers, and (n) deals with supply and distribution of newsprint to proprietors of newspapers and so on. (o) is important, and I would ask the hon. Member for Nallur to listen to it:

"(o) The measures that should be adopted and the machinery required to establish and maintain proper liaison between the Government and the Press so as to ensure that the policies and actions of the Government are adequately and objectively presented to the public without bias or distortion."

Those are all the terms of reference.

As I said before, there have been two commissions on the press in England and one in India. About six or seven of the terms of reference of those commissions are similar to ours. Our terms of reference differ only in two or three vital matters. One, as I pointed out when reading the terms, relates to suicide pacts and so on, and on that we are not at issue. The point is that since 1840, that is well over a century ago, no legislation has been brought with reference to the press in order to bring it in line with concepts of modern society.

So when we bring legislation or think of appointing a commission to inquire into the press like in India it should not be a matter for surprise. Of course, the newspapers would not like any interference, even of a very slight nature. If a poor man in Matara or in Jaffna is insulted or defamed or if a person is summoned to appear in court, he must, according to the law as it stands today, come to the District Court of Colombo to file action—

புலவர் பன் பரிணை கைமேசம்

புலவர் பன் பரிணை கைமேசம்

விலி ஷேநானாயக மை.

(திரு. டட்ளி சேனானாயக்க)

(Mr. Dudley Senanayake)

You do not want a commission for that. You must amend the law.

வினாபுரீச மை.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

Where the hon. Member is concerned there are only one or two controversial matters.

விலி ஷேநானாயக மை.

(திரு. டட்ளி சேனானாயக்க)

(Mr. Dudley Senanayake)

They are very material.

வினாபுரீச மை.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

Are you against the terms of reference of this commission with respect to the monopolistic nature of the press?

விலி ஷேநானாயக மை.

(திரு. டட்ளி சேனானாயக்க)

(Mr. Dudley Senanayake)

No.

வினாபுரீச மை.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

You are against that too. [Interruption]. I will read that to you. We gave our minds to this question of the appointment of a press commission in 1960, and in the Throne Speech of that year there was a certain paragraph in reference to this matter. I am afraid the hon. Member for Dehiwala-Mt. Lavinia (Dr. Colvin R. de Silva) does not appear to have read the Throne Speech completely.

சே. டார். சயவர்தன மை.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

I have read it to you.

வினாபுரீச மை.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

I know you read it and pointed it out to me. I think the hon. Member for Dehiwala-Mt. Lavinia said that we never made mention of a commission in the Throne Speech. This is what we said. I am reading from HANSARD of 12th August, 1960, column 56 :

“A Commission will be appointed to inquire into the functioning of the Press in connexion with the general elections, held in March and July this year, and the abuse of power or authority by the Caretaker Governments and Government officials during those elections.”

So we undertook to appoint a commission. The next paragraph says this :

“My Government will introduce legislation to take over the newspapers controlled by the Associated Newspapers of Ceylon, Limited and the Times of Ceylon, Limited and to vest such newspapers in statutory public corporations with unlimited share capital in which individual holdings will be restricted so as to ensure a broadbased ownership. This legislation will ensure the democratic character of newspapers in this country and prevent abuse by the formation of unhealthy monopolies.”

When this question was debated at that time I know the United National Party and their allies, the Federal Party, made impassioned speeches that democracy was in danger, that they were against the take-over of the press and the vesting of the monopoly in a corporation. In other words, they were against the breaking up of the monopoly of the press.

சே. டார். சயவர்தன மை.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

No.

வினாபுரீச மை.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

What did the hon. First Member for Colombo South (Mr. J. R. Jayewardene) say on that occasion? This is what he said.

ප්‍රචන්ද්‍ර පරික්ෂණ කොමිෂම

ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

What is the column?

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

At that time he was against the breaking up of the monopoly. He wanted a commission then. He is against it even today.

ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

What date is that? I will help you, it is column 326.

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

You stated that you wanted a commission.

ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

Read my speech ; never mind what we wanted.

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

This is what you stated in the House on the 24th of August 1960, column 328 of the Uncorrected HANSARD.

"So what did the Labour Party do? They brought a Bill called the Monopolies Bill. Under that Bill, if it is brought to the attention of a particular Board created by the Bill that a monopoly exists, that Board has the right to investigate that monopoly and suggest how that monopoly should be broken. The investigation is reported to the House of Commons which takes action as suggested by the Commission under the Monopolies Bill, or suggests its own terms as to how the monopoly should be broken or how there should be a diffusion of ownership.

We should be glad if you think that we need a Bill on the lines of the Monopolies Bill—"

ප්‍රචන්ද්‍ර පරික්ෂණ කොමිෂම

ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

We are supporting it.

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

I will come to that. To continue from where I left off—

"—which was passed in the United Kingdom and which has received most enthusiastic support."

ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

Not only in the press but also in the ownership of other monopolies ; we are against monopolies.

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

Then, in the course of the Debate on the Ministry of Justice Votes, this is what the hon. First Member for Colombo South said, column 1520 of the Uncorrected HANSARD of the 3rd September, 1963.

"I do not know exactly what the intention of the Government is in having this Press Commission, but it is obvious that political publications will be under review since 1956. We do not object to this Commission of Inquiry but I would like to place before this House certain facts so that I may obtain certain information from the Parliamentary Secretary as to why, in the light of what I state, a political partisan in the sense of practically—I would call her—a paid agent of the Chinese Government has been appointed as a member of this Commission."

The point I want to make is that in the course of the Budget Debate, you stated that you had no objection to the commission as such.

ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

Yes, we are not objecting to the commission.

ප්‍රචන් පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

ප්‍රචන් පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(තිரு. වික්කිරාමසූරිය)
(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

Now, we have had it from the United National Party that they are not against the appointment of a press commission.

ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මයා.

(තිரு. ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන)
(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

Certainly, nobody is against.

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(තිரு. වික්කිරාමසූරිය)
(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

You are only worried about the terms of reference, and that too in relation to quite a few only.

ජයවික්‍රම මයා.

(තිரு. ජයවික්‍රම)
(Mr. Jayewickreme)

Come to the terms of reference.

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(තිரு. වික්කිරාමසූරිය)
(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

I will come to the terms of reference a little later.

The main objection of the U. N. P. and perhaps of the Federal Party is to the composition of the membership of the commission.

ජයවික්‍රම මයා.

(තිரு. ජයවික්‍රම)
(Mr. Jayewickreme)

What about the L. S. S. P. and the M. E. P. ? They also object.

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(තිரு. වික්කිරාමසූරිය)
(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

The hon. Member for Avissawella (Mr. D. P. R. Gunawardena) made quite a sincere speech. He did not go to villify the members of the commission as some of you did.

I will deal with the criticisms made against Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana by the United National Party and their good old friends of the Federal Party. What is their point ?

ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක මයා.

(තිரு. ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක)
(Mr. Dudley Senanayake)

Your old friends.

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(තිரு. වික්කිරාමසූරිය)
(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

It is stated by them that Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana is a paid agent of the Chinese. That, in short, means that she has no independence of her own, that she cannot think for herself, that she always acts in the way that China does.

I do not know to what political party this lady belongs, whether she is a Marxist or a Communist, or any other.

කේනමන් මයා.

(තිரு. කේනමන්)
(Mr. Keuneman)

She is neither a Marxist nor a Communist.

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(තිரு. වික්කිරාමසූරිය)
(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

I will assume the worse, that she is a Marxist. I am an anti-Marxist and I must be quite frank about it. I assume, Sir, that she is a Marxist and that she is adopting the Chinese line against the Soviet Union. However, if there had not been this dispute between the Chinese and the Soviet Union a perfect defence would have come from those of the U. L. F. I will assume that she is a Marxist. It is accepted. I take it that this lady is an educated lady, that she has had a university career, that she is writing books which are sold throughout the world ; and I am also informed that she has written a book on "Khrushchevism" which is being sold in America. It has also been sold in India and perhaps if you go to the Lake House book shop tomorrow you will find it there too.—[Interruption]. Yes, I have got it myself. Here is a lady, we will assume for the moment that she has certain political convictions ; now who is the person in this country who is not having some sort

ප්‍රචන්දන පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

ප්‍රචන්දන පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

of political conviction? The opposition from the U. N. P. is that a person who is a Communist or Marxist is not fit to serve in any commission or hold a post in any Government department. I ask, is that your policy?

Sir, according to the democracy practised by the S. L. F. P., as advocated by the late Mr. Bandaranaike, the people of this country whatever their political convictions may be, would be treated according to their ability. In the time of your predecessor, Sir John Kotelawala, he went about the country saying that they will not do anything for the electorates represented by the Opposition or the Communists, and you are his worthy successor. After you ran away in 1952, he went about the country saying that. The point I am making is that in the democratic way of life we conceive of, according to the ideals of the S. L. F. P., we treat people on their merit.—[*Interruption*]. You do not have the guts to make a speech nor do you have the material to do so. I enjoy these interruptions.

When we want to appoint a person to a commission, or when a person is to be given a post in Government, we do not go and ask, what are your political convictions or are you a member of the U. N. P. or the S. L. F. P.?—[*Interruption*]. My argument is that if a man or woman is capable and efficient, we are not concerned whether he or she is a Communist or Marxist; but we are only concerned whether he or she is able to discharge the functions of a commission honourably. Take the case of the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera), who is very often the Chairman of Select Committees of this House. Nobody would turn round and say that just because he is a solid Marxist he should not be there, whether it is an inquiry regarding the D. H. S. or otherwise. Can we turn round and say that the hon. Member for Yatiyantota should not be on a committee? Take the hon. Member for Dehiwala-Mount Lavinia (Dr. Colvin R. de Silva). If he is appointed a judge of the Supreme

Court, I am sure he will adorn the Bench whatever his political convictions may be.

It is not the policy of the Sri Lanka Freedom Party when appointing people to commissions to find out what their political convictions are, because to us it does not matter at all. Surely a person is appointed to a commission because he is fit to serve on that commission.—[*Interruption*]. Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana is a lady of wide experience and educated. She has read widely.—[*Interruption*].

කථානායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please. I would request hon. Members not to interrupt. Interruptions will serve only to prolong the Debate and that would mean that other Members would have no chance to speak.

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

Certain charges were made, particularly by the hon. First Member for Colombo South (Mr. J. R. Jayewardene), apart from this lady's politics. One charge was that she had given a cheque some time ago and that "bounced" and that the money was paid by the Chinese Government. The hon. Member went a step further. He said that her income tax was paid by the Chinese Government. I checked up on that.

ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

From where?

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

From my Assistant Secretary.

ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

How would he know?

புலவர் பன் பரிணை கைமேசை

வினாபுரீசை மைய.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

I challenge the hon. First Member for Colombo South to prove those allegations or to state them outside the House where he will not be covered by Privilege.—[Interruption].

The further charge was made that this lady's two children are being educated in China. Therefore, it is alleged, she is a paid agent of China. I know of many people who have been educated in Russia; I know of so many people who have been sent on scholarships—

கைமேசை மைய.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

By whom?

வினாபுரீசை மைய.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

By you—on the recommendation of the Communist Party.—[Interruption]. In the Peking University there are two other Ceylonese—Tennekone is doing medicine and Ranatunga is doing agricultural engineering. There are people who are wealthy enough, like the hon. Leader of the Opposition, to receive their education in England. For that reason we do not say that they are stooges of England. Anybody can get a scholarship. The position in regard to her two children is that one of them is studying medicine and the other languages.—[Interruption]. If you want to drag the children into this Debate, you can do so, but it is my duty to reply. She has paid for their passage and education for the first year.

சே. ஸார். பசவர்தன மைய.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

I am prepared to make all these statements outside the House. Will you come and listen?

புலவர் பன் பரிணை கைமேசை

வினாபுரீசை மைய.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

I will come. Get a reporter also.

சே. ஸார். பசவர்தன மைய.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

You get the reporter. Will you also undertake to publish in the "Sinhala" the statements I will make?

வினாபுரீசை மைய.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

Yes. The hon. Member for Akuressa (Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe) since this Parliament began has made several visits to Russia and he has taken treatment in a sanatorium, but we do not turn round and say that he is a paid agent or a stooge of the Soviet Government. I know him for a pretty long time. When the hon. Member for Akuressa goes to Russia and gets medical attention in their sanatoriums, you do not turn round and say, therefore, he is a paid agent. I do not say so. If you send your children to Russia on scholarships, they are not agents, but when Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana sends her children she becomes an agent.

ரோய் ராபக்சை மைய.

(திரு. ரோய் ராபக்சை)

(Mr. Roy Raipakse)

The trouble is that she is not beautiful.—[Interruption.]

வினாபுரீசை மைய.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

It is a cruel lie to say that she is a paid agent of China. I say that with authority and I ask the hon. First Member for Colombo South "Come with a reporter and make those speeches outside".

புலிதர் பதர் பரிணை கைபிசு

சே. ஈர். பீல்டர்னெ மி.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

I will not come with a reporter. I will make the speeches outside. Will you bring the "Sinhala" reporter and report it?

வினாபுரி மி.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

Political considerations do not matter in Ceylon.

Allegations have been made against Mr. Walpita.

வேலாபிசு மி.

(டாக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

He is a nonentity.

வினாபுரி மி.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

That is because the hon. Member for Nallur does not know him, but if you go to the District Court of Colombo you will find that he is one of the leading civil lawyers there.

பி. சிவசிதம்பரம் மி.

(திரு. எம். சிவசிதம்பரம்)

(Mr. M. Sivasithamparam)

Who told you that?

வினாபுரி மி.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

He is not so able as you.

பி. சிவசிதம்பரம் மி.

(திரு. எம். சிவசிதம்பரம்)

(Mr. M. Sivasithamparam)

He is more in the Law Library than in the courts.—[Interruption.]

புலிதர் பதர் பரிணை கைபிசு

வினாபுரி மி.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

He is a Graduate in Science. He was a former Lecturer in the Law College in Criminal Law and Trusts and also an Examiner. He was on the panel of the Industrial Court. Nobody said that he was unfit. It may not be to the liking of my Friends, but he is a Graduate. Here is an erstwhile Examiner and Lecturer of the Law College who, just because the hon. Member for Nallur does not know him, is not good. The charges made against Mr. Walpita are unfair and uncalled for.

There is one other matter. They tried to say that Mr. Walpita is the political ally of Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana, that he is a—

வேலாபிசு மி.

(டாக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

Political tail.

வினாபுரி மி.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

—member of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Association. It is not a communist organization. After the Bandung Conference, which Sir John Kotelawala himself attended, this association called the Afro-Asian Solidarity Association was born and it held its sessions everywhere. It has its headquarters in Cairo. If membership of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Association makes Mr. Walpita a communist, then you have a communist on your front bench in the U.N.P. The Vice-President of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Association is Dr. M. C. M. Kaleel. The hon. Member for Yapahuwa (Mr. Wanninayake) admitted it as correct during the tea interval.

சே. ஈர். பீல்டர்னெ மி.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

Arab socialist.

පුවත්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිසම

ප්‍රචන්ද්‍ර පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

Whatever it is, you have communists in the front benches. Mr. D. N. W. de Silva I take it is a U.N.P. man. He was in the U.N.P. I do not know whether he still is.

The Afro-Asian Solidarity Association has its headquarters in Cairo and I believe that last year it held its sessions in Tanganyika—in its capital city, Mushik. Mr. Walpita went as a representative of that association. It may be that had Dr. Kaleel been in the best of health he himself would have gone.

පේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

Nothing is wrong with him.

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

His expenses were borne entirely by the Tanganyika Government. So to make these vile charges against Mr. Walpita is uncalled for and ungenerous.

With regard to Mr. K. D. de Silva we have had from the hon. Member for Dehiwala-Mount Lavinia (Dr. Colvin R. de Silva) one of the best certificates that could be given to any person. Even though the hon. Member for Weligama, (Mr. Jayewickreme) during the Debate on the Estimates of the Ministry of Justice, said that he was too old and was not fit to be the chairman, I am glad that that contention was refuted by the hon. First Member for Colombo South (Mr. J. R. Jayewardene) his Deputy Leader.

I want the hon. Leader of the Opposition to read this book—"Three Prime Ministers of Ceylon". Mr. J. L. Fernando who was lobby correspondent here says that during the time of the late Mr. D. S. Senanayake he was summoned to a weekly conference on Wednesdays and that he had a chat with Mr. D. S. Senanayake on political matters.

Mr. J. L. Fernando makes an astounding statement in his book. He says that when there was the dispute as to who should succeed the late Mr. D. S. Senanayake as Prime Minister and there was a tussel between the hon. Leader of the Opposition and Sir John Kotelawala, he was of the opinion that the press should remain neutral but the Lake House high command did not agree with him and came out completely in favour of the hon. Leader of the Opposition. After the hon. Leader of the Opposition became Premier he wrote a very nice letter to Mr. J. L. Fernando. This shows that the newspapers of this country are not working independently. On the occasion of the dispute between the hon. Leader of the Opposition and Sir John Kotelawala they did not remain absolutely neutral.

බඩ්ඩි සෙ'නානායක මයො.

(திரு. டட்ளி சேனஞாயக்க)

(Mr. Dudley Senanayake)

Why should they be neutral ?

ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා

(டொக்டர் கொல்வின் ஆர். டி சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

Are we fighting for the freedom of the press or the neutrality of the press ?

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

We are fighting for both freedom
and neutrality.

I will take the controversial terms of reference now. I will start with (1) and give a straightforward answer to that.

කෙතමනු මයෝ.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman.)

For once !

புலவர் பன் பரிணாமம் கொடுக்க

புலவர் பன் பரிணாமம் கொடுக்க

வினாக்கள் மூலம்.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

During the course of the Debate on the Budget Estimates the hon. First Member for Colombo South (Mr. J. R. Jayewardene) pointed out to me as the Parliamentary Secretary that Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana should not sit on this commission because, as the terms of reference stand, her paper "Trine" will also have to be investigated. Therefore, she will have to sit in judgment on her own paper.

சே. ஈ. பி. பி. பி. பி. பி.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

Why did you appoint her?

வினாக்கள் மூலம்.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

You will see in (l) "conduct of newspapers since January, 1957". We have changed the date.—[Interruption]. I am thankful to the hon. First Member for Colombo South for pointing out to us that it is not proper for a member of the commission to sit in judgment on her own paper.

ஈ. பி. பி. பி. பி. பி.

(டாக்டர் கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

If the hon. Parliamentary Secretary will permit me an interruption, it does not lead to the conclusion that "Trine" should be free of investigation if you are to investigate the rest of the press.

வினாக்கள் மூலம்.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

My answer is that the hon. First Member for Colombo South pointed it out to me and he wanted me to take action. He said that it is not proper for Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana to sit in judgment on her own paper.

சே. ஈ. பி. பி. பி. பி. பி.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

Therefore?

வினாக்கள் மூலம்.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

Therefore, very rightly, we had to exclude that paper.

சே. ஈ. பி. பி. பி. பி. பி.

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தினர்கள்)

(Hon. Members)

Shame! Shame!

சே. ஈ. பி. பி. பி. பி. பி.

(டாக்டர் நாகநாதன்)

(Dr. Naganathan)

Self-confession!

வினாக்கள் மூலம்.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

With one breath you say that it is not proper that Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana should sit in judgment on the "Trine" and when we exclude that—[Interruption].

சே. ஈ. பி. பி. பி. பி. பி.

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தினர்கள்)

(An hon. Member)

You must take her out; exclude her.

வினாக்கள் மூலம்.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

I know you tried to charge her in the "Trine" case and you failed and wanted her out at any cost.

Now, Sir, I come to the other one:

"(k) the extent to which the Lake House or the Times of Ceylon or the Virakesari sought to exercise undue influence."

ප්‍රචන් පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

ප්‍රචන් පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

[වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.]

In the earlier terms of reference you will see that all the newspapers were contemplated, but it was pointed out that if a commission sits according to those terms of reference as they stood, they would include all the newspapers in Ceylon since creation. So that, that would have made the work of the commission heavy. Therefore, what we understand by the monopolist press in Ceylon is not surely "Siyarata". Nobody takes that seriously. We are not anxious to find what is stated there, or what you say tomorrow. But in the case of the Lake House and the Times Group and the Virakesari which go as national newspapers of Ceylon—

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon Member)

What about "Dawasa" ?

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

Yes, "Dawasa" also, if you like. It is a new paper started only the other day. But those papers of the Lake House, Times of Ceylon and Virakesari, which should really be the national newspapers of Ceylon, if they have distorted news or if they have tried certain methods of favouring political parties under the guise of giving information, distorted news, well, those are things that should be brought to light. Therefore, those terms of reference as they stood, would have covered a large field and made the commissioners go into every newspaper in Ceylon. As everybody knows what we really talk of as the monopolist press in Ceylon is the Lake House, Times of Ceylon and the Virakesari Press.

When I pointed it out the hon. Member for Dehiwela-Mt. Lavinia (Dr. Colvin R. de Silva) was not here. That is, the machinery required to establish and maintain proper liaison between the Government and the press. The first part of it is word for word from the Indian terms.

ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා

(டொக்டர் கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

I am not bound by anybody's versions. If I were in India I would fight it in the Indian Parliament and resist it.

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

Now, I can understand the position of the U.L.F. I can sympathize with their view. In other words, they want the take-over of one group, not wholly.

ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා

(டொக்டர் கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

I carefully explained the concrete proposal.

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

They want to break up the monopoly of the press by handing over the "Times" to one concern, the "Dinamina" to another concern and so on.

ආචාර්ය කොල්වින් ආර්. ද සිල්වා

(டொக்டர் கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

To mass organizations of the people, to the co-operatives and the trade unions.

புலவர் பன் பரிணை கைமேலம்

புலவர் பன் பரிணை கைமேலம்

வினாபுரீயை மன.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

I can understand the U.L.F. saying that. Let me ask them this question: if the U.L.F. comes to power, will they allow any newspapers other than their party newspapers?

புலவர் கைமேலம் புலர். டி. சில்வா

(டாக்டர் கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

Certainly, and without doubt. This is the familiar piece of tub-thumping nonsense of all gentlemen of the Right against the Left. I have given him the answer. Let him take it.

வினாபுரீயை மன.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

In Russia—

புலவர் கைமேலம் புலர். டி. சில்வா

(டாக்டர் கொல்வின் ஆர். டி. சில்வா)

(Dr. Colvin R. de Silva)

I am not speaking about Russia.

வினாபுரீயை மன.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

It is the mother country of a fair section of the Marxists of Ceylon. In that country there are only three newspapers, "Pravda", "Izvestia" and "Trud." One of these papers is edited by Mr. Khrushchev's son-in-law.

கைமேலம் மன.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

There are some 275 newspapers there, if you want to know.

வினாபுரீயை மன.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

In China the "Red Flag" is the party paper; then there is "People's Daily" which is a Government paper. I do not know of any other.

The Marxists cannot bluff the people of this country. We know what freedom the press has in a Marxist country.

Recently I met a gentleman from a foreign country in the train to Galle. This person had visited most countries in the world. I asked him what he felt about Ceylon. He said he liked Ceylon very much. I asked him whether he had been to Soviet Russia. He said, "Yes." I asked him what difference he observed between the Soviet Union and Ceylon. He said, "In Ceylon you can get up on a platform and say that the Prime Minister should be sacked forthwith," but if you say such a thing in Russia you would not be in the land of the living.

What the U.L.F. wants is that Lake House and "Times" should be broken up, but where their own party papers are concerned they will not tolerate anyone touching them.

கைமேலம் மன.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Are you giving us the right to speak on Radio Ceylon?

வினாபுரீயை மன.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

I do not want to go into controversies. In spite of their being Marxists, I like them. But I can understand their objections. They

ප්‍රවෘත්ති පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

ප්‍රවෘත්ති පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

[වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.]

say, "Do anything, but where we are concerned we must have the right to strike, to capture post offices, Radio Ceylon, to cut telephone wires," and so on. We do not take them seriously. We understand them. I do not think they mean what they say. After all they are good Friends. I know that, if the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) ever becomes the Prime Minister of this country he will be a perfect democrat, and that red tie of his will disappear.

I have taken some time on this matter. As I said earlier, I am very grateful to the Opposition for all the arguments they have brought forth on this subject. As I said, I expected something quite different, something emotional, like what was said by the hon. Leader of the Opposition at Hyde Park that the lamps of freedom are being dimmed and that he is prepared to sacrifice his life in the fight for this freedom of the press. I would like to point out that there were two Royal Commissions appointed in England and one commission in India, on the question of the press, but nobody seemed to have entertained any fears, and certainly the lamps of freedom have not been dimmed.

I would like to say one word more. It is rather strange that the United National Party which said that they were in favour of a commission should now turn round and attack the personnel of the commission after the commission has been appointed. It appears to my mind that this is a familiar line they are thinking of to take in the near future.

If you refer to page 5 of the "Ceylon Daily News" of Monday the 4th November, you will see what Mr. Jinadasa Niyathapala has said speaking from the same platform as the hon. First Member for Colombo South. He stated that the Government had done something wrong in appointing two judges from the U. A. R. and Ghana to serve on the Bandaranaike Assassination Commission.

ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මයා.

(තිரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

He did not say that.

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(තිරු. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

He did say so. I will get down the paper and show it to you.

ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මයා.

(තිරු. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

He did not say it ; I said it.

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(තිරු. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

Again the "Daily News" has distorted news. According to the "Daily News" report Mr. Jinadasa Niyathapala had said that the Government is wrong—

ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මයා.

(තිරු. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

Of course it is wrong.

වික්‍රමසූරිය මයා.

(තිරු. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

That is why I said that the U. N. P. is taking a familiar line. Before the Bandaranaike Assassination Commission was appointed you said an umpteen number of times in this House, "Appoint a commission! We want that commission." But once the commission is appointed, you perhaps feel uncomfortable now.

ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මයා.

(තිරු. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

Of course not.

புலவர் பன் பரிணாம கௌரவம்

வினாக்கள் மூலம்.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

Men of eminence, men from non-Marxist countries, have been appointed to the commission. And the judge of the Supreme Court who has been appointed to serve on the commission is a person of the highest integrity.

சே. ஈ. பி. பி. பி. பி. பி.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

On a point of personal explanation. We never criticized Mr. Justice T. S. Fernando. In this House I have said, we have stopped the imports of all goods but we are importing two jokers.

வினாக்கள் மூலம்.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

I am very glad he has said it. According to the newspaper report I thought it was the joker Jinadasa Niyathapala who said that. I now find that it is not a joke but a very serious thing.

சே. ஈ. பி. பி. பி. பி. பி.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

Of course, it is a very serious thing.

வினாக்கள் மூலம்.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

Before the Bandaranaike Assassination Commission was appointed, you put forward a brave chest and said "Appoint a commission".

சே. ஈ. பி. பி. பி. பி. பி.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

Of course we said it.

புலவர் பன் பரிணாம கௌரவம்

வினாக்கள் மூலம்.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

But once the commission is appointed you turn round and say—

சே. ஈ. பி. பி. பி. பி. பி.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

We did say it, but do not get outsiders.

வினாக்கள் மூலம்.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

He has admitted it.

சே. ஈ. பி. பி. பி. பி. பி.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

I have said it in this House.

வினாக்கள் மூலம்.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

I will read from the Ceylon Daily News of the 4th instant, page 5, what Mr. Niyathapala is reported to have said :

"Mr. Jinadasa Niyathapala said that the real incidents and true happenings during the language riots in the first Bandaranaike era were made available to the public by the newspapers. The radio and film units showed a blind eye to those events."

This is what the report says further down :

"Mr. Niyathapala criticised the Government for choosing personnel from the U. A. R. and Ghana to serve on the Commission to inquire into the political aspects of the assassination of the late Prime Minister, Mr. Bandaranaike."

சே. ஈ. பி. பி. பி. பி. பி.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

It is wrong.

புலவர் பன் பரிணை கைமேலம்

புலவர் பன் பரிணை கைமேலம்

வினாபுரம் மை.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

According to the "Daily News" report, Mr. Niyathapala is supposed to have said it was wrong to bring two judges from outside, namely, from Ghana and the U. A. R. My Friend says that what he said has been put into the mouth of Niyathapala by the newspaper.

புலவர் பன் பரிணை கைமேலம்.

(திரு. ஜயவிக்கிரம)

(Mr. Jayewickreme)

These are mistakes. They do not do it deliberately. Do you not make mistakes?

வினாபுரம் மை.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

The judge from the U. A. R., Mr. Younis, is a person of the highest integrity and eminence; he is a member of the highest tribunal in the U. A. R. Then the other gentleman who has come from Ghana is a judge of the Supreme Court. You have the audacity to speak of foreigners who have lent their services at the request of the Government and the people of Ceylon in this manner. If Ceylonese were appointed you would have turned round and said that they were biassed people.

What I want to say is that you are following a new line. You said you wanted a commission. When the commission was appointed, when you knew that things would go against you because your conscience is not clear, you say the commissioners—

புலவர் பன் பரிணை கைமேலம்.

(திரு. டட்ளி சேனானாயக்க)

(Mr. Dudley Senanayake)

I protest against that. He must withdraw that.

கலாநாயகர்.

(சபாநாயகர்)

(Mr. Speaker)

I think you are going outside the point.

வினாபுரம் மை.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

What do you want me to withdraw?

புலவர் பன் பரிணை கைமேலம்.

(திரு. டட்ளி சேனானாயக்க)

(Mr. Dudley Senanayake)

That we are afraid that the Commission of Inquiry will go against us.

வினாபுரம் மை.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

What I say is this. It may go against you or it may not go against you. How can you predict?

புலவர் பன் பரிணை கைமேலம்.

(திரு. ஜயவிக்கிரம)

(Mr. Jayawickreme)

How do you know it is going to protect you?

வினாபுரம் மை.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

You wanted the Bandaranaike Assassination Commission. Now you want to tar the reputation of judges—

புலவர் பன் பரிணை கைமேலம்.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

We are against foreigners.

வினாபுரம் மை.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசூரிய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

If we appointed somebody from Ceylon you may have said they are below the mark.—[Interruption.]

පුවත්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

I think I have taken sufficient time and I am grateful for all the sentiments expressed and all the views that have been given. And if my reply hurt any of you in any way because something is unpleasant to you—sometimes the truth is unpleasant—I beg that I be pardoned.

අ. භා. 7.33

ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා. (දඹදෙනිය)

(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனநாயக்க—தம்பதெனிய)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake—Dambadeniya)

ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, කාල වේලාව නැති නිසා ඉතාමත්ම කෙටියෙන් මගේ කථාව කරන්නට මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙතවා. මේ කාලයේදී මේ රටේ පුවත්පත් වල නිදහස ගැන විශාල උද්ඝෝෂණයක් මේ රටේ ඇති වූ බව පුවත්පත් මගින්ම පෙනෙනවා. මේක පෙන්වන්නෙ පුවත් පත්වලින්මයි. පුවත්පත්වල නිදහස කෙරෙහි දක්වනවාය කියන පක්ෂ පාතිත්වය පුවත්පත් වලින්ම පෙන්වනවා. ඒ නිසා එය මොන ආකාරයට පිළිගත යුතුද කියා අපට පෙනෙනවා. මීට පෙර ඡන්ද කාලවලදී පුවත්පත් යම්කිසි පක්ෂයක් අරගෙන වැඩ කළා නම්, ඡන්දයෙන් පැරදුණේ පුවත්පත් ගත් පැත්තයි. ඒක අපි කවුරුත් දන්නා කාරණයක්. ඒ නිසා, මේ පුවත්පත්වල නිදහස කියන එක අපට අමුතු හයානක වගකිවයුතු ප්‍රශ්නයක් හැටියට පුවත්පත්වලින් පෙන්වන්නට උත්සාහ කළාට, අපි කල්පනා කරන්නට ඕනෑ ඒ නිදහස කියන එක කුමක්ද කියා. විනයක් නැති සමාජයක නිදහසක් තබා ගන්නට පුළුවන්ද? ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, තමුන්නාන්සේට පොල්ලක් අරගෙන ගහන්නට මට නිදහසක් තිබෙනවාද? එයට නිදහසක් නැහැ. මම එහෙම කළොත් මට දඬුවම් කරන්න නීතිය තිබෙනවා. මට නිදහස ඇති වුණාද? ඒ ආකාරයට පුවත්පත්වලින් පහර ගහන විට ඊට නිදහස දිය යුතුද, නැත්නම් නීතියෙන් මහජනයා රැකිය යුතුද කියා අහන්නට මා කැමතියි. විනයක් නැති සමාජයක කාටවත් නිදහසක් නැති බව හැම විටම අපි කල්පනා කරන්නට ඕනෑ. රටේ නිදහස තිබෙන්නට නම් විනයක් තිබිය යුතුයි.

පුවත්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

මේ රටේ අංශ කීපයක් තිබෙනවා. නීතිඥවරුන් ඉන්නවා. ඔවුන් පාලනය කරන්නට විශේෂ මණ්ඩලයක් තිබෙනවා. ඔවුන්ගෙන් කෙනෙක් නීති විරෝධී යම් වැඩක් කළොත් නීතිඥයින් පාලනය කරන සභාවෙන් ඔහුට දඬුවම් කරනවා. ඔහුගේ නම නීතිඥ ලැයිස්තුවෙන් කපා හරිනවා. නීතිඥයෙක් අයුතු විධියට මුදල් ඉපයුවොත් නැත්නම් රක්ෂාව අයුතු විධියට පාවිච්චි කළොත් වහාම ඔහුගේ නම නීතිඥ ලැයිස්තුවෙන් කපා දමන්නට අර පාලක මණ්ඩලයට බලය තිබෙනවා.

වෛද්‍යවරුන් සිටිනවා. ඔවුන් පාලනය කරන්නත් මණ්ඩලයක් තිබෙනවා. යම් කෙනෙක් අයුතු විධියට තමන්ගේ රක්ෂාව කරනවා නම්, නැවත වරක් රක්ෂාව කරන්නට බැරි වන අන්දමට ඔහුගේ නම ලැයිස්තුවෙන් කටුගා දමන්නට ඔවුන් පාලනය කරන අර මණ්ඩලයට පුළුවන්. මේ ලඟදී ඇති කළ එකවුන්ටන්වරුන්ගේ පාලන මණ්ඩලයකුත් තිබෙනවා. අයුතු අන්දමට හොරකම්, දූෂණ, ආදියට අසු වුණොත්, ඒ උදවියගේ රැකියාව සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම නැති කරන්නට ඒ මණ්ඩලයට බලය තිබෙනවා. ඒ අන්දමින් ඒ ඒ කොටස්වලට ඒ ඒ රැකියා පාලනය කරන්නට අමුතු පාලන මණ්ඩල තිබෙනවා නම් ප්‍රවෘත්ති පත්‍රවලට පමණක් පාලන මණ්ඩලයක් තැබීමේ අයුක්තිය කුමක්ද කියා අහන්නට කැමතියි. මහජන විරෝධී වැඩ කරන නීතිඥයින් පාලනය කරන්න නීතිඥයින්ගෙන්ම සමන්විත වූ මණ්ඩලයකට බලය තිබෙනවා නම්, විශ්ව විද්‍යාලවල අවුරුදු පහ හය ඉගෙනගෙන මහත්සි වි වැඩ කරන දොස්තරවරුන් පාලනය කරන්න එවැනිම මණ්ඩලයක් තිබෙනවා නම්, මෙවැනි උසස් වෘත්තිවල නියුක්ත වි සිටින අයගේ රක්ෂාවල් එක පැත්ත පාරින් නැති කර දමන්න බලය තිබෙනවා නම්, එමෙන්ම ගණකාධිකාරීන් පාලනය කිරීමටද මණ්ඩලයක් තිබෙනවා නම්, විනය විරෝධී, සමාජ විරෝධී, වැඩ කරන පත්තරකාරයින් පාලනය කිරීමට යම්කිසි නීතියක් තිබීමේ වරද කුමක්ද කියා මා ප්‍රශ්න කරන්නට.

[ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා.]

මහජන මතය හදන්නේ පත්තරකාර සිත්. එසේ නම් මෙවැනි වගකිවයුතු කාර්යයක යෙදී සිටින උදවිය තම කටයුතු හරියාකාර, පිරිසිදු ලෙස කිරීම සඳහා නීති රීති සකස් කළ යුතු නොවේද? ඉතාමත්ම අවශ්‍යයි, ගරු කථානායකතුමනි. විනයක් නැතිව නිදහස් ලෝකයක් තිබෙන්න පුළුවන්ද? සමාජයේ සෑම අංශයක්ම යම්කිසි නීති රීති අනුව පාලනය වෙනවා නම්, පත්තරකාරයින්ටත් විනයක් තිබිය යුතු නොවේද? වැරදි ආරංචි ප්‍රචන්පත්වල පළ කිරීම නිසා රටේ නොයෙක් ආරාධ්‍රල් ඇති වූ අවස්ථා එමට තිබෙනවා. විශේෂයෙන්ම ජාතිභේදවාදී කෝලාහල ඇති වුණේ කෙසේද කියා සොයා බැලීමට විශේෂ කොන්දේසියක් මෙහි ඇතුළත් කළ යුතුය කියා මා කල්පනා කරනවා. මේ අවධියේ “බේරෙ ගෙදරින්” පළ කළ සිංහල පත්‍රවල, “සිංහලයනි, නිදා නොසිට නැගිටිව්. භාෂාව වෙනුවෙන් සටන් කරව්” යන සටන් පාඨ පළ කළ අතර, එම ආයතනය මගින්ම පළ කරන “නිතකරන්” නමැති දෙමළ පත්‍රය, “දෙමළ භාෂාව නැති කිරීමට සිංහල ජනතාවට ඉඩ දෙන්න එපා,” යනාදී දේ පළ කරමින් දෙමළ ජනතාව උසිගැන්නුව. එකම ආයතනය මගින් පළ කළ මේ ප්‍රචන්පත් දෙක ජාතිභේදවාදය ඇවිස්සීමට කටයුතු කළේ මේ අන්දමටයි. ප්‍රචන්පත් මෙවැනි ව්‍යාපාර ගෙන ගිය නිසා ජීවිත බොහෝ ගණනක් විනාශ වී ගිය බව අප සියලු දෙනාම දන්නවා. ඒ නිසා පත්තරවල ක්‍රියා කලාපය පරීක්ෂා කරන්න කොමිෂන් සභාවක් පත් කරන්න යන මේ අවස්ථාවේදී මේ කාරණය ගැන විශේෂ පරීක්ෂණයක් කළ යුතු නොවේද?

රටකට විශාල හානියක් කිරීමේ බලයක් ඕනෑම පත්‍රයකට තිබෙනවා. මා වෙළඳ ඇමති ධුරය දැරූ කාලයේදී ඇති වූ එක සිද්ධියක් පිළිබඳ සුළු විස්තරයක් දෙන්නම්. ප්‍රචන්පත්කාරයින් තමන්ගේ වගකීම අයුතු ලෙස පාවිච්චි කිරීම නිසා රටකට කෙතරම් හානියක් විය හැකිද කියා එයින් මැන ගන්න පුළුවන්. අවිස්සාවේල්ලේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රී වරයාගේ (ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන මයා.) හැඟීමක් තිබුණා, මේ රටේ තිබෙන තේ වතු ජනසතු කළ යුතුය කියා

අවුරුදු 10 ක් යනතුරු තේ වතු ජනසතු නොකරන බව බණ්ඩාරනායක අගමැති තුමා පිට පිටම කීප වරක් ප්‍රකාශ කළා. නමුත් අවිස්සාවේල්ලේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා තමන්ගේ අදහසක් හැටියට යම් යම් අවස්ථාවලදී වතු ජනසතු කරන බව ප්‍රකාශ කළ විට මේ රටේ ප්‍රවෘත්ති පත්‍රවල වැඩ කරන ප්‍රධාන පිරිස වතු ජනසතු කරන බව ආණ්ඩුව ප්‍රකාශ කරනවායයි ගාම්භීරාකාරයෙන් පත්‍රවල පළ කළා. එවැනි ප්‍රවෘත්ති ගාම්භීරාකාරයට පත්‍රවල පළ කරන විට එංගලන්තයේ සිටින කොටස්කාරයන් අඩු මිලට තම කොටස් විකුණන්නට පටන් ගත්තවා. එසේ විකුණන විට ඒ කොටස් ඒ අඩු මිලට ගන්නෙත් පත්‍රකාරයන්මයි. තවත් ටික කලක් ගත වූ පසු අර කොටස් වැඩි මිලට විකුණනවා. මේ රටේ ප්‍රවෘත්ති පත්‍ර මේ ආකාරයට යම් යම් ප්‍රශ්න ඇති කරන්නත්, නැති කරන්නත් වැඩ කරනවා. මා වෙළෙඳ ඇමතිව සිටියදී වෙළෙඳ ව්‍යාපාරිකයන් කීප විට මා මුණ ගසී කී කාරණයක් නම් තේ මිල අඩු වී තිබෙන බව පත්‍රවල පළ වී තිබෙන බවයි. ඇත්තෙන්ම තේ මිල භයානක අන්දමට අඩු වී ඇති බව දැක්වෙන වාර්තාත් ඔවුන් මට පෙන්වා තිබෙනවා. මෙවැනි තත්ත්වයක් ඇති වී තිබෙනවාද කියා තේ වෙන් දේසිවලින් මා ප්‍රශ්න කළ විට දැන ගන්නට ලැබුණේ එවැන්නක් සිදු වී නැති බවයි. එවැන්නක් සිදු වී නැති බව බ්‍රෝකර්වරුන් කීවා. එහෙම නම් මේ ආකාරයට වැඩ කළේ සල්ලි හම්බ කර ගැනීම සඳහායි. මේ විධියේ බොරු වාර්තාවක් පත්‍රවල පළ වූ විට ඊළඟ සතියේ තේ වෙන්දේසියේ දී ඉල්ලුම්කරුවන් ඉල්ලන්නේ මිල අඩුවෙනුයි. ඉතින් මේ අනුව පෙනී යන්නේ මිල අඩු කරන්නත්, මිල වැඩි කරන්නත් අපේ පත්‍රවලට පුළුවන් බවයි. මේ තත්ත්වය කොයි බඩුව සම්බන්ධයෙනුත් සිදු වෙනවා. මෙය දිනපතා සිදු වන දෙයක්. මෙසේ වංචා සහගතව ක්‍රියා කොට ඒ මගින් මුදල් හම්බ කර ගත්තවා. ඇත්තෙන්ම මෙසේ වැඩ කරමින් විශාල වශයෙන් මුදල් උපයා ගන්නේ පත්‍ර කන්නෝරුවල වැඩ කරන ප්‍රධාන පෙළේ අයයි. එහෙම නම් මෙවැනි වැඩ පාලනය නොකළ යුතුද? හිටි ගමන් තිබෙන බව පත්‍රවල පළ වෙනවා.

පුවත්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

පුවත්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

නැවත හිටිගමන් රෙදි නැති බව පළ වෙනවා. මේ කාරණය තමුන්තාසේලා හොඳින් දන්නවා ඇති. පත්‍රකාරයන් වුව මනාවෙන්ම මෙවැනි වැඩ කරනවා. එසේ කරන්නේ එයින් වාසියක් බලාගෙනයි. අපේ ආර්ථික ප්‍රශ්නයත්, වෙළෙඳ ප්‍රශ්නයත් පැහැදිලිව නිරවුල්ව තබා ගන්නට ඕනෑ නම් ඒ සඳහා පත්‍ර පාලනය කරන ක්‍රමයක් තිබිය යුතුයි. පත්‍ර පාලනය කරන ක්‍රමයක් තැත්නම් කවරදාකවත් ඒ ප්‍රශ්න නිරවුල්ව තබා ගන්නට බැහැ. පත්‍රවල බොරු වාර්තා පළ වන විට ඒ ගැන පැමිණිලි කළයුතු ස්ථානයක් තිබිය යුතුයි. අනික් සෑම අංශයක්ම පාලනය කරන මණ්ඩල තිබෙනවා නම් පත්‍ර පාලනය කිරීම සඳහාත් එවැනි මණ්ඩලයක් නොතිබිය යුත්තේ ඇයිදැයි මට නම් වැටහෙන්නේ නැහැ. ඒ සඳහා ආණ්ඩුවට සම්බන්ධ නැති ස්වාධීන මණ්ඩලයක් තිබිය යුතුයි. අයුතු වාර්තාවක් පළ වූ විට ඒ ගැන සොයා බලා වැරදිකරුවන්ට දඬුවම් දිය යුතුයි. නමුත් දැන් තිබෙන තත්ත්වය අනව දඬුවම් දෙන්නට ක්‍රමයක් නැහැ. පුවත්පත් පාලනය කරන මණ්ඩල ඉන්දියාවේ මෙන්ම එංගලන්තයේත් තිබෙනවා නම් එවැනි මණ්ඩලයක් ලංකාවේද තිබුණාම වෙන වරද මොකක්ද?

ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, අද මේ විවාදය පැවතුණේ පුවත්පත් පාලනය කරන පණතක් පිළිබඳ විවාදයක ආකාරයටයි. නමුත් තවම එවැනි පණතක් ඉදිරිපත් කර නැහැ. දැනට කරන්ට අදහස් කර තිබෙන්නේ පරීක්ෂණය පමණයි. ඒ පරීක්ෂණයේ ප්‍රතිඵල ලැබුණාට පසුව නැත්නම් ඒ කොමිෂමේ නිර්දේශ ලැබුණාට පසුව ඒවා ගැන විපරම් කර බලන්ට පුළුවනි. පරීක්ෂණයක්වත් නොපවත්වන ලෙසද දැන් මේ කියන්නේ? විභාගයක් පවත්වන්ටත් එපාය කියන එකේ තේරුම මොකක්ද කියලා මට නම් තේරෙන්නේ නැහැ. කොමිෂම පත් කළායින් පස්සෙ කරුණු සෝදිසි කර වාර්තාවක් පිට කළායින් පස්සෙ එහි අඩංගු වන නිර්දේශ වලින් පිළිගත යුතු මොනවද, නොපිළිගත යුතු මොනවද, කියා තීරණය කරන්න මේ ගරු සභාවට පුළුවන්කම තිබෙනවා. අයු වල් නිර්දේශය හොඳ නැහැනි නිසා

කල්පනා කරනවා නම් ඒක කපනවා. අපේ සතුව අනුව—මේ ගරු සභාවේ සතුව අනුව—ඒක කරන්න පුළුවනි. එහෙම නොකර කොමිෂමක් මගින් විභාගයක් කරන්නත් එපාය කියන එකේ නම් කිසිම අදහසක් වත් කිසිම අර්ථයක්වත් නැති බව මතක් කරන්න කැමතියි. හැම දාම පුවත්පත් වලට නිදහස දිය යුතුය කියා වල්බුරු නිදහසක් සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම මේ පත්‍රකාරයින්ට දෙන්නද කියන්නේ, කියා මම අහන්න කැමතියි. තැසි ගිය ඩී. එස්. සේනානායක අගමැතිතුමාගෙ ආණ්ඩුව හැර අනෙක් ඕනෑම ආණ්ඩුවක් ගැන කල්පනා කර බැලුවොත්, ඒ කොයිම ආණ්ඩුවකටවත් තමන්ට නියමිත කාල සීමාව අවසාන කරන්න බැරි වුණේ මොන කාරණයක් නිසාද කියන එක පෙනී යනව ඇති. ඊට හේතු වුණේ මේ පත්‍රකාරයින්ගේ කියන එක කිසිම සැකයක් නැතිව කියන්න පුළුවනි. ඒක හැම දෙනාම පාහේ කියන කතාවක්. මේ තරමටම වරින් වර ආණ්ඩු කඩන්ට පුළුවන්කමක් තිබෙන මේ පත්‍රකාරයින්ට තව තවත් ආණ්ඩු කඩන්ට ඉඩ දීම නිදහස දීමක්ද කියා අහන්න කැමතියි. මේ විධියට ක්‍රියා කරගෙන යන්ට ඉඩ දුන්නොත් මේ රට ආණ්ඩු කිරීමේ කටයුත්ත මොන විධියකින්වත් කරන්න, මොන ආණ්ඩුවක්වත් මේ රටේ පවත්වා ගෙන යන්න, බැරි වන බව තමුන්තාත් සෙට මුලින්ම කියන්ට කැමතියි.

තේජා ගුණවර්ධන මැතිනියට විරුද්ධව තදින්ම විවේචන කරන්ට යෙදුණා මේ ගරු සභාවේදී. මොකක්ද එසේ කරන්ට හේතුව? ඒ මැතිනිය විනයට පක්ෂ පාවයිලි. ඉතින් මොකක්ද ඒකෙ තියෙන වැරද්ද? විනයට පක්ෂපාත වුණාම අපට තියෙන අමාරුව මොකක්ද? විනයට පක්ෂ පාත උදවිය අයින් කරනව නම් එසේ අයින් කරන්න හේතුවක් තිබෙන්නේ ඇමෙරිකාවටයි. චීනට විරුද්ධ රටක් නිසා රුසියන්කාරයින්ටත් පුළුවනි චීනට පක්ෂපාත උදවියට විරුද්ධ වෙන්න කපන්න. ඉන්දියාව චීනට විරුද්ධ රටක් නිසා චීනට පක්ෂ උදවිය අයින් කරන්න හේතුවක් ඉන්දියාවටත් තියෙනව. ඉංග්‍රීසිකාරයින්ටත් චීනට පක්ෂපාත

ප්‍රචන් පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිසම

ප්‍රචන් පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිසම

[ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා]

වෙන්න ප්‍රචවති. සිංහලයින්ට එහෙම කරන්න කිසිම හේතුවක් නැහැ. මොකක්ද අපට එසේ කරන්න නියෙන හේතුව? චින බත් අද වන තුරුත් කකා ඉන්න අපි චිනයට පක්ෂපාත කෙනෙකු පත් කළාය කියා මේ තරම් තදින් විරුද්ධ වෙන්ට හේතුවක් නියෙනවාද? එක් කෙනෙකුට කියනව චිනයේ නියෝජිතයෙක්ය කියල. හොඳයි, පත්‍ර මණ්ඩලවල ඉන්ට බැරිද කොමියුනිස්ට් පක්ෂයේ නැත්නම් රුසියාවේ නියෝජිතයෙකුට? පත්‍ර මණ්ඩලවල නැද්ද අමෙරිකන්කාරයින්ගෙ, ඉංග්‍රීසිකාරයින්ගෙ, ඉන්දියන්කාරයින්ගෙ නියෝජිතයෝ? අපට මතක නැද්ද මේ ගරු සභාවේ ගරු කථානායක ධුරයෙහි සමසමාජ පක්ෂයෙන් කෙනෙකු සිටි බව? පාර්ලිමේන්තුවේ උසස් යානාත්තරයක් වන කථානායක තනතුරට පත් කරගනු ලැබූ ඒ අවස්ථාවේ එතුමා කී දේ අපට මතක නැද්ද? “මා සමසමාජකාරයෙකු බව ඇත්ත; නමුත් මගේ දේශපාලන අදහස් මා දරන තනතුරේ යුතුකම් ඉෂ්ට කරන අවස්ථාවල මතු කරන්නේ නැත,” කියා එතුමා ඒ තනතුර භාර ගත් අවස්ථාවේ කීවේ නැද්ද? මේ ගරු පාර්ලිමේන්තු සභාව පාලනය කරන්න සමසමාජකාරයෙකුට ප්‍රචවත්කමක් තිබුණා නම්, එවැනි බලයක් අපි එදා එවැන්නෙකුට දුන්නා නම්, මොකද මේ මොන කාරණයක් තිසාද විනෙට ගිය, විනෙට පක්ෂපාත, චින ආණ්ඩුව ගැන යම්කිසි විධියක හොඳ හැඟීමක් තිබෙන කෙනෙකු ප්‍රචන් පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිසමක සභිකාවක හැටියට වැඩ කිරීම ගැන තිබෙන තහනම? මම නම් අහලාවත් නැහැ මේ විධියේ තර්කයක්. මේ තරමටම චිනය පිළිකුල් කරන උදවිය චින භාලෙන් පිසූ බත් කන්නේ නැද්ද? චින භාලේ නම් කැ හැකියි බඩ පාලෙන තුරු. එහෙම චින භාලේ කකා චිනය පිළිකුල් කිරීම බොහොම වැරදියි. අපේ සල්ලි දිල වුණත් භාලේ ගන්න අපට වෙන තැනක් නියෙනවාද? ගන්න වත්කම තිබුණත් වෙන ගන්න තැනක් නියෙනවාද? දැන් බලන්න රුසියාව දිහා. අද ඇමෙරිකාවෙන් පාන් පිටි ගෙන්වා ගන්නවානේද? අද ඒ උදවියට “පාන්” කියා ගන්න වුණත් ප්‍රචවන් වෙලා නියෙන්නේ ඇමෙරිකන්

භාලේ නැතුව හිටපු අවස්ථාවේ චිනය අපට භාලේ දුන්නේ නැද්ද? ඒ වෙනුවට අපෙන් රබර් දුන්නා තමයි. එහෙම නැතිව තිකම් දෙන්න ප්‍රචවන් රටක් කොහෙද නියෙන්නේ? කොහෙන් වත් භාලේ දෙන්නේ නැති කාලෙන් චිනය අපට භාලේ දුන්නා නම්, ඒ විධියට ක්‍රියා කරපු චිනයත් අපේ රටත් අතර නොහොඳක් නියෙන්න ප්‍රචවන්ද? අපේ රටේ වැසියන් අතර චිනය ගැන පිළිකුලක් ඇති වෙන්ට කිසිම හේතුවක් නැහැ. ඉන්දියාවට නම් චිනයත් එක්ක අමනාප වෙන්න කාරණයක් නියෙනව. චිනය පිළිකුල් කරන්න කාරණයක් ඉන්දියාවට නියෙනව වෙන්ට ප්‍රචවති. ඒ රටවල් දෙක අතරේ යුද්ධයක් නියෙනව. අද ඉන්දියාව චිනෙන් එක්ක යුද්ධයක් කරනව. ඒ රටේ හතුරන් හැටියට ඉන්දියාව චිනුන්ව හඳුන්වන එක ඇත්ත. ඒ වුණාට ඉන්දියාව චිනෙට විරුද්ධ වුණු තිසාම, චිනයට නියෝජිතවරියක හැටියට ගිය තැනැත්තියක විම ගැන සලකා තේජා ගුණවර්ධන මැතිනිය ප්‍රතික්ෂේප කරන්න කිසිම හේතුවක් හෝ කාරණයක් හෝ නැති බව මතක් කරන්න කැමතියි.

තවත් කාරණයක් නියෙනව. තමුත්තාත් සෙලා දකින්නත් ඇති, ඉන්දියාවේ “බ්ලිට්ස්” කියන පත්‍රය කොයි තරම් කැන විධියට තේජා ගුණවර්ධන මැතිනිය විවේචනය කර තිබෙනවාද කියා. ඒ මහත්මිය අවලක්ෂණ කැන ගැනියෙක්යයි කිව්ව.

රෝයි රාජපක්ෂ මයා.
(திரு. ரோய் ராஜபக்ச)
(Mr. Roy Rajapakse)

ඒක තමයි වැරද්ද. ඒ ගොල්ල සතුටු නැත්තේ ඒක නිසා තමයි.

ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා.
(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனநாயக்க)
(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

මා ගරු කරන අපේ ගාල්ලේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා වැදගත් විවේචනයක් හැටියට ඒ කාරණය එතුමාගේ කථාවෙදි සඳහන් කළා. මෙවැනි කොමිසමකට වාඩි වන්නට රූප රැජිනියක් විය යුතුද? ඒකෙන්ද සිද්ධියක් මඹන්නේ? ඇයි, පොත් ලිවීම

පුවත්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

හොඳ මදි ද? ලෝකයේ නොයෙක් රටවල ඇවිද රට නොටවල් ගැන දැන ගැනීම වරදක්ද? චිත්තු තක්කඩි රැළක් වශයෙන් හඳුන්වමින් චිත්ත නායකයන්ට බණින ඉන්දියානු ආණ්ඩුවම චිත්තය එක්සත් ජාතීන්ගේ සංගමයට ඇතුළත් කළ යුතු යයි සටහන් ගෙන යනව. තක්කඩි රැළක් නම් ඔවුන් එක්සත් ජාතීන්ගේ සංගමයට ඇතුළත් කර ගැනීමට තිබෙන වුවමනාව මොකක්ද? ඒ සභායෝගී ඒ සටහන ගෙන යනව. ඒ අතර චිත්තයට පක්ෂපාත තේජා ගුණවර්ධන මහත්මිය මේ කොමිෂමට පත් කළාය කියා අපේ රටට විශාල කැළලක් වන ආකාරයට ඉන්දියානු පත්‍ර මේ පත් කිරීම විවේචනය කිරීම සුදුසු නැහැ.

තවත් එක කාරණයක් මතක් කරන්න කමතියි. ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් බොහොම දෙනෙක් දන්නවා ඇති, අපි නොයෙක් පළාත්වල රැස්වීම්වලට ගොස් පවත්වන කථා ඒ අන්දමට පත්‍රවල වාර්තා නොවන බව. පත්‍ර කියවන විට අපට පෙනී යනවා, සමහරවිට පත්‍රවල තිබෙන්නේ අප කී දේවල් නොවන බව. ඊට හේතුව මේකයි. වාර්තාකරුවන් සාමාන්‍ය වශයෙන් සම්පූර්ණ කථාවම ලියනව. ඒ උදවිය ලගු ලේඛන ක්‍රම, “ෂෝට් හැන්ඩ්” දන්නෙ නැහැ. ඒ නිසා හිතේ තිබෙන දේවල් ලියාගෙන, ගෙදර ගිහින් බුම්මෙල් ලාම්පු පත්තු කරගෙන තවත් දේවල් ලියා පත්‍ර කාර්යාලයට යවනව. අන්තිමේදි පත්‍රවල තිබෙන්නේ අපි කිව්ව දේවල් නොවෙයි. මහජනයා මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්ගේ හොඳ නරක මණින්නේ අපේ ප්‍රකාශවලින්. එම නිසා අපේ අදහස් අවංක ලෙස, සුද්ධ ලෙස මහජනයා ඉදිරියේ තැබීම ඉතාමත්ම වටිනව. අපට ඒ අවස්ථාව දෙනවා නම් සුද්ධ ලෙස ලබා දිය යුතුයි. පත්‍ර වාර්තා කරුවන් වශයෙන් පුහුණු උදවිය පත් නොකර ඒ වෙනුවට ගුරුවරයෙකු වැනි කෙනෙකු සුළු පඩියක් දී පත් කළාම අපටයි එයින් විශාල පහරක් වදින්නේ. මේ විශාල ධනයක් තිබෙන, විශාල කර්මාන්තයක් ගෙන යන මේ පිරිසට බැරිද, ඒ ඒ පළාත්වල වාර්තාකරුවන් වශයෙන් පත් කර සිටින උදවියට කුඩා වේප් රෙකෝඩරයක් බැගින් ලබා දෙන්න? එවිට අපට හයක් නැතිව කථා කළ හැකියි. අපේ කථා

පුවත්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

වේප් එකේ තිබෙයි. එවිට අපේ කථාව ඇතුළත් වේප් එක කෙලින්ම කොළඹට එවන්නට පුළුවන්. අර මා කලින් කී විධියට කුරුටු ගහා එවන වාර්තා ඉතා හයානකයි. මා රැස්වීමකට ගොස් කථා වක් කළොත්, පසුවදා මා ඉතා හයෙන් ඒ කථාව පත්‍රවල වාර්තා වී තිබෙන්නේ කොහොමද කියා බලනව.

එක කරුණක් නිදර්ශනයක් වශයෙන් මා තමුන්නාන්සෙලාට මතක් කරන්න කමතියි. එය වුවමනාවෙන්ම කළ දෙයක් දැයි මා දන්නෙ නැහැ. අවිස්සාවේල්ලේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාත් මමත් එක ඇමති මණ්ඩලයේ සිටි කාලයේදී අපේ අදහස් අනුව නොයෙක් මතභේද තිබුණු බව ඇත්ත. අපි පොරකා බව ඇත්ත. එහෙත් අපේ හේදය කාලයක් යන තුරු එළියට ගෙනාවෙ නැහැ. ඒ කාලයේදී එක්තරා අවස්ථාවක මට වැලිවේරියේ රැස්වීමකට යන්ට ආරාධනයක් ලැබුණා. එය පිළිගෙන රැස්වීමට යන්ට බලාපොරොත්තුව සිටින අතරතුර හදිසියේ මට රටෙන් පිට යන්ට සිද්ධ වුණා. එහෙත් ඒ රැස්වීම පැවැත්වූ දිනට පසුවදා මගේ මැතිනිය පත්‍රය කියවන විට දැක තිබෙනව, කලින් දින වැලිවේරියේ රැස්වීමකදී මා ඉතා පුදුමාකාර විධියට මගේම කැබිනට් එකේ සහෝදර පිලිප් ගුණවර්ධන මහත්මයාට අපහාස කර තිබෙන බව. එවිට මැතිනිය ටෙලිපෝන් කර පත්‍ර කාර්යාලයට දන්වා තිබෙනව, මේ වාර්තාව වැරදියි, මේක වෙන්ට බැහැ, මගේ ස්වාමිපුරුෂයා රටේ හිටියෙ නැහැ, කියා. මම ඒ දිනවල රටෙන් පිටවෙලයි හිටියෙ. ඒ අවස්ථාවේදී ඒ ටෙලිපෝන් පනිවුඩයට පිළිතුරු දුන් තැනැත්තා පොරොන්දු වී තිබෙනව, බොහොම කනගාටුයි, අපි මේ ගැන සොයා බලල හෙට නිවැරදි වාර්තාව පත්‍රයේ දමන්නම් කියා. ඊළඟ දිනයේ පත්‍රය බලන විටත් ඒ වාර්තාව ඒ අන්දමටම තිබෙනවා දැක තැවතත් ටෙලිපෝන් කර කියා තිබෙනව, කෝ අර හරිගස්සනවාය කිව්ව වාර්තාව තවම හදා නැත කියා. එවිට ඒ නිලධාරියා කියා තිබෙනව, අපි ඒ ගැන සොයා බැලුවාය, ආර්. ජී. ලංකාවෙ හිටිය නම් කියන්නේ ඕකය කියා. මම හිටියේ රටින් පිට. මෙවැනි වාර්තා පළ කර මෙහෙම කියන්නට පුළුවන් නම් මේ පත්‍ර පාලනය කරන්නට ඕනෑ නේද? ඒ නිසා

පුවත්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

පුවත්පත් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂම

[ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා.]

මේ පරීක්ෂණය පවත්වා පුළුවන් තරම් ඉක්මනින් මේ පුවත්පත් පාලනය කළ යුතුයි. හැබැයි, පුවත්පත් ආණ්ඩුව අතට ගන්නය කියා මම කියන්නේ නැහැ. පුවත්පත් වලට නිදහස තියෙන්න ඕනැ. විවේචනය අවශ්‍යයි. මැති ඇමතිවරුන් යම් යම් වැඩ පිළිවෙළවල් යොදාගෙන යන විට ඒ අයගේ දුර්වලකම් නිසා වැරදි ඇති වන්න පුළුවන්. විවේචනයට ඉඩ තිබුණේ නැත්නම් ඒ වැරදි හඳුන්වන නැහැ. ඒ නිසා විවේචනයට ඉඩ තිබිය යුතුයි. ඒ විවේචනය අවශ්‍යවීමේ පරමාර්ථයක් තියෙනව. සෑම දෙනාගේම පරමාර්ථය රටට සේවය කිරීම නම් විවේචනය කිරීමත් රටට සේවය කිරීමේ අදහසින් කරන්න ඕනැ. කඩාකප්පල්කාරී පිළිවෙළට විවේචනය කරනවා නම් ඒ විවේචනවලින් රටට ජාතියට යහපතක් සිදු වන්නේ නැහැ. පත්‍ර රට ගිනි තිබ්බ. ජාතිවාදය මතු කරල එක වරක් ගිනි තිබ්බ. ඒ නිසා සිය ගණන් මිනිස්සු මැරුණ. ඒ නිසා නිදහස පාලනය කරන්නට ඕනැ. මගේ කථාව වරදවා තේරුම් ගන්න එපා. පත්‍ර ආණ්ඩුව අතට ගන්නය කියා මම කියන්නේ නැහැ. නීතිඥවරුන්ගේ පාලක සභාව ආණ්ඩුව අතට ගත්තේ නැහැ. දොස්තරවරුන්ගේ පාලක සභාව ආණ්ඩුව අතට ගත්තේ නැහැ. ඒ අයටම ස්වාධීනත්වයක් දීල තියෙනව, ඒ රැකිරිකර කරන අය පාලනය කරන්න; විනයගරුකව හදා ගන්න. එසේම පුවත්පත් පාලනය කරන්නටත් අපි ඒ පිරිසට ඉඩ දෙන්න ඕනැ. ඒ අයට එක්තරා ස්වාධීනත්වයක් ඇතිව යුක්ති සහගත පිළිවෙළට විවේචනය කිරීමට ඉඩ දෙන්න ඕනැ. යම් පත්‍රයක් බොරුවක් පළ කරල යම් කෙනකුට හිරිහැරයක් කර දරයක් ඇති කළොත් ඒ පත්‍ර කාරයන්ට දඬුවම් කළ යුතුයි.

මම පොල්ලක් අරගෙන කෙනෙකුට ගැසුවොත් උසාවියෙන් මට දඬුවම් කරනව. එහෙම නම් පත්‍රවලින් පහර ගහන විට දඬුවම් දෙන්න ක්‍රමයක් ඇති කිරීම වැරදි ඇයි? ඒ නිසා වැරදි කළාම දඬුවම් දීමට උසාවියක්, පාලන සභාවක්, පත්‍රවලටත් සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම අවශ්‍යයි. අනික් රටවලත් ඒ ආකාරයට කෙරෙනව නම් මේ රටෙන් ඒ ආකාරයට කළ යුතුයි.

ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, මට කියන්න තියෙන අවසාන කාරණාව මේකයි. නගර වල අපි ප්‍රංචි ආණ්ඩු හදාගෙන—නගර සභා හදාගෙන—නගර ශුඛ කරනව. නගරයේ තියෙන කුණු විනාශ කරනව. නමුත් හැම දාම ශත දහයක් පහළොවක් දීල පත්‍රය අරගන්න අපි ලෝකයේම තියෙන කුණු, රටේම තියෙන කුණු, ගෙදරට ගේනව. ගෙදර තිබෙන කුණු විනාශ කිරීමට නගර සභා තබාගෙන විශාල වියදමක් දරන අපි පත්‍ර මාගියෙන් විශාල කුණු තොගයක් ගෙදරට ගෙනෙනව. පත්‍ර මගින් කොයි තරම් දුරට ජාතික අධ්‍යාපනයක් ඇති කරනවද, කොයි තරම් දුරට මහජනයාගේ දැනීම දියුණු කරනවද යන්න සොයා බැලීමත් මේ කොමිෂන් සභාවෙන් කළ යුතු එක වැඩක් හැටියට ඇතුළු කළ යුතුයි. පත්‍ර මගින් රටේ නිෂ්පාදනයට කොයි තරම් උදව්වක් දෙනවාද යන්නත් සොයා බැලිය යුතුයි. ඇසිඬි බිව්ව අය ගැනත්, ජීවිතය හානි කර ගන්න අය ගැනත්, දූෂණය කළ අය ගැනත් පමණයි, අද පත්‍රවල ආරංචි පළ කරන්නේ. ඒ “විරයන්” ගැන පමණයි තොරතුරු පළ කරන්නේ. නමුත් රටට සේවයක් කරන විරයන් ගැන තොරතුරු පළ කරන්නේ නැහැ. විශාල අස්වැන්නක් ලබා ගන්න විරයන් ගැන, විශාල බඩු තොගයක් බැව වරායේ විරයන් ගැන, කම්කරු විරයන් ගැන පත්‍රවල පළ කරල ජාතික උනන්දුවක් ඇති කරන්නේ නැත්තේ ඇයි? උඩ පැන්න විරයන් ගැන, දුර පැන්න විරයන් ගැන පමණයි, වාතී පළ කරන්නේ. නමුත් රටට සේවයක් කරන විරයන් ගැන වාතී පළ කරන්නේ නැහැ. ජීවිත පුදාගෙන, මහන්සි වෙගෙන, රට ගැන කැක්කුමක් ඇතිව කුඹුරේදි වේවා, වරායේදි වේවා, වැඩ පොළේදි වේවා, කරන විර ක්‍රියා ගැන අපේ පත්‍රවල තොරතුරු පළ වන්නේ නැහැ. ඒවට පත්‍රවල ඉඩ නැහැ. මේ විධියේ කුණු ගෙනෙන ව්‍යාපාර ගෙන නොගොස්, පත්‍ර ව්‍යාපාරයේ පරමාර්ථය කුමක්ද යන්න හොඳින් දැනගෙන, රට සංවර්ධනය කරලිය හැකි වන අන්දමේ, ජාතික හැඟීම් ඇති කරලිය හැකි වන අන්දමේ උසස් පරමාථ අනුව ක්‍රියා කරන්න මෙම කොමිෂන් සභාව පිහිටුවීමෙන් හැකි වේවා යි ප්‍රාර්ථනය කරමින් මගේ වචන ස්වල්පය අවසාන කරනව.

கல் நுனிம

கல் நுனிம

கலாநாயகருமா

(சபாநாயகர்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please! It is 8 p.m. Will the Hon. Minister move the Adjournment?

கல் நுனிம

ஒத்திவைப்பு

ADJOURNMENT

ஈழநாடு ஒத்திவைப்புக் கமிட்டி, பின்னாலே சபைத் தலைவரின் கமிட்டி. “மத்திய மனவரையே நான் கல் நுனிம ய்யுது.”—[அரு. சி.பி. டி.பி. மென் மனவரையாக]

வினாக்கள் மைய.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசுரீய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

We agreed to go on till 8.30 P.M. leaders of parties have agreed to that, I understand. [Interruption].

வினாக்கள் மைய.

(திரு. டட்ளி சேனானாயக்க)

(Mr. Dudley Senanayake)

I got up to speak—

கைமன் மைய.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Mr. Speaker, our party has not been allowed to speak. We have not been allowed to speak.

வினாக்கள் மைய.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசுரீய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

The leaders of parties agreed to terminate the Debate at 8.30 P.M. If I am wrong, I want it to be corrected.

வினாக்கள் மைய.

(திரு. டட்ளி சேனானாயக்க)

(Mr. Dudley Senanayake)

After asking me to reply to a number of things he raised he wants to shut me out.

வினாக்கள் மைய.

(திரு. விக்கிரமசுரீய)

(Mr. Wickramasuriya)

It was agreed to at the leaders' meeting. I was not at the party leaders' meeting. There were two speakers on behalf of the Government, the hon. Member for Mawanella and myself.

கைமன் மைய.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Why do you want to speak on something which you do not know?

பி. பி. டி. பி. குணவர்தன மைய. (கொட்டை)

(திரு. டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன—கொட்டை)

(Mr. D. B. R. Gunawardena—Kottawa rose.)

கலாநாயகருமா

(சபாநாயகர்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please! You are wasting time. Will the hon. Member please sit down?

பி. பி. டி. பி. குணவர்தன மைய.

(திரு. டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

(Mr. D. B. R. Gunawardena)

On a point of Order. Earlier, you said that only the leaders of parties—

கலாநாயகருமா

(சபாநாயகர்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Your party has finished speaking. There is no point of Order. Will you please sit down?

பி. பி. டி. பி. குணவர்தன மைய.

(திரு. டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

(Mr. D. B. R. Gunawardena)

I will sit down but I will not accept any falsehood uttered by anybody in this House.

කල් තැබීම

தெனமந் மடா.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

If the hon. Member for Kottawa will permit, it is very late. Many points relevant to the Debate have been made and a great number of points which have no relevance whatever to the Debate have also been made principally in the speeches of the hon. Parliamentary Secretary and the hon. Member for Dambadeniya. I must say that this is a very curious frame of mind. There are a number of extraneous factors which undoubtedly have to be taken into consideration in this Debate.

I must say, Sir, that I am very much unimpressed and unmoved by the screaming of the monopolist press about the freedom of the press. These gentlemen who have utilized their monopoly to the full to keep down every little spark of progress in this country, to slander and attack all forces of progress, are now howling about the freedom of the press. I am not at all impressed by that just as much as I am not impressed by the way in which the insurance companies are publishing big advertisements about the freedom to insure. I must say I am equally very little impressed by the marches and Hyde Park meetings about the freedom of the press. With due respect to my friend the hon. First Member for Colombo South, he is very vigorous now in the matter of the defence of the freedom of the press, but I do not remember him speaking like this during the *hartal* when his Government closed down our party paper for one month. We were closed down and there was no protest.

ප්‍රේ. ආර්. පයවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

For how long?

කෙනෙමත් මිය.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

One month

කල් තැබීම

ප්‍රේ. ආර්. ප්‍රසවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(Mr. J. R. Jayewardene)

One week.

කෙනමත් මයො.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

One month or so. The hon. Member for Dambadeniya used to continue some of these bad habits when he was a Minister in the S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike Government.

I want to say, first of all, that I am opposed to the appointment of the Press Commission because I regard this as a step backwards.

In 1960 the Government made certain specific promises in its Throne Speech. Those promises were concrete and specific. They were promises to take over certain newspaper companies and to broaden their ownership.

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary keeps talking about the need for a commission and the hon. Member for Dambadeniya agrees. I ask the hon. Members of the Government, if you came to this conclusion in 1960, what is the use of appointing a Press Commission in 1963? Either you have behaved in a thoroughly irresponsible way and have held out promises you have not thought about, or else you have yielded to the pressures of vested interests and are trying to cover it up by this Press Commission.

No less than three separate Press Bills were introduced but they never got beyond the Government Parliamentary Group, because in every one of those Bills it became clear that the Government was departing more and more from the aim which it put forward in 1960, namely, the ending of the capitalistic monopoly ownership of the daily press, and was coming more and more towards attacking the freedom of the press in this country.

කල් නැයිම

කල් නැයිම

There was a Bill that was published. There was Part I, which was the implementation of a promise, and there was Part II, which was nothing but an attempt to muzzle the freedom of the press and to gag freedom of speech. That is why I say this Press Commission is nothing but a step backwards.

If this Press Commission had been appointed before there was a promise to break the monopoly of the press, there would have been a case for it. The appointment of a Press Commission three years after you had made a concrete proposal to break the press monopoly is nothing but an attempt to camouflage your surrender to vested interests.

As far as we are concerned, we are for the freedom of the press, and that is why we want to fight against press monopoly. The real obstruction to the freedom of the press in this country is the ownership of the daily press by certain monopoly capitalist concerns. That is the real absolute obstruction to the freedom of the press in this country. That is the real limitation.

What is the Government trying to do about that by this Commission? It is leaving that alone. It is not prepared to attack the obstructions to press freedom in the form of monopoly, but it is trying to make an attack in the one place where real freedom of the press does exist, and that is the periodical and weekly press of the country. If anybody wants to know what is going on in this country he should read the weekly press. There is real freedom of the press there.

What is the objection that we have against these papers of the Lake House and Times Group? We may object to their politics; we may object to their dirty tricks; but they have a right to express their views. What we do object to is that they exercise a monopoly of power over information and thought without any responsibility.

Even a conservative British Prime Minister, Mr. Stanley Baldwin, once referred to the prototype of the Lake House and Times Group papers in his country as the press that exercises power without responsibility which was, he said, the prerogative of the harlot throughout the ages. These are nameless, faceless newspapers claiming to be representatives of the nation, voice of the people, representing some independents. But, in actual fact, who owns them? Lake House is a private family company. "Times" is no different. Why should certain people claim the right to monopolize information and thought merely because they have inherited wealth or married wealth? What is their other qualification?

If you ask the majority of the people in Ceylon, they do not know who the editors of some of these papers are. They do not know the owners of some of these newspapers. But these people are speaking in the name of the nation.

If tomorrow these papers declare themselves as organs of the United National Party, I have no quarrel. The United National Party has every right to have a daily organ.—[*Interruption*].

These papers, pretending to be a national press, pretending to be non-political, pretending to be above party, are surreptitiously and openly using positions that they have, not by the authority of the people but by wealth, to subvert and misinform people. That is what you should deal with, Mr. Ministers. That is the crux of the matter. That is precisely the thing you are going to avoid.

Do you need a commission to tell you who owns these papers? Do you need a commission to tell you that monopoly is a bad thing? What is the meaning of these terms of reference? The first four questions are like a question paper for a kindergarten child. They are going to ask the commissioners to report whether press monopoly is a bad thing. Even a quarter-wit can answer these questions. Do you want to know who the

කල් තැබීම

කල් තැබීම

[කෙතමන් මග.]

paper companies are? Go to the Registrar of Companies, pay a stamp duty and you can get the information. Do you want a commission? That is not the real point. This is a camouflage. The real point is you want to control and extend your tentacles of control over certain other organs of opinion. That is the real objection that we have.

My hon. Friend, the Parliamentary Secretary, who apparently knew nothing about what he was talking except his one admission on why they had to change the terms of reference—he fell into his own trap and had to confess it—spoke about socialist countries where, he said, there are only two or three papers. Let me tell him that in the Soviet Union there are at least 240 daily papers—I do not know how many others—but every one of these is owned by different organizations of the people. Trade unions have their papers, the Communist Party has its paper, the Government has its paper, the Kom-somol Youth League has its paper, every collective farm has its paper. These papers here are owned by one or two families. That is the difference.

The hon. Member spoke about the Indian Commission and the Ceylon Commission—I do not want to go into these matters in great detail—but there is one thing that is very clear in the difference between the terms of reference of the Ceylon Press Commission and the terms of reference of the Indian Press Commission. Section 7 of the Indian Press Commission terms of reference charges the Press Commission to devise means of ensuring the freedom of the press and so does the British Commission. But there is no such thing here and of course, quite correctly, there is no such thing because the very aim of the commission is to invade those places where the freedom of the press does actually exist.

What is the point in including the question of allocation of newsprint in a commission? Is that not a veiled

threat against the papers? Is that a commission's business? The Controller of Imports and Exports can operate that. Do you think Mr. de Silva or Mrs. Gunawardhana or anybody like that would be capable of deciding the allocation of newsprint?

No, Sir! My hon. Friends are just trying to hoodwink this House and the country by suggesting that this commission is of the same type as the Indian and British Commissions.

As regards the question of the personnel of the commission I do not want to speak much. I am not interested in attacking this person or that person, and I know a great deal about some of the people who have been mentioned in this House. I only wish to say this: the choice of Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana was singularly unfortunate. With regard to Mr. Walpita, from what I know of that gentleman, I do not think that some of the charges made against him are correct.

In the case of Mrs. Gunawardhana the choice was a singularly unfortunate one. I say that the reasons given for her appointment are totally unconvincing. The only reason given up to now is that Mrs. Theja Gunawardhana is a graduate. There are many graduates in this country. It is also stated that she has written books. There are people in the University who have written books.

Why was not a working journalist appointed to this commission? Why was it that nobody in this country who knows anything about running a modern newspaper was appointed to this commission? Running a modern daily newspaper is a highly complicated matter, it is not like running a weekly paper.

Why has not the commission been asked to go into the whole question of the role of news agencies, of writers and other ancillary matters? You are not concerned with the monopolist aspect, you are only concerned with whacking the freedom of the political press in this country. You are having

கல் துணி

a press commission without including working journalists in it—people who could have given extremely valuable views. But what have you done? By appointing this type of commission you have helped the monopolists.

There are many people who have got valuable information to give and make constructive and useful proposals. There are many people who can expose these monopoly press barons and all their dirty tricks but who will never with any sense of self-respect appear before this commission as constituted with some of these personnel and this kind of terms of reference. That is why I say that you have really helped the monopolist press.

It is no wonder that these gentlemen are rejoicing. The Lake House, Times and others are the happiest people on earth today considering the type of persons appointed as commissioners. They must be throwing up their hats and dancing with joy. Is that the reason why you appointed some of these commissioners? Is it because you do not want to break this monopoly and you really want to surreptitiously stab the freedom of the press in the back that you appointed these commissioners?

That is why the amendment that the U. L. F. has put forward puts its finger on the key question of the freedom of the press, namely, the ending of the monopolies. That is the key matter and that is the matter from which you are running away, hon. Members of the Government. You talk about monopoly. What is your Radio Ceylon? It is the dullest and dreariest monopoly information service in this country. I do not know whether you like to listen in to it. In the middle of most interesting things, you can never know what is happening from Radio Ceylon. It is the biggest, dullest, idiotic joke. And these gentlemen talk about monopolies in socialist countries. They have the biggest monopoly here and they cannot even make it quite an interesting monopoly.

கல் துணி

As the hon. Leader of the Opposition has to wind up I do not want to say anything further, but I urge very strongly that the House do support the U. L. F. amendment. And I want to say that this Government's action in appointing this Press Commission is a step backward, intended to assist the monopolist owners of the press and to strike at the real sources of the freedom of the press in this country.

பி. டி. ஃப். ஜெனரல் மெய்.

(திரு. டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

(Mr. D. B. R. Gunawardena)
rose.

கலாநாயகர்

(சபாநாயகர்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please!

பி. டி. ஃப். ஜெனரல் மெய்.

(திரு. டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

(Mr. D. B. R. Gunawardena)

You promised me that—

கலாநாயகர்

(சபாநாயகர்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Your party spoke.

பி. டி. ஃப். ஜெனரல் மெய்.

(திரு. டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

(Mr. D. B. R. Gunawardena)

My party may have spoken, but we are asking this Government to give us another half an hour at least. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has only ten minutes. If you do extend for another half an hour—

கலாநாயகர்

(சபாநாயகர்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please!

பி. டி. ஃப். ஜெனரல் மெய்.

(திரு. டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

(Mr. D. B. R. Gunawardena)

We can keep order. I am ready to obey you, but—

කල් තැබීම

කල් තැබීම

කථානායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர்)

(Mr. Speaker)

You are wasting our time.

ඩී. බී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

(Mr. D. B. R. Gunawardena)

It is not a question of wasting time, but that things are stated here and they are not carried out. You give promises and you go behind them.

කථානායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Will you sit down ?

ඩී. බී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

(Mr. D. B. R. Gunawardena)

I will sit down, but you have dishonoured what you stated.

කථානායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Will you please sit down ?

ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක මයා.

(திரு. டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(Mr. Dudley Senanayake)

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the hon. Member for Kottawa has been deprived of an opportunity of speaking; but I can assure you that we would have all liked to have heard him. Unfortunately we have only ten minutes, or even less, for my reply on behalf of the Opposition.

I do not think I shall need more than ten minutes because most of what has to be said has been more than adequately said by some of the speakers who preceded me—the hon. Member for Dehiwela-Mt. Lavinia (Dr. Colvin R. de Silva) and the hon. First Member for Colombo South (Mr. J. R. Jayewardene). The case made out by them has really not been met. There were, on behalf of the Government, three speeches made, and I was wondering whether

those Members had read the actual terms of the Motion. If one carefully follows the terms of the Motion, the hon. Members who approach this question with an unprejudiced mind will agree with me that the arguments that have been hitherto brought forward by the Members of the Opposition have not really been met.

Now, what is the Motion ?

“That this House disapproves of the Commission of Inquiry on the Press as proclaimed in the Ceylon Gazette dated 25th September, 1963.”

I must allude to the fact that the hon. Parliamentary Secretary was loud in his protestations that he was not a Marxist; I disagree. If one watched his performance he was really a Marxist—not a follower of the eminent Karl Marx, but a Marxist when one thinks of the performance of the Marx Brothers.

Mr. Speaker, what were the great replies given by the hon. Parliamentary Secretary ? “At first the U.N.P. were for a commission; now they are against the commission.” Will any one reading this Motion come to the conclusion that we are against the commission? We are against this particular commission. I want to make it perfectly clear. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary tried to quote certain passages of speeches made earlier by the hon. First Member for Colombo South and was unable to quote anything in support of his argument but quoted profusely from his speeches in opposition to the argument that the hon. Parliamentary Secretary brought.

Then his next argument was that the U. K. had two commissions of inquiry, India had one; some terms of reference of our commission are similar to the U. K. and Indian terms of reference; therefore, you must accept all our terms of reference! He even quoted the words. Let us look at some of the terms of reference of the U. K. commission. They start with these words :

“Whereas we have deemed it expedient that a commission should forthwith issue with the object of furthering the free

கல் நூலித

expression of opinion through the press and the greatest practicable accuracy in the presentation of news, to inquire into the control, management and ownership of newspapers and periodicals and the news agencies including the finances, structure and the monopolistic tendencies in control, and to make recommendations therefor...."

You will see from these words that the whole object was one of giving greater freedom to the press by removing monopolistic control. That is the principal object. We are in total agreement with terms of reference which seek to achieve that. We even agree that a number of these terms of reference pursue that objective of breaking up monopolies and ensuring greater freedom for the press. But the hon. Member for Dehiwela-Mt. Lavinia pointed to a few other terms of reference which have nothing to do with that objective, and that indeed is the point that we too make.

I am sorry that the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice is not here. He kept on telling us that he would read the terms of reference, which he did in a way, and challenged us to show any difference between the Indian and U. K. terms and ours. Of course there is a difference, and the Parliamentary Secretary had to admit it.

Consider for instance (l) of our terms of reference which reads :

"....the conduct of newspapers since 1st January, 1957 in regard to any attempts to obstruct the policies of Government or the implementation of its programme of work, and the steps that should be taken to prevent a repetition of such conduct in the future."

Take only this ; there is no use talking about any other terms of reference. If this is what you want, you might as well liquidate the whole lot of us here in the Opposition. What are we here for? We are here to obstruct

கல் நூலித

your policies. We will do just that, and make no mistake about it. As the hon. Member for Dehiwela-Mt. Lavinia (Dr. Colvin R. de Silva) said, we are here as an Opposition. If we were convinced that your policies would be of benefit to the country, then there would be no purpose in our being here. And if you think that the purpose of the press in Ceylon must only be to praise you for every nonsensical and idiotic thing you do in this country, where is the democracy that you are talking about? I want to put that question seriously to you.

The hon. Member for Dambadeniya (Mr. R. G. Senanayake) confused all this with a press council. What has a press council to do with this argument? And who is trying to prevent the formation of a press council? He drew the analogy of the medical council and the council of the legal profession and said that therefore we must have a press council. By all means have one, but are these terms of reference designed to create a press council or to remove the possibility of all criticism of the Government? That is the point. Are these terms of reference confined merely to the question of the removal of monopolistic control?

එකල් හි වෙලාව අ.හ. 8.30 වූයෙන් කථානායකතුමා විසින් ප්‍රශ්නය නොවිමසා මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය කල් තබන ලදී.

මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය ඊට අනුකූලව 1963 නොවැම්බර් 7 වන ලහස්පතින්දා අ. හ. 2 වන තෙක් කල් ගියේය.

இதன்படி பி.ப. 8.30 மணிக்கு, 1963, நவம்பர் 7, வியாழக்கிழமை பி.ப. 2 மணிவரை சபை ஒத்திவைக்கப்பெற்றது.

Adjourned accordingly at 8.30 P.M. until 2 P.M. on Thursday, November 7, 1963.

பேன பிழை

பேன பிழை

புனவலெ பேன பிழை

வினாக்களுக்கு எழுத்துமூல விடைகள்

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

பெகர் பிளானே வாடி அபியாபன மெய்யாபன
வலெ அபிர் மிடி லேனெ

மேல் மாகாணத்திலுள்ள முதிர்ந்தோர் கல்வி
நிலையங்களுக்கு வழங்கப்பட வேண்டிய
உதவிக் கொடைகள்

GRANTS DUE TO ADULT EDUCATION CENTRES
IN THE WESTERN PROVINCE

3/6/63.

பிபிமேன் பி சமரக்கோடி மெ. (புலத்
சிங்)

(திரு. எட்மன் சமரக்கோடி—புலத்திங்
ஹா)

(Mr. Edmund Samarakkody—Bulath-
sinhala)

அபியாபன ஸ்ரீ சங்கரிக கடுவது பிழை
பிடி அமதினே அபி புனய: (அ) பெ
கர் பிளானே வாடி அபியாபன மெய்யாபன
வலெ பிடி யது பிமனா 1963 பனவா பி
யே பிடி பிவா நானி பெ பிவா பன
வாடி? (அ) பிவா பி பி மனடி?

கல்வி, கலாச்சார விவகார அமைச்சரைக்
கேட்ட வினா: (அ) மேல் மாகாணத்திலுள்ள
முதிர்ந்தோர் கல்வி நிலையங்களுக்கு வழங்
கப்பட வேண்டிய உதவிக் கொடைகள் 1963
ஆம் ஆண்டு முதல் வழங்கப்படவில்லை
யென்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஆ) ஆமெ
னில், ஏன்?

asked the Minister of Education
and Cultural Affairs: (a) Is he
aware that the grants due to adult
education centres in the Western Pro-
vince have not been paid since
January 1963? (b) If so, why?

பெ. பி. பி. கலுல்லே (அபியாபன ஸ்ரீ
சங்கரிக கடுவது பிழை அமதி)

(கௌரவ பி. பி. ஜி. கலுல்லே—கல்வி,
கலாச்சார விவகார அமைச்சர்)

(The Hon. P. B. G. Kalugalla—Minis-
ter of Education and Cultural Affairs)

(அ) வாடி அபியாபன மெய்யாபன பிவல்
யக பிவடி பிவடி பிவ பிவ பிவ பிவ
1963 பனவா பிவ பிவ பிவ பிவ பிவ
பிவ. பிவ பிவ பிவ பிவ பிவ பிவ
கடுவது கடுவது யது பிவ. (அ)
பிவ பிவ பிவ பிவ பிவ பிவ பிவ
பிவ பிவ பிவ பிவ பிவ பிவ பிவ

(அ) ஒருபிவ வளர்ந்தோர் கல்வி நிலையங்
களில் உரிமைக் கோரிக்கைகள் 1963, ஜனவரி
யில் இருந்து கொடுப்பனவுக்குக் காத்திருக்
கின்றன. அவற்றை விரைவில் கொடுத்து
முடிப்பதற்கு நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கப்படுகிறது.
(ஆ) ஒதுக்கப்பட்ட நிதி முடிவுற்றமை கார
ணத்தால் கொடுப்பனவுகள் செய்ய முடியா
திருந்தன.

(a) In a few adult education centres claims since January 1963, await payment. Action is being taken to settle them early. (b) Payments were held up owing to exhaustion of allocated funds.

1964

1964

1964

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