

62 වන කාණ්ඩය

1 වන කලාපය

අගනුවර වාද

1965 අගෝස්තු 31



PUBLIC LIBRARY
JAFFNA.

පාර්ලිමේන්තු විවාද

(හැන්සාඩ්)

නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ

නිල වාර්තාව

අත්තිකාරම් ප්‍රධාන කරුණු

ප්‍රශ්නවලට වාචික පිළිතුරු [නි. 2]

විස්ථාපන කෙටුම්පත් පණත, 1965-66 [අවම වෙන් කළ දිනය]
[නි. 31] :

ශීථි 1-14 කාරක සභාව විසින් සලකා බලන ලදී.

කල් තැබීම [නි. 298]

பாராளுமன்ற விவாதங்கள்

(ஹன்சாட்)

பிரதிநிதிகள் சபை

அதிகாரபூர்வமான அறிக்கை

பிரதான உள்ளடக்கம்

வினாக்களுக்கு வாய்மூல விடைகள் [ப. 2]

ஒதுக்கீட்டு மசோதா, 1965-66 [ஒதுக்கப்பட்ட எட்டாம் நாள்] [ப. 31] :

தலைப்புக்கள் 1-18. குழுவில் ஆராயப்பட்டன

ஒத்திவைப்பு [ப. 298]

Volume 62

No. 1

Tuesday,

31st August 1965

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OFFICIAL REPORT

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 2]

APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965-66 [Eighth Allotted Day] [Col. 31] :

Considered in Committee Heads 1-18.

ADJOURNMENT [Col. 298]

පාර්ලිමේන්තු විවාද

(හැත්සාඩ්)

62 වන කාණ්ඩය

නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ

නිල වාර්තාව

ලබකාවේ හයවන පාර්ලිමේන්තුවේ පළමුවන වාරය
නෛකග්‍රිත් විරාජමාන දෙවන එලිසබෙත් රාජ්‍යයෙන්
14 වන රාජ්‍ය වර්ෂය

පාර්ලිමේන්තු වාරය 1965-66

1965

ලංකාවේ මුද්‍රණයේ මුද්‍රාපිටපත

ලංකාණ්ඩුව

අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාරතුමා

විලිසම් ගොපල්ලව, එම්.බී.ඊ., උතුරුමානවහන්සේ

ගරු බඩලි පෙල්වන් සේනානායක මහතා විසින් 1965 මාර්තු මාසයේදී පිහිටුවන ලද

ඇමති මණ්ඩලය

අග්‍රාමාත්‍ය සහ ආරක්ෂක හා විදේශ කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමති සහ ක්‍රම සම්පාදක හා ආර්ථික කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමති	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී ගරු බඩලි පෙල්වන් සේනානායක
රාජ්‍ය කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමති සහ අග්‍රාමාත්‍යතුමාගේ හා රාජකාරී මණ්ඩලය හා විදේශ කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමතියෝ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම් සහ ආණ්ඩු පක්ෂයේ ප්‍රධාන සංවිධායක	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී ගරු ජූනියස් ඊවඩ් ජයවර්ධන
ආරක්ෂා හා ආහාර ඇමති ...	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී ගරු මොහොමඩාල් ලහේ ඩි.බී. බණ්ඩා
රජයේ වැඩ, නැවතුම් හා විදුලි සන්නිවේදන ඇමති ...	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී ගරු වොල්ටර් ජයසේනප්‍රිය මොන්ටේරු ජයවික්‍රම
සෞඛ්‍ය ඇමති ...	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී ගරු මහබාලගේ දොන් හෙන්රි ජයවර්ධන
ඉඩම්, වාරිමාර්ග හා විදුලිබල ඇමති හා සහායක	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී ගරු වාරිල්ස් පරිච්ඡවල් ද සිල්වා
ස්වදේශ කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමති ...	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී ගරු ආචාර්ය විජයානන්ද දහනායක
කර්මාන්ත හා සිවිල කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමති ...	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී ගරු දොන් පිලිප් රූපසිංහ අනුබවර්ධන
වාණිජ හා වෙළඳ ඇමති ...	සෙනෙට් මන්ත්‍රී ගරු වෛද්‍යවෘත්ති මහපිටියගේ චෙලින් ඩබ්ලිව් පීරිස්, ඩී.බී.ඊ.
මුදල් ඇමති ...	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී ගරු උක්කු බණ්ඩා වන්නිනායක
අධ්‍යාපන හා සංස්කෘතික කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමති ...	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී ගරු ඉමිය මුදියන්සෙලාගේ රජිසල් අභයවත්ස රිදියගොල්ල
සමාජ සේවා ඇමති ...	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී ගරු නුවරපක්ෂ සේවයලාගේ අසෝක මහනාම කරුණාරත්න
අධිකරණ ඇමති ...	සෙනෙට් මන්ත්‍රී ගරු ඇලෙක්සැන්ඩර් මාපියාර්ලි විජේමාන්න
ප්‍රවාහණ ඇමති ...	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී ගරු එඩ්වින් ලොකු බණ්ඩාර හුරුල්ලේ
ජනසතු සේවා ඇමති ...	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී ගරු විනාන ආරච්චිගෙ පුගතදාස, එම්.බී.ඊ.
පළාත් පාලන ඇමති ...	සෙනෙට් මන්ත්‍රී ගරු මුරුගේසන් තීරුවෙල්වම් රාජතිනිඳු
කම්කරු, රැකියා හා නිවාස ඇමති ...	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී ගරු මොහම්ම හනීෆා මොහම්මඩ්

පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්වරු

රාජ්‍ය කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී දෙවන් පිටර් අතපත්තු මයා.
කෘෂිකම් හා ආහාර ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී ප්‍රේමවන්ද ඉඳුලාන මයා.
රජයේ වැඩ, තැපැල් හා විදුලි සන්දේශ ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී තේනගන්දි විජයපාල මෙන්ඩිස් මයා.
සෞඛ්‍ය ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම් ...	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රීනි අයිතින් විමලා කන්නන්ගර මයා.
ඉඩම්, වාරිමාර්ග හා විදුලිබල ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී සිරිල් පිත්තු ජයතිලක සෙනෙවිරත්න මයා.
ස්වදේශ කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රීනි කුසුමා රාජරත්න මයා.
කර්මාන්ත හා බිවර කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී බොනල්ඩ් හෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.
වාණිජ හා වෙළඳ ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී සයිමන් ඇන්ඩූ පීරිස් මයා., ඩී.බී.ඊ.
මුදල් ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම් ...	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී නන්දදිව් ඩීමලසේන මයා.
අධ්‍යාපන හා සංස්කෘතික කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී ගාමනි නන්ද ජයසූරිය මයා.
සමාජසේවා ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම් ...	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී මීර ලෙඹිබේ පොද්දි මොහමඩ් මුස්තපා මයා.
අධිකරණ ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම් ...	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී මොහමඩ් හනිපා මොහමමද් නයිනා මයික්කාර් මයා.
ප්‍රවාහණ ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම් ...	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී දසනායක මුදියන්සෙලාගේ ලොකු බණ්ඩා දසනායක මයා.
පළාත් පාලන ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම් ...	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී රණසිංහ ප්‍රේමදාස මයා.
කම්කරු, රැකියා හා නිවාස ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී රත්නායක මුදියන්සෙලාගේ චන්ද්‍රසේන රත්නායක බෙලිගම්මන මයා.
ජනසතු සේවා ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී සිංහරි බණ්ඩා වෙලගෙදර මයා.

නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය

කථානායක	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී ගරු ශ්‍රීමත් ඇල්බට් එෆ්. පිටිස්, කේ.බී.ඊ.
නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායක හා කාරකසභා සභාපති	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී සී. එස්. ජර්ලි කොරොයා මයා.
කාරකසභා නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපති	පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී ඩී. ක්වින්ටින් ප්‍රනාන්දු මයා.

ප්‍රධාන නිලධාරී මණ්ඩලය

නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ ලේකම්	...	එස්. එස්. විජේසිංහ
සහකාර ලේකම්	...	එස්. එන්. සෙනවිරත්න
වේනුධාරි	...	එ. ජේ. ආර්. ද සිල්වා
සහකාර වේනුධාරි	...	ආර්. අබේසිංහ

ප්‍රධාන වාර්තාකරු හා හැන්සාඩ් සංස්කාරක :
ජී. ඊ. පී. ද එස්. වික්‍රමරත්න

සහකාර පරිපාලක :
එම්. එ. පෙරේරා

සහකාර සංස්කාරක :
එම්. එල්. ජේ. පෙරේරා

ප්‍රධාන ලිපිකරුවෝ :
වී. පාලවිතායගම්
එම්. ආර්. එච්. ද රේපාන්සේකා
ආර්. ඊ. එස්. ගුණවර්ධන

උප සංස්කාරකවරු :

ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ ලිපිකරුවෝ :
එෆ්. එස්. ලියනගේ
පී. ආර්. බී. අබයරත්න
ඊ. බී. ඩී. පෙරේරා
කේ. සිවනායගම්
බබ්ලිච්. සී. පී. ද රේපාන්සේකා
කේ. ටී. එන්. ද සිල්වා

වෙ. ප්‍රේ. නානායක්කාර
පී. එල්. රාමනාදන්
එල්. අයි. ජේ. මෙන්ඩිස්
බී. ජේ. රණසිංහ
වාර්තාකරුවෝ :
ඊ. බී. ගුණසිංහ
බබ්ලිච්. එම්. ප්‍රනාන්දු
එම්. එ. එම්. එම්. මොහිදින්
එස්. එම්. පී. බී. සකලසූරිය
එච්. පී. සිරිල්
එම්. සී. එම්. සායිරා
ආර්. ආර්. එම්. එල්. බී. රණවිර
ටී. එල්. ජුමාට්
පී. ටී. විජයදාස
එ. ජේ. එ. දොරේ
පී. රාජදොරේ
එස්. නඩරාජා
බී. එ. විජයරත්න
බී. එම්. ජයසූරිය
එච්. එල්. බබ්ලිච්. දිසානායක
ජේ. ගුණදාස
ටී. බබ්ලිච්. කරුණාරත්න
ජේ. එස්. ජෝර්ජ්
බබ්ලිච්. එස්. එම්. ප්‍රනාන්දු
ජී. එ. රණසිංහ

පුස්තකාලාධිපති ... ටී. ටී. ගුණරාජක

කථා පරිවර්තකයෝ :
එස්. කුන්ජිතපාදම්
සී. බබ්ලිච්. පන්තිල
එන්. පී. සිවසුබ්‍රමනියම්
පී. එ. එ. පෙරේරා
පී. එස්. අහංගම්
එච්. චන්තසිංහ
කේ. සිවනම්බි
බබ්ලිච්. රාජසේකරම්
එස්. කේ. නම්බිපිල්ලෙයි
එන්. සුබ්‍රමනියම්
එ. සෙල්ලදුරේ

பாராளுமன்ற விவாதங்கள்

(ஹன்சாட்)

தொகுதி 62

பிரதிநிதிகள் சபை

அதிகார அறிக்கை

இலங்கையின் ஆளுவது பாராளுமன்ற முதற் கூட்டத் தொடர்
மாட்சிமை தங்கிய மகாராணி இரண்டாம் எலிஸ்பெத் ஆட்சியின் 14 ஆவது வருடம்

கூட்டத் தொடர் 1965-66

1965

இலங்கை அரசாங்க அச்சகத்திற் பதிப்பிக்கப்பெற்றது.

இலங்கை அரசாங்கம்

மகா தேசாதிபதி

மேன்மைதங்கிய திரு. வில்லியம் கொபல்லாவ, எம். பி. ஈ.

அமைச்சரவை

[1965 ஆம் ஆண்டு மார்ச் மாதம் கௌரவ டட்ளி ஷெல்ற்றன் சேனாநாயக்க அவர்களால்
அமைக்கப்பெற்றது]

பிரதம அமைச்சரும், பாதுகாப்பு, வெளிவிவகார அமைச்சரும், திட்ட அமைப்பு, பொருளாதார விவகார அமைச்சரும்	கௌரவ டட்ளி ஷெல்ற்றன் சேனாநாயக்க, பா. அ.
இராஜாங்க அமைச்சரும், பிரதம அமைச்சரதும் பாதுகாப்பு வெளிவிவகார அமைச்சரதும் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசியும், அரசாங்க பிரதம ஒழுங்கு நடாத்துனரும்	கௌரவ ஜூனியஸ் நிச்சட் ஜயவர்தன, பா. அ.
விவசாய, உணவு அமைச்சர்	கௌரவ மொகொத்தல்லாகே டிங்கிரி பண்டா, பா. அ.
அரசாங்கக் கட்டு வேலை, தபால், தந்திப் போக்குவரத்து அமைச்சர்	கௌரவ வோல்ட் ஜெப்ரி மொண்டேகு ஜயவிக்கிரம, பா. அ.
சுகாதார அமைச்சர்	கௌரவ மஹபலகே தொன் ஹென்றி ஜயவர்தன, பா. அ.
காணி, நீர்ப்பாசன, மின்விசை அமைச்சரும் சபை முதல்வரும்	கௌரவ சால்ஸ் பேலிஷல் டி. சில்வா, பா. அ.
உள்நாட்டு விவகார அமைச்சர்	கௌரவ கலாநிதி விஜயானந்த தகநாயக்க, டா. அ.
கைத்தொழில், கடற்றொழில் அமைச்சர்	கௌரவ தொன் பிலிப் ரூபசிங்க குணவர்தன, பா. அ.
வர்த்தக, வியாபார அமைச்சர்	மூதவையினர் கௌரவ வைத்தியகலாநிதி மகபிற்றி வங்ச வெலின் பீற்றர் பீரிஸ், ஓ.பி.ஈ.
நிதி அமைச்சர்	கௌரவ உக்கு டண்டா வன்னிநாயக்க, பா. அ.
கல்வி, கலாச்சார விவகார அமைச்சர்	கௌரவ இமிய முதியன்செலாகே ரபியல் அபய வங்ச ஈரியகொல்ல, பா. அ.
சமூகசேவை அமைச்சர்	கௌரவ நுவரபக்ஷ ஹேவாயலாகே அசோக்க மகானும கருணரத்ன, பா. அ.
தீதி அமைச்சர்	மூதவையினர் கௌரவ அலக்சாண்ட பெயாலி விஜேமான்ன
போக்குவரத்து அமைச்சர்	கௌரவ எட்வின் லொகு பண்டார ஹுருல்ல, பா. அ.
தேசியமய சேவை அமைச்சர்	கௌரவ வித்தான ஆரச்சிகே சுகததாச, எம்.பி.ஈ., பா. அ.
உள்ளூராட்சி அமைச்சர்	மூதவையினர் கௌரவ முருகேசன திருச்செல்வம், கியூ. சி.
தொழில், தொழில்காண், வீடமைப்பு அமைச்சர்	கௌரவ முகம்மது ஹனிபா முகம்மது, பா.அ.

பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசிகள்

- இராஜாங்க அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி .. தொன் பீற்றர் அத்தபத்து அவர்கள், பா. அ.
- விவசாய, உணவு அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி பிரேமச் சந்திர இம்புலான அவர்கள் பா. அ.
- அரசாங்க கட்டுவேலை, தபால், தந்திப் போக்குவரத்து தேனஹந்தி விஜயபால மெண்டிஸ் அவர்கள், பா.அ.
- அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி
- சுகாதார அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி .. திருமதி ஐரின் மிமலா கன்னங்கர, எம்.பி.ஈ. பா. அ.
- காணி, நீர்ப்பாசன, மின்விசை அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி சிறில் பிந்து ஜயதிலக்க செனெவிரத்ன அவர்கள், பா. அ.
- உள்நாட்டு விவகார அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி திருமதி குசுமா ராஜரத்ன, பா. அ.
- கைத்தொழில், கடற்றொழில் அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி டொனால்ட் ஷெல்ற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ அவர்கள், பா. அ.
- வர்த்தக, வியாபார அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி சைமன் அந்த்ரூ பீரின் அவர்கள், ஓ.பி.ஈ., பா. அ.
- நிதி அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி .. நனேதிரி விமலசேன அவர்கள், பா. அ.
- கல்வி, கலாச்சார விவகார அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி காமனீ நந்த ஜயசூரிய அவர்கள், பா.அ.
- சமூக சேவை அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி .. மீரா லெப்பைப்போடி முகம்மது முஸ்தபா அவர்கள், பா. அ.
- நீதி அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி .. முகம்மது ஹனிபா மரிக்கார் முகம்மது நயினா மரிக்கார் அவர்கள், பா. அ.
- போக்குவரத்து அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி .. தசனாயக்க முதியன்செலாகே லொக்கு பண்டார தசனாயக்க அவர்கள், பா. அ.
- உள்ளூராட்சி அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி .. ரணசிங்ஹ பிரேமதாச அவர்கள், பா. அ.
- தொழில், தொழில்காண், வீடமைப்பு அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி .. ரத்னாயக்க முதியன்செலாகே சந்திரசேன ரத்னாயக்க பெலிகம்மன அவர்கள், பா. அ.
- தேசியமய சேவை அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி டிங்கிரிபண்டா வெலகெதர அவர்கள், பா. அ.

பிரதிநிதிகள் சபை

அதிகாரிகளும் பிரதான உத்தியோகத்தார்களும்

சபாநாயகர் கௌரவ ஸ்ரீமான் அல்பட் எப். பீரிஸ், கே.பி.ஈ., பா. அ.

உப சபாநாயகரும் குழுக்களின் அக்கிராசனரும் .. திரு. சி. எஸ். ஷேனி கொரியா, பா. அ.

குழுக்களின் உப அக்கிராசனர் .. திரு. ரீ. குயின்ரின் பெர்னாண்டோ, பா. அ.

பிரதிநிதிகள் சபைச் செயலதிகாரி .. எஸ். எஸ். விஜேசிங்ஹ

உதவிச் செயலதிகாரி .. எஸ். என். செனெவிரத்ன

படைக்கலச் சேவிதர் .. ஏ. ஜே. ஆர். டி. சில்வா

உதவிப் படைக்கலச் சேவிதர் .. ஆர். அபேசிங்ஹ

பிரதம அறிக்கையாளரும் ஹன்சாட் பதிப்பாசிரியரும் :

ஜி. ஈ. பீ. டி. எஸ். விக்ரமரத்ன

நிர்வாக உதவியாளர் :

எம். ஏ. பெரேரா

உதவிப் பதிப்பாசிரியர் :

எம். எல். ஜே. பெரேரா

பிரதான எழுதுவினோர் :

வி. பாலவினாயகம்

எம். ஆர். எச். டி. பொன்சேக்கா

ஆர். ஈ. எஸ். குணவர்தன

உப பதிப்பாசிரியர் :

டபிள்யூ. பீ. நானாயக்கா

பீ. எல். ராமநாதன்

எல். ஐ. ஜே. மெண்டிஸ்

டீ. ஜே. ரணசிங்ஹ

சிரேஷ்ட எழுதுவினோர் :

எப். எஸ். லியனகே

பீ. ஆர். பி. அபேரத்ன

ஈ. பி. வி. பெரேரா

கே. சீவநாயகம்

டபிள்யூ. சி. பி. டி. பொன்சேக்கா

கே. ரீ. என். டி. சில்வா

அறிக்கையாளர் :

ஈ. டி. குணசிங்ஹ

டபிள்யூ. எம். பெர்னாண்டோ

எம். ஏ. எம். எம். முஷியிதின்

எஸ். எம். பீ. பி. சகலசூரிய

எச். பீ. சிறில்

எம். லீ. எம். ஸாஹிர்

ஆர். ஆர். எம். எல். பி. ரணவீர

ரி. எல். ஜுமாத்

பீ. ரி. விஜயதாஸ்

ஏ. ஜே. ஏ. டொரே

பீ. இராசதுரை

எஸ். நடராசா

பி. ஏ. விஜயரத்ன

டி. எம். ஜயசூரிய

எச். எல். டபிள்யூ. திணைநாயக்க

ஜே. குணதாச

ரி. டபிள்யூ. கருணரத்ன

ஜே. எஸ். ஜோஜ்

டபிள்யூ. எஸ். எம். பெர்னாண்டோ

ஜி. ஏ. ரணசிங்க

நூலிலையப் பொறுப்பாளர் :

ரி. வீ. குணதிலக்க

பேச்சு மொழிபெயர்ப்பாளர் :

எஸ். குஞ்சிதபாதம்

சி. டபிள்யூ. பன்னில

என். பீ. சிவசுப்பிரமணியம்

பீ. ஏ. ஏ. பெரேரா

வி. எஸ். அகங்கம

எச். வெத்தசிங்ஹ

கே. சிவத்தம்பி

டபிள்யூ. இராசசேகரம்

எஸ். கே. தம்பிப்பிள்ளை

என். சுப்பிரமணியம்

ஏ. செல்லத்துரை

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

VOLUME 62

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OFFICIAL REPORT

FIRST SESSION OF THE SIXTH PARLIAMENT OF CEYLON
FOURTEENTH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF
HER MAJESTY QUEEN ELIZABETH II

SESSION 1965-66

1965

PRINTED AT THE GOVERNMENT PRESS, CEYLON

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

GOVERNMENT OF CEYLON

GOVERNOR-GENERAL

HIS EXCELLENCY MR. WILLIAM GOPALLAWA, M.B.E.

CABINET

[FORMED BY THE HON. DUDLEY SHELTON SENANAYAKE, March 1965]

Prime Minister and Minister of Defence & External Affairs and Minister of Planning & Economic Affairs	The Hon. DUDLEY SHELTON SENANAYAKE, M.P.
Minister of State, and Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and Minister of Defence & External Affairs, and Chief Government Whip	The Hon. JUNIUS RICHARD JAYEWARDENE, M.P.
Minister of Agriculture and Food ..	The Hon. MOHOTTALLAGE DINGIRI BANDA, M.P.
Minister of Public Works, Posts and Telecommunications	The Hon. WALTER GEOFFREY MONTAGUE JAYEWICKREME, M.P.
Minister of Health	The Hon. MAHABALAGE DON HENRY JAYAWARDENA, M.P.
Minister of Land, Irrigation and Power, and Leader of the House	The Hon. CHARLES PERCIVAL DE SILVA, M.P.
Minister of Home Affairs ..	The Hon. DR. WIJAYANANDA DAHANAYAKE, M.P.
Minister of Industries and Fisheries ..	The Hon. DON. PHILIP RUPASINGHE GUNAWARDENA, M.P.
Minister of Commerce and Trade ..	Senator The Hon. DR. MAHAPITIYAGE VELIN PETER PEIRIS, O.B.E.
Minister of Finance	The Hon. UKKU BANDA WANNINAYAKE, M.P.
Minister of Education and Cultural Affairs	The Hon. IMIYA MUDIYANSELAGE RAPHAEL ABHAYAWANSA IRIYAGOLLE, M.P.
Minister of Social Services ..	The Hon. NUWARAPAKSA HEWAYALAGE ASOKA MAHANAMA KARUNARATNE, M.P.
Minister of Justice	Senator The Hon. ALEXANDER FAIRLIE WIJEMANNE
Minister of Communications ..	The Hon. EDWIN LOKU BANDARA HURULLE, M.P.
Minister of Nationalized Services ..	The Hon. VITHANA ARATCHCHIGE SUGATHADASA, M.B.E., M.P.
Minister of Local Government ..	Senator The Hon. MURUGEYSEN TIRUCHELVAM, Q.C.
Minister of Labour, Employment and Housing	The Hon. MOHAMED HANIFFA MOHAMED, M.P.

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of State	DON PETER ATAPATTU, Esq., M. P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Food	PREMA CHANDRA IMBULANA, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works, Posts and Telecommunications	THENAHANDI WIJAYAPALA MENDIS, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health	MRS. IRENE WIMALA KANNANGARA, M.B.E., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Land, Irrigation and Power	CYRIL PINTO JAYATILLEKE SENEVIRATNE, Esq., M.P.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Home Affairs	MRS. KUSUMA RAJARATNA, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries and Fisheries	DONALD SHELTON JAYASINGHE, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Commerce and Trade	SIMON ANDREW PEERIS, Esq., O.B.E., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance	NANEDIRI WIMALASENA, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education and Cultural Affairs	GAMANI NANDA JAYASURIYA, Esq., M. P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Social Services	MEERA LEBBE PODDY MOHAMED MUSTAPHA, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice	MOHAMED HANIFFA MARIKAR MOHAMED NAINA MARIKKAR, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Communications	DASSANAYAKE MUDIYANSELAGE LOKU BANDA DASSANAYAKE, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Local Government	RANASINGHE PREMADASA, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour, Employment and Housing	RATNAYAKE MUDIYANSELAGE CHANDRASENA RATNAYAKE BELIGAMMANA, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Nationalized Services	DINGIRI Banda WELAGEDARA, Esq., M. P

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS AND OFFICIALS

THE SPEAKER THE HON. SIR ALBERT F. PERIES, K.B.E.,
M.P.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER AND CHAIRMAN OF
COMMITTEES MR. C. S. SHIRLEY COREA, M.P.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES MR. T. QUENTIN FERNANDO, M.P.

Clerk of the House of Representatives .. S. S. WIJESINHA
Clerk-Assistant .. S. N. SENEVIRATNE

Serjeant-at-Arms .. A. J. R. DE SILVA
Assistant Serjeant-at-Arms .. R. ABEYSINGHE

Chief Reporter and Editor of HANSARD : Administrative Assistant :
G. E. P. DE S. WICKRAMARATNE M. A. PERERA

Assistant Editor : Principal Clerks : V. PALAVENAYAGAM
M. L. J. PERERA M. R. H. DE FONSEKA
R. E. S. GOONEWARDENA

Sub-Editors : Senior Clerks : F. S. LIYANAGE
W. P. NANAYAKKARA P. R. B. ABEYRATNE
P. L. RAMENADEN E. B. V. PERERA
L. I. J. MENDIS K. SEEVANAYAGAM
D. J. RANASINGHE W. C. P. DE FONSEKA
K. T. N. DE SILVA

Reporters : Librarian : T. V. GOONETILLEKE

E. D. GUNASINGHE
W. M. FERNANDO
M. A. M. M. MOHIDEEN
S. M. P. B. SAKALASOORIYA
H. P. CYRIL
M. C. M. SAYIRU
R. R. M. L. B. RANAWEERA
T. L. JUMAT
P. T. WIJAYADASA
A. J. A. DORAY
P. RAJADURAI
S. NADARAJAH
B. A. WIJAYARATNA
D. M. JAYASOORIYA
H. L. W. DISSANAYAKE
J. GUNADASA
T. W. KARUNARATNE
J. S. GEORGE
W. S. M. FERNANDO
G. A. RANASINGHE

Interpreters :
S. CUNJITHAPATHAM
C. W. PANNILA
N. P. SIVASUBRAMANIAM
P. A. A. PERERA
V. S. AHANGAMA
H. WETASINGHE
K. SIVATHAMBY
W. RAJASEKERAM
S. K. THAMBIPILLAI
N. SUBRAMANIAM
A. SELLADURAI

විකි පිළිතුරු

විකි පිළිතුරු

[உதவி உரை.]

එම මැණික් රුපියල් 3,00,000 කට විකුණු
නමුත් එය විකුණන ලද්දේ රුපියල්
50,000 කට බව ලංකාවේ බලධාරීන්ට
දන්වා අසත්‍ය විකුණුම් කුවිතාන්සි ඉදිරි
පත් කළ බවත් එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ආ)
මෙම මුදලින් කොපමණ ප්‍රමාණයක් ලංකා
වට එවා තිබේද? (ඉ) ඇස්තමේන්තු
කරන ලද සම්පූර්ණ මුදල වන රුපියල්
2,50,000 ආවායයි පෙරේරා මහතාගෙන් අය
කර ගැනීමට එතුමා කටයුතු කරනවාද?

நிதி அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா: (அ) (i)
கூட்டரசாங்கத்தின் காலத்தில் மரிக்கார்
பாவாவுக்குச் சொந்தமான மணிக்கற்களை
சங்கப் பகுதி கைப்பற்றியது என்பதையும்,
(ii) சங்கப் பகுதி அவற்றால் கிடைக்கக்கூடிய
தொகை ரூபா 2,50,000 ஆக மதிப்பிட்டு
அவற்றை எலவிற்பனைக்கு விட்டது என்பதை
யும், (iii) அவற்றைக் கண்டுபிடித்த உத்தியோ
கத்தார்களின் எதிர்ப்பையும் பொருட்படுத்தாது
'மணிக்கல்' கூட்டுத்தாபனத்திடம் அம்
மணிக்கற்கள் ஒப்படைக்கப்படவேண்டுமென
முன்னாள் நிதி அமைச்சரான கலாநிதி என்.
எம். பெரேரா கட்டளையிட்டார் என்பதையும்,
(iv) கொங்கொங்கில் வதியும் அவரது இலங்
கை நண்பரான திரு. என். பி. வீரசிங்காவால்
விற்கப்படுவதற்காக அவருக்கு அனுப்புவதற்
கென அம்மணிக்கற்கள் திறைசேரியிடம் ஒப்
படைக்கப்பட வேண்டுமென கலாநிதி என்.
எம். பெரேரா பின்னர் கட்டளையிட்டார்
என்பதையும், (v) அம்மணிக்கற்களை திரு.
வீரசிங்கா 3,00,000 ரூபாவிற்கு விற்ப்புவிட்டு
50,000 ரூபாவிற்கு மாத்திரம் விற்கப்பட்ட
தென இலங்கை அதிகாரிகளுக்கு அறிவித்து
பொய்யான விற்பனைவுப் பற்றுச்சீட்டுக்களைச்
சமர்ப்பித்தார் என்பதையும் அவர் அறி
வாரா? (ஆ) இப்பணத்தில் எவ்வளவு
தொகை இலங்கைக்கு அனுப்பப்பட்டுள்ளது?
(இ) அம்மணிக்கற்களிலிருந்து கிடைக்கக்
கூடியதென மதிப்பிடப்பட்ட தொகையான
2,50,000 ரூபாவையும் கலாநிதி என். எம்.
பெரேராவிடமிருந்து அறவிடுவதற்கு அவர்
நடவடிக்கைகள் எடுப்பாரா?

asked the Minister of Finance: (a)
Is he aware that—(i) during the
period of the Coalition Government
the Customs seized gems belonging
to Marikar Bawas? (ii) the Customs

put them up for auction estimating a
return of Rs. 250,000? (iii) the then
Finance Minister, Dr. N. M. Perera,
ordered the gems to be handed over
to the Gem Corporation, in spite of
the protests of officers concerned in
this detection? (iv) later Dr. Perera
ordered the gems to be handed to
the Treasury to be sent to Mr. S. B.
Weerasinghe, a Ceylonese friend of
his residing in Hongkong to be sold
by him? (v) Mr. Weerasinghe sold
the gems for Rs. 300,000 but informed
the Ceylon authorities that they were
sold for only Rs. 50,000 and submitted
false sales receipts? (b) How much
of this money has been remitted to
Ceylon? (c) Will he take steps to
recover the full estimated return of
Rs. 250,000 from Dr. Perera?

ගරු යූ. බී. වන්නිනායක (මුදල් ඇමති)

(கௌரவ யூ. பி. வன்னிநாயக்க—நிதி
அமைச்சர்)

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

(a) (i) The gems belonging to
Marikkar Bawas were seized by the
Customs not during the period of the
Coalition Government, but earlier.
(ii) The Customs did not put these
gems up for auction. The estimated
value of these gems, according to
Customs, was not Rs. 250,000. The
valuation of the gems belonging to
Marikkar Bawas by the Customs was
Rs. 150,000. There were, however,
three other parcels of gems belonging
to other parties which had also been
seized by the Customs, valued at
Rs. 34,270. The value of all the four
parcels of gems seized, according to
Customs assessment, was Rs. 184,270.
(iii) The Gemming Corporation has
not yet been established. There is no
record of protest by the officers
concerned in the detection of these
gems. (iv) With the approval of the
Minister of Finance (at that time,
Dr. N. M. Perera), the confiscated
gems of Marikkar Bawas and of the
others were sent to the Honorary
Trade Commissioner for Ceylon in
Hongkong, Mr. S. B. Weerasinghe,
for sale in Hongkong. Before
sending these gems to the Honorary

Trade Commissioner for sale in Hong-kong, they were revalued by a panel of valuers at Rs. 289,233.25 altogether. (v) Mr. Weerasinghe has not submitted sales receipts for gems sold, but has informed us that he sold a part of the gems sent to him as follows :

for cash: gems to the value of
Hongkong Dollars 4,800

on credit: gems to the value	
of Hongkong Dollars	51,720

Of this, a sum of H.K.\$ 4,800, being the proceeds of cash sales, has already been remitted to Ceylon. Mr. Weerasinghe has not informed the Government that the whole consignment of gems has been sold for Rs. 50,000. (b) As stated earlier, a sum of H.K.\$ 4,800, being the proceeds of cash sales of gems, has been remitted to Ceylon. (c) The unsold gems are with Mr. S. B. Weerasinghe, Ceylon's Honorary Trade Commissioner in Hongkong, who has asked for time till the end of the year to sell them. The Government has already requested Mr. Weerasinghe to remit the proceeds of credit sales, as well as of other subsequent sales of gems, if any. I have also decided to recall the unsold gems from Mr. Weerasinghe with a view to closing the transaction. In view of this Question (c) does not arise.

මැතිව් මයෝ.

(திரு. மதியூ)

(Mr. Mathew)

Was Mr. Weerasinghe appointed on the recommendation of the then Minister of Finance?

ශ්‍රී වන් නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

No. He was appointed before the hon. Member for Yatiyantota became Minister of Finance.

පහල මාර්ගස්ථාව උප තැපැල් කාර්යාලය,
අනුරාධපුරය

பஹுமறகஹாவெவ உப தபால் நிலையம்,
அநுராதபுரம்

PAHALAMARAGAHAWEWA SUB-POST OFFICE
ANURADHAPURA

8. කේ. බී. රත්නායක මයා. (අනුරාධ
පුර)

(திரு. கே. பி. ரத்னாயக்க—அனுராதபுரம்)
(Mr. K. B. Ratnayake—Anuradhapura)

රජයේ වැඩ, තැපැල් හා විදුලි සන්නිවේදන
ඇමතිගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය : (අ) අනුරාධ
පුර ඡන්දදායක කොට්ඨාශයේ පහල මාර්ග
ගස්වැවේ “බී” ශ්‍රේණියේ උප තැපැල්
කාර්යාලයක් තිබෙන බව එතුමා දන්න
වාද? (ආ) මෙම තැපැල් කාර්යාලයෙන්
ගම් ගණනාවකට හා රාජංගනේ ජනපද
යෝජනා ක්‍රමයේ සැලකිය යුතු කොටස
කට සේවයක් සිදු වෙන බව එතුමා දන්න
වාද? (ඉ) මෙම උප තැපැල් කාර්යාලයට
ටැලිපෝස්ත් පහසුකම් තැනි බවත් මේ
හේතුවෙන් මහජනයා ඉමහත් කරදර
විඳින බවත් එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ඊ) මෙම
උප තැපැල් කාර්යාලයට ටෙලිපෝස්ත් පහසු
කම් දීමට එතුමා ඉක්මණින් ක්‍රියා කරන
වාද?

அரசாங்கக் கட்டுவேலை, தபால் தந்திப் போக்குவரத்து அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா: (அ) அனுராதபுரத் தேர்தற்றொகுதியிலுள்ள பறலமறகஹாவேவ என்னுமிடத்தில் “(பி” தாத்திலுள்ள உபதபால் நிலையமொன்று இருக்கின்ற தென்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஆ) இவ்வலுவலகமானது பல கிராமங்களுக்கும் இராஜாங்கணைக் குடியேற்றத் திட்டத்தின் பெரும் பகுதிக்கும் சேவையாற்றுகின்ற தென்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (இ) இவ்வுபதபால் நிலையத்தில் தொலைபேசி வசதியில்லையென்பதையும் அதன் காரணமாய் மக்கள் அதிக கஷ்டங்களை அனுபவிக்கின்றனரென்பதையும் அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஈ) இவ்வுபதபால் நிலையத்திற்குத் தொலைபேசி வசதிகளளிக்க அவர் விரைவில் நடவடிக்கைகள் மேற்கொள்வாரா?

asked the Minister of Public Works, Posts and Telecommunications: (a) Is he aware that there is a " B " Grade Sub-Post Office at Pahalamaragahawewa in the Anuradhapura Electorate? (b) Is he aware that this office serves a number of villages and a

Serves a number of villages and a

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

[செ. நி. சந்தாசக மொ.]

good portion of Rajangane Colonization Scheme? (c) Is he aware that there are no telephone facilities to this office and that because of this the people are undergoing great hardships? (d) Will he take early action to provide a telephone service to this Sub-Post Office?

செ. ரீ. லீ. நி. ஹுரல் (புலகன்
அமர்)

(கௌரவ ஈ. எல். பி. ஹுரல்—போக்கு
வரத்து அமைச்சர்)

(The Hon. E. L. B. Hurulle—Minister
of Communications)

(a) Yes. (b) Yes. (c) Yes. (d) Yes.
When funds are available.

தீர்மானம் தேயர்ந்ததென்றது: கமிஷன்
காரி உரிமை பேச்சு

புகையிரதப் பகுதி: நாசவேலை நடவடிக்கை

RAILWAY: ACTS OF SABOTAGE

11. உரிமை பேச்சு.

(திரு. மதியூ)

(Mr. Mathew)

புலகன் அமர்ந்தார் அது பின்னர்:
(அ) தீர்மானம் தேயர்ந்ததென்றது துடி கமி
ஷன் காரி உரிமை பேச்சு கிரீமென் துன்
கிரீமென் கமிஷன் உரிமை பேச்சு கமிஷன்
புலகன் அமர்ந்தார் அது பின்னர் கிரீமென்
வெறு உரிமை கமிஷன் கிரீமென்? (ஆ) உரிமை
பேச்சு, உரிமை உரிமை உரிமை கமிஷன்
உரிமை?

போக்குவரத்து அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா:
(அ) புகையிரதப் பகுதியில் முயற்சிக்கப்பட்ட
நாசவேலை நடவடிக்கைகள் சம்பந்தமாய்
புகையிரத தலைமை அபிவிருத்தி போக்குவரத்து
அமைச்சரின் நிரந்தரக் காரியதரிசிக்கு அறி
வித்தாரா? (ஆ) ஆமெனில், அவ்வறிக்கையை
அவர் சமர்ப்பிப்பாரா?

asked the Minister of Communica-
tions: (a) Did the General Manager
of Railways report to the Permanent
Secretary to the Ministry of Commu-
nications attempted acts of sabotage
in the Railway? (b) If so, will he
table the report?

செ. ஹுரல்

(கௌரவ ஹுரல்)

(The Hon. Hurulle)

(a) It is correct that such informa-
tion has been received. (b) It is not
possible to table this report as the
information received is of a confiden-
tial nature and as inquiries are
proceeding at the moment.

பி. சி. நி. கௌரவ மொ. (உரிமை பேச்சு
துன்வன மன்றத்)

(திரு. பி. ஜி. பி. கௌரவ—கொழும்பு
மத்தி மூன்றாம் அங்கத்தவர்)

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

Have any of these inquiries been
completed? And in the case of any
inquiry being completed, has sabotage
been established?

செ. ஹுரல்

(கௌரவ ஹுரல்)

(The Hon. Hurulle)

The inquiries are proceeding, and
according to the information we have
gathered there appear to be acts of
sabotage.

கௌரவ மொ.

(திரு. கௌரவ)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Will the Hon. Minister give an
assurance that after all the inquiries
are over he will make a statement to
this House with regard to any acts
of sabotage which have been proved?

செ. ஹுரல்

(கௌரவ ஹுரல்)

(The Hon. Hurulle)

That will be considered.

சென்னை கமிஷன் தீர்மானம்: புலகன்
பகுதி உரிமை

சென்னை கமிஷன் தீர்மானம் புலகன்
விளம்பரங்கள்

CEMENT CORPORATION: NEWSPAPER
ADVERTISEMENTS

12. உரிமை பேச்சு.

(திரு. மதியூ)

(Mr. Mathew)

கமிஷன் கமிஷன் கமிஷன்
கமிஷன் கமிஷன்: 1960 ஜூன் மீது
1965 மீது மீது கமிஷன்

Name of Newspaper	Whether it was National or Political	Daily, Weekly, Fortnightly or Monthly	The Year and the Amount paid per Year		Name of the Company
			Rs.	c.	
Times of Ceylon	.. National	.. Daily	..	400 00	.. Times of Ceylon Ltd.
Tribune	.. National	.. Weekly	..	1,809 25	.. Tribune Publications
Divayina	.. National	.. Weekly	..	60 00	.. Desiya Vitti Prakasakayo Ltd.
Ceylon Daily News	.. National	.. Daily	..	2,152 55	.. Associated Newspapers of Ceylon Ltd.
Dinamina	.. National	.. Daily	..	472 50	.. Associated Newspapers of Ceylon Ltd.
Tinakaran	.. National	.. Daily	..	216 25	.. Associated Newspapers of Ceylon Ltd.
Times of Ceylon	.. National	.. Daily	..	1,146 20	.. Times of Ceylon Ltd.
Lankadipa	.. National	.. Daily	..	226 00	.. Times of Ceylon Ltd.
Dawasa	.. National	.. Daily	..	216 00	.. Independent Newspapers Ltd.
Tribune	.. National	.. Weekly	..	1,108 07	.. Tribune Publications
Divayina	.. National	.. Weekly	..	60 00	.. Desiya Vitti Prakasakayo Ltd.
Ceylon Daily News	.. National	.. Daily	..	2,546 69	.. Associated Newspapers of Ceylon Ltd.
Dinamina	.. National	.. Daily	..	412 50	.. Associated Newspapers of Ceylon Ltd.
Tinakaran	.. National	.. Daily	..	426 00	.. Associated Newspapers of Ceylon Ltd.
Dawasa	.. National	.. Daily	..	55 00	.. Independent Newspapers Ltd.
Rividina	.. National	.. Weekly	..	225 00	.. Independent Newspapers Ltd.
Times of Ceylon	.. National	.. Daily	..	1,838 15	.. Times of Ceylon Ltd.
Lankadipa	.. National	.. Daily	..	117 50	.. Times of Ceylon Ltd.
Ceylon Daily Mirror	.. National	.. Daily	..	210 00	.. Times of Ceylon Ltd.
Virakesari	.. National	.. Daily	..	184 00	.. Virakesari Ltd.
Sinhala	.. Political	.. Weekly	..	284 00	.. Sri Lanka Freedom Party
Tribune	.. National	.. Weekly	..	410 0	.. Tribune Publications
Ceylon Daily News	.. National	.. Daily	..	3,104 07	.. Associate
Ceylon Observer	.. National	.. Daily	..	90 00	.. Associated Newspapers of Ceylon Ltd.
Dinamina	.. National	.. Daily	..	175 00	.. Associated Newspapers of Ceylon Ltd.

Name of Newspaper	Whether it was		Daily, Weekly, Fortnightly or Monthly		The Year and the Amount paid per Year		Rs. c.	Name of the Company
	National or Political							
Tinakaran	National	..	Daily	..	July-December 1963	224 00	Associated Newspapers of Ceylon Ltd.
Times of Ceylon	..	National	..	Daily	..	1963	1,777 50	Times of Ceylon Ltd.
Lankadipa	National	..	Daily	..	1963	121 75	Times of Ceylon Ltd.
Sri Lanka	Government	..	Weekly	..	1964	560 00	Information Department
Ceylon Daily News	..	National	..	Daily	..	1964	632 00	Associated Newspapers of Ceylon Ltd.
Dinamina	National	..	Daily	..	1964	520 00	Associated Newspapers of Ceylon Ltd.
Times of Ceylon	..	National	..	Daily	..	1964	602 00	Times of Ceylon Ltd.
Lankadipa	National	..	Daily	..	1964	404 00	Times of Ceylon Ltd.
Sri Lanka	Government	..	Weekly	..	(Jan.-March) 1965	252 00	Information Department
Ceylon Observer	..	National	..	Daily	..	1965	56 24	Associated Newspapers of Ceylon Ltd.
Times of Ceylon	..	National	..	Daily	..	1965	800 0	Times of Ceylon Ltd.
							<u>23,894 22</u>	

லேஸ்டி குனவர்டென மய. (பாநடூர்)

(திரு. லேஸ்டி குனவர்தன—பாணந்
துறை)

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene—Panadura)

Who decides whether a paper is national or whether it is political according to the categories that have been stated in the Answer?

லேஸ்டி குனவர்டென மய.

(கௌரவ ம. பி. ஆர். குனவர்தன)

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

We observe the general political content of the papers and call them "national" if they have a nation-wide circulation and they are not owned by political parties. Generally those which are controlled by political parties are termed "political".

லேஸ்டி குனவர்டென மய.

(திரு. லேஸ்டி குனவர்தன)

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

The Hon. Minister did not answer my question. The question was, who makes the decision?

லேஸ்டி குனவர்டென மய.

(கௌரவ ம. பி. ஆர். குனவர்தன)

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

The Ministry makes that decision.

லேஸ்டி குனவர்டென மய.

(திரு. லேஸ்டி குனவர்தன)

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

Which Ministry?

லேஸ்டி குனவர்டென மய.

(கௌரவ ம. பி. ஆர். குனவர்தன)

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

The Ministry concerned with releasing money; the Ministry under which these corporations operate, naturally in consultation with the Treasury.

லேஸ்டி குனவர்டென மய.

(திரு. லேஸ்டி குனவர்தன)

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

Treasury?

லேஸ்டி குனவர்டென மய.

(கௌரவ ம. பி. ஆர். குனவர்தன)

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

Yes.

கிதய குருவரயேக ஸதகா ஒர்ட்ரூமிகர்
வெக வு ரீ. பி. கருணாரத்ன மகநா

திரு. ஈ. எம். கருணாரத்ன, மாணவ ஆசிரிய
விண்ணப்பதாரர்

MR. E. M. KARUNARATNE, PUPIL-TEACHER
APPLICANT

13. பாபாரச் பி. பி. பாரேரா (யதியன்
தோட்டை)

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா—யதியன்
தோட்டை)

(Dr. N. M. Perera—Yatiantota)

அய்யாபந ஸ ஸஃகாநிக கபய்யு அமநி
கெந் அஹ் ப்ரஃநய: (அ) அநிநிநிநி ரீ.
பி. கருணாரத்ன நலந்நெக (பிஸா
அஃக பீ. 5904) 1954 வரீதயே கிதய குரு
வரயேக பித ஸதகா ஒர்ட்ரூமிகர்வெக வு
வெ பிதம நதநவா? (அ) ஸபிதிர பரிந்
தகயேரீ ரீ. பி. கருணாரத்ன மகநா
அஃநய பீயதீய பாய்லா ஸகநிக பத்யக்
ஒரீபிபந் கரந ரீ வவந் பீய அஃநய ஸக
நிகயக் வெ ஸோய கந் வெந் பிதம
நதநவா? (ஒ) மெக கருண பாரீபீய
வெந பவரூ வெ பிதம நதநவா? (ரீ)
கருணாரத்ன மகநா வெரீபீய நஹ் பவ
ரீத ஸதகா க்ரும நிய மாரீயக் கெ
நிநெ? (ரீ) கிதீத நிய மாரீயக் கெ
நதந்நி ப்ரமடய வெ ஸீ ம்ரு வெரீபீய
நஹ் பவரீய அபோஹஸந் பித வெ
கெந் க்ரும?

கல்வி, கலாச்சார விவகார அமைச்சரைக்
கேட்ட வினா: (அ) அமித்திரிகலவைச் சேர்ந்த
ஈ. எம். கருணாரத்னவென்பவர் 1964 ஆம்
ஆண்டு நடைபெற்ற மாணவ ஆசிரியர் பரீட்
சைக்கு ஜே. 5904 ஆம் இலக்கச் சுட்டிலக்கத்
துடன் தோற்றினாரென்பதை அவர் அநி
வாரா? (ஆ) நேர்முகப் பரீட்சையின்போது
பொய்யான சிரேட்ட பாடசாலைத் தராதரப்
பத்திரமொன்றைத் திரு. ஈ. எம். கருணாரத்ன
சமர்ப்பித்தமை கண்டுபிடிக்கப்பட்டதென்ப
தையும் அவர் அநிவாரா? (இ) இவ்விடயம்
பொலிஸாரிடம் ஒப்படைக்கப்பட்டதென்பதை
அவர் அநிவாரா? (ஈ) திரு. கருணாரத்னவுக்
கெதிராக வழக்குத் தொடருவதற்கு மேற்
கொள்ளப்பட்டுள்ள நடவடிக்கைகள் யாவை?
(உ) நடவடிக்கைகளெதுவும் மேற்கொள்ளப்
படாவிடின், அவர்மீது வழக்குத் தொடர்
வதற்குத் தேவையான நடவடிக்கைகளை மேற்
கொள்ளத் தாமதித்தமை அல்லது தவறிய

பாதின பிழை

asked the Minister of Education and Cultural Affairs: (a) Is he aware that one E. M. Karunaratne of Amithirigala (Index No. J 5904) was an applicant to be a pupil teacher in the year 1964? (b) Is he aware that at the interview, Mr. E. M. Karunaratne produced a false S.S.C. certificate which was detected? (c) Is he aware that this case was handed over to the police? (d) What steps have been taken to prosecute Mr. Karunaratne? (e) If no steps have been taken, what is the reason for the delay or failure to take the necessary steps to prosecute him?

மாண்புமிகு கல்வி அமைச்சர். (அ) ஆம். (ஆ) ஆம். (இ) ஆம். (ஈ) ஆம். (உ) ஆம்.

(திரு. காமனி ஜயசூரிய—கல்வி, கலாச்சார விவகார அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரிய தரிசி)

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

(a) Yes. (b) Yes. (c) Yes. (d) Police investigations have not yet been completed. (e) Depends on (d).

மாண்புமிகு கல்வி அமைச்சர்.

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

How long has this been going on? Cannot the department ginger up the police?

மாண்புமிகு கல்வி அமைச்சர்.

(திரு. ஜயசூரிய)

(Mr. Jayasuriya)

This was detected in March 1964.

தேவியோவா மற்றும் ருவனவெல்லா பூக்களில் பாதின பிழை

DEHIOWITA AND RUWANWELLA FLOOD VICTIMS

1. தேவியோவா மற்றும் ருவனவெல்லா பூக்களில் பாதின பிழை. (பி. பி. டி. ரி. வீரசேகர—தேவியோவா—தேவியோவா)

(திரு. லெஸ்லி குனவர்தன—திரு. டி. பி. ரி. வீரசேகர—தேவியோவா—தேவியோவா)

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene—on behalf of Mr. D. P. R. Weerasekera—Dehiowita)

மாண்புமிகு கல்வி அமைச்சர். (அ) ஆம். (ஆ) ஆம். (இ) ஆம். (ஈ) ஆம். (உ) ஆம்.

பாதின பிழை

அ. வினா: (அ) ஆம். (ஆ) ஆம். (இ) ஆம். (ஈ) ஆம். (உ) ஆம்.

சமூகசேவை அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா: (அ) தெனியோவா மற்றும் ருவனவெல்லா பூக்களில் பாதின பிழை. (ஆ) ஆம். (இ) ஆம். (ஈ) ஆம். (உ) ஆம்.

asked the Minister of Social Services: (a) Is he aware that there are a large number of flood victims in Dehiowita and Ruwanwella? (b) Will he take early action to formulate a relief scheme for them? (c) If so, when, and if not, why?

மாண்புமிகு சமூக சேவை அமைச்சர். (அ) ஆம். (ஆ) ஆம். (இ) ஆம். (ஈ) ஆம். (உ) ஆம்.

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன—இராஜாங்க அமைச்சரும் பிரதம அமைச்சராகும் பாதுகாப்பு வெளிவிவகார அமைச்சராகும் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசியும்—சமூக சேவை அமைச்சர் சார்பாக)

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

(a) Yes. (b) Relief has already been given to all persons eligible under the existing rules of the department. (c) Does not arise.

වංචික පිළිතුරු

පනාවල ගම්කායඝී සභාව : පිටිගහවෙල-
ගලබලනකන්ද පාර

நிற்றிஹகாவெல-ஹலபலனகந்த வீதி
பணவல கிராமசபை

RITIGAHAWELA-GALABALANAKANDA ROAD
PANAWALA V. C.

2. ලෙස්ලි ගුණවර්ධන මයා. (වීරසේ
කර මයා. වෙනුවට)

(திரு. லெஸ்லி குணவர்தன—திரு. வீர
சேக்கர—சார்பாக)

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene—on behalf of Mr. Weerasekera)

පළාත් පාලන ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු
ලේකම්ගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය : පනාවල ගම්
කායාසී සභාව මගින් නඩත්තු කෙරෙන
රිපිගහවෙල—ගලබලනකන්ද පාර අබ
ලත් තත්ත්වයක පවත්නා බව එතුමා
දන්නවාද? (අ) පනාවල ගම්කාර්ය සභා
වට අවශ්‍ය මුදල් ලබා දී අවශ්‍ය බෝක්කු
සහිතව මෙම පාර අලුත්වැඩියා කිරීමට
එතුමා එම ගම්කාර්ය සභාවට නියෝග
කරන්නවාද? (ඉ) එසේ නම්, ඒ කවදාද?
නොඑසේ නම්, ඒ මන්ද?

உள்ளூராட்சி அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசியைக் கேட்ட வினா : (அ) பணவல கிராமச் சபையால் பேணப்பட்டுவரும் நிற்றி கஹாவெல ஹலபலனகந்த வீதி திருத்தப் படாத நிலையிலுள்ளது என்பதை அவர் அறி வாரா? (ஆ) தேவையான நிதியை வழங்கி இவ்வீதியை போதிய மதகுகள் கட்டித் திருத் துமாறு பணவல கிராமச் சபைக்கு அவர் கட்டளையிடுவாரா? (இ) ஆமெனில் எப் பொழுது? இல்லையெனில் ஏன்?

asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Local Government: (a) Is he aware that Ritigahawela-Galabalanakanda road maintained by the Panawala Village Committee is in a state of disrepair? (b) Will he take action to provide necessary funds and instruct Panawala Village Committee to repair this road providing necessary culverts? (c) If so, when, and if not, why?

වංචික පිළිතුරු

ආර්. ප්‍රේමදාස මය. (පළාත් පාලන
සමිතියේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්)

(திரு. ஆர். பிரேமதாசு—உள்ளுராட்சி அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி)

(Mr. R. Premadasa—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Local Government)

(අ) ඔව්. (ආ) ගම්පහාව විසින් මෙම පාර සඳහා ආධාර මුදලක් ඉල්ලන්නේ නම් 1965-66 මුදල් වර්ෂයේ දී ඒ ගැන සලකා බැලිය හැක. (ඉ) පැන නොනගී.

වෙලන්ගල්ලේ විවිධ සේවා සමුපකාර
සමිතිය

வெலங்கல்ல பலநோக்குக் கூட்டுறவுச் சங்கம்

WELANGALLA MULTI-PURPOSE CO-OPERATIVE
SOCIETY

3. ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා (විරසේ
කර මයා. වෙනුවට)

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா—திரு. வீர
சேக்கர—சார்பாக)

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

වංශීජ හා වෙළඳ ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලි
මේන්තු ලේකම් ගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය :
(අ) වෙලන්ගල්ලේ සීමාසහිත විවිධ
සේවා සමුපකාර සමිතියේ කළමනා කරු
ගෙන් එම සමිතියට ලැබිය යුතු මුදල් අය
කර ගැනීමටත් ඔහු සේවයෙන් අස් කිරී
මටත් සහකාර සමුපකාර සංවර්ධන කොම
සාරිස් නියෝග කළ බව එතුමා දන්න
වාද? (ආ) ඔහු මෙම සමිතියේ කළමනා
කරු වශයෙන් තවමත් සේවය කරන බව
එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ඉ) මේ සම්බන්ධ
යෙන් කුමන ක්‍රියා මාර්ගයක් ගනු ලබන්
තේද?

வார்த்தக, வியாபார அமைச்சரின் பாராளு
மன்றக் காரியதரிசியைக் கேட்ட வினா: (அ)
வெலங்கல்ல பல நோக்குக் கூட்டுறவுச்சங்கம்,
விமிறெட்டின் மனேஜரிடமிருந்து அச்சங்கத்
திற்குச் சேரவேண்டிய பணத்தை அறவிடு
வதற்கும், அவரைப் பதவியினின்று நீக்கு
வதற்கும் நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கப்பட வேண்டு
மென கூட்டுறவு அபிவிருத்தி உதவி ஆணை
யாளர் கட்டளையிட்டார் என்பதை அவர் அறி
வாரா? (ஆ) அவர் இன்னமும் இச்சங்கத்தின்

වෘත්ති පිළිතුරු

(Mr. S. A. Peeris)

සෞඛ්‍ය බලා පසුව දැන්වන්නම්.

කොළඹ සමාජ ශාලා : සුදු කෙලීම හා
අනිකුත් දූෂණ

CLUBS IN COLOMBO : GAMBLING, ETC.

(திரு. எம். பீ. டி. சொய்சா சிறிவர்தன—
மினுவாங்கொட—திரு. கே. டி. டி. பெரேரா
(பண்டாரகம—சார்பாக)

(Mr. M. P. de Zoysa Siriwardena—
Minuwangoda—on behalf of Mr. K. D. D.
Perera—Bandaragama)

(திரு. எஸ். ஏ. பிரிஸ்—வர்த்தக, வியாபார அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி)

(Mr. S. A. Peeris—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Commerce and Trade)

සවදේ ශ කටයුතු ඇමතීගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය : (අ) “ ඇවිලන්ටා ” සමාජ ශාලාව වැනි සමාජ ශාලා කීයක් කොළඹ තිබේද ? (ආ) මේ සමාජ ශාලාවල සූදු කෙලීම හා අනිකුත් දූෂණ පවතින බව එතුමා දන්නවාද ? (ඉ) එසේ හෙයින්, මේ සමාජ ශාලා වසා දැමීමට එතුමා කටයුතු කරනවාද ?

உள்நாட்டு விவகார அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா: (அ) “அட்லாண்டா” போன்ற களரிகள் கொழும்பில் எத்தனை உண்டு? (ஆ) சூதாட்டமும் வேறு தூர்நடத்தைகளும் இக்களரிகளில் நடைபெறுகின்றன என்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (இ) எனவே, இக்களரிகளை மூடுவதற்கு அவர் நடவடிக்கைகள் எடுப்பாரா?

asked the Minister of Home Affairs : (a) How many clubs like the "Atlanta" club are there in Colombo ? (b) Is he aware that there are gambling and other vices in these clubs ? (c) Will he, therefore, take steps to close down these clubs ?

ගරු පි. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන (සමදේශ
කවයානු පිළිබඳ ඇමති වෙනුවට)

(கௌரவ டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன—உள்
நாட்டு விவகார அமைச்சர் சார்பாக)

(The Hon. D. P. R. Gunawardena—on behalf of the Minister of Home Affairs)

(a) The Ministry does not know the number. The Ministry does not have a list of clubs nor does it

ලෙස්'ලි ගුණවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. லெஸ்லி குணவர்தன)

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

ගරු කළානායකතුමනි, අතුරු ප්‍රශ්න
 යක් අහන්න කැමතියි. සේවයේ තබා
 ගැනීමට සුදුසු තැන කියා කලින් දන්වා
 තිබුණා. නමුත් තවමත් ඒ කලමනාකරු
 වැඩ කරගෙන යනවා. ඒ නිසා තමන්ගේ
 අදහස් ප්‍රකාශ කරනවා මිස, ඒ කලමනා
 කරු මේ ධුරයෙන් අස් කරනු පිණිස
 වෙන යමක් කරවීමට බලාපොරොත්තු
 වක් තිබෙනවාද?

Digitized by Noolaham
 noolaham.org | aavai

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

වැඩික පිළිතුරු

මෘථික පිළිතුරු

[ගරු ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන]

register them. (b) The Ministry is not officially aware of gambling and other vices. (c) The Ministry is referring this matter to the Hon. Minister of Sports.

ද සොසියා සිවිල්තා මය.

(திரு. டி. சொய்சா சிறிவர்தன)

(Mr. de Zoysa Siriwardena)

I would like to know the intention of the Government in regard to night-clubs like "Atlanta". Do you encourage them or take note of them?

ഒരു വി. പി. ഫാർ. ഗുണവർദ്ധന

(கௌரவ ம. பீ. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

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

We do not propose to encourage them. We would like to know what the previous Government did for five years.

ਭਾਵਾਰਥ ਚੰਨ੍. ਚੰਮਿ. ਭੋਰੇਰੁ

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Does the action you intend to take depend on the action taken by the previous Government?

ഒരു ടി. ടി. ഫാർ. ഗുണവർദ്ധന

(கௌரவ ம. பீ. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

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

No, certainly not.

කැබිනිගොල්ලුවේ එම්. සිරුල මහතා

கெப்பிற்றிக்கொல்லேவவிலுள்ள திரு. எம். சீரல

MR. M. SEERALA OF KEBILIGOLLEWA

7. ද සොයිසා සිරිවර්ධන මයා. (මෙමත්‍රි)

පාල සේනානායක මයා.—මැදවච්චිය—
(වෙනව)

(திரு. டி. சொய்சா சிறிவர்தன—திரு.
மைத்திரிபால சேனாநாயக்க—மதவாச்சி—
சார்பாக)

(Mr. de Zoysa Siriwardena—on behalf
of Mr. Maithripala Senanayake—Meda-
wachchiya

ඉබමි, වාරිමාර්ග හා විදුලි බල ඇමති
ගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය : (අ) හුරුලු පළාත
29 නූලාතේ අයිස්ටිගෙවැටේ අමුණ ඉදිකිරී

මෙත් පසු වතුර ගැලීමෙන් යටවූ අක්කර 1½ක ඉඩම වෙනුවෙන් කැබිනිගොල්ලුවේ එම්. සිරාලට මෙතෙක් කිසිම වන්දියක් ගෙවා නැති බව එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ආ) ප්‍රමාදයට හේතු කිසිවක් තිබේ නම් ඒ මෙතාවාද? (ඉ) වන්දි ගෙවන්නේ කවදාද?

காணி. நீர்ப்பாசன, மின்விசை அமைச்சரைக்
கேட்ட வினா : (அ) ஹுருலுபலாத்த 29 ஆம்
இலக்கத் துலானவில் ஐயதிக்வேவ அணைக்
கட்டுக் கட்டியதன் பின்னர் வெள்ளப்பெருக்
கெடுத்துள்ள 1½ ஏக்கர் காணிக்கு கெப்
பிற்றிக்கொல்லேவவிலுள்ள எம். சீரலவுக்கு
இற்றைவரை நட்டஈடு எதுவும் வழங்கப்பட
வில்லையென்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஆ)
தாமதத்திற்கான காரணங்கள் ஏதாவதிருப்
பின் அவை யாவை? (இ) நட்டஈடு எப்
பொழுது வழங்கப்படும்?

asked the Minister of Land, Irrigation and Power : (a) Is he aware that no compensation has yet been paid to M. Seeralala of Kebitigollewa for 1½ acres of land which has been inundated after the construction of the Aiyatigewewa Anicut in Tulana 29, Hurulu Palata ? (b) What are the reasons, if any, for the delay ? (c) When will the compensation be paid ?

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන (ඉබ්මි, වාරි
මාර්ග හා විදුලිබල ඇමති හා සහනායක
වෙනුවට)

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன—காணி, நீர்ப்பாசன, மின்விசை அமைச்சரும் சபை முதல்வரும் சார்பாக)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene—on behalf of the Minister of Land, Irrigation and Power and Leader of the House)

(අ) ඔව්. (ආ) මැනීමේ සැලසුම් තවමත්
සූදානම් නැත. (ඉ) මැනීමේ සැලසුම් නිකුත්
කිරීම ඉක්මන් කොට ඉඩම් අත්කර
ගැනීමේ කටයුතු අවසන් කිරීමෙන් පසුව
වත්දී ගෙවීමට දැනටමත් කටයුතු
සැලසීම ඇත.

வாசிக பிழிதூர்

வாசிக பிழிதூர்

சிமென்ட் கார்ப்பரேஷன் லிமிடெட் கங்கேசன்துறையில்
கட்டடம் அமைத்தல்

CEMENT CORPORATION : CONSTRUCTION OF
BUILDINGS AT KANKESANTURAI

5. டி. லைட்ஸ் சிரிவர்தன மியா. (மே. டி.
சி. பெரேரா மியா. வெறுவெறு)

(திரு. டி. சொய்சா சிரிவர்தன—திரு. கே.
மே. டி. பெரேரா சார்பாக)

(Mr. de Zoysa Siriwardena—on behalf
of Mr. K. D. D. Perera)

கங்கேசன்துறை ஸ்டீல் கம்பவுண்ட்
பிளாண்ட் கட்டுமானம்: (அ) லைட்ஸ் சிரிவர்தன
மியா. டி. பெரேரா மியா. வெறுவெறு, கங்கேசன்துறை
ஸ்டீல் கம்பவுண்ட் பிளாண்ட் கட்டுமானம்
கட்டடம் அமைத்தல். (ஆ) லைட்ஸ் சிரிவர்தன
மியா. டி. பெரேரா மியா. வெறுவெறு, கங்கேசன்துறை
ஸ்டீல் கம்பவுண்ட் பிளாண்ட் கட்டுமானம்
கட்டடம் அமைத்தல். (இ) லைட்ஸ் சிரிவர்தன
மியா. டி. பெரேரா மியா. வெறுவெறு, கங்கேசன்துறை
ஸ்டீல் கம்பவுண்ட் பிளாண்ட் கட்டுமானம்
கட்டடம் அமைத்தல். (ஈ) லைட்ஸ் சிரிவர்தன
மியா. டி. பெரேரா மியா. வெறுவெறு, கங்கேசன்துறை
ஸ்டீல் கம்பவுண்ட் பிளாண்ட் கட்டுமானம்
கட்டடம் அமைத்தல். (உ) லைட்ஸ் சிரிவர்தன
மியா. டி. பெரேரா மியா. வெறுவெறு, கங்கேசன்துறை
ஸ்டீல் கம்பவுண்ட் பிளாண்ட் கட்டுமானம்
கட்டடம் அமைத்தல்.

கைத்தொழில், கட்டுமான அமைச்சரைக்
கேட்ட வினா: (அ) கங்கேசன்துறையில் ஆய்
கூடமும், அலுவலகக் கட்டடமும் அமைப்
பதற்கென இலங்கைச் சிமெந்துக் கூட்டுத்
தாபனம் கேள்விப்பத்திரங்கள் கோரியதெப்
பொழுது? (ஆ) இவ்வேலைக்குக் கேள்விப்
பத்திரங்கள் அனுப்பிய ஒப்பந்தக்காரர்கள்
யார்? (இ) மிகக் குறைந்த கேள்விப்பத்திரத்
தொகை எவ்வளவு? அக்கேள்விப்பத்திரதார
ரின் பெயரென்ன? (ஈ) மிகக் கூடிய கேள்விப்
பத்திரத் தொகை எவ்வளவு? அக்கேள்விப்
பத்திரதாரரின் பெயரென்ன? (உ) ஆகக்
குறைந்த கேள்விப்பத்திரத் தொகைக்கும்
ஆகக்கூடிய கேள்விப் பத்திரத்தொகைக்கு
மிடையிலுள்ள வித்தியாசமெவ்வளவு?

asked the Minister of Industries and
Fisheries: (a) When were tenders
called for the construction of the
laboratory and the office block,
Kankesanturai, by the Ceylon
Cement Corporation? (b) Who were
the contractors who tendered for this

work? (c) What is the lowest
amount tendered and the name of the
tenderer? (d) What is the highest
amount tendered and the name of
the tenderer? (e) What is the
difference in the amount between
the lowest tender and the highest
tender?

மே. டி. சி. டி. லைட்ஸ் சிரிவர்தன

(கௌரவ மே. டி. லைட்ஸ் சிரிவர்தன)
(The Hon. D. P. R. Gunawardena)

(a) Tenders were called by a
notification in the Government
Gazette dated 9.10.1964. (b) The
contractors who tendered for this
work were:

1. Messrs. Colombo Commercial Co.
2. Messrs. Artisans, Ltd.
3. Messrs. Walker & Greig, Ltd.

(c) The lowest tender was from
Messrs. Walker & Greig Ltd., whose
tendered figure was Rs. 842,045.40. (d)
The highest tender was from Messrs.
Colombo Commercial Co., whose ten-
dered figure was Rs. 976,111.53. (e)
The difference between the highest
tender and the lowest tender was
Rs. 134,066.13.

மே. டி. சி. டி. லைட்ஸ் சிரிவர்தன
(மே. டி. சி. டி. லைட்ஸ் சிரிவர்தன)

(திரு. எம். டி. லைட்ஸ் சிரிவர்தன—
தொம்பே)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike—
Dompe)

Which tender was accepted?

மே. டி. சி. டி. லைட்ஸ் சிரிவர்தன

(கௌரவ மே. டி. லைட்ஸ் சிரிவர்தன)
(The Hon. D. P. R. Gunawardena)

The lowest tender was accepted.
Messrs. Walker & Greig Ltd.
declined to quote in this instance
although they were issued tender
documents in response to their
application. Messrs. Peter Peiris
whose tender was the lowest, with-
drew their offer stating that their
Managing Director was ill at that
time and that they would not be
able to execute the work. As all the
other tendered figures were high,
the Cement Corporation decided to
reject these tenders. Fresh tenders
were called on 9.10.64 on the basis of

මාචික පිළිතුරු

(a) Eighteen casual employees working at the Ceramic Factory, Negombo, were discontinued in April 1965, when the work on which they were engaged was completed. In reply to a question raised in Parliament on 21.5.65, the M.P. for Divulapitiya was informed that the casual employees who were originally recruited through the Employment Exchange would be re-employed when work was available. (b) Five workers had been recruited through the Employment Exchange; of them, one worker was an employee who had been discontinued in April. (c) All casual workers who had been discontinued in April, who had been originally recruited through the Employment Exchange, will be considered for re-employment when work is available in the future.

වෘත්ති විද්වතු

நிதி அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா : பி. என். 37,569 ஆம் இலக்கத்தைக்கொண்ட இளைப்பாற்றுச் சம்பளம் பெறுபவரான திரு. பி. எஸ். கூரே என்பவருக்கு, கீழ்க்காணும் விடயங்கள் சம்பந்தமாக அவர் செய்துகொண்ட அநேக முறையீடுகளுக்கு திறைசேரி நிவாரண மனிக்கவில்லையாகையால், நியாயமான தீர்ப்பொன்றை வழங்குமுகமாக, இவ்விடயம் பற்றி விசாரணை செய்வதற்கெனத் தகுதிவாய்ந்த உத்தியோகத்தரொருவரை அவர் நியமிப்பாரா :—(i) சேவையிலிருக்கும்பொழுது சம்பளத்திட்டத்திலேற்பட்ட குறைப்பு ; (ii) சேவையிலிருக்கையில் பெறுவதற்குரித்துடையதாயிருந்த சம்பள உயர்ச்சிகளையிழந்தமை ; (iii) மேற்கூறப்பட்ட விடயங்கள் தொடர்பாக இளைப்பாற்றுச் சம்பளத்திலேற்பட்ட நட்டம் ; (iv) இளைப்பாற்றுச் சம்பளக்குறிப்பு களின் 30 (1) ஆம் பிரிவின் பிரகாரம் இளைப்பாற்றுச் சம்பளம் பெறுபவருக்கு உரியதாகியிருக்கிறதா ?

பாற்றுச் சம்பளத்துடன் மேலதிகமாக வழங்கப்படவேண்டிய வருடாந்த ஊறுபாட்டுப் படி வழங்கப்படாமை?

asked the Minister of Finance: As pensioner PN 37569, Mr. B. S. Cooray, has not received redress at the Treasury in respect of his several representations regarding (i) reduction in salary scale whilst in service; (ii) loss of legitimate increments whilst in service; (iii) loss in pension arising from the above; (iv) non-payment of annual allowance for injury in terms of Section 30 (1) of the Minutes on Pensions, in addition to pension granted; will he appoint a competent officer to inquire into these matters with a view to a just settlement?

ගරු චන්‍ද්‍රිකායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

(i) What is referred to as reduction in salary scale is the appointment of Mr. B. S. Cooray to the post of unskilled labourer in the Industries Department, with effect from 27.10.1950. This post appears to have carried a salary scale less than that attached to the post of watcher, which he previously held. The Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Industries and Fisheries has on inquiry stated that the papers in connection with this appointment are not traceable. It is therefore not possible to investigate this matter further. If Mr. Cooray was aggrieved by this appointment, his appeal for redress should have been made to the proper authority within a reasonable time. (ii) The Director of Education has on inquiry stated that he has no objection to paying Mr. Cooray his increments of salary which fell due on 1.5.56 and 1.5.57. The Director of Education has accordingly been requested to pay these increments. (iii) Mr. Cooray's pension will be suitably revised after payment of increments referred to at (ii) above. (iv) Mr. Cooray has been paid an award of Rs. 4,900 under the Workmen's Compensation Ordinance. Therefore Section 29A

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

[ගරු චන්ද්‍රිකාගත]

of the Pension Minute precludes granting of an injury allowance to him. In view of (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) above, it is not necessary to appoint an officer to further inquire into these matters.

ਭਾਉਰੰਗ ਚੰਡ. ਚੰਡੀ. ਪੋਥੋਰੰਗ

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Before we pass on to another subject I have a certain matter to refer to. I understand that Question No. 6 was answered. I do not know how that Question came to be on the Order Paper because apparently it is a reflection on me. I think that a substantive Motion is the only proper form in which this matter should have been raised. The Question has however been asked and answered and I crave your indulgence to make a personal explanation at 2 P.M. because I do not have my papers with me now. The whole thing is an attempt to sling mud.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පත
1965-66

ஒதுக்கீட்டு மசோதா, 1965-66

APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965-66

[කාරක සභාවෙහිදී සලකා බලන ලදී.]

කළානායකතුමා මූලාසනාරූප විස.

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

2 වන වගන්තියේ සිට 7 වන වගන්තිය තෙක් උපලේඛන සලකා බැලීමෙන් පසු ඉදිරිපත් කිරීමට නියෝග කරන ලදී.

குழுவில் ஆராயப்பெற்றது.

சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள் தலைமதாங்கினார்கள்.

முதலாம் வாசகம் மசோதாவின் பகுதியாக இருக்க வேண்டுமென ஆணையிடப்பட்டது.

2 ஆம் வாசகத்திலிருந்து 7 ஆம் வாசகம் வரை, அட்டவணை ஆராயப்பட்டதன்பின் சமர்ப்பிக்கப்படவேண்டுமென ஆணையிடப்பட்டது.

Considered in Committee.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair.*]

Clause 1 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 2 to 7 ordered to be postponed until after consideration of the Schedules.

—කරන සහිත

පළමුවන රජ ලේඛනය

පොදු සේවා සඳහා ගෙවිය හැකි මුදල්
ප්‍රමාණයක්

முதலாம் அட்டவணை

பொதுச்சேவைகட்கு கொடுக்கப்பட வேண்டிய தொகை

FIRST SCHEDULE

SUMS PAYABLE FOR GENERAL SERVICES

1 වන ශීතිය.—අග්‍රාණ්ඩුකාර උතුමාණන්
වහන්සේ

1 වන සම්මතය.—කාර්ය මණ්ඩල පොද්ගලික පඩිනම් සහ අනිකුත් දීමනා, රු. 2,59,664

தலைப்பு 1, மகா தேசாதிபதியவர்கள்

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 1.—பணியாளரின் ஆளுக்கூரிய வேதனமும் பிற படிகளும், ரூபா 2,59,664

HEAD 1.—HIS EXCELLENCY THE
GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and other allowances of staff, Rs. 259,664

“ 1 වන ශ්‍රී ලංකා 1 වන සම්මතය සඳහා රු. 2,59,664 ක මුදල උප ලේඛනයට ඇතුළත් කළ යුතුය ” යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදීත්, සභා සම්මත විය.

1 වන ශ්‍රී ලංකා 1 වන සම්මතය උප ලේඛන
යෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට නීතිය යුතු සහි නියෝග
කරන ලදී.

“1 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பண ரூபா 2,59,664 அட்டவீணயிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

1 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணையில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 259,664 for Head 1, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Head 1, Vote 1, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

2 වන සම්මතය.—පාලන ශාස්ත්‍ර—පුනරාවේනන
විසදම්, රු. 1,60,250

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலனச் செலவுகள்—
மீண்டுவரும் செலவு, ரூ. 1,60,250

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—
Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 160,250

“1 වන ශීථියෙහි 2 වන සම්මතය සඳහා රු. 1,60,250 ක මුදල උප ලේඛනයට ඇතුළත් කළ යුතුය” යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදින්, සභාසාමාජික

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

1 වන ශීර්ෂයේ 2 වන සම්මතය උප ලේඛන යෙහි කොටසක් හැරියට තිබිය යුතු යයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.

“1 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பண ரூபா 1,60,250 அட்டவணையிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

1 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணையில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 160,250 for Head 1, Vote No. 2, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 1, Vote 2, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

2 වන ශීර්ෂය.—අග්‍රාමාත්‍ය

1 වන සම්මතය.—කාර්ය මණ්ඩල පොද්ගලික පහිතවි සහ අනිකුත් දීමනා, රු. 2,41,019.

1 වන උප ශීර්ෂය.—සේවක සංඛ්‍යා සහ වැටුප්, රු. 1,30,249.

தலைப்பு 2.—பிரதம அமைச்சர்

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 1.—பணியாளரின் ஆளுக்கூரிய வேதனையும் பிறபடிகளும், ரூபா 2,41,019

உப தலைப்பு 1.—ஊழியர் கோப்பும் சம்பளங்களும் ரூ. 1,30,249

HEAD 2.—PRIME MINISTER

Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and other allowances of staff, Rs. 241,019.

Sub-head 1.—Cadre and Salaries, Rs. 130,249.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I think it will be convenient if we deal with all questions pertaining to the Prime Minister's Votes under this Head instead of discussing some under the Votes of the Minister of Defence and External Affairs—Head 14. Most of the questions which I want to raise deal largely with policy and I think it will be a good idea if we deal with the policy of the Hon. Prime Minister and the departments under him under these Votes, if that is agreeable to the Hon. Prime Minister himself.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බන්ධාරනායක මහ.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Is that procedure being adopted?

සභාපතිතුමා

(அக்கிராசனார்)

(The Chairman)

I think it was agreed to pass these Heads without comment.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Head 2 deals with the Prime Minister and we come again to the Prime Minister under Head 14.

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක (අග්‍රාමාත්‍ය සහ ආරක්ෂක හා විදේශ කටයුතු පිළිබඳ අමති සහ ක්‍රම සම්පාදක හා ආර්ථික කටයුතු පිළිබඳ අමති)

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க—பிரதம அமைச்சரும் பாதுகாப்பு, வெளி விவகார அமைச்சரும் திட்ட அமைப்பு, பொருளாதார விவகார அமைச்சரும்)

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

You can raise those matters when you come to that Head.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

We can raise certain matters relating to the Minister of Defence and External Affairs only under Head 14. There are other matters which we can raise only under Head 2, Prime Minister; for instance, the question of the composition of the Cabinet. There are certain matters connected with the size of the Cabinet and so on which cannot be discussed under the Votes of the Minister of Defence and External Affairs. So can we not have a full discussion of Head 14 under Head 2?

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

It would be easier if hon. Members confine their remarks to the particular Head under discussion. They

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

[ශ්‍රී ලංකා සේනානායක]

can raise any matters coming under me as Prime Minister under this Head and other matters when the various other Heads are taken up.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I do not want to be precluded from raising these matters.

ශ්‍රී ලංකා සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Any questions you cannot raise under the other Heads you can raise now.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Under the Head of the Prime Minister the time schedule is 12 hours. We will stick to that.

සභාපතිතුමා

(அக்கிராசனார்)

(The Chairman)

I would like if each hon. Member keeps within the time allotted, so that everyone will have a chance of speaking.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I move :

"That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 10 in respect of sub-head 1, item 'Prime Minister'."

Under Head 2, there are one or two matters which strictly come within the Prime Minister's purview. The first matter is this. It is a little curious that the Hon. Prime Minister—when he was on this side and, I think, also before—used to be rather critical of the size of the Cabinet; even twelve to fourteen was considered to be very big. Now, my good Friend has expanded the

Cabinet to seventeen, and he is quite happy about it. It is his prerogative, no doubt. I think we are entitled to say that, surely, for a small country like Ceylon seventeen is far too big, particularly when we realize that one Minister deals with only social services, and so on. I do not think there is very much to deal with under that Ministry. I do not think the Hon. Minister of Social Services has even a couple of hours' work. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Social Services was not ready with an Answer to a Question on the Order Paper today.

ශ්‍රී ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

It was answered.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Answered by you, not by the hon. Parliamentary Secretary. So that, you can dispense with his services—it is quite clear.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

One or the other !

ප්‍ර. හා. 10.30

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

To advert to the point I raised : Certainly, a Cabinet of seventeen for a country like Ceylon seems to be on the excessive side.

The other point is this. My Hon. Friend, when he was on this side, made this statement on 6th September, 1961. The Hon. Prime Minister—then Leader of the Opposition—was adverting to the appointment of defeated candidates to corporations. This is what he said, and it is found at column 2210 of the HANSARD of 6.9.61 :

"Mr. Rajapakse contested Haputale in March. The Chairman was my opponent."

That is, the Chairman of the C. W. E.

"Then Mr. Navaratne contested Minipe in March and July. Now, that is an unfortunate and unsavoury feature."

செ. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Might I explain?

அவரே உன். எம். பெரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

The Hon. Prime Minister is the ultimate authority.

செ. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Not on corporations. If the hon. Member will give way, I will explain. The point is this. Under the law, as regards these corporations, various Ministers appoint the boards. I have, of course, been consulted, not legally.

அவரே உன். எம். பெரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

It is not a question of legality; it is a matter of principle. The question is whether the Hon. Prime Minister stands by his original policy which he himself adumbrated here.

எஃப். எம். டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(திரு. எம். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

You cannot quote against him from HANSARD!

செ. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

No, no; I will explain.

அவரே உன். எம். பெரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I have not finished with the quotation. This is what you said:

"Now, that is an unfortunate and unsavoury feature. Is it desirable to constitute Boards in that manner?"

That is, by appointing defeated candidates to boards.

"I raise that as a matter of principle, that is, as to whether the Hon. Minister should not be more careful in the selection of the members and the Chairman of the Board. Hon. Members are advocating numerous corporations for the future as well. If corporations become a haven for defeated candidates, God help the corporations!"

Mr. Ilangaratne then intervened and said:

"I do not regard that as a disqualification."

And the Hon. Prime Minister replied:

"I am dealing with the principle of it; after that let us see about the qualifications."

The Hon. Prime Minister himself adumbrated this principle. I must say that I do not agree with it. He, at least, must be consistent and see when they appoint people to the corporations, or when he is consulted and he gives the okay, that he lays down a principle and says, "I do not approve of defeated candidates being appointed to corporations." I do not entirely hold with him on this point. If there are very good men, of intellectual capacity, ability and so on, merely because they are defeated candidates, I do not see why he should rule them out. But there have been a number of appointments made to these corporations, like that of Mr. Lakshman Rajapaksa, to the Textiles Corporation.

செ. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

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

It would be appropriate only if it is raised when the Votes of that Ministry are discussed.

அவரே உன். எம். பெரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I am raising the principle now.

—කුරක සහාය

ගරු ඩබ්ලි ටෙස්^{ප්} නානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Nobody asked! Be careful of what you say.

କେନ୍ଦ୍ରମାନଙ୍କ ମଧ୍ୟରେ

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Please ask Dr. Nimalasuriya.

ගුණ බබ්ලි සෙ^{ප්} නානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

If the hon. Member makes a responsible statement he has to bear the responsibility for it.

කෙනමන් මය.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I am asking you to ask
Dr. Nimalasuriya.

ගරු ඩබ්ලි ටෙස්^{ප්} නානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Why should I ask Dr. Nimala-suriya? You are making the statement on the Floor of the House.

ගරු බඩිලි සෝනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

By whom ?

කෙතමන් මගේ.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

By your people.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි ජෝනාතාන

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I demand to be told, who asked him?

කෙනමක් මය.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I did not say that you asked him

කෙනමත් මය.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

He found it inconsistent with his conscience to continue.

The other gentleman is Mr. Kobbe-kaduwa. He left as a result of the expiry of his period of office.

Now, two other gentlemen have been appointed in their places on the advice of the Hon. Prime Minister. One is Mr. L. J. de S. Seneviratne and the other is our old friend Major Eddie Nugawela. I am not canvassing the suitability of these gentlemen; they are known to all of us, but I want to raise a certain question. Mr. Seneviratne was a distinguished public servant, and is also the husband of the defeated U. N. P.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

--කාරක සභාව

[කෙනමන් මයා.]

candidate for Pelmadulla. There are public servants including Gramasevakas who have been interdicted in the Pelmadulla electorate on the alleged ground that at the last election they worked against Mrs. Sita Seneviratne, the U. N. P. candidate for Pelmadulla, who is the wife of the newly appointed member to the Public Service Commission. The point I am making is that it is the Public Service Commission that will have to take a responsible decision on this question, and it is, to say the least, putting Mr. Seneviratne in a most invidious position when he is appointed to the same Public Service Commission. Major Nugawela, of course, is a well-known and trustworthy U. N. P. "war horse", who had fought many a battle on behalf of it, in this House and outside.

My hon. Friends on that side have spoken a great deal about the impartiality of the Public Service Commission. In point of fact, I think the Hon. Prime Minister owes an explanation to this House for making such political appointments to the Public Service Commission. On the one hand they are making big political speeches in the country demanding that the public servants should be neutral; that the public servants should not take part in party politics, in political warfare and strife, and in the hurly-burly of day to day politics. They have interdicted and transferred a number of teachers and other public servants allegedly on the ground of transgressing the theory of political impartiality of the Public Service, and then they appoint a gentleman like Mr. Nugawela, who is one of the leaders of the U. N. P., in fact a long-standing leader of the U. N. P., as Chairman of the Public Service Commission.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාතිථි என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I think he was a member of the board of "Siyarata".

කෙනමන් මයා.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

He has rendered outstanding and notable service to the U. N. P. and he is one of the protagonists of the U. N. P. policies.

This Government has survived for five months and has talked and talked of the alleged irregularities of the previous Government. If they disapprove of all that the S. L. F. P. Government did, then they should show it in their conduct and not in merely their speeches. They have been in power for five months. Let us see what they are doing now. They are now in charge of the affairs of this country. We must now assess their conduct in relation to the country's affairs.

I want also to refer to the appointment of Mr. C. G. Weeramantry as Commissioner of Assize. I have nothing against him. I have no doubt that he is a very able and well-known lawyer.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Can you not raise this question when the Justice Ministry Votes are taken up?

කෙනමන් මයා.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

No, Sir. This is an appointment which you yourself made. I am not criticizing Mr. Weeramantry. I am sure, Sir, that Mr. Weeramantry is eminently suitable to sit on the Supreme Court Bench. In my opinion, there are a number of persons like him. I remember when Mr. E. R. S. R. Coomaraswamy was appointed a Commissioner of Assize by the last Government there was a big hullabaloo made by the then Opposition members that Mr. Coomaraswamy was a member of the S. L. F. P., that he had been a defeated candidate, and so on and so forth.

Mr. Coomaraswamy was a very able lawyer. He has proved in practice that he was a good judge.

பு. ஸா. 10.45

Mr. Weeramantry was closely associated with the U. N. P. I think he was in the U. N. P. panel of lawyers for drafting election petitions.

சுரு. டிபி. சேனானாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனானாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Practically all lawyers draft election petitions, and that being so, you cannot make any appointments.

கௌ. கௌ. கௌ.

(சுரு. கௌ. கௌ.)

(Mr. Keuneman)

One would expect.—[Interruption].

சுரு. டிபி. சேனானாயக்க

(கௌ. கௌ. கௌ.)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Why did you enunciate the principle?—[Interruption].

கௌ. கௌ. கௌ.

(சுரு. கௌ. கௌ.)

(Mr. Keuneman)

— not to —[Interruption].

சுரு. டிபி. சேனானாயக்க

(கௌ. கௌ. கௌ.)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Political appointments—[Interruption].

கௌ. கௌ. கௌ.

(சுரு. கௌ. கௌ.)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Extend the principle—[Interruption]. Sir, which debate is taking place?

சுரு. டிபி. சேனானாயக்க

(சுரு. கௌ. கௌ.)

(The Chairman)

Order, please!

கௌ. கௌ. கௌ.

(சுரு. கௌ. கௌ.)

(Mr. Keuneman)

If my hon. Friends are against political appointments, then I should expect that they would not make such appointments to the Judiciary and the Public Service Commission.

I have always thought that the fact that a person was defeated at an election should not by itself be a disqualification for appointment to a public office. My hon. Friends raised their voices against political appointments, and now they proceed to do the same thing. Why does not the Hon. Prime Minister at least tell us that he has resiled from the position his party took in this House after 1956, and that the U. N. P. once again has accepted the position that political appointments are legitimate? He, as the leader of the Government, has accepted it.

சுரு. டிபி. சேனானாயக்க

(சுரு. கௌ. கௌ.)

(The Chairman)

If there are no further questions to be asked the Hon. Prime Minister might reply.

சுரு. டிபி. சேனானாயக்க

(கௌ. கௌ. கௌ.)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Mr. Chairman, the first question that was addressed to me was the size of the Cabinet. I grant that the Cabinet as constituted now may contain one or two Members more than the previous Cabinet. I am not sure how large the Coalition Cabinet was.

சுரு. டிபி. சேனானாயக்க

(சுரு. கௌ. கௌ.)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Fifteen.

சுரு. டிபி. சேனானாயக்க

(கௌ. கௌ. கௌ.)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Well, two Members more.

விசேஷ கௌரவப் பதவி, 1965-66

—காரக பதவி

டி. ஸோய்சா சிரிவர்தனா மஹா.

(திரு. டி. சோய்சா சிரிவர்தனா)

(Mr. de Zoysa Siriwardena)

But you criticized us when we raised it to fifteen from twelve.

ஓர் உறுதி கேள்வியாக

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Who?

டி. ஸோய்சா சிரிவர்தனா மஹா.

(திரு. டி. சோய்சா சிரிவர்தனா)

(Mr. de Zoysa Siriwardena)

The Opposition at that time.

ஓர் உறுதி கேள்வியாக

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

When? I would like to be quoted.

The hon. Member for Yatiyantota has quoted, and I propose to deal with that. But the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central got up and said Nimalasuriya resigned because we tried to influence him.

கேள்வியாக மஹா.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Not you. Some of your people.

ஓர் உறுதி கேள்வியாக

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I do not think anybody tried to influence him. If Nimalasuriya finds it uncomfortable to be there, it is not our business. We never tried to interfere.

பதவிபூர்வம்

(அக்கிராசனார்)

(The Chairman)

Hon. Members must be responsible for statements made by them in this House.

கேள்வியாக மஹா.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I take full responsibility for my statement.

ஓர் உறுதி கேள்வியாக

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I challenge him to get the information from Nimalasuriya and come and say it.

That is beside the point. Now, as regards the Cabinet, I want hon. Members of this House to realize the circumstances in which the Cabinet was formed. They probably object to the composition of the Cabinet and object to many parties getting together. As they themselves say, it is a *hath hawula*. So, when you have a Cabinet composed of seven different elements as they themselves say—seven different parties—it is natural that you will have more than the normal number. The surprising part of it is that it is confined to seventeen. Surely there is a case for more----

பதவிபூர்வம். உறுதி. பேரேரர்

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Hear! hear!

ஓர் உறுதி கேள்வியாக

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

—if you think of the circumstances in which the Cabinet was formed. That is my answer to you on the matter that was raised.

The hon. Member for Yatiyantota quoted something I had said in 1961. I am glad I sent for the HANSARD. I would have liked him to have proceeded with what I said.

பதவிபூர்வம். உறுதி. பேரேரர்

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I only brought an extract.

ஓர் உறுதி கேள்வியாக

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I will read from HANSARD. On that occasion I also went on to say what is at column 2211:

“I would not say that in every case it is a disqualification. Will the Hon. Minister please tell me the strength of the Board of the C. W. E.?”

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

In the same speech of mine I say :

“Out of six or seven members of the Board three are defeated candidates. Of course the Hon. Minister can appoint whom he likes. As a result of appointing defeated candidates you have heard what has been happening earlier.—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 6th September 1961; Vol. 44, c. 2211.]

And I went on to cite cases where some people had been involved in criminal proceedings—[Interruption]. The point I was making there, if you read the whole of my speech, is that “I could not say that in every case it is a disqualification”. I have said it specifically. I objected to it being packed with defeated candidates; and there were some who had been convicted. I would ask the hon. Member for Yatiyantota—I can hand over the HANSARD to him—to read everything that I said on that occasion. I did not say that a defeated candidate should automatically not be considered. If you follow the whole of my speech you would see that was exactly what I said. Further, I remember on more than one occasion adverting to the fact—and I think the Hon. Minister of Industries also did so—that a person after being appointed was doing politics. He gets paid by the corporation. I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition, then Prime Minister, introduced the Chairman of the C.W.E. to the electorate as my opponent when he was Chairman of the C.W.E. He was paid out of Government funds and the way he was utilized for political purposes was known to everybody. Hon. Members would, therefore, see that I did not say that just because a person was a defeated candidate he should not be considered for appointment to boards and corporations.

කෙනමන් මයා.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Is it the policy of the Government that members of boards and corporations should not take part in political affairs as long as they are in such institutions?

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I am coming to that matter. In fact the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central (Mr. Keuneman) will remember that we in our Throne Speech spoke of political rights for the public servants. When we consider the implementation of this proposal we will decide on that matter.

කෙනමන් මයා.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Public servants as well as employees in corporations and boards including directors?

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

We have suspended our decision on that matter—

කෙනමන් මයා.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

It is not directors of boards and corporations?

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

We will also consider the question of directors of boards and corporations when we make that decision.

As regards the agreement with the Federal Party, I have been asked often before and my reply on that matter is still the same. I do not intend changing it either. The reply is this. Whatever we have agreed on you will have an opportunity of discussing when we bring the relevant proposals before the House. That is what I said before, and I say that again now, as an answer to hon. Members who have raised the question.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක]
We next come to the question of the Chairman of the P. S. C. I have not, as quoted by the hon. Member as regards boards, enunciated any principle about the P. S. C., but I will say this. I do not think that the fact that a person had been taking part in politics earlier—I will say the Chairman, Mr. E. A. Nugawela, had taken part in politics but I can assure you that he has completely severed his connections and resigned from the party—should in itself be a disqualification; I do not think the previous Government itself thought that it should be a disqualification. Mr. H. Kobbekaduwa himself contested the elections. An hon. Member on this side says Mr. Kobbekaduwa lost his deposit. I do not know about it.

සිරිමාවෝ ආර්. ඩී. බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.
(අත්තනලේලි)

(තිருමති සිරිමාවෝ ආර්. ඩී. බණ්ඩාර
නායක—අත්තනලේලි)

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

It is nonsense.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක
(කෙළරඹ උඩුගිලි සේනානායක)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I am not saying it. I am saying what the hon. Member said. But he is also a defeated candidate.

It is my view—and I think hon. Members of this House will agree with me—that it is difficult to find in this country a fairer and more just man than Mr. Nugawela. Hon. Members know his whole record.

As regards Mr. Seneviratne, he did not take part in politics as such. His wife did come forward, of course. Mr. Seneviratne was one of the trusted officers of the late husband of the hon. Leader of the Opposition for very many years. He was given special appointments, special jobs, and so on.

කෙනමත් මිය.
(තිரு. කෙනමත්)
(Mr. Keuneman)

I raised a different question—not about his qualifications.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක
(කෙළරඹ උඩුගිලි සේනානායක)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I think that, in making appointments to the Public Service Commission, one has only to be convinced that the persons to be appointed would perform their functions fairly and justly. As the hon. Member for Yatiyantota stated, and as I have myself stated in the speech from which he quoted, the fact that a person is a defeated candidate should not, of itself, be a disqualification. I have stated that. But I should think that we have to go into the qualifications of individuals to hold those offices. In the particular cases mentioned, I have seen the records of some of the individuals in regard to their honesty and also in regard to their active participation in politics while holding those offices.

What I have said applies to Mr. Weeramantry's appointment, too. I assure hon. Members that the Hon. Minister of Justice tried to get various others, but they were not inclined to accept office as Commissioners of Assize. I think, as the hon. Member himself said, Mr. Weeramantry is a very competent person. I am sure the qualities he possesses are more than satisfactory to meet the exacting demands of the office.

I believe those are the only matters that have been raised.

ප්‍ර. සා. 11

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මිය. (හබරාදුව)
(තිரு. ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර—හබරාදුව)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera—Habaraduwa)

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, ගරු අගමැතිතුමා එතුමා කළාටදී යටිතල ව්‍යවස්ථා ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා) ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නයට—එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ ප්‍රධාන පක්ෂයේ අතර කවර ආකාරයක ගිවිසුමක් තිබෙනවාද යනුවෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නයට—පිළිතුරු වශයෙන් කියා සිටියේ එවැනි ගිවිසුමක් තිබෙනවා නම් ක්‍රියාව යොදවන්න ඉස්සර වෙලා මේ ගරු සභාවට ඉදිරිපත් කරනවා යන වගයි. මා හිතනවා

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

ඒ විධියේ අදහසක් දෙන ආකාරයට පිළිතුරු දීමෙන් ගරු අගමැතිතුමා කළේ මතු කරන ලද ප්‍රශ්නයට කෙලින්ම පිළිතුරක් දීම නොවේය කියා. මක්නිසාද, පළපුරුදු ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ පාලකයකු හැටියට එතුමන්ගෙන් අප බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ ඊට වඩා පැහැදිලි පිළිතුරක් ලබා ගැනීමටයි.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක
(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Sir, I rise to a point of Order. Any agreement to which I was a party was long before I became Prime Minister.

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கரா)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, එහෙම කිව්වත් ඇග බේරිල්ලක් නොවෙයිද ඒක?

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක
(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

This is the Prime Minister's Vote. I did not come to any agreement as Prime Minister. Any agreement I came to was before the Government was formed and before I became Prime Minister.

සභාපතිතුමා
(அக்கிராசனார்)
(The Chairman)

This matter has been raised very recently and I do not think it should be raised now again.

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கரா)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, මා කළා කරන්නේ ගරු අගමැතිතුමා දුන් පිළිතුර ගැනයි. එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයත් ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ පක්ෂයත් අතර යම්කිසි ගිවිසුමක් තිබෙනවා නම්, ක්‍රියාවේ යොදවන්න ඉස්සර වෙලා ඒ ගිවිසුම මේ ගරු සභාවට ඉදිරිපත් කරනවා යන අදහසයි ගරු අගමැතිතුමා දුන් පිළිතුරෙන් කියාවෙන්නේ.

සභාපතිතුමා
(அக்கிராசனார்)
(The Chairman)

ඒ ගැන තීරණයක් දී තිබෙනවා. ඒ නිසා කරුණාකර වෙන යම් කාරණයක් අහන්න තිබෙනවා නම් අහන්න. ප්‍රශ්නයක් අහන්න තියෙනවා නම් අහන්න පුළුවනි. එහෙත් තීරණයක් දුන් කාරණය ගැන ප්‍රශ්නයක් අහන්න බැහැ.

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.
(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கரா)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

මා අහන්නේ නැහැ ප්‍රශ්නයක්. ගරු අගමැතිතුමා මේ ගරු සභාවේදී දැන් එක්තරා ප්‍රකාශයක් කර තිබෙනවා. ඒ ප්‍රකාශය වැරදි බවයි පෙන්වා දෙන්න මා උත්සාහ කරන්නේ. එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයත් ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨ පක්ෂයත් අතර ගිවිසුමක් තිබෙනවා නම් ඒ අනුව ක්‍රියා කරන්න ඉස්සර වෙලා මේ ගරු සභාවට එනවා කිව්වා. මා තමුන්නාන්සෙට ඔප්පු කරන්න උත්සාහ කරන්නේ එහෙම කිව්වට මොකද මේ ගරු සභාවට නැවින්—යම්කිසි ගිවිසුමක් තිබුණා හෝ වේවා නොතිබුණා හෝ වේවා—යම්කිසි වෙන මාගීයකින් යම් යම් දේවල් ක්‍රියාවේ යොදවන්න පුළුවන් බවයි. එහෙම නැතිව යම් ගිවිසුමක් තිබෙන බවක් හෝ නැති බවක් හෝ පෙන්වන්න නොවෙයි මා කළා කරන්නේ. ගිවිසුමක් තිබෙනවා නම් එය ක්‍රියාවේ යොදවන්න නොයෙක් මාර්ග තිබෙනවා. ගිවිසුමක් තිබෙනවා නම් ක්‍රියාවේ යොදවන්න ඉස්සර වෙලා මේ ගරු සභාවට ඉදිරිපත් කරනවා කිව්ව ගරු අගමැතිතුමා එතුමගේ පිළිතුරු කළාවෙදී, දැන් මොහොතකට ඉස්සර වෙලා.

සභාපතිතුමා
(அக்கிராசனார்)
(The Chairman)

ඒ ගැන මා තීරණයක් දී තිබෙනවා. එහෙම කියා තිබෙනවා නම් තවත් ඒ ගැන කියන්න වුවමනාවක් නැහැ. එහෙම කියා තිබෙන නිසා ඒ ප්‍රශ්නය අහන්න බැරිය යනුවෙන් මා දුන් තීරණය කර තිබෙනවා. කරුණාකර ඒ නිසා වෙන ප්‍රශ්නයක් තිබෙනවා නම් ඉදිරිපත් කරන්න.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.

(තිரு. පිඞ්ගිස් ඉරුණසේකර)

(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

මා අහන්නේ නැහැ ප්‍රශ්නයක්. ගිවිසුමක් තියෙනවද නැද්ද කියලයි අහල තියෙන්නේ.

සභාපතිතුමා

(අක්කිරාසනාර්)

(The Chairman)

ඒ ප්‍රශ්නය ඔය තරමින් ඇති. ඊළඟට වෙන ප්‍රශ්නයක් අහන්න තියෙනව නම් අහන්න. එහෙම නැත්නම් ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා කරුණාකර වාඩි වෙන්න.

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.

(තිරු. පිඞ්ගිස් ඉරුණසේකර)

(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

මා කියන දේ තේරෙන්නේ නැත් නම්—

සභාපතිතුමා

(අක්කිරාසනාර්)

(The Chairman)

මට හොඳටම තේරෙනව. මට ඔය කියන දේ තේරුම් ගිය නිසා තමයි මා තීරණය කළේ දැන් ඔය ප්‍රශ්නය ගැන මීට වඩා කලා කරන්න වුවමනා නැත කියා. දැන් ඔය ප්‍රශ්නය ගැන මීට වඩා කලා කරන්න එපා.

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.

(තිරු. පිඞ්ගිස් ඉරුණසේකර)

(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

මොන ප්‍රශ්නය ගැනද කලා කරන්නේ?

සභාපතිතුමා

(අක්කිරාසනාර්)

(The Chairman)

මන්ත්‍රීතුමා කලා කරන ප්‍රශ්නය ගැනයි.

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.

(තිරු. පිඞ්ගිස් ඉරුණසේකර)

(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

මා කියන්නේ මේ ගරු සභාවට කරුණු ඉදිරිපත් නොකර යම් යම් ප්‍රතිපත්ති වෙනස් කරන්න පුළුවන් බවයි. එහෙම දෙයක් ගැන තමුත්තාත්සෙ තීරණයක් දීලා නැහැ.

--කාරක සභාව

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරාච්ඡි ජෙනෙරායායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

තමුත්තාත්සෙ තීරණයක් දී තිබෙනව මේ ප්‍රශ්නය ඉදිරිපත් කරන්න බැහැ කියා. එකයි කල්පනාවට ගන්න තියෙන්නේ.

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.

(තිරු. පිඞ්ගිස් ඉරුණසේකර)

(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

මේ ප්‍රශ්නය ගැන නොවෙයි මා කියන්නේ.

සභාපතිතුමා

(අක්කිරාසනාර්)

(The Chairman)

එහෙම නම් වෙන මොන ප්‍රශ්නයක් ගැනද?

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.

(තිරු. පිඞ්ගිස් ඉරුණසේකර)

(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

මා කියන්නේ මේ ගරු සභාවට ඉදිරිපත් නොකර දෙපාර්තමේන්තු මගින් සම්පූර්ණයෙන් ප්‍රතිපත්ති වෙනස් කර ක්‍රියාවේ යොදන්න පුළුවන් බවයි.

සභාපතිතුමා

(අක්කිරාසනාර්)

(The Chairman)

ඒ වෙලාවට ඉදිරිපත් කරනවා ඇති වුවමනා නම්; තමුත් දැනට ඉදිරිපත් කරන්න බැරි බවයි කියන්නේ. ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා මගේ තීරණය අනුව ක්‍රියා කරන්න. ඒ ප්‍රශ්නය ගැන නැවතත් නොකියා වෙනත් ප්‍රශ්නයක් අහන්න තිබෙනවා නම් අහන්න. එහෙම නැත් නම් කරුණා කර වාඩි වෙන්න.

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.

(තිරු. පිඞ්ගිස් ඉරුණසේකර)

(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

ඔබතුමා මට වාඩි වෙන්න කියනව නම් මම වාඩි වෙන්නම්.

සභාපතිතුමා

(අක්කිරාසනාර්)

(The Chairman)

මා යම් තීරණයක් කළොත් ඒ තීරණය පිළිගන්න ඕනෑ. එහෙම සතුටු නැත්නම් ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් අනුගමනය කළ හැකි ක්‍රියා මාර්ගයක් තිබෙනව. ඒ හා සම්බන්ධ

නීති දන්නේ නැත්නම් ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා කරුණා කරල මගේ කාමරයට ආවොත් තේරුම් කර දෙන්න මට පුළුවනි.

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.

(*திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேகர*)

(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, තමුන් තාන්සේ මට වාඩි වෙන්න කියනව නම් මම වාඩි වෙන්නම්.

සභාපතිතුමා

(*அக்கிராசனார்*)

(The Chairman)

අප්‍රින් මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක් නිසා මම බොහොම සතුටුයි දැනුම් දෙන්න, වෙන අහන්න දෙයක් නැත්නම් කරුණා කර වාඩි වෙන්න.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(*திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க*)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Mr. Chairman, I did not intend participating in the Debate under Head 2, but arising from the remarks of the Hon. Prime Minister, there are one or two small questions that I want to raise.

Sir, in explaining the speech quoted against him from HANSARD of 1961 by the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera), the Hon. Prime Minister said that he had added certain further remarks in the 1961 HANSARD. That is true. I have not had the pleasure of reading them but I recall them, now that the reference has been made to them.

But I would like to say this. The Hon. Prime Minister in the course of his remarks on that occasion said that his objection to the appointment of defeated candidates to the Board of Directors of the C. W. E. by the then S. L. F. P. Government was that they had packed the Board of Directors. His objection was that out of a total of six or seven the then Government appointed three, and I think his complaint was, "This will not do. Three out of six or seven amounts to packing the Board of Directors with undesirable persons."

In other words, the implication of that argument is that had the number been less than that, it could not have been objectionable. It comes to this: "Three out of six I consider to be dangerous, but if it is less than three, if the proportion of defeated candidates in a board of directors is less than that, I have no objection."

The first point I like to raise is, what does the Prime Minister consider the critical limit or dangerous percentage in regard to defeated candidates on a board of directors? I ask that question for the simple reason that I do not know what his standards are. He says, "Having some of them is bad. Having a dangerous limit is bad." But he does not tell us what is the particular percentage at which you find a board of directors tainted politically.

I make this point because to my knowledge there are boards of directors in which, I cannot help feeling, the Hon. Prime Minister may have transgressed his own standard, but he has certainly transgressed the standard which I would set if I were called upon to determine, according to the same principle enunciated by the Hon. Prime Minister, where the dangerous percentage lies. I would ask the Prime Minister to tell us what his standard is so that we may apply that standard to the appointments that have been made.

The question is this. Referring to the C. W. E. the Prime Minister said, "I have objected to the fact that persons who were directors of the C. W. E. at that time actively engaged themselves in politics. One of them was even introduced by the then Prime Minister as a prospective candidate against me at Dedigama." Let us accept that as true. I do not for a moment doubt what the Prime Minister says factually although I do not agree with his politics and his opinions.

The Prime Minister says, "We have not taken a decision yet as to whether it is desirable or undesirable for directors of corporations to

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

[එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]
take time for politics." He says, "We are going to take a decision on that matter. The Cabinet is going to discuss the question of the grant of political rights to Government servants," and he proposes to include corporation employees and directors in that discussion. He says, "When we consider the general principle, we will also take a decision on the desirability or otherwise of corporation directors and employees participating in politics."

In other words, the implication is that the Prime Minister has not still decided. If he has not decided, there are two possibilities. He might decide to give them political rights. He might decide not to give them political rights. The question is still open. Nothing has yet been decided. If that is the position, how can the Prime Minister tell us that it is undesirable for directors of the C. W. E., who are not prohibited from participating in politics, to have participated in politics, and that, therefore, it is a disqualification for the holding of the office of director?

In other words, he cannot have it both ways. You cannot say it is wrong and at the same time say that you have not taken a decision on the matter. In other words, the law as it stands, the rule as it stands, does not preclude these gentlemen from taking part in politics. Since they are not precluded from taking part in politics, what is the point the Hon. Prime Minister is making? If there is no prohibition, if there is nothing against it, until such time as the Prime Minister and his Cabinet take a decision on the matter, how can the Hon. Prime Minister say that this is a ground for disqualification?

My next point is this. Talking of the Public Service Commission and the appointments to it, the Hon. Prime Minister stated that he has the highest confidence in the Commissioners. I am not going to say one word about it. I am not going to make any comments about the individuals who have been appointed.

—කාරක සභාව

But I do wish the Hon. Prime Minister were consistent when he said: I never objected to Mr. Kobbekaduwa as a defeated candidate.—[Interruption]. I am not concerned with the number of votes that Mr. Kobbekaduwa got. The Hon. Prime Minister says: We are not holding that against him. But, I do wish that the Hon. Prime Minister will see to it that his own backbenchers are properly briefed, so that they speak according to the policy of the U. N. P., as enunciated by the Prime Minister.

I would like to point out that in this very Parliament, after the Prime Minister's election, in the first Debate on the Throne Speech, there was a contribution by one of his Parliamentary Secretaries, Mr. A. C. S. Hameed. I think he is a Parliamentary Secretary.—[Interruption]. There are so many in the Cabinet I have lost count of them. This is what he said —HANSARD of 22nd April 1965, column 793. The Prime Minister, as can be verified from the Minutes of the House, was present in the House on that day, and when he replied I gave special ear to find out whether the Prime Minister would have any comments to make on his own backbencher's speech. This is what the hon. Second Member for Akurana (Mr. Hameed) said:

"But that was not all. Look at the Public Service. I am very happy that in this Throne Speech it has been said that the Government will look into all just and fair demands of the Public Service. Sir, it is a well known fact today that the public servants are dissatisfied. The public servants in this country have come to realize that hard work will not carry them anywhere. During the last Government promotion had been not on merit but on stooging. Look at the Public Service Commission, the highest tribunal for the public servants in this country. Whom have we got there as Chairman? Kobbekaduwa. Who is Kobbekaduwa? An individual, Sir, who took an active part in politics, who contested a seat and lost. And he is placed where? As Chairman of the Public Service Commission."

It is all well and good for the Hon. Prime Minister to say: I have no objection to defeated candidates.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

After all, Mr. Nugawela, the present Chairman of the P. S. C., is also a defeated candidate. But his defeat is really stale; almost superannuated, one might say. But the fact remains that he did not retire from politics as a successful candidate. One does not know really whether all this argument is not a little strange, a little unreal, or, perhaps, is not meant very seriously.

The Hon. Prime Minister once said that he has never had HANSARD quotations pulled out against him. On the other hand, I have had HANSARD quotations pulled out against me. I do not insist on being infallible; I am glad to have things pointed out to me; I can change my views. But the Hon. Prime Minister says: No. If I made a statement long ago, I will never be contradicted on it, because I will always stand by what I said. So, my respectful submission is that it would be helpful, it would be much better, if the Hon. Prime Minister looks at it logically. He has appointed a commission to inquire into the C.W.E. This commission is going to tell us sooner or later as to what is wrong in the C.W.E., and make recommendations as to what reforms are required, if at all, and what action should be taken. But we ask, is it fair, anticipating that commission, anticipating the decision that he and his over-sized Cabinet might make in future, to tell us now, "Well, I object to Mr. Deshapriya Senanayake or anyone else in the C.W.E. taking part in politics?" Why not? Why should they not take part in politics? I am aware of a number of persons employed by corporations to this day who are members of village committees. I am aware of several such persons and I can see no objection to it myself. Certainly under the law, as it stands today, it is permissible. Indeed, the number of people who can hold such office is limited. They do not receive any salary, they have got to perform a public service, they do not have property and the only avenue of employment available to them really is the corporation service.

ප්‍ර. සා. 11.15

In those circumstances, why are you objecting to this? The Hon. Prime Minister himself told us, "I have not made a decision yet." No doubt, when he is prepared to disclose it after the decisions are taken, he will one day come to this House and tell us about it. In connection with the other Federal Party trouble, I am not going to talk about it in deference to your Ruling to the hon. Member for Habaraduwa. But some day the Hon. Prime Minister will tell us and we will hold our patience till then. But until then let him not make a criticism against persons on the footing that they are not suitable for appointment on a false promise.

There is one last question that I would like to put to the Prime Minister. He told us, having regard to the circumstances in which what he himself was forced to describe as a "*hath hawula*" was formed, "I am surprised that we were able to make do with as little as 17 Ministers. After all, even if we had 3 Ministers for each Party, there would be 21. It could be more." So I would like to ask the Hon. Prime Minister whether he could tell us what is the critical limit of defeated candidates who can infiltrate into the Cabinet without damaging it? May I ask the Hon. Prime Minister to tell us, what is the ideal number of Cabinet Ministers for a "*hath hawula*"? And if he could go one step further, could he kindly give us the assurance that he will not burden the economy of our nation with any Ministers or Parliamentary Secretaries with single departments under them? That is all.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාභිකු ආණ්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

There is one point which I wish to make. The Hon. Prime Minister mentioned about Mr. Weeramantry. I accept that position. But what is interesting to us is this. Mr. Coomaraswamy apparently functioned very satisfactorily. Nobody, to the best of my knowledge, during the course of his period of office as a commissioner

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

JAFFNA.

தினாபதி தினாபதி, 1965-66

[அவரின் உண். உண். பதிலுக்கு]

of assize, has ever had any complaint to make that he was not impartial or not a fit and proper judicial officer.

உண். அவர். தினாபதி தினாபதி தினாபதி.
(திரு. எம். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

He received nothing but praise as a judicial officer.

அவரின் உண். உண். பதிலுக்கு
(அவரின் உண். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)

From every person. Then why is it that he was removed?

அவர் தினாபதி தினாபதி தினாபதி.
(அவரின் உண். டடலி சேனநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

He was not removed; he was not reappointed.

அவரின் உண். உண். பதிலுக்கு
(அவரின் உண். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)

It is the same thing when it comes to a commissioner of assize. Mr. Weeramantry may be quite good. I am not denying that.

உண். அவர். தினாபதி தினாபதி தினாபதி.
(திரு. எம். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Both may be very good. Weeramantry is also good.

அவரின் உண். உண். பதிலுக்கு
(அவரின் உண். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)

All that I am saying is that if the Hon. Prime Minister now accepts the principle that merely because you happen to be a very active member of a particular political party, you are not debarred from holding high judicial office, then I do not see why we should object to Mr. Weeramantry. But why should he therefore get rid of Mr. Coomaraswamy who has functioned very satisfactorily? Was it necessary in order to appoint Mr. Weeramantry to—I would not say, get rid of—drop Mr. Coomaraswamy and not reappoint him?

—அவரின் உண்.

அவர் உண். அவர். தினாபதி தினாபதி.
(அவரின் உண். ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)
He is a better poet.

அவரின் உண். உண். பதிலுக்கு
(அவரின் உண். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Better poet? I did not know that capacity to write poetry was one of the qualifications to be a judicial officer. That is one of the questions I have to raise.

Now with regard to the appointment of defeated candidates, you have got three such candidates in the C. T. B. Oscar Livera is also a defeated candidate.

அவர் தினாபதி தினாபதி தினாபதி.
(அவரின் உண். டடலி சேனநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)
No.

அவரின் உண். உண். பதிலுக்கு
(அவரின் உண். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)

What do you mean?

அவர் தினாபதி தினாபதி தினாபதி.
(அவரின் உண். டடலி சேனநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)
When was he defeated?

அவரின் உண். உண். பதிலுக்கு
(அவரின் உண். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)
1960.

அவர் தினாபதி தினாபதி தினாபதி.
(அவரின் உண். டடலி சேனநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)
When was that?

உண். அவர். தினாபதி தினாபதி தினாபதி.
(திரு. எம். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Five years ago.

அவரே உன். உம். பரேரா
(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Kobbekaduwa lost in 1960 by 193 votes only. My point is this. I read out the extract wherein he enunciated this as a principle.

அவ் விலி சேனானாயக்க
(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனானாயக்க)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)
No. You must read what I said.

அவரே உன். உம். பரேரா
(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I remember that. It is true. He tried to hedge about this principle and said "Though I am not objecting on that ground, let us see about the qualifications".

அவ் விலி சேனானாயக்க
(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனானாயக்க)
(Hon. Dudley Senanayake)
No hedging at all.

அவரே உன். உம். பரேரா
(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Yes, because it is quite clear. He said:

"I raise that as a matter of principle . . . If corporations become a haven for defeated candidates, God help the corporations!"

அவ் விலி சேனானாயக்க
(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனானாயக்க)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)
Haven for defeated candidates.

அவரே உன். உம். பரேரா
(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)

A corporation can be a haven for even one defeated candidate.

ஃப். ஃர். டியஸ் வண்டரனாயக்க
(ஃர். எம். ஃர். டயஸ் வண்டரனாயக்க)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Not necessarily corporations; even China could be a haven.

அவரே உன். உம். பரேரா
(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)

The Hon. Prime Minister laid down another point. He said that one of the other disqualifications is that these people, while being in corporations, engage in politics and continue to engage in politics. Are not your men doing it? Capt. Dharmapala is a very active man in Akuressa. Niyathapala, Member of the Kotte U.C., is also doing it. Mr. Abeygunasekera is doing it.

அவ் வி. ஃ. சூதாடாச (சூதாடாச சேனா)
(கௌரவ வி. ஏ. சூதாடாச—தேசியமய சேவை அமைச்சர்)

(The Hon. V. A. Sugathadasa—Minister of Nationalized Services)

No, he is not.

அவரே உன். உம். பரேரா
(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)
(Dr. N. M. Perera)

He is not doing what? Every day he is addressing meetings at Kelaniya. In the last speech he said, "I am more powerful than a Minister". That was his last speech at Kelaniya.

All I am saying is let us be clear about this matter and let us have a clear principle that both sides can follow instead of speaking bana on this occasion.

I do not think the mere fact that a person has been defeated at an election is a disqualification provided his other qualities are satisfactory. That is my point.

சூதாடாச
(அக்கிராசனார்)
(The Chairman)

I think we have discussed this matter enough. We are going over the same ground several times.

—කාරක සභාව

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

I am finishing. That is one thing I want to urge. The important thing really is that once a person is appointed he should more or less keep out of politics. I think that is also important. Those are the two points we want to urge.

The first point is that he should be otherwise qualified by reason of his abilities, attainments, and so on and perhaps have a knowledge of matters particularly in the field he is called upon to serve. The other point is that once he is put into a corporation, he should not be such an active political worker as to make the position very difficult, because a number of unsavoury questions might arise. Those are points that might guide us in these appointments.

ගරු ඩබ්ලි ජේතානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)
Mr. Chairman, I repeat—

සහ පරික්ෂා

(அக்கிராசனார்)
(The Chairman)

The Hon. Prime Minister has already answered many of the questions.

ගරු ඩබ්ලි ජෝනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Yes, I have. I repeat, if you read my speech on that occasion, I specifically said that being a defeated candidate is not a disqualification. Therefore, I still maintain that I have not had an utterance of mine quoted against me. Then I said there are so many factors. In regard to numbers appointed, I do not fix a specific number. In addition I asked the Hon. Minister, "Did you look up the past records of some of those who have been appointed", and the Minister said, "No, I have not". I said, "I would suggest that you do

so" and I think, as the hon. Member for Dompe says, the Commission is doing it.

ஃபீ. ஃர். டியஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க இல்லை.
 (திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)
 (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)
 They may not find very much.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි ජේෂ්ඨානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)
It is not for me to comment.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)
We will wait and see.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි ජය්‍යායායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)
We will wait and see.

Therefore, that is not an answer that can be held against me.

The next matter is the one raised by the hon. Member for Dompe about the fact that after they are appointed they take part in politics. I merely stated that as an enunciation of new policy. In the Throne Speech we said that certain categories of Government servants will be given political rights. Therefore, the whole thing has to be re-examined in the light of that statement. If we are going to grant political rights to certain Government servants—

කෙනෙත් මය.

(திரு. கெனமன்)
(Mr. Keuneman)

One of the grounds of your objection to the Chairman of the C. W. E. was that he was an active politician in your area.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි ජෝනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Yes. I could have easily said that they should not do any politics, but as we are deciding almost immediately—

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

කෙනමන් මයා.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Then why do you not say, "Please avoid politics until we re-examine this question and decide finally" ?

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Yes, we can consider that. I think that would be desirable. We will consider the position of employees of corporations and chairmen of corporations in arriving at a decision. All those persons will come within the ambit of our decision.

Then the hon. Member for Dompe asked me for an assurance that I would not appoint any more Ministers.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බන්දාරනායක මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

No. What I asked you was as to what is the ideal number for the *hath hawula*.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I shall not give that assurance.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බන්දාරනායක මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I did not ask for an assurance.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You ought to increase the number.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I may have to.

—කාරක සභාව

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බන්දාරනායක මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I agree. You will have to, to keep everyone happy.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I do not know whether I will have to, but I may have to. But might I remind some of those who are shouting here that in a House of 100 Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike in 1959 had to have 16 Ministers, and I ask you to challenge that statement also.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බන්දාරනායක මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

He also had a very large *hawula*.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

In a House of 100 Members in 1959 Mr. Bandaranaike had 16 Ministers and I am having 17 Ministers in a House of 156 Members ; that in spite of the fact that I have a *hath hawula*.

ගරු ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන

(கௌரவ டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

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

And that was a pure S. L. F. P. Cabinet.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

There it is. He had a Cabinet of 16 Ministers. That is, after the Minister of Industries left, he had a very precarious majority and he was appointing Ministers. That is my answer to the hon. Member for Dompe.

As regards Mr. Coomaraswamy, I have nothing to say against him. The period for which he was appointed was over.

—කාරක සභාව

Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted to raise one or two points under Head 3. I should like, first and foremost, to direct a question at the Hon. Minister of Justice, namely, as to what the position is in regard to the appeal in the "*Coup*" case before the Privy Council, now that leave to appeal has been granted.

I know that instructions had been given at one stage to the Attorney-General that he should not oppose the application for leave to appeal. Now that that has been allowed I should like to ask whether it is the intention of the Government that the actual hearing of the appeal should also pass unopposed.

பு. ஸா. 11.30

I raise this matter under this Head for the reason that it is in a way a reflection on the Judges of the Supreme Court of this country when the Government takes a conscious and clear-cut decision not to support the judgments of the Supreme Court before the ultimate appeal tribunal which sits in judgment on final cases from our country.

The second matter which I wish to raise is this. I see that our Hon. Chief Justice is at present engaged in a Law Conference at which he seems to be imbibing and learning rather dangerous ideas. I see that Justice Cornelius, Chief Justice of Pakistan, has been suggesting that there should be some form of surgery to prevent thieves, criminals and robbers from using their hands. He has suggested that some surgical incision should be made to virtually paralyze them and prevent them from committing thefts.

I do not know whether this Government thinks that this is quite the type of wholesome conference to which they should have sent our Chief Justice. We believe in democracy and in maintaining the traditions of crime and punishment according to highly democratic conditions. This is the only country in the world that has dealt with a criminal conspiracy in the nature of a coup by a democratic process. We should be proud of the fact that from the time of Watt Tyler's rebellion in the 15th century no other country in the world has a record of having dealt with a coup in quite the same way.

அ. ஜே. ஐ. பி. பி. பி. பி.

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

That is because of our opposition.

பி. பி. ஐ. பி. பி. பி. பி. பி.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Because of your opposition we never could pass the Bill even after we sat till midnight and beyond. If you run into trouble and if you want a coup investigated we are always available.

The point I wish to make is this: we are sending our Chief Justice and our law officers to conferences where very anti-democratic thoughts seem to be expressed. I should therefore like to ask this Government and the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice whether he does not think it a good idea to recall the Hon. Chief Justice or at least to instruct him quickly to please try and convert Mr. Justice Cornelius of Pakistan and try to teach him that the democracy that we have in Ceylon, the democracy practised by the U. N. P. in Sri Lanka, would be an ideal model for the people of Pakistan.

“3 வது கிளியே 1 வது பத்திரிகை படிக்க 6,27,024 க்கு மேல் ரூபாய் செலவைச் செலவழித்துக் கொடுக்க” எனப் பத்திரிகை விசேஷம்.

3 வது கிளியே 1 வது பத்திரிகை ரூபாய் செலவைச் செலவழித்துக் கொடுக்க” எனப் பத்திரிகை விசேஷம்.

“3 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபாய் 6,27,024 அட்டவணைப்படிச் செலவழிப்பதற்காக” என்று விசேஷம் விசேஷப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

3 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணைப்படிச் செலவழிப்பதற்காக.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 627,024 for Head 3, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 3, Vote 1, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පත, 1965-66

—කරක සිහිව

2 වන සම්මතය.—පාලන ශාස්ත්‍ර—පුනරාවර්තන
විසදුම්, රු. 63,950

4 වන ශ්‍රේණිය කැබිනට් කායසීලය

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலனச் செலவுகள்—
மீண்டுவரும் செலவு, ரூ. 63,950

1 ஏனெனில்.—கார்ட்டர் உத்தரவு பற்றியே
பெரிசு பதிலளித்திருக்கிறார். ரூ. 1,20,031
தலைப்பு 4, அமைச்சர் சபை அலுவலகம்

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—
Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 63,950

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 1.—பணியாளரின் ஆளுக்கூரிய
வேதனமும் பிறபடிகளும், ரூபா 1,20,031

HEAD 4.—CABINET OFFICE

“ 3 වන ශීර්ෂෙහි 2 වන සම්මතය සඳහා රු. 63,950 ක මුදල උප ශ්‍රේණියට ඇතුළත් කළ යුතුය ” යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදිත්, සභාසම්මත විය.

Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and other allowances of staff, Rs. 120,031

3 වන ශීඝ්‍රයෙහි 2 වන සම්මතය උප ලේඛනයෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට නිව්ය යුතුයයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.

“ 4 වන ශීඝ්‍රයෙහි 1 වන සම්මතය සඳහා රු. 1,20,031 ක මුදල උප ලේඛනයට ඇතුළත් කළ යුතුය ” යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදිත්, සභා සම්මත විය.

“3 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பண ரூபா 63,950 அட்டவணை யிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக ” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

4 වන ශීඝ්‍රයෙහි 1 වන සම්මතය උප ලේඛන
පෙළි කොටසක් හැඩයට නිශ්චය යුතු යයි නියෝග
කරන ලදී.

3 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணை
யில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

“4 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பண ரூபா 1,20,031 அட்டவணையிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 63,950 for Head 3, Vote No. 2, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

4 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணை யில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Head 3, Vote 2, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 120,031 for Head 4, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

3 වන සම්මතය.—පාලන ශාස්ත්‍ර—මූලධන විශදම්,
රු. 15,000

Head 4, Vote 1, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 3.—பரிபாலனச் செலவுகள்—
ஆக்கப்பொருட் செலவு, ரூபா 15,000

2 වන සම්මතය.—පාලන ශාස්ත්‍ර—පුනරාවර්තන
විසදුම්, රු. 11,650

Vote No. 3.—Administration Charges—
Capital Expenditure, Rs. 15,000

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலனச் செலவுகள்—
மீண்டுவரும் செலவு, ரூ. 11,650

“ 3 වන ශීථියෙහි 3 වන සම්මතය සඳහා රු. 15,000 ක මුදල උප ලේඛනයට ඇතුළත් කළ යුතුය ” යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදීත්, සභාසම්මත විය.

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—
Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 11,650

3 වන ශ්‍රීමියෙහි 3 වන සම්මතය උප ලේඛන
යෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට නීතිය යුතුයයි නියෝග
කරන ලදී.

“4 වන ශීර්ෂයෙහි 2 වන සම්මතය සඳහා රු. 11,650 ක මුදල උප ලේඛනයට ඇතුළත් කළ යුතුය” යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදීත්, සභාසම්මත විය.

“3 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 3 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 15,000 அட்டவணையிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப் பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

4 වන ශීර්ෂයෙහි 2 වන සම්මතය උප ලේඛනයෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට තිබිය යුතුයයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.

3 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 3 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணையில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

“ 4 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 11,650 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக ” எனும் வினா விடுக் கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 15,000 for Head 3, Vote No. 3, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

4 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணையில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Head 3, Vote 3, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 11,650 for Head 4, Vote No. 2, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Head 4, Vote 2, ordered to stand **part**
of the Schedule.

—කරක සහාය

2 වන සම්මතය.—පාලන ගාස්තු—පුනරාවර්තන
විසඳුම්, රු. 1,92,850

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலனச் செலவுகள்—
மீண்டுவரும் செலவு, ரூ. 1,92,850

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—
Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 192,850

“ 5 වන ශීඝ්‍රයෙහි 2 වන සම්මතය සඳහා රු. 1,92,850 ක මුදල උප ලේඛනයට ඇතුළත් කළ යුතුය ” යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදිත්, සභාසම්මත විය.

5 වන ශීතියෙහි 2 වන සම්මතය උප ලේඛනයෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට තිබිය යුතුයයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.

“5 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பண ரூபா, 1,92,850 அட்டவணையிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

5 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணை
யில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 192,850 for Head 5, Vote No. 2, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Head 5, Vote 2, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

3 වන සම්මතය.—පාලන ගාස්තු—මූලධන වියදම
රු. 15,000

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 3—பரிபாலனச் செலவுகள்—
ஆக்கப்பொருட் செலவு, ரூபா 15,000.

Vote No. 3.—Administration Charges—
Capital Expenditure, Rs. 15,000

“5 වන ශීඨයෙහි 3 වන සම්මතය සඳහා රු. 15,000 ක මුදල උප ලේඛනයට ඇතුළත් කළ යුතුය” යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදින්, සභාසම්මත විය.

5 වන ශීර්ෂයෙහි 3 වන සම්මතය උප ලෙඛනයෙහි
 කොටසක් හැටියට නීතිය යුතුයයි නියෝග කරන
 ලදී.

“5 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 3 ஆம் வாக்குப்பண ரூபா, 15,000 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

5 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 3 ஆம் வாக்குப் பணம் அட்டவணையில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 15,000 for Head 5, Vote No. 3, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Head 5, Vote 3, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

“That the Vote be increased by Rs. 5,160 in respect of sub-head 3, new item ‘(ix) Allowance to the Leader of the Senate for Secretarial Expenses’.”—
[ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು]

“5 වන ශීඨයෙහි 1 වන වැය සම්මතය සඳහා රු. 3,82,888 ක වැඩ කරන ලද මුදල උප ලේඛන යට ඇතුළත් කළ යුතුය,” යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදිත්, සහායමත විය.

5 වන ශීථියෙහි 1 වන වැය සම්මතය, සංඥා
 විනාකාරයෙන්, උප ලේඛනයෙහි කොටසක්
 හැටියට නිව්ස යුතුයයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.

“5 ம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அதிகரிக்கப்பட்ட ரூபா 3,82,888 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக் கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

5 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம், திருத்தப் பட்டவாறு அட்டவணையில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, "That the increased sum of Rs. 382,883 for Head 5, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Head 5, Vote 1, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Head 5, Vote 3, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

—කුරක පිහිට

මත්ත්‍රීවරයකුට අමුත්තන් සඳහා ප්‍රවේශ
පත්‍ර දෙකක් ලැබුණා. නමුත් දැන්
ලැබෙන්නේ එක ප්‍රවේශ පත්‍රයයි.
විශේෂයෙන්ම ආන ප්‍රදේශවල—
හම්බන්තොට, වව්නියාව ආදී ප්‍රදේශවල
—සිට නියෝජිත මත්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය
දැක ගැනීමට හෝ විවාදයකට
සවන් දීමට අවස්ථාවක් ලබාගැනීමට
පැමිණෙන පුද්ගලයන්ගෙන් එක් අයකුට
පමණයි අපට ප්‍රවේශ පත්‍ර නිකුත් කරන්න.
පුළුවන් වෙන්නේ. එසේ වී තිබෙන්නේ
ඉඩමදකම නිසා බව අපි පිළිගන්නවා. එම
නිසා මේ අවස්ථාවේදී අප නමුත් තාත්සේ
ගෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටින්නේ, මේ ගැන කල්
පතා කර බලා වැදගත් විවාදයක් පැවැත්
වෙන අවස්ථාවකදීවත් අඩු ගණනේ එක
මත්ත්‍රීවරයකුට පිකට් පත් දෙකක් ලබා
දීමට කටයුතු සලස්වන ලෙසයි.

ඊළඟ කාරණය ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි
 මෙයයි. මෙම සභා ගර්භය තුළ ඉරි වග
 යක් ගසා තිබෙනවා. නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී
 මණ්ඩලයේ සේවය කරන සේවකයන්ට
 මේ ඉරිවලින් මෙහාට පතින්න බැහැ. යම්
 කිසි මන්ත්‍රීවරයකුට සේවකයකු වුවමනා
 කළොත් ඒ සේවකයා රවුමක් ගසා
 එන්න ඕනැ. එයින් සිදු වී තිබෙන්නේ
 හදිසි වුවමනාවකදී මන්ත්‍රීවරයාට
 සේවකයා ගෙන්වා ගැනීමට අපහසු වීමයි.

ගරු සහාපතිතුමනි, තමුන් තාත්සෙගෙ අවධානය යොමු කිරීමට කැමති තවත් කාරණයක් තිබෙනවා. දැනට නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ කරන කටා පත්‍ර මාගී යෙන් මෙන්ම ගුවන් විදුලි මාර්ගයෙන්ද ප්‍රචාරය කරගෙන යනවා. විශේෂයෙන්ම ගුවන් විදුලි මගින් ප්‍රචාරය කරන මෙම කටා එක් පක්ෂයකට පමණක් පක්ෂ පාත අන්දමින් ප්‍රචාරය කරන්නේ නැතුව, සෑම පක්ෂයකටම සාධාරණ අන්දමින් ප්‍රචාරය කරවා හරින්න කටයුතු කරනවා ඇතැයි මම බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා.

තවත් කාරණයක් හැටියට සදහන් කරන්නට තිබෙන්නේ, මෙම නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ බොහෝ මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් පදිංචිව සිටින නිවාසය වන ශ්‍රාවස්තිය හැකි. මේ හරු සභාවේ නායකයා වන තමුත්තාන්සෙගෙ පාලනය යටතෙයි එම ස්ථානය තිබෙන්නේ. මම ඉතාමත් සන්තෝෂයී කියන්නට, විශේෂයෙන්ම

உப தலைப்பு—ஊழியர் கோப்பும் சம்பளங்களும்
ரூ. 4,89,771.

Sub-head 1.—Cadre and Salaries,
Rs. 489,771

ඡෙවද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. එ. වික්‍රමසිංහ
 (අකුරුස්ස)

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ—அக்கு
றஸ்ஸ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe—Akuressa)

I move,

"That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 10 in respect of sub-head 1, item 'Clerk of the House of Representatives'."

පරිසර වික්‍රමසිංහ මයා. (කඹුරුපිටිය)

(திரு. பேர்ஸி விக்ரமசிங்ஹ—கம்புறுப்
பிட்டிய)

(Mr. Percy Wickremasinghe—Kamburupitiya)

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ වැය ශීර්ෂය යටතේ මෙම ගරු සභාවේ මෙම මණ්ඩලය ගැන වර්ෂයක් පාසා සාකච්ඡා වෙනව. නමුත් නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය සම්බන්ධයෙන් මෙම ගරු සභාවේ ඉදිරිපත් කරන ලද කරුණු ක්‍රියාවට පරිවර්තනය වී ඇත්තම් ඇත්තේ ඉතාමත් ස්වල්පයක් බව කතාගාවුවෙන් වුවද සඳහන් කළ යුතුව තිබෙනව. ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, නමුත් තාත්සෙ දත්තව ඇති, මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් හැටියට අප සියලු දෙනාම මේ ගරු සභාවට පැමිණ සිටින්නේ මහජන ජන්දයෙන් බව. නමුත් අපේ ගම්බද ප්‍රදේශවලින් මහජනතාව පැමිණී අවස්ථාවලදී, විශේෂයෙන්ම නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ විවාදයක් දැක ගැනීමට හෝ ඇසීමට පැමිණී අවස්ථාවලදී, ඒ අයට නියම ආකාරයට ආසන ලබාදිය හැකි හත්තුවායක් ඇත්තේ නැහැ. ඉස්සර නම් එක්

ශ්‍රාවස්තියේ පදිංචිව සිටින මන්ත්‍රීවරයකු වශයෙන්, තමුන් නාන්සේගෙ පාලනය යටතට පත්වුණාට පස්සෙ ඉතාමත් යහ පත් තත්ත්වයෙන් එම ස්ථානයේ පාලනය ගෙන යන බව. නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයත්, ශ්‍රාවස්තියත් යන දෙකම තමුන් නාන්සේ යටතේ පාලනය වන තමුන් මේ දෙක කොටස් දෙකක් වශයෙන් හැසිරවෙන්නේ. මේ ස්ථාන දෙක අතර ඒකාබද්ධ සේවයක්—unified service—ඇති කරන්නට ඕනෑ. එසේ නොකළොත් ශ්‍රාවස්තියේ සේවකයෙකුට නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ ස්ථානාන්තරයක් ලබා ගන්නට අවස්ථාවක් නැතිව යනවා. ජ්‍යෙෂ්ඨයෙක් සමත් උදවිය සාමාන්‍ය සේවකයන් වශයෙන් අද ශ්‍රාවස්තියේ වැඩ කරනවා. දැනට තිබෙන ක්‍රමය යටතේ ඔවුන්ට කට දුවන් අවස්ථාවක් ලැබෙන්නේ නැහැ, නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ තනතුරකට පත්වීමක් ලබාගන්නට. නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයට සේවකයන් බඳවා ගන්නේ කෙලින්ම දැන්වීම් මාර්ගයෙන් පිටතිනුයි. ඒ වගේම ශ්‍රාවස්ති මන්දිරයේ සේවකයෙකුට දිනකට පැය 17 ක් වැඩ කරන්නට සිදු වී තිබෙනවා. කම්කරු ඇමතිතුමාගෙ කඩ සාප්පු ආදිය පිළිබඳ නීති කඩ කරන උදවියට නම් දඬුවම් කරනවා. එහෙත් මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් පදිංචිව සිටින ශ්‍රාවස්තියේ සේවකයෙක් පැය 17 ක් වැඩ කරන්නට ඕනෑ. ඒ වගේම අනිකුත් රජයේ සේවකයින්ට ලැබෙන අයිතිවාසිකම් කිසිවක් ඒ සේවකයින්ට ලැබෙන්නේ නැහැ. ඒ අතින් කල්පනා කරනවිට නම් ශ්‍රාවස්ති මන්දිරය නොවෙයි එය 'වහල් හවන' යයි කියන්නට ඕනෑ. ඒ තරම් වහල් බව කින් තමයි, ශ්‍රාවස්තියේ සේවකයින් කට යුතු කරන්නේ. ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, තමුන් නාන්සේ එහි පාලනය භාර ගැනීමෙන් පසු මෙම කරුණු තමුන් නාන්සේට ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නට ලැබුණු ප්‍රථම අවස්ථාව මෙයයි. මේ තත්ත්වයෙන් තමුන් නාන්සේ ඒ සේවකයින් මුදා ගන්නවාට අපේ කිසිම සැකයක් නැහැ.

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, ශ්‍රාවස්තියේ සේවකයින්ට එතැනින් අස්වුණායින් පසුව අද මහපරාටයි, බහින්ට සිදු වී තිබෙන්නේ. ඔවුන්ට විශ්‍රාම වැටුප් ක්‍රමයක් නැහැ. ඒ සේවකයින් රජයේ සේවකයින්ගේ තත්ත්වයට වැටෙන්නේ නැහැ. ඒ

තත්ත්වය ඇති කරන්නට ඕනෑ. ලෝකයා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා, පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රීන්ට දවසකට පැය 17ක් සේවය කරන මෙම සේවකයින්ට විශේෂ පහසුකම් ලැබෙනවා ඇත කියා. මෙම සේවකයින්ගේ සේවා කාලය අවසන් වුණාම ඔවුන්ට අනිකුත් රජයේ සේවකයින්ට මෙන් විශ්‍රාම වැටුපක් නොලැබීම ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් හැටියට අපට මදි කමක්. මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් පමණක් නොව අද ශ්‍රාවස්තියේ ඇමතිවරුන් 3 දෙනෙකුත් පදිංචිව සිටිනවා. ඒ උදවියට රජයේ සේවකයින්ගේ තත්ත්වය ලැබෙන්නට සලස්වන අතරම ඔවුන්ට මේ ගරු සභාවේ ස්ථානාන්තරවලට පත්වීම් ලබාගැනීමටත් යම්කිසි වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් ඔබතුමා සකස් කරනවා ඇතැයි මා විශ්වාස කරනවා. ශ්‍රාවස්ති මන්දිරයේ සේවකයින් 30 දෙනෙකු සිටිනවා. ඔවුන් ඉතා දුකසේ නොයෙක් අමාරුකම් මධ්‍යයේ වැඩ කරන පිරිසක් නිසයි, මා මේ කරුණු ඉදිරිපත් කළේ.

නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය සම්බන්ධයෙන් තවත් එක කාරණයක් මතක් කරන්නට තිබෙනවා. ඡන්දදායකයින්ගේ ඡන්දයෙන් තේරී පත්වී සිටින මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් හමුවන්නට එන මහජනතාවට ඉතා කරදර මධ්‍යයේ තමයි, පල්ලෙහා විශ්‍රාම ශාලාවේ කාලය ගත කරන්නට සිද්ධ වී තිබෙන්නේ. ඒ ස්ථානයේ වාඩිවීමට තරම් ආසනවත් නැහැ. ඒ වගේම මන්ත්‍රීන් හමුවන්නට බොහෝ වේලාවක් ගත වෙනවා. පසුගිය වර්ෂවල මේ සභාව තුළ යෝජනා කළා, නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයට යාබද ගොඩනැගිල්ලෙන් කොටසක් ලබාගෙන මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් හමුවන්නට එන ඡන්දදායකයින්ට ආසන ආදී පහසුකම් එහි සැලසිය යුතුය කියා. එහෙත් එය මේ දක්වා ක්‍රියාවට පත් වුණේ නැහැ. මේ කරුණු කිහිපය තමුන් නාන්සේගේ සැලකිල්ලට යොමුවේවායි පතමින් මගේ වචන සවිලාය මෙයින් අවසාන කරනවා.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

සභාපතිතුමා

(அக்கிராசனார்)

(The Chairman)

ඉදිරිපත් කළ සෑම කරුණක් ගැනම දැනට මා කල්පනා කරගෙන යනවා, ඉදිරි යේදී යම්කිසි වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් සලසන අදහසින්. ගැලරියේ දෙපැත්තේම ආසන තිබෙන්නේ 163ක් පමණයි. එවිට එක මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙකුට එක අවසර පත්‍රයකට වඩා දෙත්ට අමාරු බව මන්ත්‍රීතුමාට වැටහෙනවා ඇති. මීට වඩා ඉඩ කඩ ඇති විශාල මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩල ගොඩනැගිල්ලක් සෑදීම ගැනත් අපේ කල්පනාව යොමු වී තිබෙන බව මතක් කරන්නට කැමතියි. එය ඉක්මණින් ඇති වේවායි අපි ප්‍රාර්ථනා කරමු. එවිට මහජනයාටත් මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්ටත්—මේ ස්ථානයට පැමිණෙන සෑම දෙනාටම—සුදුසු අන්දමින් පහසුකම් යොදන්න පුළුවන් වේවි.

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.

(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேகர)

(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, එක කාරණයක් ගැන තමුන්නාන්සේගේ අවධානය යොමු කරවීමට මම බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේදී ගරු ඇමතිවරුන් විසින් පිළිතුරු දිය යුතු ප්‍රශ්න, අප කැමති භාෂාවකින් ඒ ගරු ඇමතිවරුන් වෙත ඉදිරිපත් කිරීමට මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් හැටියට අපට අයිතියක් තියෙනවා. පසුගිය දිනක මට දැන ගන්නට ලැබුණා, සිංහලෙන් හෝ දෙමළෙන් ප්‍රශ්නයක් ඉදිරිපත් කළොත් ඒ ප්‍රශ්නය න්‍යාය පත්‍රයට ඇතුළත් කිරීමට, ඉංග්‍රීසියෙන් ඉදිරිපත් කරන ප්‍රශ්නයක් න්‍යාය පත්‍රයට ඇතුළත් කිරීමට ගත වන කාලයට වඩා කාලයක් ගත වන බව. සිංහලෙන් හෝ දෙමළෙන් ඉදිරිපත් කරන ප්‍රශ්නය පරිවර්තනය කිරීම සඳහා සැහෙන ප්‍රමාදයක් ඇති වන බවයි, දැන ගන්නට ලැබුනේ. මේ ප්‍රමාදය මේ විධියට ඇති වන්නට ඉඩ හැරියොත් තමන් කැමති භාෂාවකින් ප්‍රශ්න ඉදිරිපත් කිරීමට දී තිබෙන අයිතිය ටිකක් දුර්වල වුණා හා සමාන වෙනවා. ඉංග්‍රීසියෙන් ප්‍රශ්නයක් ඇසීමට කල් දුන් විට ඒ ප්‍රශ්නය වහාම න්‍යාය පත්‍රයට ඇතුල් වන අතර අනික් භාෂා දෙකෙන් ප්‍රශ්නයක්

ඇසීමට කල් දුන්විට ඒ ප්‍රශ්නය න්‍යාය පත්‍රයට ඇතුල් වීමට සැහෙන ප්‍රමාදයක් ඇති වුණොත් එහි ප්‍රතිඵලය වශයෙන් සිදු වන්නේ ඉංග්‍රීසියට විශේෂ තැනක් ලැබෙන අතර සිංහලයට හා දෙමළට අඩු තැනක් ලැබීමයි. ඒ නිසා මේ ප්‍රමාදය වළක්වා මොන භාෂාවකින් ප්‍රශ්නයක් පිළිබඳව කල් දුන්නත් එක සමාන වේගයකින් ඒ ප්‍රශ්නය න්‍යාය පත්‍රයට ඇතුළත් කිරීමට කටයුතු සලස්වන ලෙස මම ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා.

සභාපතිතුමා

(அக்கிராசனார்)

(The Chairman)

ඒ විධියේ ප්‍රමාදයක් ඇති වන බවක් මට දැන ගන්නට ලැබී නැහැ. ප්‍රශ්න එවූ කාලය අනුව ඒවා න්‍යාය පත්‍රයට ඇතුළත් කරල තියෙනවා. ප්‍රමාද වුණාය කියන ප්‍රශ්න ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙන දිනත්, ඒවා න්‍යාය පත්‍රයට ඇතුළත් වී තිබෙන දිනත් දැන්වුවොත් ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා කියන කාරණාව ගැන මට සලකා බලන්නට පුළුවනි.

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.

(திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேகர)

(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, මම ඒ පිළිබඳව විස්තර වශයෙන් කරුණු ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නමි.

පූ. හා. 11.45

ද සොයිසා සිරිවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. டி. சாய் சா சிறிவர்தன)

(Mr. de Zoysa Siriwardena)

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, එක කාරණයක් ගැන පමණක් සඳහන් කරන්නට මම බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. මේ ගරු සභාවේ සිංහලෙන් හෝ දෙමළෙන් කථා කරන්නට මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්ට බලය තිබුනත්, සිංහල පමණක් දන්න කෙනකුට දෙමළෙන් කෙරෙන කථාවක් හැන්සාඩ් වාර්තාව කියවා තේරුම් ගන්නට පුළුවන් කමක් නැහැ. ඒ වගේම සිංහල තො දන්න අපේ දුඛ සහෝදරයකුට පුළුවන් තමන් නැහැ, සිංහලෙන් කෙරෙන

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

කථාවක් හැන්සාඩ් වාර්තාව කියවා තේරුම් ගන්නට. ඒ නිසා මේ ගරු සභාවේදී දෙමළෙන් කෙරෙන කථා ඉංග්‍රීසියට සහ සිංහලට පරිවර්තනය කර පළ කිරීමටත් සිංහලෙන් කෙරෙන කථා දෙමළට සහ ඉංග්‍රීසියට පරිවර්තනය කර පළ කිරීමටත් ප්‍රථමත් නම් එය බොහොම ප්‍රයෝජනවත් වෙයි. අද පිටකොටුවේ වෙන පොත්වලට වඩා හොඳට වෙළඳාම් වන්නේ හැන්සාඩ් වාර්තාවයි. මේ විධියට කථා පරිවර්තනය කර හැන්සාඩ් වාර්තාව මුද්‍රණය කරනව නම් ඊටත් වඩා හොඳට වෙළඳාම් වෙයි. එසේ පරිවර්තනය කර මුද්‍රණය කිරීමෙන් පොත දැනට වඩා ලොකු වුනත් වැඩි වටිනාකමක් ඇති වෙනව.

සමහරවිට දෙමළ භාෂාව නොදන්න ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක් සභාවේ නැති අවස්ථාවක දෙමළෙන් කථාවක් කෙරුනොත් ඒ මන්ත්‍රීවරයාට ඒ කථාව තේරුම් ගන්නට ප්‍රථමත්කමක් නැහැ. ඒ කථාව කෙරෙන අවස්ථාවේදී මේ ගරු සභාවේ හිටියොත් පමණයි, පරිවර්තනය අසා ගන්නට ප්‍රථමත් වන්නේ. ඒ වගේම සිංහලෙන් කළ කථාවක් යාපනයේ සිටින සිංහල නොදන්න කෙනකුට තේරුම් ගන්න ප්‍රථමත්කමක් නැහැ. ඒ නිසා මේ සභාවේ කෙරෙන කථා භාෂා තුනෙන්ම හැන්සාඩ් වාර්තාවට ඇතුල් කිරීම ගැන ඔබතුමාගේ සැලකිල්ල යොමු කරන ලෙස ඉල්ලනව.

මේ සභාවේදී කෙරෙන කථා හරියාකාර පත්‍රවල වාර්තා කෙරෙන්නේ නැති නිසා එයින් මහජනයාට නියම ප්‍රයෝජනය ලැබෙන්නේ නැහැ. ඒ නිසා භාෂා තුනෙන්ම කෙරෙන කථා අතින් භාෂා දෙකටත් පරිවර්තනය කරලා භාෂා තුනෙන්ම හැන්සාඩ් වාර්තාව මුද්‍රණය කළොත් එයින් මහජනයාටත් ලොකු සේවයක් සැලසෙනව.

සභාපතිතුමා,

(අක්කිරාඡනාර්)

(The Chairman)

ඒ කාරණය ගැනත් අපි දැන් කල්පනා කරගෙන යනව.

මතු පළ වන යෝජනාව සහායමත විය :

தீர்மானிக்கப்பட்டது :

Resolved :

"That the Vote be increased by Rs. 1,800 in respect of sub-head 1, item 'Clerk of the House of Representatives'."
—[ගරු වන්නිනායක]

"6 වන ශීර්ෂයේ 1 වන සම්මතය සඳහා රු. 8,24,715 ක වැඩි කරන ලද මුදල උප ලේඛනයට ඇතුළත් කළ යුතුය," යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදීත් සහායමත විය.

6 වන ශීර්ෂයේ 1 වන වැය සම්මතය, සංශෝධිත කාරයෙන්, උප ලේඛනයෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට නිතිය යුතුයයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.

"6 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அதிகரிக்கப் பட்ட ரூபா 8,24,715 அட்டவணையிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக," எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

6 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம், திருத்தப் பட்டவாறு அட்டவணையில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, "That the increased sum of Rs. 824,715 for Head 6, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Head 6, Vote 1, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

2 වන සම්මතය.—පාලන ගාස්තු—පුනරාවර්තන වියදම්, රු. 15,81,235

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 2—பரிபாலனச் செலவுகள்—மீண்டுவரும் செலவு, ரூ. 15,81,235

Vote No. 2—Administration charges—Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 1,581,235

"6 වන ශීර්ෂයේ 2 වන සම්මතය සඳහා රු. 15,81,235 ක මුදල උප ලේඛනයට ඇතුළත් කළ යුතුය" යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදීත්, සහායමත විය.

6 වන ශීර්ෂයේ 2 වන සම්මතය උප ලේඛනයෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට නිතිය යුතු යයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.

"6 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 15,81,235 அட்டவணையிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக" எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

6 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணையில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 1,581,235 for Head 6, Vote No. 2, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Head 6, Vote 2, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

8 වන ශ්‍රීථිය.—රාජ්‍ය සේවා නොමිලත්
සභාව

1 වන සම්මතය.—කාර්ය මණ්ඩල පොද්ගලික පබ්ලික් සහ අනිකුත් දීමනා, රු. 2,10,127

தலைப்பு 8—அரசாங்கச் சேவை ஆணைக்குழு
வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 1—பணியாளரின் ஆளுகுரிய
வேதனமும் பிறபடிகளும், ரூபா 210,127

HEAD 8.—PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and
other allowances of staff, Rs. 210,127

“8 වන ශීර්ෂයේ 1 වන සම්මතය සඳහා රු. 2,10,127 ක මුදල උප ලේඛනයට ඇතුළත් කළ යුතුය” යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදින්, සභා සම්මත විය.

8 වන ශීර්ෂයෙහි 1 වන සම්මතය උප ලේඛනයෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට නීතිය යුතු යයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.

“8 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பண ரூபா 210,127 அட்டவணைநீர் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

8 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணை
மீல இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 210,127 for Head 8, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Head 8, Vote 1, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

2 වන සම්මතය.—පාලන ආස්තු—පුනරාවර්තනය
වියදම්, රු. 21,850

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 2—பரிபாலனைச் செலவுகள்—
மீண்டுவதும் செலவு, ரூ. 21,850

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—
Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 21,850

“ 8 වන ශීර්ෂයෙහි 2 වන සමිතිය සඳහා රු. 21,850 ක මුදල උප ලේඛනයට ඇතුළත් කළ යුතුය ” යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදීත්, සභාසමිතියි.

8 වන ශීර්ෂයෙහි 2 වන සම්මතය උප ලේඛන
යෙහි 'පොද්ගල' හැටියට නිශ්චය යුතු යයි නිර්දේශ
කරන ලදී.

“8 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபாய் 21,850 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமா?” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

8 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணை
யில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 21,850 for Head 8, Vote No. 2, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Head 8, Vote 2, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පත, 1965-66

—කරක සිහාව

9 වන ශ්‍රීතිය.—ගණන් පරික්ෂක
කාර්යාලය

1 වන සම්මතය.—කාර්ය මණ්ඩල පොද්ගලික පඩිනඩි සහ අනිකුත් දීමනා, රු. 32,58,447

தலைப்பு 9.—கணக்குப் பரிசோதனை அலுவலகம்

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 1—பணியாளரின் ஆளுக்கூரிய
வேதனமும் பிற படிசனும், ரூபா 3,258,447

HEAD 9.—AUDIT OFFICE

Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and other allowances of staff, Rs. 3,258,447

“9 වන ශීර්ෂයේ 1 වන සම්මතය සඳහා රු. 32,58,447 ක ඉදල උප භේදනයට ඇතුළත් කළ යුතුය” යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදීත්, සභා සම්මත විය.

9 වන ශීර්ෂයෙහි 1 වන සම්මතය උප ලේඛන
යෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට තිබිය යුතු යයි නියෝග
කරන ලදී.

“9 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 3,258,447 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு எற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

9 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணை யில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 3,258,447 for Head 9, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Head 9, Vote 1, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

2 වන සම්මතය.—පාලන ගාස්තු—පුනරාවර්තන
විසදම්, රු. 4,21,150

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 2—பரிபாஸைச் செலவுகள்—
மீண்டுவதும் செலவு, ரூ. 421,150

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—
Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 421,150

“9 වන ශීර්ෂයේ 2 වන සම්මතය සඳහා රු. 4,21,150 ක මුදල උප ඓක්‍යයට ඇතුළත් කළ යුතුය” යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදීත්, සහසම්මත විය.

9 වන ශීතියෙහි 2 වන සම්මතය උප ලේඛන
යෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට තිබිය යුතු යයි නියෝග
කරන ලදී.

“ 9 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 421,150 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக ” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

9 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணை
யில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 421,150 for Head 9, Vote No. 2, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Head 9, Vote 2, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

10 වන ශ්‍රීතිය.—නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ සභානායකගේ කාර්යාලය

1 වන සම්මතය.—කාර්ය මණ්ඩල පොද්ගලික පනිතරි සහ අනිකුත් දිමනා, රු. 61,323

தலைப்பு 10.—பிரதிநிதிகள் சபை முதல்வர்
அலுவலகம்

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 1—பணியாளரின் ஆளுக்கூரிய
வேதனமும் பிற படிகளும், ரூபா 61,323

HEAD 10.—OFFICE OF THE LEADER OF THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and other allowances of staff, Rs. 61,323

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.
(සී. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

There is one point I wish to raise. The Hon. Leader of the House runs an office for which Parliament votes money, and for which he has also got a staff provided. One of the functions of the Hon. Leader of the House is to maintain what are sometimes described as minutes of the Government Parliamentary Group meetings. Those minutes are normally maintained and kept in the office of the Leader of the House. Corresponding to that there is also the office of the Leader of the Opposition where the minutes of the Opposition Group meetings are kept.

At the time of the change of the last Government on 3rd December 1964, we found that a situation arose where even after the change of Government the minutes of the Government Parliamentary Group meetings maintained by the previous Government continued to remain—even today it is there—in the office of the Leader of the House. The minutes of the Opposition Group meetings have been removed by the then Opposition. We have no objection to that either. The only problem is, sometimes these documents are required for reference and it becomes necessary that the Government of the time should have the opportunity to look at these documents—not other people's documents but their own documents. I am not saying, for example, that the S.L.P. is interested in looking at

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සහතික

[එළුප්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරයාගේ මග.]

the minutes of the U.N.P. group meetings; they are interested in looking at the minutes of their own Parliamentary Group meetings. This problem arose and I raised the matter unofficially with the Hon. Leader of the House and also with the Hon. Prime Minister. I am now merely speaking in order to get it on record because the Hon. Minister told me that he would have no objection to my request. If these matters to confirmed on the Floor of the House as being a convention or an arrangement, then it will not become necessary to write to the Hon. Prime Minister and the Hon. Leader of the House for authority or permission whenever the need arises to refer to these minutes. I know that the Hon. Prime Minister and the Hon. Leader have no objection, but I would like to have their assurance on the Floor of the House for purposes of record.

1 වන උප ශීර්ෂය.—සේවක සංඛ්‍යා සහ වැටුප්,
රු. 29,458

உப-தலைப்பு 1.—**ஜாழியர் கோட்டம் சம்பளங்களும்,**
ரூபா 29,458

Sub-head 1.—Cadre and Salaries,
Rs. 29,458

මතු පළ වන ශෝඡනාව සහාසම්මත විය :

தீர்மானிக்கப்பட்டது :

Resolved :

“That the Vote be increased by Rs. 1,000 in respect of sub-head 1, item ‘Other Staff’.”—[ശ്രീ ഉഷാദാസ്]

3 වන උප ශීඝ්‍රය.—අනිකුත් දීමනා, රු. 12,047.

உப-தலைப்பு 3.—இதர படிக்கள் ரூபா 12,047

Sub-head 3.—Other Allowances,
Rs. 12,047

මතු පළු වන යෝජනාව සහායම්මත විය :

தீர்மானிக்கப்பட்டது :

Resolved :

“That the Vote be increased by Rs. 175 in respect of sub-head 3, item ‘i’.”—
[ಅರಳಿ ಲೆಖನಿ]

“10 වන ශ්‍රීසියේ 1 වන වැය සම්මතය සඳහා රු. 62,498 ක වැඩ කරන ලද මුදල උප ලේඛනයට ඇතුළත් කළ යුතුය,” යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදින්, සභාසම්මත විය.

10 වන ශ්‍රී ලංකා 1 වන වැය සම්මතය,
සංශෝධිතකාරයෙන්, උප ලේඛනයෙහි කොට
සක් ඇවිට තිබිය යුතු යයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.

“ 10 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அதிகரிக்கப்பட்ட ரூபா 62,498 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்பட்டு மாக ” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

10 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம், திருத்தப்பட்டவாறு அட்டவணையில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, "That the increased sum of Rs. 62,498 for Head 10, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Head 10, Vote 1, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

2 වන සම්මතය.—පාලන ගාස්තු—පුනරුවර්තන
විසදුම්, රු. 3,650

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலனச் செலவுகள்—
மீண்டுவரும் செலவு, ரூ. 3,650

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—
Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 3,650

“ 10 වන ශීර්ෂයෙහි 2 වන සම්මතය සඳහා රු. 3,650 ක මුදල උප ශ්‍රේණියට ඇතුළත් කළ යුතුය ” යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදීත්, සභාසම්මත විය.

10 වන ශීර්ෂයෙහි 2 වන සම්මතය උප ලේඛන
යෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට තිබිය යුතු යයි නියෝග
කරන ලදී.

“ 10 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 3,650 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக ” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

10 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணையில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 3,650 for Head 10, Vote No. 2, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Head 10, Vote 2, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

11 වන ශීතිය.—නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ විපක්ෂ නායකගේ කාර්යාලය

1 වන සම්මතය.—කාර්ය මණ්ඩල පොද්ගලික පඩි නඩි සහ අනිකුත් දීමනා. රු. 55,645.

தலைப்பு 11.—பிரதிநிதிகள் சபை எதிர்க்கட்சி
தலைவரின் அலுவலகம்

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 1.—பணியாளரின் ஆளுக்கூரிய
வேதனமும் பிறபடிசனும், ரூபா 55,645

HEAD 11.—OFFICE OF THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and other allowances of staff, Rs. 55,645

விசேஷ கெடுதலின் பற்றை, 1965-66

—கூடுதல் பணம்

“11 வன அலுவலர் 1 வன பதவிக்கு பதவியை 55,645 ரூ. மீட்டர் ரூ. மீட்டர் பதவியை அளவிற்கு கட்டுவது” என பதவியை விசேஷ கெடுதல், பதவியை விசேஷ கெடுதல்.

11 வன அலுவலர் 1 வன பதவிக்கு ரூ. மீட்டர் பதவியை கட்டுவது என பதவியை கட்டுவது என பதவியை கட்டுவது.

“11 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 55,645 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமா” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

11 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணியில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 55,645 for Head 11, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 11, Vote 1, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

2 வன பதவி.—பாடுதல் பதவி—பதவிக்கு பதவியை 1,200

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலனச் செலவுகள்—மீண்டு வரும் செலவு, ரூ. 1,200

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 1,200

“11 வன அலுவலர் 2 வன பதவிக்கு பதவியை 1,200 ரூ. மீட்டர் ரூ. மீட்டர் பதவியை அளவிற்கு கட்டுவது” என பதவியை விசேஷ கெடுதல், பதவியை விசேஷ கெடுதல்.

11 வன அலுவலர் 2 வன பதவிக்கு ரூ. மீட்டர் பதவியை கட்டுவது என பதவியை கட்டுவது என பதவியை கட்டுவது.

“11 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 1,200 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமா” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

11 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணியில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 1,200 for Head 11, Vote No. 2, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 11, Vote 2, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

12 வன அலுவலர்.—பாடுதல் பதவி—பதவிக்கு பதவியை 1,200

1 வன பதவி.—கூடுதல் பதவி பதவிக்கு பதவியை 8,79,100.

தலைப்பு 12.—தேர்தல் துறைக்களம் (பாடுதல் பதவி, உள்நாடு)

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 1.—பணியாளரின் ஆளுக்கூடுதல் வேதனமும் பிற பதவிகளும், ரூபா 8,79,100

HEAD 12.—DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS (PARLIAMENTARY AND LOCAL BODIES)

Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and other allowances of staff, Rs. 8,79,100

“12 வன அலுவலர் 1 வன பதவிக்கு பதவியை 8,79,100 ரூ. மீட்டர் ரூ. மீட்டர் பதவியை அளவிற்கு கட்டுவது” என பதவியை விசேஷ கெடுதல், பதவியை விசேஷ கெடுதல்.

12 வன அலுவலர் 1 வன பதவிக்கு ரூ. மீட்டர் பதவியை கட்டுவது என பதவியை கட்டுவது என பதவியை கட்டுவது.

“12 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 8,79,100 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமா” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

12 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணியில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 879,100 for Head 12, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 12, Vote 1, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

2 வன பதவி.—பாடுதல் பதவி—பதவிக்கு பதவியை 18,54,578.

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலனச் செலவுகள்—மீண்டு வரும் செலவு, ரூ. 18,54,578

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 1,854,578

“12 வன அலுவலர் 2 வன பதவிக்கு பதவியை 18,54,578 ரூ. மீட்டர் ரூ. மீட்டர் பதவியை அளவிற்கு கட்டுவது” என பதவியை விசேஷ கெடுதல், பதவியை விசேஷ கெடுதல்.

12 வன அலுவலர் 2 வன பதவிக்கு ரூ. மீட்டர் பதவியை கட்டுவது என பதவியை கட்டுவது என பதவியை கட்டுவது.

“12 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 18,54,578 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமா” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

12 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணியில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 1,854,578 for Head 12, Vote No. 2, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 12, Vote 2, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

14 வன அலுவலர்.—பாடுதல் பதவி—பதவிக்கு பதவியை 11,54,984.

1 வன பதவி.—கூடுதல் பதவி பதவிக்கு பதவியை 11,54,984.

விசேஷக் கமிட்டி அமைப்பு, 1965-66

—காரணம் காணல்

1 வது உப தீர்மானம்.—சென்னை மன்றம் மன்ற உறுப்பினர்,
ரூ. 7,20,454

தலைப்பு 14.—பாதுகாப்பு வெளிநாட்டிலுள்ள
அமைச்சர்

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 1.—பணியாளரின் ஆளுக்கூரிய
வேதனையும் பிறப்பிக்கவும், ரூபா 11,54,984

உப தலைப்பு 1.—ஊழியர் கோப்பும் சம்பளங்களும்,
ரூபா 7,20,454

HEAD 14.—MINISTER OF DEFENCE AND
EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and
other allowances of staff, Rs. 1,154,984

Sub-head 1.—Cadre and Salaries,
Rs. 720,454

அவரின் உறுப்பினர். உறுப்பினர். உறுப்பினர்

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I move,

"That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 10
in respect of sub-head 1, item 'Parliamentary Secretary'."

There are one or two points I
would like to urge. First of all on the
question of foreign policy, it is very
necessary to know, this country
would be entitled to know as they
are certainly very much concerned,
about the whole situation in Vietnam.
The Hon. Prime Minister ought to
let us know what the present position
is. I must say the Hon. Prime
Minister and his Government have
not really taken up a clear position
on the subject of Vietnam, although
the hon. the Leader of the Opposition
was prepared even to subscribe
to the view that the Geneva Convention
should be strictly adhered to
and that all foreign forces in Vietnam
should be withdrawn.

கைமையின் மையம்.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

All American forces.

அவரின் உறுப்பினர். உறுப்பினர். உறுப்பினர்

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

All foreign forces including American
forces.

அவர் உறுப்பினர் உறுப்பினர்

(கெளரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Sir, for the convenience of our
discussions, I want a Ruling on this
matter. You will see under the
Amendments moved in respect of
Head 14 there is a specific motion for
a reduction of the Vote in regard to
the item, Parliamentary Secretary,
and also.

"... sub-head 1, item 'Permanent
Secretary'.

Then, Sir, the other Amendments are
as regards sub-head 1 and also the
whole Vote.

அவரின் உறுப்பினர். உறுப்பினர். உறுப்பினர்

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Who is proposing that the Vote be
reduced? Under the Standing Orders
you cannot move an Amendment to
reduce the Votes.

அவர் உறுப்பினர் உறுப்பினர்

(கெளரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Yes, that is what I am pointing out.
There is an amendment that the
whole Vote be reduced. You cannot
do that.

அவரின் உறுப்பினர். உறுப்பினர். உறுப்பினர்

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You cannot do that.

அவர் உறுப்பினர் உறுப்பினர்

(கெளரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

That is what I am pointing out.

அவரின் உறுப்பினர். உறுப்பினர். உறுப்பினர்

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

But my previous amendment is
all right, to reduce Rs. 10 from sub-
head 1, items "Parliamentary Secretary"
and "Permanent Secretary".
That is in order.

Digitized by Noolaham Foundation
noolaham.org | aavanaham.org

விசேஷக் கௌரவப் பதவி, 1965-66

—கூடுதல் உரையின்

subject of aggression is undoubted—to take up clearly the question of the withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam.

ஏப்ரல் 12

சிரிமாவோ டி. பி. பந்தரநாயக்க மிய.

(திருமதி சிறிமாவோ ஆர். டி. பந்தரநாயக்க)

(Mrs. Sirimavo R. D. Bandaranaike)

Do we stop for lunch at 12 o'clock ?

அவரே உன். பி. பந்தரநாயக்க

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

We go on till 1 P.M.

அவரே உன். பி. பந்தரநாயக்க

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

We stop at 12 o'clock, and resume at 2 P.M.

அவரே உன். பி. பந்தரநாயக்க

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I do not know what the party leaders decided, but as far as I am aware 10 A.M. to 1 P.M. is our time.

சிரிமாவோ டி. பி. பந்தரநாயக்க மிய.

(திருமதி சிறிமாவோ பந்தரநாயக்க)

(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)

If you want to stop at 12 o'clock we do not mind.

அவரே உன். பி. பந்தரநாயக்க

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

No, no. We will lose time.

சபாபதி

(அக்கிராசனார்)

(The Chairman)

According to the programme given to me, the House will sit from 10 A.M. to 1 P.M. With one hour for the lunch interval we will resume at 2 P.M. Now we go on till 1 P.M.

அவரே உன். பி. பந்தரநாயக்க

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

We will have a tea interval.

சபாபதி

(அக்கிராசனார்)

(The Chairman)

Yes.

அவரே உன். பி. பந்தரநாயக்க

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Then, Sir, the next point I would like to ask the Hon. Prime Minister is about the Maritime Pact. You will remember, Sir, during the Address of Thanks Debate I drew pointed attention to the fact that this Government has carried out a considerable amount of propaganda on the question of the so-called Maritime Pact which the previous Government had with China. They called it undesirable, deleterious, and so on, in the sense of being harmful to the interests of our country.

I would like to know what action has been taken by the National Government in regard to this Pact. According to statements made during the election campaign there was a grave danger of an imminent invasion of Ceylon by Chinese. So bad was the Maritime Pact.

பி. பந்தரநாயக்க மிய. (அவரே உன். பி. பந்தரநாயக்க)

(ஐ. எம். அப்துல் பாக்கர் மார்கார்—
வேருவா)

(Mr. M. Abdul Bakeer Markar—Beru-
wala)

We are now safe.

அவரே உன். பி. பந்தரநாயக்க

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

But the Pact still remains in force. It has not been abrogated to the best of my knowledge.

ரபர்ட். டி. பி. பந்தரநாயக்க மிய.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பந்தரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Robert will repeal it.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

That is precisely what I should like to know. What have you done about a matter which you considered so urgent? Quite certainly, nothing has been done. Certainly, there has been no invasion by the Chinese.

Anyhow, I think the Government owes an explanation to the people of this country so that we can know exactly where we stand. Is it not a fact that what you consider such a noxious pact is merely an agreement for making arrangements on mercantile shipping? Nothing disastrous has happened. China has not taken advantage of that position.

Five months have passed. Now, let us hear what the Hon. Prime Minister has to say about it. Then we will be in a better position to know what precisely is going to happen with regard to the so-called Maritime Pact.

These are the only points I would like to raise at the present moment.

කෙනමන් මයා.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

On the subject of External Affairs, I should like to follow up, in the first instance, the remarks made by the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) on the very dangerous situation that is developing in Vietnam. The American Government, in violation of the Geneva Agreement which called for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Vietnam within a specified period, took it upon themselves, first of all, to set up a string of puppets through whom they hoped to turn South Vietnam into a colony. Obviously, Sir, these puppets have all failed to deliver the goods for America, because they change one after the other in rapid succession, so much so that nobody quite knows who is the official Prime Minister of South Vietnam today. Even the "Time" magazine, that unreliable magazine, has

published an interview with ordinary people in South Vietnam who simply are not quite sure who their Prime Minister is. I do not blame them because their Prime Minister is really President Lyndon Johnson. The fact is that, step by step, the United States of America has been, what they call, escalating this war. They have enormously increased their armed forces in South Vietnam. They are indulging in all types of terror warfare against the liberal movement in South Vietnam. There have been more than enough examples quoted in their own newspapers, American newspapers, of the use of napalm, of the use of chemical warfare, and of various other forms of barbarous and outrageous terror warfare continued against people in South Vietnam. It is a real war of aggression that is taking place against South Vietnam by the United States of America. That is the first fact of this situation.

Secondly, the United States of America has begun to bomb with its own air force the territory of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam which is a totally separate and sovereign State. These bombing raids are continuing. It is a fantastic situation that what is really an undeclared war is going on between the United States of America and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. The United States has sent its air force and dropped its bombs over the territory of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam; it is bombing the territory of another State. And it is particularly this action that is now creating such a threat to world peace and to peace in Asia.

On the 2nd of next month the Democratic Republic of Vietnam will be celebrating the 10th anniversary of its foundation. In spite of that the situation is such that all of us in Ceylon and all over the world are extremely worried about what is likely to happen.

We have discussed this question of Vietnam before this. You will recall that during the time of the Sri

விசேஷக் கௌரவப் பதவி, 1965-66

—கூடுதல் உரை

Lanka Freedom Party Government there was a Debate on the Throne Speech in regard to Vietnam. I think it was in 1963. I have the HANSARD here but I cannot find the exact place at this moment. If I had the time, I would quote it—[*Interruption*]. The hon. Member for Dompe says he will speak on it. I remember the occasion very well. I myself moved the Amendment to the Address of Thanks requesting the Government of the day to put forward the demand of the Parliament of Ceylon that the United States troops should be withdrawn from South Vietnam and that the other provisions of the Geneva Agreement should be enforced. It was a specific motion. It made two specific requests, first, the withdrawal of U. S. troops from South Vietnam, and second, the enforcement of the other provisions of the Geneva Agreement. You will recall that on that occasion the United National Party led by no less a person than the present Prime Minister voted for my Amendment. That amendment was passed by this House, and we can therefore, say that it represented the policy of the Parliament of this country.

செ. ஜே. டி. பீரவர்தன

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

The Government of the day did not support it.

கௌரவப் பதவி.

(திரு. கௌரவப் பதவி)

(Mr. Keuneman)

The Government of the day stood neutral on that question, but the Amendment was passed by this House. You did not stand neutral; you voted for it. Both the Prime Minister and the Minister of State associated themselves with that Motion. As far as I remember every other party in this *hath hawula* also voted for that Motion with the exception perhaps of the Appointed Member, Mr. Thondaman. I know that the M. E. P. and the J. P. did vote for that Amendment. I know the Federal Party also did so.

செ. ஜே. டி. பீரவர்தன

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

He—the Hon. Minister of Land, Irrigation and Power—did not vote for it.

கௌரவப் பதவி.

(திரு. கௌரவப் பதவி)

(Mr. Keuneman)

His party was formed later. Are you running a foreign policy according to the directions of the Hon. Mr. C. P. de Silva? If so you will get into a bigger mess than you have got into in respect of land policy.

I want to know what my hon. Friend the Member for Jaffna (Mr. Ponnambalam) will do. You are sending the hon. Member as a high level representative to the United Nations General Assembly meeting where this question is bound to be taken up for consideration. It is one of the key crucial questions of international affairs today which concerns the whole question of war and peace.

As far as we are concerned, two things must be achieved if there is going to be a peaceful settlement in Vietnam. The first is that the bombing of the territory of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam by United States aircraft must stop. I want to ask the Prime Minister specifically, what is the attitude of your Government on that question? What instructions have been given to our representative in the United Nations on the question of the continued bombing of the territory of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam by United States aircraft? That is the first question. This has nothing to do with the complications of the second question, but is a simple and straightforward one.

It is not denied by the United States that they are bombing the territory of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. In fact, they are boasting about it. The Indian Prime Minister Mr. Shastri has condemned this

[කෙතමන් මෑය.]

action. I think practically all the non-aligned countries have sharply come out against this bombing, with the exception of Ceylon. You say you are following a policy of non-alignment. You say you are trying to have peace in the world. You accuse the former Government of trying to dodge the question of naming a Government as the aggressor in an international dispute. So what is your attitude on this question? I think the only consistent policy is that we should ask for the immediate cessation of the bombing attacks on the Democratic Republic of Vietnam by United States aircraft.

අ. ආ. 12.15

The second question is about the withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam. When we last debated this matter, I think, on the Throne Speech, the Hon. Prime Minister raised the question that there were also North Vietnamese troops in South Vietnam. This is not so; it has never been so alleged. All that even the United States has alleged is that the National Liberation Movement in South Vietnam, led by the South Vietnam National Liberation Front has been using certain arms which they say come from North Vietnam. But even they have not made the official accusation that the North Vietnamese soldiers are taking part in military operations in South Vietnam. They talk about something called the Viet Cong, which is their way of describing the military arm of the National Liberation Front; but this is a patriotic organization of South Vietnamese. Considering what the South Vietnamese, particularly the Buddhists, have had to undergo at the hands of the U. S. A. and their puppets, nobody can blame them if they take up arms to fight for the liberation of their country.

The only countries which openly state that their troops are in operation in South Vietnam are the United States of America and, I think West Germany. This matter is getting more complicated because other countries are being drawn in. The

SEATO powers are now trying to move into this situation. I think there is a proposal that Malaysia should send troops; Australia is offering to send troops; I saw a proposal about New Zealand sending troops. In fact, the U.S. A. has tried to "internationalize" its aggression by drawing a number of its own supporters into this war of aggression against the Vietnamese people.

How the Vietnamese settle their affairs is their problem. In the North they have started to build a socialist society. What form of Government the people in the South want is for them to decide. The main thing is to get the American troops out and to stop the bombing of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

The Government made a statement on Vietnam. Most of its statements were concerned with welcoming President Johnson's announcement that he was going to give 1,000 million dollars to aid South-East Asia. On the specific question of Vietnam, however, our Government has not shown any initiative of its own nor is it prepared to associate itself with the demand for stopping the bombing of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the withdrawal of the troops of the U. S. A. from South Vietnam. That is the only policy that can be followed.

The Hon. Minister of Finance is drawing up all sorts of economic plans. If this war in Vietnam escalates, not one of your plans will be worth a penny. Please do not think that you will have a second Korean boom out of Vietnam—not even a "Gamini Corea" boom—because this time it will be a big shooting match, not a limited war like the Korean war. A war of the type of the Korean war is already there. It is possible that it may be a major war especially if the Americans go ahead and bomb Hanoi.

Therefore, this is a vital matter that concerns all of us, not only from the point of view of peace in the world and in this region, not only from the

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

point of view of supporting a just liberation struggle but also from the point of view of the economic stability of this country.

We should like to have a clear statement from the Hon. Prime Minister on where this Government stands and what instructions he has issued on the question of Vietnam to his representatives at the new session of the United Nations General Assembly which will commence shortly.

There is one other point I want to mention. I understand that it is proposed that the Afro-Asian Conference, which was to be held in Algiers earlier this year and which had to be postponed owing to the change in the governmental set-up in Algiers, is expected to be held somewhere round November.

There has been canvassing of various views of the countries that intended to participate in the conference in regard to this question.

May I know from the Prime Minister what is the position of the Government in regard to this matter? Can he make a statement on this and on any other matters which he considers to be of value on the proposal for the Afro-Asian Conference?

The last point is this. I want confirmation from the Prime Minister in regard to the truth or otherwise of a story in the newspapers. Is it correct that Mr. Robert Gunawardena has been appointed as our Ambassador to China? I do not know whether this is intended to be a favour to Mr. Robert Gunawardena or an attempt to finish off the Boralugoda family or an unfriendly act to a great power like China. I should be obliged if the Prime Minister would state what the position is in regard to that matter.

I also like to know this from the Prime Minister. I understand that recognition has been extended to certain other Governments since his Government came into power. I am not criticizing him for that—we should live on friendly terms with

all countries irrespective of their political and social systems—but would he provide us with a list of the countries that have been recognized by this Government and the countries with whom diplomatic representation has been brought to a higher level than existed before, since his Government assumed office.

That is all I like to ask at the moment. I shall take up other matters later in the light of the Prime Minister's reply.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.

(තිரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that we are now discussing the Votes of the Minister of Defence and External Affairs and that we are now on foreign policy. I do not know whether we can discuss Ceylon's Missions Abroad now. There is a separate Head, Head 19—

සභාපතිතුමා

(அக்கிராசனார்)

(The Chairman)

You can discuss that when we come to that Head.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

In regard to foreign policy the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) and the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central (Mr. P. G. B. Keuneman) have raised the question of Vietnam and I should like on behalf of the S.L.F.P. to make a few remarks and also refer to earlier pronouncements made by the Hon. Prime Minister and the Hon. Minister of State (Mr. J. R. Jayewardene) in this House since this Parliament assembled.

The history of this matter is quite straightforward. In 1954 there was what I suppose the colonial powers would describe as rebellion or revolution against the French in

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

Vietnam after the second world war. In the course of those battles that were then fought the French suffered complete defeat and it became necessary to give Vietnam her independence.

That independence was achieved and was consolidated, but in the course of the fighting, a peace settlement was entered into described as the Geneva Agreement of 1954;

You will remember, Sir, the battle of Dien Bien Phu in which nurses like Florence Nightingale on behalf of the French distinguished themselves for their courage, while the people of Vietnam also distinguished themselves for their courage by meeting a western army with relatively out-dated weapons, and fought and won a magnificent victory against the forces of colonialism in South-East Asia.

Since 1954, a parallel line, one of the lines of latitude, was adopted as an artificial demarcation between South Vietnam and North Vietnam, and the so-called rebels, the Viet-Minh, as they were then called, were given the portion of the country north of the parallel which subsequently became North Vietnam, while the portion south of the parallel was described as South Vietnam and a regime was established in office. I myself do not like to use the word "puppet regime", but certainly they were not distinguished for their independence or for participation in the real liberation of their people. By this agreement, a commission of countries, a number of nations, solemnly met at Geneva and agreed that a neutral Vietnam was absolutely necessary in the interests of peace in the world and South-East Asia, that foreign interference should be removed, that foreign arms and foreign weapons should not be introduced into the country. It was on the basis of that agreed settlement that they hoped that ultimately there would be a reunification of North and South Vietnam.

North Vietnam is a country which is sometimes described as a communist country. It is, in a sense. The people have chosen to follow a particular road to economic development according to a particular political philosophy. That is their business. In South Vietnam, however, there was no very clear-cut position of any political philosophy. Individual rulers—I suppose with influence, trained in French times—the so-called aristocracy, assumed control and command. What happened? We have seen what that aristocracy was capable of: it produced men like the dictator Diem, women like Madame Nhu, at later periods. These people were supported, whenever they ran into difficulty with their own people, by the force of American weapons and American arms. Whenever they found themselves threatened not by North Vietnam but by the people of South Vietnam, they promptly bleated for assistance to the United States of America and called for weapons, called for war, against communism. It was not communism; it was, if I may respectfully say so, a protest by the people against an oppressive regime established in South Vietnam after 1954. Against this, the people rose in revolt demanding a fair share of the Government for themselves. Sometimes when governments find themselves in a situation like that—it has happened elsewhere also—they turn for assistance to foreign countries and say: We have a common purpose here; we want your help and assistance, militarily. And, they called upon American assistance in that way. The war that is being fought in South Vietnam is not a war against North Vietnam; it is a war against the people of South Vietnam. And, as quite rightly pointed out by the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central (Mr. P. G. B. Keuneman), what has happened is that you do not find a front there, fighting is not taking place in any front. In individual villages, when

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

the American soldiers and South Vietnamese puppet armies have gone away, the people rise up, establish themselves into little guerrilla units and fight battles of a very strange order. They set fire to buildings, explosives are planted in military quarters, and most daring raids and attacks are conducted. And you find that so many American casualties are announced day after day. If you look at the place on the map, you will see that these things are taking place behind American lines, and not in front. The whole of South Vietnam, approximately four-fifths of it on the map, is in rebel hands according to official government sources. That is the remarkable part of it.

Are we in Ceylon, as a Government, going to tolerate a position of refusing to allow the South-East Asian countries to determine their own destiny? Let it be assumed that the people want to go communist. Have they not got the right to go communist if that is their wish? If a small group of people, may be people who oppose communism, may be people who do not like communism, happen to be in power here, does it mean that we are going to deny to the people the right of self-determination, the right to determine their own destiny? In other words, merely because a minority government, supported by American money and American arms, would like to remain in office, would like to oppress the people, can we as another country, an independent country, possibly lend support to that position?

අ. සා. 12.30

Now, the argument is very often confused. The South Vietnamese try to show it as a war against North Vietnam, a war against Communism, a war against the People's Republic of China. That is false. There is not a single Chinese soldier in South Vietnam. The Americans admit it. There is not a single North Vietnamese soldier in South Vietnam. It may be that a certain amount of gun-running is taking place on the borders in the

form of smuggling of weapons from North Vietnam to South Vietnam. It may be that the communists of North Vietnam are helping and assisting the communists of South Vietnam to fight their battles. That is possible. But certainly the battle is being fought not with the blood of North Vietnamese, not with the blood of Chinese people, but with the blood of the South Vietnamese. And, from the American point of view, the tragedy is that the South Vietnamese are winning the war.

They are fighting with relatively obsolete weapons—Sten guns, machine guns, Stirling guns, things like that—which are almost Second World War vintage in design. But they are fighting against jet aircraft, fighter planes, bombers, and bringing them down. The casualty rate, as admitted by American papers and magazines, certainly shows that it is impossible to fight the people. You cannot wage war against the people of a country and succeed. Not all the forces of foreign imperialism will succeed in that endeavour. And that is the real factual position which we must face.

It is no use imagining that this is a war against Communism, or imagining that this is a war against North Vietnamese who are trying to invade South Vietnam, or imagining that it is a war which is fought between America and China. It is not. You will find at the very southern tip of South Vietnam rebels attacking the Americans and blowing up their installations. How can this be a war when the people all over the place hide their little arms in different caches, in little hideouts all over the place and wait for the Americans to turn their backs on them to shoot them down? It is happening. That is why President Johnson had to conscript married men in the United States of America to be sent to Vietnam. It is becoming a question of prestige. It has become necessary to

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.]

Now, this matter has been the subject of discussion in this very House right throughout the course of the last Parliament. I then occupied the position of Parliamentary Secretary for Defence and External Affairs and these questions used to be shot at me. I have studied this matter with a great deal of care and caution not merely for the sake of raising objections with the United National Party but because it had become necessary for our country, for the Government to know the facts, to ascertain the views.

The problem first of all came up in fairly strong form in this House when the dictator Dinh Diem was in office in 1963. At that time, during the Throne Speech Debate, the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central—I think he was Second Member then—raised a question in the form of an amendment to our Throne Speech.

He said that he would like us further to condemn aggression in Vietnam—I forget the exact words of the amendment—and to call for the complete withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam—

කෙනමන් මය.

(තිரு. කෙනමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

South Vietnam.

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.

(තිரு. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

—in keeping with the Geneva Agreement. We, in our Throne Speech, had not said it quite like that. We had talked about condemning the suppression of Buddhists in Vietnam. At that time, Diem was a Catholic and there was a great deal of controversy about the use of the Buddhist Flag, and some Buddhist monks had actually set fire to the selves with petrol in the streets outside Hue. That was the position at that time. And the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central said, "When you

are sending your missions to the United Nations, please take up this question. We want you not merely to sympathize with the Buddhists and their problems in Vietnam. We want you to go further and call for a peaceful settlement in keeping with the Geneva Agreement by the complete withdrawal of American units, armed forces, weapons from South Vietnam."

When that amendment was proposed, the Hon. Prime Minister who was then Leader of the Opposition adopted it and voted with the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central. Actually, our Government did not vote for it. We felt we could not very well criticize our Governor-General on his own Throne Speech. It would not have been good manners, we felt, to tell the Governor-General, even if there be an omission, that he has not put into it something which the Opposition would like to have incorporated. It would not have been very nice for the Government to let him down, particularly when we also thought that the Throne Speech should be amended.

But we thought, at the same time, that there was a great deal of sense in what was being proposed by the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central (Mr. Keuneman) and supported by the Hon. Prime Minister. And so, what did we do? We declined to vote. In other words, by our attitude we made it possible for the Opposition Amendment to the Throne Speech to be passed. We deliberately declined to vote making it possible for them to succeed in their endeavour of getting an item included as Government policy.

That is, I think, the only time in the history of this House where a Throne Speech has been amended and where the Government had not fallen; where a Government had accepted an Amendment to a Throne Speech—apart, of course, from an Amendment by which, for instance, the Opposition throws a Government out of office. That has happened. But

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

this is the only time I know of where a Government accepted an Opposition idea and incorporated it as a part of its Foreign Policy.

Thereafter, the Government in 1963 did instruct its permanent representative in the United Nations, Mr. R. S. S. Gunawardene—an old friend of ours in this House—to take up this question. In consequence of the initiative of the Ceylon Representative there, actually a Commission was appointed by the United Nations to go and investigate the horrors of Dinh Diem in Vietnam.

They did proceed to Vietnam. I do not know whether it was due to the good offices of our Permanent Representative, but within a few days of their getting to Vietnam, Dinh Diem was assassinated. I believe the assassination was hailed by the Americans as a good thing. It gave them an opportunity to change their puppets.

Dinh Diem was thrown out. He was murdered in the streets of Saigon, and, I think, the Americans themselves thought that the time had come when this man—the man whom they created and who had become too arrogant—had to be thrown out.

The Commission report was presented to the United Nations thereafter, but it was not necessary to make any specific recommendations in view of the change of Government and in view of the fact that the oppression of Buddhists had ceased for the time being. But the major war, the major oppression of the people, did not cease. It continued apace and day by day the American forces are losing ground, their puppet regime is falling apart and the Americans are called upon to spend more money, put in more equipment, in trying to bolster up what they represent is democracy in South Vietnam.

Is it democracy, Sir, to keep in power a regime which has lost the confidence of the people, against which four-fifths of a country had risen in revolt and is fighting a perpetual war, and a winning war?

This matter was raised by us in this Parliament before the Hon. Prime Minister. The first time we raised it was on the 23rd of April this year when the Hon. Prime Minister was replying to the Throne Speech Debate. I will read how the HANSARD states what occurred on that occasion.

The Hon. Prime Minister defined his conceptions of non-alignment. He said:

“The next amendment is about my policy of non-alignment, the Maritime Treaty with China, alleged discrimination against certain foreign Consulates and the question of Vietnam.

I have always stated that my conception of non-alignment is rather different from the conception of non-alignment of the previous Government. I believe in being thoroughly non-aligned. For instance, my conception of non-alignment does not vary with the nature of the power bloc that does the wrong act. We have a good record on that score. As a party, we condemned the aggression on Suez; we condemned the aggression against Tibet and against India. The countries involved belonged to different power blocs.

A peculiar conception of non-alignment was mentioned by the hon. Member for Katugampola (Mr. T. B. Subasinghe). He said, “Well, take the Indo-China trouble. We were non-aligned.” His conception of non-alignment appears to be that we should take no side on any issue in the sense that we should not say who is right and who is wrong. It is not non-alignment to condemn the actions of one bloc when they do something wrong and to refrain from condemning the actions of the other bloc when they do likewise. If you do that, you are not non-aligned; you are well and truly aligned.”

Then, I interrupted:

“What is your view of the American bombings of North Vietnam?”

THE HON. DUDLEY SENANAYAKE: Under the Geneva Agreement—

Under the agreement there was to be no aggression by North Vietnam or South Vietnam. So if we are to condemn, we have to condemn both parties.” —[OFFICIAL REPORT, April 23rd, 1965; Vol. 60, c. 1163.]

Where is the aggression by North Vietnam? The Hon. Prime Minister had completely misunderstood the situation. Probably he was new to the office at that time and it may be that he had not studied the

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

[එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

foreign affairs position in regard to South Vietnam completely. I shall come to that in a moment. He said:

"There is no aggression on South Vietnam by North Vietnam".

The persons who are being bombed—the North Vietnamese are being bombed by the Americans—are told that we must condemn those who are bombing and those who are bombed:

"MR. KEUNEMAN: I asked you about American aggression.

THE HON. DUDLEY SENANAYAKE: American as well as the North Vietnamese aggression.

MR. F. R. DIAS BANDARANAIKE: Will you cause the withdrawal of American forces?

MR. KEUNEMAN: What about American forces—[Interruption]

THE HON. DUDLEY SENANAYAKE: Pardon! There is no aggression. Your aggression is only by South Vietnam.

MR. KEUNEMAN: What is the Geneva Agreement about American forces?

MR. F. R. DIAS BANDARANAIKE: Have the Americans the right to be there under the Agreement?

THE HON. DUDLEY SENANAYAKE: There is to be no aggression on South Vietnam by North Vietnam"—

He is proceeding entirely on the basis that the North Vietnamese are considered aggressors against South Vietnamese.

"MR. KEUNEMAN: Under the Geneva Agreement, American forces have to be withdrawn. I carefully proved that—[Interruption].

THE HON. DUDLEY SENANAYAKE: Then so far I was suffering under a delusion.

MR. KEUNEMAN: Obviously."

The Hon. Prime Minister quite frankly said that he had been arguing on wrong premises and that he would ascertain the facts.

"MR. F. R. DIAS BANDARANAIKE: Under the Geneva Agreement can the American troops be there?

MR. KEUNEMAN: You seem to get your information from the 'Time' Magazine."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 23rd April, 1965; Vol. 60, cs. 1164-6.]

Then they went on to other cross-talks about Hungary and so many other things.

—කාරක සභාව

The second occasion on which this matter was raised was on the 21st of May 1965—it is reported in HANSARD. Having quoted the same paragraph which I read just now from the Throne Speech Debate I said:

"So, the position was that the Hon. Prime Minister was not quite sure of what the position was under the Geneva Agreement at the time that he was replying—as to whether or not American forces have a right to be there and whether their actions carry with them approval of the House of Representatives, of this Parliament, and of this Government.

I should like to tell the Hon. Prime Minister this: Practically every country in the world has expressed its attitude on Vietnam. They have declared their positions. The Hon. Prime Minister himself told us that he is thoroughly non-aligned, that he is not afraid to condemn the aggressor wherever aggression is to be found. But when the question was raised by us in regard to the Rann of Kutch dispute, to this date we have not had an answer. We do not know who is the aggressor."

I can now add to that Azad Kashmir. We still do not know whether there are any infiltrators or not.

"The Dominican question was raised yesterday. We have not had any answer to that question. We found recently that Prime Minister Shastri of India was due to make a State visit to the United States of America and meet President Lyndon Johnson. What happened? President Lyndon Johnson found himself too busy with Congressional matters to see Prime Minister Shastri. But what was the real reason? Because Prime Minister Shastri was so thoroughly non-aligned as to declare the attitude of the Government of India with regard to Vietnam.

We also find that Premier Kosygin of the Soviet Union has declined to make a State visit to Great Britain, where he was due as a visitor, for no other reason than to express his country's attitude on the United Kingdom's position on the question of Vietnam aggression.

I do not know for what reason it is that the Hon. Prime Minister has not condemned what has happened in Vietnam as aggression, but I hope it will not embarrass him in regard to his future State visits to any foreign country. However I do not think that if he stands by a policy of thorough, non-alignment, as he maintains he does, then under the terms of the Geneva Agreement he should

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කුරක සභාව

certainly condemn the presence of foreign forces in Vietnam and their conducting of aggressive or any other military operations in Vietnam. It would otherwise be contrary to the spirit of the 1954 Geneva Agreement and there can be no halfway house for a country as thoroughly non-aligned as Ceylon claims to be. I therefore ask the Hon. Prime Minister, in pursuance of his own declaration of being unafraid to condemn aggression wherever he finds it, to make a clear and categorical statement on this matter.”—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 21st May 1965; Vol. 60, cs. 1774-6.]

And I wanted him to tell us whether India or Pakistan was the aggressor in the Rann of Kutch dispute. The Hon. Prime Minister was in the House that day and his answer was this,

“As regards the matter raised by the hon. member for Dompe, I do not know what exactly is written in what he quoted. As I said earlier, I never read or correct my speeches once I have made them—[Interruption]. I remember distinctly what I meant on that occasion. I said that I was trying to lead up to the point that under the Geneva Agreement both sides are aggressors.

DR. N. M. PERERA: Under the Geneva Agreement? How?

MR. F. R. DIAS BANDARANAIKE: Foreign forces have no right to be there.

THE HON. DUDLEY SENANAYAKE: Therefore, you condemn that—[Interruption].

MR. F. R. DIAS BANDARANAIKE: You have never condemned it. That is why we complain.

DR. N. M. PERERA: You agreed with our amendment.

THE HON. DUDLEY SENANAYAKE: But the point is that there are certain forces from North Vietnam also, and North Vietnam's assistance also is an infringement of the Geneva Agreement.”

අ. ආ. 12.45

It makes it quite clear that he is acting under the impression, the assumption, that North Vietnamese are fighting in South Vietnam.

To continue the quotation:

“DR. N. M. PERERA: I do not mind your saying that, but you must condemn both

THE HON. DUDLEY SENANAYAKE: So, both parties have infringed the Geneva Agreement.

MR. F. R. DIAS BANDARANAIKE: Who are the parties?

THE HON. DUDLEY SENANAYAKE: North Vietnam—[Interruption].

MR. F. R. DIAS BANDARANAIKE: America also.

THE HON. DUDLEY SENANAYAKE: Yes. So, there is no question of aggressor and non-aggressor. There is no question.

MR. F. R. DIAS BANDARANAIKE: You say both are aggressors.

THE HON. DUDLEY SENANAYAKE: Both are aggressors.

DR. N. M. PERERA: Obviously, the Viet Cong in South Vietnam are not the aggressors.

MR. F. R. DIAS BANDARANAIKE: Anyway, he has condemned U. S. aggression today for the first time. We are very happy.”—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 21st May 1965; Vol. 60, cs. 1786-88].

That was the second occasion that Vietnam was referred to in this House. But the Hon. Prime Minister argued on the footing that North Vietnamese are fighting battles in South Vietnam. We raised this matter once again on 6th July 1965 during the Adjournment, where I made the express criticism that by this time the Hon. Minister of Justice had been in London for the Commonwealth Prime Ministers Conference—the Hon. Prime Minister being ill—and that the Hon. Minister of Justice went completely against every single statement made on the Floor of the House, supported by the U.N.P. in 1963, supported by the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central in 1963, 1964 and 1965, and supported by us ever since 1963. I made the point that his speech was exactly the opposite of what this House has also said. I criticized the Hon. Minister of Justice for taking up an attitude of that sort. The Hon. Prime Minister was not here, he was sick, and the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and Minister of Defence and External Affairs and the Minister in charge of Zoological Gardens, and general factotum, replied on behalf of the Hon. Prime Minister.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

This is what I said on that occasion :

"The Hon. Minister of Justice went abroad recently on behalf of the Hon. Prime Minister. We sympathize with him in the present circumstances. But however much he may get new subjects and functions assigned to him by "Order-in-Council" and designate himself "Minister of Planning and Economic Development", the fact remains that he has very little independence if the facts as I have already stated them are true, and the Government cannot have the guts to tell this country and the Parliament exactly where it stands in relation to foreign organizations.

But what happens in regard to Vietnam? This House has indicated its attitude time and time again exactly as to where we stand on this question. We have demanded, and indeed the Hon. Prime Minister has informed this House on more than one occasion that he himself shared that demand even when he was in the Opposition, that American forces must be withdrawn from Viet Nam as a condition precedent to the settlement of the problems of Vietnam.

This is not an Opposition demand now put forward by us. It is something completely acquiesced in and agreed to by the Hon. Prime Minister. The Minister of Justice goes to London, presses for a Peace Mission to proceed from the Commonwealth to Vietnam and to other places to try to bring about peace in the area—a very laudable objective. But what is significant is that, in all the Commonwealth Conference communiques issued, to which the Minister of Justice was a party, the withdrawal of American forces and the cessation of bombing by America have not been put down by the Minister of Justice. In other words, the diametrically opposite point of view to the point of view expressed by this House was taken up by the Minister of Justice. May I ask on behalf of the Opposition in this House whether it has the sanction of the Government and of the Hon. Prime Minister who in answer to questions here branded the Americans as aggressors and said that he himself and his party stand for the withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam? And I can quite understand the embarrassment of the Hon. Prime Minister who in the circumstances thought, quite apart from any question of illness, that he should not participate in this Peace Mission because his very terms of which he himself informed this House have not been adhered to by the Minister of Justice in every single pronouncement he made, from the moment he landed in the airport in London to the conclusion of the conference when he addressed the press. In other words—I have gone through every single one of

these communiques—the very points which were urged by the United National Party when it stood here in this House on this side, and which were reiterated by the Hon. Prime Minister on that side of the House, have now been violated and the mandate has been completely exceeded by what has happened. In other words, a feeble peace attempt is being made under the leadership of the British Prime Minister. For what? For no other purpose than to try to save face for the Americans in Vietnam. And to try to save face for them how? Not by calling for the cessation of bombing, not by calling for the withdrawal of American troops, but on the basis that there is something here that is negotiable: let us negotiate for the cessation of bombing attacks; let us negotiate for the withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam; and let us negotiate for a loan.

My respectful submission is that an answer is due from the Members of the Government when they themselves have expressed a policy, declared it more than once on the Floor of this House, and reiterated it repeatedly when the matter was raised. I do submit that it is a very wrong act on the part of the Minister of Justice to go abroad and to declare this country's attitude in gross violation of what the Hon. Prime Minister has declared to us.

Let us know once and for all, what is your attitude on Vietnam? Do you really brand the Americans as aggressors? Do you really stand for the withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam? Do you really want the American bombings to cease? Or is it that here too you have an international entanglement which you are ashamed to declare to this House"—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 6th July 1965; Vol. 60 cs. 2431-33.]

Then the Hon. Minister of State, Parliamentary Secretary and all the rest of it, replied and this is the answer he gave. Of course, the Prime Minister said, "I do not read my own speeches". The hon. Parliamentary Secretary said, "I do not read even the speeches of the Minister of Justice."

කෙනෙක් මයා.

(තිரு. කෙනමන්)

(Mr. Keunemaa)

I do not blame him.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(තිரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

He said :

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

"... I found the hon. Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike) in the Lobby and I asked him what his question was. He said that he would like to know what our policy is in regard to Vietnam, because he said the Hon. Minister of Justice, representing the Hon. Prime Minister, had been making statements in London which, as reported in the newspapers were quite contrary to the Hon. Prime Minister's policy as stated here. I am afraid I did not read those speeches as reported in the newspapers, but our policy is, as stated by the Hon. Prime Minister, that there should be no outside interference in what is happening in Vietnam, outside interference either from the North or from the West. That is the position we take up. We like the people of Vietnam both of the North and of the South to be united and to be independent. I do not think the Hon. Minister of Justice said anything outside that context."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 6th July 1965; Vol. 60, c.s. 2439—40.]

I do not know whether the hon. Parliamentary Secretary has had the time to look up the speeches subsequently to advise the Prime Minister on his sick bed, but if he does, he will find that one of the prime movers behind the Commonwealth peace mission, the ill-fated peace mission that never took off, was our Hon. Minister of Justice. He thought it would bring kudos to our Prime Minister if he were included in this mission. But the Prime Minister was too wily a bird, he did not fall into the trap. As soon as the news came through that they were inviting the Hon. Prime Minister, he very properly declined and said, "I would have nothing to do with it."

Now, Sir, what is the true position? I would like to ask this Government: have you, through your Ambassador, got any actual information that there is any aggression by North Vietnam or by the People's Republic of China in South Vietnam? How can they continue aggressive operations in the southern tip of South Vietnam? How did they get there? The maximum which anyone can complain about is that there may be a certain amount of gun-running on the border at the parallel between North and South Vietnam. Well, it is for the Governments to patrol their borders to prevent smuggling of weapons. That

is certainly not a matter which can be declared aggressive. On that basis we should describe illicit immigration as being aggression against Ceylon, but we cannot say that. The Government of India has nothing to do with it. People are coming across our border, coming down Palk Strait. In the same way smugglers are bringing all manner of things to Velvettiturai. The National Government has, I think, made them even more prosperous. But I respectfully submit, Sir, that you cannot regard this as an aggression by North Vietnam on South Vietnam. What is really happening in South Vietnam is a war of liberation, a war of liberation which might result, if successful, in the establishment of a government of a socialist type, may be a communist type—I do not know enough about the internal politics of South Vietnam. But merely because some people do not like communism, merely because some people prefer to avoid socialism—even a reference to socialism—they consider it dangerous. It is one of the dirty words. I do not think it is correct for us in the expression of our foreign policy to identify ourselves with people who maintain that they are fighting a war against communism. The Americans are not fighting a war against communism, they are not fighting a war against international communism but they are fighting against the determination of the people of South Vietnam to be free.

I would like to ask this House, "How would you like if such a situation arises in Ceylon? How would you like if a government could not be upset and overthrown at the polls?" We have done it several times; we have had governments being overthrown by means of the vote. That is one of our privileges as a fairly developed country and we are proud of it.

I know sometimes that when a delay occurs in handing over resignation even so much as by a day, people begin to get panicky thinking that the government intends to stay on.

[ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.]

I think the late Mr. Bandaranaike, on the first day of the election results—there was a three-day election at that time—was somewhat nervous that the then Prime Minister might decide even if he lost at the election on the second and third days' results to engage in some adventure. I think he issued a statement at that time.—[Interruption].

I agree it was needless. And even here it was a needless fear—on 22nd March, 1965. Certainly it was a needless fear. Now, you will agree in retrospect. I certainly had no fear then, I can assure you. I remember discussing at that time, pointing out even to others that there was nothing to be afraid of. If I may be premitted to say this: supposing such a situation arises, supposing a government which has lost the confidence of the people were to send for aid from America saying, "Here we are fighting communists", or to some other countries—say Russia or China—saying, "There is an American weasel here. Please send military assistance. We want to keep ourselves in power", will the people of the country tolerate that?

The people of a country have to determine their own affairs. What I want to point out is that we adopt a different standard as far as the people of South Vietnam are concerned. The Hon. Prime Minister must certainly use the instrument of his foreign policy—he must get the hon. Member for Jaffna (Mr. Pon-nambalam) to be as telling in his vocabulary as when he is scolding the Federal Party. You must get him at the United Nations to denounce American aggression in the same way he denounces the hon. Member for Kankesanturai (Mr. Chelvanayakam).

What is important here is to ensure that Ceylon's foreign policy is determined not according to the will of your lackeys and officials in the Ministry of External Affairs but

in conformity with the wishes of this House. This House has expressed its position in relation to this matter in no uncertain terms. What I say is that you should decide your foreign policy, clearly state it, and adhere to it, without being deluded by the information you get in the "Time" magazine on South Vietnam. You are basing your information on the "Time" magazine. I think it is the only authority which claims there is aggression by North Vietnam. I have never heard of it; it is a physical impossibility for North Vietnam.

All that we are asking is that we be given a clear statement, indicating what steps you have taken to bring this matter to a settlement. Do not go to war with South Vietnam or North Vietnam, but use your diplomatic channels, to achieve this objective.

I have some other matters too to deal with quite apart from the question of South Vietnam. May I, therefore, continue after lunch?

සභාපතිතුමා

(அக்கிராசனார்)

(The Chairman)

Order, please! The Sitting is suspended till 2 P.M. On resumption Sir Razik Fareed, will take the Chair.

දක්වම ඊට අනුකූලව තාවකාලිකව අත්සිටුවන ලදීන් අ. හ. 2 ට පත් කරන ලද මන්ත්‍රී තැන්පත් ක්‍රමය රාසින් පරිසි මහතාගේ සභාපතිත්වයෙන් කැමත පවත්වන ලදී.

அதன்படி அமர்வு இடைநிறுத்தப்பட்டு மீண்டும் பி. ப. 2 மணிக்கு ஆரம்பமாயிற்று. ஸ்ரீமான் ராசிக் பரீத், ச.பி.ஈ. (நியமன அங்கத்தவர்) தலைமை தாங்கினார்.

Sitting accordingly suspended till 2 P.M. and then resumed. SIR RAZIK FAREED, O.B.E., [APPOINTED MEMBER] in the Chair.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Before we proceed, Sir, I wish to mention that I told the Hon. Speaker that I would like to make a personal explanation at 2 P.M., but the document concerned has not been sent to me by the office. I want permission to refer to it tomorrow.

இலேසனார் உள் தி

(தலைமை தாங்கும் அங்கத்தவர்)

(The Presiding Member)

You can do it tomorrow.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බන්ධාරනායක මහ.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Mr. Chairman, I was concluding my remarks in regard to the subject of Vietnam when we adjourned at lunch time this afternoon. I would also like to refer to the same subject before I pass on. You will find the text of the Amendment in the HANSARD of 30th July, 1963, which is as follows:-

"Amendment proposed, at the end to add the words: 'but whilst welcoming the efforts of Your Excellency's Government on behalf of the Buddhists of South Vietnam, urges upon the Government to continue its efforts until the rights of the Buddhists of that country have been achieved.'—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 30th July 1963; Vol. 52, c. 823.]

To that the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central moved as an Amendment, the following:

"leave out all words after 'Government' in line 2. and insert the words, 'to take action in the United Nations and elsewhere to help the Buddhists of that country by enlisting the support of other governments and public organizations to ensure that American troops are withdrawn from South Vietnam and other provisions of the Geneva Agreement of 1954 enforced.'—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 30th July 1963; ol. 52, c. 823.]

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

May I correct it? He added that to our amendment.

—කාරක සභාව

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බන්ධාරනායක මහ.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

The original part of the Amendment was the U. N. P. Amendment. The hon. Third Member for Colombo Central added certain other words which were accepted by the U. N. P. and it was voted on by the U. N. P. and Communist Party. I know the Hon. Prime Minister will agree as correct that the voting was also on the same basis. The voting took place on the same day, 30th July, 1963.

Although the Hon. Prime Minister in the earlier period of the Throne Speech seemed to have forgotten the terms of the Geneva Agreement, he seemed to have been under a delusion about whether there was an invasion by North Vietnam into South Vietnam, and about condemning North and South Vietnam. My respectful submission is that he has had time to get acquainted with the full situation in Vietnam and I ask him to consider seriously his present views if they are in consonance with the views expressed in this House, and as I said, to take proper action in that regard.

Of course, Sir, times have changed. The need for diplomatic action is considerably less than ever it was before, because the war in Vietnam is being won by the people of Vietnam. It looks as if in spite of all the forces and weapons available to the Americans the people of South Vietnam are now triumphing. It looks as though it is President Johnson who is in retreat, and it looks as though even without effort on our part the problems of Vietnam will now resolve themselves in the way in which they have to be resolved. The only way in which they can be resolved is in favour of the people of Vietnam. Any effort now to make this a negotiable proposition will only succeed in giving the Americans a line of escape, of giving the Americans a diplomatic attempt to get out of the difficulty. They have caught the tiger by the tail, and indeed to

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

enable them to escape that tiger seems to be the only purpose of attempting to negotiate with gangsters in your own territory, a position which nobody can accept. No country in the world can possibly keep an honourable peace settlement on the basis of negotiations when you have got foreign forces in your own country, foreign forces which claim the right to remain in your country unless you are agreeable to peace.

Sir, if you find a gangster in your house, you tie him to a tree before you enter upon negotiations with him for the return of the loot.

The second matter I wish to raise in regard to foreign affairs is about the maritime agreement with China. The hon. Third Member for Colombo Central raised it before. I wish to raise it again on behalf of our party and speak on it. I raise this question on this occasion too because the Hon. Prime Minister has made a statement in the course of the Throne Speech which I should like to quote and to refer to.

Briefly the position is this. The Hon. Prime Minister said: "There is an agreement with China. I am aware of it. I have referred to it during the course of the elections." Then we asked him the specific question, "Well, do you think it is a good agreement or a bad agreement? Do you think it is in the interests of our country or against the interests of our country?" He said, "I have to look into that." And we asked him, "If you do find it is against the interests of our country, will you please tear it up? Will you please release our country from the obligations of a vicious agreement, from the obligations of a bad agreement?"

He said that when we were the Government, we entered upon a treaty with the People's Republic of China which is bad, which is against our national interest, which ought never to have been entered into. According to him we bartered away

our independence and made our country a vassal of the People's Republic of China. That was the way he argued it then. And we made use of that argument and asked, "If you say that and if you really think that, please tell us whether you will destroy it." We also said, "You have not had much time to look into it. We agree. The Throne Speech was on the 23rd of April 1965 and you assumed office only on the 26th of March 1965." The Hon. Prime Minister said, "I want some time to look into this. And certainly, if it is against the interests of our country, I will give notice of the termination."

Now six months have elapsed since he assumed office, plenty of time for him to make the changes. The Hon. Prime Minister has had the opportunity to make changes in the Defence and External Affairs Ministry as he wanted. He had the opportunity to appoint such advisers as he has confidence in to advise him, and he now should surely tell us what the position is.

As far as I know, the maritime agreement with China is still in force. Notice of termination has still not been served by the Government of Ceylon. And what I want to know is, what is the reason for this? The only reason I can infer is that the Prime Minister, having looked into the agreement, is now satisfied that there is nothing in that agreement against the interests of our country. If, on the other hand, he thinks it is against the interests of the country, he surely owes this House a duty to say so and to give notice of termination. I think the terms of the agreement make it quite proper without any violation of international obligations for him to tell the Chinese Government, "We do not want to stand by this treaty. We want to be released of our obligations under the treaty." They have that power. If they have that power and they have not exercised that power, then it has to be inferred that there is nothing obnoxious in the agreement.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

I can certainly understand the Prime Minister saying, "I want time to look into it". But I do not think he can say, "I have been looking into it for six months", the whole period of giving notice. The Hon. Prime Minister must surely tell this House that if the agreement is a bad one, that he is serving notice of termination of that agreement with the People's Republic of China, or that he is seeking at any rate to cancel the present agreement and to re-negotiate a new agreement, if he wants one on terms which are satisfactory. But you cannot say, "I denounce the agreement; I think the agreement is a bad one", and at the same time, having used it as a political stick to belabour our Government, the Government of the Sri Lanka Freedom Party, to say now, "I denounce the agreement; I think not politically a very straightforward attitude to adopt if one denounces the agreement, on the one hand, and says, on the other hand, "Well, I now take a different view of the agreement and while I denounce it to you internally I approve the agreement and am prepared to stand by it as far as international relations are concerned." I should like for the purposes of record to give you the particular passage in question in regard to the Maritime Agreement with China. I am reading from column 1166 of HANSARD of the 23rd April 1965. The Hon. Dudley Senanayake, Prime Minister said this :

"Now there is the question of the Maritime Pact with China. First, let me ask the Members of the previous Government opposite, what was the necessity for this Maritime Pact?"—

If you say there is no necessity, you can tear it up.

"Surely, it is no argument in favour of the pact to say that you are willing to sign similar pacts with all other countries."—

We did say that and that was our answer.

"I am asking you, why did you not allow China and Russia to use the ports in the way that all other countries use our ports. What is this?"

I remember, we were told, when this matter was raised in the Senate, that under this arrangement just as China can use our ports, we can use the Chinese ports. But the Chinese ports are prescribed. You cannot use any Chinese port under the agreement. There are special ports which only you dare use. They can use any of our ports.

Then there are certain peculiar features in the Agreement about taxation advantages which have been given to them. I asked the Commissioner of Inland Revenue; he had never been consulted. I asked the Legal Draftsman whether he had been consulted. No; never. A Commercial Counsellor of the Chinese Embassy, on the one side, and the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Commerce and Trade, on the other, drew this up without going into the legal interpretation.

It is curious why the first draft speaks of 'mercantile' ships flying the national flag of the People's Republic of China and the Treaty knocks off mercantile ships as such. The first draft speaks only of mercantile ships. But in the draft that was signed, the word 'mercantile' is left out.

THE HON. J. R. JAYEWARDENE : Why ?

THE HON. DUDLEY SENANAYAKE : Why ? If it is a matter of trade, surely you must confine it to mercantile ships. Why is it that all ships can come in?"—

The implication being that it covers war ships.

"THE HON. J. R. JAYEWARDENE : Air ships.

THE HON. DUDLEY SENANAYAKE : And we have to give six months notice to abrogate it. So are you surprised that I became suspicious of this pact and attacked it? They ask me why I have not decided to tear it up. But then the hon. Member will say, is that the way to deal with a country like China? Surely, as a responsible head of a Government, I owe it to that great country to discuss with them and find out the need for this pact before I tear it up."—

So I am asking the Hon. Prime Minister, have you discussed it with the Government of China? Have you assessed their needs and our needs during the last six months? Can you tell us what the need is from the point of view of the Government of Ceylon to keep to this pact with all these peculiar features and disastrous arrangements made by a Permanent Secretary who did not consult even the Legal Draftsman or the Commissioner of Inland

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

Revenue before we made provision about taxation and about legal interpretation?

—“Surely, as a responsible head of a Government, I owe it to that great country to discuss with them and find out the need for this pact before I tear it up. Do you want me to come up and just tear it up? So much for that. I propose to discuss this with the Chinese Government and find out the real need—I have my doubts about the need.

MR. F. R. DIAS EANDARANAIKE: If you are not satisfied, will you give notice?

THE HON. DUDLEY SENANAYAKE: Yes.”

I, therefore, raise the question. If you are not satisfied you said you would give notice. You have not given notice. The only inference this House can draw is that you are satisfied with the Agreement. Very well, you are still thinking about it. You will still think about it the next year and the year after. But, Mr. Prime Minister, my respectful submission is, that is not the way to deal with this House. We can understand your saying so on the 23rd April, we appreciate that view. Certainly that is not the way to deal with a great country like China. If the Agreement is bad—it cannot be two things; it has to be either good or bad from the point of view of the Government of Ceylon. You were suspicious about it; you had your doubts about it; that is your point of view. Well then, to be honest to this House, to be honest to yourself, you must adopt a consistent attitude and tell us whether you propose to abrogate this pact or to keep it.

අ. ආ. 2.15

The third question that I wish to raise relates to the policy of non-alignment professed by the Hon. Prime Minister. He has become very, very non-aligned recently. In the course of the Debate on the Throne Speech he told us that he was thoroughly non-aligned, and he condemned us for our brand of non-alignment. He said, “Your brand of non-alignment is peculiar”. He charged that when it came to a

dispute between two sides, the Sri Lanka Freedom Party Governments of those days insidiously took sides. He said, “Whenever you found a conflict between one power bloc and another, you consciously or unconsciously, deliberately or not so deliberately, took sides with Communist countries and Communist power blocs.” That was the implication. He referred, I think, to the disputes over Hungary and Tibet. They were periods when I was not a Member of this House and I shall not talk about them.

He talked about the Sino-Indian border problem and said that our attitude was heavily weighted on the side of China and that we had failed to condemn Chinese aggression in India. We have answered these charges before. If you examine our proposals, you will find, in actual fact, in regard to the Sino-Indian dispute, that our proposals were found acceptable by India and were rejected by China. So, I do not think it was fair to say that our proposals were really drafted in such a way as to help China, or that the Ceylon Government consciously or otherwise adopted attitudes that we did not hold. On the other hand, our attitude was an honest one, one which we believed was a correct compromise. And we had the courage to put it forward.

The Hon. Prime Minister went further in the first flush of his enthusiasm when replying in the course of the Debate on the Throne Speech. He said, “We shall not be like you. We shall condemn aggression wherever we find it, irrespective of power blocs, irrespective of countries. We shall not be afraid to express our point of view. We are thoroughly and truly non-aligned.” What a short time this non-alignment lasted. Dispute after dispute arose, and were raised in this House. The Hon. Prime Minister has, to this day, not answered those questions. In regard to the Rann of Kutch dispute he was questioned several times as to who was the aggressor. He said, “I am trying to make them good friends again”.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

He was trying to make them kiss and be friends again. We also like these parties to kiss and be friends. But yours is the party that professed to be thoroughly non-aligned. I should like to ask why there is no answer.

In regard to the Dominican Republic, we have asked why, while the Dominican people were appealing to the United Nations, ours is the one country in the world that is afraid to condemn the presence of American forces in Dominica. You had no answer.

In regard to what is happening now in Azad Kashmir, will you tell us what your position is? Who are the aggressors—the Indians or the Pakistanis? Or is nobody the aggressor? Surely we are entitled to an answer? What is the position in regard to Kashmir, anyway? Kashmir has been a problem—a sore problem—in international relations over a long period. Armed forces, both on the Indian and the Pakistani borders, stand poised and ready for action at a moment's notice. It is a continuing situation. Every now and then we are told of military build-ups in both these countries through your so-called national press. I should like to ask the Hon. Prime Minister what the attitude of Ceylon's new Government is on the Kashmir problem. What is your attitude towards the incarceration of Sheik Abdullah? I appreciate that you were very nice and kind when you said you were hoping to send the hon. Member for Dambadeniya (Mr. R. G. Senanayake), the Hon. Prime Minister's cousin, to settle this problem for us in Kashmir. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary, when asked a question in the absence of the Prime Minister, who was sick, said that Ceylon's solution to the problem of Kashmir and the problem of Sheik Abdullah would be to send the hon. Member for Dambadeniya on a peace mission, especially to solve these problems. But apart from flippancy, I should like to ask you: Do you really think, on the merits of this problem, that Pakistan has the better case or that India has the better case? Do you

really think that there is a case for a plebiscite, or that the Indian Government have correctly amended their Constitution in such a way as to incorporate Kashmir as part of their territory and thereby to remove the matter from discussion? Do you think the matter is incapable of negotiation or do you think the matter is beyond negotiation?

Do you think it is correct on the part of the Government of India to lock up Sheik Abdulla, to keep him in detention? For what? For the crime of having visited another country.

These are the questions on which we would like to have a clear statement from you. After all, the Kashmir problem became a problem in your time, when you were the Government. I think the first fighting broke out in Kashmir during the time the United National Party was in office.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Was there no problem before?

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මහ.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I am not saying that. I am saying that the problem became acute during that time. It was referred to the United Nations when the United National Party was in office. Of course, Ceylon was not a member of the United Nations then, and I am not blaming you for it. I am not saying that you should have settled it then, but what I am saying is that the problem is a long-standing one and you are acquainted with it. You are not new to it. In the circumstances, what is your attitude to this problem?

We all like India and Pakistan to be friends. But it was your party that once considered President Ayub Khan to be a dictator. It was your party that objected to President Ayub Khan even coming here on a State visit and addressing a meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association on the basis that he

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

was against democratic traditions. There was an objection to President Ayub Khan addressing a Commonwealth Parliamentary Association meeting right here, outside the Chamber. [Interruption]. Ask the Minister of State.

Ask the Minister of State. "What is the meaning of inviting a dictator to come here and give an address?" That was the argument then.

I do ask you in all sincerity, what is your attitude to these problems? When these problems arise the Government is mute and incapable of answer. Is this the progressive non-alignment that we hear so much about?

The next question that I wish to raise relates to the German Democratic Republic. Many statements have been made on the subject in every Budget speech since 1960 onwards. I remember the time we had no relations with the German Democratic Republic, and then we came as far as Consul-General status by 1963.

During the last days of our Coalition Government in 1964, I believe the then Minister of Finance, the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) negotiated an agreement with the German Democratic Republic for aid for approximately Rs. 250 million. That was the amount of aid offered at that time. I believe the agreement was signed by the then Minister of Finance. Thereafter, after this Government came into office. I believe a problem arose. The problem was this. My information may be wrong but I think it is correct. The argument was taken that the agreement had not been ratified by the Government or placed before this House. The House was not sitting at that time.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරව උද්ගි ජෙනෙරායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

This is the first time I hear of it.

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(ති. ආ. ආර්. උයස් පණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Then I am probably wrong and I shall not say anything more about it. But I should like to ask the Hon. Prime Minister whether it is correct that the German Democratic Republic has invited a team of officials or Ministers to visit the German Democratic Republic for the purpose of implementing the agreement, to bring that agreement to a conclusion. I think I am correct in saying that to this day no reply has been sent; and we would like to ask your Government this question. Is it your policy of non-alignment that you are refusing aid especially when you are stuck with problems such as those analysed by the Minister of Finance in his Budget speech?—[Interruption]. In fact, they are also wanting to work it out. They are asking you to send a team to discuss and implement the agreement signed. They are not asking you to simply take the aid; they want to work out the projects for which the aid will be utilized. All we are asking you is, will you take it? Or, does your non-alignment prevent you from accepting it? If you accept it we shall be pleased, because now you are taking aid from one camp. But, so far, what relations—

The Hon. Prime Minister has told us that he thought, having regard to the economic relations between Ceylon and the German Democratic Republic, the size of their Consulate is too big, that according to the nature and size of the trade and commercial relations—

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරව උද්ගි ජෙනෙරායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I gave figures.

விசேஷக் கெடுதலின் பணம், 1965-66

ஓபி. ஈ. டி. டியஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I think it was Mr. Glanville Peiris who reduced the size of the Consulate. My point is this: Here is a country which is prepared to give us Rs. 240 million worth of aid and why do you not send your team and negotiate the details of the agreement? The Hon. Prime Minister says that he has not made any attempt to drop it. I am glad that he is keeping to his original intention of taking aid from all sources. That is perfectly correct, and that is a policy in regard to which we shall give you full support. Only, we should like to see aid utilized for the development of the industrial sector and not, perhaps, to inflate an already inflated particular foreign sector that already exists as the only private sector in this country.

I see the hon. Appointed Member here, and I think I am entitled to make this remark. All I say is this: I do ask the Hon. Prime Minister, if aid is forthcoming from East Germany, please take it, do not refuse to take it for fear of treading on anybody else's corns. That is important if you wish to remain non-aligned.

The last question I would address to the Prime Minister is this: Will the Hon. Prime Minister please give us a short statement—I am only asking this because I do not recall the U.N.P. having made a statement on this subject before—as to what their position is in regard to the problems of Germany, particularly the problems of Berlin? We have not had any statement from you before. Our parties have all made statements on this subject. I cannot recall having found a statement by you in the HANSARD. A statement will be helpful. I should therefore like if the Hon. Prime Minister will make a short statement on that subject.

—காரைக்காலம்

அப்துல் கைர் மாகார்

(ஜனாப் அப்துல் பாக்கீர் மாகார்)

(Mr. Abdul Bakeer Markar)

I wish to take up a few matters that come under Head 14. I do not know whether this is the correct time for me to do so, but I must say that I was a little inquisitive to know whether we were debating the policy on external affairs, for the simple reason that from morning we have been listening to questions relating to Vietnam and other external matters. This is a subject that has been taken up over and over again in this House, so that I was wondering whether we were going to spend all our time at this Committee stage confining ourselves to external affairs that do not concern us. All the same, that is neither here nor there.

I only want to mention one fact. Under this Head there are certain matters to which I would like to draw the attention of the Hon. Prime Minister.

The first matter I wish to bring to his notice is that during the previous regime, the Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Defence and External Affairs, while interpreting certain provisions of the Finance Act, imposed certain restrictions on some of the citizens of this country—

டாக்டர் என். எம். பெரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You cannot raise it now; we have agreed not to take it up now.

இருப்பினும்

(தலைமை தாங்கும் அங்கத்தவர்)

(The Presiding Member)

I believe you can take it up under Head 19.

விசேஷ கமிட்டி பதவி, 1965-66

—கருணா அனந்தம்

[இருவரும் மௌனம்]

But I think we have decided to take it up later. You can take it up under Head 20.

அதிபலர் அவர்கள் அவை.

(ஜனாப அப்துல் பாக்கீர் மார்க்கார்)

(Mr. Abdul Bakeer Markar)

Then I will raise it at that time.

அ. அ. 2.30

வெங்கடேசன் சி. சி. சிவசுப்பிரமணியம்

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்கம்)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the attitude of the Government on external affairs, especially its policy in relation to the present situation in Vietnam, hon. Members who preceded me have put forward very correctly the position of the Opposition. In Vietnam the American imperialists are being condemned as guilty of conducting a barbaric war. On that matter, the Prime Minister, other Ministers and Members of the Government Party have made repeated statements which indicate that they are either grossly misinformed or pathetically ignorant.

I do not think even the Ministers would feel comfortable in agreeing with the sentiments expressed by their own back-bencher, the hon. Member for Beruwala in regard to external affairs. So I am not going to waste my time over the question of the relevance of discussing matters of external policy in this House. We have come to that sorry position where Members of the Government Party are challenging the very sanity of discussing matters in relation to other countries with which we have diplomatic relations, Asian countries with which we have had connexions for thousands of years.

As the main justification for not openly making an unequivocal declaration regarding the aggression in Vietnam, the Government Party have—to confuse the issue—taken two lines of defence. One is, that it is

a communist-inspired conspiracy in Vietnam. The national struggle for liberation is described as a base conspiracy of either world communism or Communism in Vietnam and, probably, of neighbouring China.

Then they slander the people of South Vietnam and the liberation struggle of the people of Vietnam by saying that this is not a struggle of the people of Vietnam but a struggle of the people in South Vietnam against the armed forces of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

I would like to remind the Prime Minister in particular that the struggle for independence in Vietnam, which was formerly known as Indo-China, started long before the Communist Party of Vietnam was formed. The Communist Party of Vietnam was formed in 1930; the Communist Party of China was formed about 1922. The liberation struggle of the Vietnamese people started in the 19th century against the French occupation. There has been a continuous struggle of the Vietnamese people against French occupation of Vietnam.

The next question is, what is the fundamental difference between North Vietnam and South Vietnam? In 1945, after four or five years of struggle by the Vietnamese people against the Japanese occupation—you will remember that when the Japanese troops invaded Indo-China, the French abandoned the Indo-Chinese people to the mercy of the Japanese fascist invaders and completely without fight betrayed the people to the Japanese fascists and during these four years of struggle they were able to liberate a large portion of the country from Japanese occupation. In September or December 1945 the biggest rally after the formation of an independent government of Vietnam was celebrated in Saigon. Saigon had the biggest demonstration of the liberation of the people of entire Vietnam.

விசேஷக் கெடுதல்கள் பற்றி, 1965-66

—காரைக்காலம்

After 1945 the French colonialists with the help of British and American imperialists re-occupied Vietnam, and to the eternal shame of our country between 1945 and 1954 in this colonial war of the French Imperialists backed by Britain and later almost entirely by the Americans, the U.N.P. Government of the time also gave assistance to the French colonialists in suppressing the freedom struggle of Vietnam.

I refer to one main incident. During the time your worthy Colleague Sir John Kotelawala was the Prime Minister, Katunayake airport was allowed to be used by American planes which were transporting bombs, war materials and armies because they were hard pressed in North Vietnam. A few months before the final victory of the troops in North Vietnam, at the great victory of Dien Bien Phu battle, hectic efforts were made to reinforce the demoralized French troops.

செ. ஜே. ஐ. பி. பி. பி.

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

They were not American.

செ. ஜே. ஐ. பி. பி. பி.

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

The American bombers and planes from France were transporting troops to Vietnam.

செ. ஜே. ஐ. பி. பி. பி.

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

French were using American planes. America was not fighting.

செ. ஜே. ஐ. பி. பி. பி.

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

America and Britain were openly interfering and helping. France could

not re-occupy Vietnam nor could the Dutch have re-occupied Indonesia after the last War if it were not for the other imperialist powers. U.S.A. and Britain directly assisted with air transport, sea transport, money and armaments to recapture the liberated Indonesia and the liberated Indo-China.

செ. ஜே. ஐ. பி. பி. பி.

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

Who summoned the Geneva Conference ?

செ. ஜே. ஐ. பி. பி. பி.

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

I will come to it. After nine years of the liberation struggle of the entire Indo-Chinese people, from 1945 to 1954, when the position became completely untenable and the French were to face total defeat, the Geneva Conference was called in 1954. America did not participate but the American representative was authorized to sign the statement to say that they would honour the agreement that had been reached between Soviet Union, Britain, France, China and the other powers which participated in the Geneva Conference in 1954.

செ. ஜே. ஐ. பி. பி. பி.

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

America participated.

செ. ஜே. ஐ. பி. பி. பி.

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

America did not participate.

சுரு. சே. ஸ்ரீ. பீயவரீசன

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

Bedell Smith led the delegation.

வெடுபென் பீ. எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

They did not sign, but they undertook solemnly to honour the agreement. At that conference they drew an artificial demarcation line between North Vietnam and South Vietnam. North Vietnam was to be completely free because all the fighting was concentrated in North Vietnam and they had liberated the entire country. In order to prevent a conflagration of another war the other powers got together and brought about a peaceful settlement whereby the French Government agreed that South Vietnam is not a colonial country and that they had no right to interfere in South Vietnam; that no foreign troops or foreign arms should be brought into South Vietnam; that South Vietnam in 1956 would be free to decide whether they were to form one government with North Vietnam or whether they were to have a separate government. In two years, after a plebiscite, parliamentary elections were to be held and by 1956 a democratic government was to function.

But, from 1954 itself, from the very date of the signing of the Geneva Agreement, America, although they had promised to honour the Geneva Agreement, violated their undertaking and started to interfere, and they appointed this ill-fated Dinh Diem as the Dictator of Vietnam by a military coup.

In 1956 they did not allow democratically conducted elections to take place in South Vietnam. From 1954 to 1959—five years—the Fatherland Front that was formed in South Vietnam openly announced that they had formed that Front to fight for the

democratic rights of the South Vietnamese people, and that they would struggle by peaceful means to achieve this end.

During this period American puppets, with the help of the American imperialists, started a campaign of suppression and terrorizing of the people who were making peaceful demonstrations for the implementation of the Geneva Agreement. In 1960 thousands were poisoned in concentration camps. In 1959 the Liberation Front of South Vietnam was formed, and from that time onwards they openly declared that as there had been so much repression and violence resorted to by American-sponsored dictators, they have no alternative but to resist with any arms available to them.

Then the struggle for the liberation of the country from their own oppressors took the form of a struggle of the peasants in Vietnam, and guerilla warfare developed.

The position since the beginning of this year is fundamentally different to what the position was until the end of 1964 in regard to the problem in Vietnam. Up to 1964 the American imperialists were able to mislead and deceive gullible sections of reactionary parties by saying, "We are not interfering in Vietnam. We are only assisting a friendly government. They are asking our aid and we are giving it. We are not sending arms. We are only sending military experts, technical men to train Vietnamese soldiers, and giving them military advice".

They said it was military assistance they were sending. But now what is the position? Now there are about 150,000 American troops landed in South Vietnam. Hundreds of air-fields for military purposes have been established in Vietnam. There are 11 or 12 big American naval bases along the coast of South Vietnam. Now it is

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

entirely a country occupied by American armed forces, naval and military.

In such a situation the Americans themselves say, "Saigon is a capital without a territory." More than four-fifths of the territory is now liberated, more than three-fourths of the population live in liberated territory. But under the American assisted regime during the last 18 months there have been 12 Governments—12 Prime Ministers—in South Vietnam. That clearly shows the instability of South Vietnam and the utter farce of saying that there is a Government in South Vietnam, legally constituted or any Government at all. That is only too transparent. To say that they are helping the National Government is nothing but a big hoax that the Americans are trying to perpetrate to the world.

අ. සා. 2.45

The Americans organized over a thousand strategic villages—the area that was under the temporary control of the puppet regime in South Vietnam—and transformed them into concentration camps. The populations of the villages were forcibly herded into a military enclosure guarded by the army under the direct supervision of American officers. The entire rural population had to live in concentration camps. But most of these concentration camps have been destroyed by the peasants themselves.

Today, General Westmoreland, one of the chief leaders of the American fighting forces, has declared—and his statement is quoted freely—that the Americans do not depend on the present generation of Vietnamese people. This generation will be brought to submission by destruction. They have said that they depend on the next generation. The present generation will be wiped out. This was an official statement by General Westmoreland.

They are using poison gas. That has been admitted. It has not only been considered immoral but it is also a

crime for any nation to use poison gas on people. Even fascist Germany did not use poison gas in relation to other nations; they only used poison gas to liquidate millions of Jews with—in their own territory. But because of the fear of retaliation they did not use poison gas during the war on other nations. However, the United States forces have used poison gas manufactured in the U. S. A. on the rural population of Vietnam.

They are using splinter bombs which explode about 30 feet above ground and destroy everything in its vicinity. Shrapnel as sharp as razor blades are in these bombs and everything in the vicinity of an explosion gets completely destroyed. They used napalm bombs also. All these weapons have been prohibited in warfare under repeated international agreements by all the nations of the world during the 19th century and during the 20th century. But today all those conventions have been completely flouted by these American barbarians and this barbaric warfare is justified by the Government on the plea that the North Vietnamese Government is sending troops out to South Vietnam. If North Vietnamese armies are coming to South Vietnam it is not difficult to establish that fact, but up to date no proof of it has been forthcoming. Morally, no one can deny the right of the North Vietnam people helping the South Vietnam people.

This line of demarcation was made in 1956 to be eliminated later; it was not a permanent line of demarcation. In 1956 the South Vietnam people were given the right by a common plebiscite either to unite with North Vietnam or to remain as a separate State. But that was denied by American interference. Today, Americans have come eight thousand miles to South Vietnam and have established several naval and air bases, and indulged in genocide there. For the North Vietnamese people to support the South Vietnamese people is their moral and

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[වෛද්‍යවරයා එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ]

patriotic duty. Even then the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam has up to date not violated the Geneva Agreement, which stipulated that in South Vietnam there should be no interference by troops from outside. It is stipulated that foreign troops should have no right to come into South Vietnam. By no stretch of the imagination could one say that North Vietnamese are foreigners in South Vietnam. Even then no armies from North Vietnam have entered South Vietnam to help the people of South Vietnam. It is a slander on the people of South Vietnam to say that North Vietnam armies have come to the assistance of South Vietnam, because the South Vietnam people themselves have shown remarkable courage both in relation to armed resistance and in fighting American aggression.

When we consider that the whole population of South Vietnam is only about fourteen million and that the biggest military power in the world is now having a large section of its naval fleet centred around South Vietnam, the resistance of the people of South Vietnam is something that will go down to history. It is a great inspiration for people of Asia to realize that foreign powers, specially Western powers, have no future in Asia and Africa if they attempt to re-conquer these territories and to re-establish colonialism.

I would also wish to associate myself with the other hon. Members who preceded me in requesting the Hon. Prime Minister to make a clear statement condemning the American imperialists who by their present war of aggression in South Vietnam are endangering not only the freedom of the people of South Vietnam but also endangering the peace of the world, because there has been talk in the Pentagon that they will use nuclear weapons. This small people of South Vietnam have, by their resistance, created a situation in America itself in that thousands of mothers are openly demonstrating

in the United States against the recruitment of their sons for a war in a country in which they have no desire to fight. The position in every University in America is, they have openly demonstrated, that a movement called the "Teach-in" movement has been started in all Universities in the United States of America. Thousands of students have marched to Washington to demonstrate against the policy of the American Government in Vietnam. But our Government, claiming to be leaders among Buddhists, have not had the courage up to date to condemn aggression in Vietnam. Personally, I think, it is the unprincipled approach to these imperialist powers devoid of self-respect, devoid of national honour, devoid of conscience, with the hope of getting some money from the American imperialists with the hope that they may not have to ask aid from socialist countries, that they had encouraged American imperialism directly helped by several of the SEATO powers to perpetrate one of the worst crimes in the history of warfare. The Government is doing this merely because they are trying to salvage the decaying semi-feudal, capitalist economy in this country.

There is one other matter with regard to the German Democratic Republic. The hon. Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike) referred to this matter. I want to mention only this fact. The Prime Minister cannot be ignorant of the fact that not only did the German Democratic Republic offer Rs. 250 million loan on very favourable terms to Ceylon for the development of the chemical and textile industries, but also for the first time, they produced a comprehensive, integrated report on the textile industry, which incorporated the existing handlooms and all the other textile centres in this country both private and public. It was a scheme for self-sufficiency in textile before 1970 by developing the State sector both for cotton and nylon fabric.

விசேஷக் கெபிபென் பதன, 1965-66

--காரக கலவி

With regard to the chemical industry, this matter will be discussed in detail when the Votes of the Minister of Industries come up. I want to refer to his responsibility. They have produced a very comprehensive report on the chemicals industry as well. In the first stage they had plans to utilize the existing raw materials in Ceylon and to integrate the Paranthan Chemicals plant which was installed by the United National Party when it was in power from 1948-56.

ஃப். ஃர். டியஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Mr. Ponnambalam's white elephant.

வேலையாபீஸ் ஃப். ஃர். விக்கிரமசிங்ஹ

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

They have made far-reaching proposals to make it a part of an integrated chemical industry, so that Paranthan Chemicals, instead of being a white elephant and made to run at a loss, could be developed for the economic benefit of this country. I think, the Prime Minister cannot ignore the comprehensive report they have produced because his Permanent Secretary was the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Industries and he handled this report. We must show our appreciation and gratitude to the German Democratic Republic for letting us have the know-how for chemical industries which is considered important for any country to be modern and developed. Chemical industries play the leading role in a country's industrial and economic development, in improving the standard of living. With regard to the grossly neglected industrial development they prepared a scheme to develop the chemical industry with all the available raw material. They also agreed when the oil refinery is established to utilize the by-products of the oil refinery for other chemical industries. For all this, the

only gratitude shown by the Hon. Minister was to discover a convention signed in Vienna in the mid-twenties giving Government the right to interfere with the composition of consulates within its territory, and to tell them that they had too many on their staff. This was a Government which helped us by preparing two of the most outstanding reports on the industrial development of this country, and they were told to send away three of their diplomatic personnel within a week. Sir, that is the gratitude shown by this Government in appreciation of the work done by them for us.

ஃ. ஹ. 3

இலாசனாரூப மெந்திரி

(தலைமை தாங்கும் அங்கத்தவர்)

(The Presiding Member)

Order, please! The hon. Member can deal with that question when the votes of the Ministry of Industries are being discussed.

வேலையாபீஸ் ஃப். ஃர். விக்கிரமசிங்ஹ

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

I am not going into the merits of industrial development.

இலாசனாரூப மெந்திரி

(தலைமை தாங்கும் அங்கத்தவர்)

(The Presiding Member)

You are going into details.

வேலையாபீஸ் ஃப். ஃர். விக்கிரமசிங்ஹ

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

I was only referring to the removal of personnel from the consulate. The removal of the personnel of the consulate is a sin of commission by the Prime Minister. How can I talk about it under the votes of the Ministry of Industries?

டூடலி சேனானாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனானாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

The longer he speaks, the better it is for me.

விசேஷ கௌரவ உறுப்பினர், 1965-66

—கூடுதல் உறுப்பினர்

வேலுநாதர் சி. ஏ. வி. வி. வி. வி. வி.

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்க)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

I would like him to apply his mind to this matter. I know, Sir, that if one is unprincipled and is a slave to foreign imperialism one can only answer back by appearing to be "holier than thou". I pointedly asked them to let us know whether they unequivocally condemn American aggression and demand the withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam. [Interruption]. Even that I do not mind. I do not mind their getting this blood-money if they say that the American troops must be withdrawn immediately from South Vietnam. The position is that the American aggressor must withdraw from Vietnam.

வேலுநாதர் சி. ஏ. வி. வி. வி. வி. வி.
(அதிபலாங்கொடை)

(வைத்திய கலாநிதி எம். எச். சந்தாசேன
—அம்பலாங்கொடை)

(Dr. M. H. Saddhasena—Ambalangoda)

Sir, as a newcomer with no knowledge of foreign affairs, I am much aggrieved to see that America has become the butt of criticism of the hon. Members of the Opposition. They are very much worried about America.

I would like to ask these hon. Members whether any one of them raised his voice in this House when the Tibetans were massacred. And when India was attacked by China, were they concerned about it? What did they do? Russian imperialism is good enough; but American help is bad for the Russian commanders and Soviet ambassadors here. Ceylon is a neutral country, and we follow that policy of non-alignment. We are not aligning with either Russia or America, but we will stand by our neutral policy.

அரு. வி. வி. வி. வி. வி.

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Mr. Chairman, many questions have been asked on this occasion from me by hon. Members and I

choose to start with the hon. Member for Akuressa (Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe). It is not that I want to leave out the others but I will deal with those questions in due time.

To my mind the greatest stooge of a foreign power has the audacity to level a charge against those of us over here. In the course of his remarks on the Vietnam question the hon. Member for Akuressa (Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe), had occasion to say that our attitude was entirely coloured by financial considerations. I want to know from him whether in his whole life he has ever differed from the actions of a certain camp. Are we to presume that that camp has always been infallible, and having never differed, as I said earlier, he has the audacity to call us stooges. He had better look elsewhere to find a stooge. There is no mirror in this Assembly.

Mr. Chairman, he was talking about imperialist wars and wars of liberation. These wars are getting confused, Mr. Chairman. Sometimes there are wars within wars. Sometimes you find wars of liberation going on alongside wars for other purposes.

I will take the hon. Member's mind back to the time when he and I were in a war of liberation together in the Ceylon National Congress during the last war.

வேலுநாதர் சி. ஏ. வி. வி. வி. வி. வி.

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்க)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

You were in the Left movement. When my party joined the National Congress your father walked out.

அரு. வி. வி. வி. வி. வி.

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

My father was always right and I was a fool to believe you.

I remember at that time we were a subject country. The hon. Member joined us in the war of liberation. My father well knew his intent. The moment he joined us my father left

விசேஷ கமிட்டி உண்மை, 1965-66

—காரைக்காலம்

the Congress and both of us were instrumental in sending my father out because he rightly gauged the liberator-objectives of the hon. Member for Akuressa (Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe). He was there intent on waging war within a war. I remember the time during the last war—the hon. Member must take his mind back. At first it was an imperialist war.

செ. இராஜகோபால்

(கேள்வியை அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)
(An hon. Member)

He was in jail.

செ. இராஜகோபால்

(கேள்வியை டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

No, he was not in jail. I remember the L. S. S. P. leaders were gaoled. My colleague, Mr. Dahana-yake, was also gaoled. But we, rightly or wrongly, believed what he said, that it was an imperialist war, and we were trying to get these people out of jail. But he was going round preventing that.

வெ. இராஜகோபால் உள். சி. இராஜகோபால்

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்க)
(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

False, Sir.

செ. இராஜகோபால்

(கேள்வியை டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

It is not false.

வெ. இராஜகோபால் உள். சி. இராஜகோபால்

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்க)
(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

I challenge it. It is a deliberate low falsehood.

செ. இராஜகோபால்

(கேள்வியை டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

It is not a low falsehood. It is the truth. The hon. Member was canvassing downstairs against it when this resolution was being debated in the State Council.

வெ. இராஜகோபால் உள். சி. இராஜகோபால்

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்க)
(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)
Absolutely false.

செ. இராஜகோபால்

(கேள்வியை டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)
You opposed it.

வெ. இராஜகோபால் உள். சி. இராஜகோபால்

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்க)
(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)
Will you prove it?

செ. இராஜகோபால்

(கேள்வியை ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)
Yes. Will you resign if we prove it?

வெ. இராஜகோபால் உள். சி. இராஜகோபால்

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்க)
(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)
It is completely false.

செ. இராஜகோபால்

(கேள்வியை ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)
I moved the Resolution.

வெ. இராஜகோபால் உள். சி. இராஜகோபால்

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்க)
(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)
There was no Resolution. You cannot prove it. Produce it.

செ. இராஜகோபால்

(கேள்வியை ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)
I cannot do it now.

வெ. இராஜகோபால் உள். சி. இராஜகோபால்

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்க)
(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)
He has no right to say it unless he can show the document.

பிப்ரவரி 1965-66

—காரைக்காலம்

சுருதிபதி பேரவை

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

All I am saying is that when there was a Motion in the State Council brought up by Mr. Susantha de Fonseka, the then Member for Panadura, that these people be released, the hon. Member for Akuressa was canvassing against that Motion.

சுருதிபதி பேரவை

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

Deliberate falsehood. Deliberate liar, you are!

சுருதிபதி பேரவை

(தலைமை தாங்கும் அங்கத்தவர்)

(The Presiding Member)

Please withdraw that.

சுருதிபதி பேரவை

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

I have a right to call him a liar. He cannot prove it.

சுருதிபதி பேரவை

(தலைமை தாங்கும் அங்கத்தவர்)

(The Presiding Member)

The hon. Member for Akuressa, please withdraw the word "liar".

சுருதிபதி பேரவை

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

Deliberate liar!

சுருதிபதி பேரவை

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

In the Congress you voted against the resolution at the Broadway Theatre, Matara.

சுருதிபதி பேரவை

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

You are the second liar.

சுருதிபதி பேரவை

(தலைமை தாங்கும் அங்கத்தவர்)

(The Presiding Member)

Order! Order! Will the hon. Member withdraw the word "liar"?

சுருதிபதி பேரவை

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

Absolute lies.

சுருதிபதி பேரவை

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I do not know about that, but I know what you were doing downstairs here.

சுருதிபதி பேரவை

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

I saved you from the crowd. Do you remember that day?

சுருதிபதி பேரவை

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I remember that day at Weligama when you had to be saved by me from the crowd.

சுருதிபதி பேரவை

(தலைமை தாங்கும் அங்கத்தவர்)

(The Presiding Member)

Order! Order! Will the hon. Member for Akuressa please withdraw the word "liar"?

சுருதிபதி பேரவை

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

He cannot make slanderous statements.

சுருதிபதி பேரவை

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

You have used unparliamentary

words.

செ. ஜே. டி. பி. பி. பி.

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

Were you for their release?

வேலுநாலை பி. பி. பி. பி.

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

Absolutely. One hundred per cent. You had declared my party illegal at the time.

செ. ஜே. டி. பி. பி. பி.

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Not at all.

இலாசனாரூப மந்திரி

(தலைமை தாங்கும் அங்கத்தவர்)

(The Presiding Member)

Order, please!

வேலுநாலை பி. பி. பி. பி.

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

You never removed the illegality. We were agitating for both the parties to be made legal.

இலாசனாரூப மந்திரி

(தலைமை தாங்கும் அங்கத்தவர்)

(The Presiding Member)

[rising in his place].

Order, please! The hon. Member for Akuressa must withdraw the word "liar". I want decency and decorum in this House.

வேலுநாலை பி. பி. பி. பி.

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

It is a deliberate untruth.

இலாசனாரூப மந்திரி

(தலைமை தாங்கும் அங்கத்தவர்)

(The Presiding Member)

You must first withdraw the word "liar". Then you can use the other.

வேலுநாலை பி. பி. பி. பி.

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

I withdraw all the unparliamentary words. But it is a deliberate untruth uttered to mislead the House.

செ. ஜே. டி. பி. பி. பி.

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

He may shout this as much as he likes. He may say it a hundred times.

வேலுநாலை பி. பி. பி. பி.

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

You may say it a thousand and one times.

செ. ஜே. டி. பி. பி. பி.

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I know your whole history. At first it was an imperialist war, and these people and we who were all in it, called it an imperialist war. But immediately Russia was attacked, they called it the People's War; The imperialist war became the People's War! The antagonism was against the people who were obstructing the People's War. They had to be kept in jail because they were obstructing the People's War. They asked all the workers to tap more rubber because it was the People's War. At first it was an imperialist war.

வேலுநாலை பி. பி. பி. பி.

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

You jailed me too for one year.

செ. ஜே. டி. பி. பி. பி.

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

He was jailed earlier.

வேலுநாலை பி. பி. பி. பி.

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

During the People's War you sent me to jail for one year and imposed a Rs. 3,000 fine.

செ. ஜே. டி. பி. பி. பி.

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

For publishing a libel.

பிசுப்சன கெபிபிபன் பனா, 1965-66

—காரக கலாவி

சுரு வபிபி சேநானாயக

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனானாயக்க)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)
I sent you to jail?

சுரு சே. ஈர். பீயவர்தன

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஈர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)
The courts.

வேலுமலார்சு பீ. பீ. விசுவசிங்

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)
(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

Under your Government. The law was made by your Government.

சுரு வபிபி சேநானாயக

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனானாயக்க)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

There was no government of mine during the last war.

வேலுமலார்சு பீ. பீ. விசுவசிங்

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)
(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)
I am sorry, your father's.

சுரு வபிபி சேநானாயக

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனானாயக்க)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)
Those were State Council days.

இலாசகாரக மன்றத்

(தலைமை தாங்கும் அங்கத்தவர்)
(The Presiding Member)
Shall we carry on?

சுரு வபிபி சேநானாயக

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனானாயக்க)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I was just telling him that these wars change their complexion according to the angle from which you look at them ; sometimes, it is an imperialist war, sometimes it is a war of liberation. It may be an imperialist war and a war of liberation going on at the same time, just as hon. Members discovered during the course of

the World War, how suddenly an imperialist war became a People's War. Many things can happen in the course of a war. That is what I want to impress on hon. Members. I have stated this on previous occasions on the Floor of this House. This time he had, shall I say, the courage to get up and deny. It went unquestioned on previous occasions.

வேலுமலார்சு பீ. பீ. விசுவசிங்

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)
(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)
You show it?

ஈ. ஈ. 3.15

சுரு வபிபி சேநானாயக

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனானாயக்க)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)
I will show it.

Mr. Chairman, I said I would deal with the hon. Member first because I know his politics through and through. There is not an aspect of it which I do not know. I have known it for the last thirty years.

Coming to the other hon. Members from the Opposition who spoke on this Head, I will first deal with the other question beside the Vietnam question which was the main one.

Firstly, there was the question as regards the Maritime Agreement with China. I would like to tell the hon. Member, as I have stated before, that I personally do not see the need for such a pact at all. As I stated on the previous occasion, when the question was asked why I did not tear it up at once, I would repeat that that is not the manner in which a responsible Government should behave. I may have a certain opinion but before I act I must get the views of those who are responsible for advising me as regards certain aspects of the pact. One was a legal aspect, and there were other aspects. The Principal Collector of Customs, of course, has said that he was never consulted and that in his view an agreement of that nature was not at all necessary because the ports can be used without such an agreement.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

The matter had to be referred to the Attorney-General too to get legal opinion about the agreement. I grant, it seems to have taken a long time. I am sorry to say that I have not had the opinion of the Attorney-General yet.

කෙනමන් මයා.

(තිரு. කෙනමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

On the last occasion you stated that you were going to discuss this matter with China.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උද්ග්‍රී ජේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I have to get these views before I can have discussions.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාතිථි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Six months is a long time.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උද්ග්‍රී ජේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I grant that hon. Members will agree that we have not been idle in other directions during this time—*[Interruption]*. I do not know the cause for the amusement. Perhaps, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has some other interpretation of my activities in other directions.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the Maritime Agreement, therefore, I still stand by what I said on the previous occasion and intend to act in the manner I indicated.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(තිරු. ආර්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

So if you are not satisfied with the agreement will you give notice?

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උද්ග්‍රී ජේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Oh, yes! Certainly.

An hon. Member raised a question about Mr. Robert Gunawardena being sent to China. As regards that matter I do not know whether it is

proper for me to divulge the facts to the House before the Queen has been informed.

කෙනමන් මයා.

(තිරු. කෙනමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

You would not like to contradict the newspaper story?

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උද්ග්‍රී ජේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Why should I?

කෙනමන් මයා.

(තිරු. කෙනමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Because if it is not correct you can definitely say so.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උද්ග්‍රී ජේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I do not say it is not correct.

ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා. (දඹදෙනිය)

(තිරු. ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක—දඹදෙනිය)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake—Dambadeniya)

You are worried that the Queen may not accept him?

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උද්ග්‍රී ජේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I am not worried that the Queen may not accept him. Had I chosen you, that may have happened. I am only thinking of the normal procedure, namely, that the first person who should be informed is the Queen where a diplomatic appointment is concerned.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාතිථි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

What we wanted to know was whether you recommended it.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

We recommended Mr. D. B. R. Gunawardena's appointment. That is all I have got to say.

In regard to the Afro-Asian Conference, as hon. Members are aware, we sent our representatives to it on the last occasion and they had unfortunately to come back. I do not know what happened—whether it was a war of liberation or not. Something happened and the conference did not take place. Now it is intended to hold this conference on the 5th of November. It was postponed for the 5th of November. The Foreign Ministers' conference is on the 28th of October. The position is not quite clear as yet.

කෙනමත් මයා.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Can you tell us anything more definite?

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I am unable to say anything more.

Then, as regards Vietnam, the hon. Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike) drew a very interesting picture of what is happening there. He told us how it all started and how the present situation has been reached. One would have thought, listening to him, that we were the Government right through that period. As I said earlier, there was a Resolution before this House. It was an Amendment to the Throne Speech—

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

On which we acted.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Let me tell you how you acted. When we were discussing a Throne Speech of the Government, an

Amendment was moved by my party, to which a further Amendment was added by the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central. We supported that Amendment. But what did the S. L. F. P. Government do about it?

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

We accepted it.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

You did not. You declined to vote.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I said that we declined to vote.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

That is not accepting an Amendment.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Of course, it was. I explained that.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

That was adopting an attitude of non-alignment on the Motion. Whatever it was, I well remember that not one of the Government Members voted for that Amendment.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

And I said so.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

You said so, but what was your excuse? Your excuse was that it would have been discourtesy to the

விவரணை கெடுப்பதன் பதன, 1965-66

—காரக கலாவி

Governor-General. Utter rubbish! How can it be discourtesy to the Governor-General if you accept an Amendment proposed by the Opposition if you agree with it? You know very well that a Throne Speech is really your speech. So, you were afraid of being discourteous to yourselves, not to the Governor-General. If you felt so strongly on this question of Vietnam, as you tried to make out today, I cannot understand your behaviour on that occasion. You should have readily accepted the Amendment moved by the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central, which was itself an Amendment to our Amendment. Then it would have been the unanimous wish of the House. But the majority of Members in the House declined to vote on it. That is the fact.

கெனமன் மொ.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

The Amendment was passed.

செரு டிபிளி சேனாயக்க

(கெளரவ டட்ளி சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

So far as I am concerned and so far as my Government is concerned, we are of the same view.

ஃப். ஃர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க மொ.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Why are you condemning North Vietnam?

செரு டிபிளி சேனாயக்க

(கெளரவ டட்ளி சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Let me come to that. You can speak after me.

As I stated on an earlier occasion—the Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike) referred to the speech I made on that occasion—we are against all aggressors who have nothing to do with South Vietnam.

As I stated earlier, we are against aggression by physical pressure or by other indirect means.

We are for a settlement. So far as I can gather from the speech of the hon. Member for Akuressa (Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe), he is not for a settlement. He says, "If they try to settle now, it is because America is in a difficulty."

வேலையாட்சி உள். ஃ. வினாமசிங்ஹ

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

If the Americans withdraw, then there is the way for a settlement.

செரு டிபிளி சேனாயக்க

(கெளரவ டட்ளி சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

You are not for a discussion for a settlement.

கெனமன் மொ.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

First of all, let the Americans pull out.

செரு டிபிளி சேனாயக்க

(கெளரவ டட்ளி சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

As far as this Government is concerned, we have more than once indicated—[Interruption.]

கெனமன் மொ.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Sir, when there is a strike on, hon. Members on the other side always say, 'Call off the strike first. After that we will have discussions.' It is the same principle here. The South Vietnamese say, "Call off the bombings, take the troops away. Then we can discuss." That is very reasonable.

செரு டிபிளி சேனாயக்க

(கெளரவ டட்ளி சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

As far as we are concerned, we have not condoned the action of any country in this matter. Certainly, we have not.

பிப்ரவரி மாதம், 1965-66

—காரைக்காலம்

வேலுநாட்டிய சி. ஏ. வி. வி. வி. வி.

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்கம்)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

There is only one country.

கேனமன் மை.

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Specifically, what is your attitude to the American bombings?

டாக்டர் சி. ஏ. வி. வி. வி.

(கேனமன் டாக்டர் சி. ஏ. வி. வி. வி.)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I think it is most unfortunate. I think it militates against a settlement of this question.

வேலுநாட்டிய சி. ஏ. வி. வி. வி.

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்கம்)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

Unfortunate, not monstrous?

டாக்டர் சி. ஏ. வி. வி. வி.

(கேனமன் டாக்டர் சி. ஏ. வி. வி. வி.)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

It depends on the angle from which you look at these things. The Member for Akuressa told us that the Americans were using all sorts of bombs, napalm and so on, as if wars are fought on the Queensbury rules of boxing. Once a war is started, there is no limit to the weapons that are used, ordinary bombs or napalm bombs. When a war starts they do not don boxing gloves and fight according to the Queensbury rules.

I do not think that some of the nations that the hon. Member for Akuressa follows have been very particular about—

வேலுநாட்டிய சி. ஏ. வி. வி. வி.

(டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்கம்)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

What are you referring to?

டாக்டர் சி. ஏ. வி. வி. வி.

(கேனமன் டாக்டர் சி. ஏ. வி. வி. வி.)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I am referring to things you know or at least ought to know. I am referring to certain incidents that happened in certain countries in

Europe and about which you ought to know very well. They did not do things according to the Queensbury rules.

As far as this matter is concerned, we have not condoned the action of the aggressors. We are for the strict observance of the Geneva Agreement of 1954. That has been our position and that will be our position always.

We are not afraid of differing from any other country, and as I challenged him earlier, I ask the hon. Member for Akuressa to show me one instance where he differed from a particular camp during the last thirty years. Then it will be evident who are the blind stooges. He will forgive me for speaking like this but he flung that accusation at us when he was speaking. If you are prepared to do that, you must also be prepared to take it back, and every word I utter here is absolutely true.

Mr. Chairman, I think those were the main questions addressed to me.

சி. ஏ. வி. வி. வி. வி. வி. வி. வி.

(திரு. எம். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Kashmir.

கேனமன் மை.

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

What are the instructions that you have given Mr. Ponnambalam when this matter is raised at the General Assembly of the United Nations?

சி. ஏ. வி. வி. வி. வி. வி. வி. வி.

டாக்டர் சி. ஏ. வி. வி. வி.

(கேனமன் டாக்டர் சி. ஏ. வி. வி. வி.)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

It is only customary when a deputation leaves to give them instructions on matters that are on the agenda. Vietnam is not on the agenda.

கேனமன் மை.

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

If it is taken up?

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උද්ග්‍රී ජේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

If it is taken up, he will wire for instructions.

කෙනමත් මය.

(තිරු. කෙනමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Do you not anticipate it?

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උද්ග්‍රී ජේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

What is the use of anticipating it?
It is not on the agenda.

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.

(තිරු. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

It is before the Political Committee; may be, it is not before the General Assembly.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උද්ග්‍රී ජේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

According to the information I have—I just checked up during the lunch interval—I was told that it was not on the agenda.

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.

(තිරු. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Is it on the agenda of the Political Committee?

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උද්ග්‍රී ජේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I could not say that. However, now that the hon. Member for Dompe has asked us about Kashmir, this question is a very old one.—[Interruption.]—I do not know what the connection is between Mr. R. G. Senanayake and Kashmir.

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.

(තිරු. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

You wanted to send him on a special mission to settle it.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උද්ග්‍රී ජේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

The hon. Member for Dompe knows very well how old this question is.

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.

(තිරු. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Who are the aggressors now?

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උද්ග්‍රී ජේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Quite frankly, I cannot tell you who are the aggressors now.

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.

(තිරු. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Have you tried to find out?

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උද්ග්‍රී ජේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Well, we are trying to find out. Perhaps, the hon. Member for Dompe will enlighten me, because the Pakistanis say that they have nothing to do with it, and the Indians say that Pakistanis are sending troops across.

කෙනමත් මය.

(තිරු. කෙනමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Probably nothing is happening there after all!

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උද්ග්‍රී ජේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

It is not sufficient for me to blindly brand a nation as an aggressor. Of course, hon. Members are willing to brand any nation at the slightest provocation.

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.

(තිරු. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Certainly not.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරව උද්ගිරි ජේත්‍රනායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Probably, those who are in the know, the hon. Member for Dompe or those across here, will be able to enlighten me as to who are the aggressors in the recent incidents in Kashmir.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(තිரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

We do not have ambassadors there. You have.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරව උද්ගිරි ජේත්‍රනායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I have no ambassador in Kashmir.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(තිரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Not in Kashmir. In Pakistan and India—the two countries concerned.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරව උද්ගිරි ජේත්‍රනායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

But the matter is taking place in Kashmir.

I think those are the main questions that have been raised, and I think I have dealt with them sufficiently.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(තිரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Mr. Chairman, with your permission I want to raise just one matter which arose out of the Prime Minister's reply. Regarding the facts about Vietnam we are very grateful to him for his statement and to know that he proposes to adhere to it. Of course, his attitude seems to be: if no question is raised by anybody else I will also keep quiet. And he hopes that in the U. N. no one will be so indelicate as to raise this question and that Vietnam will not be touched.

I would like to ask the Hon. Prime Minister this. He said that I made an interesting statement of the facts in regard to the history of this matter. I would like to ask him whether he accepts the facts as stated by me, namely, that no North Vietnamese are actually fighting in South Vietnam, that the war is really a war between the people of South Vietnam and the Government of South Vietnam backed by American force, and that at most, if there is anything in the nature of any interference by North Vietnamese, it amounts to gun running across the border of North Vietnam into South Vietnam, which may be happening, we do not know. But, if it does, it certainly is not a matter which can be described in any sense as being a war between two sides. It is a question of patrolling the borders and the government looking after itself and preventing the smuggling of arms or weapons across the border.

On the other hand, does he agree with what I stated, namely, that this is really in the nature of a civil war, of a people's fight against a government imposed from above, supported by American arms and weapons and that the only foreign forces in South Vietnam are the Americans? If that is his position, if he accepts those facts, then certainly, his explanation speaks for itself and we in this House are quite content with the assurance the Hon. Prime Minister has given.

ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා.

(තිரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனநாயக்க)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

ශ්‍රී සභාපතිතුමනි, අගමැතිතුමාගේ වැය ශීර්ෂය සාකච්ඡා කරන මේ අවස්ථාවේදී ද්‍රවිඩ සම්මේලනයේ—

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරව උද්ගිරි ජේත්‍රනායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

He has come here at the wrong time and raised the wrong thing at the wrong place.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා.

(තිரு. ඥා. ජී. සේනානායක)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

මෙය විදේශ කටයුතු අංශයට අයත් කාරණයක්. ඒ නිසයි, මා ඒ ප්‍රශ්නය මතු කරන්න අදහස් කරන්නේ.

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උද්ග්‍රී සේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Mr. Chairman, as we decided, those matters have to be raised under the appropriate Heads. He was not here when we discussed and decided on procedure.

ලේස්ලි ගුණවර්ධන මයා.

(තිரு. ලෙස්ලි ගුණවර්ධන)

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

Before I raise this matter and the Hon. Prime Minister replies to it, I must first of all express my regret for not having been here to ask this question in the morning.

මූලාසනාධිකාරී මන්ත්‍රී

(තலைமை தாங்கும் அங்கத்தவர்)

(The Presiding Member)

He has already replied.

ලේස්ලි ගුණවර්ධන මයා.

(තිරු. ලෙස්ලි ගුණවර්ධන)

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

I wish to express my regret that I was not present here in the morning to ask this question. The explanation I wish to give is this. I am sorry the Hon. Speaker himself is not here. The atmosphere here is very uncongenial for people who wear the banian and cloth as I do. I find it far too cool, so that when we sweat outside and come inside we get a chill. I think it will be much more convenient if we adopt this procedure—

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උද්ග්‍රී සේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Does this come under this Vote?

ලේස්ලි ගුණවර්ධන මයා.

(තිරු. ලෙස්ලි ගුණවර්ධන)

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

I am only pointing out the reason why I was not here.

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උද්ග්‍රී සේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

We have passed the House of Representatives' Vote.

ලේස්ලි ගුණවර්ධන මයා.

(තිරු. ලෙස්ලි ගුණවර්ධන)

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

If the Hon. Prime Minister will show the same patience towards me as he is reputed to show towards the public, he will understand it. All I am trying to do is to give an explanation for the added inconvenience caused to the Prime Minister and to this Committee by my inability to raise this point in the morning. I find this temperature too uncomfortable.

ශ්‍රී ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන

(කෙළරාව ඥා. ඥා. ජයවර්ධන)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

Come over to this side.

ලේස්ලි ගුණවර්ධන මයා.

(තිරු. ලෙස්ලි ගුණවර්ධන)

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

Do you think it is better or warmer on that side?

The point I wish him to explain is one thing which I find it difficult to understand, namely the Prime Minister's relations with Vietnam. During this discussion as well as on earlier occasions he has said in this House that he also stands for the policy of non-alignment which has been pursued in the past by the previous Government. But I must confess that from the replies that he gives to so many questions and accusations from this side, I find it difficult to accept that explanation. In fact, when a charge is made that he is an American

தமிழ்நாடு மன்றம், 1965-66

—காரைக்காலம்

[சென்னை மன்றம்]

stooge and he gets up and says, "But you are a Russian stooge", it is not a reply to the accusation. I have the distinct feeling, the impression, created not merely by the declarations but by the actions of this Government that far from following a policy of non-alignment, it pursues a policy which is one—I will not say of completely stooging for America—that definitely has a strong bias towards, and heavily leans on, America.

சென்னை மன்றம்

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Why do you say that?

சென்னை மன்றம்

(திரு. லெஸ்லி குணவர்தன)

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

First of all, for example, even in the very definition of non-alignment which was made in the Throne Speech, I found that there was apparently a misconception as to what is meant by non-alignment, because, as you will recollect, the position taken up by the present Government in the Throne Speech is that it follows the principles of non-alignment laid down at Bandung. As far as I am aware—if I am wrong I would like to be corrected—no principles of non-alignment were laid down in Bandung.

சென்னை மன்றம்

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

Even before that.

சென்னை மன்றம்

(திரு. லெஸ்லி குணவர்தன)

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

I am referring to the Throne Speech.

China participated in that conference at Bandung. China is definitely aligned with one side. So there is

no question of the Bandung Conference having taken a non-aligned position. Anyway, after a Government comes into power, what is more important is not its theoretical positions but its practical actions. After this Government came into power, there certainly seem to me to be two attitudes on the question of Vietnam in which the actions of this Government have rather tended to side the United States.

Firstly, I refer to the very declaration made by the Hon. Prime Minister immediately following the radio broadcast by President Johnson in which he called for discussions to settle the Vietnam question. The Hon. Prime Minister himself post-haste issued a statement approving of that and saying, "Yes, we would like discussions held as soon as possible". It seems to me that that statement was a little hasty because the problem is not so simple as that. I think even today the North Vietnam Government is ready for discussions with South Vietnam under certain conditions. The hon. Member for Akuressa (Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe) is supposed to have stated—I was not here—that the position of the North Vietnam Government is: you must first withdraw, then we will discuss. I do not think the North Vietnam Government is taking such a position. I am sure they are prepared to discuss withdrawal provided the principle is agreed upon. So merely asking for a discussion, as the Hon. Prime Minister did on that occasion, immediately following a public declaration by the President of the U. S., obviously made in a situation where he was finding the going not too good in Vietnam, certainly helped American policy at that time.

The second example is the behaviour of the Hon. Prime Minister's representative at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference in London where the British Prime Minister put forward the suggestion of a Commonwealth peace mission to try to bring about a settlement of the

விவரம் கெட்டுப் போன பணம், 1965-66

—காரைக்கால்

Vietnam conflict. Our representative, the Hon. Prime Minister's representative, was the first to get up and support that proposal. In fact, in a statement published in the Government or pro-Government press of this country, he is reported to have said that if he did not get up and support that proposal, it would have fallen through. In other words, the representative of the Hon. Prime Minister at that Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference was the strongest supporter of the Wilson proposal. You and I know that that proposal has fallen through apparently because it was one that would have helped one side as against the other.

In both these matters the alacrity with which either the Hon. Prime Minister his representative, the Hon. Minister of Justice, acted or took a step or made a declaration which was in line with a proposal made by the United States or a friendly country or an agency of the United States naturally raises the suspicion in our minds that the concept of non-alignment of this Government differs in certain respects from the concept of non-alignment of the previous Government. I would therefore ask for a clarification of this matter. In politics it is all right to have differences, but it is important that we should clarify this matter and find out where we stand. Either there is a difference or there is no difference. If there is a difference, to what extent is there a difference? It is better always to have a clarification not only for the benefit of this House but also for the benefit of the country at large.

It seems to me that this question of non-alignment has two very important ingredients. One is that we do not take the side of either the one or the other of the major military and political camps in the world.

அ. சே. ஐ. பி. பி. பி.

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

What do you do?

அ. சே. 3.45

சே. சே. சே. சே.

(திரு. லெஸ்லி குணவர்தன)

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

We do not take any side. Non-alignment means—

அ. சே. ஐ. பி. பி. பி.

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

Are you non-aligned?

சே. சே. சே. சே.

(திரு. லெஸ்லி குணவர்தன)

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

Yes. I stand by the policy of non-alignment and I believe that the previous Government also stood for the policy of non-alignment. What I am trying to find out is whether the present Government's assertion that it also stands for a policy of non-alignment actually is or is not an unfortunate misunderstanding. That is what I am trying to find out.

It seems to me that the policy of non-alignment, as it has evolved, has several important ingredients. The first and most important ingredient appears to me to be that we do not take the side of one military or political camp or the other. Everyone knows that the world is divided into two camps, hostile, rival, military and political camps. The second ingredient seems to be this. the non-aligned countries must do their best to bring about a settlement, to narrow the gap, between the two hostile camps. Active support for every proposal for disarmament and for improving international relations is something which would help bridge that gap.

There is also a third ingredient—a very important ingredient—that has arisen among these non-aligned countries, largely, I suppose, due to the fact that the vast majority of them are countries that have very recently emerged from colonial status. This third ingredient is the wish to see the end of colonialism in this world, and being prepared to give support to colonial peoples who

[ලෙස්^ඒලි ගුණවර්ධන මයා.]

are struggling for their independence. This does not mean that non-aligned countries are in a position to supply arms or go to war on the question of the liberation of colonial countries, but it means that within reason, wherever possible, by the position non-aligned countries take before the world on such questions, they give help, if not by deed at least by word, to countries that are struggling for their independence.

Now, I do want to know whether the present Government agrees that those three important ingredients are included in its conception of non-alignment as it has evolved today, not as evolved after Bandung.

I am asking this question because of these two specific events: firstly, the Prime Minister's reaction immediately to President Johnson's appeal for an immediate discussion without any conditions and the alacrity with which he supported that appeal; and secondly, the behaviour of the Hon. Minister of Justice, who was the Prime Minister's representative at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference, who was the first to support the proposal of sending a peace mission to Vietnam and who himself has said that the proposal would have fallen through if he had not come forward and given his support to it.

එஃச். ஃரீ. டியஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க மஹ.
 (திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)
 (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Sir, with the permission of the Hon. Prime Minister I would like to refer to this matter arising from the Hon. Prime Minister's answer also. He said that he had not sufficient time to consult various officials about the Maritime Agreement with China. He said he had consulted the Attorney-General but had not got a reply yet.

ගරු ඩබ්ලි ටෙස්තාමායක

(கௌரவ டப்டி சேனாபாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Not that I had no time, but that I had got no reply.

—කාරක සහති

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරත්න මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

That is what I said, that you had not got a reply yet.

ගරු ඩබ්ලි ජේ^ථ නානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

A lot of time has elapsed and I have not got a reply yet.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

He conceded the time factor but he said that he had not got a reply yet from the Attorney-General. That is what I also said not that he had no time.

He also said that he had consulted the Principal Collector of Customs and that the latter had told him that in his opinion such an agreement was not needed, was not required.

What I would like to ask is this: It is true that one can ascertain these facts or ask questions from public servants. You can take your time over that. I appreciate that sometimes public servants do take longer than they ought to in answering questions put to them. The point I am making is this. Where does the answer to this question take you? After all, if a public servant says that the Maritime Agreement with China was not required, does it mean, therefore, that you are going to say that because it was not considered required by a public servant you are going to terminate it, or does it mean that it becomes a bad agreement against the interests of our country? All I want to know is this. We are now asking questions. We are now in the process of ascertaining and obtaining advice from public servants whose duty it is to give you advice. Fair enough. You say you want time for that also. I know that he has taken a longer time than is necessary. I accept that also. I am not

blaming the Hon. Prime Minister for that. But having obtained all these answers what is he going to do?

I do not know whom else he wants to consult; may be the Principal Collector of Customs, may be the Legal Draftsman or the Commissioner of Inland Revenue on taxation matters. It may be that he will consult the Attorney-General and other public servants. I do not mind all that. All I want to know is this from the Prime Minister: Are you taking advice to ascertain whether this agreement is against the national interests or are you taking advice to find out whether we could have afforded to do without this agreement?

In other words, we can have an unnecessary agreement which does no harm or we can have an unnecessary agreement which does a great deal of harm. What we are really asking the Hon. Prime Minister is to make up his mind whether this agreement is in the interests of this country or against its interests. No doubt for this purpose the Hon. Prime Minister can take advice. He can ask people. I appreciate that he has taken time. May be I was wrong in assuming that the Hon. Prime Minister had sufficient time. May be it requires a little longer. I am not making a point of that. What I would like the Hon. Prime Minister to do is to tell us approximately how soon he will be able to inform this House as to when he can make up his mind and the mind of this Government as to the desirability or otherwise of this treaty. Let us know whether he proposes to take action to terminate this agreement.

For our part we think that the agreement may have been unnecessary. That is true in the sense that this country would not have collapsed without it. We believe that the Chinese Government asked for it. We saw no harm in it. We thought that there was nothing against the interests of our country in entering into this agreement. I agree with the Hon. Prime Minister that nothing extraordinary would have happened if

the agreement was not entered into. It was in point of fact entered into by our Government. We saw no harm in it. But the Hon. Prime Minister during the elections thought that there was a great deal of harm. Now as Prime Minister he naturally wants to consider more carefully this whole question with the considered advice of all his officials. Fair enough. But I would like to ask the Hon. Prime Minister whether he could kindly tell us the nature of the questions that he is now seeking advice on. Is he trying to find out whether it is against the national interests and how soon roughly can this House be informed on this point?

ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා.

(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனநாயக்க)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, ත්‍රිකුණාමලේ වරාය පිළිබඳව ප්‍රශ්නයක් අහන්න කැමතියි. මධ්‍යස්ථ දේශපාලන ප්‍රතිපත්තියක් අනුගමනය කරනවාය කියනවා. නොබැඳුණු දේශපාලන ප්‍රතිපත්තියක් ගත හැකි තැනම ප්‍රකාශ කරනවා. එහෙත්, මැනව් වනතුරුම එක්තරා නාවික හමුදා කණ්ඩායමක් ත්‍රිකුණාමලේ පාවිච්චි කර තිබෙනවා. මේ අගෝස්තු මාසය වන තෙක් නාවික හමුදා කණ්ඩායම් කිපයක්ම ත්‍රිකුණාමලේ පාවිච්චි කිරීම සිරිතක් වශයෙන් කෙරී ගෙන ආවා. මේ රට මෙපමණ කලක් යුද මධ්‍යස්ථානයක් වශයෙන් තිබුණාය, නමුත් දැන් එහෙම නැත යනුවෙන් ලෝකයට ප්‍රකාශ කර තිබෙන අවස්ථාවේ මේ අන්දමින් පිටස්තර නාවික හමුදාවන්ට අපේ වරායක් පාවිච්චි කරන්න ඉඩ හැරීම යුක්තිසහගතද? එහෙම කරනවා නම්, එය පාවිච්චි කරන්නේ මොන මොන නාවික හමුදාවන්ද කියා දැනගන්නට කැමතියි. මට ආරංචියි පොදුරාජ්‍ය මණ්ඩලීය රටවලට වුනත් සම්පූර්ණ සහයෝගය ලැබෙන්නේ නැති බව. පකිස්ථානය පිට කර තිබෙනවාය කියා මට ආරංචියි. මොකක්ද එයට හේතුව? පොදු රාජ්‍ය මණ්ඩලයට පකිස්ථානය අයිති නැද්ද?

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, අතික් කාරණය මේකයි. එනම්, ජින් අබ්දල්ලා සිර අඩස්සියට ගැනීමයි. ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් මට

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කරක සභාව

[ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා.]

ලැබුණු පිළිතුර නම්, එය ඉන්දියාවේ අභ්‍යන්තර ප්‍රශ්නයක්ය, ඒ නිසා එයට විරුද්ධ වන්නට අපට යුතුකමක් නැත කියන එකයි. ඡීක් අබ්දුල්ලා කාශ්මීරයේ නායකයෙකු හැටියට සැලකෙන කෙනෙක්. ඉන්දියාවට එන්නය කියා ඔහුට ආරාධනා කළා. ඒ අනුව ඔහු ඉන්දියාවට ගොස් සාකච්ඡා කරගෙන යන විට නඩුවක් කිසිත් නැතිව, අධිකරණයේ සෝදිසියක් නැතිව, එක පාරටම සිර අඩස්සියට ගත්තා. ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදය ගැන අපි කතා කරනවා නම්, ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදී ප්‍රතිපත්ති කඩන විටත් එයට විරුද්ධ වෙන්න ඕනෑ. විදේශ නායකයෙක් ඉන්දියාවට පැමිණි විට ඔහු—පකිස්ථානයත් ඔහුත් අතර තිබෙන මිත්‍රත්වය උඩ—නඩුවක් නැතිව සිරසාරයට ගන්නා විට එය නීති විරෝධීය කියා පෙන්වා දෙන්න අපට යුතුකමක් තිබෙනව. පිළිතුරේ පැහැදිලි වශයෙන් පෙන්වන්නෙ ඡීක් අබ්දුල්ලා ඉන්දියාවේ පුරවැසියෙකු හැටියටයි. නමුත් ඡීක් අබ්දුල්ලා ඉන්දියාවේ පුරවැසියෙක් නොවන බව අපි පැහැදිලිවම දන්නවා. එහෙම නම්, නඩුවක් නැතිව එවැනි කෙනෙක් ඉන්දියාවේ හිරකර තබා ගන්නේ කෙසේ ද? පකිස්ථානයට තිබෙන සහෝදරකම උඩ ඡීක් අබ්දුල්ලා සිරසාරයට ගැනීම ජාත්‍යන්තර නීති විරෝධී වැඩක් නේද කියා මතක් කරන්න අපට යුතුකමක් තිබෙනව.

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරඹ උද්ගිරි ජයරාජායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

The hon. Member for Panadura (Mr. Leslie Goonewardene), referred to two instances to prove that we had been partial on the Vietnam question. One was the statement issued by us following the statement made by the President of the U.S.A. This is our statement:

"The Government of Ceylon welcome the statement of President Johnson made on 7.4.65 that the U. S. A. remain ready for unconditional discussions in searching for a peaceful settlement in Vietnam. The Government also welcome the pledge of the President that until peace was achieved the U. S. A. would try to keep the conflict from spreading."

Now, what is wrong in that statement? Does that statement disclose a partiality? I cannot agree with the contention that welcoming such a statement in those words—

කෙනමත් මයා.

(කිරු. කෙනමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Does the statement take all the facts into consideration?

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරඹ උද්ගිරි ජයරාජායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I will read it again:

"The Government of Ceylon welcome the statement of President Johnson made on 7.4.65 that the U. S. A. remain ready for unconditional discussions in searching for a peaceful settlement in Vietnam. The Government also welcome the pledge of the President that until peace was achieved the U. S. A. would try to keep the conflict from spreading."

I do not know, but I cannot by any stretch of the imagination agree that that shows a partiality to any one side.

ලෙස්ලි ගුනවර්ධන මයා.

(කිරු. ලෙස්ලි ගුනවර්ධන)

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

Without taking into consideration the other side! For example, President Johnson did not say that he was prepared to discuss with North Vietnam; but he was prepared to discuss with the Viet Cong.

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරඹ උද්ගිරි ජයරාජායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Viet Cong are people in South Vietnam. They are the rebels.

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(ඩොක්ටර් ඒ. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

You call them rebels?

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරඹ උද්ගිරි ජයරාජායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Call them what you like. They are parties to a civil war there.

—කුරක සහාය

ගරු ඩබ්ලි ජෙප් නානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Mr. Chairman, I was answering some of the questions put to me, particularly by the hon. Member for Panadura (Mr. Leslie Goonewardene). I think I answered two matters he raised.

Then there are two questions raised by the hon. Member for Dambadeniya (Mr. R. G. Senanayake).

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

So, one party to a civil war would be present at a conference but not the other party?

ଆୟାତ୍ତଙ୍କ ଶ୍ରୀ. ଶ୍ରୀ. ଶ୍ରୀ. ଶ୍ରୀ.

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

The point I am making is this. I cannot agree that this statement shows a partiality.

About Sheik Abdulla.

The other matter is that the Minister of Justice representing me at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference supported a peace mission. I will put this specific question to the hon. Members across : Are they for peace or not? If they are for peace, then every endeavour in striving to achieve peace must be supported, even if this peace mission may not succeed. I have my doubts about the peace mission ; that is why I did not take part. But if anybody supports a peace mission, surely, of itself that fact does not indicate that one is taking sides or is partial in the matter. Those were the two instances referred to by the hon. Member for Panadura. It is now 4 o'clock. I shall deal with the other points raised later.

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Before that he asked something else about Trincomalee. The position of the Government is this. The Government has been giving permission to use Trincomalee harbour for Commonwealth Naval Exercises. However, since 1962 no permission was granted and the Trincomalee Naval Base was not used for these exercises. Pakistan did not participate since 1962. This was not a deliberate exclusion of Pakistan.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

After 1962 Trincomalee has not been used at all?

ගැ බිලි සේ නානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

As far as I am aware. I wondered whether he was confusing it with the request made during the Rann of Kutch incident. I believe Pakistan, through her High Commissioner, wanted permission to use our airports for her planes on transit from West Pakistan to East Pakistan. At that time there was trouble going on between the two countries. I was

මලාසකාරුසි මන්ත්‍රී

(தலைமை தாங்கும் அங்கத்தவர்)

(The Presiding Member)

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

රැස්වීම පිට අනුකූලව තාවකාලිකව අත්සිටුවන ලදිත්, අ. හා. 4.30 ට නැවත පවත්වන ලදී.

இதன்படி அமர்வு பி. ப. 4.30 மணிவரை இடை
நிறுத்தப்பட்டு, மீண்டும் ஆரம்பமாயிற்று.

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

விசேஷன கெடுதலின் பழை, 1965-66

—காரக கலாவ

[ஒரு விலி சேனாநாயக]
wondering whether he was confusing that. There too we said, "You can use, provided no troops or weapons are carried aboard those planes". This was done because there was trouble going on between the two countries. That is what I have to say about that. They can still use the airports if they wish to, provided no weapons or troops are carried.

பா. சீ. சேனாநாயக மன.

(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனாநாயக)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

Trincomalee is not a centre any more for naval manoeuvres.

ஒரு விலி சேனாநாயக

(கெளரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

My instruction is, since 1962 it has not been.

Then he referred to the matter of the incarceration of Sheik Abdullah. He made his contention on the basis that Kashmir was an independent country. I do not think Kashmir is an independent State, whatever the interpretation of Pakistan is about Kashmir and the interpretation of India is about Kashmir. Kashmir is not an independent country as far as India is concerned. A certain portion of Kashmir, they say, under their own Constitution has been incorporated as part of India.

பா. சீ. சேனாநாயக மன.

(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனாநாயக)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

Under Article 370 of the Indian Constitution it is a separate State and that has not been abrogated yet.

ஒரு விலி சேனாநாயக

(கெளரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I merely stated India's contention in that matter. It may be that that is not accepted. But the contention of India is that a part of Kashmir has been incorporated as part of India.

however, Pakistan may be contesting that position. The incarceration has become a domestic matter. It is very rarely, I do say never, that one interferes in a domestic matter of this nature.

பா. சீ. சேனாநாயக மன.

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

What about the G. D. R. question ? That was asked earlier.

கெனமன் மன.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

What about the G. D. R. loan ?

ஒரு விலி சேனாநாயக

(கெளரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Certainly, we will consider.

பி. பி. பா. வசீர் மனவரெ மன.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Are you sending a mission ?

ஒரு விலி சேனாநாயக

(கெளரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

The question of sending a mission will be considered. We have not turned down that loan ; not at all. I made a specific public statement recently that we welcome assistance from all quarters. The hon. Members there are of the same view. The hon. Third Member for Colombo Central (Mr. Keuneman), and the hon. Member for Akuressa (Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe) will hold an entirely different view. We are not following their policies. We welcome assistance from all quarters.

பி. பி. பா. வசீர் மனவரெ மன.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்சா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Arising out of the explanation given by the Hon. Prime Minister in regard to the G. D. R. loan, I want

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

to point out to this hon. House this aspect of the matter. Loans which were not yet completely negotiated are shown in the Budget of the Hon. Minister of Finance, under revenue Heads ; that is Rs. 100 million for the purpose of cushioning the foreign assets against any possible depreciation in future due to acts of God, or nature, and things like that. Rs. 150 million unnegotiated yet—where the negotiations are not complete—is to be spent on the basis of getting greater imports for the purpose of developmental projects. But, here is a loan which has been negotiated, where the negotiations are completed. In regard to it, the expenditure under that loan, we are given no information how that enters into the development or any other projects planned by this Government. We are absolutely not given any information. Then, is it wrong for us to infer from that that for other political reasons there was a certain amount of doubt whether you are going to use it or not, while where the negotiations are not completed you are ready to make budgetary allocations ?

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

That contention is entirely wrong. In fact, the Hon. Minister has mentioned new ones. As a matter of fact, a number of old ones had not been mentioned in the Budget. They were negotiated and were over. The ones mentioned are those in process of negotiation.—[Interruption]. They are not included in the Budget.

කේනමන් මයා.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to flog this question of Vietnam too much. There is one contention of the Hon. Prime Minister which we cannot allow to pass without comment.

Before that I want to deal with the question of foreign loans and foreign aid because he had referred to me. Here, I should like to make my

position clear. I made that position clear last time but apparently it has not penetrated his comprehension.—[Interruption]. I want to use a more polite phrase.

In general, we have reason to believe that imperialist powers in giving these loans attach political strings. I gave an example of the American aid and the West German aid. I do not want to repeat it. First of all we are opposed to foreign private capital being invested in this country. That we oppose. We are not opposed to government-to-government loans provided there are no political strings attached and provided other conditions to the loan are favourable. I want to point out that we have never opposed Canadian aid or Australian aid ; we are never opposed to Colombo Plan aid ; but we were extremely critical of American and West German aid, and it was proved in practice that this aid was subject to certain political conditions because it was cancelled for the non-fulfilment of political conditions and not for the non-fulfilment of any economic conditions attached to that aid. That is by the way.

The Hon. Prime Minister read us a section of his—or rather the Government's—statement on Vietnam. He made the contention that no one can regard this as a biased statement. Sir, this word “biased” can be interpreted in many ways. Cannot I say, that this statement looked at only one aspect of the matter and kept completely silent on the other aspect of the matter on Vietnam ? That document was dated 7th April, 1965.

Now, Sir, at that time, United States bombing of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam had been going on for some weeks. There had been a big protest throughout the world against this. Today, for the first time, the Hon. Prime Minister has told us that the Government regards that action of the United States as unfortunate and he also added that action will make a settlement of this problem more difficult. I do not know whether the Government has subsequently come to that decision. If he was making a full statement on the

பிப்ரவரி மாதம், 1965-66

—காரைக்கால்

[கேள்விகள்]

question of Vietnam, at least these two points might have been incorporated in the statement of April 7th.

What does he say, Sir? He welcomes the statement by President Johnson that he is ready for unconditional negotiation, and later, of course, he made a reference to the Minister of Justice and about Mr. Wilson's abortive peace mission. I do not intend going into the merits of President Johnson's statement or Mr. Wilson's abortive peace mission which is also President Johnson's peace mission. But the point is this: why did the Government not even in the mild way in which it was expressed today, incorporate in the statement of April 7th, that the Government regards the U. S. bombings as unfortunate and that action will make a settlement of the problem more difficult?

The Government had not, up to date, made any statement on this question until the Prime Minister, in reply to a question by me, made a statement today. I think the position of Ceylon as a whole would have been much stronger if this had happened. I would not say anything more on Vietnam now.

May I now pass on to another question—the question on Army and Defence.

சென்னை மன்றம்

(கேள்விகள் டி. என். சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Not on this Head.

கேள்விகள்]

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Very well, Sir.

சென்னை மன்றம்

(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனாயக்க)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

Sir, if as the Hon. Prime Minister said that Kashmir is already incorporated—[Interruption.]

சென்னை மன்றம்

(கேள்விகள் டி. என். சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I said that that was India's contention.

சென்னை மன்றம்

(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனாயக்க)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

Sir, under the Indian Constitution, Section 370, Kashmir enjoys a special position. Its future is under suspension until a plebiscite is held in Kashmir. The United Nations has intervened on three occasions to determine whether it should be with Pakistan or with India. Therefore, the very act that there was intervention by the United Nations positively shows that the status of Kashmir has not been determined, though India may be physically controlling it. Legally, a decision has not been made. India threatens to incorporate Kashmir in the Union.

பு. எ. 4.45

That shows that it is still not incorporated. If under those circumstances it is still not incorporated, then would not the imprisonment of Sheikh Abdullah be rather high-handed? Because if it is a part of India, the imprisonment of one of their own nationals is certainly within the right of any Government. If it is not incorporated and he is not a citizen of India, then it is most high-handed that a person who is not a citizen should be imprisoned without trial.

சென்னை மன்றம்

(கேள்விகள் டி. என். சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

The hon. Third Member for Colombo Central spoke about the statement on April 7th in referring to the bombing. I believe the bombing of North Vietnam was after April 7th. That is my recollection. I do not think it was before.

கேள்விகள்]

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

No, Sir. It started last year.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

ගරු ඩබ්ලි ටෙස්'තානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

No, after April 7th. That is my recollection.

As regards the matter raised by the hon. Member for Dambadeniya, whatever the contention, this fact is clear, that Kashmir is not an independent state. I do not think there is anybody who claims it to be one.

ආර්. ජී. සෝනානායක මයා.

(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனாநாயக்க)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

Therefore, they cannot imprison one who is not a national.

හරු ඩිඞ්ලි සෝනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Therefore, the status of Kashmir is in doubt. So we cannot proceed as in the case of an independent country.

ආර්. ජී. ජෝනාතාන මිය.

(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனாநாயக்க)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

But does India have a right to imprison a person who is not a citizen? How can India imprison a person whose citizenship is in doubt?

හරු බඩලි සෝනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Well, the hon. Member wants us to shoot citizens of other countries.

“14 වන ශීතියෙහි 1 වන සම්මතය සඳහා රු. 11,54,984 ක මුදල උප ලේඛනයට ඇතුළත් කළ යුතුය” යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදිත්, සභා සම්මත විය.

14 වන ශීථියෙහි 1 වන සම්මතය උප ලේඛන
යෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට නිබ්බ සූත්‍ර යයි නියෝග
කරන ලදී.

“14 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 11,54,984 அட்டவணையிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

14 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணையில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 1,154,984 for Head 14, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Head 14, Vote 1, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

—කුරක සහාව

2 වන සම්මතය.—පාලන ශාස්ත්‍ර—පුනරාවර්තන
විසදම්, රු. 17,11,221

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலனச் செலவுகள்—
மீண்டுவதும் செலவு, ரூ. 17,11,221

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—
Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 1,711,221

“ 14 වන ශීර්ෂයේ 2 වන සම්මතය සඳහා රු. 17,11,221 ක මුදල උප ලේඛනයට ඇතුළත් කළ යුතුය ” යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදීත්, සභා සම්මත විය.

14 වන ශීඝ්‍රයෙහි 2 වන සම්මතය උප ලේඛන
යෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට නිබන්ධ යුතු යයි නියෝග
කරන ලදී.

“ 14 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 17,11,221 அட்டவணையிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக ” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

14 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவண
யில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 1,711,221 for Head 14, Vote No. 2, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Head 14, Vote 2, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

4 වන සම්මතය.—දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව විසින් සපයන
සේවා—පහරුවර්තන වියදම, රු. 3,59,000

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 4—திணைக்களத்தால் அளிக்கப் படும் சேவைகள், மீண்டுவரும் செலவு. ரூபா 3,59,000

Vote No. 4.—Services provided by the Department—Recurrent Expenditure, Rs. 359,000.

“ 14 වන ශීඝ්‍රයෙහි 4 වන සම්මතය සඳහා රු. 3,59,000 ක මුදල උප ලේඛනයට ඇතුළත් කළ යුතුය ” යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදීත්, සභා සම්මත විය.

14 වන ශීථියෙහි 4 වන සම්මතය උප ලේඛන
යෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට නීතිය යුතුයයි නියෝග
කරන ලදී.

“14 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 4 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 3,59,000 அட்டவீணயிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

14 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 4 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணையில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 359,000 for Head 14, Vote No. 4, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Head 1A, Vote 4, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

விசேஷக் கெடுதல்கள் பற்றி, 1965-66

—காரக கலாவி

5 வன கலிமைய.—தேயுதிலேன்துல விசினு கலயன
கேவா—இலகன விசுதல, ரு. 20,00,000

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 5—திணைக்களத்தால் அளிக்கப்
படும் சேவைகள்,—ஆக்கப்பொருட்செலவு, ரூபா
20,00,000.

Vote No. 5.—Services provided by the
Department—Capital Expenditure,
Rs. 2,000,000.

“14 வன கலியேகி 5 வன கலிமைய கலயன
ரு. 20,00,000 க இலக ருப லேவனயல கலயுலுன்
கல கலயுய”, கன கலயின விசன கலயன், கல
கலிமைய விச.

14 வன கலியேகி 5 வன கலிமைய ருப லேவன
யேகி கலாபகன் கலயில கலிய கலயுயகி கலயேக
கல கலயன்.

“14 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 5 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா
20,00,000 அட்டவணையிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும்
வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

14 ஆம் தலைப்பு 5 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணை
யில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 2,000,000
for Head 14, Vote No. 5, be inserted in
the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 14, Vote 5, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

ரனினாயக மலா.

(திரு. ரத்தனாயக்க)

(Mr. Ratnayake)

I have some points to raise on
Vote 5.

இலகனாயக மன்றத் தினிபலே

(தலைமை தாங்கும் அங்கத்தவர்)

(The Presiding Member)

I am sorry.

We pass on to Head 15.

ஃபி. ஃபி. கலயன் கலயினாயக மலா.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

On a point of Order, Sir. It was
agreed at the commencement when
we were discussing the procedure to
be adopted in discussing the Votes,
to take up foreign affairs first and
not mix them up with any of the
other affairs under the Hon. Prime
Minister.

Now, under Head 14, Vote 5, comes
the Anuradhapura Preservation
Board. It is really not a matter we
could have possibly confused with
foreign affairs. We thought you
would allow us to take it up appro-
priately. We did not wish to take
up the personal emoluments of staff
one by one, as well as the other sub-
heads. Therefore, we took up all
foreign affairs matters together. But
I do submit that it would be unfair
for the position to be taken up that
Head 14, Vote 5, has been passed
without debate when there are
special matters pertaining to the
Anuradhapura Preservation Board.
I am sure the Government would not
object to these matters being dis-
cussed now, and I am quite sure the
Hon. Prime Minister would have no
objection. I do urge you to allow
us to raise this matter under Vote 5.
There are only one or two hon. Mem-
bers who wish to speak on this
matter. I would respectfully ask you
to permit us to discuss these special
matters under Vote 5.

கல கலிவி கலயினாயக

(கெளரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

The hon. Member who wants to
raise the question has not moved a
cut under this Vote.

ஃபி. ஃபி. கலயன் கலயினாயக மலா.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

A cut has been moved, but not by
the hon. Member for Anuradhapura.

கல கலிவி கலயினாயக மலா.

(திருமதி சிறிமாவோ பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)

At the meeting of party leaders it
was agreed that only the names of
leaders of parties should be put down
against the Motion and that other
hon. Members who wished to speak
on any matter would be allowed to
do so.

கல கலிவி கலயினாயக

(கெளரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I have no objection.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

රත්නායක මයා.

(திரு. ரத்னாயக்க)

(Mr. Ratnayake)

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, අනුරාධපුර සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලය පිළිබඳ වැය ශීතිය ගැන වචන කීපයක් කෙටියෙන් ප්‍රකාශ කරන්නට මම බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. දැනට අනුරාධපුර සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයෙහි කෙරෙන වැඩ කටයුතු ගැන විශේෂයෙන්ම ගරු අගමැති තුමාගේ අවධානය යොමු කරවන්නට මම බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. අනුරාධපුර සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලය පිහිටුවන්නට යෙදුණේ 1961 අවුරුද්දේයි. මෙම මණ්ඩලය පිහිටුවීමේ පරමාපිය වුණේ අනුරාධපුර පූජනීය පෙදෙස සංරක්ෂණය කිරීමේ වැඩ කටයුතු ඉක්මණින් කරන අතරම නව නගරය ඉක්මණින් ඉදි කිරීමයි. මේ සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලය පිහිටුවන අවස්ථාවේදී ඒ සඳහා “අනුරාධපුර සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩල පනත” යනුවෙන් විශේෂ පනතක් ඇති කළා. එහි සාමාජිකයින් වශයෙන් හත් දෙනකු නම් කර තිබුණා. ඒ හත් දෙනා අතර පුරාවිද්‍යා කොමසාරිස්තුමාත් නගර නිර්මාණ ශිල්පී තැනත් භාණ්ඩාගාරයේ නියෝජිතයකුත් නිල බලයෙන්ම එහි සාමාජිකයන් වුණා. ඒ තුන් දෙනා ඇතුළුව තවත් සාමාජිකයින් හතර දෙනකුත් සමග මුළු සාමාජිකයින් ගණන හත් දෙනෙක් වුණා.

මෙම සාමාජිකයින් හත් දෙනාගෙන් එක් තැනැත්තකු මණ්ඩලයේ සභාපති විය යුතු බවයි පනතෙහි සඳහන් වී තිබෙන්නේ. 1961 සිට 1965 ජනවාරි මාසය වන තෙක් අනුරාධපුර සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයේ සභාපති වශයෙන් ඒ පළාතේ දිසාපතිතුමා පත් කර සිටියා. පළමුවෙන්ම නිශ්ශංක විජේරත්න මහතා. එතුමා මාරු වී ගියාට පසු උපාලි ගුණරත්න මහත්මයාත් එතුමාද මාරු වී ගියාට පසු ප්‍රේමවර්ධන මහතාත් අනුරාධපුර සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයේ සභාපතිවරුන් වශයෙන් කටයුතු කළා. ප්‍රේමවර්ධන මහත්මයා අනුරාධපුරයේ දිසාපති වශයෙන් පත් වී ආ විට, එතුමාට අනුරාධ

පුරයේ දිසාපති වශයෙනුත් සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයේ සභාපති වශයෙනුත් එකවර කටයුතු කිරීමට නුපුළුවන් බවත් එසේ කටයුතු කිරීමෙන් නියම විධියේ සේවයක් කරන්නට අපහසු බවත් එතුමා එවකට සිටි අගමැතිණියටත් රජයටත් දන්වා සිටියා. සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයේ සභාපති තනතුරෙන් අස් වී එහි සාමාජිකයකු වශයෙන් පමණක් කටයුතු කරන්නට එතුමා සතුටු බවත් දන්වා සිටියා.

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, අනුරාධපුරයේ දිසාපති තනතුරට පත්වන තැනැත්තා කවුරු හෝ වේවා, ඒ තැනැත්තාම අනුරාධපුර සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයේ සභාපතිද විය යුතුය කියන එකයි අපගේ හැඟීම. මක් නිසාද කියතොත්, අනුරාධපුර සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයෙන් දිසාපති තුමාගේ කාර්යාලය වන කච්චේරියෙන් කටයුතු අතර සම්බන්ධයක් තිබෙන නිසයි. ඉඩම් අත්පත් කර ගැනීම සම්බන්ධ කටයුතු ඒ පිළිබඳ විශේෂ කරුණක් හැටියට පෙන්වන්නට පුළුවනි. ඉඩම් අත්පත් කරගන්නා අවස්ථාවලදී ඒ පිළිබඳ විභාග පැවැත්වීමට දිසාපති තුමාට හැර වෙන කිසිම කෙනකුට බලයක් නැ. එම නිසා අනුරාධපුර දිසාපතිතුමාගේ සභාපතිත්වය අනුරාධපුර සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයට නැතිවීම ගැන අප විශේෂයෙන් කණගාටු වෙනවා. මේ නිසා සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයේ වැඩ කටයුතු වලට යම් යම් බාධා ඇතිවේය යන හැඟීමයි අපගේ කණගාටුවට හේතුව.

මා කලින් කී පරිදි, ප්‍රේමවර්ධන මහතාගේ ඉල්ලීම අනුව, සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයේ සභාපති තනතුරට, පිටස්තර කෙනකු වූ දොස්තර ජයවර්ධන මහත්මයා පත් කරන්නට යෙදුණා. එතුමා උදේ 8.30 සිට හවස 4.30 වනතුරුත් මුළු කාලය යොදා තම රාජකාරි කටයුතු ඉතාමත් උනන්දු වෙන් කළා. අනුරාධපුරය සදාකාලිකවම සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලය යටතේ තබා ගන්නට බැරිය, සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයේ වැඩ කටයුතු ඉක්මණින් අවසාන කොට අනු

[රත්නායක මයා.]

රාධපුරයට නැවතත් නගර සභාවක් දිය යුතුය යන අදහස එවකට සිටි අගමැතිණිය තුළ තිබුණු නිසා එය ඉක්මණින් සම්පූර්ණ කරන ලෙස එතුමිය විසින් විශේෂ නියෝග යක්ද දී තිබුණා. ඒ අනුව දොස්තර ජය වර්ධන මහත්මයා ඉතාමත් උනන්දුවෙන් සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයේ වැඩ කටයුතු කර ගෙන ගියා. ඒ අදහස් සභාපතිතුමාටත් දන්වා තිබුණා. මට මතකයි, පසුගිය අවුරුද්දේදී අපේ නියෝජිත පිරිසක් එවකට සිටි ස්වදේශ කටයුතු හා පළාත් පාලන ඇමතිතුමා හමු වී ඒ ඉල්ලීම ඉදිරිපත් කළ අවස්ථාව. ඒ අවස්ථාවේදී පළාතේ මන්ත්‍රී වරයා වශයෙන් මා, පළාත් පාලන කොමසාරිස්වරයා වූ වි. සී. ජයසූරිය මහත්මයා සමග පෞද්ගලික වශයෙන් සාකච්ඡා කර විශේෂ ඉල්ලීමක් කළා. මට මතක හැටියට අනුරාධපුර පළාත් ආණ්ඩු සභාව විසුරුවා හැරියේ 1952 වර්ෂයේයි. ඒ නිසා නැවතත් හැකි තරම් ඉක්මණින් අනුරාධපුර ප්‍රදේශ වාසීන්ට පළාත් ආණ්ඩු සභාවක් පිහිටුවා ගැනීමේ අයිතිය දිය යුතුය යනුවෙන් මා ඉල්ලීමක් කළා.

මා සිතන්නේ අනුරාධපුර සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයේ වැඩ කටයුතු පුළුවන් තරම් ඉක්මණින් නිම කර නැවතත් ඒ ප්‍රදේශ වාසීන්ට පළාත් ආණ්ඩු සභාවක් පිහිටුවීමේ අයිතිය දිය යුතුය කියා රජය කල්පනා කරන්නට ඇත්තේ ඒ නිසයි. මෙවැනි තත්ත්වයක් තිබෙන අවස්ථාවේදී, පසුගිය මහා මැතිවරණයෙන් පසු, 1965 මාර්තු මාසය වන තෙක් සිටි අනුරාධපුර සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයේ සභාපතිතුමා ඉල්ලා අස්වුණා. සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයේ සභාපතිකමෙන් ඉල්ලා අස්වීමේ ලිපිය ඒ මහත්මයා ගරු අගමැතිතුමාට එව්වා. නමුත් සභාපති කමෙන් ඉල්ලා අස්වූවාට ඒ මහත්මයා මණ්ඩලයේ සාමාජිකත්වයෙන් ඉල්ලා අස්වුණේ නැහැ. ඉන් දින කීපයකට පසු අපේ නව අගමැතිතුමා අනුරාධපුරයේම සිටින නීතිඥ මහත්මයාකු—බණ්ඩාර මහත්මයා

—සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයේ සභාපති වශයෙන් පත් කළා. දැනටත් ඒ මහත්මයා නීතිඥයකු වශයෙන් සේවය කරනවා. සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයේ වැඩ කටයුතු ඉක්මණින්ම කරන්නට නම් ගරු අගමැතිතුමා මේ කාරණය සම්බන්ධයෙන් කරුණාවෙන් තම අවධානය යොමු කළ යුතුයි. දැනට සභාපති වශයෙන් පත් කර සිටින මහත්මයා සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයේ ගත කරන්නේ සාමාන්‍යයෙන් දවසකට පැය 2 ක පමණ කාලයක්. මා ඒ මහත්මයාට දෙස්කියනවා නොවෙයි. ඒ මහත්මයා උසාවියේ වැඩ කටයුතු අවසන් වන තුරු, සවස 2.30 පමණ වන තුරු, වැඩ කරනවා. ඊටපසු 2.30 සිට 4.30 වන තුරු පමණයි සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයේ වැඩ කරන්නේ. ඒවාගේම පොළොන්නරුවේ උසාවිය තිබෙන විට සතියකට දවස් දෙකක්, සිකුරාදා, සෙනසුරාදා දවස්වල ඒ මහත්මයාට පොළොන්නරුවටත් යන්න සිද්ධ වෙනවා. ඔයින් මෙයින්, සාමාන්‍යයෙන් සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයේ සභාපති වශයෙන් ඒ මහත්මයාට වැය කරන්නට පුළුවන් වෙන්නේ සතියකට පැය 3 ක කාලයක් පමණයි.

ඒවාගේම තවත් ප්‍රශ්නයක් තිබෙනවා. මගේ දැනීමේ හැටියට නම් නව සභාපති තුමාගේ පත්වීම නීති විරෝධීයි. මා එසේ කියන්නේ පනතේ මේ විධියට තිබෙන නිසයි :

“3. (1) The Board shall consist of—

(a) five members appointed by the Minister, one of whom shall be an officer of the General Treasury,

(b) the person for the time being holding the office of Archaeological Commissioner, and

(c) the person for the time being holding the office of the Government Town Planner.

(2) The Minister shall appoint one of the members of the Board to be the Chairman of the Board.”

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

අ. භා. 5

බණ්ඩාර මහත්මයා සභාපති වශයෙන් පත් කරන අවස්ථාවේදී සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයේ සාමාජිකයන් 7 දෙනෙකු සිටියා. සාමාජිකයන් වශයෙන් 7 දෙනෙකු සිටින විට තවත් කෙනෙක් සභාපති වශයෙන් පත් කළාම මුළු සාමාජිකයන් ගණන 8 දෙනෙක් වෙනවා. [බාධා කිරීමක්] මණ්ඩලයේ සාමාජිකයන් වශයෙන් බෞද්ධයන් දෙදෙනෙකුත් පත් කරනවා. බණ්ඩාර මහත්මයා සභාපති වශයෙන් පත් කරන අවස්ථාවේදී මණ්ඩලයේ සාමාජිකයන් 7 දෙනෙකු සිටියා. ඒ අනුව බණ්ඩාර මහත්මයා සභාපති වශයෙන් පත් කරනවාත් සමගම මණ්ඩලයේ මුළු සාමාජිකයන් ගණන 8 දෙනෙක් වුණා.

ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. member)

ඒ හත්දෙනා කවිද?

රත්නායක මයා.

(திரு. ரத்னாயக்க)

(Mr. Ratnayake)

ඒ අවස්ථාවේදී සිටි 7 දෙනාගේ නම් මෙසේයි: එච්. පී. ප්‍රේමවර්ධන—දිසාපති තුමා, නෙවිල් ගුණරත්න—නගර නිර්මාණ ශිල්පියා, ආචාර්ය සී. ඊ. ගොඩකුඹුරු—පුරා විද්‍යා කොමසාරිස්, දෙස්තර එම්. ඩී. එස්. ජයවර්ධන, නිශ්ශංක විජේරත්න, පී. එස්. ද සිල්වා—භාණ්ඩාගාරයේ නියෝජිතයා, එච්. බී. තෙන්නකෝන් මයා.—අනුරාධපුරයේ වැසියෙක්. නව සභාපතිතුමාත් සමග 8 දෙනෙක් වූ නිසයි, විශාල ප්‍රශ්නයක් ඇති වූයේ. බණ්ඩාර මහත්මයාට පත් විම ලැබුණේ අප්‍රේල් 22 වන දා. එදා සිට ජූනි 26 වන දා තෙක් සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයේ රැස්වීමක් තබන්න බැරි වුණා. මන්ද? අට දෙනෙක් සිටින විට සභාපති හැටියට කෙනෙක් තෝරා ගන්න බැරි වූ නිසයි. ඒ අවස්ථාවේදී දෙස්තර එම්. ඩී. එස්. ජයවර්ධන එහි සාමාජිකත්වයෙන් අස් කළා. ඊට පසුවයි, මණ්ඩලයේ රැස්

වීමක් පැවැත්වූයේ අප්‍රේල් 22 වන දා සිට ජූනි 26 වන දා තෙක් සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයේ 8 දෙනෙක් සිටියා. මගේ හැඟීමේ හැටියට එය නීති විරෝධීයි. එය එක් කාරණයක්.

අනික් කාරණය මෙයයි: අනුරාධපුරයේ දිසාපතිවරු සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයේ සභාපති හැටියට රාජකාරි කරන අවස්ථාවේදී එතුමන්ලා කිසිම මුදලක් සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයෙන් ගත්තේ නැහැ. දොස්තර ජය වර්ධන පත් කළාට පසු එතුමා මුළු කාලයම මණ්ඩලයේ කටයුතු සඳහා යෙදවූ නිසා එතුමාට මාසයකට රුපියල් 800 ක ගෙවීමක් කිරීමට නියම කර තිබුණා. ගමන් ගාස්තු වශයෙන් රුපියල් 250 ක් ගෙව්වා. තමන්ගේ සම්පූර්ණ කාලය යොදවා වැඩ කළ ඒ සභාපතිතුමාට දුන් මුදලම දවසකට පැය දෙකක් පමණක් වැඩ කරන නව සභාපතිතුමාට දීම සාධාරණ නැත කියායි මා කියන්නේ. දවසකට පැය 2 ක් වැඩ කිරීම සඳහා ඒ තරම් මුදලක් ගෙවීම අනුව ගණන් බලන විට එය මාසයකට රුපියල් 10,000 ක පමණ පඩියක් ගෙවීමකට සමාන වන බව පෙනී යනවා. මා මේ ප්‍රශ්නය කලින් ඉදිරිපත් කළ අවස්ථාවේදී ගරු අගමැතිතුමා පිළිතුරු දුන්නා ඒ පිළිබඳව කල්පනා කර බලන වාස කියා. ගරු අගමැතිතුමා වැඩි කල් යත් නට මත්තෙන් ඒ පිළිබඳව සුදුසු වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් යෙදවෙත් අපි සතුවු වෙනවා.

මම තවත් කාරණයක් පිළිබඳව—ඉඩම් පිළිබඳව—ගරු අගමැතිතුමාගෙන් ප්‍රශ්න කළ විට එතුමා ප්‍රකාශ කළා, සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයේ ක්‍රියාකාරී නිලධාරියා වශයෙන් සාමාන්‍යාධිකාරීතුමා ඉන්නවාය කියා. එතුමා ඒ සියල්ල කළ යුතුය කිව්වා. ඒ කටයුතු සභාපතිතුමා විසින් කළ යුතු නැතැයි කිව්වා. මම ගරු අගමැතිතුමාට දන්වන්න කැමතියි. දැනට සිටින සභාපති වන බණ්ඩාර මහත්මයා ඒ තනතුරට අප්‍රේල් 22 වන දා පත් වූ හැටියේම කළේ කුමක්ද කියා. සාමාන්‍යාධිකාරීතුමා ගේ නිලය සභාපතිතුමා සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[රත්නායක මයා.]

භාර ගත්තා. භාරගෙන එහි ඇති ඉඩ කඩම් දෙන්න පටන් ගත්තා. ගෙවල් දෙන්න පටන් ගත්තා. කඩ දෙන්න පටන් ගත්තා. දැන් සාමාන්‍යාධිකාරීතුමා මණ්ඩලයෙන් අස් කර තිබෙනවා. සාමාන්‍යාධිකාරීතුමා අස් කරන තෙක් මණ්ඩලය කිසිම රාජකාරියක් කළේ නැහැ. මම ගරු අගමැතිතුමාගෙන් දැන ගන්න කැමතියි, පාලන රාජකාරි සියල්ලම සාමාන්‍යාධිකාරීතුමා වෙත පවරා තිබෙනවා නම් සභාපතිතුමා ගත් ඒ ක්‍රියා මාර්ගය හරිද කියා. ඒ අපේ ප්‍රශ්නයට පිළිතුරු දෙමින් ගරු අගමැතිතුමා මේ ගරු සභාවට ඉදිරිපත් කරන ලද ලැයිස්තුවේ හැටියට කඩවලට ඉඩම් කට්ටි 4 කුත්, ගෙවල් සඳහා ඉඩම් කට්ටි 50 කුත්, කඩ සෑදීමට වෙන් වශයෙන් ඉඩම් 4 කුත් වෙන් කර තිබෙනවා. මගේ දැනීමේ හැටියට නම් මේ ලැයිස්තුවේ ගෙවල් දුන් අයගෙන් සියයට 75 ක්ම නුසුදුසු අයයි. සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයේ ගෙවල් සෑදුවේ කාගේවත් නිවාස ප්‍රශ්නය විසඳීමට නොවෙයි. පූජනීය පෙදෙසට අයත් නැති උදවියටත් ගෙවල් දී තිබෙනවා. නමුත් මා ඒ ගැන තර්ක කරන්නේ නැහැ. සමහර අය වැරදි ලිපිනයන් දී තිබෙන අතර සමහර විට එක ගෙදර සිටින දෙතුන් දෙනකුට ගෙවල් දී තිබෙනවා. මා හෙදින් දන්නා කුමාරස්වාමි නම් තැපැල් කන්තෝරුවේ සේවයෙහි නියුක්ත මහත්මයාකු සිටිනවා. ඔහු ඇල්ල කට්ටු පාරේ ඤාතියකුගේ ගෙදරකයි, පදිංචි වී සිටියේ. ඒ ගෙයි කාමර කීපයක්ම තිබෙනවා. ඒ ගෙදර පදිංචි වූ අනික් පිරිස සිටියදී මේ මහත්මයා පමණක් ඉවත් කෙළේ ඇයි? පූජා නගරයේ ගෙදරකින් පිරිසක් ඉවත් කරන විට ඒ ගේ කඩන සිරිතක් තියෙනවා. ඉතින් ඔය කී අන්දමේ කීප දෙනකුටම ඉඩම් ලැබී තිබෙනවා. මේ අන්දමට පූජනීය ප්‍රදේශයේ සිටින අය සඳහා සෑදූ ගෙවල් වෙත අයගේ නිවාස ප්‍රශ්නය විසඳීම සඳහා දෙනවා නම් පූජනීය ප්‍රදේශයෙන් මිනිසුන් ඉවත් කරන්නට තව අවුරුදු 10 කටවත් බැරි වේවි.

ඉඩම් දීම ගැනයි, මා කියාගෙන ආවේ. බණ්ඩාරනායක මැතිනියටත්, නිශ්ශංක විජේරත්න මහතාටත් ඉඩම් දීම ගැන ගරු අගමැතිතුමා එදා පෙන්නා දන්නා. නව නගරයේ පදිංචි වීම සඳහා ඉඩම් දෙන විට

කොටස් 4ක් යටතේ එම ඉඩම් දෙනවා. පූජනීය පෙදෙසේ සහ නව නගරයේ ඉඩම් අත්පත් කර ගත් අය පළමුවැනි කොටසට අයත් වෙනවා. දෙවැනි කොටසට අයත් වන්නේ අනුරාධපුර නගරයේ සවිර පදිංචි යක් තිබෙන අයයි. තුන් වැනි කොටසට අයත් වන්නේ උතුරු මැද පළාතේ අයයි. හතර වැනි කොටසට ලංකාවේ සිටින ඕනෑම කෙනකු අයත් වෙනවා. මේ හතර වැනි කොටස යටතේ එදා එස්. ඩබ්ලිව්. ආර්. ඩී. බණ්ඩාරනායක මැතිතුමාට ඉඩම පවරා තිබෙනවා. අනුරාධපුර නගරයේ දෙවැනි පියවරේදී, මේ ඉඩම දී තිබෙන්නේ. බණ්ඩාරනායක මැතිතුමාට දුන් ඉඩම එතුමාගෙන් පසු එම මැතිනියට අයිති වුණා. නිශ්ශංක විජේරත්න මහතාට ඉඩම දී තිබෙන්නේ ඔහු අනුරාධපුරයෙන් අවුත් ඒ සඳහා ඉල්ලුම් පත්‍රයක් ඉදිරිපත් කළාට පසුවයි.

ගරු ඩබ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க),
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)
ඒ දෙකම වැරදියි.

රත්නායක මයා.

(திரு. ரத்நாயக்க)
(Mr. Ratnayake)

ඒ දෙදෙනාට පමණක් නොව අනුරාධ පුර නගරයට අයිතිවාසිකම් නැති කීප දෙනකුටත් මේ ඉඩම් දී තිබෙනවා. අනුරාධ පුරයෙන් පිට පදිංචි අයට දී තිබෙනවා. එම නිසා ඉහත කී ඉඩම් කැබලි දෙක දී මෙන් ඒ දෙදෙනාට විශේෂයක් කළා යයි කියන්නට අමාරුයි. මේ සංරක්ෂණ ක්‍රමය නව නවත් දික් කර ගන්නේ නැතිව— මුලින් පරමාර්ථය වී තිබුණු හැටියට මා හිතන්නේ බණ්ඩාරනායක රජය ක්‍රියා කළාක් මෙන්ම—නව රජයටත් ඕනෑකම තිබෙන්නේ මේ පූජනීය ප්‍රදේශය සංරක්ෂණය කිරීමේ කටයුතු ඉක්මන් කර, නව නගරය හැකි තාක් ඉක්මනින් දියුණු කර, නගර වාසීන්ගේ සාධාරණ අයිතිවාසිකම් ලබා දීමය කියා අප විශ්වාස කරනවා. ඒ නිසා මා ඉතා ඕනෑකමින් ඉල්ලනවා වැඩි කලක් ගත වී යන්නට මත්තෙන් අනුරාධ පුර පූජනීය ප්‍රදේශය ප්‍රච්චන් තරම් ඉක්මනින් සංරක්ෂණය කර එහි පාලන ය පුස්තකවරුන්ට භාර දීමට කටයුතු කරන

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

අතර නව නගරයට සීමා වන ප්‍රදේශය සඳහා වැඩි කලක් ගත වන්නට පෙර යු.සී. ගෙවත් පළාත් ආණ්ඩු සභාවක් වැනි පළාත් පාලන සංස්ථාවක් ලබා දීමට ක්‍රියා කරන ලෙස, ඒ ඉල්ලීම ඉතා ගෞරවයෙන් ඉදිරිපත් කරමින් මගේ වචන සවලපය මා අවසන් කරනව.

මෛත්‍රිපාල සේනානායක මයා. (මැද වට්ටිය)

(තිரு. මෛත්‍රිපාල සේනානායක—මධ්‍ය වාසි)

(Mr. Maithripala Senanayeke—Meda-wachchiya)

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, ප්‍රශ්න දෙකක් සම්බන්ධයෙන් පමණක් කරුණු පැහැදිලි කර ගන්න සතුටුයි. ඉඩම් දීම සම්බන්ධයෙන් කලින් අනුගමනය කළ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය මේ රජය වෙතස් කර තිබෙනවද යන්න ඉන් පළමුවැන්නයි. රජය මගින් හදන ගෙවල පදිංචි කරන අය සම්බන්ධයෙන් අනුගමනය කළ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය වෙතස් කරන ලද්දේද යන්න දෙවැන්නයි. ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් වචන සවලපයක් කථා කරන්න මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනව. අනුරාධපුරය සංවර්ධනය කිරීමේ මණ්ඩලය—අනුරාධපුර සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලය—ඇති කළාට පස්සේ නව නගරය තුළ ඉඩම් දෙන පිළිවෙළ කොන්දේසි පහක් යටතේ තිබුණා. යම් කෙනෙකුගේ ඉඩම් රජය අත්පත් කර ගන්නා නම් ශුද්ධ නගරය පරිශුද්ධ කිරීමට ඒ අයට පළමුවෙන්ම ඉඩම් දුන්නා. ඒ පළමුවන කණ්ඩායමයි. පරණ නගරය තුළ ඉඩම් තිබුණු කණ්ඩායමට ඊළඟට ඉඩම් දුන්නා. ඒ දෙවන කණ්ඩායමයි. පරණ නගරයේ සරීර පදිංචි කාරයින්ට ඊළඟට ඉඩම් ඉන්නා. ඒ තුන්වන කණ්ඩායමයි. උතුරු මධ්‍යම පළාතේ අයට ඊළඟට ඉඩම් දුන්නා. ඒ හතරවන කණ්ඩායමයි. පස්වන කොටස වශයෙන් පිට අයට ඉඩම් දුන්නා. මා දන්න හැටියට නම්, ඒ පස්වැනි කොටසට අයිති කෙනකු වශයෙනුයි බණ්ඩාරනායක මැතිනියටත් නිශංක විජේරත්න මහත්මයාටත් ලැබුණේ. බණ්ඩාරනායක මැතිනියට ඉඩම් දුන්නේ ගරු බණ්ඩාරනායක මැතිතුමාට දීලා නොවෙයි, මැතිනිය ඉල්ලා තිබුණු නිසාය කියලා මා හිතනව.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(ගෙළරා වැට්ටි සේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

ඉල්ලා තිබුණා; නමුත් දීලා තිබුණේ නැහැ.

මෛත්‍රිපාල සේනානායක මයා.

(තිரு. මෛත්‍රිපාල සේනානායක)

(Mr. Maithripala Senanayeke)

ඔව්, ඒක ඇත්ත. ඉල්ලා තිබුණා. දේශ පාලනයෙන් විවේක ගත් දවසක අනුරාධ පුරයේ පදිංචි වෙන්න ඕනෑය යනුවෙන් එතුමා කල්පනා කරගෙන සිටියා. ඒ අනුව ඉල්ලා තිබුණා. එතුමාගේ අභාවයෙන් පසු ඒ වෙනුවට මැතිනියගේ ඉල්ලීම පිට මැතිනියට දෙවැනි කොටසින් ඉඩමක් දුන්නා. එහෙත් පළමුවන කොටස සම්පූර්ණයෙන් අවසන් කරන්න ඕනෑය කියා එවකට හිටපු දිසාපතිතුමා පළමුවන කොටසේ ඇබැරිතුවක් ඇති වූ වහාම දුන් අක්කරය වෙනුවට අක්කර භාගයක් දීලා තියෙනව.

සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(තිරුමති සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)

අක්කරයක් දුන්නා. දෙකක් වැඩි කියලා මම එකක් ඉල්ලා ගන්නා.

මෛත්‍රිපාල සේනානායක මයා.

(තිරු. මෛත්‍රිපාල සේනානායක)

(Mr. Maithripala Senanayeke)

අක්කර දෙකක් දීලා, නැවත, අක්කර දෙකක් වැඩිය කියා අක්කරයක් ලබා ගන්නා. ඒකයි ඉඩම් දෙන ප්‍රතිපත්තිය වශයෙන් තිබුණේ.

අ. හා. 5.15

ගෙවල් දෙන ප්‍රතිපත්තිය වශයෙන් තිබුණේ මේකයි: වහාම තමන්ගේ ගෙයක් හදා ගන්නව නම් ඉඩම දෙනව. එසේ නැතිව ශුද්ධ නගරයේ ඉන්න ඥාති පදිංචිකාරයන්ටම ගෙවල් දීම නොවෙයි. ඉල්ලුම් පත්‍ර කැඳවා, පරීක්ෂණ කරයි ගෙවල් දුන්නේ. ගෙවල් 150ක් පමණ අවසන් වුණේ අප්‍රේල් මාසයේ දීය කියා මා හිතනව. කලින් කථා කළ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා කිව්වා වශයෙන් විධියක අකමිකතා ඇති වුණාය

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[මෛත්‍රීපාල සේනානායක මයා.]

කියන චෝදනාව ඇති කරන්න සිද්ධ වෙලා තියෙන්නෙ ප්‍රතිපත්තියක් වශයෙන් පසුගිය රජය ක්‍රියා කළාය කියා හිතන අන්දම නිසා වෙන්න ඇති. යම් කෙනෙකුට නව නගරයේ ගෙයක් දෙනවා නම් පරණ නගරයේ ගෙවල් තිබුණු ගෙවල් කැඩුණු අයටයි දෙන්නෙ. ඒ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය වරදවා තේරුම් ගැනීමක් නිසා මේ චෝදනාව නැගුවා විය හැකියි. එක් ගෙයක හතර පස් දෙනකු ඉන්නවා නම් එක් කෙනෙකුට නව නගරයෙන් ගෙයක් දීලා තවත් අය ශුද්ධ නගරයේ තබා ගැනීමට වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් යෙදුවෙ නැහැ. කිසිම සුදුසුකමක් නැති—ඒ කියන්න අර මා සඳහන් කළ පරිදි පදිංචිය අනුව දීමට සුදුසුකම් නැති—අයට නව සහාපතිතුමා ගෙවල් දීලා තියෙනව. ඒ තිසයි ඒ ගැන කියන්නෙ. මේක දේශපාලන ප්‍රශ්නයක් නොවෙයි. අයවැය ලේඛනය පිළිබඳ දෙවන වර කියවීමේ විවාදයට සහභාගි වෙමින් මා කිව්වාය කියලා මා විශ්වාස කරනව, අපත් නව රජයත් බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නෙ පුළුවන් තරම් ඉක්මණින් ශුද්ධ නගරය පරිශුද්ධ කිරීමට බව. එහෙම නම් කලින් අනුගමනය කළ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය වෙනස් කර හිතුමනයේ හැටියට එක් එක්කෙනාට ඕනෑ හැටියට ගෙවල්—රජයෙන් හදන ගෙවල්—දෙන්නට ගියොත් තවත් අවුරුදු 25 ක් 30 ක් නොව, ඊටත් වඩා කාලයක් ගත වෙන්න පුළුවනි මේ වැඩ කොටස අවසන් කිරීමට. මක්නිසාද, මුළු ජනගහනයෙන් භාගයක්වත් තවම මෙහාට අරන් නැහැ. ඒ නිසා මම ගරු අගමැතිතුමාගෙන් පැහැදිලි කර ගන්න කැමතියි, ඉඩම් සහ ගෙවල් දීම සම්බන්ධයෙන් කලින් තිබුණ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය වෙනස් කර තිබෙනවාද කියා. එසේ වෙනස් කර තිබෙනවා නම් ඒ නව ප්‍රතිපත්තිය මොකක්ද කියන එකයි මගේ ප්‍රශ්නය.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරාච්චි ජයරත්නපාය)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

ගරු සහාපතිතුමනි, අනුරාධපුර මන්ත්‍රීතුමාත් (කේ. බී. රත්නායක මයා.) මැද වච්චියේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාත් (මෛත්‍රීපාල

සේනානායක මයා.) අනුරාධපුර සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලය ගැන ප්‍රශ්න කීපයක් මතු කරන්න යෙදුණා. අනුරාධපුර මන්ත්‍රීතුමාගෙ කථාවෙදි එතුමා අපට පැහැදිලි කර දුන්නා, පළමුවෙනි සහාපතිවරුන් තුන් දෙනාම දිසාපතිවරුන් වශයෙන් සේවය කළාය කියා. ඒකෙන්ම පිළිගන්න බැරිදි සම්පූර්ණ කාලය යොදා කටයුතු කිරීමට අවශ්‍ය පුද්ගලයෙක් වුවමනා නැති බව ඒ රජය කල්පනා කළාය කියා? එසේ නම්, සම්පූර්ණ කාලය යොදා කරන්න එහි වැඩක් නැති බව පසුගිය රජය පිළිගත්තාය කියා අපට පිළිගන්න බැරිදි? සහාපති වශයෙන් සම්පූර්ණ කාලය යොදන්න තරම් වැඩ තිබෙනවා නම් දිසාපති සහාපති යන පදවි දෙකේම කටයුතු කරන්නෙ කොහොමද? තවත් කාරණයක් නම්, ඒ සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයේ වැඩ මීට වඩා අධිකව තිබුණ කාලයේදී—පළමුවෙනි අවුරුදු තුනේ අද තිබෙන ප්‍රමාණයට වඩා වැඩ තිබුණා—එදා රජය කල්පනා කළා අනුරාධපුර දිසාපති වශයෙන් ක්‍රියා කරමින්ම සහාපති වශයෙන් සේවය කරන්නත් පුළුවන් ය කියා. තමුන්නාන්සේලා එදා තුන් වතාවක්ම කල්පනා කළා නම් අනුරාධපුර දිසාපති වශයෙන් සිටිමින් ම සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයේ සහාපති හැටියට කටයුතු කරන්න පුළුවන් ය කියා—

මෛත්‍රීපාල සේනානායක මයා.

(තිල. මාමත්තිරිපාල ජයරත්නපාය)

(Mr. Maithripala Senanayake)

දෙවනාවයි.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරාච්චි ජයරත්නපාය)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

නැහැ. තුන් වතාවක්.

සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(තිල. මාමත්ති සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)

දෙවනාවයි. තුන්වෙනි එක්කෙනා

නැහැ. ගන්න බැහැ කියා.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරඹ උද්ගිරි ජයරත්නපාය)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

හරි. තුන්වෙනි වතාවටත් තමුන්ගෙන් සේලා කල්පනා කළා නම්—ඒ තැනැත්තාට බැහැ කියා කී එක වෙනම ප්‍රශ්නයක්—අනුරාධපුර දිසාපති වශයෙන් ක්‍රියා කරමින්ම සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයේ සභාපති හැටියට ක්‍රියා කළ හැකිය කියා, මම කල්පනා කළොත් නීතිඥයෙක් ඒ සඳහා යෙදවිය යුතුය කියා ඒක වැරදිද? නීතිඥයෙකුට නැහැ දිසාපතිවරයෙකුට තරම් වැඩ. එතකොට මම එහෙම කල්පනා කළොත් එය වැරදිද? නැහැ. මන්ද? ඒ මණ්ඩලයේ සාමාන්‍යාධිකාරීතුමා ඉන්නවා. ඒ සාමාන්‍යාධිකාරීතුමා තමයි සම්පූර්ණ කාලය යොදා ක්‍රියා කරන්නේ. දැන් අපේ සංයුක්ත මණ්ඩල ආදිය තිබෙනවා. අද ලංකාවේ සංයුක්ත මණ්ඩල රාශියක් තිබෙනවා. තමුන්ගෙන් සේලා ගෙ කාලයෙන් ඒ මණ්ඩල තිබුණා. සම්පූර්ණ කාලය යොදා වැඩ කිරීමට තමුන්ගෙන් සේලා ඒ මණ්ඩල වලට සභාපතිවරුන් පත් කළා. අනුරාධපුර මන්ත්‍රීතුමා අපට කියන්න යෙදුණා, ජයවර්ධන දොස්තර මහත්මයා සභාපති හැටියට සම්පූර්ණ කාලය යෙදු නිසා ඒ මහතාට විශේෂ පඩියක් දුන්නාය කියා. තමුන් දිසාපතිවරුන්ට ඒ සඳහා පඩියක් දුන්නේ නැහැ. ආණ්ඩුවේ යම්කිසි සේවකයෙක් සංයුක්ත මණ්ඩලයක සේවය කරන විට වැඩි පඩියක් දෙන බව ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා දන්නවා ඇති. තමුන් ජයවර්ධන දොස්තර මහතාට විශේෂ පඩියක් දී තිබෙනවා. මොකක්ද දුන් පඩිය? රුපියල් 800කුත් ඒ මහතාගේ විශ්‍රාම වැටුපත් යන දෙකම. ඒ දොස්තර මහත්මයාට, රුපියල් අට සියයක් සහ විශ්‍රාම වැටුප් යන දෙකම ලැබුණු තමුන් සාමාන්‍යයෙන් ආණ්ඩුවේ සේවකයකු පත් කරන කොට ඒ දෙකෙහි වෙනස පමණයි ගෙවන්නේ. ඒකයි සාමාන්‍ය සිරිත.

රත්නායක මයා.

(ශ්‍රී ලං. රාත්‍රායක)

(Mr. Ratnayake)

ඒක එලවන්ස් එකක්!

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

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරඹ උද්ගිරි ජයරත්නපාය)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

එලවන්ස් එකක් හරි මොනව වුණත්.

මෙමත්‍රීපාල සේනානායක මයා.

(ශ්‍රී ලං. මාමත්‍රීපාල ජයරත්නපාය)

(Mr. Maithripala Senanayake)

There is no salary.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාතිත්‍රි ආචාර්ය. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

The difference between the pension and the substantive salary.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරඹ උද්ගිරි ජයරත්නපාය)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

තමුන් මම ඔප්පු කරන්න යන්නේ දැන් බණ්ඩාර මහතාට ගෙවනවාට වඩා විශාල මුදලක් ජයවර්ධන දොස්තර මහතාට රජයෙන් ලැබුණු බවයි.

මෙමත්‍රීපාල සේනානායක මයා.

(ශ්‍රී ලං. මාමත්‍රීපාල ජයරත්නපාය)

(Mr. Maithripala Senanayake)

ගරු අගමැතිතුමා ඉඩ දෙනවා නම් එය පැහැදිලි කර දෙන්න පුළුවනි.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරඹ උද්ගිරි ජයරත්නපාය),

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

හැම තිස්සේම මම ඉඩ දෙනවා.

මෙමත්‍රීපාල සේනානායක මයා.

(ශ්‍රී ලං. මාමත්‍රීපාල ජයරත්නපාය)

(Mr. Maithripala Senanayake)

සාමාන්‍යයෙන් සංයුක්ත මණ්ඩල සභාපති ධුරවලට විශ්‍රාම ගත් අය පත් කරනවා නම් එම ධුර සඳහා පඩි නියම කරනවා.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කුරක සභාව

[මෙහිපිළි සේනානායක මයා.]

එසේ පඩි නියම කර එයින් විශ්‍රාම වැටුප් මුදල අඩු කරනවා. මේකෙ එහෙම දෙයක් නැහැ. මේකෙ පඩි නියම කර තිබුණේ නැහැ නෙ. ඒ කියන්නෙ, අපි හිතමු අනු රාධපුර සංරක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයේ සහාපති තනතුර සඳහා රුපියල් දෙදහසක පඩි යක් දෙනවා නම් විශ්‍රාම වැටුප් මුදල එයින් අඩු කරගෙන ඉතුරු ගණන දෙනවා. මේකෙ එහෙම දෙයක් තිබුණේ නැහැ. පඩියක් නියම කර තිබුණේ නැහැ. පළමු වන වරට ඒ මහතාට, සම්පූර්ණ කාලය යොදා වැඩ කිරීම සඳහා රුපියල් අටසිය ගණනක් දුන්න. දැන් අපි කියමු තාව කාලික වශයෙන් වැඩ කරනවාය කියා, එහෙම නම් ඇයි ඒ මුදල් ප්‍රමාණය දෙන්නෙ? එසේ දීම සුදුසුද කියා මම අහනවා.

ගරු ඩබ්ලි ටේප් කානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க),
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

මම කියන දේවත් විකක් ඇහුම්කන් දෙන්න. අනුරාධපුර මන්ත්‍රිවරයා කීවා, ජයවර්ධන දොස්තර මහතා පත් කරන කොට එය සම්පූර්ණ කාලය යෙදිය යුතු නිලයක්ය කියා පිළිගත් බව. එහෙම නම් ඇයි පඩියක් නියම කළේ නැත්තේ? තමුත්තාත්සෙල පිළිගත්ත නම් සම්පූර්ණ කාලය යෙදිය යුතු නිලයක් හැටියට ඇයි පඩියක් නියම කළේ නැත්තේ? මෙය, මින් මත්තට මේ ස්ථානයට පත් වන පුද්ගලයන් වෙනුවෙන් සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම ක්‍රියාවේ යොදන්නට ඕනෑ. එම නිසා අප නියම කළා, රුපියල් දහස හෝ දෙදහස හෝ ඒ නිලයට පුදුසු පඩියක්. එසේ නියම කර ඒ පඩියයි විශ්‍රාම වැටුප් මුදලයි අතර ඇති වෙනස පමණයි ගෙවන්නේ. තමුත් ඒක එදා කළේ නැහැ. එදා ගෙව්ව, රුපියල් අටසියයක් සහ විශ්‍රාම වැටුප ගත දෙකම. තමුත් දැන් බණ්ඩාර මහත්මයට ගෙවන්නේ රුපියල් හත්සිය පණහයි. ජය වර්ධන මහත්මයට ගෙවූ මුදලටත් වඩා අඩයි.

ඊළඟට, ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, ප්‍රශ්නයක්
 ඉදිරිපත් කළා බණ්ඩාර මහත්මයාගේ පත්
 වීම ගැන. ප්‍රථමයෙන්ම ජයවර්ධන මහත්
 මය සිය කැමැත්තෙන්ම එම ධුරයෙන් අස්
 වුණා,

Digitized by Noolah
 noolaham.org.lk

ලෙමනිපාල සෝනානායක මයා.

(திரு. மைத்திரிபால சேனநாயக்க)
(Mr. Maithripala Senanayake)
ஐக்கியத்திற்குப் பதிலாக.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි ජෝනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

මොන තනතුරෙන් අස් වුණත් ප්‍රථම
යෙත්ම අස් වුණේ සිය කැමැත්තෙන්. ඒ
අවසරාවේදී අප කල්පනා කළේ සම්පූර්ණ
යෙත්ම අස් වුණාය කියයි. ඒ නිසයි ඒ
වෙනුවට බණ්ඩාර මහත්මයා පත් කළේ
නාවක දැනගන්න ලැබුණා, සභාපති තන
තුරෙන් පමණයි අස් වුණේ කියා.

මෙම පොත සේනාධිපති මහා.

(திரு. மைத்திரிபால சேனநாயக்க)
(Mr. Maithripala Senanayake)
லீஸுமேன் அலுவலகம்.

ගරු ඩබ්ලි ජෝනානාසක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

සමහර විට පැහැදිලිව තිබුණු ඒවත්
වෙනස් වෙනව.

මෙමනිසාද සේ නානායක මයා.

(திரு. மைத்திரிபால சேனநாயக்க)
(Mr. Maithripala Senanayake)
உரையிடுவோம் என்றே!

ගරු බඩිලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

එවිට පිළිගත්ත අස් වී තිබෙන්නෙ සභා පති තනතුරෙන් පමණක් ය කියා. ඊ ළඟට මම අතික් තනතුරෙන් අස් කළේ වැඩි පුර සංඛ්‍යාවක් ඉන්න නිසා. එසේ අස් කිරීම නීති විරෝධී නැහැ. ඒ පිළිබඳ පණතෙ 3 වන වගන්තියෙ මේ ආකාරයෙන් කියා තිබෙනව :

"No act or proceeding of the board shall be invalid by reason only of the existence of any vacancy among its members or any defect in the appointment of a member thereof."

ප්‍රකාශන විරෝධ නැත.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

ඊ ළඟට, ඉඩම් දීම, නිවාස දීම පිළිබඳව ප්‍රශ්නයක් ඉදිරිපත් කළා. දවස් සවලපය කට ප්‍රථම අනුරාධපුර මන්ත්‍රීවරයා මගෙන් ප්‍රශ්න වශයක් ඇසුවා, මෙම ඉඩම් දීම ගැන. මම දීර්ඝ වශයෙන්, ඉඩම් ලැබුණු අයගේ විස්තර සහිතව, පිළිතුරු දුන්න.

• කලාතුරකින් ප්‍රතිපත්තියෙන් පිට කොටස් වලටත් ඉඩම් දී තිබෙන බව ඒ පිළිතුරෙන් පෙනී යනවා. යම් පුද්ගලයෙකුගේ ගොඩ නැගිල්ලක් හදිසි ගංවතුරකින් අබලන් වී ගියාද, අන්න එවැනි විපත්ති සිදු වූ උදව් යට—අවසා සවලපයකදී—ඒ ප්‍රතිපත්තියෙන් පිට නිවාස දී තිබෙනවා. මා හිතන්නේ නැහැ, ඒක වරදක් කියා. තමාගේ නිවස කඩා වැටීම වැනි විපත්තියක් සිදු වූ යම් පුද්ගලයෙකු ගැන කල්පනා කර ඔහුට සහනයක් ලබා දීම වරදක් නොවෙයි. අවසා සවලපයකදී එවැනි පුද්ගලයින්ට සහන සලසා තිබෙනවා. එම නිසා ඒක විශේෂ අළුත් ප්‍රතිපත්තියක් අනුගමනය කිරීමක් වශයෙන් පිළිගන්නට බැහැ. මා හිතන්නේ නැහැ, ඒ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා වත් විපතට පත්වූ පුද්ගලයෙකුට එවැනි සහනයක් ලබා දෙනවාට විරුද්ධ වෙයි කියා. ඊළඟට ඒ මන්ත්‍රීතුමා ඒ ප්‍රශ්න අසන අවසාවේදී මගෙන් ඇහුව, ප්‍රදේශයෙන් පිට උදවියට ඉඩම් ලැබී තිබෙනවාය, ඒ ගැන තමුන් තාන්සේ පරීක්ෂණයක් පවත්වල සුදුස්සක් කරනවාද කියා. මා කිව්ව, ප්‍රදේශයෙන් පිට නොයෙක් අයට ඉඩම් ලැබී තිබෙන බව මම දන්නවා, හිටපු අගමැතිනියටත්, නිශ්ශංක විජයරත්න මහත්මයාටත් ලැබී තිබෙනවා, කියා. එහෙම නම් මගෙන් අහනවද, ඒ ගැනත් සෝදිසි කරල සුදුස්සක් කරනවද කියා?

සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.

(තිලුමති සිත්තිමාවෝ පණ්ඩාරනායක)
(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)

ඔව්. ගත්තට ඕනෑ නම් ආපසු දෙන්නට ලැබෙන්නිසි.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරඹ උඩ්ගි ජෙත්තනායක)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

මගේ ප්‍රශ්නයක් මම ඇහුවෙ. පිට උදව් යට ලැබී තිබෙන බව මා දන්නවා. ප්‍රදේශයට විශේෂ අමුත්තන් වශයෙන් හිටපු

අගමැතිනියටත් හිටපු දිසාපතිතුමාටත් ලැබී තිබෙනවා. මගෙන් ඉල්ලන විට පිට අයට ලැබුණු හේතු ගැන විභාග කරන්නට කියා, මා අහන්නේ මේ දෙකත් ඇතුළත් කරන්නටද කියයි.

සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.

(තිලුමති සිත්තිමාවෝ පණ්ඩාරනායක)
(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)

බොහොම හොඳයි; අපේ කිසි අකමැත්තක් නැහැ. කොමිසමක් පත් කළත් කමක් නැහැ.

රත්නායක මිය.

(තිලු. රත්නායක)
(Mr. Ratnayake)

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, මගේ තර්කය මේකයි. මා ප්‍රශ්න කළේ සාදා තිබෙන නිවාසත්, කඩ සඳහා වෙන් කර තිබෙන පර්චස් දහය-දොළහ ඉඩනුත් සම්බන්ධයෙනුයි.

ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(කෙළරඹ ආභුතත්තවාර් ඉලුචාර්)
(An hon. Member)
ඒව වහනවා.

රත්නායක මිය.

(තිලු. රත්නායක)
(Mr. Ratnayake)

වහනවා නොවෙයි. මා ප්‍රශ්න කළේ “residential sites” ගැන නොවෙයි.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරඹ උඩ්ගි ජෙත්තනායක)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

මා ඒ ගැන මීට ප්‍රථම සම්පූර්ණ විස්තර දැන ගත්ත. මන්ද? මේ ප්‍රශ්නය මතු වූ අවසාවේදී නිශ්ශංක විජයරත්න මහත්මයා තමාගේ නිදහසට කරුණු දක්වමින් පත්‍ර වලට ප්‍රකාශනයක් නිකුත් කළා. ඒ ප්‍රකාශනයේ සඳහන් වී තිබුණ, නැසිගිය අගමැතිතුමා ඒ පුද්ගලයාට දන්වා තිබුණාය, නැසිගිය අගමැතිතුමාට යම් දවසක අනුරාධපුරයේ පදිංචිවන්නට හෝ කලින් කල මගෙන් නිවසක් සාදා ගන්න

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කුරක සභාව

[ගරු ඩබ්ලිව් සෝ නානායක]

ඉඩමක් වුවමනාය කියා. එ' නිශ්ශංක විජයරත්න මහත්මයා කිව්ව දේයි. අග මැතිතුමා නම් නැතිවෙලා ඉවරයි. මේක ඇත්තද නැද්ද කියා දැනගන්න වචන යක්වත් නැහැ. කිසිම ඉල්ලීමක් නැහැ. ලියමනක්වත් නැහැ. විජයරත්න මහත්මයාගේ වචනය පමණයි තිබෙන්නේ. සමහර විට මා හිතන්නේ, නිශ්ශංක විජයරත්න මහත්මයාගේ වචනය හිටපු අගමැතිනිය පිළිගන'ට ඇති.

අ. ණ. 5.30

සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.

(திருமதி சிறிமாவோ பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)

ඒ කියා තිබෙන්නේ එතුමා අන්තිම වතාවට අනුරාධපුරයට ගිය අවස්ථාවේදීයි. එතුමාගේ අභාවයට සති දෙකකට කලින්. ලියවිල්ලකින් ඉල්ලනට තරම් වෙලාවක් තිබුණේ නැහැ.

ගුණ ධර්ම සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

එක මම පිළිගන්නව. තිශ්ශංක විජය රත්න මහත්මයා පත්‍රවලට නිකුත් කළ ප්‍රකාශනයෙන් කිව්වෙ, ඒ නිසා ඒ ඉඩම් කොටස හිටපු අගමැතිනියට පැවරුවා කියයි. තවදුරටත් එහි සඳහන් වුණා, අගමැතිනියට අක්කර දෙකක් වුවමනා කළේ නැත, අක්කරයක් පමණක් ඇතිය කිව්ව නිසා අනික් අක්කරය තමා ගත්තාය කියා. දිසාපති හැටියට හැන්ද එයා ගෙ අතේ තිබුණු නිසා එයාටම බෙදා ගන්නා. එයාම පත්‍රයෙන් ප්‍රසිද්ධ ලෙස ඒක කිව්ව. අපි ඉතින් ඔය ගැන ඊට වඩා කළා කළේ නැහැ. ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, මම ගල්ඔයෙන් කොටසක් ගත්ත නම් මට ලැබෙන්නෙ බැණුම්. මම ගල්ඔයෙන් අක්කරයක් නොවෙයි, අක්කර අරික් කාලක් ගත්තා නම් මට අද වන තෙක් බැණුම් අහන්න වෙයි. මේක අල්ලගෙන අවරුදු ගණනක් තිස්සේ රැස්වීම් තියයි. එහෙනම් ඒක හරිතාල් එකට වඩා ලොකු එකක් වෙයි. මටත් පළවන්නම තිබුණ, ගල්ඔයෙන් ඉඩම් ගන්න. මහඑ වයසෙදී ගල්ඔයේ පදිංචි වෙන්න මමත් බොහොම ආසයි.

Digitized by Noolah
noolaham.org

පී. බී. තෙන්නකෝන් මයා. (දඹුල්ල)

(திரு. ஈ. பி. தென்னகோன்—தம்புளை)

(Mr. T. B. Tennekoon—Dambulla)

ගල්ඔයෙයි, අනුරාධපුරයෙයි ලොකු වෙනසක් තියෙනව.

ගරු ඩබ්ලි ජේෂ්වතානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

එක වෙනසයි, තියෙන්නෙ. එක සහෝ
දරයෙක්—දුටු ගැමිණි රජතුමා—අනුරාධ
පුරය බිඳලවන්න ක්‍රියා කළා. අනික් සහෝ
දරයා—සද්ධානිසිස කුමාරයා—ගල්මිය
ප්‍රදේශය සම්බන්ධයෙන් ක්‍රියා කළා.

පී. බී. තෙන්නකෝන් මයා.

(திரு. ஈ. பி. தென்னகோன்)

(Mr. T. B. Tennekoon)

බෞද්ධයන්ගේ සැලකිල්ලේ වෙනසක්
නියෙනව.

ගරු ඩබ්ලි ජේතානායක

(கௌரவ டப்டி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

එක නොවෙයි, ඉදිරිපත් වන ප්‍රශ්නය.
ආමතිවරුන් වශයෙන් අපි මේ විධියේ
ව්‍යාපාර සම්බන්ධයෙන් ක්‍රියා කරන විට
අපි ඒ ව්‍යාපාරවලින් ඉඩම් කොටස් අයිති
කර ගැනීම සදුසද කියන එකයි, ප්‍රශ්නය.

අ. හා. 5.33

මුලාසනාරූප මත්ත්ව

(தலைமை தாங்கும் அங்கத்தவர்)

(The Presiding Member)

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

අනතුරුව ශ්‍රීමත් රසික් fපරිච්ඡි මහතා මූලාසනයෙන් ඉවත් වූයෙන්, කථානායකතුමා මූලාසනාරූඪ විය.

அதன் பிறகு சேர். றுசிக் பரீத் அவர்கள் அக்கிராசனத் திவிருந்து நீங்கவே சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள் தலைமை தாங்கினார்.

[Whereupon SIR RAZIK FAREED left the Chair, and MR. SPEAKER took the Chair.]

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි ජෙෆ් තානායක

(கௌரவ டப்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, මා කළා කරමින් සිටියේ එක් තරු ප්‍රතිපත්තියක් ගැනයි.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

මගේ පියාත්, මමත් ඒ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය අනුගමනය කළා නම් ලංකාවේ හැම ප්‍රදේශයකින්ම මටත් අක්කරය, අක්කරය භුක්ති විඳින්න තිබුන. අපේ කාලවලදී අපි ජනපද ව්‍යාපාර රාශියක් ආරම්භ කළා. ඒ ගැන කියන්න තියෙන්නෙ එපමණයි.

අනුරාධපුර නව නගරයේ සංවර්ධනය අවසාන කර එය මහජනයාගේ පාලනයට භාර දෙන්නෙ කවදද කියන ප්‍රශ්නය ඉදිරිපත් කළා. නමුත්තාත්සෙලා මේ සම්බන්ධයෙන් දීර්ඝ කාලයක් ගත්තා. නව නගරයේ පාලනය මහජනයාට භාර දෙන්න කියා මහජනයාගෙන් කීප විටක් ඉල්ලීම් ඉදිරිපත් වුණු බව මම දන්නවා. ලබන අවුරුද්ද අවසානයේදී නව නගරයේ පාලනය මහජනයාට භාර දෙන්න පුළුවන් වෙය යන්නයි, අපේ විශ්වාසය. මා හිතන විධියට මේ සම්බන්ධයෙන් ඉදිරිපත් වුණු ප්‍රශ්න එපමණයි.

සභාපතිතුමා,

(அக்கிராசனார்)

(The Chairman)

Head 14, Vote 5, has been passed.

We pass on to Head 15.

15 වන ශීර්ෂය.—සුද්ධ හමුදාව

1 වන සම්මතය.—කාර්ය මණ්ඩල පොද්ගලික පති නඩි සහ අනිකුත් දීමනා, රු. 2,24,93,773

1 වන උප ශීර්ෂය.—සේවක සංඛ්‍යා සහ වැටුප් රු. 1,26,93,386

தலைப்பு 15.—தரைப்படை

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 1.—பணியாளரின் ஆளுக்கூரிய வேதனையும் பிறப்புகளும், ரூபா 2,24,93,773

உப தலைப்பு 1.—ஊழியர் கோப்பும் சம்பளங்களும் ரூபா. 1,26,93,386

HEAD 15.—ARMY

Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and other allowances of staff, Rs. 22,493,773

Sub-head 1.—Cadre and salaries, Rs. 12,693,386

කෙනමත් මයා.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Mr. Chairman, I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 10 in respect of sub-head 1, item '350 Officers'"

During the course of his speech on the Second Reading Debate, the Hon. Minister of State (Hon. J. R. Jayewardene) chose to make a somewhat extended statement on some of the changes that have recently been made in the commands of regiments of the Ceylon Army.

There has been quite a lot of public unease on this matter, and my Hon. Friend, the Minister of State, in his attempt to build a new image of himself made statements on certain questions.

I know that the Prime Minister is in charge of the army. I do not know whether it was a temporary arrangement during the period that he was ill and unable to attend to work or whether it was a more permanent arrangement, but in practice his authority has been exercised by the Minister of State. Of course, the Prime Minister is responsible and he has never avoided that responsibility.

I should like to raise certain matters in relation to some changes that have taken place in the army for the purpose of clarification.

The Minister of State in his role of Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and, shall I say, *de facto* political boss of the army, has been going round visiting various army cantonments and regiments and generally making himself conspicuous wherever the army is to be found and making a number of speeches about loyalty. I do not know how accurately my Hon. Friend has been reported by the newspapers that support him, but I read a very interesting speech which he is alleged to have made at Diyatalawa where he stated that as far as he is concerned a disloyal soldier is a dead soldier. I do not know whether that was a threat to the members of the army that if the Minister of State considered them disloyal they would no longer be in the land of the living.

Now, Sir, in view of these statements that have been made and my Hon. Friend's own statements in the

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

[කෙනමන් මය.]

course of his speech on the 18th of this month on the Second Reading Debate and also in view of the intervention, later or earlier, by the Prime Minister that the Government has a right to have its own trusted and loyal men at the top—

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උද්ග්‍රී ජෙනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Does not the Government have that right!

කෙනමන් මය.

(ති.රු. කෙනමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Oh, yes!

I want to know whether certain changes that have taken place in the commands—

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උද්ග්‍රී ජෙනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

What are the changes?

කෙනමන් මය.

(ති.රු. කෙනමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

— of regiments in the Ceylon Army are part of the Government's desire to ensure loyalty through its own trusted men in the army. Or are they some changes made from the point of view of strengthening the efficiency of the army and its command?

I want to ask this question first: What is the need to create this new volunteer regiment in the South? The Hon. Minister of State, when I questioned him in the course of his speech, confirmed that they are starting a new volunteer regiment in the South. He also confirmed that Lieutenant-Colonel Dharmapala, the defeated U. N. P. candidate of Akuressa and now a member of the C. T. B., one who has engaged in U. N. P. politics, is to be in charge of

—කාරක සභාව

this new volunteer regiment that is being formed. I do not know Major Dharmapala's qualifications as a military man, but I do know that he is an extremely loyal U. N. P. man. His loyalty to the party in power is beyond doubt. I hope I am not doing him an injustice when I refer to him as "Major". I do not know if he has been promoted.

ශ්‍රී ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන

(කෙළරාව ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

Lieutenant-Colonel.

කෙනමන් මය.

(ති.රු. කෙනමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Why is it necessary to create this new regiment? What is the purpose? Has there been some greater and hostile external threat to Ceylon? If so, is it only the South of Ceylon that is threatened? Why have you selected one of your top political men, a temporary officer, shall I say, a gentleman officer, not even a regular soldier, to be in charge of your new volunteer regiment? Is he going to do the recruiting for this regiment? Is this going to be the green-shirted regiment of the Ceylon Army? Are we going to have the Ceylon Army commanded by the defeated candidates of the U. N. P. who have military qualifications or, at least, military titles? [Interruption].

The Hon. Minister of Public Works, Posts and Telecommunications is not a defeated candidate. He is a successful candidate, but he is also a former military man.

So, we should like to know the reason and the purpose in starting this new volunteer force. Hon. Members know that there are certain lessons to be learnt from the experience of the abortive *coup d'état* of 1962. A good number of the persons who took a prominent part in leading this *coup d'état* came from these so-called volunteer regiments. They were spare-time officers, full-time

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

politicians. Any Government must be seriously concerned with an attempt by the armed forces, or a section of it, to use the arms in its possession to overthrow the Government in power or to seize power in the State. Any Government must be concerned with it. And when there has been an experience of one such attempt, where a considerable number of the persons involved came from these so-called volunteer regiments, surely my hon. Friends should think twice before they come to the conclusion of extending and creating new volunteer forces even if they are going to put the members of the executive committee of the United National Party in charge of them.

First of all, I would like to know what is the purpose of this new regiment and why is Lt.-Col. Dharmapala being selected as the person to command the Southern Volunteers, the "green shirt regiment"?

The Minister of State went on to refer to certain other matters. I wonder if my hon. Friend the Prime Minister, or the Minister of State, is in a position to give us a list of changes in command of regiments in the Ceylon Army that have been made since this Government came into power. My hon. Friend gave certain names, certain changes. There are certain other changes which he has not mentioned. I would like to take up one or two of those matters.

A matter that was raised was that concerning Lt.-Col. Caldera. I think, he is now Temporary Colonel C. T. Caldera. He was the Commanding Officer of the First Regiment, Ceylon Signal Corps. The Minister of State confirmed that Colonel Caldera had been transferred to the Task Force in charge of illicit immigration. He had been relieved of the command of the First Regiment of the Ceylon Signal Corps and transferred to the Task Force which he said was detecting illicit immigrants in our northern and eastern shores. My hon. Friend was obviously disturbed. He read what he said was an extract from the

"Jana Dina" which had accused him of getting rid of Col. Caldera because he was a Buddhist officer, and he went on to make two statements to which I would like to draw your attention.

At column 352 of the HANSARD of 18th August, 1965, my hon. Friend the Minister of State said in respect of Col. C. T. Caldera:

"I did not know he was a Buddhist. I have never met the man."

Again, at column 353 he says:

"I have never met him. But I do not want him to resign."

අ. ආ. 5.45

Now this is a matter on which I would like my hon. Friend to give us a confirmation and I will accept his statement on the question. I am asking him to do so because this is a matter that has been fairly widely talked about in Army circles, and if my hon. Friend can say that it is not correct, I am prepared to accept that fact.

It has been widely stated in Army circles that, in point of fact, Lt.-Col. C. T. Caldera was called up on 24th June 1965, to the Ministry of Defence and External Affairs by the Minister of State and that the Minister of State told him that he was being relieved of the command of the Signal Regiment for reasons which could not be divulged.

ශ්‍රී ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන

(කෙනරාම ඉ. ජී. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

By the Army Commander.

කේනමන් මහ.

(කී. උ. කේනමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

And the Army Commander was also present. Therefore, the statement made by the Hon. Minister that he had never met this man is not correct. He said:

"I did not know he was a Buddhist. I have never met the man."

பிப்ரவரி மார்ச் மாதம், 1965-66

—கனம் உறுப்பினர்

சுரு. சே. ஸ்ரீ. சீவசாமி

(கனம் ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)
Until that day.

கனம் உறுப்பினர்.

(திரு. கெனமன்)
(Mr. Keuneman)

It is obvious that he had forgotten that meeting in the Ministry.

சுரு. சே. ஸ்ரீ. சீவசாமி

(கனம் ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)
Until that day I had not seen him.

கனம் உறுப்பினர்.

(திரு. கெனமன்)
(Mr. Keuneman)

But then you have seen him and told him that you were moving him out for reasons which you did not wish to disclose.

சுரு. சே. ஸ்ரீ. சீவசாமி

(கனம் ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)
No, that is not correct.

கனம் உறுப்பினர்.

(திரு. கெனமன்)
(Mr. Keuneman)

Is it correct that he was told that he could accept his transfer to the north or resign?

சுரு. சே. ஸ்ரீ. சீவசாமி

(கனம் ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)
The Army Commander told him.

கனம் உறுப்பினர்.

(திரு. கெனமன்)
(Mr. Keuneman)

You were also present. This was said in your presence.

சுரு. சே. ஸ்ரீ. சீவசாமி

(கனம் ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)
Yes.

கனம் உறுப்பினர்.

(திரு. கெனமன்)
(Mr. Keuneman)

Therefore, when my hon. Friend went on to give a long explanation that Lt.-Col. Caldera was moved because of the great importance that is now being attached to the Task Force and things like that, I do not think he was giving us, shall I say, a full and accurate picture of all the circumstances attendant on the transfer of this officer. My hon. Friend actually spoke as though, shall I say, a high favour was being conferred upon Lt.-Col. Caldera by his action.

This is what my hon. Friend said in column 352 :

“Colonel Caldera has been sent to be in charge of the Task Force Illicit Immigration which has set up overall command headquarters in Jaffna under the command of a full Colonel. He is in charge of a larger number of people than he was when he was here. He was holding the appointment of Commanding Officer, First Regiment, Ceylon Signal Corps. I will give other details at the Committee stage.”

We await that.

“This appointment involves overall supervision and command of personnel of all three services. It was decided on the recommendations of the Army Commander that a separate headquarters to control and co-ordinate illicit immigration activities from Puttalam to Pooneryn be set up in Mannar. Colonel Caldera, in view of his infantry experience, his thorough knowledge of signal deployment and his experience in intelligence matters, was considered the most suitable officer for this important appointment which carried the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel. He is now a temporary Colonel and will be made a full Colonel.”— [OFFICIAL REPORT, 18th August, 1965; Vol. 61, cs. 352-3.]

So you see that my hon. Friend, in justifying his action last time, forgot to tell us that Colonel Caldera had been called up to the Ministry by him and the Army Commander and had been told that he must go to the North or else he could resign.

விசேஷ கௌரவப் பதவி, 1965-66

—கார்ன கலாவி

சுரு. சே. ஃபர். ஜயவர்தன

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

It is not correct.

கேனமன் மியா.

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

It is correct that he was called up?

சுரு. சே. ஃபர். ஜயவர்தன

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

He was sent for because he threatened to resign and he was asked not to be a fool.

கேனமன் மியா.

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

He was sent for and he was told to go, and he was also told that you could not disclose the reasons why he was transferred.

சுரு. சே. ஃபர். ஜயவர்தன

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

No. He dare not ask.

கேனமன் மியா.

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Was he not told that you have asked him to go for reasons which you did not want to disclose?

சுரு. சே. ஃபர். ஜயவர்தன

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

No. The Army Commander asked him.

கேனமன் மியா.

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

In any case, he was not being sent on promotion. That is quite clear.

சுரு. டி. டி. ஸேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டி. டி. ஸேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I will answer that.

கேனமன் மியா.

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Please do. You have not explained what happened. Apparently, you were not present at the discussion.

சுரு. டி. டி. ஸேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டி. டி. ஸேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

No. I am responsible for everything.

கேனமன் மியா.

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I know you are responsible but you cannot speak to an incident that happened at an interview.

சுரு. சே. ஃபர். ஜயவர்தன

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

I told you.

கேனமன் மியா.

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

He can speak to what you told him.

The point I wish to raise is that it is obvious that for some reason of your own other than the question of the Army, you have decided on this transfer of the Commanding Officer of the Signal Corps to be in charge of the Immigration Task Force. It may be for a good reason. I do not know. I cannot presume to read your mind. All I can try to do is to compare the reason that you said inspired you when you made this change in the Army with what apparently did take place at a special meeting with this officer, yourself and the Army Commander. So what happens from there? A series of other moves on the chessboard take place.

I understand that Colonel Caldera has been replaced as Commanding Officer of the First Regiment Ceylon

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[කෙතමන් මැ.]

Signals by Lt. Col. C. F. Fernando, Colonel Fernando, I believe, is an artillery officer. I do not know whether he has had any special training in signals like Colonel Caldera. I do not know whether he knows very much about signals but I understand that he is a good artillery officer. Because you wanted to get rid of Colonel Caldera for reasons that you do not wish to disclose, he is moved out, and an artillery officer is moved in in charge of signals even though there is no indication that he has any special qualifications to hold this post.

There are certain other changes which have taken place for which we would like to have some type of explanation. If all this is explained purely on the basis of loyalty or that you think that all these officers are disloyal or lacking in the degree of loyalty that you expect of them, that is the end of the matter; and we know where we stand. But the Hon. Minister of State took a totally different position from that taken by the Hon. Prime Minister. He did not speak about loyalty; he speaks about loyalty outside. But here he said that he was doing something in the larger interests of the Army, including efficiency and so on.

Then why was Colonel Ramanayake of the Engineers shunted off to the Cadet Corps? I understand that he has been doing a good job. I know that army engineers are being used to assist the civil power in a number of civil engineering works. But now, apparently, Colonel Ramanayake is to be called upon to train young lads at school in marching, shouldering arms, forming fours, fixing bayonets and unfixing bayonets and all other military operations of a Cadet Corps. It seems a waste of an officer, a technical officer, in the army. Is this a political transfer, or is this for the better functioning of the armed forces? That is what we would like to know.

Another question I want to raise is this. I understand that prior to this Government coming into power, there was a division of authority at the head of the Army: that troops at Panagoda, the infantry units at Diyatalawa and Echelon Square came directly under the command of Brigadier Heyn—of course, Brigadier Heyn was under the Army Commander as now—and that despite this, the Armoured Corps came directly under the command of the Commander of the Army. I think that was the arrangement until quite recently. My hon. Friend has suddenly taken a decision to change that. In other words, the Armoured Corps the troops at Panagoda and the infantry units have been brought under Brigadier Heyn, subject to the overall supervision of the Army Commander.

I have not asked the previous Government why they took that decision to separate the chains of command; I presume that it was one of the things that they thought necessary after the experience of the abortive *coup d'état*—that it would be better to have some dispersal of authority, some dispersal of commands. I remember Major-General Wijekoon who was Army Commander at the time of the *coup d'état*, took a little time to find out what was going on. Apparently, he had not the slightest idea, rather like the I.G.P., as to what was going on among some of his own officers. Why did it become necessary to bring together again the trends of command in this way? Did you think that the arrangement made in the past was wrong and, if so, why?

There were certain other matters to which my hon. Friend referred and which have to be brought in issue. I think we would like a little more clear explanation of what exactly the Government is getting at.

I understand, for instance, that there were a number of officers who were due for retirement: commanding officers, senior officers. The previous Government had, I think, decided to introduce Sinhala, the official

language, into the Army, and they were insisting on senior officers, commanding officers, having some knowledge of the official language. As a result, certain senior officers had decided to send in their papers of retirement. I do not know whether it is called "retirement" in the Army. That appears to have been changed.

අ. න. 6

There is the case of Major Mc Heyzer. He has been ten years a Major—I speak subject to correction. I think he was ten years a Major and his release, I understand, had been agreed upon because he had served in the highest position, namely, as a Major, and also because he was not sufficiently proficient in the official language.

Now I understand Major Mc Heyzer has been put in charge of the Artillery. He has been allowed to continue, put in charge of the Artillery and made a Lieutenant-Colonel. Why has that happened?

There is also the case of Major Rajayogam of the C. E. I understand that he had sent in his papers for retirement on the basis that he was not proficient in the official language. That had been recommended and forwarded to the Army Commander, but, apparently, the retirement papers have been withdrawn.

Then there is another case, that of Major Soysa. Can the Hon. Prime Minister please tell us, has the decision that the officers in the Army Command should have some degree of proficiency in the official language been dropped altogether? Do you feel, for instance, that it is not necessary for Command Officers in the Army to have a sufficient degree of proficiency in the official language, just as the Hon. Minister of State told us that they feel that there were certain classes of Government employees, like labourers, technical officers and so on, who need not have proficiency in the official language? Are the Army Officers included or grouped within that group of Government officers who, you now say, do not require any knowledge of

the official language, or are they now grouped in that class of old entrants who, you told us, the present Government had exempted from any requirement to gain proficiency in the official language?

Could you please explain to us what role, if any, proficiency in the official language plays now in promotions, transfers and retirements of officers in the Ceylon Army?

I also understand that there were certain officers who were sent on compulsory leave after the events of the abortive *coup d'état*. I have a list of their names but I do not think it is fair to those officers to read out their names on the Floor of this House. I will therefore only deal with the general question. What is the position of the Government regarding these people? Are you investigating into the role they are supposed to have played in those events which led to the abortive *coup d'état* in 1962 or are you re-admitting them to the army without an investigation? My Hon. Friend informed us that they are going into the cases of persons who were sent on compulsory leave in connection with the events of January 1962. He confirmed that in the case of two persons who had been accused but who had been discharged by the *coup* court—Mr. Gunasekera who is a major in the army and Captain Felix—they were being taken back. I think, they are being taken back to their substantive posts.

Have you set up a board to examine these cases or what is the procedure that you are now adopting with regard to deciding whether or not to take back to the Army those officers who have been sent on compulsory leave in connection with the abortive *coup d'état* in 1962?

I also understand that under Army Service Regulations a soldier who has been enlisted for five years can again be re-enlisted for seven years and he can once again thereafter be re-enlisted for 10 years—a period of 22

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[කෙතෙක් මො.]

years service in all—unless some type of inefficiency is proved. I have only information given to me by some soldiers and I speak subject to correction. I understand that in the case of a certain number of soldiers who have been granted this ten-year extension, this period has been suddenly cut down to one year or even much less. Is this correct? If this is correct, in regard to how many soldiers has it happened and why has it happened? As I said, I have not got this information from a source which I can say is unimpeachable; but it seems to be a matter which was agitating the minds of some soldiers who spoke to me about this matter. I wish to know from my Hon. Friend whether this is correct or not.

I do not wish to mention names, but I understand that one of the reasons that are being adduced for some of the changes that are taking place in the higher circles of the army is that certain officers had been suspected of being involved in conduct unbecoming of an officer and a gentleman in the matter of funds in their charge—I am putting it as politely as possible! I would like my Hon. Friend to give me information on two matters in particular. I understand that there was an inquiry with regard to Capt. A. F. C. Stave of the C. A. C. C. I do not want to read out the charges because it is not proper to do so on the Floor of this House. An inquiry was held with regard to certain allegations against this officer. May I know what the result of this inquiry is?

I understand that there was an inquiry about some irregularities that took place in the unit of which Lt.-Col. Jayaratne was the Commanding Officer. I think he is still the Commanding Officer C. A. G. S. C. I do not think there was any charge of direct culpability against Lt.-Col. Jayaratne but there was a question of his accountability with regard to certain matters. I would like to know what happened to this inquiry. When was this matter first taken up and what is the decision reached?

I am raising these matters not because there are no more important questions concerning the army to be raised. There is the whole question of the position of privates, the ordinary rank and file soldiers. There was some improvement in their emoluments during the last few years. The hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa) will be speaking on this question; so I do not want to anticipate what he will say. I have an opportunity of becoming acquainted with some of their problems particularly in the matter of their allowances—separation allowance and so forth—because certain of the privates and non-commissioned officers are voters in my electorate. I do hope that some effort will be made to look into these questions as well. My Hon. Friend the Minister of State is very anxious to explain away the changes that have taken place in these commands. Apparently, he is anxious to see that all weapons are in proper order. But I would like him to spend a little time to see that the men behind the guns are also treated like human beings and given the attention which they deserve.

I must say that we are getting a very good type of lad in the army now. I am quite impressed by some of the young men I met in the army. They are of good physique; they seem to be quite intelligent. A lot of them are boys who come from rural areas and they seem to have a sense of patriotism, which is very gratifying to find in the army. I hope the same can be said of some of the other services. I do feel that they need material encouragement by way of betterment of their conditions, and this is a matter that can be looked into usefully by the Government.

I would like to know the reasons for these changes which have taken place. If it is all a question of loyalty or if it is all a question of the Government insisting on having its own officers in whom it has implicit trust, then tell us that that is the case, and everybody will

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

know that that is so. But if it is being argued that some of these changes are made for the greater good and glory of the Ceylon Army and its increased efficiency, then it is very difficult to accept that. Some of them appear to be political decisions being enforced by political authority to achieve political interests. That is why it would be far better than merely making broad statements to have some fairly concrete statements on the specific questions which have been raised.

ජයසූරිය මහා.

(திரு. ஜயசூரிய)

(Mr. Jayasuriya)

Mr. Chairman, I will not take very much of your time; there are just two matters which I would like to place before the Hon. Prime Minister regarding the Army. They affect not only the army but, perhaps, they have a bearing on the navy and the air force as well.

For a very long time many Governments have felt that a Widows' & Orphans' Pension Scheme was a very necessary thing to have for the Services. The idea was mooted in 1955. There have been two commissions but up to date nothing has been done to have such a scheme. The Indian Army, the Pakistani Army and the British Army all have a similar scheme. I think, the Gratiaen Report also recommends that the armed services should be given this privilege of having a Widows' and Orphans' Pension Scheme. The Public Service has such a scheme. Public servants who had left the Government Service and joined the army continue to contribute to the Widows' and Orphans' Pension Fund, but direct recruits to the army cannot contribute to it, and they do not have the benefit of such a scheme. I think it is a very necessary thing. I would earnestly request the Hon. Prime Minister to give thought to this matter and see that a Widows' and Orphans' Fund is started for the benefit of the Army, Navy and Air Force very soon.

අ. හා. 6.15

The other matter relates to other ranks. From the inception of the army camp at Panagoda soldiers who lived in Colombo and other areas had the privilege of getting to the Panagoda cantonment using army vehicles. They need not have to pay for their travelling. That has been the practice from the very inception of the army in this country. Unfortunately, the last Coalition Government decided to charge these soldiers Rs. 10 for travel in the army trucks. To these soldiers Rs. 10 means a lot of money, specially with the rising cost of living and the difficulties they have to face. Furthermore, when you take away a privilege they have been enjoying it is bound to create a little unhappy feeling. I would earnestly request the Hon. Prime Minister to consider this matter too and see that until such time as housing and other amenities are provided, these soldiers who have to travel from areas outside Panagoda camp are allowed to travel in army trucks as earlier without any charges whatever.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මහා. (දකුණු කොළඹ)

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா—கொழும்புத் தெற்கு அங்கத்தவர்)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa—Colombo South)

Mr Chairman, I am glad the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central (Mr. Keuneman) raised the question of certain transfers in the army because it relieves me of any necessity of going into those questions. The grievances of the other ranks among the non-commissioned officers of the army have been subjects that I have on more than one occasion raised when this honourable House came to discuss the annual Estimates. In the discussions of 1958-59 and subsequently, I had occasion to mention a number of grievances in regard to army personnel particularly the other ranks. We ourselves belong to the "other ranks", and it is nothing but natural that we should have a little sympathy for the ordinary soldier. The particular grievances that I raised in 1960 related to certain

සිසිරිපාන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.]

levies that were being made on the pay abstract. Deductions were being made at source. There was a certain charge being levied called 'barrack damages' and whether a person happened to be occupying quarters in the barracks or not he had to pay this levy. It was deducted at source.

Now that I am raising this matter, I must express my gratitude to the hon Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike) who was Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Defence and External Affairs who took some note of the complaints that were being made, and made an order in 1962. I shall straight way give you the reference—CA/A/277 of 16.10.1962. The order was that these barrack charges should not be levied any longer. But, Sir, that was only a correction of one particular item. I do not think that the hon. Parliamentary Secretary on that occasion was completely aware of the entire scope of the revisions that were being made. As everybody knows, from 1956 onwards it was the desire of the governments that had the custody of the affairs of this country to effect certain changes or reforms in the army. There was a lot of thinking done on that matter but, as a result of the Government of 1956 coming to an untimely end in 1959, the direction of those changes took some time in being formulated. As everybody knows, institutions like the army, navy, police force and so on, are the most resistant in regard to changes. Governments may come, and Governments may go, but all these continue to remain unaltered because those in the upper echelons of these forces are particularly conservative, generally tend to be ultra conservative in their attitude to changes, and resist changes because they feel any changes are likely to undermine efficiency and discipline.

I therefore do not necessarily blame my good Friend the hon. Parliamentary Secretary for not being able to complete all the changes he envisaged in his time. Of the

departmental charges that were made, one was removed—this question of barrack damages—and I want to thank him for having attended to that matter. Along with that circular which came from an army source there was also a letter in which a request was made for certain charges which were apparently, voluntary, for example a contribution to sports and charges to be paid to the army barber. Now I understand that the barber is paid out of the public purse and that the army grounds, the sports equipment and all the rest of these things are also provided out of public funds. In those circumstances, I do not quite understand why this levy should be made. Of course, it was said that this was a voluntary contribution, and on the pay sheet there are two columns to indicate whether a person has consented to the levy being made or not. When the contribution is called voluntary, when you make provision in your pay abstract for that purpose, every poor soldier feels that he is compelled to pay this; otherwise, he is likely to get into the bad books of the superiors. A moral compulsion to pay operates very severely in that kind of institution like the army. It is specifically stated in this letter, the reference number of which I quoted, that a person is free to choose his barber—the great freedom allowed in the army—that you can choose your tonsorial artist who is likely to improve your appearance in that respect. While that is so, the fact remains that when a person is asked whether he is going to make this contribution or not, the atmosphere that prevails in an institution like the army is such that every poor soldier feels that he is called upon to make this contribution; otherwise, he is likely to get into disfavour. So, these levies continue. There is the compulsory sports levy—I do not know for what reason—when these grounds are maintained out of public funds; sports equipment is bought out of public funds and pavilions are also constructed out of public funds.

When all these expenses are met out of public funds, I do not know the reason why the poor soldier is called upon to pay these contributions from his meagre salary. This applies to all ranks—from warrant officers to staff sergeants and downwards.

Welfare services in regard to army personnel are very poor. These were matters that were noted by Mr. E. F. N. Gratiaen, when he sat as Commissioner for purposes of reforming the salaries and wages structure of the armed services.

Now, Sir, it was with a very good intention that the Gratiaen Commission was appointed. But following the traditions that obtained in the army, what the army heads at that time did was to undertake to speak on behalf of everybody in the army. The rank and file of the army had no opportunity of making their representations to Mr. Gratiaen, with the result that their case for a salary reform did not receive the due heed that would have been given if they had been made. The army heads took it upon themselves to speak on behalf of everybody.

Now, Sir, when top-ranking officers and commissioned officers go before a commission like that, it is difficult to believe that they can exercise the necessary amount of sympathy for the small man or that they had exercised that amount of sympathy for the small man. They did not. The result was that although Mr. Gratiaen with progressive and liberal ideas tried to effect a proper revision in the wages and salary structure of the army, he succeeded in perpetuating and making as bad as before a gap that exists in regard to emoluments, promotion prospects, and the like, between the commissioned section, the non-commissioned section, and the rank and file.

The ordinary soldier gets a miserable rate of increment, just a few cents every year—a few cents, mind you—and once in four years, about four times that amount. That remains the basic incremental rate of the ranker. Now, this kind of miserable pittance is not likely to help in

creating a proper sense of satisfaction or a material basis on which the defenders of our country should be compelled to exist.

It is for that reason, Sir, that it is time for us to urge that another commission be appointed and that everybody—all sections of the army—be given the opportunity of stating their case before the commission. I have no complaints to make against Mr. Gratiaen as a commissioner but I have to state that the report could not take into account all aspects relating to the army since a large section of the army was denied the opportunity of making representations before the commission. I would therefore urge that these matters should be properly considered and that it is the duty of this Government to appoint a new commission to go into army pay scales, navy pay scales and pay scales in the air force, so that proper recommendations may be made in order to liquidate the problems that have come down during the past 15 or 20 years without proper heed being given to the voices of the rankers.

I am very happy, Sir, that the hon. Member for Homagama, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Education and Cultural Affairs referred to the need for a Widows' and Orphans' Pension Fund for the armed services. I brought this matter to the notice of the Parliamentary Secretary in the last Government, the hon. Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike) who, I think, said that an actuarial report had been called for and assured me that the matter was well in hand. I do not see any reason why this Government should not implement a proposal merely because the last Government initiated it.

Fortunately, Sir, our army does not produce a larger number of widows than any other Service in this country, thanks to the fact that we have not yet been involved in any major war. We have an army that has not been tested in the fires of battle in a big way barring a small contingent that went as part

விவரண கெடுபிதன் பனந, 1965-66

—காரக ஸகாவ

[வீரநாதி ஸோகிஷ மன.]

of the U. N. Forces to the Congo. Even there I do not think that they saw much fighting. Since the last war when we supplied some troops to fight in Libya and Central Africa and places like that, our army has not really tasted any kind of battle experience—thank goodness, because the Widows' and Orphans' Pension Fund is to a considerable extent simplified by the fact that there are not to be more widows of army personnel than of members of the Public Service. My principal belief therefore in order to cut matters short in regard to this Vote is that you appoint another commission which will go into the salary scales and the like, but not to delay the Widows' and Orphans' Pension Fund till then, as the work on it has already commenced and only requires completion.

அ. ஸ. 6.30

Another question in regard to which I want some kind of redress is that some effort be made now to close the widening gap between non-commissioned officers or other ranks, on the one hand, and the commissioned section of the army, on the other, the upper echelons. This is a matter which affects the three Services, the Army, the Navy and the Air Force. In particular, in the Air Force, I had reason to complain in the past that with the continuance in Ceylon for a number of years for technical reasons, of British other rankers, the B.O.R.R., as they were known, there was a tendency on the part of our own people who were in the upper echelons of the Air Force, to develop a pukka sahib mentality, and I have even pleaded with the then Parliamentary Secretary, the hon. Member for Dompe, that that attitude be corrected. I was not asking for anybody's heads. I was asking that steps be taken in order to correct this outlook, this kind of mentality which belonged to a past and which we are trying to get away from. This pukka sahib outlook and this kind of attitude to other ranks makes life in

the Services an unhappy experience for everybody, and we should, therefore, try to get away from that kind of thing. I do not know whether a change of Government has strengthened the belief in some of those people, now that a pukka sahib Government has come into being, that they can continue with the same attitude. I would like the Hon. Minister of State to discourage that tendency if possible and to see that an attitude which was compatible in the days when Kipling sang of empires should not be allowed to persist today even though the Government may have set its target in regard to the restoration of colonialism on the economic side.

These are the principal requests I make to this Government and my suggestion in regard to wages and salaries is the appointment of a commission: the removal of the gap between the other ranks and the upper echelons in regard to promotion prospects and the like, the removal of these unhappy levies, the establishment of a Widows' and Orphans' Pension Fund, and the correction of the incremental rate of the common soldiers. These are matters which I would like to impress upon the Minister of State, and I trust that some early action will be taken in order to see that they are remedied.

கா. பொ. ஓர்நிதீ மன. (கிளி
னோலீ)

(திரு. கா. பொ. இரத்தினம்—கிளிநொச்சி)
(Mr. K. P. Ratnam—Kilinochchi)

கௌரவ தலைவர் அவர்களே, படை வீரர்கள் அதிகமாகப் போர்க் காலங்களில் அல்லது அவசரகால நிலை பிரகடனஞ் செய்யப்படும் போதுதான் உள்ளூர்களில் நடமாடுவார்கள். இதற்கு விதி விலக்கான முறையில் வடமாகாணத்தில் வருடம் முழுவதும் போர்ப் படை வீரர்கள் நடமாடுவதை எவரும் அவதானிக்கலாம். இதற்கு தற்போதைய அரசாங்கத்தினர் காரணமல்ல என்ற போதிலும் போர்ப்படையினரின் நடவடிக்கைகளால் பாதிக்கப்பட்டுள்ள மக்களின் பிரதிநிதி என்ற முறையில் இங்கு சில கருத்துக்களைக் கூறக் கூடாது.

விசேஷக் கௌரவம் உடைய, 1965-66

—கூர்மை கலை

அமைதியான காலங்களிலேயே வட மாகாணத்தில், அதுவும் படிப்போ எழுத்து வாசனையோ இல்லாத மக்கள் வாழ்கின்ற கிராமப் புறங்களில் போர்ப்படை வீரர்கள் நடமாடுகிறார்கள். இவர்களின் நடமாட்டத்தை வட பகுதியில் கூட்ட வேண்டுமென்று எதிர்க் கட்சியினர் நாடெங்கும் பிரசாரம் நடத்திக் கொண்டிருக்கும் இந்த நாட்களிலே அந்தப் பகுதி மக்கள் அடைகின்ற துன்பங்களையும் கஷ்டங்களையும் எடுத்துக் கூற நான் கடமைப்பட்டிருக்கிறேன்.

அனேகமாக வட மாகாணத்தின் கரையோரங்களில் போர்ப்படை வீரர்கள் நிறுத்தப்பட்டிருக்கிறார்கள். இவர்கள் ஊருக்குள் வரும்பொழுது இவர்களுடைய கடமை என்ன, எதற்காக வருகிறார்கள், என்ன நோக்கத்துக்காக வருகிறார்கள் என்பதை அறியாது பொது மக்கள் பயப்படுகிறார்கள். இந்தப் போர்ப்படை வீரர்களின் கடமை பற்றிப் பொது மக்களுக்கு, அதாவது சாதாரண கிராம மக்களுக்கு எதுவும் தெரியாது. அவர்களுடைய கவலையெல்லாம் இன்று தேசிய அரசாங்கம் பதவிக்கு வந்தம்கூடத் தங்களுடைய துன்பங்கள் குறையவில்லையே என்பதுதான். இந்த மக்கள் அடைகின்ற துன்பத்தை நீக்கத் தேசிய அரசாங்கம் விரும்பினாலும் கூட அதைத் தடுக்கும் முறையில் எதிர்க் கட்சிப் பாராளுமன்ற உறுப்பினர்கள் பாராளுமன்றத்திற்கு உள்ளும் புறமும் கூக்குரல் இடுவதை நாம் காண்கிறோம். தேசிய அரசாங்கம் பதவிக்கு வருவதற்கு முன்னர் தங்களை அடக்கி ஆளும்பொருட்டே இராணுவம் வட பகுதியில் நிறுவப்பட்டிருப்பதாகத் தமிழ் மக்கள் கருதினார்கள். கௌரவ தொம்பே பிரதிநிதி (திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டார நாயக்கா) அவர்கள் அண்மையில் இச்சபையிலே கூறியதைப் போல ஒரே இனம் ஒரே மொழி ஒரே மதம் என்ற அந்த அடிப்படைக் கொள்கைக்காகத்தான் இராணுவம் வட பகுதியில் நிறுத்தப்பட்டிருப்பதாகத் தமிழ் மக்கள் கருதினார்கள். இக்கருத்தை நாங்கள் மட்டுமல்ல, தமிழ் மக்களால் நடத்தப்படுகின்ற பத்திரிகைகள் மட்டுமல்ல; சிங்கள மக்களால் நடத்தப்படுகின்ற பத்திரிகைகளும் கூடத் தெரிவித்திருக்கின்றன. வட பகுதி மக்களை அடக்கி ஆளத்தான் இராணுவம் அங்கு நிறுத்தப்பட்டிருக்கின்றது என்ற கருத்து அன்று பலரிடையே இருந்தது. கள்ளக் குடியேற்றத்தைக் கட்டுப் படுத்துவதென்ற போர் வதற்கு போர்ப் படையை வைத்திருக்க

வையில் தென்னிலங்கையிலுள்ள சிங்கள தீவிரவாதிகளைத் திருப்திப்படுத்தவே வட பகுதியில் இராணுவம் வைக்கப்பட்டிருப்பதாக அன்று பலரும் கூறி இருக்கிறார்கள். புதிய அரசாங்கம் பதவிக்கு வந்த பின்னர்—அதுவும் சிறப்பாக இப்போர்ப் படைப் பிரிவில் புதிய நிரந்தரக் காரியதரிசி ஒருவர் பதவியேற்றதற்குப் பின்னர்—வடபகுதியில் போர்ப் படையினரின் அட்டேழியம் மிகவும் குறைந்திருக்கின்றது. என்றாலும் வட பகுதிகளிலிருந்து இராணுவத்தை முற்றாக மீட்டால் ஒழிய அங்குள்ள மக்கள் சமாதானமாக அமைதியாக வாழ முடியாது என்பதை நான் அரசாங்கக் கட்சியினருக்கும் சிறப்பாக எதிர்க் கட்சியினருக்கும் சொல்லி வைக்க விரும்புகிறேன்.

உதாரணமாக பூநகரி என்ற பகுதியில் கடந்த மூன்று நான்கு ஆண்டுகளாக இரண்டே இரண்டு பேரை மட்டுந்தான் கள்ளக் குடியேற்றக்காரர் என்ற சந்தேகத்தின் பேரில் இந்தப் போர்ப் படையினர் கைது செய்தார்கள். பின்னர் அவர்களையும் கள்ளத் தோணிகள் அல்ல என்று விட்டு விட்டார்கள் என்று அறிகிறேன். பூநகரி காரியாதிகாரி பகுதியில் ஒருவர் கூட கள்ளத் தோணி என்று பிடிக்கப்படவில்லை. வீணாகப் பணம் செலவழிக்கப்பட்டதோடு இப்பகுதி மக்கள் துன்புறுத்தப் பட்டிருக்கிறார்களேயன்றி வேறெதுவுமே நடைபெறவில்லை.

இப்போர்ப்படை வீரர்கள் கிராமங்களில் புகுந்து கிராம மக்களைத் துன்புறுத்தும் பொது இவர்களை அடையாளம் காண்பது பொது மக்களுக்கு மிகவும் சிரமமான காரியமாகும். இப்பொழுது நடைபெறுகின்ற தாழையடி இராணுவ அட்டேழிய வழக்கைப் பத்திரிகைகளில் பார்த்தால் இராணுவத்தினர் எவ்வளவு கேவலமாக அங்கு மக்களை நடத்தினார்கள் என்பதை அறியக் கூடியதாக இருக்கும். இன்று தேசிய அரசாங்கத்தினர் எமது பொது மக்கள் குறைகளை மிகவும் நீதியான முறையில் நியாயமான முறையில் கவனித்து வருகிறார்கள் என்பதை இங்கு நான் பெருமையுடன் கூறிவைக்க விரும்புகிறேன். இச்சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் நான் எதிர்க்கட்சியினருக்குச் சொல்லி வைக்க விரும்புவது என்னவென்றால் தமிழ் மக்களும் இந்த நாட்டு மக்கள்தாம்; எனவே அவர்களை அங்கே அடக்கி ஆளவதற்கு போர்ப் படையை வைத்திருக்க

தமிழ்நாடு கலாச்சாரப் பணம், 1965-66

—காரைக்கலை

[ஒரு நினைவு.]

வேண்டும், இன்னும், மேலும் மேலும் அனுப்ப வேண்டுமென்ற கூக்குரலை மனிதாபிமானத் துடன் நீங்கள் விட்டுவிட வேண்டும். அப்படிச் செய்தால்தான் இந்தத் தேசிய அரசாங்கம் கூட இந்தப் போர்வீரர்களால் துன்பம் ஏற்படாத நிலையை உண்டாக்க முடியுமென்பதை நான் இங்கு கூற விரும்புகிறேன்.

தமிழரசுக் கட்சியினர். அல்லது தமிழ் மக்கள் தமிழர் தொகையைப் பெருக்குவதற்காக கள்ளக் குடியேற்றக்காரரை வரவழைக்கிறார்கள்; அதனால் அவர்களுடைய தொகுதிகளைக் கூட்டலாமென்று கூட போலிக் கொள்கைகளைச் சிலர் பரப்புகிறார்கள். இத்தகைய கருத்துக்களைப் பைத்தியக்காரர் கூட சொல்ல மாட்டார்கள். ஏதோ கள்ளத்தோணியில் வருகின்ற 500, 600 கள்ளக் குடியேற்றக்காரரைக் கொண்டு தமிழர் இந்நாட்டிற் பெரும்பான்மையினராகிவிடலாம் என்று கருதக் கூடிய அரசியல் வாதிகள் இந்நாட்டிலிருந்தால் அது வெட்கப் பட வேண்டிய விஷயமாகும். இன்று மட்டுமல்ல, கடந்த காலத்திலும் நாங்கள் கூறியிருக்கிறோம். கள்ளக் குடியேற்றக் காரரைத் தடுப்பதற்கு நாங்கள் அரசாங்கத்துக்கு எல்லா உதவிகளையும் செய்வோமென்று. என்னைப் பொறுத்தவரை தென்னிந்தியாவிலிருந்து இலங்கைக்குக் கள்ளத்தனமாகக் குடியேறுவோரை விடாதீர்கள் என்று எனது நண்பர்களாக இருக்கும் அரசாங்கத்தைச் சேர்ந்தவர்களுக்கு மட்டுமல்ல, திராவிட முன்னேற்றக் கழகத்தைச் சேர்ந்த தலைவர்கள் திருவாளர்கள் அண்ணாதுரை, நெடுஞ்செழியன் ஆகியோருக்கும், தமிழரசுக் கழகத் தலைவர் சிவஞானக்கிராமணியார், நம் தமிழர் இயக்கத் தலைவர் ஆதித்தனார் ஆகியோருக்கும் மற்றும் சுதந்திரக் கட்சித் தலைவர்களுக்கும் எழுதியிருக்கின்றேன். கள்ளக் குடியேற்றக்காரர் இங்கு வராமல் தடுப்பதற்கு நாங்கள் எங்களால் செய்ய வேண்டியதைச் செய்து வருகின்றோம். இங்கே மட்டுமல்ல, இந்தியாவின் கூட அரசியல் தலைவர்களுக்கு, “இங்கே வரும் கள்ளக்குடியேற்றக்காரர் மிகவும் அனுதாபமற்ற முறையில் நடத்தப்படுகிறார்கள். அவர்கள் இங்கு நடத்தப்படும் விதம் தமிழ் இனத்துக்கு மட்டுமல்ல, நாகரிகம் படைத்த மக்கள் இனம் அனைத்துக்கும் அவமானமாகும், ஆகையால் கள்ளக் குடியேற்றக்காரரை முடித்துக் கொள்கிறேன்.

குடியேற்றக்காரர் இங்கு வருவதைத் தடுங்கள்” என்று நாங்கள் எடுத்துக் கூறியிருக்கிறோம் என்பதைப் பகிரங்கமாக நான் உலகமறியக் கூறுகின்றேன்.

பூநகரிலுள்ள போர்ப்படை அகற்றப்படல் நன்று; அப்படி அகற்றப்படுவதை எதிர்க்கட்சியினர் எதிர்த்து கூக்குரல் விடமாட்டார்கள் என்று நான் நம்புகிறேன். பூநகரில் இதுவரை எவராவது பிடிபட்டு வெளிநாட்டுக்கு அனுப்பப்படாமலிருந்தால் இப்படையினர் பூநகரிலிருந்து அகற்றப்பட வேண்டும். இவர்களை அகற்றுமாறு பூநகரி மக்கள் நாள் தோறும் என்னிடம் முறையிடுகிறார்கள். இவர்களுடைய முறையீட்டுக்கிணங்க நான் பிரதம அமைச்சர் அவர்களை வேண்டிக்கொள்வதன்படி இப்படையினர் அகற்றப்படுவதை எதிர்க்கட்சியினர் அரசியல் காரணமாக எதிர்த்து நிற்காமல் எம் மக்களின் நல்வாழ்வுக்காக அதனை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ள வேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.

பிரதம அமைச்சர் அவர்களுக்கு நான் விடுக்கும் இரண்டாவது வேண்டுகோள், போர்வீரர் அங்கிருக்கு மட்டும் அவர்களுக்கு ஒரு அடையாளம்—ஒரு எண்ணையோ வேறு எந்த விதமான அடையாளத்தையோ—கொடுக்க வேண்டுமென்பதாகும். அப்பொழுதுதான் அவர்களைப் பொதுமக்கள் அடையாளங்கண்டுகொள்ள முடியும். இரண்டாவதாக இப்படை வீரர்க்கு என்ன உரிமைகள் இருக்கின்றன, அவர்கள் எப்போது வெளியே வரலாம், எந்த வழிகளால் அவர்கள் செல்லலாம் என்பனவற்றைப் பொதுமக்கள் அறியச் செய்தால்தான், போர் வீரரும் தாங்கள் பல விதிகளுக்குக் கட்டுப்பட்டு நடக்கவேண்டுமென்பதைப் பொதுமக்கள் அறிந்திருக்கிறார்கள் என்று அதற்கேற்ப நடப்பார்கள்; அவ்வாறு நடக்காவிடின் மக்களும் அதனை அதிகாரிகளுக்கு அறிவிக்கத் தக்கதாக இருக்கும். ஆகவே, இவ்விரு வேண்டுகோள்களையும் நான் கௌரவ பிரதம அமைச்சரிடம் சமர்ப்பித்து

விசேஷத் திருவிழைப் பணம், 1965-66

—காரைக்காலம்

சி. எஸ். டி. டியாஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க
(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

"I do not want to make a long speech, but the point that I want to emphasize is that a reorganization of the armed forces, particularly the army, is urgently required. The old officers must be retired; young officers who are attuned to the times, patriotic officers who have a love for the country, language and culture, officers who do not always look to England for inspiration but who feel that this is their country, their home, should be promoted.

So far as the commanding officer is concerned, I have no complaint to make, but I begin to wonder whether in the selection of the chief of staff the Government has made the best choice. The officer, though young, is of the old order in his outlook. Undoubtedly he is efficient as an officer, but there are more efficient officers who are senior but who are also officers with the old outlook, who have been retired or sent to Panagoda.—"

சு. ஓ. 6.45

When I was Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Defence—I do not want to go into details—I read out to this House, on 30th August 1963, a list of names :

—"Col. Jayatileke, Commanding Officer, First Sinha Regiment

Lt.-Col. Jayaweera—

—a reactionary of the first order.

Lt.-Col. W. Perera

Lt.-Col. R. de Zilva

Lt.-Col. L. de Silva

Col. Heyn.

I do not want to give their designations. You will find them in column 1051 of HANSARD of 30th August 1963, and that list will show that their loyalty is not to this country, they are men of the old outlook, they will fight always for the propertied and the privileged, and they want the restoration of the old regime.

It is necessary to appoint a commission to go into the army administration. Sometimes, commissions are not of much use. The reports are read, pigeon-holed and kept for years. But I think it is necessary in the interests of the independence of this country, in the interests of having an army on which you can rely, to go into the entire administration of the army—a commission which will go into it

with a view to immediately reorganizing the army and having an army which will be useful to an independent Ceylon.

It is true that conditions are not very satisfactory. The treatment meted out to other rankers is certainly not of the best. It is the old type of army still so far as the officers are concerned. The "officer caste" as I said before has not changed despite the recruitment of some good officers during the last few years. No radical reorganization of the army has taken place since the S. L. F. P. Government was formed. And a radical reorganization of the army is necessary.

The Commander—I have no complaints. But the Chief of Staff is a person you might watch a little. I too followed some of the evidence given by various people in the coup trial. I do not want to refer to that. Of course there are some people who are always on the winning side. If developments had been in a different direction some of the new officers who appear to be loyal today might not be there.

In view of all these things I would like to ask the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to consider seriously the question of appointing a competent commission to go into these matters with a view to reorganizing the army so that non-commissioned officers who have had a fairly long record of good service are promoted. At present the selection boards are packed and packed largely with the old reactionary officers.

There is no reason to feel that 'Catholic Action' in the army has ceased to operate. Their methods are a bit different from what they were two or three years ago, but 'Catholic Action' is operating among the 'officer caste'. That is why I say that the reorganization of the army after a full investigation into its administration is urgently required".

சு. டி. பி. டி. குணவர்தன

(கௌரவ டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

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

From what are you reading?

சி. எஸ். டி. டியாஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

These remarks which I made just now are quoted verbatim commencing from column 661 to column 663 in HANSARD of the 19th August 1964. They are not only my own remarks. They are the remarks of the hon. Member for Avissawella then, who is the present Minister of Industries and Fisheries.

விசேஷக் கமிட்டிப் பணம், 1965-66

—கூடுதல் கமிட்டி

[ஃபீ. ஃபீ. டியஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க மஹ.]

I should like to ask the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Defence and External Affairs—

ஹ. டி. பி. ஃபீ. குணவர்தன

(கௌரவ டி. பி. ஃபீ. குணவர்தன)

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

What were you doing for four years?

ஃபீ. ஃபீ. டியஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க மஹ.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I am asking now whether the Hon. Minister of Industries and Fisheries agrees with these remarks about changes in the “officer caste”, about the need for the appointment of a commission and about the chief of staff being an unsatisfactory person. I wish to ask him whether he agrees that these necessary types of “Catholic Action” which the Hon. Minister then referred to now require some degree of reform.

ஹ. எம். டி. பண்டா

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

What are your views?

ஃபீ. ஃபீ. டியஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க மஹ.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

If you want to know my views in regard to these matters you can also find them in the HANSARD because I replied to this identical speech last year. And now I would like to know from this Government whether they identify themselves with the points of view expressed by the then Member for Avissawella in the speech which I read out just now.

ஹ. எம். டி. பண்டா

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

Do you stick to your own speech of last year?

ஃபீ. ஃபீ. டியஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க மஹ.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I have no changes to make, but what I want to know is, when you have a statement made by a member of your Government expressing his views about the army, what do you now have to say? There is one sentence in this speech which I think is particularly prophetic coming from the Hon. Minister of Industries and Fisheries. I do not think even he realized at that time how prophetic it was:

“And of course there are some people who are always on the winning side.”

Next, I should like to make a comment arising from the speech of the hon. Member for Kilinochchi (Mr. Ratnam) a moment ago. He talked about the removal of the army from the Northern Province. He asked the Hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to think about it and to take away the army.

ஹ. டி. டி. ஸேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டி. டி. ஸேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

He never said that.

ஃபீ. ஃபீ. டியஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க மஹ.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

The hon. Member for Kilinochchi said that the army should not be kept there.

ஹ. டி. டி. ஸேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டி. டி. ஸேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

He talked of harassment, not of the removal of the army.

ஃபீ. ஃபீ. டியஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க மஹ.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Then, may I refer to some remarks made by the hon. Member for Udupiddy (Mr. M. Sivasithamparam), also last year and in the course of

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

the same Debate? They said the strangest things in those days, and they now find themselves hoist with their own petard. This was the argument of the hon. Member for Udupiddy then:

"I want to make an earnest request to the hon. Parliamentary Secretary. I certainly ask the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to withdraw these army personnel."

Now, apparently, they are not asking for withdrawals.

"But, if you should have them, then you should also send some women there so that these personnel need not come to our houses and to our ladies and start troubling them. After all, during the war there used to be Wrens and all sorts of such comforts were given to army personnel stationed in this part of the world. Therefore, you should kindly send some women so that their attention would be diverted towards them."—
[OFFICIAL REPORT, 19th August, 1964: Vol. 57, c. 657.]

May I commend that suggestion to the Hon. Prime Minister if he proposes, as he says, to keep the army in the Northern Province? If, as he says, he is right in stating that the hon. Member for Kilinochchi does not want the army removed from the Northern Province, I want to know from the Hon. Prime Minister whether he would be able to accommodate the hon. Member for Udupiddy and send some women to the Northern Province in accordance with the request made by him in 1964.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි ජේනානායක

(කෙළරඹ උද්ග්‍රී ජේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I shall try as far as possible to deal with the questions raised in the order in which they were raised.

Firstly, there were some references to the actions of my Hon. Friend on the left, the Hon. Minister of State, who is also my Parliamentary Secretary. It is true that he is taking a particular interest in army matters, and I am glad that he is doing so. All his actions are with my approval, and I am responsible for all those actions

to hon. Members of this House. I am, as I said earlier, very glad about it. He has taken on a good part of the burden in regard to the departments under me, and I think no person could wish to have a better Parliamentary Secretary.

කෙනමන් මය.

(තිරු. කෙනමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Is he in charge of the army only or of the armed services?

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි ජේනානායක

(කෙළරඹ උද්ග්‍රී ජේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Armed services. As hon. Members are aware, Ministers have the right to delegate certain functions, and these functions have been happily delegated by me.

Next, a reference was made to a speech supposed to have been made. I rather thought it was a brilliant speech. In fact, I also heard from those who were present that it was a very good speech. He had said that a democratic army has to be free of politics and to be loyal to the government elected by the people.

කෙනමන් මය.

(තිරු. කෙනමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

And to the State.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි ජේනානායක

(කෙළරඹ උද්ග්‍රී ජේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

And to the State. If hon. Members are prepared to endorse those sentiments, then I cannot see how they can criticize the Hon. Minister of State for that speech, because those are the sentiments he expressed.

කෙනමන් මය.

(තිරු. කෙනමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

What is the meaning of his saying a disloyal soldier is a dead soldier?

பிப்ரவரி 1965-66

—காரைக்கால்

சென்னை மன்றம்

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Possibly it was a picturesque way of saying that in those circumstances the army is dead.

சென்னை மன்றம்

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

It may be a practical way of saying, "Be loyal or else—"

சென்னை மன்றம்

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

The hon. Third Member for Colombo Central (Mr. P. G. B. Keuneman) spoke about changes due to political reasons. I can assure hon. Members that we have not come to the stage of appointing political commissars to overlook the army as some of the countries which the hon. Member so much admires have.

In fact, I was wondering when he was making that speech where he would have been had he made such a speech in some of the countries he so admires. For a moment he had departed from this House and I thought that signified the fate that would have awaited him if he made that speech in some of those countries.

The hon. Member wanted me to say why certain changes in the army were made. Surely I am not going to say that. I am not answerable to anybody for those changes.

சென்னை மன்றம்

(சுலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Not even to the House?

சென்னை மன்றம்

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Not even to the House.

சென்னை மன்றம்

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Should it be alleged that a change was made unjustly or unfairly, are you not answerable?

சென்னை மன்றம்

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

It is the duty of the Government when dealing with the armed forces to make changes that the Government desires and the Government is not bound to give reasons for every such change. That is my position and I will continue to take up that position. Remember you are dealing with the armed forces. They are not government departments.

சென்னை மன்றம்

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

There have been two reasons given for these changes. One is that the Government must assure itself of loyalty. The other—that is the reason given by the Minister of State in his speech not at Diyatalawa but in this House on the 18th—is that these changes were the result of expansion and technical developments of the army. If the broad reason is that these changes have been made because you must satisfy yourself about loyalty, say so. Then we know where we stand.

சென்னை மன்றம்

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

There are various factors, loyalty being one. Those factors, as to why these changes were made, as I stated earlier, I am not prepared to state to the House. I am adopting this attitude only as regards the armed forces.

Why? I remember the attitude taken up about the reorganization of the whole army after the coup. The then Government took up the position that the government was entitled to have its own officers. I quite agree

விசேஷக் கமிட்டி பணம், 1965-66

—காரைக்காலம்

with that position; I have always taken up that position and will always continue to take up that position.

அவர்கள் உன். எம். பெரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

That you are not answerable to the House?

அவர் டிபுட்டி சேனாயாகை

(கௌரவ டிபுட்டி சேனாயாகை)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Yes, about the changes, transfers, in the army.

கௌரவ மெ. கெனமன்

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

If the security of the State is involved, naturally, I agree that you are not answerable. But if the security of the State is not at stake, I do not see why you are not answerable to the House.

அ. அ. 7

அவர் டிபுட்டி சேனாயாகை

(கௌரவ டிபுட்டி சேனாயாகை)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

As to whether the security of the State is involved or not is a matter for me to decide, and it is a matter which will be kept by me and nobody else, in my own confidence. That is the position. As regards those matters, therefore, it is useless asking me. You will only take up the time of the House. If you think that that attitude is wrong—I do not adopt that attitude as regards the other departments; I adopt that attitude only as regards the Armed Forces—the remedy is in your hands. Move a Vote of Censure and see that future Governments open themselves to be dictated to by you as to transfers and various other matters, and—

அவர் எம். டி. பாண்டா

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பாண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

As to which officer should be where.

அவர் டிபுட்டி சேனாயாகை

(கௌரவ டிபுட்டி சேனாயாகை)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

—as to which officer should be where.

கௌரவ மெ. கெனமன்

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

No.

அவர் எம். டி. பாண்டா

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பாண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

Oh yes. It is coming to that. You want particular officers to stay in a particular place.

அவர் டிபுட்டி சேனாயாகை

(கௌரவ டிபுட்டி சேனாயாகை)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I must make it perfectly clear that as regards the other departments, civilian departments, of course, I will give reasons.

Now, about the volunteer forces. In the expansion of the army, the hon. Member will agree that volunteer forces cost us much less than expanding the regular army. So, if it is a choice between expanding the regular army and the volunteer forces, well, as far as the costs are concerned, if that is to be one of the criteria, I am sure the hon. Member will not blame me if we show a partiality towards expanding the volunteer force. As regards the Gemunu Watch, it was there in existence and it was disbanded, I think, by the late Mr. Bandaranaike long ago. We are just bringing it into being again, and these people are on the reserve, including Major Dharmapala.

அவர் எம். என். பெரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Why Dharmapala?

விசேஷ கெடுதல்கள் பற்றி, 1965-66

—கூடுதல் பதவி

அ. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

He was in the reserve. The next question is as to whether anybody who had anything to do with politics should be in the army.

அ. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

But he continues to be in politics.

அ. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

The point is this. There were in the volunteers in the past many people who were in politics and who continued to be in politics, who were candidates at elections—Bertie Seneviratne, for instance. They had contested seats. If you are going to have a man in the army, then, of course, avenues of command must be open to him. Then you must decide that no man who has had anything to do with politics should be even in the volunteer force.

அ. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

Major Nugawela.

அ. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Well, is that the decision you want us to make? Then we will be very restricted in our choice for the army.

கே. கே. மன்.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

If we want you to do that, will you do it? Otherwise, why do you ask us?

அ. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Because I know that you will not want me to do it.

அ. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Why not? I think it is a good idea.

அ. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Then I will examine that idea. I am telling you about the practice that prevails not only under this Government. It was also the practice that prevailed before.

கே. கே. மன்.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

You are drawing in the volunteers for the wrong task.

அ. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

The next point was about Caldera. What I have said applies not only to his appointment but to any other appointment as well. So I do not want to answer that.

Now I come to the coup. It was said that some of those who were interdicted were—

அ. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Brought back.

கே. கே. மன்.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Others who were discharged.

அ. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

There are two committees appointed: one for the police, and the other for the army. They are going into it.

விசேஷ கௌரவ உறுப்பினர், 1965-66

—காரைக்காலம்

கேனமன் மீசர்.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Has no one been taken back?

சுரு. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Not as far as I am aware. As far as the army personnel are concerned, no one has been taken back. Those committees are going into their cases and, probably, there will be certain recommendations made as a result of the investigations.

About the question of the official language, the position in the army is the same as in the Government service. There is no difference regarding the official language.

கேனமன் மீசர்.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Why is it that people who had submitted their papers for retirement on the question of non-proficiency in the official language are allowed to come back?

சுரு. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Because certain changes have been made as regards the Government service, too, and the same policy is followed in the army service.

கேனமன் மீசர்.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Part of the old-entrants policy?

சுரு. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Part of the same policy. I think the hon. Member will agree that if there is a policy for the Public Service then as far as the army too is concerned the policy must be the same on the question of language.

With regard to the question of the Widows' and Orphans' Pension Fund, the admission of army personnel into

such a scheme has been approved in principle. The preparation of a Cabinet Memorandum on the subject is now receiving attention at the Treasury, and it will be presented to the Cabinet as a Cabinet Paper after the financial implications are carefully studied.

கேனமன் மீசர்.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I asked the Prime Minister whether he is in a position to tell us the changes that have taken place in the commands of regiments. He refused to give the reasons. Is he refusing to give the changes in the commanding officers also?

சுரு. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I understand that the hon. Member has asked a Question and it is on the Order Paper. He will have the full facts as regards the changes, not the reasons.

கேனமன் மீசர்.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

You refused to give the reasons.

சுரு. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Then I think somebody spoke about Captain Stave. The same reply applies.

கேனமன் மீசர்.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

That is not a question of change. There was an inquiry into certain allegations. That inquiry is over. What has happened to that? Are you refusing to divulge that information?

சுரு. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

The inquiry is over.

விசேஷ கமிட்டி பதவி, 1965-66

—கொடுக்க கமிட்டி

கேள்விகள் இல்லை.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Has he been found not guilty?

கேள்விகள் இல்லை.

(கொளரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

He has been reinstated. All moneys have been repaid.

கேள்விகள் இல்லை.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

He has been found not guilty of the charges?

கேள்விகள் இல்லை.

(கொளரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Captain Stave was concerned in the collection of savings from recruits undergoing training under him. Collections of savings were made but these moneys were not paid into the Savings Account in the Post Office Savings Bank. The matter was investigated and all moneys were repaid to the recruits concerned. The officer was severely reprimanded.

கேள்விகள் இல்லை.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Have you considered the question whether or not it was temporary misappropriation?

கேள்விகள் இல்லை.

(கொளரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

If the hon. Member suggests that it is not sufficient, I myself feel like going into the matter further.

கேள்விகள் இல்லை.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Please go into the question further.

கேள்விகள் இல்லை.

(கொளரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I am inclined to agree.

As regards transport of army personnel raised by the hon. Member for Homagama (Mr. Gamini Jayasuriya), army vehicles are used to transport personnel for work in Panagoda. A levy is being made from these personnel for transport. The provision of suitable quarters for married personnel is the real permanent solution to the problem of transport. Arrangements are now being made to extend the use of transport for a period of three years during which time a phased building programme to provide adequate accommodation would be undertaken.

கேள்விகள் இல்லை.

(திரு. ஜயசூரிய)

(Mr. Jayasuriya)

Would it be possible to waive off that charge? It is a privilege they enjoyed earlier.

கேள்விகள் இல்லை.

(கொளரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

The matter is being considered.

The hon. Member for Kilinochchi (Mr. Ratnam) raised the matter of harassment by the army personnel of the villagers in the Northern and Eastern Provinces. As a matter of fact, hon. Members across must be thinking that I may have put him up to ask that because the charge against me is that they are not doing anything and I am withdrawing the personnel. So we have to have a balance.

கேள்விகள் இல்லை.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Who is going to be the commanding officer of the comfort corps?

விசேஷக் கௌரவத் தலைவர், 1965-66

— காரைக்காலம்

செ. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

We have to have a balance between the two. We must see that illicit immigration is somehow satisfactorily tackled and at the same time see that the villagers are not unnecessarily harassed. I can assure the hon. Member that we are trying to see that this sort of thing does not take place and I am sure he will see the results before long. Complaints in respect of harassment and misconduct on the part of the troops deployed in these operations have reached the Ministry of Defence from time to time. Whenever such complaints are received, they are promptly investigated and if disciplinary action is indicated, such action is always taken with a view to preventing recurrences. Incidents also have been referred to of the police who have taken firm action against guilty persons of the armed forces. Arrangements will be made to maintain a high standard of public relations between the troops stationed in these areas and the general public.

Then the hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa) raised the matter of levies for sports equipment. I understand that the levy is 10 cents per person per month for sports.

செ. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

That is from privates. From warrant officers and staff sergeants they levy more. In any case a levy even of 10 cents should not be made because Government pays for sports.

செ. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Government does not.

செ. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Yes, for the upkeep of the grounds and so on.

செ. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

As regards the barber, the levy is 40 cents for a hair-cut. I understand that the barber is not paid from public funds.

செ. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

There should be no compulsory levy at all. That was the point I was making.

செ. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

The barber must get something. He does not get anything from public funds.

செ. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

The man can have his hair cut anywhere he wants. This is supposed to be a voluntary levy but it operates compulsorily. A person who goes to a barber outside still continues to contribute.

செ. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I do not know whether he can get a hair-cut anywhere else for 40 cents. I have not been successful in that.

செ. டி. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

If the Hon. Prime Minister gives way I will explain. There are persons who go to private barbers

விசேஷத் தைவ்விதத் பதன, 1965-66

—கூர்வ வலாவ

[பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா மொ.]

operating in the Fort and pay 50 cents or a rupee for a shave or a hair-cut. In addition to that they make this contribution also because they think if they do not, they would get into trouble. They allow the deduction to be made from their salary. Such deductions must be stopped.

பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா மொ.

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Even if he gets his hair cut here or not?

பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா மொ.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

No. Some other system of payment should be worked out. If he takes a shave or a hair-cut he pays on the spot and goes; what is the reason for a deduction from his pay?

பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா மொ.

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

If there is objection to it we can have another way of doing it.

பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா மொ.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

My objection is to a voluntary contribution becoming compulsory by this process; that was my complaint.

பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா மொ.

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Mr. Chairman, I believe that was all—

பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா மொ.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

I raised some other matters also

பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா மொ.

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

What are the others?

பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா மொ.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

The appointment of a new Pay Commission.

பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா மொ.

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

About the wages?

பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா மொ.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Yes, primarily wages, incremental rates, welfare services, etc. The question about the W. & O. P. you have answered already. Then, the narrowing of the gap between the non-commissioned and other ranks on the one side and the commissioned—the higher echelons—on the other. There is a big caste gap that is widening.

பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா மொ.

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Widening because of the pay?

பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா மொ.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Yes, mainly pay scales; also promotion prospects and so on.

பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸா மொ.

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I must confess that I am not in a position to answer that immediately. I will certainly have that looked into.

கௌரவ மொ.

(திரு. கௌரவ மொ.)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I raised the question of Lieutenant-Colonel Jayaratne. Please go into that. That is all I am asking.

விசாரணை கமிட்டி பற்றி, 1965-66

செ. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Jayarathne? I believe I have the facts here.

கே. கே. மன.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I believe he was in charge of the Pay Unit of the C.A.S.C. Charges have not been framed against him. There was a loss of Rs. 2 lakhs or so. In addition to being commanding officer of one unit, now he has been made commanding officer of another unit. Please look into it. There is no need to answer it now.

செ. டி. 7.15

செ. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I have got the facts here. I will look into the matter. There had been certain irregularities occurring.

கே. கே. மன.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

The real point is that certain irregularities took place. He may not be personally guilty but he is responsible. He was a responsible officer. He was commanding officer of one unit. Now, in addition to that, he has been made commanding officer of another unit. That is what I have been informed.

செ. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

The matter, I understand, is being inquired into by the C. I. D. and a special army court consisting of certain senior officers. The matter is being investigated.

கே. கே. மன.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

If the matter is being investigated, in my opinion he should be relieved of his command until the matter is over. But now he has two commands

—காரைக்காலம்

செ. டி. சேனநாயக்க

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

If the facts are as stated, they need looking into, and certainly I will look into them.

Any other matters?

கே. கே. மன.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

No.

"15 வது தலைப்பு 1 வது பகுதியைச் சேர்ந்த ரூ. 2,24,93,773 க்கு உட்பட்ட செலவுகள் அல்லாதவை" என புகார் விசாரணை செய்து, சம்பந்தம் இல்லை.

15 வது தலைப்பு 1 வது பகுதியைச் சேர்ந்த ரூ. 2,24,93,773 க்கு உட்பட்ட செலவுகள் அல்லாதவை" என புகார் விசாரணை செய்து, சம்பந்தம் இல்லை.

"15 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 2,24,93,773 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமா" என்றும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

15 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணியில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 22,493,773 for Head 15, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Head 15, Vote 1, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

2 வது பகுதியை.—பாடு வாய்—புறவழிச் செலவுகள்
விசாரணை, ரூ. 1,18,21,198

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலனச் செலவுகள்—
மீண்டு வரும் செலவு, ரூ. 1,18,21,198

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—
Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 11,821,198

"15 வது தலைப்பு 2 வது பகுதியைச் சேர்ந்த ரூ. 1,18,21,198 க்கு உட்பட்ட செலவுகள் அல்லாதவை" என புகார் விசாரணை செய்து, சம்பந்தம் இல்லை.

15 வது தலைப்பு 2 வது பகுதியைச் சேர்ந்த ரூ. 1,18,21,198 க்கு உட்பட்ட செலவுகள் அல்லாதவை" என புகார் விசாரணை செய்து, சம்பந்தம் இல்லை.

"15 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 1,18,21,198 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமா" என்றும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 11,821,198 for Head 15, Vote No. 2, be inserted in the Schedule," put, and agreed to.

Head 15, Vote 2, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

விவரம் கீழ்க்கண்டது, 1965-66
3 வது திட்டம்.—பொது நிர்வாகம்—மொத்தம் ரூ. 14,35,000

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 3.—பரிபாலனச் செலவுகள்—
ஆக்கப்பொருட் செலவு, ரூபா 14,35,000

Vote No. 3.—Administration Charges—
Capital Expenditure, Rs. 1,435,000

“15 வது திட்டத்தில் 3 வது திட்டம் கீழ்க்
ரூ. 14,35,000 க்கு இடம் உடனடியாக அளிக்க
பெறும்” என முன் வைக்கப்பட்டு, கீழ்க்கண்ட
தீர்மானம்.

15 வது திட்டத்தில் 3 வது திட்டம் உடனடியாக
அளிக்கப்பட்டு, கீழ்க்கண்ட தீர்மானம்.

“15 ஆம் திட்டம் 3 ஆம் திட்டம் வாக்குப்பணம்
ரூபா 14,35,000 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமா”
எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

15 ஆம் திட்டம், 3 ஆம் திட்டம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணியில்
இணைப்பைப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 1,435,000 for Head 15, Vote No. 3, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 15, Vote 3, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

16 வது திட்டம்.—பொது நிர்வாகம்—மொத்தம் ரூ. 14,35,000

1 வது திட்டம்.—பொது நிர்வாகம்—மொத்தம் ரூ. 1,04,80,000

தலைப்பு 16.—இலங்கை அரசு கட்டுப்பாடு
வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 1.—பணியாளரின் ஆளுக்கூரிய
வேதனமும் பிறப்புகளும் ரூபா 1,04,80,000

HEAD 16.—ROYAL CEYLON NAVY
Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and other allowances of staff, Rs. 10,480,000

“16 வது திட்டத்தில் 1 வது திட்டம் கீழ்க்
ரூ. 1,04,80,000 க்கு இடம் உடனடியாக அளிக்க
பெறும்” என முன் வைக்கப்பட்டு, கீழ்க்கண்ட
தீர்மானம்.

16 வது திட்டத்தில் 1 வது திட்டம் உடனடியாக
அளிக்கப்பட்டு, கீழ்க்கண்ட தீர்மானம்.

“16 ஆம் திட்டம், 1 ஆம் திட்டம் வாக்குப்பணம்
ரூபா 1,04,80,000 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமா”
எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

16 ஆம் திட்டம், 1 ஆம் திட்டம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணியில்
இணைப்பைப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 10,480,000 for Head 16, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 16, Vote 1, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

2 வது திட்டம்.—பொது நிர்வாகம்—மொத்தம் ரூ. 49,20,570

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலனச் செலவுகள்—
மீண்டு வரும் செலவு, ரூ. 49,20,570

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—
Recurrent Expenditure, Rs. 4,920,570

“16 வது திட்டத்தில் 2 வது திட்டம் கீழ்க்
ரூ. 49,20,570 க்கு இடம் உடனடியாக அளிக்க
பெறும்” என முன் வைக்கப்பட்டு, கீழ்க்கண்ட
தீர்மானம்.

16 வது திட்டத்தில் 2 வது திட்டம் உடனடியாக
அளிக்கப்பட்டு, கீழ்க்கண்ட தீர்மானம்.

“16 ஆம் திட்டம், 2 ஆம் திட்டம் வாக்குப்பணம்
ரூபா 49,20,570 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமா”
எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

16 ஆம் திட்டம், 2 ஆம் திட்டம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணியில்
இணைப்பைப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 4,920,570 for Head 16, Vote No. 2, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 16, Vote 2, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

3 வது திட்டம்.—பொது நிர்வாகம்—மொத்தம் ரூ. 28,00,000

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 3.—பரிபாலனச் செலவுகள்—
ஆக்கப்பொருட் செலவு, ரூபா, 28,00,000.

Vote No. 3.—Administration Charges—
Capital expenditure, Rs. 2,800,000

16 வது திட்டத்தில் 3 வது திட்டம் கீழ்க்
ரூ. 28,00,000 க்கு இடம் உடனடியாக அளிக்க
பெறும்” என முன் வைக்கப்பட்டு, கீழ்க்கண்ட
தீர்மானம்.

16 வது திட்டத்தில் 3 வது திட்டம் உடனடியாக
அளிக்கப்பட்டு, கீழ்க்கண்ட தீர்மானம்.

“16 ஆம் திட்டம், 3 ஆம் திட்டம் வாக்குப்பணம்
ரூபா 28,00,000 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமா”
எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

16 ஆம் திட்டம், 3 ஆம் திட்டம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணியில்
இணைப்பைப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 2,800,000 for Head 16, Vote No. 3, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 16, Vote 3, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

17 වන ශීර්ෂය.—රාජකීය ලංකා ගුවන් හමුදාව

1 වන සම්මතය.—කාර්ය මණ්ඩල පෞද්ගලික පඩි නඩි සහ අනිකුත් දීමනා, රු. 85,00,760

தலைப்பு 17.—இலங்கை அரசு விமானப் படை

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 1.—பணியாளரின் ஆளுக்கூரிய வேதனமும் பிறப்புகளும் ரூபா 85,00,760

HEAD 17.—ROYAL CEYLON AIR FORCE
Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and other allowances of staff, Rs. 8,500,760

“17 වන ශීර්ෂයේ 1 වන සම්මතය සඳහා රු. 85,00,760 ක මුදල උප ලේඛනයට ඇතුළත් කළ යුතුය” යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදීත්, සභා සම්මත විය.

17 වන ශීර්ෂයේ 1 වන සම්මතය උප ලේඛනයේ කොටසක් හැටියට නිව්ය යුතු යයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.

“17 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 85,00,760 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

17 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணியில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 8,500,760 for Head 17, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 17, Vote 1, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

2 වන සම්මතය.—පාලන භාණ්ඩ—පුනරුප්පිත වියදම්, රු. 46,47,740

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலனச் செலவுகள்—மீண்டு வரும் செலவு, ரூ. 46,47,740

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 4,647,740

“17 වන ශීර්ෂයේ 2 වන සම්මතය සඳහා රු. 46,47,740 ක මුදල උප ලේඛනයට ඇතුළත් කළ යුතුය” යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදීත්, සභා සම්මත විය.

17 වන ශීර්ෂයේ 2 වන සම්මතය උප ලේඛනයේ කොටසක් හැටියට නිව්ය යුතු යයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.

“17 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 46,47,740 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

17 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணியில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 4,647,740 for Head 17, Vote No. 2, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Vote 17, Vote 2, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

3 වන සම්මතය.—පාලන භාණ්ඩ—මූලික වියදම්, රු. 4,32,000

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 3.—பரிபாலனச் செலவுகள்—ஆக்கப்பொருட் செலவு, ரூபா 4,32,000

Vote No. 3.—Administration Charges—Capital Expenditure Rs. 432,000

“17 වන ශීර්ෂයේ 3 වන සම්මතය සඳහා රු. 4,32,000 ක මුදල උප ලේඛනයට ඇතුළත් කළ යුතුය” යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදීත්, සභා සම්මත විය.

17 වන ශීර්ෂයේ 3 වන සම්මතය උප ලේඛනයේ කොටසක් හැටියට නිව්ය යුතු යයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.

“17 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 3 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 4,32,000 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

17 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 3 ஆம் வாக்குப் பணம் அட்டவணியில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 432,000 for Head 17, Vote No. 3, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 17, Vote 3, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

18 වන ශීර්ෂය.—පොලිස් දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව

1 වන සම්මතය.—කාර්ය මණ්ඩල පෞද්ගලික පඩි නඩි සහ අනිකුත් දීමනා, රු. 3,42,83,455

1 වන උප ශීර්ෂය.—සේවක සංඛ්‍යා සහ වැටුප්, රු. 1,69,36,137

தலைப்பு 18.—பொலிஸ்

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 1.—பணியாளரின் ஆளுக்கூரிய வேதனமும் பிறப்புகளும், ரூபா. 3,42,83,455

உப தலைப்பு 1.—ஊழியர் கோப்பும் சம்பளமும், ரூ. 1,69,36,137

HEAD 18.—POLICE

Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and other allowances of staff, Rs. 34,283,455

Sub-head 1.—Cadre and Salaries Rs. 16,936,137

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I move,

“That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 10 in respect of Sub-head 1, ‘Inspector-General of Police’.”

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

The discussion of the police Votes every year produces a crop of complaints in regard to the misbehaviour of police officers. I have consistently avoided making complaints not because I think that complaints are unjustifiable but because there should be some division of labour in this matter and I would rather leave the complaints against policemen to be made by somebody else while I make the complaints on behalf of the policemen.

That has generally been my attitude in this matter and I only want to depart from it to this extent, that is to say, the matters complained of at the initial stage of the formation of this Government in regard to a number of officers taking the law into their own hands, a number of officers acting in an illegal manner in various areas where the residents had reason to complain that almost a reign of terror had been set going. While, of course, you cannot maintain a reign of terror like that over a long period of time and the matters complained of have to some extent abated now, there is still a lot of evidence in a number of cases that acting out of reasons that have a political complexion a considerable degree of harassment is going on. No doubt, hon. Members who have received these complaints might be dealing with these matters at length.

My principal theme is the grievances of the police force itself. I first want to make the request which I had made from the hon. Member for Dompe when he was Parliamentary Secretary, that is, there should be some change in the Departmental Orders. The hon. Member for Dompe, when he was Parliamentary Secretary, agreed to go into this matter. There was a considerable delay on account of the sequel to the events of January 28th 1962, when various other political matters took up the attention of the hon. Member for Dompe and I do not think he had the

necessary time to deal with some of these problems. So I shall repeat, if I may, some of those requests which I had addressed to him and in regard to which even in the Budget Debate of last year he promised concrete relief. I think it might be useful to continue such matters as he has already commenced to a conclusion and initiate actions in regard to other matters.

The first point I wish to make is that these Departmental Orders should be changed. They are outmoded, out of date and they come down from a period which is much better forgotten. They still smack of all the factional warfare that took place in the police force in the days of Banks and R. M. M. Bacon when there was a pro-Banks faction and an anti-Banks faction, a pro-Bacon faction and an anti-Bacon faction. These Departmental Orders require revision. They must be revised. They are outmoded. They do not apply to the needs of the service today, and the principal difficulty from which this flows is the whole military concept of the police force. I must still plead for a demilitarization of the police force. It was all right in the days of imperialist rule here to have the police force treated almost as one of the armed services but it is unnecessary today, and it is unnecessary for a free country to have a police force maintained on that basis. Some attempt was made, I know, to start this process of demilitarization but I do not know for what reason the attempt has met with arrested development.

It is from that concept of the police force as a military unit that all these difficulties and troubles arise. That there should be discipline in the police force, anybody will grant. That it should be a disciplined unit, anybody will grant. A law enforcement instrument like the police force has to be highly disciplined—that I am not denying. But there is no need to have a military concept in the police

With regard to the police training school, the form of training given there is also orientated on the same foundation, that is, on a militaristic concept. For instance, members of the public complain of a lack of politeness when they are addressed to by members of the police force. Most of us have complained that they speak very rudely to the public and when members of the public resent that they descend to something worse.

Where do these habits originate? They find their origin in the kind of training given in the training school where their ranking officers talk to them in the same way. Some of the officers who are in charge of training in the training school, I have heard from trainees, do not know polite forms of speech in any language, English, Sinhala or Tamil. So, how can the trainees who receive their training from such officers, who are spoken to in that manner, be expected to follow a better standard when they come to deal with the public? They adopt the same mannerisms. The root cause lies in the outmoded training they receive in the training school. I am not blaming the hon. Parliamentary Secretary who wanted to do something in the matter. The difficulty lies in the heads of these institutions—the army, navy and the air force—who have a very ultra conservative outlook on these matters. So there is a considerable degree of resistance to change, particularly to changes which have a progressive character. The matters I am talking about have nothing to do with political changes, but stem from administrative difficulties and lack of proper control in regard to administration within the services themselves.

The police constables often complain to me that the kind of camaraderie that prevails among inspectors and higher officers permits a very effective system of revenge against any particular police constable whom an officer dislikes. If, for instance, an inspector in one station develops a sense of grievance in regard to one

of his subordinates, say, a poor constable or a sergeant, he becomes almost a blacklisted person in relation to the entire service, and wherever he goes he carries this stigma and he is treated in a harsh and ungentle manner.

The fact that constables do not have a means to have their grievances redressed is another matter I wish to bring to the notice of the Hon. Minister. They cannot come to a politician. If they are found to have come to a person like the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central or myself, they are punished, so that they are afraid to come to us to make a complaint. They do not have access to the Minister. They do not have access necessarily to the I. G. P. They have to go through the normal forms of public service representation that operate in a more severe manner, and, therefore, the grievances of the policeman cannot get redressed. He is generally at the receiving end in regard to everything that is unpleasant. He has to deal with the public. He is more in touch with the public than the higher officers. When he makes a mistake he is punished very severely, but often the mistakes for which he is responsible are not of his own doing; they come from having to disobey some orders and instructions given by persons higher up. The lot of the constable is an extremely unhappy one and the possibilities of victimization, of private revenge on the part of others against him, all these operate in a very big way in the police service even today.

අ. සා. 7.30

There is a welfare organization. For long years there was no association at all. A former Government disbanded the Police Sergeants' and Constables' Association and it never came back. The whole question of to what extent rights of that kind could be given to the public servants is a matter that received a final resolution in regard to principles and policies only in the last days of the Government that came into being in 1960,

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[බර්තාඩ් සොයිසා මහ.]

and, therefore, implementation could not be embarked upon in the lifetime of that Government. But, Sir, a welfare organization was set up for police officers. This welfare organization operates on a class basis. It is supposed to look after officers who go to the Police Hospital. When a police constable goes to the Police Hospital—it is very rarely that he is sent there, he has to go with the rest of the public to the General Hospital or to one of the clinics in any of the district hospitals—he is not given anything. But when an inspector enters the Police Hospital this welfare organization sees that Rs. 10 is set apart for any immediate requirements that the officer may want. That kind of welfare vote, unfortunately, did not operate in the case of the poor constable. I am not saying that the inspector should not get it. I am only saying that it be democratically applied; that others be entitled, too. The welfare organization cannot see the ordinary constable; the constable is not visible to this organization. I do not know what or who this committee consists of at the moment. I am not levelling any accusation against any person or persons. The manner of operation of the present welfare organization apparently does not take into account the ordinary constable.

There are contributions made to a provident or mutual aid fund. No interest is paid on the first five years' contributions. I do not know why. Interest is payable on the contribution only after five years. Very often a police constable, within the first five years, on account of illness or sudden emergencies may draw that money and on account of the fact that he has taken loans and is in the process of paying them back, no interest accrues to him even during the period interest is payable. There is a very strong request that interest be payable on their contributions from the commencement.

There is the absence of an insurance scheme. I know the hon. Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike), when I discussed this over two years ago promised to give some relief in this matter and some investigation was started. I do not know what happened to that investigation. But I know that he started an investigation on that matter about setting up an insurance scheme for police officers who have to take risks in the performance of their duties. Such an insurance scheme should not be difficult for the Government to operate. There are various forms of insurance possible and the Government itself has its own Insurance Corporation. There is no reason why the policeman should not be insured through the corporation by means of something similar to a group insurance scheme in respect of workers, which is easy to operate.

I do not know how much of money is actually spent on the Police Hospital; I do not know whether it serves the purpose. There are two medical officers and a small number of nurses, attendants. A certain number of privileged officers get admission to that hospital and are treated there while the vast majority of the police force has to go to hospitals maintained by the Government like the General Hospital, Colombo South Hospital, and the Colombo North Hospital; and in the outstations they have the other Government hospitals. If this money that is spent on maintaining the Police Hospital is utilized for the purpose of providing from the Inspector General down to the common ranker proper hospital facilities, a special ward in the General Hospital or any other main hospital can be kept for them. That would be far more useful than this hospital, which has to rely for specialized service on the General Hospital in any event.

I know that a section of the top officials fought for the maintenance and the continuance of this police hospital and that is why the last Government found it difficult to do away with it. I do not see that it

serves its proper purpose and the fact that certain privileges accrue to certain people begins to breed discontent and distrust in those others who do not get those privileges. What is the use of that hospital if, in any case, for specialized services you have to go to the General Hospital? Why isolate a certain number of persons?

In regard to uniforms, one of those things flowing from departmental orders is a thing called kit inspection. Now, Sir, there should be kit inspection in a service which gives a complicated uniform, I am prepared to grant that, but these kit inspections do not take place uniformly everywhere. Each officer conducting this kit inspection has his own notion of how it should be done, with the result that when a person who gets used to one officer's whims and fancies undergoes a kit inspection under some other officer, he suddenly finds himself penalized for no fault of his own because there is no uniformity in this whole matter. Sir, in regard to kit inspection, there was a constable who was punished because he had not placed the kit in the correct order in which the inspecting officer desired it. He had learned that particular order of placing the kit from some other officer who said that was the way to do it. Now, this is a most harassing kind of treatment meted out to the poor constable. The kit inspection is held in order to see that his button is in the proper place or the belt is in the proper place. You can understand that; but this kind of treatment seems to be most harassing.

The uniform of a constable today is calculated to give him the maximum amount of discomfort. I know that the whole question of uniforms in the police and the public service was investigated by a joint committee. They made a report and I do not know how far they went into the question of policemen's uniforms. Why is it necessary in a tropical climate like ours to have putties and things like that? These heavy

regimental boots are extremely uncomfortable to wear with woollen stockings, and a thick khaki coat which closes up to the neck does not allow the slightest degree of ventilation within the clothes. Why all this quite unnecessary equipment? What is required for purposes of protecting a constable from a reasonable amount of wear and tear, to protect the wearer from injury, all that I can understand. But why maximize the discomfort to the wearer? Why cannot something be done to change this?

With regard to the pay scales of officers, I know that twice changes were made; one, somewhere in 1959, and again, during the period of the last Government, certain changes were made, but the pay, despite these changes, are geared to the conception of rates obtainable in the Public Service in regard to what are called comparable service. There is no comparable service, and I do not see how you can equate a police constable with a semi-skilled worker. The conditions are entirely different. The nature of the work performed is entirely different, so that that kind of equation by salaries commissions of the past appear to me to be unfair.

The hon. Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike) last year stated that he was going to make certain changes in the pay scales of police drivers. They are paid at the rate paid for policemen but they do not enjoy the privileges and perquisites of policemen. They are treated like drivers but they are paid as though they are ordinary constables. Why cannot police drivers be paid as other drivers in the Public Service? There is no reason why this should not be rectified. This matter has been under agitation for a long time. The rates of increment in all sections of the Police Service require some kind of overhaul.

Then, Sir, in regard to inspectors, and the division of police stations into categories "A", "B" and "C", and the appointment of officers to

[බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.]

stations "A", "B" and "C", it is very difficult to find some kind of method or some kind of rule that operates in regard to these appointments. That is why I had occasion to complain before this that in the matter of appointments which pave the way to promotion and advancement in service, kissing went by favour. I find, Sir, that the same sentiments are repeated in an article in regard to the police force in the daily papers.

The grading of police stations as "A", "B" and "C" may be necessary for administrative reasons. But when appointments are made which pave the way for promotions and so on, there should be some proper authority, or proper basis, or some known rule providing certain avenues for appeal where an officer is dissatisfied when these appointments are made. The grading of stations may be necessary for administrative reasons, but you will find constables, sub-inspectors, and inspectors remaining in certain stations for many years without any reason given, while others are transferred to remote and unpleasant parts of the Island where work is heavy and living conditions are difficult. There is no reason given for such discrimination.

Now, Sir, there is one way in which this matter might be remedied, and that is to establish a permanent committee with members of the public appointed, who can constantly sit and look into matters of this kind and see that the members of the Police Service are given some means of making their complaints. They may even be called upon to listen to complaints made by the public in regard to policemen. There should be some consistent method of keeping tab on the stations and seeing that changes are made as and when required, so that the multiplicity of grievances that begin to fester within the service can be removed.

The hon. Member for Galle (The Hon. W. Dahanayake) made a suggestion on the Floor of this House

somewhere in 1961 that a police commission be set up: not a commission to investigate into charges against the police force but a commission that went into the entire reorganization of the police force. He mentioned the fact that the last commission sat in 1946. That is to say, independent Ceylon has known no police commission! There has been no police commission for the purpose of reorganizing the force in order to suit the conditions of today. And the conditions of today are very, very different from the conditions that obtained in Ceylon in 1946. There is a new tempo in the country; people's attitudes have changed; the policeman's attitude has changed; a new person goes into the police force; the problems both urban and rural have changed; the pattern of crime both major and minor has begun to change. The manner of dealing with these, how you can have an efficient law enforcement instrument without necessarily becoming oppressive within itself or as against the public, that is a matter for investigation. We have a number of ideas which we could give in order to see that some effective change is made. It is time that a properly functioning police commission went into all these matters to give all policemen a chance of stating what they have to state in regard to necessary reforms—the inspectors, the assistant superintendents and superintendents, and the ordinary constable, who is the most important. There are big gaps once again, as in the case of the army, between the lesser ranks and the rest. It is time that they were removed. They do not happen to be acceptable to people in the modern world. It is therefore necessary to reduce these gaps that have grown over the years as between these sections. That is why I say these are particular matters. Most of the matters I raised could properly be gone into by a police commission and that is the principal request I am making, namely, that a police commission be appointed which will go into all these matters and see that the necessary changes are made.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

අ. හා. 7.45

පී. බී. විජයසුන්දර මයා. (කිරිඇල්ල)

(කි.ප්‍ර. ඒ. ඩී. බී. විජේසුන්දරා—කිරිඇල්ල)

(Mr. P. B. Wijesundara—Kiriella)

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, දකුණු කොළඹ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.) විසින් දැන් පොලිස් දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව සම්බන්ධව සැඟහෙණ විවේචනයක් කර තිබෙන මේ අවස්ථාවේදී ගම්බද පොලිස් ස්ථානවල වැඩ කෙරෙන ආකාරය සම්බන්ධව සුළු විස්තරයක් කරන්නට මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා.

විශේෂයෙන්ම ගම්බද පොලිස් ස්ථානවල තත්ත්වය කුමක්ද කියා අප සියළු දෙනාම හොඳාකාර දන්නවා. ගම්බද පොලිස් ස්ථානවලින් අද හරි අන්දමින් සාධාරණ අන්දමින් සේවය ඉෂ්ට නොවෙනවාය කියා පැමිණිලි රාශියක් ලැබී තිබෙනවා. ඒ නිසා ගම්බද පොලිසිවලින් නියම අන්දමින් සාධාරණය ඉෂ්ට කරවීමට කුමන අන්දමේ වාතාවරණයක් ඇති කළයුතුද කියා කල්පනා කර බලන්නට වටිනවා.

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, අපි දන්නවා, දෙපක්ෂයක් පැමිණිල්ලක් කරන්නට ගම්බද පොලිස් ස්ථානයකට ගිය විට, ඒ පොලිස් ස්ථානය භාරව සිටින පොලිස් පරීක්ෂකවරයාට හෝ වෙනත් නිලධාරියාට තැත්නම් පොලිස් කොස්තාපල් තැනට ප්‍රශ්න රාශියකට මුහුණපාන්නට සිද්ධ වන බව. දෙපක්ෂය පැමිණිල්ල කරන්න පොලිස් ස්ථානය කරා ගොස් පැය කීපයක් ගතවීමට පෙර පොලිස් පරීක්ෂකවරයා හමුවීමට ඒ කිව්වුව සිටින වතු අයිතිකරු හෝ වතු සුපිරිත්ලන්ඩන්ට පදවිය දරණ පුද්ගලයා හෝ පුද්ගලයන් යනවා. පොලිස් පරීක්ෂකවරයා මුණ ගැසෙන ඔවුන් අර පැමිණිල්ල සම්බන්ධව කථා බස් කරනවා. පොලිස් පරීක්ෂකවරුන්, පොලිස් නිලධාරීන්, කොස්තාපල්වරුන් යන අය සහ වතු අයිතිකරුවනුත් වතු සුපිරිත්ලන්ඩන්ට වරුනුත් අතර තිබෙන සම්බන්ධය කුමක්ද අපි හොඳාකාරව දන්නවා. ගම්බද පොලිස් ස්ථාන තිබෙන්නේ නගරවලින් සැතපුම් ගණන් ඇත්තයි. ඒ නිසා ගම්බද

පොලිස් ස්ථානවල පොලිස් පරීක්ෂක වරුන්, කොස්තාපල්වරුන් ඇතුළු අනිකුත් නිලධාරීන්ට තමන්ගේ මිත්‍රයන් හමුවී විනෝදවී සන්ධ්‍යාවක් ගත කරන්නට ලැබෙන්නේ ඉතාමත් කලාතුරකින්. මේ හේතුව නිසා ඒ පොලිස් නිලධාරීන් තමන්ගේ සමාජ ආශ්‍රය පවත්වා ගැනීම සඳහා අර වතු පාලකවරුන් හෝ ගමේ සිටින මධ්‍යම පන්තික ඉංග්‍රීසි උගතුන් ආදීන් සමග සම්බන්ධකම් ඇති කර ගන්නවා. එය ස්වභාවික දෙයක්. මේ සමාජ ක්‍රමය උඩ එය වැළැක්වීම දුෂ්කරයි. මේ තත්ත්වය නිසා සමහර අවස්ථාවලදී ඒ පොලිස් නිලධාරීන්ට ඔවුන්ගේ මිත්‍රයන් වන වතු පාලකවරුන් හෝ වතු අයිතිකරුවන් ආදී උදවියගේ වචනවලට ඇහුම්කන් දෙන්නට සිද්ධ වෙනවා. මේ තත්ත්වය සම්බන්ධයෙන් අප කල්පනා කර බැලිය යුතුයි. ඒ නිසා ගම්බද පොලිස් ස්ථානවල විශේෂයෙන්ම පොලිස් පරීක්ෂකවරුන්ට සහි අත්තයේදී ඔවුන්ගේ මිත්‍රයන් හමුවී නිවාඩුවක් ගත කරන්නට අවස්ථාවක් සලසා දීම හොඳය කියා මා කල්පනා කරනවා. එවැනි දෙයක් නෙකළොත් රාජකාරිය කිරීමේදී ඒ නිලධාරීන්ට අනිසි බලපෑම්වලට මුහුණ දෙන්නට සිද්ධ වෙනවා. ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, ඒවාගේම බලපාන තවත් කොටසක් ඉන්නවා. ගම්බද කඩ හිමියන්, මුදලාලිවරුන් ආදී අයත් මේ පොලිස් ස්ථානවල පරීක්ෂකවරුන් හා කොස්තාපල්වරුන් කෙරෙහි බලපාන්නට පටන් ගන්නවා. අපි හොඳාකාර දන්නා කාරණයක් තමයි, බොහෝ දුරට ගම්බද පොලිස් ස්ථානවල පොලිස් පරීක්ෂකවරුන් හා කොස්තාපල්වරුන් මේ කඩහිමි මුදලාලිලාටත් වෙනත් ණය දෙන උදවියටත් ණය ගැනිවී සිටින බව. මේ තත්ත්වය ඇතිවී තිබෙන්නේ සමහරවිට ඔවුන්ගේ පඩි විෂමතාව නිසා වෙන්ත පුළුවන්; සමහර විට වෙනත් ප්‍රශ්න නිසා වෙන්ත පුළුවන්. කෙසේ වුවත් යම්කිසි පැමිණිල්ලක් පොලිසියට ආවාම කඩහිමි මුදලාලිලා ඇතුළු උදවියන් පොලිසිය කරා දවගෙන එනවා. මෙවැනි තත්ත්වයක් ඇතිවී තිබෙන නිසා දකුණු කොළඹ බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා සඳහන් කළ අන්දමට පොලිස් නිලධාරීන්ගේ පඩි ප්‍රශ්නය පිළිබඳව විශේෂයෙන්ම සලකා බලන්නට වටිනවා.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[විජයසූත්‍රයේදර මයා.]

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, එවැනිම තවත් ප්‍රශ්නයක් තිබෙනවා. බොහෝ විට පොලිස් ස්ථානවල පොලිස් පරීක්ෂකවරුන්ටත් කොස්තාපල් වරුන්ටත් බැරැක්ක හෝ වෙනත් වාසස්ථාන නැහැ. ඒ නිසා සමහර පොලිස් නිලධාරීන්ට පෞද්ගලික ගෙවල් හිමියන්ගේ ගෙවල්වල කුළියට පදිංචි වෙන්න සිද්ධ වෙනවා. බොහෝ විට මේ ගෙවල් කුළි හරියාකාර නොගෙවන තත්ත්වයක් තිබෙනවා. මේ තත්ත්වය නිසා සමහර අවස්ථාවලදී ඒ ගෙවල් අයිතිකරුවාගෙන් පොලිස් නිලධාරීන් කෙරෙහි බලපානවා. අපේ සමාජ ක්‍රමය යටතේ ඇතිවී තිබෙන මෙවැනි දුෂ්කරතාවන් හා වැටුප් විෂමතාවන් ගැන කල්පනා කර බලා පොලිස් නිලධාරීන්ට සිය සේවය අපක්ෂපාත අන්දමින් කරන්නට පුළුවන් වාතාවරණයක් වහාම ඇති කළයුතු බව මගේ කල්පනාවයි.

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, පැමිණිලි සම්බන්ධව අප දැන් සාකච්ඡා කළා. මේ පැමිණිලි ලිවීම සම්බන්ධවත් නොයෙක් අර්බුද ඇති වෙනවා. සමහර අවස්ථාවලදී යම්කිසි මනුෂ්‍යයකු පැමිණිල්ලක් කරන්නට පොලිස් ස්ථානයට පැමිණෙන විට “රිසර්ච්” එකේ නැත්නම් ඒ පොලිස් ස්ථානයේ ඉන්නේ අර මනුෂ්‍යයාගේ භාෂාව නොතේරෙන පරීක්ෂකවරයෙක්, නැත්නම් කොස්තාපල් කෙනෙක්. සිංහල මනුෂ්‍යයකු පැමිණිල්ලක් කරන්න පැමිණෙන විට දෙමළ පොලිස් නිලධාරියකු ඉන්න පුළුවන්. නැත්නම් දෙමළ මනුෂ්‍යයකු පැමිණිල්ලක් කරන්න පැමිණෙන විට සිංහල පොලිස් නිලධාරියකු ඉන්න පුළුවන්. මේ නිසා නොයෙක් අවස්ථාවලදී, පැමිණිලි භාර ගැනීමේදී අර්බුද ඇති වෙනවා. සමහර පැමිණිලි හොඳ සිංහලෙන්වත්, හොඳ ඉංග්‍රීසියෙන්වත්, හොඳ දෙමළෙන්වත් සටහන් වන්නේ නැහැ. එම නිසා පැමිණිලි සටහන් කර ගැනීමේදී මීට වඩා පරීක්ෂා කාරීව කටයුතු කෙරෙන විධියට වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් සලස්වන හැටියට මා ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා.

පසුගිය සතියේද කොහේද, මා ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නයකට රාජ්‍ය කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ගරු ඇමතිතුමා පිළිතුරු දුන් බව මට මතකයි. පොලිස් නිලධාරීන්ට විරුද්ධව කරන පැමිණිලි සම්බන්ධයෙන් කරන පරීක්ෂණයන් පිළිබඳවයි, ඒ. එතුමා දුන් පිළිතුරේ සඳහන් වුණා, එවැනි පරීක්ෂණ පවත්වන විට සාමාන්‍ය මහජනයාගෙන් තෝරා ගත් කෙනෙකුත්, ගැසට් කළ පොලිස් නිලධාරියකුත්, එම පොලිස් ස්ථානය භාර පරීක්ෂකවරයන් කියන තිදෙනා ඇතුළත් මණ්ඩලයක් මගින් එය පවත්වනු ලබන විය කියා. තවමත් එවැනි දෙයක් ක්‍රියාත්මක වන්නේ නැහැ. සමහර පළාත්වල එවැනි වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් ක්‍රියාත්මක වෙන වද කියන්න මා දන්නේ නැහැ. මා දැනු වත්ව නම් නැහැ. එය ක්‍රියාවේ යෙදෙන්නේ නැති නම්, වහාම ක්‍රියාවේ යෙදෙන්න ය කියා මා එතුමාගෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා. එවැනි විභාගයක් පවත්වන විට නිලධාරී මහත්වරුන් නිල ඇඳුමෙන් නොව සිවිල් ඇඳුමෙන් සැරසී සිටිනවා නම් හොඳයි. අපේ මිනිසුන්ගේ මානසික තත්ත්වය ගැන කල්පනා කර බලන විට, එවැනි අය සිවිල් ඇඳුමෙන්ම පෙනී සිට මිත්‍ර ලීලා වෙන් ඒ විධියේ පරීක්ෂණ පවත්වනවා නම්, සාමාන්‍ය මිනිසා පොලිස් යුනිෆෝම් එකට දක්වන බිය නැති වී ගොස්, ඔවුන්ට නියම ආකාරයට කට උත්තර දෙන්න පුළුවන් තත්ත්වයක් ඇති වෙන බව කියන්නට ඕනැ.

පොලිස් හමුදාවට බැඳීම ගැන ඊළඟට කියන්න තිබෙනවා. එම කටයුත්තෙහිදී ලොකු විනෝද සහගත තත්ත්වයක් තිබෙනවා. රාජ්‍ය කටයුතු භාර ගරු ඇමතිතුමාටත් මා මේ ගැන කියා තිබෙනවා. පොලිසියට බැඳෙන්නට ගිය විට ක්‍රියාවේ යෙදවන පැරණි සම්ප්‍රදායයක් තිබෙනවා. යම් කෙනෙක් පොලිසියට බැඳෙන්නට ගියා ම, ඔහුගේ චරිතයත්, ඔහුගේ පියාගේ චරිතයත්, ඔහුගේ සියලු චරිතයත් ගැන සොයා බැලීමේ සිරිතක් තිබෙනවා. එය නීතියක්ද, සම්ප්‍රදායයක්ද කියන්න දන්නේ නැහැ. යම් විධියකින් එවැනි තැනැත්තකුගේ පියාගේ හෝ සියලු චරිතයෙහි වරදක් තිබෙනවා නම්, ඔහුට එම පදවියට ඇතුළත් වෙන්න බැහැ. මේ විධියට බැලුවොත් යම් විධියකින් බන්ධනාගාර ගත වී සිටින කෙනෙකුගේ

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

මුණුබුරෙකුට වුණත් පොලීස් දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවට ඇතුළත් වෙන්න බැහැ. එතකොට, අපේ ගරු අගමැතිතුමාගෙ දරුවකු සිටිනව නම් ඔහුටත් පොලීස් දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවට ඇතුළත් වෙන්න බැහැ.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

මට දරුවෙක් නැහැ.

විජයසුන්දර මයා.

(திரு. விஜேசுந்தர)
(Mr. Wijesundara)

සිටිනව නම්. ඒ මොකද, තමුන්නාන්සෙගෙ පියා බන්ධනාගාර ගත වී සිටි තිසා.

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන

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

ඒ, වරදක් නැතුව.

විජයසුන්දර මයා.

(திரு. விஜேசுந்தர)
(Mr. Wijesundara)

දේශපාලන ප්‍රශ්නයක් උඩ එසේ වුණත්, මෙපමණ කලක් එයද ඊට බලපා තියෙනව. එය වෙනස් කරන්න ඕන. මොන කරුණක් නිසා හෝ ඊමාන්ඩ් භාරයෙ සිටියත් ග්‍රාම සේවක මහත්මයා ඒ ගැන වාර්තා කරන්න ඕන. එසේ කළාම, අර පුද්ගලයට පොලීසියට බැඳෙන්න බැරි වෙනව. සමහරවිට අපේ දෙමව්පියොත්, අපේ දෙමව්පියන්ගෙ දෙමව්පියොත් වැරදි නොකළා වුණත් එවැනි දේට අසු වී තිබෙන්න පුළුවනි. තවමත් පොලීස් දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවෙ පවතින මෙම සම්ප්‍රදාය වහාම නැති කර දමන්න ඕන. මේ ආකාරයට දිගින් දිගට වරින ගැන සෙවීමේ ක්‍රියා මාර්ගය නතර කර අයදුම්කරු ගැන පමණක් සොයා බලා පොලීස් හමුදාවට බඳවා ගැනීමේ ක්‍රමයක් සලස්වන ලෙස මා ඉල්ලා සිටිනව.

එපමණක් නොව, පොලීස් වාහන හිඟ කමේ ප්‍රශ්නය උඩ තවත් විෂමතාවක් පැන නැග තිබෙනව. අපේ නිලධාරීන් නිතරම පැමිණිලි කරනව, සැහෙන ප්‍රමා

ණයට වාහනවත් පෙට්රල්වත් ලැබෙන්නෙ නැත කියා. මෙම ප්‍රශ්නය කොයි විධියෙන් විසඳනවද යන්න ගැන සිතීම ගරු අගමැතිතුමාට භාරයි. යම් පැමිණිල්ලක් කරන්න දෙපක්ෂයක් පොලීසියට ගියාම වාහනයක් සපයන්න පුළුවන්කම තියෙන පක්ෂයට ලොකු වාසියක් සැලසෙනව. පැමිණිල්ලක් කරන්න ගිය තැනදි, පරීක්ෂකවරයා කීවොත්, “පොලීස් ජීප් රථය ගමනක් ගිහිල්ලා” ය කියා, වාහනයක් සපයන්න තරම් ධනයක් තියෙන පක්ෂය කරන්නෙ, ඔවුන්ගෙ වාහනය කීත් පොලීස් නිලධාරීන් කැඳවාගෙන යාමයි. එසේ යාමෙදි, ඔවුන්ට වුවමනා විධියට පරීක්ෂණය පවත්වන්න කටයුතු යොදා ගන්නව. එහෙම කොතෙකුත් කෙරෙනව. යම් පැමිණිල්ලක් කරන්න ආවාම, පැමිණිල්ල පැත්තෙ වාහනයකින් හෝ විත්තිය පැත්තෙ වාහනයකින් හෝ ගොස් රාජකාරිය කරන්න වුනාම, විෂමතාවක් සිදු වෙනව.



දෙපැත්තෙම වාහන තිබුණොත්.

විජයසුන්දර මයා.

(திரு. விஜேசுந்தர)
(Mr. Wijesundara)

මන්ත්‍රීතුමනි, මම කපා කරන්නෙ මෙම සාකච්ඡාවට අවශ්‍ය දේ පමණයි. පොලීස් දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවට අයත් වුවන්ගෙ විදේශගත පුහුණු කිරීම්වලදී ලොකු වෝදනා එනව, උසස් නිලධාරීන්ට පමණයි, එවැනි දේට වරප්‍රසාදය ලැබෙන්නෙ කියා. විදේශීය පොලීස් අධ්‍යාපන ආයතනවලට ගොස් පුහුණුව ලැබීමට අවස්ථාව ලැබෙන්නෙ උසස් නිලධාරීන්ට පමණය කියන වෝදනාව ලැබෙන නිසා දක්ෂකම් තිබෙන සාමාන්‍ය බුද්ධිමත් කොස්තාපල්වරුන්ටත් ඒ සඳහා අවස්ථාව සලස්වනව නම් හොඳයි. විදේශයන්ට ගොස් පුහුණුව ලබා ගැනීම සඳහා සාමාන්‍ය පොලීස් කොස්තාපල්වරුන්ටත් අවස්ථාව සලසා දිය යුතුයි.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[විජයසුන්දර මයා.]

සමහර පොලිස් කොස්තාපල්වරුන්, සාප්තවරුන් එක් ස්ථානයක බොහෝ කල් සිටිනවා. මේ නිසා පොලිස් පරීක්ෂක වරුන්ට තමන්ගේ රාජකාරිය නිසි අන්දමින් කරගෙන යාමටත් අපහසුකම් ඇති වෙනවා. කලක් තිස්සේ සිටින පොලිස් කොස්තාපල් තැන තැන්නම් සාප්තවරුන් බොහෝ දෙනෙකු දන්නා අදහන නිසා බොහෝ දෙනෙකු සමඟ හිතවත්කම් ඇති කරගෙන තිබෙන නිසා පොලිස් පරීක්ෂක තැනට තම රාජකාරි වලදී අපහසුකම්වලට මුහුණ පාන්නට සිදු වී තිබෙනවා. මේ ගැනත් කල්පනා කර බලන්නට ඕනෑ.

පොලිස් ස්ථානවලට තිබෙන ලොකුම අඩු පාඩුවක් නම් ටයිප් යන්ත්‍ර නැතිකම හා ලිපිකරුවන් නැතිකමයි. ටයිප් යන්ත්‍ර නැති නිසා ඒ යන්ත්‍ර තිබෙන පෞද්ගලික ස්ථානයකට ගොස් යම් යම් ලියකියවිලි ටයිප් ගසා ගැනීමට පොලිස් නිලධාරීන්ට සිදු වෙනවා. මෙයින්ද යම් යම් අකටයුතු සිදු වෙන්නට ඉඩ තිබෙනවා. අලුතින් පොලීසිය ප්‍රතිසංවිධානය කරන විට මේ කරුණු ගැන කල්පනා කර බලනවා ඇතැයි මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා.

එච්. කුලරත්න මයා. (රක්වාන)

(කි. ෮. ෨෪. ෧෪—රක්වාන—රක්වාන)

(Mr. H. Kularatne—Rakwana)

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, පොලිස් සේවක යන්ට මුහුණ පාන්නට සිදු වී තිබෙන අසාධාරණ කමක් ගැන මතක් කරන්නට යි, මා බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ. “ආරංචි සටහන් පත්‍රය” නැත්නම් “ඉන් ටෙලිජන්ස් ජීට්” නමින් සාමාන්‍ය පොලිස් නිලධාරීන්ට බලපාන සටහන් පත්‍රයක් තිබෙනවා. ඒ අනුව හැම සුළු පොලිස් නිලධාරියෙකුම අඩු වශයෙන් මාසෙකට නඩු තුනක් හෝ ඉදිරිපත් කිරීම අවශ්‍යයි. උප පොලිස් අධිකාරී තැන මාස තුනකට වරක් ඒවා පරීක්ෂා කර බලන අතර පොලිස් අධිකාරී තැන හය මාසෙකට වරක් පරීක්ෂා කර බලනවා. පොලිස් නිලධාරීන් මාසෙකට නඩු තුන බැගින් ඉදිරිපත් නොකළහොත් ඔවුන්ගේ පඩි වැඩි වීම් නතර කරනවා. මේ අනුව කාර්යාලවල සහ උසාවිවල වැඩ කරන සුළු පොලිස් නිලධාරීන්ට පඩි වැඩි වීම් ඇණහිටින අවස්ථා බොහෝ සෙයින් යුතුයි.

තිබෙනවා. එසේ වන්නේ ඒ අයට නඩු සොයා ගෙන යන්නට අවස්ථා නැති නිසයි. සුළු පොලිස් නිලධාරීන්ට මුහුණ පාන්නට සිදු වී තිබෙන මේ තත්ත්වය නිසා ගම්බද මහජනතාවට ලොකු අසාධාරණයක් සිදු වී තිබෙන බවත් මතක් කරන්නට ඕනෑ. අවුරුද්ද අවසානයේදී උසස් පොලිස් නිලධාරීන් විසින් සුළු පොලිස් නිලධාරීන් පිළිබඳ සටහන් පරීක්ෂා කර බලන්නට පෙර නඩු සොයා ගන්නට ඒ සුළු පොලිස් නිලධාරීන් උත්සාහ කරන නිසා කරදරයක් සිදු වී තිබෙන්නේ දුප්පත් මහජනතාවටයි. පොලිස් නිලධාරීන් නොයෙකුත් උපක්‍රම මගින් තමන්ගේ නඩු ගණන වැඩි කර ගන්නට උත්සාහ කරන විට ඊට ගොදුරු වන්නේ දුප්පත් මහජනතාවයි. ඔවුන් බොහෝ විට බොරු නඩු හදනවා. ඒ බොරු නඩු සෑදීම සඳහා ඔත්තුකරුවන් අවශ්‍යයි. බොහෝ විට පිහියා නඩු සහ රා නඩු මේ පොලිස් නිලධාරීන් විසින් ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නට උත්සාහ කරනවා. බොරු නඩු හදන්නට පොලිස් නිලධාරීන් දරන වැයම නිසා සමහර විට මිනීමැරුම් පවා ගම්බද ප්‍රදේශවල ඇති වෙනවා.

රක්වාන ප්‍රදේශයේ බොහෝ දෙනා වලවේ ගං මිටියාවතට වී මැණික් ගැරීම කරන්නේ ඔවුන්ට කරන්නට වෙනත් රක්ෂාවක් නැති නිසයි. මේ මැණික් ගැරීමෙහි නියුක්ත වුවත් අල්ලා ගැනීමට පොලීසියට ඒ තරම් මහත්සි වන්නට වුවමනා නැහැ. කොයි වෙලේ ගියත් තුන් හාර සියයක් මේ රැකියාවේ යෙදී සිටින බව දැක ගන්නට පුළුවනි. දැනට බොහෝ කාලයක සිට ඒ ප්‍රදේශයට නියං සායක් ඇති වී තිබෙනවා. ඒ නිසා ගොවිතැන් වැඩවල යෙදී සිටියවුන්ට දැන් ඒ වැඩ කරගෙන යාම අපහසු නිසා වලවේ ගං මිටියාවතට වී මැණික් ගැරීම ඔවුන්ගෙන් වැඩි දෙනෙකුගේ සිද්ධියි. ඒ මැණික් ගරන්නන්ට විරුද්ධව පොලීසිය ක්‍රියා කරන නිසා ලොකු කරදරයකට මුහුණ පාන්නට ඒ දුප්පත් පිරිසට සිදු වෙනවා. පොලිස් නිලධාරීන්ට මුහුණ පාන්නට සිදු වී තිබෙන තත්ත්වය නිසා අසරණ පිරිසක් කරදරවලට ගොදුරු වන හෙයින් පොලිස් නිලධාරීන් සඳහා පනවා ඇති ඒ නියෝග අවලංගු කළ යුතුයි. “ඉන් ටෙලිජන්ස් ජීට්” ක්‍රමය අවලංගු කර දැමිය යුතුයි. වලවේ ප්‍රදේශයේ ජලයට යටවන,

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

ආහාර පාලන නියෝග

ප්‍රයෝජනයක් නැති ඉඩම්වල මැණික් ගැරි මෙහි යෙදී සිටින දුප්පත් ජනතාවට විරුද්ධව පොලීසිය තදින් ක්‍රියා කිරීම අප රාධයක් බව මතක් කරන්නට ඔබ. පසු ගිය රජය වලවේ ප්‍රදේශයේ ප්‍රදේශයට යට වන ඒ ඉඩම් වෙන්දේසියේ මැණික් ගැරීම සඳහා වෙන්දේසි කෙළේ ඒ ඉඩම් වලින් ප්‍රයෝජනයක් ගත නොහැකි නිසයි. එම නිසා කරදරයක් හිරිහැරයක් නැතිව ඒ ප්‍රදේශයේ ඉඩම්වල මැණික් ගරා ගැනීමට දුප්පත් ජනතාවට ඉඩ දිය යුතු බව මතක් කරන්නට කැමතියි.

එකල්හි වේලාව අ. හ. 8 වූයෙන්, මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයට ප්‍රගතිය වාර්තා කරනු පිණිස සභාපතිතුමා මූලාසනයෙන් ඉවත් විය.

කාරක සභාව ප්‍රගතිය වාර්තා කරයි; නැවත රැස් වීම 1965 සැප්තැම්බර් 1 වන දිනදා.

நேரம் பி. ப. 8 மணியாகிவிட்டவே, குழுவின் பரிசீலனை பற்றி சபைக்கு அறிவிக்கும் பொருட்டு அக்கிரா சனர், அக்கிராசனத்திலிருந்து நீங்கினார்.

குழவினது பரிசீலனை அறிவிக்கப்பட்டது அடுத்த கூட்டம்: 1965 செப்டம்பர் 1, புதன்கிழமை

It being 8 P.M., the Chairman left the Chair to report Progress.

Committee report Progress; to sit again on Wednesday, 1st September, 1965.

ශ්‍රී ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

There are certain non-controversial matters which might be taken up at this stage if the House agrees. They are items 15 to 29, except item 25, on the Order Paper.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

May I move some of my items that are on the Order Paper. They are items 15 to 24. These are regulations that have been published in the Government Gazette as a requirement under the Food Control Ordinance. Once these regulations are gazetted they have to be presented in Parliament for approval. They are purely formal regulations. In fact, they had been published in the gazette in 1963,

they had got on to the agenda but somehow or other had not been taken up and passed. I would request that these items be taken up now.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

We agree.

ආහාර පාලන නියෝග

உணவுக்கட்டுப்பாட்டுக் கட்டளைகள்

FOOD CONTROL ORDERS

මතු පළවන යෝජනාව සභාසම්මත විය:

பின்வரும் பிரேரணை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது:

Resolved:

"That the Food Control Order No. 205 of 27.6.63, made by the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Co-operatives under Section 4 (1) of the Food Control Act, No. 25 of 1950, and published in Government Gazette Extraordinary, No. 13,687 of 27.6.63, which was presented on August 9, 1965, be approved.—[ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා]

මතු පළවන යෝජනාව සභාසම්මත විය:

பின்வரும் பிரேரணை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது:

Resolved:

"That the Food Control Order No. 206 of 10.7.63, made by the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Co-operatives under Section 4 (1) (iv) of the Food Control Act, No. 25 of 1950, and published in Government Gazette Extraordinary No. 13,695 of 11.7.63, which was presented on August 9, 1965, be approved."—[ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා]

මතු පළවන යෝජනාව සභාසම්මත විය:

பின்வரும் பிரேரணை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது:

Resolved:

"That the Food Control Order No. 207 of 10.7.63, made by the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Co-operatives under Section 4 (1) (vi) of the Food Control Act, No. 25 of 1950, and published in Government Gazette Extraordinary No. 13,695 of 11.7.63, which was presented on August 9, 1965, be approved."—[ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා]

මතු පළවන යෝජනාව සභාසම්මත විය:

பின்வரும் பிரேரணை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது:

Resolved:

"That the Food Control Order No. 208 of 26.7.63, made by the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Co-operatives under

சுமார் பாரத நியோஜ

மேட்டர் ரப் மனாமன ரேஜுலாசி

Section 4 (1) (i) of the Food Control Act, No. 25 of 1950, and published in Government Gazette No. 13,710 of 29.7.63, which was presented on August 9, 1965, be approved.”—[அரு. சி. டி. லை]

மது பழவன ஸேச்சாவ ஸகாஸிமன விச:

பின்வரும் பிரேரணை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது:

Resolved:

“That the Food Control Order No. 209 of 27.12.63, made by the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Co-operatives under Section 4 (1) of the Food Control Act, No. 25 of 1950, and published in Government Gazette Extraordinary No. 13,900 of 2.1.64, which was presented on August 9, 1965, be approved.”—[அரு. சி. டி. லை]

மது பழவன ஸேச்சாவ ஸகாஸிமன விச:

பின்வரும் பிரேரணை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது:

Resolved:

“That the Food Control Order No. 210 of 11.1.64, made by the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Co-operatives under Section 4 (1) (iv) of the Food Control Act, No. 25 of 1950, and published in Government Gazette Extraordinary No. 13,922 of 13.1.64, which was presented on August 9, 1965, be approved.”—[அரு. சி. டி. லை]

மது பழவன ஸேச்சாவ ஸகாஸிமன விச:

பின்வரும் பிரேரணை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது:

Resolved:

“That the Food Control Order No. 211 of 11.1.64, made by the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Co-operatives under Section 4 (1) (vi) of the Food Control Act, No. 25 of 1950, and published in Government Gazette Extraordinary No. 13,922 of 13.1.64, which was presented on August 9, 1965, be approved.”—[அரு. சி. டி. லை]

மது பழவன ஸேச்சாவ ஸகாஸிமன விச:

பின்வரும் பிரேரணை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது;

Resolved:

“That the Food Control Order No. 212 of 11.1.64, made by the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Co-operatives under Section 4 (1) (i) of the Food Control Act, No. 25 of 1950, and published in Government Gazette No. 13,922 of 13.1.64, which was presented on August 9, 1965, be approved.”—[அரு. சி. டி. லை]

மது பழவன ஸேச்சாவ ஸகாஸிமன விச:

பின்வரும் பிரேரணை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது:

Resolved:

“That the Food Control Order No. 213 of 11.1.64, made by the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Co-operatives under Section 4 (1) (i) of the Food Control Act, No. 25 of 1950, and published in Government Gazette No. 13,922 of 13.1.64, which was presented on August 9, 1965, be approved.”—[அரு. சி. டி. லை]

மது பழவன ஸேச்சாவ ஸகாஸிமன விச:

பின்வரும் பிரேரணை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது:

Resolved:

“That the Food Control Order No. 214 of 11.1.64, made by the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Co-operatives under Section 4 (1) (i) of the Food Control Act, No. 25 of 1950, and published in Government Gazette Extraordinary No. 13,922 of 13.1.64, which was presented on August 9, 1965, be approved.”—[அரு. சி. டி. லை]

பி. சி. டி. டி. மனாமன பாரிமோகிசன

திரு. என். எம். டி. கூட என்பவருக்குப் பணிக்கொடை

GRATUITY TO MR. N. M. DE HOEDT

மது பழவன ஸேச்சாவ ஸகாஸிமன விச:

பின்வரும் பிரேரணை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது:

Resolved:

“That an ex-gratia gratuity of Rupees Seven hundred (Rs. 700) chargeable to Advance Account, Item 177—Posts and Telecommunication Service—Maintenance and running expenses of the Overseas Telecommunication Service inclusive of conferences abroad be paid to Mr. N. M. D. Hoedt who retired from the Overseas Telecommunication Service with effect from 1.8.1962.”—[அரு. சி. டி. லை]

மேட்டர் ரப் மனாமன ரேஜுலாசி

மோட்டார்ப் போக்குவரத்துப் பிரமாணங்கள்

MOTOR TRAFFIC REGULATIONS

மது பழவன ஸேச்சாவ ஸகாஸிமன விச:

பின்வரும் பிரேரணை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது:

Resolved:

“That the Regulation relating to the declaration of the part of the town of Agalawatta situated in the Maha-Pattu village area in the Kalutara District in the Western Province as Urban Area, for the purpose of the Motor Traffic Act (Chapter 203), made by the Minister of Communications under Sections 228 and 237 of the Motor Traffic Act (Chapter 203), which was presented on August 18, 1965, be approved.”—[அரு. சி. டி. லை]

மேலே ருப அமைக்கவேண்டிய

இது பற்றிய செய்தியை எழுதிவைக்கவேண்டிய

பின்வரும் பிரேரணை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது :

Resolved :

"That the Regulations relating to parking within the limits of Nattandiya Town Council, in the Puttalam District in the North-Western Province for the purposes of the Motor Traffic Act (Chapter 203), made by the Minister of Communications under Sections 166 (2) and 237 of the Motor Traffic Act (Chapter 203), which were presented on August 18, 1965, be approved."—[அரு. சி. சி. இரட்டை]

இது பற்றிய செய்தியை எழுதிவைக்கவேண்டிய

பின்வரும் பிரேரணை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது :

Resolved :

"That the Regulations relating to parking within the limits of the Akuressa Town Council, in the Matara District in the Southern Province for the purposes of the Motor Traffic Act (Chapter 203), made by the Minister of Communications, under Sections 166 (2) and 237 of the Motor Traffic Act (Chapter 203), which were presented on August 18, 1965, be approved."—[அரு. சி. சி. இரட்டை]

அரு. சி. சி. இரட்டை (கலெக்டர், கிராமிய, ஸ்ரீ லங்கா)

(கௌரவ எம். எச். முகம்மது—தொழில், தொழில் காண், வீடமைப்பு அமைச்சர்)

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

There is one more item which is also a formal matter, namely, item 30. This is for the purpose of controlling the payments made to presidents of industrial courts.

கௌரவ எம். எச். முகம்மது.

(திரு. கௌரவ எம். எச். முகம்மது)

(Mr. Keuneman)

We require some sort of discussion in regard to the working of industrial courts.

அரு. சி. சி. இரட்டை

(கௌரவ எம். எச். முகம்மது)

(The Hon. M. H. Mohamed)

I will give you an opportunity of discussing this matter at some other time because I will be bringing further regulations on the same subject. This regulation is for the purpose of limiting the payment to presidents of industrial courts to a maximum of Rs. 1,000. We are now paying large sums of money to these people.

கலெக்டர்

கௌரவ எம். எச். முகம்மது.

(திரு. கௌரவ எம். எச். முகம்மது)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I am objecting to it being taken up now.

கலெக்டர்

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

If there are any objections we cannot take it up.

கௌரவ எம். எச். முகம்மது.

(திரு. கௌரவ எம். எச். முகம்மது)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I object.

அரு. சி. சி. இரட்டை

(கௌரவ எம். எச். முகம்மது)

(The Hon. M. H. Mohamed)

This is only a formal matter. I shall give hon. Members an opportunity to discuss the industrial courts.

கலெக்டர்

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

I am sorry, even if one hon. Member objects, the matter cannot be taken up.

கௌரவ எம். எச். முகம்மது.

(திரு. கௌரவ எம். எச். முகம்மது)

(Mr. Keuneman)

We do not get an opportunity of discussing the work of the industrial courts. This is the only chance that we shall get to do so.

கலெக்டர்

ஒத்திவைப்பு

ADJOURNMENT

செய்தியை ஒத்திவைக்கவேண்டிய காரணத்தினால் இன்று இரவு இடைவிடப்படும்.

"இன்று இரவு இடைவிடப்படும்" —[அரு. சி. சி. இரட்டை]

பிரேரணை பிரேரிக்கப்பட்டு, வினா எடுத்தியம்பப்பெற்றது

"சபை இப்பொழுது ஒத்திவைக்கப்பெறுமா?" —[கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன]

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the House do now adjourn"—[The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene.]

කල් තැබීම

කල් තැබීම

අ. හා. 8.05

ඉකනමන් මයා.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I have a question for the Hon. Minister of Communications. I read in the newspapers that the Hon. Minister had gone to Kuruwita in Ratnapura and inspected a certain site there. It is understood that there is a proposal to build an airstrip in the Ratnapura District. I should like to know whether this is correct. Is the Hon Minister contemplating having an airstrip in the Ratnapura District, and, if so, has he already selected a site for the purpose?

අ. හා. 8.06

විජයසුන්දර මයා.

(திரு. விஜேசுந்தர)

(Mr. Wijesundara)

ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, ගරු අධිකරණ ඇමතිතුමාගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමා ගෙන් ප්‍රශ්න දෙකක් අහන්නට තිබෙනවා. ඉන් පළමුවැනි ප්‍රශ්නය මෙයයි : පසුගිය දිනවල වැලිකඩ හිර ගෙදර සිදු වුනායයි කියන සිදුවීම් රාශියක් පිළිබඳව දිනපතා පුවත්පත් කීපයකම වාර්තා පළවුණා. ඒවගේම අපට ආරංචිත් වුණා. ආයුධ, රිමෝල්වර්, පිස්තෝල, වොම් තුවක්කු ආදී දේවල් වැලිකඩ හිර ගෙදර තිබුණාය කියන විශාල රාවයක් තිබුණා. එපමණක් නොව හිරකරුවන්ගේ හිර මැදිරි ඇර තිබුණාය කියාත් ප්‍රචාර්ති පත්‍රවල පළ වී තිබුණා. මේ කරුණු සම්බන්ධයෙන් වැරදි කාරයින් කවුදැයි සොයා බැලීමට වහාම කොමිෂන් සභාවක් පත්කොට පරීක්ෂා කළ යුතු අවස්ථාවක් පැමිණ තිබෙනවා. ඒ මක්නිසාදයත්, මේවා තමන් විසින් කළ දේවල් නොව කුමන්ත්‍රණයක් අනුව සිදු වුණු දේවල්ය කියන මතයක් අහිංසක හිරකරුවන් තුළ තිබෙන නිසයි. මෙය කොයි තත්ත්වයේ දෙයක්ද කියා සොයන්නට බැරි අවස්ථාවකට පැමිණ තිබෙන නිසා වහාම මේ ගැන පරීක්ෂණ මණ්ඩලයක් පත් කොට පරීක්ෂා කර බලා මේ සම්බන්ධ වැරදිකාරයින් සිටිනවානම් නිසි අන්දමින්

කටයුතු කරන ලෙස මම අධිකරණ ඇමති තුමාගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමාට දැනුම් දෙනවා.

දෙවැනි ප්‍රශ්නය මෙයයි : පසුගිය සතියේ දී මා විසින් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නයකට පිළිතුරු දුන් ගරු අධිකරණ ඇමතිතුමාගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමා, ජාති හේද වාදී කෝලහල ඇවිස්සූ, රිමාන්ඩ් භාරයේ සිටි උදවිය සමාදාන මණ්ඩලවල සභාපතිවරුන් වශයෙන් පත් නොකරන බව සඳහන් කළා. නමුත් එවැනි උදවිය එසේ පත් කර සිටින බව මම දන්නවා. එම නිසා, වහාම සියලුම පොලිස් අධිකාරීන්ටත් දිසාපති වරුන්ටත් පළාත් පාලන ආයතනවලටත් දැනුම් දී මේ ගැන සොයා බලා වාර්තාකොට එවැනි පුද්ගලයින් සිටිනවා නම් ඔවුන් එම සභාවලින් අයින් කරන ලෙස මම ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා.

ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

කවුද ඔවුන් පත් කළේ ?

විජයසුන්දර මයා.

(திரு. விஜேசுந்தர)

(Mr. Wijesundara)

කවුරු පත් කළත් ඔවුන් ඒ සභාවලින් අයින් කළ යුතුයි. මම පුද්ගලයින්ගේ නම් සඳහන් කරන්නට කැමති නැ.

අ. හා. 8.08

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்ஸா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, පළාත් පාලන කටයුතු භාර ගරු ඇමතිතුමාගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමාගෙන් ප්‍රශ්නයක් ඇසීමට තිබෙනවා. කොළඹ නගර සභාවේ තත්ත්වය උසස් කරන ලෙස එම සභාවෙන් කළ ඉල්ලීමක් තිබෙනවා. එම ඉල්ලීමෙන් අදහස් කරන්නේ ඒ සභාවේ නම වෙනස් කිරීමක් පමණක් නොවෙයි ; එම සභාවට වඩාත් බලතල ලැබෙන ආකාරයට ව්‍යවස්ථා සංශෝධනය කොට ඒ මගින් එහි තත්ත්වය උසස් කරන ලෙසයි ඉල්ලීම කර තිබෙන්නේ. එම ඉල්ලීම

අනුව, මේ අවුරුද්ද කෙලවර වන්නට මත්තෙන් සංශෝධනයක් කරන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවාද එසේ නැත්නම් එය ලබන වර්ෂයකට හෝ ඊටත් එහාට හෝ කල් තබනවාද නැද්ද යන ප්‍රශ්නයට පිළිතුරක් දෙන්නට පුළුවන් නම් අන්න ඒ පිළිතුර ලබා ගන්නටයි මා මේ ප්‍රශ්නය අහන්නෙ.

අ. හා. 8.9

ගරු හුරුල්ලේ

(கௌரவ ஹுருல்ல)

(The Hon. Hurulle)

With regard to the matter raised by the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central (Mr. Keuneman), I should like to say that it is correct that a request was made for an airstrip. Inspection took place. We have gone into the matter and we find that it is not economical to have an airstrip there. We have decided accordingly.

අ. හා. 8.10

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

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

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

I remember reading in the papers myself about pistols and guns being found in the Welikade gaol. It is a matter that is being investigated into. I am not sure that I can subscribe to the allegation made by the hon. Member that there was a conspiracy on the part of some persons. I am not aware of the facts, and until a full inquiry is made into the matter it is not possible to say whether it is a conspiracy or whether it was done by somebody else.

In regard to the other question, namely, that some of the chairmen of conciliation boards are convicted

people, etc., I should like to say that there are a large number of chairmen of conciliation boards and, so far as we are aware, there is not a single instance of this nature. If the hon. Member will bring to my notice the case of any such person who has been appointed chairman, we shall and we can under the Ordinance take action to have him removed. But until he gives us names and particulars, it will not be possible for us to take action unless we go on a long voyage of discovery, trying to find out which of the chairmen fall into the category of those who should be penalized.

විජයසුන්දර මයා.

(திரு. விஜேசுந்தர)

(Mr. Wijesundara)

I have already addressed many communications to Ministers in charge of the administration of justice. I have received the reply that they are taking action but nothing has been done so far.

අ. හා. 8.11

ප්‍රේමදාස මයා.

(திரு. பிரேமதாச)

(Mr. Premadasa)

ගරු කළානායකතුමනි, දකුණු කොළඹ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.) ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නයට පිළිතුරු වශයෙන් කියන්න තියෙන්නෙ මෙයයි : කොළඹ නගර සභාව පිහිටුවා සිය වසක් ගතවීම නිමිත්තෙන් එහි තත්ත්වය උසස් කිරීම සඳහා ඉල්ලීමක් එම නගර සභාවෙන් පළාත් පාලන අමාත්‍යාංශයට ලැබී තිබෙනවා. මා කල්පනා කරන භාවයට මේ ප්‍රශ්නය කාලයක් මුළුල්ලේම සැලකිල්ලට භාජන වෙමින් පවතින්නක්. එහෙත් අපේ ආණ්ඩුව පිහිටුවනු ලැබීමෙන් පසු මැතකදී ඒ ප්‍රශ්නය අප ඉදිරියේ තබන්නට යෙදුණා. ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් විධිමත් ක්‍රියා මාර්ගයක් අනුගමනය කිරීමට පළාත් පාලන අමාත්‍යාංශය ඉතාමත් කැමැත්තෙන් සිටිනවා. නමින් පමණක් නොව අත්‍යවශ්‍ය බලතලත් ඇති වන ආකාරයටයි ඒ උසස් කිරීම සිදුකර ඒ උසස් තත්ත්වය ලබා දීමට අප බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නෙ.

කළ^p නැවීම

කල් නැතම

[ප්‍රේමදාසී මයෝ.]

එහෙත් කොළඹ නගර සභාවේ ගත සං
වත්සරය නිමිත්තෙන් ඒ උසස් තත්
ත්වය ලබා දෙන්නායි ඉල්ලා තිබෙන නිසා
වහාම දිය හැකි බලතල මොනවාදැයි
දැනට පළාත් පාලන අමාත්‍යාංශයේ කල්
පනාවට ගොස් තිබේ. එමෙන් පවතිනවා. ඒ
නිසා ඒක කලක් ගත වීමට මත්තෙන් ඒ
ගැන තීරණයක් ගැනීමට බලාපොරොත්තු
වන බව මේ අවස්ථාවේ ප්‍රකාශ කරන්න
පුළුවනි.

සුභ් නය විමසන ලදින්, සහා සම්මත විය.

வினா விடுக்கப்பெற்று ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

Question put, and agreed to.

මන්නි මණ්ඩලය ඊට අනුකූලව අ.හා.
8.12 ට, 1965 අතෝස්තු 26 වන දින සහ
සම්මතය අනුව, 1965 සැප්තැම්බර් 1 වන
බදාදා ප්‍ර.හා. 10 වන තෙක් කල් ගිණිය.

அதன்படி சபை மி.ப. 8.12 மணிக்கு, 1965 ஓகஸ்ட் 26 ஆம் திகதிய சபையினது தீர்மானத்திற்கிணங்க, 1965 செப்டம்பர் 1 ஆம் திகதி புதன்கிழமை மு.ப. 10 மணிவரை ஒத்திவைக்கப்பெற்றது.

Adjourned accordingly at 8.12 P.M. until 10 A.M. on Wednesday, 1st September 1965, pursuant to the Resolution of the House of 26th August 1965.

1965

1965

1965