



පාර්ලිමේන්තු විවාද

(හැන්සාඩ්)

නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ

නිල වාර්තාව

අත්තරීත ප්‍රධාන කරුණු

ප්‍රශ්නවලට වාචික පිළිතුරු [නි. 2433]

පිළිගත්වන ලද කෙටුම්පත් පණත [නි. 2466] :

කමකරු වන්දි (සංශෝධන) පණත් කෙටුම්පත

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පණත, 1965-66 [දහසයවන වෙන් කළ දිනය]
[නි. 2467] :

ශී 105-120 ; 125-129 ; 134 කාරක සභාව විසින් සලකා බලන ලදි

පරිපූරක මුදල [නි. 2731]

ආහාර පාලන නියෝග [නි. 2734]

කල් තැබීම [නි. 2736]

பாராளுமன்ற விவாதங்கள்

(ஹன்சாட்)

பிரதிநிதிகள் சபை

அதிகாரபூர்வமான அறிக்கை

பிரதான உள்ளடக்கம்

வினாக்களுக்கு வாய்மூல விடைகள் [ப. 2433]

வேலையாளர் நட்ட ஈடு (திருத்த) மசோதா [ப. 2466] :

முதல்முறை மதிப்பிடப்பெற்றது.

ஒதுக்கீட்டு மசோதா, 1965-66 [ஒதுக்கப்பட்ட பரிசீலனாவது நாள்] [ப. 2467] :

தலைப்புக்கள் 105-120 ; 125-129 ; 134—குழுவில் ஆராயப்பெற்றன.

குறை நிரப்புத் தொகை [ப. 2731]

உணவுக் கட்டுப்பாட்டுக் கட்டளை [ப. 2734]

ஒத்திவைப்புப் பிரேரணை [ப. 2736]

Volume 62

No. 9

Monday,

13th September 1965

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OFFICIAL REPORT

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 2433]

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION (AMENDMENT) BILL [Col. 2466] :

Read the First Time

APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965-66 [Sixteenth Allotted Day] [Col. 2467] :

Considered in Committee—Heads 105-120 ; 125-129 ; 134

SUPPLEMENTARY SUPPLY [Col. 2731]

FOOD CONTROL ORDERS [Col. 2734]

ADJOURNMENT MOTION [Col. 2736]

வாவிக பிலிதூர்

வாவிக பிலிதூர்

ஈர். ப்ரேமடாச மலா. (பலாந் பாலா
ஈமநிளே பாரிலிமேந்நு லேகலி—ஈவடேல
கலயநு ஈமநி வெநுவல)

(திரூ. ஆர். பிரேமடாச—உள்ளூராட்சி
அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி—
உள்ளாட்டு விவகார அமைச்சர் சார்பாக)

(Mr. R. Premadasa—Parliamentary
Secretary to the Minister of Local
Government—on behalf of the Minister
of Home Affairs)

(a) to (d). At the Grama-sevaka
examination held in 1961 all village
headmen under 45 years of age and
who were in service were permitted
to apply, irrespective of their educa-
tional qualifications.

**ரூர் னா நூனெகீர் பலாந்லல சிங்கல
ஓர்வரன்**

வடக்கு, கிழக்கு மாகாணங்களுக்குச் சிங்கள
ஆசிரியர்கள்

**SINHALA TEACHERS FOR NORTHERN AND
EASTERN PROVINCES**

5. சி. லி. கீ. தைநகேந் மலா.
(திரூ. பி. எம். கே. தென்னகூக்)
(Mr. P. M. K. Tennekoon)

ஈவாபந னா சிங் காரிக கலயநு ஈமநி
ளே ஈகூ ப்ரள்நல: (ஈ) ரூர் னா
நூனெகீர் பலாந்லல சிங்கல ஓர்வரன்லி
சடலா ஈகூ ஓர்வரன் தைர் னூ
விவாஸக் ப்லாந் லு லல ல்லும ஈந்ந
லட? (ஈ) விவாஸகேன் சமந் லு ஈபேக்
கககிந் சலிலுல பரீகூகூகல பாத்ந
கல லல ல்லும ஈந்நலட? (ஓ) பந்லி
டேந்நே கலடட?

கல்வி கலாச்சார விவகார அமைச்சரைக்
கேட்ட விவா: (அ) வடக்கு, கிழக்கு மாகா
ணங்களில் சிங்களம் கற்பிப்பதற்கு மாணவ
ஆசிரியர்களை நியமிக்குமுகமாய் அவர்களைத்
தெரிவு செய்வதற்கென பரீட்சையொன்று
நடத்தப்பட்டதென்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா?
(ஆ) சித்தியெய்திய பரீட்சார்த்திகளுக்கு
நேர்முகப் பரீட்சை நடாத்தப்பட்டது என்
பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (இ) நியமனங்கள்
எப்பொழுது கொடுக்கப்படும்?

asked the Minister of Education and
Cultural Affairs: (a) Is he aware
that an examination was held to

select pupil teachers to be appointed
to the Northern and Eastern Pro-
vinces to teach Sinhala? (b) Is he
aware that successful candidates were
interviewed? (c) When will the
appointments be given?

ஓர் ஈகி. லி. ஈர். லீ. லீலகலேல
(ஈவாபந னா சிங் காரிக கலயநு பிலிதூ
ஈமநி)

(கௌரவ ஐ. எம். ஆர். ஏ. ஈரியகலால்—
கல்வி, கலாச்சார விவகார அமைச்சர்)

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

(ஈ) ரூர் நூனெகீர் பலாந்லல ஈகூ
ஓர்வரன் தைர் னூகிமக் ஈநி லு
நூ. நலுந் ஈலந னாஓல ஈந்நா ரூ
ஓர்வரன் சடலா விவாஸக் ப்லாந்லல.
(ஈ) சலிலுல பரீகூகூகல நலல னலர் லி
நூ. (ஓ) லீ பரீகூகூகல ஈலசந் லு பலு
பந்லி ஈல ஈநி.

கலாநலகலுல
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

Question No. 11.

ஓர் லிலிலி ஈேநாநலக (ஈலாநாநல சல
ஈர்கூக னா லிஈல கலயநு பிலிதூ ஈமநி
சல க்ரூ சலிபாடக னா ஈர்லிக கலயநு பிலி
லட ஈமநி)

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க—பிரதம
அமைச்சரும் பாகாப்பு, வெளி விவகார
அமைச்சரும் திட்ட அமைப்பு, பொருளாதார
விவகார அமைச்சரும்)

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

I request that further time be
allowed in order that the data may
be collected.

ப்ரள்நல ம்ல ஈககடி ஓடிபலன் கிபிலல ஈலேல
கரந லடி.

விவாலை மற்ரூரு தினத்துக்குச் சமர்ப்பிக்க ஆலீண
யிடப்பட்டது.

Question ordered to stand down.

වෘත්තීය පිළිතුරු

වෘත්තීය පිළිතුරු

මහජනයාද ඔවුන්ගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු නියෝජිතයින් ද ඉල්ලුම්කර නිබන්ධන නමුත් 64.1.1 සිට 65.8.1 දක්වා වැලිපිටිය සේවා පහසුකම් නුදුරු උතුරු සහ නැගෙනහිර ප්‍රදේශවලට අයත් උප නැපැල් කායනීලිය ලැයිස්තුව:—

- යෝමරන් කඩවල
- සෝමපුර
- පදියතලාව
- පත් කුඩාවෙලි
- පෙරියපුල් ප්‍රමලෙයි
- මිරවොඩ්ඩෙයි
- මුතලෙයිකුඩා
- පුන් කුලම
- කන් නියා
- පුල් මොට්ටේ
- නිරියායි
- නිරු පලාකාමඹි
- බක් කිආල්ල

උතුරු පළාත

- අන් කෝපුර
- අන් නියඩ්
- ඉරුප් පිඩිඩි
- උරනිව්
- උලුක් කුලම
- කරවෙඩ්ඩි නැගෙනහිර
- කොක් කුපාබෙයියන්
- නකර්කෝයිල්
- නවාලි
- නුනුවිල් හන්දිය
- නෙල්ලන්දෙයි
- නොල් පුරම්
- සිල්ලොයි
- පත් නලම්
- පල්ලවරායන් කව්වුව
- පෙරියමාඩු
- පොලිකාන්ඩ්
- යාපනය යෝනක විදිය
- මඩුවිල් දකුණ
- මාමඩුව
- මුරුසමොඩ්ඩෙයි
- මුල්ලිවයිකල්
- වනිරි
- වඩ්ඩිකව්විය
- වලන් නාලෙයි
- වවුනිකුලම්
- වීරවිල්
- ඉයක් කව්වි
- පුනකරි නල්ලුර්
- පනිපුලම්

The names of "C" Grade sub-post offices noted for consideration of up-grading to "B" Grade

1. Navatkadu
2. Suruvil
3. Koddai Kallar
4. Muraicholai
5. Periyathambanai
6. Nagendramadam
7. Puthukudiyiruppu
8. Thirupalugamam
9. Periyapalam
10. Thikkodai
11. Maviddapuram
12. Tharmapuram

The names of "A" Grade sub-post offices noted for consideration of up-grading to post offices

1. Kilinochchi
2. Mankulam

Only 25 sub-post offices can be given telephone facilities a year, due to lack of funds and other facilities. Hence, it is necessary to draw up priority lists to allocate the limited resources.

List of sub-post offices in the Northern and Eastern Provinces which were not given telephone facilities in spite of requests from the people and their representatives during the period 1.1.64 to 1.8.65.

නැගෙනහිර පළාත

- කන් නලේ සිනි කම්හල
- කිලිවෙඩ්ඩිය
- කුරුමාන් වේලි
- කොඩ්ඩේයිකල් ෆාර්
- කොහොඹාන
- දෙහිවත් න

Northern Province

- Agbopura
- Attiadie
- Iruppiddi
- Urativu
- Ulukkulama

මාසික පිළිතුරු

මාසික පිළිතුරු

සභාමේසය මත තබන ලද පිළිතුරු මෙසේ යි :

சமர்ப்பிக்கப்பட்ட விடைகள் வருமாறு :

The Answer tabled is as follows :

(i) "සි" ශ්‍රේණියෙන් "බී" ශ්‍රේණියට උසස් කරන ලද උප තැපැල් කාර්යාල

උප තැපැල් කාර්යාලයේ නම		උසස් කළ දිනය	ඡන්ද කොට්ඨාශය
1. කරදෙටියාන 64. 3. 1	... ගලිගමුව
2. ඇලපාන 64. 3.16	... නිව්තිගල
3. බෝපිටිය-බටුවන 64.12. 1	... දැදිගම
4. දෙහිවත්ත 64. 4. 1	... මුතුර්
5. අක්කරායන්කුලම 65. 4. 5	... කිලිනොච්චි
6. පාලුකඩවල 64. 3. 2	... යාපහුව
7. කෝන්පොල 64. 5.16	... මාවතගම
8. තලල්ල 64. 2. 1	... දෙවිනුවර
9. ඉහළගෙවස්ස 64. 2. 1	... බෙන්තර-ඇල්පිටිය
10. යෝනකපුර 64. 9. 1	... දෙවිනුවර
11. නින්දන 64.10. 1	... අම්බලන්ගොඩ
12. දිගලලේනම 64.10. 1	... අකුරැස්ස
13. නරවැල්පිට 64.10. 1	... හක්මන
14. සේරන්කඩ 64. 2. 1	... බිබිලේ
15. හීල්මය 64. 3. 2	... බණ්ඩාරවෙල
16. බෝවෙල 64. 3.16	... උඹ-පරණගම
17. ආටිගල 64. 2.10	... හෝමාගම
18. කහනුඩුව 64.11. 1	... හෝමාගම
19. කොට්ටාව 65. 7.20	... කොට්ටාව
20. පරගොඩ 64. 2.17	... බුලන්සිංහල
21. තැඹිලිගල... 65. 8. 2	... නාවලපිටිය

(ii) "බී" ශ්‍රේණියෙන් "ඒ" ශ්‍රේණියට උසස් කරන ලද උප තැපැල් කාර්යාල

උප තැපැල් කාර්යාලයේ නම		උසස් කළ දිනය	ඡන්ද කොට්ඨාශය
1. කොළඹගම 64. 7. 1	... කොලොන්න
2. පිටිහුම හන්දිය 64.12. 1	... කැගල්ල
3. කුඩහකපොල 64. 9. 1	... ජාආල
4. නිවන්දම 64. 9. 1	... ජාආල
5. කිතලවලාන 64. 7.16	... මීරිගම
6. විදියවත්ත 64. 7.16	... ගම්පහ
7. පදවිසිරිපුර 64. 3. 1	... මැදවව්විය
8. සම්පලතිව 64. 8. 1	... ත්‍රිකුණාමලය
9. දියබෙදුම 65. 1. 1	... මින්නේරිය
10. මිල්ලවාන 65. 7. 1	... දඹුල්ල
11. වලන්තලෙයි 64. 8. 1	... වඩිඬුකොඩිබෙයි
12. වතරාවත්තෙයි 64. 9. 1	... කෝපායි
13. පල්ලම 64. 1. 1	... නිකවැරටිය
14. විරපොකුණ හන්දිය 64. 1.16	... බිංගිරිය
15. දුම්මලදෙනිය (බටහිර) 64. 7. 1	... වෙනන්ප්පුව
16. කෝන්වැව 64. 7. 1	... යාපහුව

වෘත්තීය පිළිතුරු
උප තැපැල් කාර්යාලයේ නම

වෘත්තීය පිළිතුරු
උසස් කළ දිනය ජන්ද කොට්ඨාශය

17.	ඉහළපුලියන්කුලම	64. 7.16	...	නිකවැරටිය
18.	පනාදරගම	64. 8. 1	...	වාරියපොල
19.	මොන්නකුලම	64. 9.16	...	නිකවැරටිය
20.	අවුලේගම	64. 9.16	...	නිකවැරටිය
21.	ආඩිගම	64.11. 2	...	නිකවැරටිය
22.	ගල්ගාමුල්ල	65. 1. 1	...	කුලියාපිටිය
23.	පුස්වැලිතැන්න	65. 7. 1	...	දෙඩම්ගස්ලන්ද
24.	අගලිය	64. 6.16	...	බද්දේගම
25.	චිතකොරටුව	64. 6.16	...	ගාල්ල
26.	ගොම්බද්දල	64. 7. 1	...	මාතර
27.	රත්වාගොඩ	64. 7. 1	...	කඹුරුපිටිය
28.	පොල්හේන	64. 7. 1	...	මාතර
29.	මොරගල කිරිලපොහේ	64. 7.16	...	දෙනියාය
30.	කන්දේගොඩ	64. 9. 1	...	බලපිටිය
31.	කහව	64.10. 1	...	රත්ගම
32.	අමුගොඩ	65. 3. 1	...	බෙන්තර-ඇල්පිටිය
33.	මාවිල්මඩ	64. 7. 1	...	සෙන්කඩගල
34.	වතුචල	64. 7. 1	...	අකුරණ
35.	ඇතිලිවැව	64. 5. 2	...	මොනරාගල
36.	බදුල්ල-කඩවිදිය	64. 6. 1	...	බදුල්ල
37.	බිබිලේගම	64. 7.15	...	පස්සර
38.	නිකපොත	64. 7.15	...	හපුතලේ
39.	බොරලන්ද	64. 7.15	...	වැලිමඩ
40.	කහටරුප්ප	64. 7.15	...	මහියංගනය
41.	කුඹුක්කන	64. 8. 1	...	මොනරාගල
42.	හිඟුරාන	64.11.15	...	අම්පාරේ
43.	වැකඩ	64. 4.15	...	පානදුර
44.	කුරුප්පුමුල්ල	64. 4.15	...	පානදුර
45.	පට්ටිය දකුණ	64. 4.15	...	පානදුර
46.	පිත්වත්ත	64.11. 2	...	පානදුර
47.	මොරගල්ල	64. 4. 1	...	බෙරුවල
48.	කාලවිල-කිරන්ඩිය	65. 4.15	...	බෙරුවල
49.	හල්කදවිල	65. 7. 1	...	බෙරුවල
50.	කලවතුගොඩ	64. 5. 2	...	කොට්ටාව
51.	කනන්විල	64. 4.15	...	හොරන
52.	කටුබැද්ද	64.11.16	...	මොරටුව
53.	පිටගොන්ඵලිය	64. 4.15	...	කලුතර

வலீக பிழீதூர்

வலீக பிழீதூர்

(i) “சி” தரத்திலிருந்து “பி” தரத்துக்கு தரம் உயர்த்தப்பட்ட உப தபாற் கந்தோர்கள்

(i)	உபதபாற் கந்தோர்களின் பெயர்	தரம் உயர்த்தப்பட்ட திகதி	தேர்தற்றொகுதி
1.	கரதெட்டியானை	1. 3.64	கலிகமுவை
2.	எல்ப்பாதை	16. 3.64	நிவித்திகலை
3.	போப்பிட்டியபந்துவானை	1.12.64	டெடிகம
4.	தெகிவத்தை	1. 4.64	மூதூர்
5.	அக்கராயன்குளம்	5. 4.65	கிளிநொச்சி
6.	பலுகுடாவனை	2. 3.64	யப்பகூவ
7.	கோணபோலை	16. 5.64	மாவத்தகம
8.	கல்லலை	1. 2.64	தெவிநுவரை
9.	இகலகெவசை	1. 2.64	பெந்தறை-எல்பிட்டிய
10.	யோகைபுரம்	1. .64	தெவிநுவரை
11.	நிந்தானை	1.10.64	அம்பலாங்கொடை
12.	தீகலைலெனாவை	1.10.64	அக்குறசை
13.	நாரவெல்பிட்டி	1.10.64	கக்மனை
14.	சேரன்கொடை	1. 2.64	பிபினை
15.	கீலோயா	2. 3.64	பண்டாரவனை
16.	போவெலை	16. 3.64	ஊவாபறனகம
17.	அத்திகலை	10. 2.64	கோமகம
18.	ககத்துடுவை	1.11.64	கோமகம
19.	கொட்டாவை	20. 7.65	கொட்டாவை
20.	பறகொடை	17. 2.64	புலத்திங்கள
21.	தம்பிலிகல	2. 8.65	நாவலப்பிட்டி

(ii) “பி” தரத்திலிருந்து “ஏ” தரத்துக்கு தரம் உயர்த்தப்பட்ட உப தபாற் கந்தோர்கள்

(ii)	உபதபாற் கந்தோர்களின் பெயர்	தரம் உயர்த்தப்பட்ட திகதி	தேர்தற்றொகுதி
1.	கொழும்புகம	1. 7.64	கொலன்னு
2.	பிட்டிசிலுமைச்சந்தி	1.12.64	கேகலை
3.	குடாக்கப்பொலை	1. 9.64	ஜானலை
4.	நிவந்தாவை	1. 9.64	ஜானலை
5.	சிற்றலாவலானை	16. 7.64	மீரிகம
6.	வீதியாவத்தை	16. 7.64	கம்பகா
7.	பதவிசிறீபுரம்	1. 3.64	மதவாச்சி
8.	சாம்பல்தீவு	1. 8.64	திருகோணமலை
9.	இடியபெதுமை	1. 1.65	மின்னேரியா
10.	மில்லவானை	1. 7.65	தம்புல்லை
11.	வலந்தலை	1. 8.64	வட்டுக்கோட்டை
12.	வதறுவத்தை	1. 9.64	கோப்பாய்
13.	பள்ளம்	1. 1.64	நிக்கவெறட்டி
14.	வீரபொக்குணைச்சந்தி	16. 1.64	சிங்கிரி
15.	தும்மலதெனியா (மேற்கு)	1. 7.64	வென்னப்புல
16.	கொஸ்வெவை	1. 7.64	யாப்புகுல

வலிக பிழிவூர்

வலிக பிழிவூர்

உபதபாற் கந்தீதூர்களின் பெயர்		தரம் உயர்த் தப்பட்ட திகதி	தீர்தற்றெருகுதி
17.	இகலபுளியங்குளம் ..	16. 7.64	நிக்கவெரட்டி.
18.	பறதற்கம ..	1. 8.64	வாரியப்பொலை
19.	மொன்னேகுலாம ..	16. 9.64	நிக்கவெரட்டி.
20.	அவுலேகம ..	16. 9.64	நிக்கவெரட்டி.
21.	ஆண்டிகம ..	2.11.64	நிக்கவெரட்டி.
22.	கல்கமுடலை ..	1. 1.65	குளியாப்பிட்டி.
23.	புஸ்வெலிதென்னை ..	1. 7.65	தொடங்கஸலந்தை
24.	அகலியை ..	16. 6.64	பத்தேகம
25.	சீனாததோட்டம் ..	16. 6.64	காலி
26.	கொம்பட்டளை ..	1. 7.64	மாத்தறை
27.	ஒருஞ்சுகொடை ..	1. 7.64	கம்புறுப்பிட்டி.
28.	பொலசேனை ..	1. 7.64	மாத்தறை
29.	மொறகல-கிரில்லப்பனை ..	16. 7.64	தெனியாயை
30.	கண்டெகொடை ..	1. 9.64	பலப்பிட்டி.
31.	ககாவை ..	1.10.64	இரத்தகம
32.	அழுகொடை ..	1. 3.65	பெந்தற-எல்பிட்டி.
33.	மாவில்மடை ..	1. 7.64	செங்கடகல
34.	வத்துவளை ..	1. 7.64	அக்குறனை
35.	எதிலிவெவை ..	2. 5.64	மொனறாகலை
36.	பதுளைக் கடைவீதி ..	1. 6.64	பதுளை
37.	பிபிலேகம ..	15. 7.64	பசறை
38.	நிக்கபொத்தை ..	15. 7.64	கப்புத்தளை
39.	பொறலந்தை ..	15. 7.64	வெலிமடை
40.	ககதறுப்பை ..	15. 7.64	மகியங்களை
41.	கும்புக்களை ..	1. 8.64	மொனறாகலை
42.	கிங்குறூனை ..	15.11.64	அம்பாறை
43.	வேகடை ..	15. 4.64	பாணந்துறை
44.	குறுப்புமுலலை ..	15. 4.64	பாணந்துறை
45.	பட்டிதெற்கு ..	15. 4.64	பாணந்துறை
46.	பின்வத்தை ..	2.11.64	பாணந்துறை
47.	மொறகல்லை ..	1. 4.64	வேருவலை
48.	கலவிலை-சீறன் திட்டி ..	15. 4.65	வேருவலை
49.	கல்கந்தவிலை ..	1. 7.65	வேருவலை
50.	தலவத்துகொடை ..	2. 5.64	கொட்டாவை
51.	கணன்விலை ..	15. 4.64	கொறனை
52.	கட்டுபெத்தை ..	16.11.64	மொறட்டுவை
53.	பிற்றுகோணெலி ..	15. 4.64	களுத்துறை

(i) *Sub-post offices up-graded from "C" grade to "B" grade :*

<i>Name of Sub-Post Office</i>	<i>Date of Up-grading</i>	<i>Electorate</i>
1. Karadetiyanana	1. 3.64	Galigamuwa
2. Elapatha	16. 3.64	Nivitigala
3. Bopitiya-Batuwana	1.12.64	Dedigama
4. Dehiwatta	1. 4.64	Mutur
5. Akkarayankulam	5. 4.65	Kilinochchi
6. Palukadawala	2. 3.64	Yapahuwa
7. Konpola	16. 5.64	Mawatagama
8. Talalla	1. 2.64	Devinuwara
9. Ihala-Hewassa	1. 2.64	Bentara-Elpitiya
10. Yonakapura	1. 9.64	Devinuwara
11. Nindana	1.10.64	Ambalangoda
12. Deegala-Lenama	1.10.64	Akuressa
13. Narawelpita	1.10.64	Hakmana
14. Serankoda	1. 2.64	Bibile
15. Heeloya	2. 3.64	Bandarawela
16. Bowela	16. 3.64	Uva Paranagama
17. Atigala	10. 2.64	Homagama
18. Kahatuduwa	1.11.64	Homagama
19. Kottawa	20. 7.65	Kottawa
20. Paragoda	17. 2.64	Bulathsinghala
21. Tambiligala	2. 8.65	Nawalapitiya

(ii) *Sub-post offices up-graded from "B" grade to "A" grade :*

<i>Name of Sub-Post Office</i>	<i>Date of Up-grading</i>	<i>Electorate</i>
1. Colombagama	1. 7.64	Kolonna
2. Pitihuma Junction	1.12.64	Kegalla
3. Kudahakapola	1. 9.64	Ja-ela
4. Niwandama	1. 9.64	Ja-ela
5. Kitalawalana	16. 7.64	Mirigama
6. Weediyawatta	16. 7.64	Gampaha
7. Padavisiripura	1. 3.64	Medawachchiya
8. Sampalativu	1. 8.64	Trincomalee
9. Diyabeduma	1. 1.65	Minneriya
10. Millawana	1. 7.65	Dambulla
11. Valanthalai	1. 8.64	Vaddukoddai
12. Vatharavaththai	1. 9.64	Kopay
13. Pallama	1. 1.64	Nikaweratiya
14. Weerapokuna Junction	16. 1.64	Bingiriya
15. Dummaladeniya (West)	1. 7.64	Wennappuwa
16. Konwewa	1. 7.64	Yapahuwa
17. Ihalapuliyakulama	16. 7.64	Nikaweratiya
18. Paradaragama	1. 8.64	Wariyapola
19. Moonekulama	16. 9.64	Nikaweratiya
20. Avulegama	16. 9.64	Nikaweratiya
21. Andigama	2.11.64	Nikaweratiya
22. Galgamulla	1. 1.65	Kuliyapitiya

වෘත්තීය පිළිතුරු

වෘත්තීය පිළිතුරු

Name of Sub-Post Office		Date of Up-grading	Electorate
23.	Puswelitenna ..	1. 7.65	.. Dodangaslanda
24.	Agaliya ..	16. 6.64	.. Baddegama
25.	China Gardens ..	16. 6.64	.. Galle
26.	Gombaddala ..	1. 7.64	.. Matara
27.	Ranchagoda ..	1. 7.64	.. Kamburupitiya
28.	Polhena ..	1. 7.64	.. Matara
29.	Moragala-Kirilapone ..	16. 7.64	.. Deniyaya
30.	Kandegoda ..	1. 9.64	.. Balapitiya
31.	Kahawa ..	1.10.64	.. Ratgama
32.	Amugoda ..	1. 3.65	.. Bentara-Elpitiya
33.	Maviimada ..	1. 7.64	.. Senkadagala
34.	Wathuwala ..	1. 7.64	.. Akurana
35.	Ethiliwewa ..	2. 5.64	.. Moneragala
36.	Badulla-Bazaar ..	1. 6.64	.. Badulla
37.	Bibilegama ..	15. 7.64	.. Passara
38.	Nikapotha ..	15. 7.64	.. Haputale
39.	Boralanda ..	15. 7.64	.. Welimada
40.	Kahataruppa ..	15. 7.64	.. Mahiyangana
41.	Kumbukkana ..	1. 8.64	.. Moneragala
42.	Hingurana ..	15.11.64	.. Ampara
43.	Wekada ..	15. 4.64	.. Panadure
44.	Kuruppumulla ..	15. 4.64	.. Panadure
45.	Pattiya South ..	15. 4.64	.. Panadure
46.	Pinwatta ..	2.11.64	.. Panadure
47.	Moragalla ..	1. 4.64	.. Beruwala
48.	Kalawila-Keeranthidiya ..	15. 4.65	.. Beruwala
49.	Halkandawila ..	1. 7.65	.. Beruwala
50.	Talawathugoda ..	2. 5.64	.. Kottawa
51.	Kananwila ..	15. 4.64	.. Horana
52.	Katubedda ..	16.11.64	.. Moratuwa
53.	Pitagoneliya ..	15. 4.64	.. Kalutara

යටියන්තොට සුළු නගර සභාව : බදු එකතු කරන්නෙකු පත් කිරීම

யட்டியாந்தோட்டைப் பட்டண சபை :
வரிசேகரிப்பாளர் நியமனம்

YATIYANTOTA TOWN COUNCIL: APPOINTMENT OF TAX COLLECTOR

1. එම්. පී. ද සෙ.සීසා සිරිවර්ධන මහා. (මිනුවන්ගොඩ—ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා—යටියන්තොට—වෙනුවට)

(திரு. எம். பீ. டி. சொய்சா சிறிவர்தன—மினுவாங்கொட—கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா—யட்டியாந்தோட்டை சார்பில்)

(Mr. M. P. de Zoysa Siriwardena—Minuwangoda—on behalf of Dr. N. M. Perera—Yatiyantota)

පළාත් පාලන ආමතයේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්ගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය: (අ) පත් කිරීම් පිළිබඳ ව්‍යවස්ථාවලට පටහැනිව,

ඉල්ලුම් පත්‍ර නොකැඳවා 1965 ජූලි මස 1 වැනි දින සිට යටියන්තොට සුළු නගර සභාවට බදු එකතු කරන්නෙකු පත් කරන ලද බව එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ආ) සුළු නගර සභාවේ එක් සහකරුවෙකු මෙම කාරණය සම්බන්ධයෙන් තමාගේ විරුද්ධත්වය රත්නපුරේ සහකාර පළාත් පාලන කොමසාරිස් වෙත ඉදිරිපත් කර ඇති බව එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ඉ) මෙම අයථා පත්වීම අවලංගු කිරීමට එතුමා කටයුතු කරන්නවාද?

உள்ளூராட்சி அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசியைக் கேட்ட வினா: (அ) வரிசேகரிப்பாளர் நியமனங்களுக்குரிய விதிகளுக்கு முரணானவகையில், விண்ணப்பங்கள் கோராது, யட்டியாந்தோட்டைப் பட்டண சபைக்கு 1965, ஜூலை 1 ஆம் தேதி வரிசேகரிப்பாளரொருவர் நியமிக்கப்பட்டாரென்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஆ) பட்டண சபையின் அங்கத்த

වෛක පිළිතුරු

වෛක පිළිතුරු

ආර්. ප්‍රේමදාස මයා.

(තිரு. ආර්. பிரமதாச)

(Mr. R. Premadasa)

(a) A lorry load of dry fish bought by a dried fish dealer from the Kurunegala C. W. E. Depot was intercepted on its way to Colombo as there was information that the manager of the C. W. E. Depot, Kurunegala, had made an irregular sale. (b) Yes. (c) The lorry was kept overnight and released after inquiry. (d) Messrs. Sathiyawadi Transporters Ltd., Dambulla Road, Kurunegala. (e) The store manager concerned has been interdicted and disciplinary action is being taken against him.

සොරනාතොට ගමිකාර්ය සභාව : ජල යෝජනා ක්‍රමය

சொரணதொட்ட கிராம சபை : நீர்த் திட்டம்

SORANATOTA VILLAGE COUNCIL WATER SCHEME

6. කේ. එම්. විජේරත්න බණ්ඩා මයා. (සොරනාතොට)

(තිரு. கே. வை. எம். விஜேரத்ன பண்டா—சொரணத்தொட்டை)

(Mr. K. Y. M. Wijeratne Banda—Sorاناتota)

පළාත් පාලන ආමතීගේ පරිලිමේන්තු ලෙක්මිගේ ආසු ප්‍රශ්නය : (අ) පසුගිය රජය විසින් සොරනාතොට ගමිකාර්ය සභාවේ කන්දේගෙදර ජල යෝජනා ක්‍රමය සඳහා කොපමණ මුදලක් වෙන් කර තිබේද? (ආ) මේ යෝජනා ක්‍රමය වෙනුවෙන් කොපමණ මුදලක් මෙතෙක් වැය කර තිබේද? (ඇ) මේ යෝජනා ක්‍රමයේ වැඩ අත්හිටුවා තිබෙන බව එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ඈ) මේ යෝජනා ක්‍රමයෙන් ගොවීන්ට සෙනක් සිදු නොවන බව එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ඊ) එසේ නම්, ගමි කාර්ය සභාව සකස් කරන ලද යෝජනා ක්‍රමය එතුමා ක්‍රියාත්මක කරනවාද? (උ) නොඑසේ නම්, එම යෝජනා ක්‍රමයේ වැඩ ආරම්භ කිරීම සඳහා මෙම ගමිකාර්ය සභාවට අවශ්‍ය මුදල් එතුමා ලබා දෙනවාද? (එ) එසේ නම්, ඒ කවදාද? නොඑසේ නම්, ඒ මන්ද?

உள்ளூராட்சி அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசியைக் கேட்ட வினா : (அ) சொறண தொட்டக் கிராமச்சபையின் கந்தேகெதறத் தண்ணீர்த்திட்டத்திற்கென முன்னாள் அரசாங்கத்தினால் ஒதுக்கப்பட்டுள்ள பணமெவ்வளவு? (ஆ) இத்திட்டத்தின்மீது இற்றைவரை செலவு செய்யப்பட்டுள்ள பணமெவ்வளவு? (இ) இத்திட்டத்தின்மீதான வேலை தற்காலிகமாக நிறுத்திவைக்கப்பட்டுள்ளதென்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஈ) இத்திட்டத்தின்கீழ் பயிர்ச் செய்கையாளர்கள் பயனடையவில்லையென்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (உ) அவ்வாறாயின், கிராமச்சபையினால் தயாரிக்கப்பட்ட திட்டத்தினை அவர் செயற்படுத்துவாரா? (ஊ) அன்றேல், அத்திட்டம் சம்பந்தமான வேலையை ஆரம்பிப்பதற்குத் தேவையான நிதியை இக் கிராமச்சபைக்கு அவர் வழங்குவாரா? (எ) அவ்வாறாயின், எப்பொழுது? அன்றேல், ஏன்?

asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Local Government : (a) How much money has been allocated by the former Government for the Kandegedara Water Scheme of the Soranatotota Village Committee? (b) How much has been spent so far on this scheme? (c) Is he aware that the work on this scheme has been suspended? (d) Is he aware that the cultivators are not benefited under this scheme? (e) If so, will he implement the scheme formulated by the village council? (f) If not, will he grant the necessary funds to this village council to start work on it? (g) If so when, and if not, why?

ආර්. ප්‍රේමදාස මයා.
(තිரு. ஆர். பிரமதாச)
(Mr. R. Premadasa)

(a) Rs. 59,823. (b) Rs. 36,197.28. (c) Yes. Because the contractor defaulted and the contract was cancelled. (d) No. (e) The scheme will be completed when the contract is given to some other contractor. (f) Does not arise. (g) Does not arise.

வாசிக பிழிதூர்

வாசிக பிழிதூர்

விசேரந்ந லநீர்வா மயா.

(திரு. விஜேரத்ந பண்டா)

(Mr. Wijeratne Banda)

மே ப்ல யேர்ச்சநா துமயே ப்லமூ கனாந் துந்நகர் டேபார்தமேந்நுவேந் டேந லட பஃபீப விநுணாநெந ஈநி லவ ஈரஃபி ஃ. ஸ் ஃமீநிந்நிசெந் டேபார்தமேந்நுவே யமீ துியா மார்டயக் ஈந திநெநவாட?

ஈர். ப்ரேமடாச மயா.

(திரு. ஆர். பிரேமதாச)

(Mr. R. Premadasa)

ஸ் கனாந்நுந்நுவ ஈபலேஃ கர் திநெ நவா.

விசேரந்ந லநீர்வா மயா.

(திரு. விஜேரத்ந பண்டா)

(Mr. Wijeratne Banda)

டேபார்தமேந்நுவேந் டேந லட பஃபீப விநுணா ஈநிம ஈந மூந பிசவரந்நட ஈந்நே?

ஈர். ப்ரேமடாச மயா.

(திரு. ஆர். பிரேமதாச)

(Mr. Premadasa)

ஸ் பிழிநடவ பரீந்நா கர்ஈநெ யநவா.

லநீர்வாநாயக ஈநுஃமரண ஃநாயந்நர ஃகலிஃ ஈலாவ ஈ ஃநிந ரஈநல

பண்டாரநாயக்க ஈரபகார்தத சர்வதேச மகாநாட்டு மண்டபமும் தேசிய அரங்கும்

BANDARANAIKE MEMORIAL INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE HALL, AND NATIONAL THEATRE

7. ட ஃகலிஃ ஃரிவர்டன மயா. (பி. லி. ஃலிஃஃஃ மயா.—கபுலமீபேல—வெநுவடு)

(திரு. டி சௌய்சா சிறிவர்தந—திரு. ஈர். பி. ஃபசிங்க—கட்டுகம்பௌ—சார்பாக)

(Mr. de Zoysa Siriwardena—on behalf of Mr. T. B. Subasinghe—Katugampola)

ரஃயே வவ, துபுல ஈ விடூலி ஃஃடேஃ ஈமநிஈநே ஈஃஃ ப்ரீநய: (ஈ) மஃபந வி ஃலுஈஈஃவெந் லுநெ ஈமிர வலிந் கௌலஃ லுலூஃ பாரே ஈலேஃ பிபிசே, லநீர்வாநாயக ஈநுஃமரண ஃநாயந்நர ஃகலிஃ ஈலாவ ஈ ஃநிந ரஈநல ஓடிநிஃமவ யேர்ச்சவாக் திஃ லவ ஸ்நும டந்நவாட? (ஈ) ரஈநல வெநுவடு ஈலேஃஃஃ ஓடிநிஃமவ ரஃய டந் ஈடஃஃ

கர் திநெந லவ ஸ்நும டந்நவாட? (ஓ) ஃயலூம தாஃகர்வந் ஈ பேலூ மஃபநயா மேம ரஈநல ஓடிநிஃம ஓநா ஈஈவெந் லுலுபேரேந்நுவி ஃபிச லவ ஸ்நும டந்ந வாட? (ஃ) மேம ரஈநல ஓடி துநிஃமவ ஈநு மூநவாட? (ஃ) ரஈநல ஃடிதே லுலே திர்ணய துியந்நக கர்ந லவடு ஸ்நும மேம ஃஈவடு ஃஈநிந வெநவாட?

அரசாங்க கட்டுவெலை, தபால் தந்திப் போக்கு வரத்து அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா: (அ) மக்கள் சினக்ருடியரசிடமிருந்து கிடைக்கப் பெற்ற உதவியைக்கொண்டு கொழும்பு, புல் லேர்ஸ் விதியிலுள்ள “கொல்வ்” விஈயாட்டு மைதானத்தில் பண்டாரநாயக்க ஈரபகார்தத சர்வதேச மகா நாட்டு மண்டபமும் தேசிய அரங்கும் அமைப்பதற்கான திட்டமொன்றி ருந்ததென்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஆ) அரங்கினை அமைப்பதற்குப் பதிலாக உணவு விடுதிச்சாலையொன்றை இவ்விடத்தில் அமைப் பதற்கு அரசாங்கம் தற்பொழுது தீர்மானித் துள்ளதென்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (இ) கலை ஈர்கள் அனைவரும், அத்துடன் பொதுமக் களுங்கூட இவ்வரங்கு அமைக்கப்படுவதை மிக ஆவலுடன் எதிர்பார்த்துக் கொண்டிருக் கின்றனரென்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஈ) இவ்வரங்கை அமைக்காதமைக்கான காரணங் கள் யாவை? (உ) அரங்கு அமைப்பதென ஏற் கனவே செய்யப்பெற்ற தீர்மானம் செயற்படுத் தப்படுமென அவர் இச்சபைக்கு உறுதியளிப் பாரா?

asked the Minister of Public Works, Posts and Telecommunications: (a) Is he aware that there was a proposal to construct the Bandaranaike Memorial International Conference Hall and the National Theatre at the Golf Links, Buller's Road, Colombo, with the aid received from the People's Republic of China? (b) Is he aware that the Government has now decided to construct a hotel at this place instead of the theatre? (c) Is he aware that all the artists and as well as the general public were eagerly waiting for the construction of this theatre? (d) What are the reasons for not constructing this theatre? (e) Will he assure this House that the original decision to construct the theatre would be implemented?

உலக பிழை

உலக பிழை

විජයපාල මෙන්ඩිස් මයා.

(திரு. விஜயபால மெண்டிஸ்)
(Mr. Wijayapala Mendis)

(අ) මහජන චිත ජන රජයේ ලත් ආධාරවලින් හැවිලෝක් ගෝල්ප් ක්‍රීඩා පිටියේ බණ්ඩාරනායක අනුස්මරණ ජාත්‍යන්තර සාකච්ඡා ශාලාවක් තැනීමට කර ඇති යෝජනාවක් ගැන විනා ජාතික රහලක් පිළිබඳ යෝජනාවක් ගැන තොදනිමි. (ආ) නැත. (ඉ) නැත. (ඊ) මෙම රහල ගෝල්ප් ක්‍රීඩා පිටියේ යෝජනා ක්‍රමයට ඇතුලත්වී නැත. (උ) පැන නොනගී.

විනුපටි කමිෂන් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂන් සභාවේ නිර්දේශ

திரைப்படக் கைத்தொழில் பற்றிய ஆணைக்குழுவின் சிபாரிசுகள்

RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMISSION ON FILM INDUSTRY

8. ද සොයිසා සිරිවර්ධන මයා. (ටී. බී. සුබසිංහ මයා, වෙනුවට)
(திரு. டி. சாய்சா சிறிவர்தன—திரு. டி. பி. சுபசிங்க சார்பாக)

(Mr. de Zoysa Siriwardena—on behalf of Mr. T. B. Subasinghe)

අධ්‍යාපන හා සංස්කෘතික කටයුතු ඇමති ගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය: (අ) 1965 වර්ෂයේ II වැනි සැසි වාර්තාවේ (ලංකා විනුපටි කමිෂන් පරීක්ෂණ කොමිෂන් සභාවේ වාර්තාව) නිර්දේශයන් ක්‍රියාත්මක කිරීමට රජය අදහස් කර තිබේද? (ආ) මෙම වාර්තාවේ නිර්දේශ කර ඇති පරිදි ජාතික විනුපටි සංස්කෘතික මණ්ඩලයක් පිහිටුවීමට එතුමා ඉක්මණින් කටයුතු කරනවාද? (ඉ) ඉතා වැදගත් හා ජාතික අතින් වැදගත්කමක් ඇති, කිසිදු අපහසු වක් නොමැතිව ක්‍රියාවේ යෙදවිය හැකි පහත සඳහන් නිර්දේශයන් හැකි ඉක්මණින් ක්‍රියාත්මක කිරීමට එතුමා ඉක්මණින් කටයුතු කරනවාද? (i) විනුපටි පරීක්ෂක මණ්ඩලය ප්‍රතිසංවිධානය කිරීම; (ii) විදේශීය විනුපටි කාර්මිකයින් සතු දැනට තිබෙන තාවකාලික වාස බලපත්‍ර ඉක්ම ගිය විට ඒවා අවලංගු කිරීම; (iii) ඉන්දියානු හා ඉංග්‍රීසි විනුපටි ආනයනය කිරීම අඩු කිරීම; (iv) සිංහල විනුපටි පෙන්වන කාලය දීර්ඝ කිරීම.

கல்வி, கலாச்சார விவகார அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா: (அ) 1965 ஆம் ஆண்டின் II ஆம் இலக்கப் பருவப்பத்திரத்திலுள்ள (இலங்கையில் திரைப்படக் கைத்தொழில் பற்றி விசாரணையிட்ட ஆணைக்குழுவினது அறிக்கை) சிபார்சுகளை செயற்படுவதற்கு அரசாங்கம் தீர்மானித்துள்ளதா? (ஆ) அவ்வறிக்கையில் சிபார்சுசெய்யப்பட்டுள்ளவாறு தேசிய திரைப்படக் கூட்டுத்தாபனமொன்றினை நிறுவுவதற்கு அவர் விரைவில் நடவடிக்கைகள் மேற்கொள்ளுவாரா? (இ) மிக முக்கியமானவையும், தேசிய நலனுக்குகந்தவையும், கஷ்டமெதுவுமின்றிச் செயற்படுத்தற்கூடியனவுமான கீழ்க்காணும் சிபார்சுகளை மிகளிரைவாகச் செயற்படுத்துவதற்கு அவர் விரைவில் நடவடிக்கைகள் மேற்கொள்வாரா? (i) திரைப்படத் தணிக்கைச் சபையினை மாற்றியமைத்தல்; (ii) தற்போதுள்ள அந்நிய திரைப்பட நுண்தொழிலாளர்களினது தற்காலிக வதிவு அனுமதிச்சீட்டுக்கள் காலாவதியானதும் அவர்களது தற்காலிக வதிவு அனுமதிச்சீட்டுக்களை இரத்துச் செய்தல்; (iii) இந்திய, ஆங்கிலப் படங்களின் இறக்குமதியினைக் குறைத்தல்; (iv) சிங்களப் படங்களினது திரைக்காட்சி நேரத்தினை அதிகரித்தல்.

asked the Minister of Education and Cultural Affairs: (a) Has the Government decided to implement the recommendations of the Sessional Paper II of 1965 (The Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Film Industry in Ceylon)? (b) Will he take early steps to establish a National Film Corporation as recommended in this report? (c) Will he take early steps to implement the following recommendations which are very important and of national interest and can be implemented without any difficulty as early as possible: (i) the reorganisation of the Film Censor Board; (ii) the cancellation of the temporary residence permits of the foreign film technicians on the expiry of their present temporary residence permits; (iii) the reduction of the import of Indian and English films; (iv) the extension of the screen-time of the Sinhala films?

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

Secretary would bring this to the notice of the Hon. Minister and see that this matter of providing judges with official bungalows is attended to immediately.

දු. භා. 10.15

I should like to say one or two words about the Supreme Court judges. The present system of extending their service even for one year should be done away with. Their period of service should be fixed so that they could retire after a limited time instead of having to rely on the benevolence of the Government for an extension of their period.

I think there is another principle which has been adopted by other countries, which should be incorporated in the Ceylon Constitution, namely that no judge should be available for any public office after his retirement for a period of three years. That is a very salutary provision which obtains in certain countries and which should find a place in Ceylon.

Another suggestion I should like to make is that the present system of appointment of judges to the Supreme Court requires revision. I know that the Hon. Prime Minister feels very strongly that there should be no political influence in the matter of the appointment of judges. In that respect the Singapore Government has a very salutary provision, namely that the appointment of judges to the Supreme Court should lie solely with the judges of the Supreme Court. The person has to make an application first and the judges of the Supreme Court thereafter will select the person who should be appointed.

I certainly do not wish to mention instances, because the judges can be identified if I were to mention them, but there have been cases where either because of a song of praise of the Prime Minister or because of some other act persons had been appointed to the Supreme Court

Bench or where, as a result of an invidious principle which has found a place in a certain Act, certain judges were appointed in particular cases by the Minister of Justice. Those things should be done away with.

Excepting for that, as I said earlier, all of us are very proud of our judiciary and we should see that nothing is done to detract from its dignity. Both sides of the House should agree that the independence of the judiciary should be safeguarded.

There was a certain criticism which was made of a previous Chief Justice. I am not here to defend him but I should only like to commend two characteristics of his life to all the other judges; one is, when he was a Crown Counsel, for 20 years he had not taken one day's leave, and the other is, he attended office every day at 8.45 a.m. and left at 5.30 p.m. Although some of the hon. Members may criticize some of the actions of that particular judge after he retired from office, everybody will agree that he certainly was a judge who gave a very patient hearing to whatever bad case came up before him. He listened patiently and never interrupted Counsel and said, "You have repeated your arguments several times; please sit down". He was very courteous. I should say one other thing of him: he wiped out a certain amount of corruption which was found in the Registry of the Supreme Court. Those days one knew what had to be done in order to get a case listed, but after he assumed duties all that was done away with. I would like to commend that part of his work to the hon. Members who criticized him.

A judge, after his retirement, can do whatever he likes. If he does not like the Marxist system, I do not think it is wrong for him to spend his entire fortune in order to wipe out Marxism, but I do not think that all that criticism that was levelled against that particular judge was really deserving.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[හැර එම්. ඩී. එම්. ජයවර්ධන]

The United National Party, when it came into power in 1952, appointed two commissions, the Civil Courts Commission and the Criminal Courts Commission, but the recommendations of neither could be put into effect because the United National Party went out of office in 1956. But I should like to commend to the hon. Parliamentary Secretary an important recommendation made by the Criminal Courts Commission, that is, to incorporate Section 115 of the Indian Criminal Procedure Code into our code. That is a section which empowers a magistrate to restore possession of a property to a person who has been forcibly ejected from it. Today, one knows that the magistrates' courts are congested with cases of people who come to regain possession of their property and who, after several days of hearing, are referred to the civil courts to file a proper civil case. In such cases the ends of justice are defeated by this long delay whereas Section 115 of the Indian Criminal Procedure Code gives power to the magistrates to restore possession of the property till the litigation is over. That is a salutary provision. The United National Party presented a Cabinet Paper and I think the draft legislation was ready, but as the party was defeated, it could not be introduced. I think it is high time that that provision was introduced.

Much has been said about the conciliation boards. I should like to make only two points about these conciliation boards. As far as civil disputes are concerned the conciliation board is a blessing, but there is unlimited civil jurisdiction. Any civil dispute, whatever the monetary value, even if it involves lakhs and lakhs of rupees, must go before the conciliation board. I should like a monetary value to be fixed for these disputes which are referred to the conciliation boards.

The other point is, all criminal matters should be removed from the jurisdiction of the conciliation board.

Because of this jurisdiction the very person who introduced the measure, the then Member for Jaela and Finance Minister, Mr. Stanley de Zoysa, became a victim; he had a tumbler thrown at him. He went before the conciliation board but he was not prepared to abide by the decision of the conciliation board; he wanted the matter referred to the court.

Now, in these conciliation boards, even petty offences which in ordinary times are treated lightly may become very serious offences during election time, involving criminal intimidation; they should therefore be referred to the courts.

Today rural courts have no work. With the creation of conciliation boards and courts of requests, the rural courts have no work. I think all these minor matters should be referred to the rural courts. There they can be dealt with much more expeditiously. There would be judicial findings in such cases. This is better than referring them to the conciliation boards and later the parties having to go before the magistrate's court.

Minor matters like definition of boundaries, disputes as regards foot-paths, should immediately be referred to the conciliation board and a decision taken which would help the parties, because otherwise they will have to produce survey plans and so on. This involves expense to the poor villager who may not be able to bear it.

In regard to motor traffic offences, the hon. Member for Dompe said that a person involved in such an offence should be allowed to go before a higher police officer and plead guilty, instead of going to courts. Although the suggestion is commendable, it involves a principle because the courts are there to judge typical cases and there may be cases of people with previous offences which have to be brought to the notice of the court, where the judge will take all the factors into

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

consideration and impose a penalty. If a person goes and pleads guilty then it takes one minute only for the fine to be imposed. I do not agree with the hon. Member for Dompe when he says that these matters should be considered by administrative officers. I say that the jurisdiction of the courts should not be taken away.

He also made the point that in the Supreme Court, where a person wants to put in a plea, a lot of time is wasted by the case being postponed. Our experience is that even where a person puts in a plea but the Crown Counsel feels that the case is a very bad one where the death penalty should be imposed, it invariably ends with the judge taking a reasonable view of the case. I think some provision should be made to enable the accused, at the stage at which the case is committed to the higher court, to make a plea. The Attorney-General should look into this matter.

In the past we had people in the Attorney-General's Department who went into these cases very carefully, and where they found that a plea was possible they recommended that it should be accepted. There have been cases where the Attorney-General's Department discharged people for lack of evidence. Such cases are few and far between now.

The Attorney-General does not exercise the discretion that is vested in him of allowing accused persons bail. In murder cases they wish to keep the accused on remand although it is quite apparent to anybody reading the brief that the case will never end in a conviction. I would, therefore, ask the Attorney-General to see that Crown Counsel do look into these cases and do not act as machines.

In the good old days one never knew who was handling a particular case in the Attorney-General's Department. Now every person knows who is handling a particular case and, unfortunately, political influence seems to have crept even into the Attorney-General's Department.

which should be entirely free from political bias. Therefore I would plead with the Attorney-General and Crown Counsel to be very careful in what they do.

My last point refers to the prerogative of mercy. The prerogative of mercy was exercised all these years, except the last few years, upon certain principles. In recent times, in a number of cases the accused, as soon as they got their pardon, had gone and flung the pardon before the magistrate, which was almost an insult to him. I can cite cases where *kasippu* dealers who had been fined Rs. 1,000 had got free pardons; and when questions were asked in this House the previous Government took cover under Privilege and said, "This is a prerogative which is exercised by His Excellency the Governor-General and we should, therefore, not disclose it." It is now open to us to re-open those cases and allow the public to know the circumstances of the pardon granted, but I should be slow to do that. I am, however, commending to the hon. Parliamentary Secretary that, whatever may be the wrongs in the past, at least we should see that the prerogative of mercy is exercised on certain recognized principles and that political leanings or any such considerations should not be a criterion for a person to get a pardon.

These are a few of the matters to which I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Parliamentary Secretary. There are many other matters on which I could speak, but I hope the few matters which I have raised would receive his earnest consideration. All of us here, on either side of the House, I think, are agreed that everything should be done to protect the dignity of the judges and see that there is quick disposal of these cases. And quick disposal does not mean, as some people sometimes think, that even before an accused is heard he should be convicted. There should be a full trial, and the accused should leave the court with the feeling that he had had a full and fair

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[ගරු එම්. ඩී. එච්. ජයවර්ධන]

trial. As a lawyer who has practised for many years in the courts, I hope that every accused person will be given a full and fair trial.

I commend to the hon. Parliamentary Secretary that justice should not only be done but must also appear to be done. Everything should be done in the courts to make the accused feel that he has had a full and fair trial. The judges should be made to realize that we are all out to protect their dignity and give them every assistance in the discharge of the onerous duties that have fallen on them.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාநிති என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I am wondering whether we are living in a topsy-turvy world.

සහාපතිතුමා

(அக்கிராசனர்)

(The Chairman)

Why?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

The Hon. Minister of Health got up and, however mildly, criticized the Minister of Justice. That is the implication of his speech.

ගරු එම්. ඩී. එච්. ජයවර්ධන

(கௌரவ எம். டி. எச். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena)

I was speaking of the previous Minister, of how the prerogative of mercy had been exercised during his time.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Is that the only thing that the Hon. Minister did?

සහාපතිතුමා

(அக்கிராசனர்)

(The Chairman)

Order, please! Is the hon. Member raising a point of Order?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

No. I am making a criticism.

සහාපතිතුමා

(அக்கிராசனர்)

(The Chairman)

I am sorry.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Why are you sorry, Sir? Cannot I make a criticism?

සහාපතිතුමා

(அக்கிராசனர்)

(The Chairman)

You can, but the time is limited.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I agree. The Hon. Minister has now created a new precedent. Normally, I would not have interfered, but you are now supposed to be having a Cabinet with Cabinet responsibility. Here is a Minister who gets up and says that he is only criticizing us. That is not all. He is also making a suggestion to the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice. That suggestion can only be made in the Cabinet and not in this House. So far as we are concerned, we welcome it. But what I want to know is whether this is not a precedent that you are creating. All that I am saying is that you are now creating a new principle where a Member of the Cabinet gets up and really criticizes the Minister of Justice. You are saying that you are criticizing the conciliation procedure in the past.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

Why did you not raise it in the Cabinet and say, "The conciliation procedure is not working satisfactorily. These are the limitations of it. Let us amend it."? But that is the Hon. Minister's duty in the Cabinet and not in the House. You have to make your proposals to the Cabinet and say, "I am not satisfied with the position taken up by the Minister of Justice. I want a change." You cannot play fast and loose. You want to appear to the people outside that you have got ideas and you have expressed them in the House—

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. එච්. ජයවර්ධන

(කෙළරව எம். டி. எச். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena)

I do not.

සභාපතිතුමා

(அக்கிராசனர்)

(The Chairman)

I think it is a matter for the Cabinet.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

It is also a matter for us, so far as we understand it. The Cabinet has collective responsibility; it has stated in this House that there is collective responsibility. If a Minister gets up and criticizes another in this House, there is no collective responsibility. You cannot get away from that position. So far as I am concerned, on behalf of the Opposition, I want that position clarified and also placed on record. That is the important thing from my point of view. We want it to go on record here—what has been done by the Hon. Minister of Justice. In point of fact, however mildly or indirectly he puts it, he has really criticized his own Minister of Justice for the shortcomings of the Ministry of Justice.

පූ. භා. 10.30

Apparently, the Hon. Minister of Health did not understand the implications of his own statement. It is true that he was defending the *ex* Chief Justice. I wish I could say the same thing of the retired Chief Justice, for I witnessed a case he was conducting, and having observed how he behaved, I went to the then Prime Minister, Mr. Bandaranaike, and told him that he must be immediately removed from his post. [Interruption]—That is neither here nor there. I am not worried about it; I am not concerned with it. But this is the first time in recent years we have seen a Minister getting up in this House, and, in point of fact, criticizing the Minister of Justice for the failure of the conciliation boards. If that is proper, then even the Prime Minister can get up in this House and say, "These are the changes I would like." But my point is this: these are the functions of the Cabinet; these are things that the Cabinet has to do.

I also heard the Hon. Minister of Health saying how the magistrates should be treated; he wanted their salaries increased. These are matters that you have to deal with in the Cabinet, and not here. Of course, the back-benchers could do it on the Floor of this House, but you cannot do it.

Anyway, I am very glad that there is so much misunderstanding within the Cabinet.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. එච්. ජයවර්ධන

(கெளரவ எம். டி. எச். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena)

You are hoping.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I do not need to hope.

One point more, Sir. This question of corruption in the Fiscal's Department is proverbial. All that

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා]

I want you to do is to look at least into the position at Ratnapura at the moment. Some estimable gentleman is there whose sole job is to make money at the expense of the poor litigants; he is in charge of the fiscal's department there. That is all I want to say about corruption. I would not have intervened in this discussion if the Hon. Minister of Health had not spoken in that strain.

සභාපතිතුමා

(அக்கிராசனர்)

(The Chairman)

The hon. Member for Beruwala will speak next. Before the hon. Member starts, I wish to bring to the notice of hon. Members that, according to the time schedule, we have to finish the Votes of this Ministry by 11 A.M. today. I hope hon. Members will co-operate with me to finish the Votes of the Ministry by 11 A.M.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

The hon. Parliamentary Secretary will have to reply.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස්. බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

We can extend the time limit on this and reduce the time limit on the Ministry of Local Government.

සභාපතිතුමා

(அக்கிராசனர்)

(The Chairman)

That is a matter entirely for you to decide.

එම්. අබ්දුල් බකීර් මාකර් මයා. (බේරු වල)

(திரு. எம். அப்துல் பாக்கீர் மாக்கார்—
வேருவலை)

(Mr. M. Abdul Bakeer Markar—
Beruwala)

I have certain suggestions to make with regard to the reforms necessary and other matters connected with the Ministry of Justice to which I hope the Minister of Justice will pay heed.

In view of the time limit placed, I would not be long. The first point I would like to make is in relation to the question of the Crown's liability in tort. Although this matter has been set out in the Throne Speech, so far no attention has been paid to this matter. I think it is time that we did something in order to see that the Crown is held liable in tort. We find that in the nationalized ventures and other Government departments, due to the negligence of the officers concerned, damage is being caused to private life and property. In view of these circumstances, I feel that immediate action should be taken to see that a Crown Liabilities Act is introduced to remedy the existing position.

Much has been said about the work in magistrates' courts. In this connection, I would commend certain suggestions to the hon. Parliamentary Secretary for his consideration. Sir, in relation to the granting of bail, there is an over-emphasis laid in the matter of security by some of the judicial officers, and this places difficulties in the way of the general public. For instance, in cases of trivial offences, the accused are not prepared to plead guilty. In such circumstances, the judicial officers, making use of the discretion vested in them in the matter of calling for security, have called for heavy security; and when the accused are not in a position to furnish such heavy security, they are even remanded. That is a matter which I commend to the hon. Parliamentary Secretary. I hope he will see that immediate action is taken.

Much was said about the Supreme Court. We know the great deal of time and money spent by members of the public whenever they want to appeal against a judgement. Most of these appeals that come before the Supreme Court—on points of law and so on—are rejected; very few are the instances

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

where the appeal is upheld. But there is no criterion by which the appellant could know the reason or reasons for the rejection of his appeal. This is a matter which the Ministry of Justice must pay heed to, because, although thousands of rupees are paid to advocates, yet the appellant is not told the reason for the rejection of his appeal. I would draw the attention of the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the fact that even the Privy Council recently had occasion to remark that if the Supreme Court of Ceylon had given the reasons, they could have made certain comments. Under those circumstances, I am asking the Hon. Minister to take steps to see that when appeals are decided by the Supreme Court, reasons are given as to why an appeal is upheld or rejected. That, I think, is a thing that the general public, particularly the appellant, should know.

I now come to the Partition Act and the Mortgage Act. I think—as a practitioner, you will agree with me, Sir—that the Partition Act has not got everything that is desirable. Certain difficulties are placed in the way of clients and even the lawyers. Similarly with the Mortgage Act. I think we must immediately see that the provisions of these Acts are examined and reviewed and certain reforms are introduced.

The hon. Member for Dompe brought up a number of matters in this House with regard to the language issue. The hon. Member repeats off and on, at every Debate, the same thing about this issue; he is making every Debate an occasion to hurl insult on the Federal Party members. We know that in the Debate on the Throne Speech he mentioned the same facts. We heard him, we listened to him, on that occasion and we know what he said about the Federal Party and the language policy. Again, in the Budget Debate he attacked the Federal Party on the language issue. And once again during the Committee stage he repeated the performance. I wish to tell the hon. Member that the United National Party, in its manifesto, placed its language policy

before the country. They accepted that policy and placed the U. N. P. in power; it rejected the previous Government and brought them down. Therefore, why ask us now what our language policy is? Our policy has been accepted by the country; therefore, there is no occasion now for that question to be raised. If we do err or make a mistake, our judges are not the hon. Member for Dompe or the Members of the Opposition: our judges are the electors who returned us to power. When the time comes, it is for the country to reject us or punish us. The U.N.P. was in power for nine years; it was sent out of power once. In the same way, once again, if we do err, the remedy is in the hands of the people.

The Federal Party has got their own reasons for supporting us. We know what the hon. Member for Dompe did in the past—the part he played in July 1960 in bringing about unity between the S.L.F.P. and the F.P. I might say on this occasion that in July 1960 almost hundred per cent. of the Tamil votes were cast against the U.N.P and the Tamils gave their entire support to the S.L.F.P. For what reasons? We know the assurances that were given, the promises that were made, the agreements that were signed. From 1960 they ruled the country, and they just threw to the winds the promises they had given to the F.P.; they tore the paper on which the agreement was signed. In this very House the hon. Member for Dompe denied there was an agreement, in spite of the Members of the Federal Party repeatedly saying, “What about your agreement with us?” Do you expect the Federal Party and the Tamil community to have trust in them again? Why do you blame them now? But I would say this. If the people reject our language policy, we are prepared to accept their verdict at the next elections when they will have an opportunity to hurl brickbats, if any, against us.

Certain lawyer Members made some remarks regarding the former Chief Justice, Mr. H. H. Basnayake. May I point out that if there was

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[අබ්දුල් බකීර් මාකර් මය.]

one Chief Justice who brought prestige to this country the credit must go to Mr. Basnayake, for it was who stood firm to uphold the independence of the judiciary when attempts were made by the S.L.F.P. to produce a subservient judiciary. Thanks to him, our Supreme Court is now held in high esteem the world over.

One more fact before I sit down: the former Chief Justice has been a very good Buddhist. He rejected and disliked the Marxists. So, when this Marxist monster was raising its head during the last elections, Mr. Basnayake, as a good and true Buddhist, came out against them. He was not impelled by political or monetary reasons or by greed for power. He cautioned the country that once again the Marxist monster was raising its head and therefore we should join hands to fight this monster and save democracy. Naturally the hon. Member for Yatiyantota and other Members of the Opposition will now have much to say against him. But thanks to Mr. Basnayake, democracy was saved.

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

I raised it in 1956, not now.

අබ්දුල් බකීර් මාකර් මය.
(ஐயாபு அப்துல் பாக்கீர் மாக்கார்)
(Mr. Abdul Bakeer Markar)

Democracy has been saved and once again there is justice and fair play in the country.

පී. එච්. ඩබ්ලිව්. ද සිල්වා මය.
(දෙවිනුවර)

(திரு. பி. எச். டபிள்யூ. டி சில்வா—தெளி
நுவர)

(Mr. P. H. W. de Silva—Devinuwara)
ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, ඉතා කෙටියෙන්, සාම මණ්ඩල සම්බන්ධයෙන් වචන සාධාරණයක් කළා කරන්නට මම අදහස් කරන්නෙ. සාම මණ්ඩල පනත නැසීගිය එම්. ඩබ්ලිව්. එච්. ද සිල්වා අධිකරණ

ඇමතිතුමායි ඒ කාලයේදී ඉදිරිපත් කළේ, ඉතා වැදගත් සේවයක් ඉටු කිරීමේ බලාපොරොත්තුවෙන්. අපේ ගම්වල ඇති වන සුළු කලකෝලාහල, ආරාචුල්, ඒ වාගේම ඉඩම් සම්බන්ධයෙන් ඇති වන මතභේද ආදිය දුරු කර ගමේ සාමය ආරක්ෂා කිරීමේ, විශේෂයෙන්ම ගම්වැසියන් සුළු සුළු මතභේදයන් නිසා උසාවිවලට ගොස් අධික වියදම් දැරීම සහ නිරපරාදේ කාලය ගත කිරීම වැළැක්වීමේ පිරිසිදු වැදගත් වේතනාවෙන් යුක්තවයි සාම මණ්ඩල පනත එද ඉදිරිපත් කළේ. එම සාම මණ්ඩල ක්‍රියාත්මක වන පළාත්වල, සමහර සාම මණ්ඩල මගින් වර්ධනය වීමේ අන්දමින් ගම්බද ප්‍රදේශවල සිදුවන ආරාචුල් හත් අවසියයක් නැත්නම් දහක් පමණ නිරවුල් කරන බව සියලුදෙනාම, අධිකරණ අමාත්‍යාංශය පවා, දන්නා කරුණක්.

ප්‍ර. භා. 10.45

මෙම සාම මණ්ඩලවලට දෙ ආකාරයකින්, ඒ කියන්නේ අපරාධ සහ සිවිල් නඩු සම්බන්ධව සාමය ඇති කිරීමට, ආරාචුල් නිරවුල් කිරීමට බලය දී තිබෙන බව ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමන් ශ්‍රී දන්නවා ඇති. සමහර අවස්ථාවල පාලනයන් නඩු—බෙදුම් නඩු—දමාගෙන තමන්ගේ දේපල බෙදා ගැනීමට, එක පවුලේ සහෝදර සහෝදරියන් කාලය ගත කරන බව, මුදල් නාස්ති කර ගන්නා බව, තමුන් නාත්සෙ දන්නව ඇති. අන්ත එවැනි අවස්ථාවලදී, තමන්ගේ පවුලේ ඉඩ කඩම් සහෝදර සහෝදරියන් අතර සාමයෙන් බෙදා වෙන්කරගෙන, ඉන් පසුව දිස්ත්‍රික් උසාවියකට ගිහිත්, උසාවියෙන් “ඩික්රී” බලයෙන් ඒ බෙදා වෙන් කිරීම තහවුරු කරගැනීමට—මෙම සාම මණ්ඩලවලට රුපියල් ලක්ෂයක් වුණත් වටිනා ඉඩකඩම් බෙදා වෙන්කර දීමේ අයිතිවාසිකමක් තිබෙනව—ප්‍රථමත් බව තමුන් නාත්සෙ දන්නව ඇති. එම නිසා මේ හැම කරුණකින්ම පැහැදිලි වෙනව, අද මේ රටේ සාම මණ්ඩල ඉතා වැදගත් ස්ථානයක් උසුලන බව.

ඉඩම් ප්‍රශ්නය පමණක් නොවෙයි, ගම්වල, පොල් අත්තට, දෙල් ගෙඩියට, කොස් ගෙඩියට කලකෝලාහල කර ගන්න

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

එක මේ රටේ සත්‍යයක්. අන්ත එවැනි ආරාධනා, එවැනි කලකෝලාහල, සුළු දේවල් වුණත් නිරවුල් කර සාමය ආරක්‍ෂා කිරීමටයි මේ සාම මණ්ඩල පනත එදා ඉදිරිපත් කළේ. අද මේ පනත ක්‍රියාත්මක වන පළාත් කීපයකම මේ කර්තව්‍ය ඉතා වැදගත් සේ ඉටු වනවා පමණක් නොවෙයි, මහජනතාව මේ සාම මණ්ඩල කරා ඉතා ආසාවෙන් තමන්ගේ සුළු හේද පසිඳා ගැනීමට, විසඳා ගැනීමට යන බව තමුන් තාත්සෙ දන්නවා ඇති. එම නිසා මේ සාම මණ්ඩල කටයුතු ගැන කල්පනා කර බලන විට අපට කියන්න බැහැ, මේවාට දී ඇති බලතල වැඩිය කියා. ඒ මන්ද? සාම මණ්ඩලයක දෙන තීරණයක් පිළිගන්න හෝ නොගන්න දවස් 31ක කාලයක් තිබෙනවා; දවස් 31කට ඉස්සෙල්ලා තීරණයක් ගැනීමට දෙපක්‍ෂයටම බලය තිබෙනවා. ඒ තීරණය පිළි නොගන්නවා නම් පමණයි ඊට පස්සේ උසාවි යන්නේ. එම නිසා මෙයින් කාටවත් අවහිරයක් වෙන්නේ නැහැ. තමන්ගේ ගමේ ඇතිවන සුළු සුළු ආරාධනා, තමන් අතරේදීම නිරවුල් කර දීමේ අවස්ථාව, මෙම පනතින් සාම මණ්ඩලවලට ලබා දී තිබෙනවා. එයින් ගම්වාසීන්ට සැලසෙන්නේ ඉමහත් ප්‍රයෝජනයක්. එම නිසාම, සාම මණ්ඩල මේ රටේ තිබෙන ගම්බද මහජන උසාවි වශයෙන් අපට හඳුන්වන්න පුළුවනි. සාම මණ්ඩලවලට පත් වෙන්නේ ගමේ සියලු දෙනාම දන්න, ගමේ පවුල් අතර ඇතිවන හේද ගැන දන්න, ගමේ අයම නිසාත්, ඒ ප්‍රේද්ශයේම අය නිසාත්, මෙම ආරාධනා ගමේදීම නිරවුල් කර ගැනීමට හැකි විම නිසාත් ගම්බද මහජනතාව මෙම සාම මණ්ඩල, ගම්බද මහජන උසාවි වශයෙන් සලකන්න පුරුදු වී සිටිනවා.

ඒ වාගේම මෙම සාම මණ්ඩලවල සභාපතිවරුන්ට තිබෙන බලතල ඉතා වැදගත්. විශේෂයෙන්ම සාම මණ්ඩලයක සභාපතිවරයකු අධිකරණ බලතල පැවිච්චි කරනවාය කියන්නටත් පුළුවනි. එම නිසා මෙහිදී විවේචනයට ලක් කිරීමට වුවමනා කරන එක් කරුණක් තිබෙනවා. සාම මණ්ඩලවලට විශේෂයෙන් සභාපතිවරුන් පත් කරන්නේ අධිකරණ ඇමතිතුමායි;

සම්පූර්ණ බලය ඇත්තේ අධිකරණ ඇමති තුමාටයි. නමුත් මැනකදී කර ඇති ඇතැම් පත්වීම් ගැන නම් මට සන්තෝෂයට පත් වෙන්න බැහැ. මෙසේ සාම මණ්ඩලවලට සභාපතිවරුන් තෝරීමේදී දේශපාලන බලපෑම් ඇති වී තිබෙන බව ඉතා කනගාටුවෙන් මතක් කරන්න ඕනැ. මෙවැනි වැදගත් මණ්ඩලවලට, ගමේ පක්‍ෂපාතව වැඩ කරන, කිසිම දේශපාලන පක්‍ෂයකට සම්බන්ධව වැඩ කරන අය පත් කරන්න හොඳ නැහැ. විශේෂයෙන්ම මැතිවරණවලදී පිරිසිදුව ක්‍රියා නොකළ, ආණ්ඩු පක්‍ෂයට හෝ විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයට හෝ ප්‍රමුඛ ස්ථානයක් දරා වැඩ කළ අය මෙම සාම මණ්ඩලවලට සභාපතිවරුන් වශයෙන් හෝ නියෝජිතයන් වශයෙන් හෝ පත් කිරීමෙන් නියම අන්දමට සාධාරණව ක්‍රියා කරනවාය කියා, සාම මණ්ඩලවල සභාපතිවරුන් කෙරෙහිවත්, සාම මණ්ඩල කෙරෙහිවත් ගමේ සියලු දෙනා තුළ විශ්වාසය රඳා පවතින්නේ නැති බව තමුන්තාත්සේට වැටහී යනවා ඇති.

මට ලැබී ඇති විනාඩි පහ දැන් අවසානයයි. මේ සම්බන්ධයෙන් මම නැවතත් කියා සිටින්නේ මෙයයි. සාම මණ්ඩල මගින් ගම්බද ජනතාව තුළ සාමය ආරක්‍ෂා කිරීම සඳහා ගම්බද සාමය ආරක්‍ෂා කිරීම සඳහා විශාල සේවයක් ඉටු කරන්න පුළුවන්. නමුත් මෙම මණ්ඩලවලට දී ඇති බලතල නියම අන්දමින් ක්‍රියාවේ යොදවන්න නම් සාම මණ්ඩලවලට පුද්ගලයන් පත් කිරීමේදී දේශපාලන බලපෑම්වලින් හෝ දේශපාලනඥයන්ගේ බලපෑම්වලින් තොරව අපක්‍ෂපාත පුද්ගලයන් පත් කරන හැටියට නැවත වරක් ඉල්ලමින් මගේ චචන සවලපය අවසන් කරනවා.

එස්. තොන්ඩමන් මයා. (පත් කරන ලද මන්ත්‍රී)
 (ති.රු. எஸ். தொண்டமான்—நியமன அங்கத்தவர்)
 (Mr. S. Thondaman—Appointed Member)

Mr. Chairman, I rise to request the Ministry of Justice to review the existing laws in the context of the progress made in the fields of labour and industrialization.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[තොන්ඩමන් මය.]

The advances made in these respects are today nullified by employers having recourse to certain existing laws which have not been brought up to date, that is, in line with the progress made in the field of labour laws.

For instance, in the case of a termination of employment by an employer of an employee, no longer is the decision of the employer on his right to terminate employment final and conclusive. The worker has always got the right to go before a labour tribunal or industrial court or to ask that the matter be referred to arbitration and so challenge the decision of the employer, and if he is successful he can get himself reinstated. But what happens in estates where the workers live in line rooms on the plantations? Workers on the plantations live in quarters provided by the employer. What happens is that while a dispute between employer and employee is still pending before a labour tribunal, the employer goes to court and charges the employee with criminal trespass under the provisions of the Penal Code. While the case is still pending before a labour tribunal, the employer charges the employee with criminal trespass and tries to eject him out of his living quarters and the estate. What happens is that the whole purpose and object of referring the dispute to a labour tribunal is lost.

The employer has dismissed the employee and while the employee is canvassing that decision before a tribunal, while that matter is still pending, the employer goes to the criminal court and files an action against the employee for trespass in order to get him ejected; and the labour tribunal might order that the employee be reinstated. In this way the whole object of the labour laws and the referring of disputes to tribunals is lost.

The Ministry of Justice should either by administrative order or, if necessary, by amendments to the law, see that such actions do not take place

The strike is now recognized both by the employer and the Government as a legitimate means of collective bargaining. But what happens now is that when a strike is on employers adopt means by which to break the strike. For that purpose they successfully invoke the police and the courts. For instance when a strike is on in an estate, the employer introduces blacklegs, armed watchmen and thugs in order to break the strike.

There was a voluntary agreement called the "I. G. P. Agreement" under which if a certain number of workers are on strike, two-thirds, then the employer will not run the estate but close it down till the matter is settled. That has a wonderful effect on both sides to the dispute, and peace, law and order are maintained while the strike is on.

Now what happens? Employers have unilaterally revoked that "I. G. P. Agreement," and when a strike is on they introduce outsiders and take advantage of rival unions and attempt to break the strike. Then the recognition of the strike as a legitimate means of the working class to secure redress is lost.

Some employers go even further and get armed thugs to stone the living quarters of the labourers. I do not say that in these matters the labourers are always right. They are also human. Under provocation, they react strongly. Then what happens is that the police come and round up the union leaders or the most active members and take them to court.

In court the judge mercilessly orders bail in a sum of Rs. 2,000 for each of the persons produced. Is it possible for an ordinary worker to furnish bail in that amount? By ordering such high bail, the magistrate in effect changes aailable offence into a non-bailable offence, but if it is a non-bailable offence the legislature would have said so. But what happens? Judges in courts, especially in the plantation areas,

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

give no consideration at all to the fact that the offence being a bailable one, the amount of bail that is decided upon must be within the reach of the accused before the man can be enlarged on bail. Actually, what happens is that the bail fixed is in the range of Rs. 2,000, so that in effect the bailable offence is made non-bailable. This is a very serious matter which leads not only to the main leaders being locked up in the remand jail but, what is more serious, to the strike being broken and the employer achieving his purpose. In practice today, the Government's recognition of the legal right of the workers to redress their grievances by resort to strike is lost.

Therefore, I would strongly urge the Minister of Justice to amend the law or to see to it that the terms of the agreement entered into with the I. G. P. which embodies a principle agreed to by the employees to close down the estate for the duration of the dispute, are enforced. This is not something new I am urging. I know that in Madura when Mr. V. V. Giri was the Minister of Labour in 1936, when the Britishers were in power, an employer—a British mill owner—wanted to open his factory and run it. But Mr. Giri said, "No, close it down. I fear a breach of the peace. I issue order under Section 144. Close down the mill until there is peace."

It is not by taking workers to court and locking them up in the remand jail that industrial peace can be assured. The employers must be told, "If you are unable to run your factories and estates without the goodwill of your workers, close them down until such time as peace prevails". I would urge the Government to adopt some such policy on those lines and to give it its serious consideration.

The next thing I wish to refer to is this: it will not be disputed that workers on estates live collectively. They even go for their muster and report for work in hundreds and two-hundreds. A gang of workers normally consists of ten or fifteen

workers. What happens now if there is an altercation or a small dispute among them in their gangs? Naturally, there have to be disputes when an unreasonable order is given or an unreasonable task is imposed on them. In such instances, it is natural for the workers to react, and quite rightly too.

What happens in such circumstances is that the police are brought in. The first charge the police make against the workers is a charge of unlawful assembly. These workers do not collect for the purpose of doing any criminal act. Their work and their life is such that at any one time there will be more than five people in a group. It is quite another matter if a charge of unlawful assembly is brought against a group which collects specially to do a criminal act. But where there is an altercation or a dispute in the circumstances I have set out, the Government must take steps to see that a charge of unlawful assembly is not brought for the reason that the workers have collected together in the normal course of their work and not to break the peace.

The Government must change its policy. Otherwise, it will become necessary for the unions to instruct the workers not to report for work in batches of more than four. That will be an impossible situation for the employers because an entire industry can be paralysed in that way. Therefore, in those circumstances, where the unions are out to co-operate where charges of unlawful assembly have been brought against workers who have collected together for no other purpose than work, the unions will be compelled to give instructions to their members not to report for work in batches of more than four; that they should report for work always in batches of four and less.

The third matter I wish to refer to is in regard to rural courts. The rural court is another institution to which workers, especially in plantation areas, are taken and convicted. Such a conviction is cause enough for

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[ගොන්ඩමන් මහ.]

the employer to dismiss the worker. In the rural courts there are no official interpreters, with the result that a plantation worker speaking Tamil lacks the necessary facilities of being able to present his case. Either the president of the court does not know Tamil or no interpretation at all is done. The only interpreter is the police constable who is used as a stooge by the employer and taken to court. How can a prosecuting police constable interpret the proceedings in court to the accused? It is a very unfair practice. Every facility must be provided to enable the accused to put forward his defence.

Then there are cases where the accused wishes to have the assistance of counsel as he is unable to defend himself. Now, when a plea is made that a particular case be transferred to the magistrate's court, as a rule that plea is not granted. That right, even, is denied to the accused. Why should there be a refusal of the right of a person to be judged in a proper court where he can make his defence effectively?

Therefore, I would earnestly state that while I am not opposed to a person being charged before a rural court, if any accused wants his case sent to a higher court, there should be no obstruction placed in his way. As far as the accused—the worker—is concerned, the matter is very serious. On the strength of a conviction in the rural court he can be dismissed; not only the person concerned, the entire family is put on the road. I would, therefore, place this matter before the hon. Parliamentary Secretary so that he would give it his earnest consideration.

සිරිමාවෝ ආර්. ඩී. බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.
(අත්තනලේල)

(තිලකති සිඵ්‍රිමාවෝ ආර්. ඩී. බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.
පසුපස—අත්තනලේල)

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

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, අධිකරණ අමාත්‍යාංශය යටතේ ඇති වැය ශීර්ෂ සාකච්ඡාවට භාජන වී තිබෙන මේ අවස්ථාවේ මගේ

අදහස් ද කෙටියෙන් ප්‍රකාශ කිරීමට මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙතමි. තවත් මන්ත්‍රී වරුන් කීපදෙනෙක්ම කථා කිරීමට සිටින නිසා මට ලැබෙන කාලය ඉතාම සුළු බව මා දන්නමි. ඒ නිසා මගේ අදහස් කෙටියෙන් ප්‍රකාශ කිරීමට මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙතමි.

මා විශේෂයෙන්ම කියන්න බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ මේ රජයේ රාජ්‍ය භාෂා ප්‍රතිපත්තිය ගැනයි. මේ රටේ රාජ්‍ය භාෂා තත්ත්වයන් දෙමළ භාෂාවට ලැබෙන්න යන සාධාරණ තත්ත්වයන් ගැන රටේ නොසංසුන්තාවයක් ඇති වී තිබෙන බව කවුරුත් දන්නමි. එයට මූලික හේතුව නම්, මේ රජයේ මැති ඇමතිවරුන් නොයෙක් නොයෙක් අවස්ථාවල කර තිබෙන ප්‍රකාශයි. ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්‍ෂය මේ භාෂා ප්‍රශ්නය පිළිබඳව ගෙන ගිය වැඩ පිළිවෙළත් ඉදිරියට ගෙනයාමට බලාපොරොත්තු වන වැඩ පිළිවෙළත් සඳහන් කරමින්, ඒ අනුව සුදුසු අන්දමින් මේ රජය කටයුතු කරනවා නම් එසේ කිරීමට අපේ පක්‍ෂය සහයෝගය දෙන බව මා සඳහන් කරන්න කැමතියි. භාෂා ප්‍රතිපත්තිය ගැන මේ රජයේ මැති ඇමතිවරුන් කළ ප්‍රකාශ හැන්සාඩ් වාර්තාවලින් ප්‍රචන්පත් වලින් උපුටා දක්වීමට මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙතමි. ඊට ප්‍රථමයෙන් පසුගිය මැතිවරණ සමයේ සිංහල ජනතාවටත් දෙමළ ජනතාවටත් මේ භාෂා ප්‍රතිපත්තිය පිළිබඳව දී තිබුණු පොරොන්දු මේ ගරු සභාවට මතක් කරන්න කැමතියි.

ප්‍ර. භා. 11

අපි දෙගොල්ලන්ගේම ප්‍රකාශනවල ඒ තරම් වෙනසක් ඇත්තේ නැහැ. ඒ කාලයේ එක්සත් ජාතික පක්‍ෂය මේ භාෂා ප්‍රශ්නය සම්බන්ධව දුන් පොරොන්දු සාධාරණ අන්දමින් ක්‍රියාවේ යොදනවා නම්, එයට සහයෝගය දෙන්නට අප සූදනම් බව මේ අවස්ථාවේදී කියන්න ඕනැ. මැතිවරණ කාලයේදී නිකුත් කළ අපේ ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්‍ෂයේ ප්‍රකාශනයන් එක්සත් ජාතික පක්‍ෂයේ ප්‍රකාශනයන් යන දෙකම

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

මේ ගරු සභාවේ දැනගැනීමට මේ අවස්ථා වේදී කියවන්නට ඕනෑ. භාෂා ප්‍රශ්නය ගැන ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්‍ෂයේ මැතිවරණ ප්‍රකාශනයේ නිබුණු පොරොන්දු මේවායි :

“ සිංහල භාෂාව රාජ්‍ය භාෂාව වන පරිදි නීතිගත කරන ලද පණත සම්පූර්ණ ලෙස ක්‍රියාත්මක කිරීමට අවශ්‍ය සියලුම පියවර ගැනීම සහ ද්‍රවිඩ භාෂාවේ සාධාරණ භාවිතය සඳහා නීතිගත කොට ඇති පණත සිංහල දෙමළ දෙවර්ගයාටම පිළිගත හැකි පරිදි ක්‍රියාත්මක කොට රටේ බහුතර වර්ගයේ සහ සුළු වර්ගවල ජනතාව අතර සමගිය සහ හරි අවබෝධය ඇතිවීමට කටයුතු කිරීම.”

භාෂා ප්‍රශ්නය සම්බන්ධව එක්සත් ජාතික පක්‍ෂයේ මැතිවරණ ප්‍රකාශනයේ සඳහන් වන්නේ මෙහෙමයි :

“ සිංහල රජයේ භාෂාව වශයෙන් යොදවා එම රුමුච තුළ මුළු මහත් ජාතියම එක්සත් කිරීමේ වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් ක්‍රියාත්මක කිරීමට අපි වටමේස සාකච්ඡා වක් කැඳවමු. රටේ ස්ඵිර පදිංචිකරුවන්ගෙන් බහුතර සංඛ්‍යාවකගේ භාෂාව වී ඇත්තේ සිංහලය හෙයින්, එය සියලු ජාතින් එක්සත් කිරීමේ භාෂාව විය යුතු ය. ස්ඵිර පදිංචිකරුවන් අතරින් රාජ්‍ය භාෂාව තො දත්තා අයට භාතියක් නොවන පරිදි දෙමළ පාවිච්චි කිරීමටද ඉඩකඩ සලසා දෙනු ලැබේ.”

මේ මැතිවරණ පොරොන්දු දෙක එකට සසඳා බලන විට සිංහල භාෂාව රාජ්‍ය භාෂාව වශයෙන් යොදවා ඒ රුමුච තුළ මුළු මහත් ජනතාවගේ එක්සත් වීම පිණිස වට මේස සාකච්ඡාවක් කැඳවනවා යයි එක්සත් ජාතික පක්‍ෂය දුන් පොරොන්දුව අප පක්‍ෂයන් අනුමත කරනවා. සිංහල භාෂාව සියලුම ජාතින්ගේ එක්සත් වීමේ භාෂාව විය යුතුම යයි එක්සත් ජාතික පක්‍ෂය සිංහල ජනතාවට දුන් පොරොන්දුවත් අපි පිළිගන්නවා. එමෙන්ම රාජ්‍ය භාෂාව තො දත්තා දෙමළ ජනතාවට දෙමළ භාෂාව පාවිච්චි කිරීමට ඉඩකඩ සලසා දෙන බවට එක්සත් ජාතික පක්‍ෂය මගින් දුන් පොරොන්දුවත් සාධාරණ බව අපි පිළිගන්නවා. එමෙන්ම මුළු මහත් ජනතාව එක්සත් කිරීම පිණිස වටමේස සාකච්ඡාවක් කැඳවන බවට එක්සත් ජාතික පක්‍ෂය දුන් පොරොන් දුව අනුව අප පක්‍ෂයන් එයට සහභාගී වී එය සාර්ථක කිරීමට සහයෝගය දෙන බවට අපි පොරොන්දු වෙනවා. සිංහල භාෂාව රාජ්‍ය භාෂාව වශයෙන් යොදා එම රුමුච තුළ මුළු මහත් ජාතිය එක්සත් කිරීම සඳහා කටයුතු කරන බවට එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂය විසින් දී ඇති පොරොන් දුව ඉටු කිරීම පිණිස යොදන වැඩ පිළිවෙලට අපේ පක්ෂය සහයෝගය දෙන බවට අපි පොරොන්දු වෙනවා.

ප්‍රේමදාස මයා.

(ශ්‍රී ල. ප්‍රිමොදාස)

(Mr. Premadasa)

එහෙනම් හේදයක් නැහැ.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාත්‍රිති ආච. ආච. ධර්මරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

නමුත් නාන්සේලා ඒක අත් හැරල.

ප්‍රේමදාස මයා.

(ශ්‍රී ල. ප්‍රිමොදාස)

(Mr. Premadasa)

කොහේද? පෙන්වන්න.

සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.

(ශ්‍රී ලංකා ශ්‍රී ජිත්‍රිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)

පෙන්වන්නම්. අය වැය ලේඛනය දෙවන වර කියවීමේ විවාදයේදී රාජ්‍ය ඇමති තුමා රාජ්‍ය භාෂාව පිළිබඳව දීර්ඝ විස්තරයක් කලා. ඒ ප්‍රකාශනයේ කොටසක් අපට පිළිගන්න පුළුවනි. අනික් කොටස අපි පිළි නොගන්නවා පමණක් නොව, ඒ කොටස මෙම රාජ්‍ය භාෂා පණත අහෝසි කිරීමට ගෙන යන ක්‍රියාමාර්ගයක් බවයි අපේ අදහස. ඒ නිසා ඒ සම්බන්ධ යෙන් රටට කරුණු කියා දීමට අපට සිද්ධ වී තිබෙනවා. අපි විශ්වාස කරනවා ඊට මේ රජය බාධා නොකරයි කියා. ඒ කරුණු මහ ජනයා වෙත පැහැදිලි කර දෙන්නට යන අවස්ථාවේදී, ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදයේ ආරක්ෂක යො හැටියට පෙන්නුම් කිරීමට උත්සාහ කරන මෙම රජය අපේ ඒ වැඩ පිළිවෙලට බාධා නොකරනවා ඇත කියා අපි විශ්වාස කරනවා. හැබැයි එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂය කිව්වා වාගේ අපි රටට කියන්නේ නැහැ, මරපියව්, කපපියව්, කොටපියව් කියා. ප්‍රජා තන්ත්‍රවාදීව, සාමකාමීව, සාධාරණ විධියට ඒ කාරණා මහජනයාට පැහැදිලි කර දීමට අපි උත්සාහ කරන්නේ. එසේ නැතිව විප්ලවයක් කරන්නවත්, කුමන්ත්‍රණයක් ඇති කර ආණ්ඩුව පෙරලන්නවත් අපි අදහස් කරන්නේ නැහැ. මේ ආණ්ඩුව ඒ ගැන කිසිම බයක් වෙන්න ඕනෑ නැහැ. අපේ රටේ තිබෙන ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදී නිදහස අනුව අපි එය මහජනයාට තේරුම් කර දීමට බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

එක් කොටසක් පා සටහනකින් වැසී ඇති අන්දමට කළුපාට කරලයි තියෙන්නෙ. අන්තිම පිටුවෙන් සිතියමක් ඇදලා තියෙනව. සිතියමට යටින් වාසගමක් ලියා තිබෙනව. එයින් කියවෙන්නෙ මේ ගිවිසුම හෙතුකොට ගෙන—ඉන්දියානුන් නිසා— යෝජිත ද්විඛ රාජ්‍යයට එකතු කිරීමට බලාපොරොත්තු වන කොටස තිත්වලින් දැක්වෙයි කියයි. මෙන්න ඒ සිතියම මා ලඟ තිබෙනව. මේ විදියට ජාතිවාදය අවුස්සන්න උත්සාහ කළ ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මහත්මයාලා අද අප ජාතිවාදීන් හැටියට හංවඩු ගහන්න උත්සාහ කිරීම ගැන අප පුදුම වෙනව. අපි නම් මෙහෙම පොත් ගහන්නෙත් නැහැ; සිතියම් අදින්නෙත් නැහැ. අපි නම් මෙවැනි දේ කරන්න බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නෙ නැහැ.

1960 ජූලි මාසයේ පැවැත්වුණු මැතිවරණය හා සම්බන්ධ කාලයේදීත් අපට විරුද්ධව කටයුතු කරගෙන ගියා. ලොකු සිතියම් ඇදලා ඇතැම් කොටස් රතු පාටින් පාට කර ලංකාවේ නොයෙක් නොයෙක් නගරවල තාප්පවල ඇලෙව්වා; ගම්බද පළාත්වල ගස්වල ඇලෙව්වා. එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ ආධාරකාරකරීන්ගේ ගෙවල බිත්තිවලත් ඇලෙව්වා. ඔය විධියට ලොකු ව්‍යාපාරයක් ගෙන ගියේ මේ රට දෙකට කඩන්න ඒපඩරල් පක්ෂයේ නායකතුමන් සමග අප උත්සාහ කරනවය කියා රටට ඒත්තු ගන්වන්නයි. අපට ජාතිභේදය අවුස්සන්න එපායයි දැන් බණ කියන්න එන්නෙ එදා ඔය විධියට ජාතිභේදය අවුස්සන්න උත්සාහ කළ රාජ්‍ය කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ගරු ඇමතිතුමා සහ එතුමට සහයෝගය දෙන ප්‍රචාරිත්‍රී පත්‍ර බව මේ අවස්ථාවේ කියන්න ඕනෑ. මේ ගැන දෙමිපේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාර නායක මයා.) විසිනුත්, මා විසිනුත්, අගෝස්තු මාසයේ 26 වැනිදා මේ ගරු සභාවේදී අයවැය විවාදයට සහභාගි වෙමින් කළ අපේ කථාවලින් විස්තර කර තිබෙනව. රාජ්‍ය කටයුතු භාර ගරු ඇමතිතුමා එදා අගෝස්තු 18 වැනිදා මේ ගරු සභාවේ කළ කථාවකදී මා අම්බලන්ගොඩදී කළ කථාවක් ගැන සඳහන් කර තිබෙනව.

පරිදි එතුමාගේ කථාවෙන් කොටසක් මෙසේයි :

“The paper called the ‘Jana Dina’ of 13th August says ‘Mrs. Bandaranaike addressing a meeting at Ambalangoda said that the statement of Mr. Thiruchelvam that the language of administration in the Northern and Eastern Provinces would be Tamil has not been either confirmed or contradicted by the Hon. Prime Minister. This shows that what the Hon. Minister stated is the truth.’”—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 18th August 1965; Vol. 61, c. 37.]

මම මේ කථාව කළාය කියා මට දෙස් කියා තිබෙනව. එතුමා කියා තිබෙනව “පමණක්” යන වචනයේ තේරුම මා දන්නෙ නැත කියා. මා කතාගාටු වෙනව එම වාර්තාවේ මා කී වචන දමා නොතිබීම ගැන. මා කීවෙ, උතුරෙන් නැගෙනහිරින් ද්විඛ භාෂාවෙන් පමණක් රජයේ කටයුතු කරන්න දෙන බව තිරුවෙල්වම් ඇමතිතුමා සඳහන් කර තිබෙන බවයි. එය එම පත්‍රයේ සඳහන් කර නැහැ. මෙම රජයේ මැති ඇමතිවරු, විශේෂයෙන් ඒපඩරල් පක්ෂයේ අය, නොයෙකුත් අවස්ථාවලදී කර තිබෙන ප්‍රකාශන කීපයක් ඉදිරිපත් කරන්න මා මෙම අවස්ථාවේදී බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනව. එය ඉතා වැදගත් දෙයක්. මේවා නිසා තමයි, අද රටේ නොසන්සුන් තත්ත්වයක් ඇති වී තිබෙන්නෙ.

පූ. හා. 11.15

අගෝස්තු මස 3 වැනි දින “ටයිම්ස්” පත්‍රයේ පළ වූ වාර්තාවක් අනුව උතුරු ප්‍රදේශයේ උග්‍රතිව්‍රී ප්‍රජා මණ්ඩලයේ පැවැත්වූ රැස්වීමකදී තිරුවෙල්වම් ඇමතිතුමා කියා සිටියේ, ඔහුට සහතික වශයෙන්ම දෙමළ ජනතාවට කියන්නට පුළුවන්ය කියයි, තව අවුරුදු දෙකක් ඇතුළත උතුරේ සහ නැගෙනහිර පාලන භාෂාව දෙමළ භාෂාව පමණක් වන බව. ඒ රැස්වීමේදී කයිට්ස් පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී වී. නවරත්නම් මහතා කියා සිටියේ, සමහර දේශපාලනඥයෝ ඒපඩරල් පක්ෂය සිංහල භාෂාව උතුරේ සහ නැගෙනහිර රාජ්‍ය භාෂාව හැටියට පිලිගත් බව හැඟවීමට උත්සාහයක් දරනවාය; ඔවුන් එසේ පැවසුවාට තමාට කිය හැක්කේ නිත්‍ය වශයෙන්ම උතුරේ සහ නැගෙනහිර එකම පාලන භාෂාව වන්නේ දෙමළ

1965 අගෝස්තු 18 වන දින නිකුත් වූ හැන්සාඩ් වාර්තාවෙහි සඳහන් වන

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.]

භාෂාව පමණක් ය, යනුවෙනි. මෙවැනි වාර්තාවක් එදිනම “ඩේලි මිරර්” පත්‍රයේද පළ විය.

අගෝස්තු මස 10 වෙනි දින තිරුවෙල් වම් ඇමතිතුමා යාපනයේ උත්සව රැස්වීමකදී කළ කථාවක් “ඩේලි මිරර්” පත්‍රයේ පළ විය. ඒ අවස්ථාවේදී ඔහු කියා සිටියේ ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක ඇමතිතුමා භාෂා ප්‍රශ්නය විසඳා දීමට විශේෂ උත්සාහයක් දක්වන බවත් ඒවාගේම ළමයින් දෙමළ භාෂාව උතුරේ සහ නැගෙනහිර ප්‍රදේශවල පාලන භාෂාව වන බව ඔහුට පවසන්නට පුළුවන් බවත්ය.

නයිනාතිවිවි ගම් සභාව මගින් පැවැත්වූ උත්සවයකදී දෙමළ ජනතාවගේ ඉල්ලීම් පරිදි “පොසිත්ටි පේදුරුවේ සිට කසිට්ස් දක්වා දෙමළ භාෂාව පාලන භාෂාව විය යුතුයි” කියා තිරුවෙල් වම් ඇමතිතුමා පවසා ඇති බව අගෝස්තු මස 12 වෙනි දින “ඩේලි මිරර්” පත්‍රයේ පළ වී තිබිණ.

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, ඊටත් වඩා වැදගත් ප්‍රකාශයක් ගැන මා මේ අවස්ථාවේදී මතක් කරන්නට සතුටුයි. එනම් ජේපබරල් පක්ෂයේ නායක වෙල්වනායගම් මහත්මයා මාවිට්ටපුරමිනි රැස්වීමකදී කළ කථාවකුයි. එය 1965 ජූනි මස 9 වන දින “සිලෝන් ඔබ්සර්වර්” පත්‍රයේ පළ වී තිබුණා. මේ ප්‍රකාශය සම්බන්ධයෙන් දොම්පේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාත් (ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.) අගෝස්තු මස 26 වන දින එතුමා මේ ගරු සභාවේදී කළ කථාවේදී සඳහන් කළාය කියා මට මතකයි. ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, ජේපබරල් පක්ෂයේ නායකතුමා ප්‍රකාශ කර තිබෙන්නේ මෙහෙමයි. එය ඉංග්‍රීසියෙන් තිබෙන නිසා ඉංග්‍රීසියෙන්ම කියවන්නට මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා:

“‘Ceylon Observer’ 9th June, 1965.

The party in power has agreed to make Tamil the language of administration in the Northern and Eastern Provinces. They will in addition grant the rights of the Tamil-speaking persons in the rest of Ceylon to transact their business with the government in Tamil. We have agreed to accept this as a settlement for the time being without abandoning our aim for parity as a lasting solution. It would be folly on our part to reject such a solution.”

මේ වෙල්වනායගම් මන්ත්‍රීතුමා එදා ඒ යාපනේ රැස්වීමේදී කළ ප්‍රකාශයක්. දැන් මේ කර තිබෙන කථා සහ ප්‍රකාශ අනුව මා අම්බලන්ගොඩදී කළ ඒ ප්‍රකාශය වැරදිද කියා රාජ්‍ය කටයුතු ඇමතිතුමාගෙන් ප්‍රශ්න කරන්නට සතුටුයි. පත්‍රවල පළවී තිබෙන මේ ප්‍රකාශ එකක්වත් වැරදිය කියා අගමැතිතුමාගෙන් වෙන කෙනෙකු වත් මෙතෙක් කියා නැහැ. ඒ නිසා මේවා සත්‍ය ප්‍රකාශ හැටියටයි අප භාර ගන්නේ. මේ රජයට පත්‍ර සෑම අවස්ථාවකදීම සහ යෝග්‍ය දෙන නිසයි වඩාත්ම ඒවා සත්‍ය ප්‍රකාශ හැටියට අප සලකන්නේ.

ඊළඟට රාජ්‍ය කටයුතු ඇමතිතුමා පිළිබඳ වත් මේ අවස්ථාවේදී යමක් කිව යුතුව තිබෙනවා. එතුමා මේ ගරු සභාවේදී කළ කථාවක් කියවන්නට දැන් මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. 1960 අප්‍රේල් මාසයේ 20 වන දින කර තිබෙන ඒ කථාව එදින හැන්සාඩ් වාර්තාවේ 314 වන තීරුවේ තිබෙනවා:

“We do not know how an S.L.F.P. Government can be supported by the Federal Party which, when they discussed with us, said, ‘We can only join and support a Government which concedes to us certain points.’ However small they may be from the F. P.’s point of view, those are points that we cannot concede. One is the establishment of regional councils with the right of autonomy that makes them almost independent. Mind you, the stopping of colonization of the Northern and Eastern Provinces by Sinhalese settlers, the making of Tamil a language of administration of the Northern and Eastern Provinces with complete parity in other provinces, the amendment of the Citizenship Acts so that all Indians in spite of their origin can become Ceylon citizens, and an amendment to the Constitution to enable 4 Appointed Members to be nominated by the Ceylon Democratic Congress pending the passing of all this legislation. Whether you are imposing the same conditions on the S.L.F.P., whether the S.L.F.P. has in secret accepted these conditions, we do not know, but these are the conditions you laid before us which our Prime Minister was unable to accept. Therefore I think hon. Members will see that the defeat of this Government and the formation of a new one in the way the House is now composed seems to be most difficult to accomplish without any particular party giving up its cherished

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

principles and becoming purely an appendage of one of the other parties.” —[OFFICIAL REPORT, 20th April 1960; Vol. 38, cc. 314-5.]

ඊළඟට රාජ්‍ය කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමතිතුමා ජූලි මාසයේ 28 වනදා කලුතර දී කළ කථාවක් “දිනමිණ” පත්‍රයේ පළ වී තිබෙනවා. එහි මෙසේ සඳහන් වී තිබෙනවා.

“රාජ්‍ය භාෂා පනත බණ්ඩාරනායක මහතාගේ කැලයේ ඉදිරිපත් කරන ලදුව නීතිගත කර ඇතැයි ද එය අබමල් රේඛාවක ප්‍රමාණයක් වත් වෙනස් නොකොට ක්‍රියාවේ යෙදවීම ජාතික රජයේ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය යයි ද අද එය ඉන්දියානුත්, ඒපබරල් පක්ෂිකයින් හා වෙනත් ජාතිකයින්ගේද සම්පූර්ණ සහයෝගය ලබාගෙන බණ්ඩාරනායක මහතාට පවා කිරීමට නොහැකිවූ පුළුල් පදනමක් මත දෙවුන්දර සිට පේදුරුකුඩුව දක්වාද, කොළඹ සිට මඩකලපුව දක්වා ද ක්‍රියාවේ යෙදවීමට යන්හෝ යයිද ඒ මහතා කීය.”

එතුමා එයින් අදහස් කළේ ලංකාවේ සිටින ද්‍රවිඩයින් සිංහල භාෂාව මුළු දිවයින පුරාම රාජ්‍ය භාෂාව වශයෙන් පිළිගෙන ඇත යන්නය. 1965 අගෝස්තු මස 22 වැනිදා රත්මලානේ පැවැත්වූ රැස්වීමකදී රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා මෙසේ පවසා ඇත :

“සිංහල භාෂා පනත අබමල් රේඛාවක තරම්වත් ජාතික ආණ්ඩුව වෙතස් කිරීමට බලාපොරොත්තු වක් නැත. සිංහලයන් සිටින පළාත්වල පමණක් නොව දෙමළ අය සිටින පළාත්වලද සිංහල පනතට කීසිදු හානියක් වීමට ඉඩ තබන්නේ නැත.

ඒ ප්‍රකාශයෙන් අපට තේරුම් ගන්නට තිබෙන්නේ ඒපබරල් පක්ෂයන් ද්‍රවිඩ සංගමයන් මේ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය පිළිගෙන තිබෙන බවයි. එසේ පිළිගෙන තිබෙනවාද යන බව අප දැනගන්නට කැමතියි. නමුත් නොයෙක් නොයෙක් අවස්ථාවලදී කර තිබෙන ප්‍රකාශ දෙස බලන විට නම් අපට එය විශ්වාස කරන්නට අමාරුයි. වැඩි කල් යන්නට පෙර උතුරෙන් නැගෙන හිරෙන් පාලනය ද්‍රවිඩ භාෂාවෙන් ගෙන යන බව තිරුවෙල්වම් මහතා ප්‍රකාශ කර තිබෙනවා. නමුත්, රාජ්‍ය කටයුතු භාර ගරු ඇමතිතුමා රත්මලානේදීත් කළුතර දීත් කර තිබෙන ප්‍රකාශ ඊට හාත්පසින්ම විරුද්ධයි. මේ විධියේ ප්‍රකාශ නිසාම රටේ නොසන්සුන්තාවක් ඇති වී තිබෙන බව මම නැවත වරක් තරයේ කියන්නට කැමතියි. රජයේ ගරු ඇමතිවරුන් මේ විධියේ පරස්පර විරෝධී අදහස් ප්‍රකාශ කරමින්, ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂය සිංහල

භාෂාව රාජ්‍ය භාෂාව බවට පත් කිරීමට ගත් ක්‍රියා මාර්ගය අහෝසි කිරීමට සූදානම් වන විට අපට නිශ්චයව සිටිය නොහැකි බව ගරු සභාපතිතුමාට හොඳහැටි පෙනී යනවා ඇති.

1960 ජූලි මැතිවරණයේදී ගරු අගමැති තුමා දැදිගම කළ කථාවකදී, ඒපබරල් පක්ෂයන් ලංකා සමසමාජ පක්ෂයන් කොමියුනිස්ට් පක්ෂයන් ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයන් එකතු වී පිහිටුවන්නට යන අවිචාරු ආණ්ඩුවෙන් කරන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ කුමක්ද කියා එතුමා ප්‍රකාශ කළ බව “ඩේලි නිව්ස්” පත්තරයෙහි සඳහන් වී තිබුණා. මේ පක්ෂ හතර එක් වී ආණ්ඩුවක් පිහිටුවන්නට යන බව ප්‍රකාශ කළ එතුමා එය “අවිචාරු ආණ්ඩුවක්” හැටියට හත්වඩු ගසාත් තිබුණා. එසේ නම්, අද තිබෙන මේ ඊනියා ජාතික ආණ්ඩුව අවිචාරු ආණ්ඩුවක් නොවෙයි ද කියා මම අහනවා. අද මේ අවිචාරු ආණ්ඩුවට කොවිට් මිලිසුන් එකතු වී තිබෙන බව අපට පෙනෙනවා.

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

සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.
(திருமதி சிறிமாவோ பண்டாரநாயக்க)
(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)
සැර වැඩි බව තමයි අපිත් කියන්නේ.

සභාපතිතුමා
(அகிலராசனார்)
(The Chairman)

The hon. Leader of the Opposition has addressed the House for half an hour. How long does she want to address ?

සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.
(திருமதி சிறிமாவோ பண்டாரநாயக்க)
(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)

තව මිනිත්තු 10 යි. එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂය මැතිවරණ කැලයේදී භාෂා ප්‍රතිපත්තිය සම්බන්ධයෙන් දුන් පොරොන්දු අකුරටම ඉෂ්ට කරනවාද කියා මම ගරු

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.]

අගමැතිතුමාගෙන් අහනවා. ටේප් රිකෝර්ඩ් පක්ෂය එම ප්‍රතිපත්ති පිළිගන්නවාද කියාත් ඒ එක්කම මම ඒ පක්ෂයේ නායක වෙල්වනායගම් මහත්මයාගෙන් අහනවා. එය මෙම ගරු සභාවට විස්තර වශයෙන් ප්‍රකාශ කිරීම ඒ දෙදෙනාගේ යුතුකමක්. එසේ නැත්නම්, රටේ පවතින නොසන්සුන්තාව තව තවත් වැඩි වෙනවා මිස කවදාවත් අඩු නොවන බව මේ අවස්ථාවේදී ප්‍රකාශ නොකරම බැ. අගෝස්තු මස 18 වැනිදා රාජ්‍ය කටයුතු භාර ගරු ඇමතිතුමා මෙම ගරු සභාවෙහිදී කළ කථාවේදී මෙම රජයේ නව භාෂා ප්‍රතිපත්තිය ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්නට යන පිළිවෙල විස්තර වශයෙන් කියා සිටියා.

දිවංගත බණ්ඩාරනායක අගමැතිතුමා විසින් 1956 ජූලි මාස 16 වැනිදා ඉදිරිපත් කළ යෝජනා අනුව ආදි ප්‍රවේශකයින්ට යම් යම් සහනයන් දෙන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වන බව රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා ඒ අවස්ථාවේදී ප්‍රකාශ කර තිබෙනවා. ඒ සහනය නම්: “1956 ජූලි මාස 24 වැනිදාට ප්‍රථමයෙන් රජයේ සේවයට බැඳුණු නිලධාරීන් සිංහල භාෂාවෙන් රජයේ කටයුතු කරන්නට වුවමනා නැත” කියන එකයි. එතුමා අපට දොස් කියා තිබෙනවා, අපි දිවංගත අගමැතිතුමාගේ භාෂා ප්‍රතිපත්තිය වෙනස් කර තිබෙනවාය කියා. භාෂා ප්‍රතිපත්තිය මේක නොවෙයි. දිවංගත අගමැතිතුමාගේ භාෂා ප්‍රතිපත්තිය සිංහලය රාජ්‍ය භාෂාව කිරීමයි. එය ක්‍රියාත්මක කිරීමට යම් යම් යෝජනා වගයක් එතුමා කැබිනට් මණ්ඩලයට ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබුණා. එයින් එකක් තමයි, ආදි ප්‍රවේශකයින්ට සිංහල භාෂාවෙන් කටයුතු නොකරන්නට අවසර දීම.

ප්‍ර. භා. 11.30

එහෙත් 1960 දී අප බලයට පත්වූ අවස්ථාවේදී අපට පෙනී ගියා, මේ යෝජනාව ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්නට ගියොත් රජයේ භාෂාව 1990 වන තෙක් නියම විධියට ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්නට නොහැකි බව. ඊට හේතුව නම් 1956 දී හා ඊට පෙර ආසන්න කාලයේදී ඇතුළත් වුණු රජයේ සේවකයින් විශාල සංඛ්‍යාවක් සිටීමයි. 1948 අපට නිදහස ලැබීමෙන් පසු නොයෙක් නොයෙක් අළුත් දෙපාර්තමේන්තු පිහිටුවීම.

ඒවාට අළුත් නිලධාරීන් රාශියක් බඳවා ගන්නට යෙදුණ. ඒ අයගෙන් වැඩි පිරිසක් සිංහල භාෂාව නොදන්න අයයි; සිංහල භාෂාවෙන් කටයුතු කරන්නට නොහැකි අයයි. ඒ අය විශ්‍රාම ගන්න තෙක්ම ඒ අයට ඉංග්‍රීසි භාෂාවෙන්ම රජයේ කටයුතු කරගෙන යන්නට ඉඩ හැරියොත් සිදු වෙන්නෙ කුමක්දැයි අපි විකක් කල්පනා කර බලමු.

1956 දී, අවුරුදු 18ටත් 21ටත් අතර වයස් වූ කෙනෙක් රජයේ සේවයට බැඳුණා නම්, ඔහුට තමාගේ වයස අවුරුදු 55 හෝ 60 වන තෙක්, අවුරුදු 34ක් නැත්නම් 39ක් පමණ සේවය කරන්නට පුළුවන්කම තිබෙනවා. විශ්‍රාම ලබන්නට පුළුවන්කම තිබෙන්නෙ වයස 55 දී හෝ 60 දීයි. එම නිසා ඒ උදවියට සිංහල භාෂාවෙන් කටයුතු නොකරන්නට අවසර දුන් නොත් අවුරුදු 34ක් නැත්නම් 39ක් පමණ ගත වන තුරු සිංහල රාජ්‍ය භාෂාව වශයෙන් නියම විධියට ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්නට බැහැ. මන්ද? නොයෙක් නොයෙක් දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවල මාණ්ඩලික නිලධාරීන්, සාමාන්‍ය නිලධාරීන් හා සුළු සේවකයින් අතර සිංහල භාෂාව නොදන්නා විශාල සංඛ්‍යාවක් සිටිනවා. සමහර සිංහල අයට පවා සිංහල භාෂාවෙන් රජයේ කටයුතු කරන්නට පුළුවන්කමක් නැහැ. ඒ අය විශ්‍රාම ලබන තුරු ඔවුන්ට ඉංග්‍රීසියෙන් වැඩ කරගෙන යන්නට ඉඩ හැරියොත් 1990 නැත්නම් 1995 පමණ වන තුරු සිංහල භාෂාව නියම අන්දමට ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්නට බැරි වන බව පෙනී ගිය නිසයි, අපට ඒ යෝජනාව වෙනස් කරන්නට සිද්ධ වුණේ. එසේ නැතුව අපි භාෂා ප්‍රතිපත්තිය වෙනස් කළේ නැහැ. ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්නට තිබුණු යෝජනා කීපයක් වෙනස් කරන්නට සිද්ධ වුණා.

සිංහල නොදන්නා සේවකයින්ට සිංහල ඉගෙනීමට අපි නොයෙක් පහසුකම් ලබා දුන්න. එපමණක් නොව සිංහල ඉගෙන ගන්නට බැරිය කිව්ව දෙමළ අයට පමණක් නොව සිංහල අයට පවා වන්දි ඇතුළු විශ්‍රාම ගැනීමට අවස්ථාව දුන්නා, අවුරුදු 5 ක කාලයක් ඇතුළත් කරල. රාශියක් ඒ අනුව විශ්‍රාම ගත්ත. සිංහල භාෂාව ඉගෙන ගෙන කටයුතු කරගෙන යාමට කැමති අයට රජය මගින් නොයෙක් පහසුකම්

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

ලබා දුන්න. ඒ උදවියට සිංහල ඉගෙනීමට ගුරුවරුන් පවා රජය මගින් ලබා දුන්න. ඒ වගේම සිංහල ප්‍රවීණතාව ලබා ගත් උදවියට අපි විශේෂ ආරිතෝෂික දීමනා ලබා දුන්න. සිංහල ප්‍රවීණතා පරීක්ෂණ වලින් සමත් වූ විශාල සංඛ්‍යාවක් ඒ දීමනාව ලබා ගත්ත. අපි ඒ ක්‍රියාමාර්ග ඇති කළේ සිංහල භාෂාව නියම අන්දමට ක්‍රියාත්මක කිරීමටයි. ඒ වැඩ පිළිවෙළ නිසා අපට පුළුවන් වුණා, හුඟක් දුරට සිංහල භාෂාව දෙපාර්තමේන්තු අතර ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්නට. අපි ලබා දුන් නොයෙක් නොයෙක් පහසුකම් නිසා ඒ සේවකයින් තුළ විශාල ධෛර්යයක් ඇති වුණා, සිංහල ඉගෙන ගැනීමට. ඒ වැඩ පිළිවෙළ නිසා සමහර දෙමළ නිලධාරී මහත්වරු පවා සිංහල ඉගෙන ගත් බව අපි දන්නවා. සමහරු ඉගෙන ගත්ව බැරි වුණත් උත්සාහ ගත්ත.

නමුත් මේ රජය මේ වැඩ පිළිවෙළ වෙනස් කර තිබීමෙන් සිදුවන්නට යන්නේ කුමක්ද? ටිකක්වත් සිංහල ඉගෙන ගත්ව උත්සාහ කළ අය නැවත වරක් ඉංග්‍රීසි යෙන් කටයුතු කරගෙන යාමයි. මෙයින් අපට පෙනී යන්නේ, නැවත වරක් ඉංග්‍රීසි භාෂාව රජයේ භාෂාව වී ගෙන යන බවයි. එසේ නොකිවත්, දැනටමත් සිදුවීගෙන යන්නේ ඒකයි. බණ්ඩාරනායක මැතිතුමාගේ ප්‍රතිපත්ති පිළිගන්නවාය කියමින්, ඒ මුවාවෙන් කරන්නට හදන්නේ, ඉංග්‍රීසි භාෂාව නැවතත් මේ රටේ රාජ්‍ය භාෂාව කිරීමයි.

මදුරාසියේ ද්‍රවිඩ අය හින්දි භාෂාව රාජ්‍ය භාෂාව කරනවාට විරුද්ධව සටන් කළේ මොකද? ඒ අය ඉල්ලා සිටියේ ඉංග්‍රීසි රජයේ භාෂාව කරන්නට කියායි. ඒ අය ඉංග්‍රීසි භාෂාව පිළිබඳව දක්ෂකමක් ලබා ගත් මිනිස්සු. ඒ වගේ විශේෂයෙන් මේ රටේ උතුරේ ද්‍රවිඩ අයටත් ඉංග්‍රීසි භාෂාව පිළිබඳව දක්ෂකමක් තිබෙනවා. මන්ද? ඉංග්‍රීසි ආණ්ඩු කාලයේ මිෂනාරීන් ඒ පළාත්වල හොඳ පාඨශාලා විවෘත කළා. ඒ නිසා ඒ අයට හොඳ ඉංග්‍රීසි අධ්‍යාපනයක් ලබා ගත්ව පුළුවන් වුණා. අද මේ පෙඩරල් කාරයන් කරන සටන මොකක්ද? ඉංග්‍රීසි භාෂාවෙන් කටයුතු කරගෙන යන්නටයි.

වී. ධර්මලින්ගම් මයා. (උඩුවිල්)
 (ති.රු. ඩී. තර්මලිංගම්—උඩුවිල්)
 (Mr. V. Dharmalingam—Uduvil)
 We do not want English. We want the official languages.

සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.
 (ති.රු.ම. සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක)
 (Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)
 That is what you say, but what really is happening ?

ඒ. අමර්තලින්ගම් මයා. (වඩ්ඩුක්කොඩෙයි)
 (ති.රු. ආ. අමර්තලිංගම්—වඩ්ඩුක්කොඩෙයි)
 (Mr. A. Amirthalingam—Vaddukkottai)
 We told you also that when you tried to get our support.

සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.
 (ති.රු.ම. සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක)
 (Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)
 You say a different thing now.

දැන් මෙයින් අපට පෙනී යන්නේ රාජ්‍ය භාෂාවට ඉංග්‍රීසි රාමුවක් ඇතුළත් කර දෙන්නට උත්සාහ දරණ බවයි. මේ ගැන අපට කිසිසේත්ම නිශ්ශබ්දව සිටිය නොහැකි බව ගරු සභාපතිතුමාට පැහැදිලිව පෙනෙනවා ඇති.

සභාපතිතුමනි, රාජ්‍ය කටයුතු විවිධයේ දී ගරු අගමැතිතුමා කිවවා එතුමා මේ රටේ ජාතික සමූහයක් ඇති කිරීමට උත්සාහ කරනවාය කියා. ඒ ගැන අපිත් එතුමා සමඟ එකඟ වෙනවා. එදා දොම්පේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා කතා කරමින් කියා සිටියා, මේ රට සමඟ කිරීම සඳහා උතුරේ සිට දකුණ දක්වාම සිංහල භාෂාව බලපැවැත්විය යුතුය කියා. එසේ කියන විට පදිපිට පුවේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (එස්. එම්. රාස මානික්කම් මයා.) කිවවා, එය කවදාවත් වෙන්නේ නැත කියා. මේ රට ඒ විදියට සමඟ කරන්න බැරිය කිවවා. ඒ නිසා අපි ගරු අගමැතිතුමාගෙන් අහන්න කැමතියි, එතුමා මේ රට සමඟ කරන්න බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ කොහොමද කියා. එතුමාගේ ආණ්ඩු පක්ෂයේම සිටින රේපබ්ලික්

விசர்ச்சன கெடுதலின் பணை, 1965-66

—கூடுக கலாவி

அநாகரிசுமான, ஒழுக்கத்துக்கு மாறான, பௌத்தம், கிறிஸ்தவம், மற்றைய சமயங்கள் ஆகியனவற்றின் உயர்ந்த இலட்சியங்களுக்கு மாறான ஒரு கொள்கையாகத்தானிருக்கும்.

பி. கை. 11.45

இப்படியான ஒன்றை, ஒற்றுமைக் கொள்கையென்று நினைப்பது எந்தத் தூண்டு தலினால் என்று எனக்குத் தெரியாது. ஒரு வேளை பழங்காலத்திலே கண்டி நாட்டிலே, தமையன் தம்பியுடன் ஒற்றுமையாக இருப்ப தற்காக தன்னுடைய மனைவியைத் தம்பி மேற் சமத்துவது ஒற்றுமைக் கொள்கையென்று நினைப்பதைப் போல, தம்முடைய மொழியை தமிழ்த் தம்பிமேற் சமத்த நினைக்கின்றாரோ என்னமோ தெரியவில்லை. இத்தகைய கொள்கை பழைய பிற்போக்கான நிலையிலிருந்து உருவாகிறது என்றுதான் நினைக்கிறேன். எங்களுடைய கௌரவ எதிர்க்கட்சித் தலைவர் சொன்னது போல, வடக்கிலிருக்கும் நல்ல கல்வி நிலையங்களில் அவர் கற்றிருந்தால், இப்படியான பிற்போக்கான கொள்கைகள் அவருடைய மனதில் வந்திராது.

கடந்த 2000 ஆண்டுகளாக நாங்கள் சிங்கள மக்களோடு தமிழர்களாக இருந்தோம். தொடர்ந்தும் சிங்கள மக்களோடு தமிழர்களாகத் தான் இருப்போம் என்று திட்டமாகக் கூற விரும்புகின்றேன். நாங்கள் சிங்கள மக்களோடு ஒற்றுமையாகச் சேர்ந்து வாழவே விரும்புகின்றோம். அப்படிச் சேர்ந்து வாழ்வதற்கு ஒரு புதிய முயற்சியைத் தேசிய அரசாங்கம் ஏற்படுத்தியிருக்கின்றது. அதனால் தான் நாங்கள் எவ்வித கஷ்டங்களுக்கிடையேயும் சேர்ந்தியங்கி ஒற்றுமையாக வாழ்வதற்கு வழி வகுக்கின்றோம். நாங்கள் எங்களுடைய கொள்கையில் எந்த விதமான மாற்றமும் செய்யவில்லை. இங்கு உரை நிகழ்த்தும் பொழுது கௌரவ எதிர்க்கட்சித் தலைவர் எங்களுடைய கொள்கை என்னவென்று வினவினார். எங்கள் கொள்கையைப் பற்றி அவர் அக்கறை கொள்ள வேண்டிய அவசியமில்லை. எங்களைப் பாதுகாக்க, எங்களுடைய கொள்கையைப் பாதுகாக்க எங்களுக்குத் தெரியும். ஆனால் இங்கு நான் ஒரு விடயத்தைப் பற்றிச் சொல்ல விரும்புகிறேன். கிரிக்கெட் பந்தாட்டத்தில் ஒருவர் பந்தை வீச மற்றவர் அதை மிடுத்து அடிக்கும் வழக்கத்தைக் காண்கிறோம். இவ்வித முறை விளையாட்டுத் துறைக்

குப் பொருந்துமே அல்லாது அரசியலுக்குப் பொருந்த மாட்டாது. ஜனநாயக அரசாங்கம் ஒன்றைச் செய்தால் அதைக் கட்டாயம் எதிர்ப்பதுதான் தங்கள் கடமை என்று எதிர்க் கட்சியினர் நினைக்கக் கூடாது. எவரும் நாட்டின் நன்மையை உத்தேசித்து இயங்குவதுதான் உயர்ந்த அரசியலாகும்.

ஐ. தே. க. அரசாங்கம் மொழிப்பிரச்சினையைத் தீர்க்கக் கூடாது என்று நினைத்து நாட்டிற்கு நன்மையான விடயங்களை அரசாங்கம் செய்தாலும் அதை எதிர்ப்பதுதான் தங்கள் கடமை என்ற ரீதியில் எதிர்க் கட்சியினர் இயங்குவது மிகப்பிழையானதாகும். இந்த நாட்டில் இரண்டு மொழிகள் இருக்கின்றன. அவை இரண்டும் இந்த நாட்டில் நிரந்தரமாக இருக்க வேண்டும். இந்த நாட்டில் நான்கு சமயங்கள் இருக்கின்றன. இந்த நான்கு சமயங்களும் இந்த நாட்டில் நிரந்தரமாக இருக்க வேண்டும். இவைகளை எங்கள் கொள்கைகள். இந்த நாட்டில் இரண்டு மொழிகள் தேசிய மொழிகளாக இருப்பது போல் இந்த நாட்டிலுள்ள நான்கு சமயங்களையும் தேசிய சமயங்களாக நாங்கள் கருதுகிறோம். இந்த நாட்டிலிருக்கக்கூடிய எந்தவொரு சமயத்தையும் வெளிநாட்டுச் சமயம், புறத்தே இருந்து வந்த சமயம் என்று நாம் நினைக்கக் கூடாது. பௌத்த சமயம்கூட இந்த நாட்டிற்குப் புறத்தே இருந்து வந்த சமயம்தான். ஆனால் இரண்டாயிரம் ஆண்டுகளாக ஒரு சிறந்த கொள்கையை வளர்த்து, உலகத்திற்கு நல்ல சிந்தனை முறையை, வாழ்க்கை முறையை, தத்துவத்தை எடுத்துக்காட்டக் கூடிய தோவாத பௌத்தமாக பௌத்த சமயம் இந்த நாட்டில் இன்று வளர்ந்திருக்கிறது. இரண்டாயிரம் வருடங்களுக்கு முன் புறச் சமயமாக இருந்த பௌத்தம் இன்று அதி உன்னத தேசிய சமயமாக மாறி இருப்பதைக் காண்கிறோம். இவைகளைக் கவனித்து நாங்கள் உண்மையான தேசியப்பற்றோடு ஒவ்வொருவரும் தங்கள் தங்கள் மொழியையும் சமயத்தையும் இந்த நாட்டில் நிரந்தரமாகப் பின்பற்றி வாழ வழி வகுப்பதுதான் எங்கள் எல்லோருடைய கடமையுமாகும். இவ்வித நோக்கங்களுக்கு எதிர்க் கட்சியினர் தடையாக இராது நல்ல உயர்ந்த நோக்கத்தோடு தங்கள் கொள்கையை அனுஷ்டிக்க வேண்டுமென்று மிகத் தாழ்மையாகக் கேட்டுக் கொள்கிறேன்.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

amended because the law itself says that a district court could impose only a maximum sentence of two years' imprisonment.

Then with regard to presidents of rural courts, I understand that there are certain presidents who are kept in one station for more than five years. That is not at all satisfactory because even judicial officers of the minor judiciary such as district judges and magistrates are not kept in a station for more than five years. So in the case of a president it is highly irregular that he should be kept in a station for more than five years. The president is a human being. He might be exposed to all sorts of corrupt practices. I understand that in a particular case the president had been allowed to function at one station for ten years. Therefore I should like the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to look into those matters and have a maximum period of five years in one station in the case of presidents of rural courts too.

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)

Mr. Chairman, it is no formal courtesy that makes me congratulate hon. Members of this House for their contribution but indeed a very real sense of appreciation of the purposeful, constructive suggestions and contributions made by them in the course of this Debate. I believe this is the first time that the Ministry of Justice has been probed, if I may say so, for a number of hours over a wide variety of subjects. I am very grateful for the high standard of debate and the seriousness with which hon. Members have dealt with matters ranging over a large variety of subjects; they have shown a great deal of practical wisdom and insight into

the problems that affect those issues. Indeed, very broadly speaking, I think they touched upon matters affecting the official language and the department dealing with that subject, the language of the courts, the law's delays, reforms of the law, conciliation boards, appointment of justices of the peace, prison reforms, and other minor matters. I assure hon. Members that we shall give very serious and careful consideration to the views expressed on those matters. In respect of most of the subjects mentioned there seems to be some unanimity of views. I think it would be useful and convenient, instead of covering the large number of subjects that have been commented upon, to make my own observations on the matters on which there has been a great deal of criticism. I do not want to deal individually with the criticisms of hon. Members as it would take too much of the time of this House. I think it would be fair from the point of view of the Ministry to deal with them under broad heads. When I have finished dealing with these main matters, I shall certainly deal with the number of minor individual matters that have been raised during the course of the Debate so that it will not be said that I have not taken into consideration those minor criticisms.

දිවල් 12

I think, Sir, the first matter is the one relating to conciliation boards and the appointments of justices of the peace. I am taking both of them together as I feel that they are complementary to each other in a sense.

With regard to conciliation boards, I think the hon. Member for Mulkirigala (Mr. George Rajapaksa), the hon. Member for Kamburupitiya (Mr. Percy Wickremasinghe) the hon. Member for Akmeemana (Mr. A. D. S. de Silva) and several others have raised the same question. The leading question that was asked was whether there has been a proper assessment of the work done by the conciliation boards. I quite agree with hon. Members that the conciliation

[නයිතා මයිකාට් මැණි]

board is a very important institution in so far as it deals with adjudication of disputes and offences in the rural areas. I think it was a very fine institution which the late Hon. M. W. H. de Silva, in his time, proposed and embodied in an Act which we have been working for a number of years. Several speakers have stated on the Floor of this House that the conciliation boards are doing very fine work in reconciling disputes in the rural areas and also in seeing that these people do not go into litigation and unnecessary expense.

I think, Sir, the peace of the countryside is very much dependent upon the settlement of these minor disputes, and from that point of view it is a very admirable institution. As you are aware, any institution can be good or bad depending on the personnel that man it. It was pointed out by several speakers that we should have on conciliation boards men of quality, character and attainment, men who are looked upon with respect by the local people and men who would not have what is known as class bias. I think there was a suggestion that some rich people might get into a board and start persecuting or harassing or intimidating poor villagers. I do not think that sort of danger is there because selection is done on a proper level.

As you know, Sir, the normal procedure is to advertise. The rural development societies, the co-operative societies, the D.R.O. and such others recommend names; these names are carefully looked into, and then on the recommendation of the government agent and so on, we constitute the board. There seems to have been some kind of fear that political considerations are being taken into account in forming these boards. I can assure hon. Members of this House that as far as the Ministry is concerned, we are really moved by one consideration only and that is that we select the best possible men since we realize that if we are going to select people purely on

a political basis we can never constitute a board because in every area you find people who are politically inclined one way or the other.

I must say that during the last regime the last Government violated this principle, and most of the difficulties that we are now facing, so far as the old boards are concerned, are due to this political bias which they had given to these boards.

As I told you, I think the conciliation boards are doing a very good job of work. We do get a kind of return from the various chairmen of these boards. Unfortunately, we do not have a correct assessment of the work done because we have not asked them to send us a report with their observations as to the various kinds of disputes they have settled. It is only then that one can assess or evaluate the quality of the work that is being done. It is useless their saying, "We had 100 cases and we have settled 80 or 90", without giving their observations on the nature and quality of the work that they have done. That is a matter which the Ministry shall certainly look into. We will ask the chairmen of these boards in future to send their personal comments and observations on the work done over a period of years. In that way I think we can assess and evaluate the work of the boards so that if there are any handicaps or shortcomings we will be able to overcome them.

As for the appointment of J.P.'s, I think there was an allegation made by the hon. Member for Kamburupitiya (Mr. Percy Wickremasinghe) that the last Government appointed J.P.'s indiscriminately. I do not know to what extent it is true, but certainly, as far as we are concerned, we appoint J.P.'s on the basis of, firstly, utility, that is to say, whether a particular area needs the services of a J.P. If that particular area needs a J.P. and there are insufficient J.P.'s, we appoint J.P.'s on a territorial basis. It is true that we cannot sometimes conform altogether to this particular principle because,

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

as you know, today, the only title or recognition of honour that the Government can give to a person is a J.P. We have abolished various other titles and this is, therefore, looked upon with a great deal of expectation by a number of people who have served the State or Government and also by those after their retirement from service.

In our policy relating to these appointments we try to create as many J.P.'s as possible without in any way bringing political considerations into the question of these appointments. In most of these appointments it is also our principle or policy to consult the M.P.s of the areas so that we will not be told that their candidates or their nominees have been overlooked or that we have given undue preference to some of the people whose character or whose position in that particular place is questionable. That is so far as the conciliation boards and the J.P.'s are concerned.

I shall now deal with the next matter, the law's delays and legal reforms. A number of hon. Members referred to this problem. It is really an acute problem in any part of the world. One of the oppressive things about legal administration is the law's delays. And as one hon. Member put it, I think quite rightly, the law's delay means justice delayed and justice denied.

Now it is not an easy thing to perfect a system of justice whereby the administration of justice can be made expeditious, quick and cheap. Although that appears to be the ideal of the administration of justice, we have to consider the social *milieu* in which the legal system has to work. Of course, we can have a large number of courts. One of the main difficulties is that we do not have a sufficient number of courts. The hon. Member for Mulkirigala (Mr. George Rajapakse) said as far as Hambantota and Tissamaharama are concerned there is only one magistrate's court and that that

magistrate is busy with a number of non-summary cases. That seems to be the complaint of most of the areas. If we can have quite a number of courts operating in areas where there is a great deal of litigation, then I think one of the obstacles to the delays in the law can be eliminated.

It was also pointed out that cases are prolonged because the lawyers concerned are not too anxious to get their cases disposed of. That is true to some extent, but it is not altogether fair to make that accusation against the lawyers. I know that there have been delays in a number of cases in spite of their efforts. Certain matters which, in the adjudication of the cases, should have been urged before the courts are never urged in time. For example, owing to non-production of survey plans or some report and so on and so forth cases are invariably postponed. I am not giving any justification for their acts, I am only highlighting some of the obvious obstacles to the administration of justice in an expeditious and quick way. No doubt it means a tremendous cost to the litigants because they have to come from all sorts of places and that also involves expense.

Then, of course, there is the procedural difficulty referred to by some of the hon. Members about reports from the Government Analyst or from some other officer about surveys in partition cases and a number of other things not being available for the consideration of the case. I think some of the procedure is defective. The commission on the Criminal Procedure Code as well as the Civil Procedure Code had highlighted these procedural difficulties and recommended certain amendments to our legal system. We are looking into those matters so as to eliminate some of the more obvious and oppressive procedural difficulties.

Then there was this criticism about laws being archaic and uncertain. There was a suggestion by certain hon. Members of this

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[තයිනා මරික්කාර් මය.]

House that we should amend and revise certain laws like the law on registration of titles. The hon. Member for Dompe suggested that there should be a codification of the principles of Roman Dutch Law while the hon. Member for Uduppiddy said that certain acts which were already passed by this House were reactionary, undemocratic and contrary to the rule of law, of which, I think, one was the Criminal Law (Special Provisions) Act No. 1 of 1962. He also referred to some Maintenance Ordinance which prescribed the payment of an allowance of not more than Rs. 100. He said it was quite inadequate. He also referred to the powers of tribunals which we will have to consider in view of the Privy Council decision.

There is another aspect of legal reform which hon. Members did not mention but which struck me forcibly because I was one of those who raised that matter. That is about Muslim law. There is a good portion of the Muslim law which is doubtful and uncertain and which requires not merely clarification but to a large extent codification. For example, in a Privy Council appeal Sir Lionel Leach made particular reference to the subject of donation in Muslim Law.

These are matters which cannot be dealt with overnight. They have to be looked into carefully, and I think what we are now trying to do is to have a sort of law revision committee which will go into most of the problems of legal reform, amendments to existing legislation, bringing them up to date, and so forth. Once we have that committee and it goes into these questions it is possible in the near future to introduce some kind of order, neatness and logic into our legal system.

අ. ආ. 12.15

But I do want to emphasize to hon. Members of this House the fact that this is a very big problem. Codification of law is not an easy matter.

Today we have three systems of law in this country. My lawyer Friends here know all about it. I do not want to expand on that theme because it will take a lot of time. Since there are these three systems it is very difficult indeed to codify them into one code.

What we ought to attempt is a re-statement of the various areas of law which are uncertain and in that way reduce the law to a certainty. But that requires very competent men, men who would be able to devote their time to the study of these various aspects of law. As you know, our practitioners are very busy men. It is very difficult to get them to come and do a job of work. We had that experience for example in the Law Revision Committee which was constituted sometime ago. They come and try to do their best, but it is not what we would desire it to be.

Those are the problems we have to face. We in the Ministry, like the hon. Members of this House, are very anxious that the delays in the law, the hiatus and the deficiencies in the legislation, should be remedied as early as possible. And I think all hon. Members will agree with me that our legal system is really the bulwark of the democratic rights of the citizens.

I think there was a reference to the issue of summons, the fault committed by the process server; that is to say, he swears an affidavit and says he has served it on the defendant or the respondent whereas in fact he has not done so. I do not know what exactly the remedy is. The remedy suggested is that the person on whom it is intended to be served should give him an endorsement; it is only then that it can be taken as being validly served and not upon a mere affidavit by a process server. I am aware of a large number of cases where the defendant has been defrauded with this kind of tactics.

I do not know whether I have covered the large number of points made about the law's delays. It is

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

impossible to deal with each and every matter that has been raised in the course of this Debate as far as legal reform is concerned, but I think all those things that have been said by hon. Members—and they have said it with seriousness and a certain amount of practical experience—will certainly receive our very serious consideration. As for me I am very happy that hon. Members have brought into this Debate a sense of purpose, a sense of seriousness and a desire that something must be done in order to make our legal system at least workable and acceptable to the large majority of the people.

I now come to the next main matter which hon. Members referred to in the course of their speeches, the Information Book. I think that is a very important matter. I have thought it fit to deal with it as an individual item because I think it is a very important matter from the point of view of the accused who have been charged with criminal offences. It is also a matter which has been referred to by the Gratiaen Commission on Criminal Procedure—the Criminal Courts Commission.

You will remember, Sir, that during the last Parliament an amendment was brought in this House which we accepted, I think with unanimity, namely the Criminal Procedure Code (Amendment) Act, No. 42 of 1961. That Act amended Section 122 of the Criminal Procedure Code. It laid down that, in proceedings which are instituted in a magistrate's court under Section 148, in pursuance of any information given under Section 121 (1), the accused or his proctor shall be entitled to obtain from the proper authority a certified copy of such information and of any statement made under sub-Section (1) of Section 122 by the person against whom or in respect of whom the accused is alleged to have committed an offence; that the said certified copies shall be *prima facie* evidence, and that it is not necessary for the officer to be called to prove it.

I think what the hon. Members want is a step further; they want the statements made by the accused or other people who are witnesses too to be made available to both parties, certainly for the defence. Speaking for myself, I think that it is a very reasonable provision to be made because in a large number of cases the proper course of criminal investigations, particularly of defence, can be taken if we know the truth or what actually happened. Of course, it is liable to be abused. They say that the defence can always shape their defence from the statement made in the books, and that is a risk that we must be prepared to take. After all, in a criminal trial we ought to know the truth and this truth can be ascertained from the recorded statements of witnesses. It may be that this procedure is liable to be abused. My own view is that the sum total of the benefit that such a provision will give will be greater than what is derived now by the people who have been charged with criminal offences. That is a matter we shall consider very seriously and carefully. I think we will recommend it to the Hon. Minister for his consideration and if he approves of it we will certainly place it in the form of a Bill in this House.

The next matter to which I should like to refer is the question of prison reforms. This is the first time, I think, that we had such an intense and long discussion on prison reforms. The contributions made by the hon. Members of the Opposition and, shall I say, particularly the hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa), were of a very high order. He has always been one who has interested himself in the question of prison reforms.

I must say that I am entirely new to this subject and, therefore, it has awakened in me a considerable amount of interest. It is not purely an institutional problem as such; it is, as the hon. Member for Colombo South puts it, a very human problem. One might call it in the negative sense, "man's inhumanity to man".

[නයිත මරික්කාර් මය.]

I am happy, therefore, that the hon. Members who took part in this Debate on the question of prison reforms have given a great deal of thought to this matter. It is so vast and wide that within a short period of a few hours I do not think we can cover the many problems, the many facets, of the prison reforms we have to consider.

I do not know whether it is necessary for me to go through every one of the many points raised by hon. Members for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa), Panadura (Mr. Leslie Goonewardene), Second Akurana (Mr. A. C. S. Hameed) who spoke with a certain amount of feeling and authority on this subject, the hon. Appointed Member, and the hon. Member for Kotte (Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne), because we are more or less agreed on many of the points that were raised by them.

The main plea of the hon. Joint Member for Colombo South was that we must have a change of attitude towards prisoners. I entirely agree with him; but it is not altogether easy because in the ultimate end anything that we do, any changes that we like to bring about, are conditioned by the buildings available and other material considerations. I think the Gratiaen Report refers to that in very clear terms. I do not want to weary the hon. Members by reading that report, except one paragraph which, I think, sums up the quintessence of the whole problem. I refer to page 6, paragraph 5, which says :

"5. The prisons in the Island are grossly over-crowded, and are acutely understaffed. So long as this state of affairs is permitted to continue, and particularly in the antiquated buildings which serve as prisons at the present time, it is evident that no attempt to introduce and apply to convicted persons the modern methods of rehabilitative treatment can possibly succeed."

It reminds me of Sir Winston Churchill's famous words: "We shape the buildings, and the buildings in turn shape us." I think that is true also of prison architecture—

"...The vital principle of segregating first offenders from recidivists has become an impossible ideal to achieve, and in the larger prisons where a small percentage of the prison population consists of dangerous criminals, the emphasis which is laid on "maximum security" has had the result of unduly repressive conditions being insisted upon to the detriment of other prisoners who are more easily reclaimable. Indeed, the prison staff is itself imprisoned in a rigid code of rules governing the most minute details of administration...and much of their time and energy are taken up with counting and re-counting prisoners and with the mere locking and unlocking of heavy steel doors" (Benney's "Gaul Delivery"). Under such conditions prisons have "no room and even less redemption" for their inmates, and it follows that the average prisoner is rarely, if ever, equipped on the date of his discharge to find suitable employment or to take his place as a useful member of society. The percentage of recidivism is in consequence alarmingly high. We doubt if it is generally realised how very seriously a continuation of this state of affairs, involving as it does an enormous wastage of reclaimable human material, will progressively impair the welfare of the State."

That paragraph, I think, highlights, sums up, the very essence of the problem. Subject to correction—I am new, as I said, to this question—I do think that that is really the most important problem we have got to face and most of the other things really flow from that.

There were a number of minor points which were raised during the course of the Debate by various hon. Members. One was the large number of re-convicted prisoners, some 3,444. The other is the category of prisoners who are in jail for non-payment of fines—4,388. It is rather sad and tragic that there should be such a large number of prisoners who have to spend a part of their life in prison for non-payment of fines. According to one estimate it is 81 per cent. I thought the report said it was 40 per cent. Whatever it is, it is a fairly large number. I have been trying to find the reason

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

for this, and I have been offered an explanation, namely, that most of these offences are really under the Excise Ordinance, and that the magistrate, in sentencing them to imprisonment, is really trying to reach the man who is responsible for it, namely, the *kasippu mudalali*. That may be one explanation. I do not think I am in a position to supply statistics of each and every case. But it is certainly a problem which needs consideration, because I am in entire agreement with the suggestion made that people should not be sent to prison on the spur of the moment or on first impulse thus overcrowding the prison buildings and creating work for the prison staff. I am of the view that something must be done to prevent, as much as possible, such a large number of people being sent to prison for non-payment of fines. I think that is a matter we will look into and give careful consideration to in order to see whether some kind of formula cannot be followed so that while recovering the fines and exercising some deterrence on the offenders, we may at the same time prevent them from going to prison, because prison contaminates the person who is sent there.

අ. න. 12.30

Then there was a reference to parole. I think the Pallekele experiment is one that has proved a great success. It has worked very well and we are now trying to extend that system to other areas because the idea is to give the prisoners a sense of dignity and a sense of belonging to society and at the same time to see that they are reclaimed as citizens who would be able to lead an honourable life after discharge. I do not think hon. Members want me to discuss this Pallekele experiment. We are taking steps to widen the scope of this experiment. We are considering one or two other places; they have been mentioned in the Administration Report. Hon. Members who are keen on studying this experiment will be able to get all the available material from the Administration Report.

Then there seems to be an insistent demand from hon. Members that there must be a commission to go into the entire working of the prison system, a commission on the lines of the Gratiaen Commission. I am really in favour of it, but our advisers say that the Gratiaen Report is itself comprehensive and that, if properly implemented, another commission is not necessary. If a commission is necessary, I can recommend the appointment of one to the Hon. Minister. The Gratiaen Report was submitted in 1949 and since then the world has not stood still—changes have occurred in many parts of the world and many new proposals on penology have been introduced and implemented, and therefore it may be fruitful and advantageous to have a commission to go into the working of the prison system and also prison administration very much on the same lines as the Gratiaen Commission. In fact, I think a large number of recommendations of the Gratiaen Report have been implemented. I do not know whether I should weary hon. Members by pointing out each and every recommendation that has been implemented, but the following are some of the recommendations that have been implemented—Nos. 17, 28, 51 and 52. There are a large number of other recommendations which need to be implemented but which have not been implemented maybe on account of administrative difficulties.

This subject of prison reform and prison administration is a very important one. We have also to face the problem of the large number of juvenile delinquents who year in year out go to prison and contaminate themselves. I think it is a dictum that in the incidence of crime in any part of the world cases of juvenile delinquency are the highest. It is so even in a place like England; it is 65 or 70 per cent.

I think the hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa) stated that there were some 60,000 children in the Colombo suburbs living in shanties, and he suggested that, as a method of removing them

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[නයිත මරික්කාර් මය.]

from evil influences, they be settled in decent homes and conditions created in which they could live happily and contented. I think that is a very good suggestion. I do not know to what extent it could be implemented, but one must, of course, not be frightened of the difficulties of implementation. It is a useful and worthwhile suggestion. It is a matter that the Ministry officials and the prison officials will seriously consider, and I would ask the hon. Member, who is such a learned and erudite authority on these matters, to help us with his suggestions in meeting this problem. In fact, that is an appeal I would like to make to all hon. Members of this House, because very few people realize how important this question of prison administration is.

Recently the press has highlighted or painted an exaggerated picture of the kind of thing that goes on in the prisons. Those who are aware of prison administration in this country and outside know that we need not be very worried about these matters because they are problems that are quite common to all prisons. For instance sex deviation practices and the violation of rules by prison officials themselves participating in or encouraging these things are all matters common to prison administration everywhere. I am not, therefore, saying that these things should be condoned or ignored; but I trust that people will not be stampeded into panic and say, "Well, the people in this prison should behave themselves", and expect those who are behind prison walls to conduct themselves like monks when they have been denied ordinary comforts and outlets in the matter of their physical needs.

These things are bound to happen, and I think the only human way in which we can meet these problems and difficulties is first to realize that they are behind prison walls and then, without unduly harassing them, to introduce reforms into our system so that they will be rehabilitated as ordinary men.

That is so far as prison reforms are concerned. I do not think I have done justice to the subject because it is a vast subject, an involved subject requiring a great deal of thought and study, but since for the first time on the Floor of this House this matter received such serious consideration, I thought I should present our own attitude towards it, however, I can assure hon. Members that in the matter of prison reform we shall always welcome constructive criticism and purposeful co-operation in order to build up a prison system which will probably be, if I may be a little boastful, the pride of the whole world.

There were a number of matters referred to by various hon. Members. One matter which requires some kind of answer is the one raised by the hon. Member for Panadura. I think he referred to a letter which he had addressed to the Attorney-General about the printing of ballot papers in contravention of section 52 of the Ceylon Parliamentary Elections Order in Council. I believe he said that he had written to the police and that the police had said that there was no contravention, and they were not going to take any action. Therefore the hon. Member had written to the Attorney-General asking whether that was the advice he tendered, and he read out a letter from the Attorney-General in which that officer is supposed to have said that he was unable to convey his decision as it would be improper to communicate the advice he has tendered to the Government.

Unfortunately, the Attorney-General himself is tied up and he is unable to give out any decision or any reason for giving the advice he has given. According to current and accepted practice, he is not in a position to inform any Member of this House as to what his advice has been because such advice is of a confidential nature, and he should not be asked to reveal it.

But that does not mean that matters of this nature cannot be raised on the Floor of this House,

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

because I think in the final analysis the administration of justice in this country is as important to all of us as it is to anybody else. I think even in England it is quite proper to raise matters like this before the Minister of Justice or the one who is in charge of justice, particularly the Minister concerned, so that he could make the necessary investigations in these matters as far as possible in an attempt to find out whether the Attorney-General or the Law Officer has acted correctly and fairly.

I think the hon. Member for Panadura should have no grievance because under this very Act he could have, if he wanted to, instituted an action in the District Court charging the person concerned with a breach of the particular law. As you know, in the District Court, a conviction on an offence like that carries with it a penalty of a fine of Rs. 500.

Then a reference was made by several Members to the conditions of service of Fiscal and Process Servers. The complaint was that some of these process servers have been on an acting basis for nearly ten or fifteen years—some of them. It seems really unfair to me that having been employed on a casual basis they should be kept on in this state of suspended animation over a number of years without giving them any right whatsoever to permanency. As it is, they are neither in the service nor outside the service. The nature of their service is such that they are unable to find extra work in combination with this.

The real reason, I understand, is that this service gives a large number of people employment, whereas if you give it a permanent basis, probably the number of people employed in it will be much less than now. Now there are process servers employed both on a permanent as well as on a casual basis. Of course there is no justification for it, and I think it is a matter that requires

reform. The Ministry will look into it and see that they are placed on a permanent basis.

Then there was a reference to Mr. Basnayake. I thought I should make some observations on that matter, but since the question has been raised and answered by hon. Members on the Floor of the House, I do not think I shall refer to it except to say that when Mr. Basnayake was a Supreme Court judge he discharged his functions without fear or favour, and if, immediately thereafter, he participated in politics, he must have done so out of a conviction that he could not stand by at a time when big issues were at stake. From that point of view, I do not think that we could, as some hon. Members did, condemn him when really he adorned that office.

අ. ආ. 12.45

I next come to the explosive question of the official language policy and the language of the courts. I find it very difficult to start at any point on this matter because it has been debated not merely in relation to this Ministry but also in the course of the Debate on the Throne Speech and on several other occasions.

So far as the language of the courts is concerned, certain pointed questions were asked of me by the hon. Member for Mulkirigala (Mr. George Rajapaksa), and I hope I shall be able to answer those questions. He wanted to know how far we have progressed with Sinhala as the language of the courts. He wanted to know whether there are any technical difficulties, lack of stenographers, typists, etc. He wanted to know whether there were any political impediments, whether there was a sinister, surreptitious agreement with the Federal Party which prevented us from implementing the Language of the Courts Act. He wanted to know whether the judgments in the magistrate's courts and the Supreme Court were delivered in Sinhala. He

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[කසිකා මරික්කාරී මයා.]

wanted to know whether this Government has changed the policy of the previous Government. Similar questions were raised by other hon. Members, and I do not want to catalogue and summarize them. The trend of their argument seems to be what I stated, namely, that we are no longer implementing the Language of the Courts Act, that we are shirking our responsibilities, that we are playing a game of hide and seek because of an unknown, undeclared, undisclosed agreement with the Federal Party.

May I say this. The charge cannot be laid at our door. The simple reason is that we have been in office only for three or four months. It was the S. L. F. P. Government which passed the Language of the Courts Act in 1960, and if they have not implemented it as they should have done, why attack us, why indict us with the charge that we are not playing fair by the intention of the Legislature? That is my first answer.

As for the second answer, I think it is quite clear that we are not deviating at all from the Language of the Courts Act. I think we have said that repeatedly, namely, that so far as our language policy is concerned, we shall implement all the three Acts—the Sinhala only Act, the Tamil Language (Special Provisions Act), and the Language of the Courts Act.

But I think one has to bear in mind that there are many practical difficulties. I do not want to go into details in regard to these difficulties. Hon. Members who have studied this problem are aware of those practical difficulties. One must bear one important fact in mind, and in that connection it is I think worth the while to quote what a former Minister of Justice, Mr. S. P. C. Fernando, who is now in the salubrious climate of Cairo, said. This is what he said when he introduced the Language of the Courts Bill. I want to emphasize that particular extract from his speech because people seem to be in a kind of indecent haste to

willy-nilly implement the Act. However it may be done, whoever may be affected and whatever may be the consequences it leads to are questions that do not matter. I want to read two or three extracts from his speech. It is in Volume 16, column 237 of the Senate HANSARD. He says:

“There are fears outside that an order under Clause 2...”

That is where the Minister has the power to declare that a court should work in Sinhala—

“...to be made by the Minister in consultation with the Prime Minister, may be imposed in places where it may give offence, or cause embarrassment, or cause hardship to certain people. Allow me to say, Mr. President, on behalf of the Prime Minister of this Island, that nothing will at any stage be done by me or by her which will give cause for any kind of hardship, embarrassment or offence to anyone. Indeed, it boils down to this—that it should seem impracticable to any sensible person to impose the Sinhala language in the courts in any place or area where that language is not understood or where that language is not spoken by the larger majority of the people of that place.”

That is one extract.

I want to continue the extract because it is very interesting from the historical point of view. It shows the kind of mind the Hon. Minister of Justice had when he introduced this Bill. It is relevant because we must appreciate the difficulties we have got to contend with when we try to implement this Act.—

“Having said that much, will you permit me to say why an order under Clause 2 has got to be made. One way of dealing with the Official Language Act is by saying that Sinhala shall be the language of the courts. That would be a logical consequence of the Official Language Act. But it must be appreciated, not only by those to whom, as I said earlier, hardship would be caused but even by the Sinhalese-speaking people themselves that undue urgency in imposing the Sinhala language into the courts is bound to cause a great deal of hardship to those Sinhalese themselves who expect justice from the courts. In other words, to any right-thinking person it must seem quite plain that if we should suddenly say that from tomorrow in any court, in any of the

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

superior courts—if I may call them that—Sinhala should be the language, there is bound to be a denial of justice. People look to the courts for justice—not for the settlement of their language problems, not for urging their enthusiasm in regard to language. I suppose it is the attitude of any right-thinking person that the courts should be the last place, if I may respectfully say so, where we should have these language matters unnecessarily urged”—[OFFICIAL REPORT, SENATE, 5th January 1961 ; Vol. 16, c. 237.]

Then he continues and points out the difficulties. Perhaps it is better to read the extract rather than paraphrase it in my own language, because I think the Hon. Minister must have spent a good deal of time in formulating these phrases in order to make it not only logical but also sensible.

He reads out Clause 2, and then continues :

“That means that until the Minister, after consultation with the Prime Minister, makes an order in respect of any court, Sinhala will not be the language of the court. It is only when an order is made in respect of, say the Magistrate’s Court, Kalutara, or the Magistrate’s Court, Panadura, that Sinhala will be the language of those courts.

THE PRESIDENT : What happens in other courts ?

SENATOR THE HON. FERNANDO : You have posed a question, Mr. President, which it is almost dangerous to answer !

THE PRESIDENT : I am sorry, but I could not follow you and that is why I asked. Would they carry on in English ?

SENATOR THE HON. FERNANDO : That is what I said was implied in the Bill. That is what I said was not so much expressed as implied in the Bill. It is only after an order is made, at the point of time of the order being made under Clause 2, that Sinhala becomes the language of a particular court. Until then, by implication, of course, the present state of affairs, or rather the language or practice, would continue. It would be unwise to have an immediate switch-over. One has got to see whether there would be a denial of justice in any court by reason of deficiency of language, by reason of the absence of New Law Reports, and so on. In the absence of any decisions in respect of a matter in Ceylon we looked to decisions from South Africa and England. We have to ensure that our people can expect justice from our courts. It would be unwise to proceed until we have got some kind of re-statement or codification of our laws and have everything ready. It would

be most unwise—just because some enthusiast is of the opinion that it can be done today or that by next year we can get the judges and lawyers to know something of the language—to have an immediate switch-over.”—[OFFICIAL REPORT, SENATE, 5th January, 1961 ; Vol. 16, cc. 239-40.]

Therefore, he is highlighting the practical difficulties, and I think those are the real questions we have got to consider in implementing the official language in the courts. I am not, by implication, saying that we are going to sabotage the Language of the Courts Act. We shall certainly work this Act in the way in which it was intended when it was passed by this House as well as the Upper House. I know of the intense hostility with which it was received on the Floor of the House, particularly by my hon. Friends on the other side.

සභාපතිතුමා

(අக்கිරාඡනර්)

(The Chairman)

Can you finish before one o’clock ?

නයිනා මරිකාර් මහා.

(ஜனாப் நயினா மரிக்காரர்)

(Mr. Naina Marikar)

I can, if you want me to, but so many matters have been raised. Well, I will try to finish by one o’clock.

So, that is my answer. We are implementing the Language of the Courts Act. There are already a number of stenographers and typists who have, I believe, been specially trained for this purpose, and we are going into the whole question of implementing the Language of the Courts Act, subject, of course, to its being practicable and causes no hardship to the people. We cannot, as that Hon. Minister has said, order a particular court to work in Sinhala and expect the whole Judicial Service to work in that language, because we have got to face certain difficulties such as interpreters. Then you might find the members of the Judicial Service may themselves not know the language. So, what is the use of declaring Sinhala the language of the courts when in fact the people may not know the language ?

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[නයිනා මරිකාර් මයා.]

I think one or two hon. Members referred to Bills not being presented in Sinhala. My answer to that is that English is still the language of the courts. I have it on authority from a decision of the Supreme Court. In *Queen vs. Liyanage*, reported in 64 N. L. R., the whole question of the effect of the Official Language Act in relation to the language of the courts was argued at great length by very eminent counsel, and this is what the judges held—I will just read the decisive part of their order :

“Held, (i) that, even assuming that on or after 1st January 1961 official acts of officials could have been or can be performed only in the Sinhala language, as English is still admittedly the language of the Court, the communication by the Minister to the Court by documents made out in English of the direction and nomination of Judges by him was a sufficient compliance with the existing law and was not rendered null and void by the provisions of section 2 of the Official Language Act, read with the Language of the Courts Act, No. 3 of 1961.” [LXIV N.L.R. at page 314.]

The point raised there was that the nomination of judges was bad because it was in English. But they said it was good because the language of the court was English. I think that is the reason why we find it difficult to present Bills here in Sinhala because when amending an Act in English we do not know which portion is in Sinhala and which portion is in English. Until the whole question of this language is gone into and clarified in relation to legislation—legislation in relation to our courts—it would be extremely difficult.

සභාපතිතුමා

(අக்கිරාඡනර්)

(The Chairman)

Will you be able to finish before 1 P.M.

නයිනා මරිකාර් මයා.

(ඉනාඨ නයිනා මරිකාර්)

(Mr. Naina Marikar)

Can you give me 5 minutes more, Sir. I have a number of points to reply to.

සභාපතිතුමා

(අක්කිරාඡනර්)

(The Chairman)

Will the House agree to sit for a few minutes more?

රු මන්ත්‍රීවරු

(කෙනරාව අඬුකත්තිනර්කර්)

(Hon. Members)

Aye!

නයිනා මරිකාර් මයා.

(ඉනාඨ නයිනා මරිකාර්)

(Mr. Naina Marikar)

As far as the official language is concerned, the hon. fair Leader of the Opposition referred to certain matters which were wholly irrelevant to the question concerned. She said that there is contradiction in what the S.L.F.P. said and what the U.N.P. has said. I think we have said it over and over again, both on the Floor of this House as well as outside, and even in our manifesto, that as far as the language question is concerned we shall uphold the three Acts, that is, the Sinhala Only or Official Language Act, the Tamil Language (Special Provision) Act and the Language of the Courts Act.

I would refer to the Hon. J. R. Jayewardene's speech about old entrants and new entrants. I am sorry I do not have the time; otherwise I could read out the Cabinet conclusions of the late Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike as well as the present Cabinet conclusions to show that there is no substantial difference except that old entrants or new entrants are to be given three more years' extension of time to study the language. I do not think the hon. fair Leader of the Opposition got the whole matter right. She seems to have been emotionally worked up. As I said earlier, I do not have the time; otherwise I could show where she has erred both in facts as well as in the enunciation of our policy. My time is limited and I do not think it is necessary to go into all that. I can assure this House that

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

as far as our language policy is concerned—we have said it over and over again—we shall work within the framework of the existing legislation, and we shall implement it with due consideration to all other minority communities, the Tamil community and the Muslim community as well, and in the process of doing that we will see that no grave injustice is caused to anyone.

අ. ස. 1

I wish to refer to the speech of the Hon. Minister of State because I think the hon. Fair Leader of the Opposition was pointedly referring to him. He seems to be the bogey-man of the hon. fair Leader of the Opposition. I want to refer to one statement of the Hon. Minister of State—I refer to HANSARD of 18th August 1965, Volume 61, column 334 :

“THE HON. J. R. JAYEWARDENE :

A charge was made that it is the intention of the Government to make Tamil the language of administration in the Northern and Eastern Provinces. I am replying to that charge to say that we are not going beyond the law of the land today which the hon. Leader of the Opposition's husband placed in the Statute Book and which, he said, was the most courageous act he had done. What does she say now? Is she repudiating her husband's policies? Is she saying that we must repeal the Tamil Language (Special Provisions) Act?

MR. KEUNEMAN : No, who said that?

THE HON. J. R. JAYEWARDENE : She does not know what she is saying ; that is the difference.”—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 18th August 1965 ; Vol. 61, c. 334.]

The point here is that in the Tamil Language (Special Provisions) Act there is a section which says that for certain administrative purposes Tamil can be prescribed. Well, that is precisely what we are going to do. If the leaders of the Federal Party and others do make statements, those are statements which must be taken in their proper context. As far as we are concerned, I think we have made it categorically clear that we will follow strictly the three Acts

and we shall work within the framework of those Acts. We believe completely that that will lead to unification of the people; they may not have one language, one religion or one caste, but certainly it will promote amity and goodwill. Certainly we shall not have a clash like the Indian-Pakistani clash that we are witnessing today, and I think in course of time the people will be sensible and practical. I think there will be goodwill, and I am sure this language problem, which is no problem from our point of view, will be solved to the satisfaction of everybody.

I am sorry I cannot deal with all the matters that have been raised on the Floor of the House. I require more time if I am to deal with them all. If I have omitted to deal with any of the matters raised, it is not because I have considered them to be unimportant or because they did not deserve answers from me, but for sheer want of time to deal with all the points that have been raised. If the hon. Members who made those suggestions want them to be implemented or if they want those matters discussed, certainly they can see me and again discuss those matters with me personally, and I shall only be too happy to accommodate their views.

“105 වන ශීර්ෂයේ 1 වන සම්මතය සඳහා රු. 4,69,514 ක මුදල උප ලේඛනයට ඇතුළත් කළ යුතුය” යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදීත්, සහසම්මත විය.

105 වන ශීර්ෂයේ 1 වන සම්මතය උප ලේඛනයේ කොටසක් හැටියට නිතිය යුතුයයි නියෝග කරන ලදී.

“105 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பண ரூபா 4,69,514 அட்டவணையிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

105 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணையில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 469,514 for Head 105, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 105, Vote 1, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

விசேஷ கைப்பிழை பணம், 1965-66

—கூடுதல் பணம்

2 வன சமீபம்.—பாடுதல் மந்திரி—புறம்தொடர்வை
விசேஷம், ரூ. 28,200

106 வன சமீபம்.—நிதி புகழ்ச்சி மன்றம்
மந்திரி நிதி புகழ்ச்சி மன்றம்

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலனை செலவுகள்—
மீண்டுமும் செலவு, ரூ. 28,200

1 வன சமீபம்.—கூடுதல் மன்றம் புகழ்ச்சி
மந்திரி மந்திரி நிதி மந்திரி, ரூ. 14,241

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—
Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 28,200

தலைப்பு 106.—சட்டவாக்கங்கள் மீளவாய்த
லும் துணைச் சட்டங்களும்

“ 105 வன சமீபம் 2 வன சமீபம் மந்திரி
ரூ. 28,200 க் குடிசை புகழ்ச்சி மந்திரி
மந்திரி ” மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி, மந்திரி
மந்திரி.

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 1.—பணியாளர் ஆளுகூறு
மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி, ரூபா 14,241

HEAD 106.—REVISION OF LEGISLATIVE
ENACTMENTS AND SUBSIDIARY LEGISLATION

Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and
other allowances of staff, Rs. 14,241

105 வன சமீபம் 2 வன சமீபம் புகழ்ச்சி
மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி
மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி

“ 106 வன சமீபம் 1 வன சமீபம் மந்திரி
ரூ. 14,241 க் குடிசை புகழ்ச்சி மந்திரி
மந்திரி ” மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி, மந்திரி
மந்திரி.

106 வன சமீபம் 1 வன சமீபம் புகழ்ச்சி
மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி
மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி

“ 105 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா
28,200 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக ” எனும் வினா
விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

105 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணி
யில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “ That the sum of Rs. 28,200
for Head 105, Vote No. 2, be inserted in
the Schedule ”, put, and agreed to.

“ 106 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா
14,241 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக ” எனும்
வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

106 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணி
யில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Head 105, Vote 2, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

Question, “ That the sum of Rs. 14,241
for Head 106, Vote No. 1, be inserted in
the Schedule ”, put, and agreed to.

4 வன சமீபம்.—புகழ்ச்சி மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி
மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி

Head 106, Vote 1, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 4.—திணைக்களத்தால் அளிக்கப்
பும் சேவைகள், மீண்டுமும் செலவு ரூபா
50,000

2 வன சமீபம்.—பாடுதல் மந்திரி—புறம்தொடர்வை
விசேஷம், ரூ. 100

Vote No. 4.—Services provided by the
Department—Recurrent Expenditure,
Rs. 50,000.

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலனை செலவுகள்—
மீண்டுமும் செலவு ரூ. 100

“ 105 வன சமீபம் 4 வன சமீபம் மந்திரி
ரூ. 50,000 க் குடிசை புகழ்ச்சி மந்திரி
மந்திரி ” மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி, மந்திரி
மந்திரி.

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—
Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 100

“ 106 வன சமீபம் 2 வன சமீபம் மந்திரி
ரூ. 100 க் குடிசை புகழ்ச்சி மந்திரி
மந்திரி ” மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி, மந்திரி
மந்திரி.

105 வன சமீபம் 4 வன சமீபம் புகழ்ச்சி
மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி
மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி

106 வன சமீபம் 2 வன சமீபம் புகழ்ச்சி
மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி
மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி மந்திரி

“ 105 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 4 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா
50,000 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக ” எனும் வினா
விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

“ 106 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 100
அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக ” எனும் வினா
விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

105 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 4 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணி
யில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

106 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்ட
வணியில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “ That the sum of Rs. 50,000
for Head 105, Vote No. 4, be inserted in
the Schedule ”, put, and agreed to.

Question, “ That the sum of Rs. 100 for
Head 106, Vote No. 2, be inserted in the
Schedule ”, put, and agreed to.

Head 105, Vote 4, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

Head 105, Vote 4, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

பிசுப்தன கெடுபிசுப் பதன, 1965-66

—கூரக ஸகை

107 வன ஸிதீய.—ஃப்திநிஃ ஃபாதி

108 வன ஸிதீய.—பிந்வுஃபி ஃபாதி ஸகை
ஃகைஃப்திநிஃ ஃபாதி

1 வன ஸதீதகை.—கூபீய ஃகைஃபி ஃபாதிஃபி
ஃபிநிஃ ஸகை ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ, ரூ. 27,07,368

1 வன ஸதீதகை.—கூபீய ஃகைஃபி ஃபாதிஃபி
ஃபிநிஃ ஸகை ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ, ரூ. 22,05,834

தலைப்பு 107.—மாவுட்ட நீதிமன்றம்

தலைப்பு 108.—விண்ணப்ப நீதிமன்றங்களும்
நீதவான் நீதிமன்றங்களும்

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 1.—பணியாளின் ஆளுக்கூரிய
வேதனமும் பிறப்புகளும், ரூபா 27,07,368

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 1.—பணியாளின் ஆளுக்கூரிய
வேதனமும் பிறப்புகளும், ரூபா 22,05,834

HEAD 107.—DISTRICT COURTS

HEAD 108.—COURTS OF REQUESTS AND
MAGISTRATES' COURTS

Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and
other allowances of staff, Rs. 2,707,368

Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and
other allowances of staff, Rs. 2,205,834

“107 வன ஸிதீயேதி 1 வன ஸதீதகை ஸஃகை
ரூ. 27,07,368 க இஃபி ஃபாதிஃபிஃபி ஃபிநிஃ
ஃபிநிஃ” ஸகை ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ, ஸகைஃபிநிஃ
ஃபிநிஃ.

“108 வன ஸிதீயேதி 1 வன ஸதீதகை ஸஃகை
ரூ. 22,05,834 க இஃபி ஃபாதிஃபிஃபி ஃபிநிஃ
ஃபிநிஃ” ஸகை ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ, ஸகைஃபிநிஃ
ஃபிநிஃ.

107 வன ஸிதீயேதி 1 வன ஸதீதகை ஃபாதிஃபி
ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ
ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ.

108 வன ஸிதீயேதி 1 வன ஸதீதகை ஃபாதிஃபி
ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ
ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ.

“107 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பண ரூபா
27,07,368 அட்டவணையிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும்
வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

“108 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பண ரூபா
22,05,834 அட்டவணையிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும்
வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

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

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

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 2,707,368
for Head 107, Vote No. 1, be inserted in
the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 2,205,834
for Head 108, Vote No. 1, be inserted in
the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 107, Vote 1, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

Head 108, Vote 1, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

2 வன ஸதீதகை.—பாடுத ஸஃப்தி—புதர்வுப்திநிஃ
ஃபிநிஃ, ரூ. 2,61,050

2 வன ஸதீதகை.—பாடுத ஸஃப்தி—புதர்வுப்திநிஃ
ஃபிநிஃ, ரூ. 3,34,935

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலனச் செலவுகள்—
மீண்டு வரும் செலவு, ரூ. 2,61,050

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலனச் செலவுகள்—
மீண்டு வரும் செலவு, ரூ. 3,34,935

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—
Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 261,050

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—
Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 334,935

“107 வன ஸிதீயேதி 2 வன ஸதீதகை ஸஃகை
ரூ. 2,61,050 க இஃபி ஃபாதிஃபிஃபி ஃபிநிஃ
ஃபிநிஃ” ஸகை ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ, ஸகைஃபிநிஃ
ஃபிநிஃ.

“108 வன ஸிதீயேதி 2 வன ஸதீதகை ஸஃகை
ரூ. 3,34,935 க இஃபி ஃபாதிஃபிஃபி ஃபிநிஃ
ஃபிநிஃ” ஸகை ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ, ஸகைஃபிநிஃ
ஃபிநிஃ.

107 வன ஸிதீயேதி 2 வன ஸதீதகை ஃபாதிஃபி
ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ
ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ.

108 வன ஸிதீயேதி 2 வன ஸதீதகை ஃபாதிஃபி
ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ
ஃபிநிஃ ஃபிநிஃ.

“107 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பண ரூபா
2,61,050 அட்டவணையிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும்
வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

“108 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பண ரூபா
3,34,935 அட்டவணையிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும்
வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

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

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

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 261,050
for Head 107, Vote No. 2, be inserted in
the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 334,935
for Head 108, Vote No. 2, be inserted in
the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 107, Vote 2, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

Head 108, Vote 2, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

விவரணை கையெழுத்துப் பதிவு, 1965-66

—கூடுதல் பணம்

109 வன அமைச்சு.—பின்புலப் பணியை மேற்கொடுக்க

110 வன அமைச்சு.—பின்புலப் பணியை மேற்கொடுக்க

1 வன அமைச்சு.—கூடுதல் மன்றம் பணியை மேற்கொடுக்க

1 வன அமைச்சு.—கூடுதல் மன்றம் பணியை மேற்கொடுக்க

தலைப்பு 109.—பின்புலப் பணியை மேற்கொடுக்க

தலைப்பு 110.—இணக்கச் சபைகள்

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 1.—பணியாளரின் ஆளுக்கூலிய வேதனையும் பிற படிக்களும், ரூபா 15,62,637

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 1.—பணியாளரின் ஆளுக்கூலிய வேதனையும் பிற படிக்களும், ரூபா 1,37,967

HEAD 109.—FISCAL'S DEPARTMENT

HEAD 110.—CONCILIATION BOARDS

Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and other allowances of staff, Rs. 1,562,637

Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and other allowances of staff, Rs. 137,967

“109 வன அமைச்சு 1 வன அமைச்சு பணியை மேற்கொடுக்க” என பின்புலப் பணியை மேற்கொடுக்க

“110 வன அமைச்சு 1 வன அமைச்சு பணியை மேற்கொடுக்க” என பின்புலப் பணியை மேற்கொடுக்க

109 வன அமைச்சு 1 வன அமைச்சு பணியை மேற்கொடுக்க

110 வன அமைச்சு 1 வன அமைச்சு பணியை மேற்கொடுக்க

“109 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 15,62,637 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமா” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

“110 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 1,37,967 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமா” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

109 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணியில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

110 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணியில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 1,562,637 for Head 109, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 137,967 for Head 110, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 109, Vote 1, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Head 110, Vote 1, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

2 வன அமைச்சு.—பாதுகாப்பு—புனல்வெட்டி

2 வன அமைச்சு.—பாதுகாப்பு—புனல்வெட்டி

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலனச் செலவுகள்—மீண்டுமும் செலவு, ரூ. 8,02,005

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலனச் செலவுகள்—மீண்டுமும் செலவு, ரூ. 6,500

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 802,005

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 6,500

“109 வன அமைச்சு 2 வன அமைச்சு பணியை மேற்கொடுக்க” என பின்புலப் பணியை மேற்கொடுக்க

“110 வன அமைச்சு 2 வன அமைச்சு பணியை மேற்கொடுக்க” என பின்புலப் பணியை மேற்கொடுக்க

109 வன அமைச்சு 2 வன அமைச்சு பணியை மேற்கொடுக்க

110 வன அமைச்சு 2 வன அமைச்சு பணியை மேற்கொடுக்க

“109 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 8,02,005 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமா” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

“110 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 6,500 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமா” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

109 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணியில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

110 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணியில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 802,005 for Head 109, Vote No. 2, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 6,500 for Head 110, Vote No. 2, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 109, Vote 2, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Head 110, Vote 2, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

விசேஷ கௌன்சில் பண, 1965-66

—காரக சபை

111 வன சீதீய.—ஊடுவெர்னி சநரூல்

112 வன சீதீய.—நீநி கௌன்சில் கர்

1 வன சமீதனய.—கூர்ய ஊர்வல ஸெர்வென்சு சமீ
நமீ சப டிநிசுந் டீவன, ரூ. 10,29,120

1 வன சமீதனய.—கூர்ய ஊர்வல ஸெர்வென்சு சமீ
நமீ சப டிநிசுந் டீவன, ரூ. 3,99,243

தலைப்பு 111.—சட்டத்துறைத் தலைமை
அதிபதி

தலைப்பு 112.—சட்டத் தயாரிப்பாளர்

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 1.—பணியாளரின் ஆளுக்கூரிய
வேதனமும் பிறபடிசனும், ரூபா 10,29,120

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 1.—பணியாளரின் ஆளுக்கூரிய
வேதனமும் பிறபடிசனும், ரூபா 3,99,243

HEAD 111.—ATTORNEY-GENERAL

HEAD 112.—LEGAL DRAFTSMAN

Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and
other allowances of staff, Rs. 1,029,120

Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and
other allowances of staff, Rs. 399,243

“111 வன சீதீயெகி 1 வன சமீதனய சடூய
ரூ. 10,29,120஑ இடல ஸெர்வென்செ டிநிசுந் கல
சூய” ஑ந ஸூநய விவசந லீடீந், சபாசமீதெ
வீய.

“112 வன சீதீயெகி 1 வன சமீதனய சடூய
ரூ. 3,99,243஑ இடல ஸெர்வென்செ டிநிசுந் கல
சூய” ஑ந ஸூநய விவசந லீடீந், சபாசமீதெ
வீய.

111 வன சீதீயெகி 1 வன சமீதனய ஸெர்வென்செ
யெகி கௌன்சில் ஑டுவென்செ விவீய சூயயெகி நியென்செ
கர்ந லீடீ.

112 வன சீதீயெகி 1 வன சமீதனய ஸெர்வென்செ
யெகி கௌன்சில் ஑டுவென்செ விவீய சூயயெகி நியென்செ
கர்ந லீடீ.

“111 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா
10,29,120 அட்டவணையிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும்
வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

“112 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா
3,99,243 அட்டவணையிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும்
வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

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

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

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 1,029,120
for Head 111, Vote No. 1, be inserted in
the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 399,243
for Head 112, Vote No. 1, be inserted in
the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 111, Vote 1, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

Head 112, Vote 1, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

2 வன சமீதனய.—சாடுத ஸர்வீசு—சூநர்வெர்நி
வீயடீ, ரூ. 3,78,200

2 வன சமீதனய.—சாடுத ஸர்வீசு—சூநர்வெர்நி
வீயடீ, ரூ. 5,500.

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலனச் செலவுகள்—
மீண்டுவரும் செலவு, ரூ. 3,78,200

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலனச் செலவுகள்—
மீண்டுவரும் செலவு, ரூ. 5,500

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—
Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 378,200

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—
Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 5,500

“111 வன சீதீயெகி 2 வன சமீதனய சடூய
ரூ. 3,78,200஑ இடல ஸெர்வென்செ டிநிசுந் கல
சூய” ஑ந ஸூநய விவசந லீடீந், சபாசமீதெ
வீய.

“112 வன சீதீயெகி 2 வன சமீதனய சடூய
ரூ. 5,500 ஑ இடல ஸெர்வென்செ டிநிசுந் கல
சூய” ஑ந ஸூநய விவசந லீடீந், சபாசமீதெ
வீய.

111 வன சீதீயெகி 2 வன சமீதனய ஸெர்வென்செ
யெகி கௌன்சில் ஑டுவென்செ விவீய சூயயெகி நியென்செ
கர்ந லீடீ.

112 வன சீதீயெகி 2 வன சமீதனய ஸெர்வென்செ
யெகி கௌன்சில் ஑டுவென்செ விவீய சூயயெகி நியென்செ
கர்ந லீடீ.

“111 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா
3,78,200 அட்டவணையிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும்
வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

“112 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா
5,500 அட்டவணையிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும்
வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

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

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

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 378,200
for Head 111, Vote No. 2, be inserted in
the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 5,500
for Head 112, Vote No. 2, be inserted in
the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 111, Vote 2, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

Head 112, Vote 2, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

விசேஷ கெடுதல்த் பதன, 1965-66

—காரக ஸதாவ

113 வன சிதீய.—மதீநெ டுஸாதி

1 வன ஸதீமதய.—கார்டீய மன்த்ரீய லேடீயலீக பதீநதீ ஸத ஁நீகந்த் டீமத, ரூ. 12,85,816.

தலைப்பு 113.—கிராம நீதீமந்றங்கல்

வாக்ருப்பணம் இல. 1.—பணியாளீன் ஆளுக்ருரிய வேதனமும் பிறபடிகளும், ரூபா 12,85,816

HEAD 113.—RURAL COURTS

Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and other allowances of staff, Rs. 1,285,816

“113 வன சிதீயேகீ 1 வன ஸதீமதய ஸடீயா ரூ. 12,85,816 க இடல டுப லேநதயல ஁நீகந்த் கடு ஸ்துய” ஁ந ப்ரீதய விமஸந லடீந், ஸதாஸதீமத தீய.

113 வன சிதீயேகீ 1 வன ஸதீமதய டுப லேநத யேகீ மன்த்ரீய ஁நீகந்த் ஁நீகந்த் தீநீய ஸ்துயயதீ தீயேந் ஁நீகந்த் லடீ.

“113 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்ருப்பணம் ரூபா 12,85,816 அட்டவணையிற் றேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

113 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்ருப்பணம் அட்டவணையில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 1,285,816 for Head 113, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 113, Vote 1, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

2 வன ஸதீமதய.—பாடந ஁ஸ்து—புநடவீதந தீயடதீ, ரூ. 1,73,787.

வாக்ருப்பணம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலனத் றேலவுகள்—மீண்லேரும றேலவு, ரூ. 1,73,787

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 173,787

113 வன சிதீயேகீ 2 வன ஸதீமதய ஸடீயா ரூ. 1,73,787 க இடல டுப லேநதயல ஁நீகந்த் கடு ஸ்துய” ஁ந ப்ரீதய விமஸந லடீந், ஸதாஸதீமத தீய.

113 வன சிதீயேகீ 2 வன ஸதீமதய டுப லேநத யேகீ மன்த்ரீய ஁நீகந்த் ஁நீகந்த் தீநீய ஸ்துயயதீ தீயேந் ஁நீகந்த் லடீ.

“113 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்ருப்பணம் ரூபா 1,73,787 அட்டவணையிற் றேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

113 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்ருப்பணம் அட்டவணையில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 173,787 for Head 113, Vote No. 2, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 113, Vote 2, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

114 வன சிதீய.—தீய லேதீதே மன்த்ரீய

1 வன ஸதீமதய.—கார்டீய மன்த்ரீய லேடீயலீக பதீநதீ ஸத ஁நீகந்த் டீமத, ரூ. 89,339.

தலைப்பு 114.—கடன் இணக்கத் றபை

வாக்ருப்பணம் இல. 1.—பணியாளீன் ஆளுக்ருரிய வேதனமும் பிறபடிகளும், ரூபா 89,339

HEAD 114.—DEBT CONCILIATION BOARD

Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and other allowances of staff, Rs. 89,339

“114 வன சிதீயேகீ 1 வன ஸதீமதய ஸடீயா ரூ. 89,339 க இடல டுப லேநதயல ஁நீகந்த் கடு ஸ்துய” ஁ந ப்ரீதய விமஸந லடீந், ஸதாஸதீமத தீய.

114 வன சிதீயேகீ 1 வன ஸதீமதய டுப லேநத யேகீ மன்த்ரீய ஁நீகந்த் ஁நீகந்த் தீநீய ஸ்துயயதீ தீயேந் ஁நீகந்த் லடீ.

“114 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்ருப்பணம் ரூபா 89,339 அட்டவணையிற் றேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

114 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்ருப்பணம் அட்டவணையில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 89,339 for Head 114, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 114, Vote 1, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

2 வன ஸதீமதய.—பாடந ஁ஸ்து—புநடவீதந தீயடதீ, ரூ. 12,826.

வாக்ருப்பணம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலனத் றேலவுகள்—மீண்லேரும றேலவு, ரூ. 12,826

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 12,826

“114 வன சிதீயேகீ 2 வன ஸதீமதய ஸடீயா ரூ. 12,826 க இடல டுப லேநதயல ஁நீகந்த் கடு ஸ்துய” ஁ந ப்ரீதய விமஸந லடீந், ஸதாஸதீமத தீய.

114 வன சிதீயேகீ 2 வன ஸதீமதய டுப லேநத யேகீ மன்த்ரீய ஁நீகந்த் ஁நீகந்த் தீநீய ஸ்துயயதீ தீயேந் ஁நீகந்த் லடீ.

“114 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்ருப்பணம் ரூபா 12,826 அட்டவணையிற் றேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

114 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்ருப்பணம் அட்டவணையில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 12,826 for Head 114, Vote No. 2, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 114, Vote 2, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

விசரீசன கெடுமீபந் பனந, 1965-66

—காரக ஸஸாவ

117 வந ஸீதீய.—ஸுரீயஸாமிகரணஸுரீ ருசீஸீடுரீ

118 வந ஸீதீய.—வந் வநாஸார டுடபரீத மூன்துவ

1 வந ஸமீமநய.—காரீய மனீவரெய ஸுரீடுரீக பவீநவீ ஸந னநிகுந் டீமந, ரு. 9,11,140

1 வந ஸமீமநய.—காரீய மனீவரெய ஸுரீடுரீக பவீநவீ ஸந னநிகுந் டீமந, ரு. 59,90,650

தலைப்பு 117.—உயர் நீதிமன்றப் பதிவாளர்

தலைப்பு 118.—சிறைச்சாலைத் திணைக்களம்

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 1.—பணியாளரின் ஆளுக்குரிய வேதனமும் பிறப்புகளும், ரூபா 9,11,140

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 1.—பணியாளரின் ஆளுக்குரிய வேதனமும் பிறப்புகளும், ரூபா 59,90,650

HEAD 117.—REGISTRAR OF THE SUPREME COURT

HEAD 118.—DEPARTMENT OF PRISONS

Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and other allowances of staff, Rs. 911,140

Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and other allowances of staff, Rs. 5,990,650

“117 வந ஸீதீயெகி 1 வந ஸமீமநய ஸடயா ரு. 9,11,140 க மூடல ருபலேவநயெடு னுதுலந் கடு ஸுதுய” ஸந ப்ரஸீநய விமஸந லுடீந், ஸஸாஸமீமந வீய.

“118 வந ஸீதீயெகி 1 வந ஸமீமநய ஸடயா ரு. 59,90,650 க மூடல ருபலேவநயெடு னுதுலந் கடு ஸுதுய” ஸந ப்ரஸீநய விமஸந லுடீந், ஸஸாஸமீமந வீய.

117 வந ஸீதீயெகி 1 வந ஸமீமநய ருபலேவநயெகி கைவஸந் ஸுடுயெடு திநிஸ ஸுது ஸமி தியேஸீள கரந லுடீ.

118 வந ஸீதீயெகி 1 வந ஸமீமநய ருபலேவநயெகி கைவஸந் ஸுடுயெடு திநிஸ ஸுது ஸமி தியேஸீள கரந லுடீ.

“117 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 9,11,140 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

“118 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 59,90,650 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

117 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணியில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

118 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணியில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 911,140 for Head 117, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 5,990,650 for Head 118, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 117, Vote 1, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Head 118, Vote 1, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

2 வந ஸமீமநய.—பாலந ஸஸீது—புநரூவரீதந விஸடூ, ரு. 3,44,804

2 வந ஸமீமநய.—பாலந ஸஸீது—புநரூவரீதந விஸடூ, ரு. 37,04,280

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலனச் செலவுகள்—மீண்டுவரும் செலவு ரூ. 3,44,804

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலனச் செலவுகள்—மீண்டுவரும் செலவு ரூ. 37,04,280

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 344,804

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 3,704,280

“117 வந ஸீதீயெகி 2 வந ஸமீமநய ஸடயா ரு. 3,44,804 க மூடல ருபலேவநயெடு னுதுலந் கடு ஸுதுய” ஸந ப்ரஸீநய விமஸந லுடீந், ஸஸாஸமீமந வீய.

“118 வந ஸீதீயெகி 2 வந ஸமீமநய ஸடயா ரு. 37,04,280 க மூடல ருபலேவநயெடு னுதுலந் கடு ஸுதுய” ஸந ப்ரஸீநய விமஸந லுடீந், ஸஸாஸமீமந வீய.

117 வந ஸீதீயெகி 2 வந ஸமீமநய ருபலேவநயெகி கைவஸந் ஸுடுயெடு திநிஸ ஸுது ஸமி தியேஸீள கரந லுடீ.

118 வந ஸீதீயெகி 2 வந ஸமீமநய ருபலேவநயெகி கைவஸந் ஸுடுயெடு திநிஸ ஸுது ஸமி தியேஸீள கரந லுடீ.

“117 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 3,44,804 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

“118 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 37,04,280 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

117 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணியில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

118 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணியில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 344,804 for Head 117, Vote No. 2, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 3,704,280 for Head 118, Vote No. 2, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 117, Vote 2, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Head 118, Vote 2, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

விசேஷக் கெடுதல்கள் பற்றி, 1965-66

—காரணம் கலா

3 வது தலைப்பு.—பாடல் கலா—புலகல் விசேஷக், ரூ. 15,000

119 வது தலைப்பு.—காரணம் கலா—புலகல் விசேஷக், ரூ. 4,73,579

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

1 வது தலைப்பு.—காரணம் கலா—புலகல் விசேஷக், ரூ. 4,73,579

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

தலைப்பு 119.—அரசாங்க இராசாயனப் பகுப்பாளர்

“ 118 வது தலைப்பு 3 வது தலைப்பு விசேஷக் ரூ. 15,000 க் குடல் குடல் விசேஷக் குடல் குடல் ” க் குடல் குடல் விசேஷக் குடல் குடல் ” க் குடல் குடல் விசேஷக் குடல் குடல் ”

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 1.—பணியாளரின் ஆளுக்கரிய வேதனமும் பிறப்புகளும், ரூபா 4,73,579

HEAD 119.—GOVERNMENT ANALYST

Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and other allowances of staff, Rs. 473,579

118 வது தலைப்பு 3 வது தலைப்பு விசேஷக் குடல் குடல் விசேஷக் குடல் குடல் ” க் குடல் குடல் விசேஷக் குடல் குடல் ”

“ 119 வது தலைப்பு 1 வது தலைப்பு விசேஷக் ரூ. 4,73,579 க் குடல் குடல் விசேஷக் குடல் குடல் ” க் குடல் குடல் விசேஷக் குடல் குடல் ”

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

119 வது தலைப்பு 1 வது தலைப்பு விசேஷக் குடல் குடல் விசேஷக் குடல் குடல் ” க் குடல் குடல் விசேஷக் குடல் குடல் ”

118 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 3 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணியில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

“ 119 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 4,73,579 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக ” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

Question, “ That the sum of Rs. 15,000 for Head 118, Vote No. 3, be inserted in the Schedule ”, put, and agreed to.

119 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணியில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Head 118, Vote 3, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Question, “ That the sum of Rs. 473,579 for Head 119, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule ”, put, and agreed to.

4 வது தலைப்பு.—புலகல் விசேஷக், ரூ. 68,000

Head 119, Vote 1 ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 4.—திணைக்களத்தால் அளிக்கப்படும் சேவைகள்—மீண்டுமருள் செலவு, ரூபா 68,000

2 வது தலைப்பு.—பாடல் கலா—புலகல் விசேஷக், ரூ. 71,650

Vote No. 4.—Services provided by the Department—Recurrent Expenditure, Rs. 68,000.

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலனச் செலவுகள்—மீண்டுமருள் செலவு, ரூ. 71,650

“ 118 வது தலைப்பு 4 வது தலைப்பு விசேஷக் ரூ. 68,000 க் குடல் குடல் விசேஷக் குடல் குடல் ” க் குடல் குடல் விசேஷக் குடல் குடல் ”

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 71,650

118 வது தலைப்பு 4 வது தலைப்பு விசேஷக் குடல் குடல் விசேஷக் குடல் குடல் ” க் குடல் குடல் விசேஷக் குடல் குடல் ”

“ 119 வது தலைப்பு 2 வது தலைப்பு விசேஷக் ரூ. 71,650 க் குடல் குடல் விசேஷக் குடல் குடல் ” க் குடல் குடல் விசேஷக் குடல் குடல் ”

“ 118 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 4 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 68,000 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக ” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

119 வது தலைப்பு 2 வது தலைப்பு விசேஷக் குடல் குடல் விசேஷக் குடல் குடல் ” க் குடல் குடல் விசேஷக் குடல் குடல் ”

118 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 4 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணியில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

“ 119 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 71,650 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக ” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

Question, “ That the sum of Rs. 68,000 for Head 118, Vote No. 4, be inserted in the Schedule ”, put, and agreed to.

119 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணியில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Head 118, Vote 4, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Question, “ That the sum of Rs. 71,650 for Head 119, Vote No. 2, be inserted in the Schedule ”, put, and agreed to.

Head 119, Vote 2, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

3 වන සම්මතය.—පාලන ගාස්තු—මූලික විද්‍යාව,
රු. 27,000

2 වන සම්මතය.—පාලන ගාස්තු—සුනරුවර්තන
විද්‍යාව, රු. 29,450

වාக்குප්පණம் இல. 3.—பரிபாலனச் செலவுகள்—
ஆக்கப்பொருட் செலவு, ரூபா 27,000

වාக்குප්පණம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலனச் செலவுகள்—
மீண்டுவரும் செலவு, ரூ. 29,450

Vote No. 3.—Administration Charges—
Capital Expenditure, Rs. 27,000

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—
Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 29,450

“ 119 වන ශීර්ෂයෙහි 3 වන සම්මතය සඳහා
රු. 27,000 ක මුදල උප ලේඛනයට ඇතුළත්
කළ යුතුය ” යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදීත්, සහසම්මත
විය.

“ 120 වන ශීර්ෂයෙහි 2 වන සම්මතය සඳහා
රු. 29,450 ක මුදල උප ලේඛනයට ඇතුළත් කළ
යුතුය ” යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදීත්, සහසම්මත
විය.

119 වන ශීර්ෂයෙහි 3 වන සම්මතය උප ලේඛන
යෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට නිව්ය යුතු යයි නියෝග
කරන ලදී.

120 වන ශීර්ෂයෙහි 2 වන සම්මතය උප ලේඛන
යෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට නිව්ය යුතු යයි නියෝග
කරන ලදී.

“ 119 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 3 ஆம் வாக்குப்பண ரூபா
27,000 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக ” எனும்
வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

“ 120 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா
29,450 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக ” எனும்
வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

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

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

Question, “ That the sum of Rs. 27,000
for Head 119, Vote No. 3, be inserted in
the Schedule ”, put, and agreed to.

Question, “ That the sum of Rs. 29,450
for Head 120, Vote No. 2, be inserted in
the Schedule ”, put, and agreed to.

Head 119, Vote 3, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

Head 120, Vote 2, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

120 වැනි ශීර්ෂය—මහාභාරකාර

සභාපතිතුමා

1 වන සම්මතය.—කාර්ය මණ්ඩල පෞද්ගලික
පඩිනම් සහ අනිකුත් දීමනා, රු. 2,57,746

(அக்கிராசனர்)

தலைப்பு 120.—பொது நம்பிக்கைப்
பொறுப்பாளர்

(The Chairman)

වාக்குප්පණம் இல. 1.—பணியாளரின் ஆளுக்கூரிய
வேதனமும் பிறப்புகளும், ரூபா 2,57,746

We shall next take up Head 125—
Minister of Local Government. The
hon. Member for Colombo South
(Mr. Bernard Soysa) will start at
2 P.M.

HEAD 120.—PUBLIC TRUSTEE

Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and
other allowances of staff, Rs. 257,746

The Sitting is suspended till 2 P.M.
On resumption, the Deputy Chairman
of Committees will take the chair.

“ 120 වන ශීර්ෂයෙහි 1 වන සම්මතය සඳහා
රු. 2,57,746 ක මුදල උප ලේඛනයට ඇතුළත්
කළ යුතුය ” යන ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදීත්, සහසම්මත
විය.

රැස්වීම ඊට අනුකූලව නාවකාලිකව අත්සිටුවන
ලදීත් අ.හ. 2 ට කාරක සභා නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපති
තුන්පත් ටී. ක්වෙන්ටින් ප්‍රනාන්දු මහතාගේ
සහාපතිත්වයෙන් නැවත පවත්වන ලදී.

120 වන ශීර්ෂයෙහි 1 වන සම්මතය උප ලේඛන
යෙහි කොටසක් හැටියට නිව්ය යුතු යයි නියෝග
කරන ලදී.

இதன்படி அமர்வு பி.ப. 2 மணிவரை இடைநிறுத்தப்
பட்டு, மீண்டும் ஆரம்பமாயிற்று. குழுக்களின் உப அக்கிராசனர் [திரு. டி. குவினரன் பெர்னாண்டோ] தலைமை தாங்கினார்.

“ 120 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா
2,57,746 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக ” எனும்
வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

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

Question, “ That the sum of Rs. 257,746
for Head 120, Vote No. 1, be inserted in
the Schedule ”, put, and agreed to.

Sitting accordingly suspended till 2 P.M.
and then resumed, MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN
OF COMMITTEES [MR. T. QUENTIN
FERNANDO], in the Chair.

Head 120, Vote 1, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

விசேஷ கைடுமென் பண, 1965-66

—காரக கலாவ

125 வன கீதீய.—பலூன் பாலன ஐமண
வரலா

1 வன கமெல.—கூரீய மலர்மல பாலீயலீ

பலீயலீ கல ஐதீயூன் தீமல, ரூ. 2,24,166

1 வன ரூப கீதீய.—கேவல கலக கல

வலுலீ, ரூ. 1,45,298

தலீயு 125.—உள்ளூரூரூடீ அமலசீசர்

வாக்ரூபணம் இல. 1.—பலீயாலரீயின் கலககரூரீய

வேதனமும் பிற பலீகலும், ரூபா 2,24,166

உபதலீயு 1.—கூரீயரூ கோபுயம் சம்பளங்கலும்,

ரூ. 1,45,298

HEAD 125.—MINISTER OF LOCAL
GOVERNMENT

Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and
other allowances of staff, Rs. 224,166

Sub-head 1.—Cadre and Salaries,
Rs. 145,298

லீதீயூலீ கலககல மல. (தீயூனூ கலககல)

(தீயூ. பலர்லூட் சலயலூ—கலககலபுத

தலகரூ அங்கதீயவர்)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa—Colombo South)

I move,

“That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 10
in respect of sub-head 1, item ‘Minister’”.

Mr. Chairman, the discussion of the
Votes of the Ministry of Local Gov-
ernment requires that we should
state first of all that while there were
a large number of good intentions
in regard to local government reform,
for a large number of years nothing
really got implemented because the
question of local government changed
and got tied up with the question of
language. Any solution of the pro-
blem in regard to language policy
was tied up with any proposal for a
serious change in local government.

Certain changes were made on the
basis of the Choksy Commission re-
commendations with regard to the
enhancement of the powers of vil-
lage councils, larger allocation of
funds and better sources of revenue
for village councils and the like.
There were a number of changes in-
troduced by an earlier Minister of
Local Government who is no longer
with us. I do not want to overstep
the bounds of fairness in discussing
a person who is not here. I am re-
ferring to Mr. Mahanama Samara-
weera whose changes in regard to
local government, where they were

good, were not sufficiently far-
reaching. On the other hand, where
they were bad, they were certainly
very, very reprehensible. He made
certain changes which we had occa-
sion to condemn on the Floor of this
House. The re-allocation of wards
in the city of Colombo just prior to
the election of 1962 was one matter.
I think hon. Members on that side
with whom he finds himself in
political alliance today joined us in
condemning it on that occasion.

The first place I have to make is
that this whole question of local gov-
ernment has to be reviewed. I am
not entirely in agreement with all
the recommendations contained in
the Choksy Report. In some matters
the Choksy commissioners were very
conservative.

Sir, while we are entirely in agree-
ment with the position that local
autonomy has to be increased, that
more power has to be given to the
local authorities and that some effort
has to be made, if there is to be a
plan of development, to gear the local
authorities to that plan, we have to
state categorically that we do not
envisage the grant of local autonomy
on the lines of a federal constitution.
We cannot accept that position. I do
not know whether any such demand
is being made today or not, but I
know for a fact that the question of
the implementation of the regional
councils idea suffered ship-wreck on
the question of the extent of the de-
volution of power from the Central
Government to the local government
authorities constituted as regional
councils.

In this matter I want to point out
to the hon. Parliamentary Secretary
that a Bill to implement the district
councils idea which was a modified
form of the extended local govern-
ment reform as thought of by the last
Government was ready at the time
the last Government went out of
office. It had been ready for some
time. It was resuscitated by the hon.
Parliamentary Secretary's predeces-
sor Mrs. Vivienne Goonewardene who
was the Member for Borella, and she
was anxious to get it implemented

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[බර්තාඩ් සොයිසා මය.]

at the time the Government went out of office. All the controversial matters were dealt with in a comprehensive report which accompanied that Bill, and I believe that various demands that were made in regard to the changes necessary in the structure of these new local authorities that were to be created had been more or less satisfied. I want to ask the hon. Parliamentary Secretary whether it is the intention of this Government to carry through those proposals or not, and if so how soon they expect to be able to bring them in legislative form here before this honourable House.

The question of local government reform is also tied up with the demand of the Colombo Municipal Council for a change of status. I was one of those who along with the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central (Mr. Keuneman) went before the Choksy Commission and asked for enhanced powers for the Colombo Municipality. We were certainly in favour of a reconstitution of a Greater Colombo Region on the lines of the London County Council which would allow within the region so envisaged further smaller local authorities which would function under the larger council.

Since then, of course, the idea has undergone considerable change. Dehiwala-Mt. Lavinia which would have formed part of the Greater Colombo area has been given municipal council status, and to what extent it would be possible to go into reverse gear in regard to this matter is a little doubtful. The area covered by any such Colombo local authority would now have to be confined to the Colombo Municipal Council area, the Kotte Urban Council area, the Kolonnawa Urban Council area and the Ambatalenpahala Village Council area, and perhaps Wattala and Peliyagoda.

That is not a very satisfactory arrangement. But while the Ministry would be giving its mind to that problem a demand has been

made, as the hon. Parliamentary Secretary is aware, by the Colombo Municipal Council that its status be raised to that of a corporation on the lines more or less of the corporations in India—the corporations of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary is aware in two ways—as Parliamentary Secretary for Local Government and also as a member of the Colombo Municipal Council—of the correspondence which one wing which he represents, the Ministry, has had with the other wing which he represents, the Colombo Municipal Council. I do not know whether the hon. Parliamentary Secretary wrote to himself in the matter but the fact remains that what he represents in one capacity is in communication with what he represents in another capacity, indicating that the demands made by one side of course could not be granted in that way! I am aware of the fact that the Ministry's position on this matter of the demand for the status of a corporation is that all powers can be given save two. One is that the employees of the corporation must continue to be the employees of the Local Government Service Commission. The second stipulation is that, whatever the status the corporation may have in regard to enhancement of powers, responsibility, revenue and duties, the Minister must have the power to dissolve the corporation at will in the same way in which he has the power to suspend or dissolve local authorities ranging from village councils right up to municipal councils. The matter of dissolution of the councils is purely a subjective matter on the part of the Hon. Minister; he is not called upon to satisfy anybody else, but he has to be satisfied, and that satisfaction is purely a subjective matter. If he is satisfied he can dissolve a council. That is a matter on which we made representations to the Choksy Commission because we felt that whatever the powers the Minister may have in regard to the minor local authorities, village

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

councils and the like, it would be impermissible and improper for a Minister to exercise that kind of power over a body of the status of the Colombo Municipal Council. If you are going to raise the level of that council to that of a corporation on the lines of the Bombay, Calcutta and Madras corporations then, Sir, it is still less seemly for the Minister to be able to dissolve a council at will.

අ. ආ. 2.15

I have known various places where local governing institutions within the British Commonwealth have tended to follow the same pattern; the evolution of local government institutions has tended to follow the same pattern where, under the kind of law that obtained in countries of a colonial status, the government of the day took upon itself, while allowing the local authorities to function, the power to dissolve at will. I have seen in other countries within the Commonwealth, that this kind of power carried over from colonial times continued to be vested in the Minister whereas you do not find any such counterpart in Great Britain itself. There is no such counterpart or any such power like that; not in the same way. But where the colonies were concerned, when Britain allowed local institutions to develop, they reserved for the central government this overriding power of dissolution, and though the constitutions of these countries have now changed and much greater autonomy is given—a greater degree of autonomy is conceded to these countries, political independence in some cases—that power which the colonial authority kept for itself has now been vested in the central government, which has come to replace it.

Now, Sir, that is an aspect to which it is necessary to give one's attention in any change in the structure of local government in this country. I do not think that the central government should be robbed of its power; in certain situations of emergency, where certain functions of local authorities are not

properly attended, the central government should have the power to interfere. I am not denying it that right, but it should not have the right or power of dissolving an elected body at will.

We have had the unhappy experience several times before where local bodies were suspended, suspended for years and years. For instance, Anuradhapura had no local authority for a large number of years; they dissolved the Anuradhapura Urban Council somewhere just before the last war, and it had not been restored. I do not think it is restored yet; we have the Preservation Board, but there is no local authority restored. Now, that is an unhappy situation.

කෙනමන් මයා.

(තිரு. කෙනමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Everything restored except democracy.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(තිரு. බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

Now, I want to say that where the Minister reserves to himself the right to dissolve a council like that, an elected body, there should be some procedure, at least, laid down by which he is bound. But let it be not purely a matter of subjective satisfaction on the part of the Minister, to act as an autocrat, to be given absolute power in that way. There should be a limitation of powers, at least; you can limit that power in so many ways. It can come in the form of a body which goes into the question of the pros and cons of the case that is being made against that council, where the matter is heard and properly adjudicated upon. You can have an appellate board to which a council that is aggrieved in regard to a decision of such a body can appeal. You can have at the same time powers given to the Minister to deal with an emergency. Supposing it is brought to the notice of the Minister that in the larger interests

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මහා.]

of the community it is necessary to take away, say, the scavenging functions from a particular local authority because that function is not being adequately performed, he should have the right to intervene. For instance, where the health services are not properly manned, the Minister should have the right to intervene.

Now, in that kind of matter, first the council should be given an opportunity to correct itself if there is anything wrong; and then there should be an opportunity for the Minister to step in and handle that function for a time and then get away. But, where the power of dissolution, of a complete dissolution of a council is concerned, I say that there should be a limitation upon the Minister who has to exercise that power. The limitation can come by way of a certain procedure which is laid down in law, the procedure which has to be followed, where other persons, some kind of body with semi-judicial functions, can sit upon the matter and adjudicate in regard to the particular complaint made against the local authority before the Minister takes it upon himself to dissolve a body which has come into existence through the votes of the people.

I make this complaint principally in regard to the attitude adopted by the Ministry to the request made by the Colombo Municipal Council for the grant of the status of a corporation. I am aware of the fact—and I think the hon. Parliamentary Secretary is also aware—that the Minister was prepared to be very generous in regard to the powers that were sought for this corporation, but with these two limitations: (1) in regard to the employees, the stipulation is made that the employees shall continue to be placed under the L. G. S. C., and (2) that the Minister should have the power to dissolve the corporation at will. That is not very satisfactory.

I will deal with the first aspect, the L. G. S. C. The L. G. S. C. is a body against which it is possible to

make very serious complaints. I am not blaming individual commissioners. There was a time when I did. I am not on this occasion blaming individual commissioners. I say, they are more sinned against than sinning. This body is an impossible body as at present constituted. It is not of the same status as the P. S. C. which is granted its status by the constitution of our country. This is a creation of the Minister under a particular Ordinance as amended by various Acts, and this body acts in relation to the Local Government Service with all the powers of the P. S. C. plus a number of functions which it exercises, but which are not functions exercised by the P. S. C. at all. The P. S. C. does not necessarily sit upon every transfer; it delegates its powers. There is no delegation of powers by the L. G. S. C. except to certain smaller committees of itself where the committee goes into some kind of disciplinary matter or inquiry against a particular officer. Other than that, there is no delegation of powers. Now, the P. S. C. delegates its powers, sits more or less as an appellate body. It sits also in regard to disciplinary matters. In regard to other matters, minor transfers and the like, the powers are delegated to others. In regard to appointments also, it delegates a large area of its responsibilities, allowing interviews and so on for appointments to be held by other persons, and only acts on the results submitted to it at the final stage.

Now, I am a person who has always believed that the P. S. C. itself is in need of reform. We cannot discuss the P. S. C. here. As you are aware, under our Standing Orders, we have to introduce a special Motion. I do not propose to discuss the P. S. C. But my opinion has always been that the P. S. C., the J. S. C. and the L. G. S. C., constituted in different ways but exercising authority over certain sections of employees in three different services, are just three fig leaves which cover a grim

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

reality, the reality of political interference on the part of the Government of the day, whatever the Government may be. These three commissions are just three fig leaves. I am still of that view. And of these three commissions, the worst is the L. G. S. C. because, as it is constituted, it is called upon to exercise functions and responsibilities which would normally weigh down and make it impossible for any such body to function. That is why I do not blame the members of the L. G. S. C. as such. My case is collectively against the body as such.

I have a very serious charge to make against it: the newly constituted L.G.S.C. has shown itself completely hostile to the trade unions of the Local Government Service employees. It has shown itself very hostile to them. At one stage they introduced a new rule that members of the fire brigade in the Colombo Municipal Council were not entitled to form a trade union because they belonged to some kind of military service in their opinion, which is just so much nonsense. There they took it upon themselves to adopt an attitude of pique which no such body should adopt. But the Colombo Municipal Council Employees' Union passed a resolution in which it detailed a large number of grievances that had accumulated over the years, grievances in regard to matters that the L.G.S.C. had been called upon to correct and had failed, and at the end of that resolution they said they had no confidence in the L.G.S.C. Just because they had passed a motion of no confidence in the L.G.S.C., they took upon themselves the right and the power to send for the union to appear before them and tell them to withdraw that resolution. They said, "We shall not negotiate with your union unless you withdraw that motion". It happened not very long ago but recently.

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike—
Who was the mayor?)

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சோய்சா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

They demanded of the union to withdraw that motion as the price of negotiation. That kind of attitude on the part of the L.G.S.C., I think, we cannot be sufficiently loud or sufficiently emphatic in condemning.

Now, what is the cure for this? I say the cure is not what Mr. Mahanama Samaraweera proposed in his time. He proposed to change the constitution of the L.G.S.C. on the lines of the boards and corporations where the Minister reserves to himself the right to issue general and special directives. In respect of the C.T.B., the Port (Cargo) Corporation and various other bodies like that, I think there is always a clause where the Minister has the right to issue general and special directives. But the L.G.S.C., in the matter of managing the employees of local authorities, is not on the same level as those corporations which engage themselves in commercialized ventures. If you are going to have these commissions, I do not think you can give the right to the Minister to issue general and special directives. The cure for the misdeeds of commissions such as these, about which you can complain, is to have an appellate body constituted on the lines of the P.S.C. in India. That could be taken as a model. They may be reconstituted or re-fashioned in that way; but do not give the Minister the right to intervene. In that case, you may say that the employees are the creatures of the Minister. The whole idea in constituting the L.G.S.C., the valuable idea enshrined in the creation of the L.G.S.C. on the part of the late Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike, was that

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.]

the employees should be given a fair deal, free from political interference by persons even though they may be elected representatives of the people. If you leave the fortunes of the employees to the whims and fancies of the mayors and chairmen of the local authorities who may come and go, the employees might not get a fair deal. That was his idea. You do not serve that idea by transferring the possible political interference from the level of the local authority to the level of the Minister. That is not what was intended.

If you want an independent commission, let it be independent; there is no use pretending that there is an independent commission when you give the Minister the power to interfere in that way. The L.G.S.C. has to be reconstituted. It should be scrapped and replaced by a body on the lines of similar authorities in India. That is not difficult to do.

Now, Sir, in regard to the L.G.S.C. and its relations with the Colombo Municipal Council, I have a large number of complaints to make but I do not wish to take up the time of this honourable House in dealing with all these matters.

I have to mention particular grievances in respect of which redress has not been given because the L.G.S.C. has not given its mind to these matters properly. In these matters the Minister has been willing, the Parliamentary Secretary has been willing, to settle them, but as things stood the powers were vested in the L.G.S.C. and they just refused to move.

Here are some of the grievances of the Colombo Municipal Council Employees Union. One was the implementation of a promise made on the basis of a Cabinet decision taken on 4th December 1957 and contained in circular No. DA. 213 of 18th January 1958 issued by the Commissioner of Local Government to all local authorities that there would be an

equation of the terms and conditions of service of Local Government Service employees with those of the Public Service. That has not been implemented.

Then, Sir, the old Municipal Councils' Pension Minute had a clause which enabled employees to add five years to the length of their service on retirement as a climatic bonus. This addition of five years has been denied in the case of employees recruited after the 1st April 1946. All employees recruited after that date do not enjoy this climatic bonus.

අ. භා. 2.30

There are three grievances in regard to the matter of pensions. While there is a general delay in the Public Service in regard to the matter of the payment of pensions, that delay is considerably increased in the case of employees of the Local Government Service, because there is a delay on the part of the local authority and on the part of the commission in the transmission of these papers to the other places.

සහායක මාමු

(அக்கிராசனார்)

(The Chairman)

Does the hon. Member want more time?

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சாய்சா)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa)

I shall not take much more time, but as the Mover of the Amendment I might be given the indulgence of a little more. Thank you.

Then, Sir, there were those who belonged to the old transferable service. They were allowed to commute their pensions. Those people who had commuted their pensions have not been given the benefit enjoyed by those who commuted their pensions in the Public Service, namely, after ten years there was a restoration of the pension to its original quantum as if commutation had not taken place. That was allowed by the last

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

Government to the Public Service, but the parallel change in the Local Government Service has not yet materialized. There are a large number of old pensioners who have been looking forward to getting an enhanced pension even before they end their days. Those people are still waiting, and have not got what they expected to get.

Then there is another grievance: new entrants in the Local Government Service are not allowed to commute their pension. Commutation of their pensions is not allowed to them.

All these matters were put up in one Bill which lapsed because of the prorogation of Parliament. There were certain parts of that Bill which I, personally, did not like. But apart from that, there has been no action to get these matters corrected even since then.

There were certain demands made by these people ten or fifteen years ago to the Local Government Service Commission. Every annual general meeting of the union passes resolutions and sends them up, but they remain unattended. One was that these employees be given advances for the purchase of land to build houses; that at least they be empowered to take loans from the People's Bank for this purpose. This has not been attended to. Another is the setting up of an anomalies commission which can go into anomalies that exist in the terms and conditions of their employment, parallel to the one-man salaries commission appointed by the previous Government—the Christoffelsz Anomalies Commission. The demand was made at that time but has not yet been implemented.

Then, there was a strike of the Colombo Municipal employees in November and December 1957. Up to that time even those who were in the Public Service and had gone on strike were given their salaries for the period. A decision not to pay wages or salaries for the period of

the strike came into operation only after 1958. Despite so many promises on the part of the Minister and the Parliamentary Secretary that this would be paid, the Local Government Service Commission has failed to move in the matter.

In regard to the new draft regulations of the Local Government Service Commission, I moved a motion in the Colombo Municipal Council condemning them because they did not give the employees even the privileges they now enjoy. The conditions those new regulations seek to bring into being are more retrograde than the conditions obtaining in the Public Service, and they are based on a Manual of Procedure which itself is in need of amendment.

The last matter I wish to refer to in regard to the Local Government Service Commission is the question of recognition that should be given to trade unions. As I mentioned earlier, the Colombo Municipal Council Employees' Union has long suffered from this particular disability. They have been told that unless they withdraw their "No confidence" resolution, their representations cannot be entertained. In any case, replies sent to trade unions are sometimes lacking in courtesy—I refer to the mode of replying. I do not see why it should be so. I just cannot understand it. The manner in which they treat the grievances that are brought to their notice shows a lack of desire to go into matters and satisfy the employees that at least somebody has understood the case that has been sought to be made. Even that is not there.

I ask that the Local Government Service Commission be re-constituted to the extent almost of scrapping the commission as at present constituted, and that a new commission be set up more or less on the lines of what they have in the sub-continent, India.

I have also got to plead that a special commission be set up for the purpose of granting the Colombo

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[ඉරිනාඩි සොයිසා මයා.]

Municipality the status of a corporation ; that you remove the fear of the employees regarding autocratic acts on the part of the commission by allowing for some kind of appellate body ; and that you remove a large number of the functions of the commission by allowing for a delegation of powers, particularly in regard to interviews, minor appointments and the like. Unless you do that, Sir, the existing grievances of the Local Government Service Commission employees will continue for a long time. The principal case for a separate commission for Colombo is that nearly 60 per cent. of the employees of the Local Government Service Commission are employees of the Colombo Municipal Council. Therefore, there is a strong case for their being placed under a separate authority.

Regarding the status of a corporation and the powers that are sought by the Colombo Municipality through the grant of corporation status, I want to mention, in particular, the question of electricity. The Hon. Minister of Land, Irrigation and Power mentioned the matter the other day and what he said was misconstrued, I think, by the press, publicity being given to the idea that the Colombo Municipal Council was to be given the right to distribute electricity within the municipal limits. I do not think the Hon. Minister said that. What the department has at present proposed is to give the council, legally, the power to manage the street lighting system up to a point—to erect the posts, fix the bulbs, see that the chain is pulled at the correct time so that the light is put on and put off, and replace a bulb if it is damaged ; that is all. Those functions the Colombo Municipal Council now exercises. They propose to give these powers legally and to ask the council to take over all the employees now maintained by the department for lighting. This means that the council is not given any extra power but is called upon to handle a part of the present salaries bill of the department. That is all the change proposed.

This is very unsatisfactory. I plead with the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to ask the Minister to grant the council the right to distribute electricity within the city limits.

Then, the council is robbed of its revenue in a number of ways. In regard to the dues which should come from the registration of motor vehicles in the city, we are given the same amount that was given as a grant to the council at the time this source of revenue was taken over by the Central Government. Either the grant should be increased, or the total of the fees from registration of vehicles should come to the council.

The last matter I wish to refer to is the question of the rating system. I mentioned this matter when the Votes of the Ministry of Land, Irrigation and Power were discussed, because valuation is a subject under that Ministry. I want to complain that annual values on the basis of assessments in the city have gone up unconscionably over the last 15 years. If you take the total of the annual values obtaining today and the total of the amount expected by way of rates on the 30 per cent. consolidated rate obtaining in the city—there is a differential rate, of course, in respect of the areas taken over from Kotte—if you take the quantum derived by way of rates from the city today, that is equal in amount to the totality of the annual values obtaining 12 years ago. The total of the annual values 12 years ago and the quantum of rates levied today are equal. That shows how much annual values have increased in assessments over the past few years. This places an intolerable burden of rates upon the city dwellers. The city council is called upon to exploit the city dwellers, and the landlord is making use of the situation in order to charge enhanced rents. The rents go up ; thereby the blackmarket rents go up. The blackmarket rents become the measure of judgment. The rates go up at the next revision. Then the blackmarket rents go up. It is a vicious circle which goes on

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

turning and in the process grinds the poor tenant in the city to dust.

I have asked for a reassessment of this system of rating. I have asked, through a motion moved by me in the Colombo Municipal Council, that a system of graded rates be established. This was a promise made by the U. N. P. at the municipal polls in 1954. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary will remember the slogan "ගෙවල් කුලී අඩු කරන්න—යූ. එන්. පී. යට ඡන්දය දෙන්න." Now that he represents the council, represents local government here, he may as well get the graded system of rates implemented now, because through that alone it is possible to give some kind of relief to the poor rent-paying tenants in the City of Colombo.

Those are the matters to which I want the Hon. Minister, through the hon. Parliamentary Secretary, to give serious attention in order that some of these things may be corrected without much delay.

විමලා කන්නන්ගර මිය. (සෞඛ්‍ය ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්)

(திரும்பி விமலா கன்னங்கர—சுகாதார அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசி)

(Mrs. Wimala Kannangara—Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health)

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, ලක්දිව රජ කල සිට නොකඩවා පැවත එන පාලන ක්‍රමයක් තිබෙනවා නම්, එය ගම්සභා ක්‍රමය බව අපට නොබියව කියන්න පුළුවනි. මට පෙර කලා කල ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා කලා කළේ නගර සභා වැනි විශාල ආදායම් ලැබෙන පළාත් පාලන ආයතන ගැනයි. නමුත් මම ගලිගමුවේ මන්ත්‍රීවරිය වුණත්, අදත් ගම්සභාපතිනියක වශයෙන්, ලංකාවේ ඇති පළාත් පාලන ආයතනවලින් වැඩියක්ම ඇත්තේ ගම්සභා නිසා ඒවායේ තිබෙන අඩුපාඩුකම් රාශියක් ගැන ගරු පළාත් පාලන ඇමතිතුමාගේ අවධානය යොමු කිරීම පිණිස ඒවා ඔබතුමා වෙත ඉදිරිපත් කරනවා.

නමුත් නාන්සෙ දත්තව ඇති, වරින් වර ඇති වූ රජයන් විසින් ගම්සභාවලටත්, ඒවාගේම ගම්සභාපතිවරුන්ටත් වැඩිපුර බලතල දෙනවාය කී නමුත් මේ වනතුරු වැඩි පුර බලතල කිසිවක් දී නැති බව. උත්පත්තියේ සිට මිනිවල දක්වා යනතුරු මහජනතාවට සුභදායක අන්දමින් වැඩ කිරීමට සිදු වෙතත්—නිසි හතලිස් දහක මහජනතාවගේ වග කීම භාරගෙන කටයුතු කරන ගම්සභාපති කෙනෙකුට, ගම්සභාවක සාමාජික වරුන්ට, තමන්ගේ ශ්‍රමයත් කාලයත් වැය කරමින්, වැටුපක්වත් නොලබා, මහජන ඡන්දයෙන් පත් වී ඇතිව සේවය කිරීමට සිදුවෙතත්—අදත් අපේ ගම්වල ජනතාවට වතුර ලබාගන්න සිදු වී තිබෙන්නේ හරකුත් වතුර බොන වළ වල් වාගේ වළවල්වලිනුයි. අප පරමාණු යුගයේ ජීවත් වුණත් අපේ ගම් ඇතුළෙ තිබෙන්නේ තවමත් බරකරන්න යුගයයි. කොටින්ම බරකරන්නයක්වත් හරියට ගෙන යන්නටවත් බැරි තත්ත්වයක් ඇත්තේ. එම නිසා මේවා නියම අන්දමින් ක්‍රියා කිරීමට නම්, ගම් මෙයට වඩා දියුණු කිරීමට නම්, වැඩිපුර බදු මුදල් වුවමනා කරන නිසා නමුත් නාන්සෙගෙ අවධානය යොමු කරනවා, මේ ගම්සභා ආඥාපනත—1961 අංක 60 දරණ ගම් සභා සංශෝධන ආඥාපනත—28 වන ඡේදයේ සඳහන් කර ඇති බදු පිළිබඳව. මේ බදු ගම්සභාවලට ලබාදීමට ක්‍රියා කළොත් ගැමි ජනතාවට මෙයට වඩා සුභ දායක අන්දමින් වැඩ කරන්න පුළුවන් බව මගේ විශ්වාසයයි. ඒ බදු පිළිබඳ පරිච්ඡේදයන් මේවායි: (අ) සුරාබදු ආඥාපනත 42 වන පරිච්ඡේදය, (ආ) අබින් සහ අන්තරාදායක ඖෂධ ආඥාපනත 172 වන පරිච්ඡේදය, (ඉ) ආහාර සහ ඖෂධ ආඥාපනත 1949 අංක 25 දරන පරිච්ඡේදය.

මෙවැනි බදු ලබා දුන්නොත්, ඒ ඒ පළාත්වල ගුවන් විදුලි බලපත්‍ර සඳහා අය කරන ගාස්තු ලබා දුන්නොත්, ඒ ප්‍රදේශ වල රථවාහන සඳහා අය කරන බදු ලබා දුන්නොත්, එසේ ලැබෙන ආදායමින් ගම්බද ජනතාවගේ ජීවන තත්ත්වය උසස් කිරීමටත්, ජීවත් වීමේ පහසුකම් සලසා දීමටත් ක්‍රියා කළ හැකි බව ඔබත්

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[විමලා කන්තගර මිය.]

කරන න කුමනිසි. ඒ සමගම මතක් කරන්න ඇත්තො, මම කලින් සදහන් කළ අන්දමට බරකරන්න යුගයේ ජීවත් වුණත්, ගම්බද ඇති ඇතැම් පාරවල බර කරන්නයක්වත් ගෙන යන්නට බැරි බවයි. ගම්සභාවල ඇති අරමුදල්වලින් අතු කපා, පාරවල් සුද්ධ කලායින් පසුව, බෝක්කු සෑදීමට, තාර දැමීමට, බොරලු දැමීමට විශේෂ ආධාරයක් නොලැබෙන නිසා එම පාරවල් සේදී යාමෙන් හා කරන්න එහා මෙහා ගමන් කිරීමෙන් මහා වලවල් සෑදී, කිසිම අන්දමකින් ගමන් කරන්නට බැරි තත්ත්වයක් ඇති වෙනව. එම නිසා මෙයට වඩා වැඩි ප්‍රමාණයක් ගම්සභා පාරවල් ප්‍රසිද්ධ වැඩ දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවට ගෙන, නිසි අන්දමට ඒවා සකස් කර භාර දිය යුතුය යනු වෙන් යෝජනාවක් මම ඉදිරිපත් කර නව.

අ. හා. 2.45

මේ ලඟදී ප්‍රසිද්ධ වැඩ දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවට ගිය අවස්ථාවෙදී මට දැනගන්න ලැබුණා, ගම්සභා පාරවල් ගන්නෙ නැත යන්න. එය එසේ නම්, වහාම එය වෙනස් කොට, ගම්සභාවලට අයත් පාර වල් වැඩි සංඛ්‍යාවක් බාරගෙන රථවාහන යන්න පුළුවන් අන්දමින් සාදා දිය යුතු ය කියායි මම ඉල්ලා සිටින්නේ. හැම පැලකටම උළු දෙනවාය කී නිසා ඒවා ලබා ගැනීමට හැම දෙනාම බලාපොරොත්තු වුණා වගේ අප බලාපොරොත්තුවන්නේ නැහැ හැම පැල්පතකටම මෝටර් රථයක් යන්නට පුළුවන් අන්දමින් පාරවල් සකස් කරවා ගැනීමට. නමුත් ගම්සභා පාරවල් බාරගෙන සකස් කර දෙනවා නම්, එක ගම්මුලාදැනි වසමකට, බස් රථ ගමනා ගමනය කරන්න පුළුවන් එක මාර්ගය බැගින්වත් තනා දිය යුතු බවයි මතක් කර සිටින්නේ. දැනට තනා තිබෙන පාරවල බස් රථ ධාවනය කරන්නටය කියා ලංකා ගමනා ගමන මණ්ඩලයෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටියාම අපට දෙන පිළිතුර නම් බෝක්කු කැඩී යන්නට පුළුවන් නිසා ටොන් හය හතක් බර බස් ධාවනය කරවීමට පුළුවන්කමක් නැති බවයි. ගම්සභාවලට පාරවල් සදහා

ආධාර මුදල් දෙන විට—මහජන මුදල් නාස්ති කරන්නේ නැතිව, මෙපමණ කලක් ගෙන ගිය ඒ ව්‍යවස්ථා හා නීති රීති ආදිය වෙනස් කර—ටොන් හයේ හතේ බස් රථ යා හැකි විධියේ පාරවල් සදහා සකස් කර ඇති සැලැස්මවල් අනුව එම පාරවල් තනාගැනීමට පුළුවන් වන විධියට, මුදල් දෙන්නය කියා පළාත් පාලන ආමතිතුමාගෙන් ගොරව යෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටිනව.

එමෙන්ම අවුරුදු 10 කටත් වැඩි කාලයක් තිස්සේ අප ගෙන යන සටනක් තිබෙනව. පොදුවේ ගම්සභාපතිවරුන් වෙනුවෙනුයි මා මේ ඉල්ලීම කරන්නේ. ග්‍රාම සංවර්ධන සමිති මගින් සාදන පාරවල් රාශියක් තිබෙනව. ඉඩම් හිමියන් නොමිලයේ දෙන ඉඩම්වල දුප්පත් කම් කරු ජනතාව දහඩිය මහන්සියෙන් ශ්‍රම දාන ව්‍යාපාර අනුව කපන පාරවල කැනඩා ආධාරයෙන් මුදල් යොදා රජය මගින් බෝක්කු සාදා ගම්සභාවලට බාර දෙනව. සැහෙන ආදායමක් නැතිකමින් මෙම පාරවල් නඩත්තු කරන්නට මෙම ආයතනවලට බැරි විම නිසා අවුරුද්දක් දෙකක් ගිය විට පාර තිබුණාටත් වඩා අබලන් තත්ත්වයකට පත් වෙනව. එම නිසා ග්‍රාම සංවර්ධන සමිති මගින් පාරවල් සාදා වෂීයක් පාසා යම්කිසි හැතැප් ම ගණනක් ගම්සභාවලට බාරදෙනවා නම් ඒවාට ගල් ලයිසන් කිරීමට හෝ තාර දැමීමට හෝ බොරළු දැමීමට—දෙනු ලබන ප්‍රමාණයන් අනුව—අවුරුදු පතා ගම්සභාවලට රජයෙන් ආධාර මුදලක් දෙන හැටියට මා ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමනි, ගම්සභා 17 කුත්, සුළු නගර සභා 6 කුත්, එක නගර සභාවකුත් කැගලු දිස්ත්‍රික්කයේ තිබෙනව. එපමණ තිබියදීත් එහි පළාත් පාලන උප කොමසාරිස්වරයෙක් නැහැ. අපට පළාත් පාලන කාර්යාලයක් නැහැ. අවුරුද්දකට දෙවරක්වත් උප කොමසාරිස්වරයෙක් දකින්න නැහැ. ලිපියක් යැවුවත් පිළිතුරක් ලැබෙන්න දින හතරක් පහක් යනව. අනිකුත් හැම දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවක් සදහාම කැගලු දිස්ත්‍රික්කයේ කාර්යාල තිබෙනවා නම්, පළාත් පාලන කටයුතු සදහා පමණක් සබරගමු

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

වට නැත්තම් රත්නපුරයට යන්නට සිදු වී තිබෙන්නේ ඇයි? ඒ නිසා කැගලු දිස්ත්‍රික්කයට විශේෂ සහකාර කොමසාරිස්වරයෙකුත්, කාර්යාලයකුත් ලබා දෙන ලෙස මා ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා. 1938 සිට මේ වනතුරුම ගම්කාර්ය සභා ආඥාපනතේ 257 වැනි අධිකාරය අනුව කලින් කලට නීති රීති වෙනස් කරමින් එය සංශෝධනය කළා මිස ස්ඵර දියුණුවක් කරා ගෙන ගියේ නැහැ. නොයෙකුත් අත් දමේ නීති රීති නිසා අද අපට වැඩ කර ගන්නට බැරි වී තිබෙනවා. කැරකෝප්පුවක් සඳහා ඉඩමක් ගන්න ගියත් නීති පෙන්වා අපේ වැඩ වලට බාධා පමුණුවනවා. ඒ නිසා දැනට සිටින ගරු ඇමතිතුමා දක්ෂ අධිනීතිඥයෙක් හෙයින් අළුතින් නීති සකස් කර ඉක්මණින් කටයුතු කරන්නට පුළුවන් අන්දමට වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් ඇති කරාවිය කියා අපි බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා.

අපේ ගැමි ජනතාවගේ යහපත පිණිස, රථවාහන යන්නට පුළුවන් පාරවල් පිළිබඳ සැලැස්මවල් හා විදුලි බලය ලබාදීමට හා කර්මාන්ත දියුණු කිරීමට සැලැස්මවල් සාදා දී දුප්පත් ගැමි ජනතාවගේ යහපතට කටයුතු කරනවා ඇත කියා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. අද ගම්කාර්ය සභා ආඥා පනතේ ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්න බැරි නීති තිබෙනවා. ඒවා ක්‍රියාවේ යොදන්නේ කොහොමද කියා කොමසාරිස්තුමා වත් දන්නේ නැහැ. ඒ නිසා මා සඳහන් කළ කරුණු ඉටු කර ගැමි. ජනතාවට විශාල සේවයක් කිරීමට—රට ස්වයංපෝෂිත කිරීමට කෘෂිකර්මය ආදී ව්‍යාපාර ගෙන යන මේ අවස්ථාවේදී—දැනට වඩා බර, විශාල රථවාහන ගෙන යා හැකි අන්දමට—එවැනි සැලැස්මක් අනුව—පාරවල් සාදා ආදායම් මාර්ග දියුණු කිරීමට, අපේ ගැමි ජනතාවගේ දියුණුව ලබා දීමට මේ ගරු සභාවේ සාමදෙනාගේම සහයෝගය ලැබේවායි පතමින් මගේ වචන ස්වල්පය අවසාන කරනවා.

හැටියටත් පෙනෙන්න පුළුවන්. ඒ මක් නිසාද? පළාත් පාලන ආයතනත් රාජ්‍ය භාෂාවත් අතර බෙහෝම කිට්ටු සම්බන්ධ කමක් තිබෙන නිසයි. අවුරුදු ගණනාවක් තිස්සේ “රීජනල් කවුන්සිල්ස්” නොහොත් ප්‍රාදේශීය සභා හැටියට අලුත් ආයතන වගයක් පිහිටුවන්නට යෝජනාවක් තිබුණත්, මෙම භාෂා ප්‍රශ්නය හරි හැටි විසඳා ගන්නේ නැති නිසා ඒ අලුත් පළාත් පාලන ආයතන පිහිටුවීම සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම වාගේ ඇණ හිට තිබෙනවා. මෙම කාරණය පිළිබඳව කල්පනා කරන විට වැඩි දවසකට ඉහත නොවෙයි, ඊයේ පෙරේදා ගරු අගමැතිතුමා මහියංගන උත්සවයේදී කළ එක්තරා ප්‍රකාශයක් සඳහන් කරන්න බිහි. එම උත්සවයට සහභාගි වූ එතුමා මේ දිනවල පැතිර පවතින ඉන්දු-පකිස්ථාන් යුද්ධය ගැන සඳහන් කරමින් කියා තිබෙනවා, ඉන්දියාවත් පකිස්ථානයත් අතර තිබෙන හේදය අපි පාඩමකට ගෙන අපේ මේ රට දෙකඩ කරන්නේ නැතිව සමගියෙන් රටේ කටයුතු පවත්වාගෙන යමුය කියා. ගරු අගමැතිතුමා මහියංගනයේ ඉදගෙන ඒ වාගේ ප්‍රකාශයක් කරන අතර, ගරු අගමැතිතුමාගේ ආණ්ඩුවේ සහකාරයෙක් වන පෙඩරල් පක්ෂයේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් මේ ගරු සභාවේ ඉදගෙන කර තිබෙන ප්‍රකාශ මොනවාද කියා අපි මොහොතකට බලමු.

පසු ගිය සිකුරාදා මේ ගරු සභාවේදී දෙමිපේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාගේ කථාවට පිළිතුරු වශයෙන් කථා කළ නල්ලුරුවේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය ඊ. එම්. ඩී. නාගනාදන්) මේ රටේ භාෂා ප්‍රශ්නයත්, ජාතික මත හේදවලට තුඩු දුන් අතින් ප්‍රශ්නත් ගැන සඳහන් කරමින් මෙසේ කීවා. මා මෙය උපුටා දක්වන්නේ 1965 ජූනි 13 වෙනිදා හැන්සාඩ් වාර්තාවේ 2669 වෙනි තීරුවෙනුයි :

“We in this country under this National Government have joined together to bring about unity and to see that we have a united Lanka just as you have a united Switzerland, a united Russia, a united India and a united Pakistan.”

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, ජාතික ආණ්ඩුවක් යයි කියා ගන්නා මේ ආණ්ඩුවේ ගරු අගමැතිතුමා කියනවා, ඉන්දියාවත්, පකිස්ථානයත් ආදියට ගෙන එයින් අපි පාඩමක්

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා. (හබරාදුව)
 (திரு. பிரிள்ஸ் குணசேகரா—ஹபரதுவ)
 (Mr. Prins Gunasekera—Habaraduwa)
 ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, පළාත් පාලන අමාත්‍යාංශයේ අයවැය ශීඝ්‍ර ගැන සාකච්ඡාව ඇරඹුණත් මෙයද සමහර විට රාජ්‍ය භාෂා දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව පිළිබඳ විධිදියක්

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.]

ඉගෙන ගනිමුය, ඒ රටවල පවතින විධියේ තත්ත්වයක් මේ රටේ ඇති වන්නට ඉඩ නොදෙමුය කියා. නමුත් මේ ආණ්ඩුවේම කොටස්කාරයෝ මේ ගරු සභාවේදී කියන ව, ඉන්දියාවත් පකිස්ථානයත් ආදියට ගෙන ජාතියක් ගොඩනංවමුය කියා. නල්ලු රුවේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාගෙ මුළු කථාවේදීම එතුමා පදනම කර ගත්තේ කුමක්ද? මේ රට කවදාවත් එක ජාතියක් හැටියට එක භාෂාවකින් පාලනය කරන්න බැරිය යන්නයි. ඒපඩරල් පක්ෂයට ඉංග්‍රීසියෙන් “ඒපඩරල්” කියා කීවත් දෙමළෙන් කියන්නේ, “ඉලංගෙයි තමිල් අරසු කච්චි” — இலங்கைகள் தமிழ் அரசுக் கட்சி—කියායි. එහි තේරුම, “ලංකා ද්‍රවිඩ රාජ්‍ය පක්ෂය” යනුයි. මේ ලංකාවේ ද්‍රවිඩ රාජ්‍යයක් පිහිටුවීමට අරඳින, මේ ලංකාවේ ද්‍රවිඩ රාජ්‍යයක් පිහිටුවාගන්නා තෙක් තමන්ගේ උත්සාහය අත්හරින්නේ නැතෙයි කියන පක්ෂයක් තමයි, මේ ඒපඩරල් පක්ෂය. එසේ නම් මේ රටේ දෙමළ රාජ්‍යයකුත් සිංහල රාජ්‍යයකුත් ඇති වුණොත් මහියංගන උත්සවයෙහිදී ගරු අගමැතිතුමා අපට ආදේශයට නැතිනම් පාඩමකට ගන්නය කී තත්ත්වය මේ රටේ පැන නගින්න පුළුවනි. එම නිසයි, මා ගරු පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමාට කියන්නේ, ඒපඩරල් පක්ෂයත්, එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයත් අතර යම් කිසි ගිවිසුමක් තිබෙනව නම් එය කුමක්දැයි එළි කරන ලෙස එතුමාගෙ නායකයාට කියන්නය කියා. තමුත්තාත් සෙ මහියංගනයෙදී එක විධියකට කියනව. නාගනාදන් මහත්මයා මෙම ගරු සභාවේ දී මේ විධියට කියනව. තමුත්තාත් සෙලා ගෙ නායක ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක මහත් මයා සමහරවිට කියාවි, “මාත් ඒපඩරල් පක්ෂයත් අතර ඇති මේ ගිවිසුම තමුත්තාත් සෙටවත් මේ ගරු සභාවටවත් එළි දරව් කරන්නේ නැත” කියා. මේක “අග මැති වූවාට පසු එළඹුණු ගිවිසුමක් නොවෙයි; අගමැති වෙන්න පෙර එළඹුණු ගිවිසුමක්” යනුවෙන් කියන්නත් පුළුවනි. එහෙනම් ගරු පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමනි, අරලියගහ වලව්වේ සිටින ගරු අගමැතිතුමා ගෙ ගිවිසුම එළිදරව් කරන්න කැමති නැති නම් “වුඩ්ලන්ඩ්ස්” මන්දිරයේ සිටින ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක මැතිතුමාගෙන් අහන්න

න මොකක්ද ඒපඩරල් පක්ෂය එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයත් සමග ඇති කර ගෙන තිබෙන ගිවිසුම කියා. මේ පිළිබඳව පැහැදිලි පිළිතුරක් අපට වුවමනා කරනව. එළිදරව් නොකරන ලද යම් කිසි ගිවිසුමක් තිබෙනවා නම් එය පදනම් කරගෙන මේ විධියේ රට රැවටීමක් ගෙන යාම දෙගොල්ලත් ටම හොඳ නැහැ. සමහරවිට තමුත්තාත් සෙල මේකෙන් දේශපාලනමය වශයෙන් එක්තරා විධියක ප්‍රයෝජනයක් ලබා ගන්න බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනව ඇති. මැති වරණය කිට්ටු වන විට ඒපඩරල් පක්ෂයත් එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයත් වෙන්ව ගොස් සිය මැතිවරණ කටයුතු ගෙන යන්න බලා පොරොත්තු වෙනව ඇති. ඒපඩරල් පක්ෂය උතුරට ගිහිත් කියාවි, “ඔය සිංහල යු. එන්. පී. කාරයන්ගෙන් දෙමළ මිනිසුන්ට සුගතියක් ලබා ගන්න බැරි වුණු නිසා මෙන්න අපි කැඩිල බිදිල ආව” කියා. ඒ වගෙම, සමහරවිට, එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයත් සිංහල පළාත්වලට ගිහිත් කියන්න බලාපොරොත්තුව ඇති, “ඒපඩරල් කාරයෝ අපෙන් නොයෙකුත් දේ ඉල්ලුව; අපි දුන්නේ නැහැ; එම නිසා ඔවුන් අපෙන් කැඩිල ගියා” කියා. ඒ විධියේ චේතනාවකින් හත් හවුල් ආණ්ඩුව ගෙනියනව නම්, ඊට රැවටෙන්න තරම් මේ රටේ මහජනයා මෝඩයන් නොවන බව තමුත්තාත් සෙලට කල් තියාම කියන්න ඕනෑ.

අ. භා. 3

භාෂා ප්‍රශ්නය සම්බන්ධයෙන්ම තවත් කරුණක් ඉදිරිපත් කරන්න මා කැමතියි. හවුල් ආණ්ඩුවේ සිටින එකම දෙමළ ඇමති තුමා සිටින්නේ, මේ ගරු පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමාගෙ අමාත්‍යාංශය භාරවයි. එම නිසයි මුළු රටම විශේෂයෙන් මෙම ප්‍රශ්නය ගැන වැඩි සැලකිල්ලකින් බලා සිටින්නේ. මෙතෙක් කිසිවකුගෙන් අපට පැහැදිලි ප්‍රකාශයක් ලැබුණේ නැහැ, තමුත්තාත් සෙල දෙගොල්ල එකතු වී ගෙන යන භාෂා ප්‍රතිපත්තිය කුමක්ද යන්න ගැන. මේවර මහියංගන උත්සවයෙදී තමුත්තාත් සෙල ගෙ අමාත්‍යාංශය මගින් තිකුත් කළ තිවේ දනයක් මා අතේ තිබෙනව. යම් යම් අයට

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

සිය මෝටර් රථවාහනවල අලවාගෙන එන්නය කියා ගල් අවිවුවේ අවිවු ගැසු පත්‍රිකාවක් දී තිබුණි; එම පත්‍රිකාවයි, දැන් මා අතේ තිබෙන්නේ. මෙම පත්‍රිකාව මම තමුත්තාන්සෙට ඉදිරිපත් කරනවා. ඒපඩ රල් පක්ෂයත් එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයත් අතර තිබෙන ගිවිසුමේ තවත් අංගයක් මෙය නම්, මෙතනින් භාෂා තුනකට සම තැනක් දීමයි සිදු වී තිබෙන්නේ. මුලටම සිංහලෙන් “ම” යන්න තිබෙනවා. ඊළඟට දෙමළෙන් “මානා”—M—කියා සඳහන් වී තිබෙනවා. ඊළඟට ඉංග්‍රීසියෙන් “එම්”—M—අකුර සඳහන් කරනවා. “ම” යන්නට “මානා” යන්න මානල, ඊළඟට “එම්” අකුර යොදනවා. “එළ හරකයි මී හරකයි මැනීමක්ය” යනුවෙන් කතාවක් සිංහලයන් අතර තිබෙනවා. ඊටත් වඩා නරක විධියට තුන් ගොල්ලක් එකට මානලයි තියෙන්නේ. දෙමල සිංහල භාෂා දෙකට සමතැන් දෙන්නට එපාය කියා මේ රටේ කල කෝලාහල ඇති වුණා. ඒ ප්‍රශ්නය උඩ මිනිස්සු මැරුණා. දැන් තමුත්තාන්සේලා දෙන්නට යන්නේ මේ සම තැනද කියා මම අහන්නට කැම තිබේ. ඒ එක පැත්තකින්. අනිත් පැත්තෙන් අගමැතිතුමා හැමදාම කියනවා, ඒපඩරල් පක්ෂයත් සමග යම් කිසි ගිවිසුමක් තියෙනවා නම් ඒ පිළිබඳ විස්තර මේ ගරු සභාවට ඉදිරිපත් නොකර ඒ ගිවිසුම කවදාවත් ක්‍රියාවේ යොදවන්නේ නැහැ කියා.

මා ළඟ තිබෙන මේ අතින් ලියවිල්ලේ ඒ ප්‍රශ්නය තව වරක් මතු වෙලා තියෙනවා. මා මේ ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නේ 1965 අගෝස්තු 23 වැනිදා “ජනදින” පත්‍රයේ පළ වී තිබෙන කරුණක්. මේ පත්‍රයේ මුල් පිටුවේම පළ කර තියෙනවා, ආණ්ඩුවේ දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවක් විසින්—සෞඛ්‍ය දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව විසින්—එසේ මෙසේ කෙනකුට නොව තමුත්තාන්සෙලාගේ හවුල් ආණ්ඩුවේ ප්‍රධාන හවුල්කාර ඒපඩ රල් පක්ෂයේ ප්‍රධාන නායක රාජනීතිඥ එස්. ජේ. ඩී. වෙල්වනායගම් මහත්මයාට යවන ලද ලිපියක ඡායාරූප පිටපතක්. එහි ලිපිනය ලියා තිබෙන්නේ සිංහලයෙන්. “රාජනීතිඥ එස්. ජේ. ඩී. වෙල්වනායගම් මහතා, පාර්ලිමේන්තු මන්ත්‍රී, ඇල්ප්‍රඩ් හවුස් ගාවින්, කොළඹ 3.”

මේ ලියමන තමුත්තාන්සෙලා කියවීමට කියා මම දන්නේ නැහැ.

ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)
(An hon. Member)

අපි ඔය පව පත්‍ර බලන්නේ නැහැ.

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.

(திரு. பிழிள்ளு குணசேகர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

තමුත්තාන්සෙලාගේ ආණ්ඩුවෙන් කෙරෙන දේ දැන ගන්න මේ පත්‍රය බලන්න ඕනෑ. සිංහලයෙන් ලිපිනය ලියන ලද මේ ලිපිය වෙල්වනායගම් මහත්මයාගේ ගෙදරට ගිය විට එය ආපසු හරවා එවා තිබෙනවා.

“Returned to sender. Address not intelligible.”

ලිපිනය කියවන්නට බැරිය කියා, එය යැවූ තැනැත්තාට නැවත හරවා යවා තිබෙනවා.

ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)
(An hon. Member)

කවද ලියල තියෙන්නේ?

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.

(திரு. பிழிள்ளு குணசேகர)
(Mr. Prins Gunasekera)

කවරු හරි ලියා ආපසු යවා තිබෙනවා. ගරු පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමනි, මේ ගැන කෙලින්ම පිළිතුරක් දෙන්න. තමුත්තාන්සේගේ අමාත්‍යාංශයේ භාෂා ප්‍රතිපත්තිය මේකද? භාෂා 3 ටම සම තැන දීමද? එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයත් ඒපඩරල් පක්ෂයත් සමග තියෙන ගිවිසුම මේකද? එසේ නැත්නම් “ජනදින” පත්‍රයෙන් එළි වන ප්‍රතිපත්තියද ඒ ගිවිසුමේ තියෙන්නේ? සිංහලයෙන් යවන ලියුම් දෙමළ නායකයන් නො පිළිගැනීමද ඒ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය? තමුත්තාන්සේගේ භාෂා ප්‍රතිපත්තිය මේ දෙකම නොවෙයි නම් ඒ කුමක්ද යන්න පැහැදිලි කරන්න. භාෂා ප්‍රේමී සියලු දෙනාම මේ සිදු වන්නේ කුමක්ද කියා බලාගෙන ඉන්නවා. අපට වුවමනාවක් නැහැ—මට වුවමනාවක් නැහැ—භාෂා හේදයක් අවුස්සන්නට. භාෂා හේදයක් අවුස්සා මේ රටේ කල කෝලාහල ඇති කරවන්නට මට වුවමනා

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[ප්‍රින්ස් ගණසේකර මයා.]

වක් නැහැ. දේශපාලන වශයෙන් ඔය විධියේ ප්‍රශ්නයක් කවදාවත් මගේ ආසනයේ මතු වන්නෙත් නැහැ. භාෂාව ගැන බොහොම වේදනාවෙන්, බොහොම අමාරුවෙන් වැඩ කළ පිරිසක් මේ රටේ ඉන්නව. ඒ මිනිස්සු මේ ප්‍රශ්නය විසඳෙන සැටි බලාගෙන ඉන්නව. පසුගිය අවුරුදු 9 තුළදීත් මේ භාෂා ප්‍රශ්නය හරි හැටි විසඳුනේ නැහැ. මේ ප්‍රශ්නය විසඳන්නට ඕනෑය කියා අරගෙන තිබෙන පියවර ටිකත් තමුන් තාන්සේලා ආපසු ගෙන මේ ප්‍රශ්නය නො විසඳන තත්ත්වයක් ඇති කරුවිය කියා සාධාරණ භයක් ඔවුන් තුළ ඇති වී තිබෙනව. මේ කාරණය ගැන තමුන් තාන්සේගේ නායකතුමාගෙන් කරුණු විමසා අවංක පිළිතුරක් දෙනවා ඇතැයි අපි බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනව.

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, පළාත් පාලන මැති වරණවලදී බලපවත්වන නීතියත්, පාර්ලිමේන්තු මැතිවරණවලදී බලපවත්වන නීතියත් අතර අදත් එක්තරා වෙනසක් තියෙනව. මේ නිසා නියම නීතිය කුමක් දැයි ඡන්දදායකයින්ටත් ඡන්ද කටයුතුවල යොදවනු ලබන නිලධාරීන්ටත් උපදෙස් දීම සම්බන්ධයෙන් මැතිවරණ නිලධාරීන්ට නොයෙක් අවස්ථාවලදී අමාරුකම්වලට ළිහුණ පාන්න සිදු වී තිබෙනව. ඒ නිසා පාර්ලිමේන්තු මැති වරණ කෙරෙහි බල පාන නීතියත් පළාත් පාලන මැතිවරණ කෙරෙහි බලපාන නීතියත් යන මේ නීති දෙක අතර ඇති වෙනස නැති කර සමානත්වයක් ඇති කර දීමට ක්‍රියා කරන මෙන් ගරු පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමාගෙන් මා ඉල්ලා සිටිනව. මේ විධියේ වෙනසක් තිබෙන්න වුව මනාවක් ඇතැයි මා හිතන්නේ නැහැ. පාර්ලිමේන්තු මැතිවරණවලදී මේ දක්වා ක්‍රියාවට නගන්න බැරි වූ දෙයක් ගැන ඒ එක්කම මතක් කරන්න ඕනෑ. ඡන්ද දයකයන් හඳුනා ගැනීමේ කාඩ් පත් පිළියෙල කර, මී ප්‍රභව ඇති වන පළාත් පාලන මැතිවරණවලදීත් ක්‍රියාත්මක වන පරිදි වැඩ කරගෙන යාමට අවශ්‍ය පියවර ගන්නා ලෙස මා ඉල්ලා සිටිනව.

ගම්කාර්ය සභාවල නියෝජිත මහතන් පඩි නොලබා සේවයක් කරන අය වුවත් පළාත් බදුව ජීවත් වන අය නිසා—මහ

ජනයා අතර නිතර නිතර ගැවසෙන අය නිසා—ඔවුන්ගෙන් එක්තරා වැදගත් සේවයක් ලබා ගන්න පුළුවනි. මා අදහස් කරන්නේ ගමේ සාමාන්‍ය මහජනයාට නිතර නිතර වුවමනා කරන දිවුරුම් පෙත්සම් සම්බන්ධවයි. දිවුරුම් පෙත්සම් අත්සන් කරවා ගැනීමට වුවමනා වූ විට සාමදාන විනිශ්චයකාරයෙකු වෙත ය යුතුයි. දැනට තිබෙන නීතිය අනුව ගම්කාර්ය සභාවල සභාපතිවරුන්ට පමණක් නිල බලයෙන් ජේ. පී. හෙවත් සාමදාන විනිශ්චයකාර ධුර ලැබී තිබෙනව. ගම්කාර්ය සභාවල සියලුම උපදේශක මහත්වරුන්ට ඒ විධියට නිල බලයෙන්ම සාමදාන විනිශ්චයකාර ධුර පිරිනැමීමට නොහැකිදැයි සොයා බලා ඒ ගැන සුදුසු ක්‍රියා මාර්ගයක් ගන්නා ලෙස මා ගරු පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමාගෙන් ඉල්ලනව.

අවසාන වශයෙන්, මා ගරු පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමාගෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටින්නේ, ගම්කාර්ය සභා, පළාත් ආණ්ඩු සභා සහ නගර සභා ආදී පළාත් පාලන ආයතන වලට ඒවායේ පාලනය සඳහා ආදායම් ලබා ගැනීමේදී දැනට රජයෙන් වෙන් කරනු ලබන මුදල බොහෝ විට ප්‍රමාණවත් නොවන නිසා—විශේෂයෙන්ම ගම්කාර්ය සභාවලට—ඒවායින් මහජනයාට සපයනු ලබන පහසුකම්—පාරවල්, ළිං, පුස්තකාල, ආරෝග්‍යශාලා, බෙහෙත් ශාලා ආදිය—අතුරින් අවශ්‍යම පහසුකම්වත් සපයා දීමට හැකි වන ලෙස මීට වඩා ප්‍රමාණවත් මුදලක් සැපයීමට පියවර ගන්නා ලෙසයි.

ඩී. ඊ. නිලකරන්ත මයා, (රත්ගම)
(කීරු. 14. අ. තිබකරත්න—රාජගම)
(Mr. D. E. Tillekeratne—Ratgama)

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය සභාපතිතුමනි, මාත් පළාත් පාලන අමාත්‍යාංශයේ වැය ශීඝ්‍රය යටතේ වචන සවලපයක් කපා කරන්න කැමතියි. ප්‍රජාමණ්ඩල සඳහා දෙන මුදල මදි බව පළමුවෙන්ම මතක් කරන්න ඕනෑ. විශේෂයෙන් ගමේ ගොඩේ ඉන්න උදවියට ප්‍රජාමණ්ඩලවලින් විශේෂ සේවයක් කෙරෙන බව අද කවරුත් දන්නව. සමහර අවස්ථාවලදී මේ ප්‍රජාමණ්ඩලවලින් ග්‍රාම සංවර්ධන සමිතිවලින් කෙරෙනවට වඩා ලොකු සේවයක් ගම් පළාත්වලට කෙරෙනව. එහෙත් ඔය ගම්කාර්ය සභා ප්‍රදේශ තුළ තිබෙන ප්‍රජාමණ්ඩලවලට

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

අවුරුද්දකට රුපියල් සියයක්වත් හම්බ වන්නේ නැහැ. එහෙත් මේ අයගෙන් විශාල සේවයක් නම් අප බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනව. ගම්වල ඉන්න නුගත් අයට යම් කිසි දැනුමක් ලබා දෙන්න, දේශපාලන අවබෝධයක් ලබා දෙන්න, සමාජයේ යම් තැනක් අරන් දෙන්න, රටේ තත්ත්වය ගැන හැඟීමක් ඇති කර දෙන්න, ග්‍රාම සංවර්ධන සමිතීන්ට වඩා ශක්තියක් ප්‍රජා මණ්ඩලවලට තිබෙන බව ගරු පාර්ලි මේන්තු ලේකම්තුමාට මතක් කරන්න කැමතියි. එම නිසා, මේ වර්ෂයේදීවත් එසේ නැත්නම් මීට පසුවත් මේ ප්‍රජා මණ්ඩල සමිතීන්ටයෙන් මීට වඩා සැල කිල්ල යොමු කර, ඒ ඒ ප්‍රදේශවල පළාත් පාලන ආයතන මාගියෙන් හෝ වේවා වෙනත් ආයතන මාගියෙන් හෝ වේවා ප්‍රජා මණ්ඩලවලට විශේෂ දීමනාවක් ලැබෙන හැටියට කටයුතු කරන මෙන් මා පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමාගෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා.

හබරාදුව ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා කීව්වා වාගේ ගම් කාර්ය සභාවලට ආණ්ඩුවෙන් වෙන් කරන මුදල ප්‍රමාණවත් නොවන බව මතක් කරනවා. මගේ ඡන්ද කොට්ඨාශයේම ගම් කාර්ය සභා ගැන මට කියන්නට පුළු වනි. ඒ ප්‍රදේශයේ ලඟදී අළුත් ගම් කාර්ය සභාවක් පිහිටුවා තිබෙනවා. ඒ අළුත් ගම් කාර්ය සභාව පිහිටුවන අවස්ථාවේදී මගේ ඡන්ද කොට්ඨාශයේ හික්කඩුව ගම් කාර්ය සභාවය කියා ගම් කාර්ය සභාවක් තිබුණා. ඒ ගම් කාර්ය සභාවෙන් ඡන්ද කොට්ඨාශ තුනක් අම්බලන්ගොඩ කොට්ඨාශයේ පිහිටවූ ඒ අළුත් ගම් කාර්ය සභාවට වෙන් කර දුන්න. විශේෂයෙන්ම මගේ කොට්ඨාශයට අයත් ගම් කාර්ය සභාව සමිතීන්ටයෙන් කළ වැඩක් ගැනයි මා මේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම් තුමාගේ අවධානය යොමු කරවන්නේ. හික්කඩුව ගම් කාර්ය සභාවේ ඡන්ද කොට්ඨාශ 13 ක් තිබුණා. එයින් ඡන්ද කොට්ඨාශ තුනක් අළුත් ගම් කාර්ය සභාව සදහා අපේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ඡන්ද කොට්ඨාශයෙන් වෙන් කර දුන්නා. නමුත් ඒ සමගම හික්කඩුව ගම් කාර්ය සභාවට ලැබිය යුතු මුදල්වලින් 3/4 පංගුවක් පමණ අර අළුත් ගම්කාර්ය සභාවට දී තිබෙනවා. ඒක කොයි තරම් ලොකු වැරද් දක්ද කියා කල්පනා කර බලන්න. ඒක

දේශපාලන පළිගැනීමක් කියා මා කිය නවා. මා එසේ කියන්නේ කුලරත්න මහත්මයාගේ වුවමනාවටම අර අළුත් ගම් කාර්ය සභාව පිහිටවූ නිසයි. දැන් තිබෙන තත්ත්වයේ හැටියට අපේ පරණ ගම් කාර්ය සභාවේ මොනම කාරණයකට වත් මුදල් නැහැ. ළමයින්ට දෙන පීටිවලට වත් මුදල් නැහැ; පාරවල් නඩත්තු කරන්නටවත් මුදල් නැහැ; ඒ වාගේ ම කලින් පාරවල වැඩ කරන්න නියම කර තිබුණු කොන්ත්‍රාත්කරුවන්ට දෙන්න වත් මුදල් නැහැ. ඒ විධියේ තත්ත්වය කුසි අද තිබෙන්නේ. අපේ ගම් කාර්ය සභාව සමිතීන්ටයෙන් පමණක් නොවෙයි, වෙනත් ආයතනයක් සමිතීන්ටයෙන් වුවත් ඒ විධියේ වැඩ කටයුතුවලට ගරු පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමා ඉඩ දෙන්න එපා. එ වැනි කටයුතු කිරීමට ඉඩ දෙන නිලධාරීන් සිටිනවා නම් ඔවුන්ට දඩුවම් පැමිණ විය යුතු බවත් මා පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමාට මතක් කර සිටිනවා.

අ. හා. 3.15

ඊ ළඟට, මගේ කොට්ඨාශයේ දෙල්දූව නම් කුඩා දූවක් තිබෙන බව පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමාත් දන්නවා ඇති. ඒ දෙල්දූවට යන්න තිබෙන්නේ එකම පාල මයි. ඒ පාලම හැරුණාම දෙල්දූවට යා යුතුව තිබෙන්නේ ඔරුවලින්. රජයෙන් රුපියල් 35,000 ක් පමණ වියදම් කරලයි ඒ පාලම හරිගස්සුවේ. දැන් ගම්මුත් විසින් සිය ශ්‍රම දානයෙන් ගමේ සිට පාලම දක්වා පාරක් සාදා තිබෙනව. නමුත් පාලම පාවිච්චි කරන්න අනික් ගමේ සිට පාරක් දමා දෙන්නය කියා ගම් කාර්ය සභාවෙහුත්, අප පෞද්ගලික වශයෙන් දැන් අවුරුදු දහයක් තිස්සේම ඉල්ලා තිබෙනව. නමුත් මේ වන තුරු ඒ ඉල්ලීම ඉෂ්ටවී නැහැ. මේ වනතුරු ඒ පාරට මුදල් වෙන් කර නැහැ. ඒක විශාල අපරාධයක්. දෙල්දූවෙ ගම්වාසීන්ට හදිසියේ ලෙඩෙකු වත් ගෙන යන්න විධියක් නැහැ. රැකට ඔරුවක් තැනි වුණොත් ඒ රුපියල් 35,000 ක් පමණ වියදම් කර තැනු පාලමට යා යතුව තිබෙන්නේ ඒ දණ්ඩකිනුයි. තවත් රුපියල් 5,000 ක් පමණ වියදම් කළොත් ඒ පාර හරිගස්සන්න පළවත්. ඒ නිසා මේ කාරණය සමිතීන්ටයෙන් විශේෂ උනන්දුවක් හා සැලකිල්ලක්

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

every stage was that we were prepared to compromise with the Tamils. But there is nothing that is indicative of compromise as far as the present Government is concerned. There are whole generations of people in the Island who do not know Sinhala and for whom a compromise is essential, and we must work out a compromise. And we state that if the Tamils are prepared to teach their children and to let them learn Sinhala without opposition, we for our part are quite prepared to make any compromise to make it possible for the Tamil-speaking people to live with us as brothers in this country. But what was the answer to that? Their answer was that, as part of a settlement, they could not agree to learn Sinhala. If that is the answer that the Tamil-speaking people have to give us, if that is the leadership that the Federal Party imposes, I ask you, Mr. Chairman, what does it amount to but communalism. If it is a question of being told, "Look, do not legislate and create situations where it becomes impossible for us to live in this country, where the Sinhalese and we have to live in this country", that is beyond dispute. The Sri Lanka Freedom Party has no problems on that, if, as part of the same settlement, the Tamil-speaking people agree on the principle of one language one nation.

But look at the answers we have had in this House. The hon. Member for Paddirippu, interrupting me in the course of the Second Reading Debate—the Hon. Prime Minister quoted that passage—said, "It can never be that the Sinhalese-speaking and the Tamil-speaking peoples will be one nation. It can never be." Look at the statements made by the hon. Member for Nallur (Dr. Naganathan), in the Committee stage, on 9th September, 1965. At column 2370—the earlier column was quoted by the hon. Member for Habaraduwa—of HANSARD, he has stated :

"Democracy is the rule of the people by the people for the people."

Having quoted Lincoln, he goes on to say :

"The people of Sinhala *nadu* must rule themselves in the Sinhala language. The people of Tamil *nadu* must rule themselves in the Tamil language."

I do not know whether it is the wish of this House, the wish of this National Government, to talk in terms of a Sinhala *nadu* and a Tamil *nadu*. As far as we are concerned, the Sri Lanka Freedom Party, speaking for the Opposition, I say there is no question of two different *nadus* one way or the other. We believe that there must be one nation in this country, that the unifying bond must be language and it must be the Sinhala language for the future.

We are quite prepared to concede that there are administrative problems in the Northern and Eastern Provinces where the vast majority of the people do not know Sinhala, where they have never been educated in Sinhala. If it is a question of making a compromise on that, the Sri Lanka Freedom Party will help the National Government to make that compromise in practical terms and will not oppose any solution for the sake of opposing it. We have taken the position that, although the National Government cannot tell us what their solutions are, we are prepared to tell you what the correct direction for the solution is. We are prepared to tell you the principles on which we can arrive at a settlement, and you can enter into the settlement in the sure and certain confidence that the Sri Lanka Freedom Party of the Opposition will support you.

What does the Government say? The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice, speaking on the Votes of the Justice Ministry, told us shortly before the Adjournment, "We are going to implement your statute—the Tamil Language (Special Provisions) Act. We are going to make Tamil the language of administration in the Northern and

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.]

Eastern Provinces, of course, to the extent that your statute provides for it."

That is true. Read that statute. Read the Tamil Language (Special Provisions) Act of 1958. What does it say? It says that, for certain specified administrative purposes in the Northern and Eastern Provinces, the Tamil language may be used.

ප්‍රේමදාස මය.

(ති. පිරෙමදාස)

(Mr. Premadasa)

Where?

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.

(ති. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I do not have the statute with me. If you give it to me, I will show you.

The Tamil Language may be used for specified purposes. There is no argument about that. I will show it to you. It says in Section 5:

"In the Northern and Eastern provinces the Tamil language may be used for prescribed administrative purposes, in addition to the purposes for which that language may be used in accordance with the other provisions of this Act without prejudice to the use of the official language of Ceylon in respect of those prescribed administrative purposes."

Section 4 says:

"Correspondence between persons, other than officials in their official capacity, educated through the medium of the Tamil language and any official in his official capacity or between any local authority in the Northern and Eastern Provinces and any official in his official capacity, as prescribed, shall be in the Tamil language."

I accept that. Those are the two sections.

What does the Hon. Minister tell us? He gave us the answer when we asked a Question about the Maviddapuram speech. He said, "We are going to bring regulations to make Tamil the language of administration in the Northern and Eastern Provinces." The hon. Parliamentary Secretary says, "We are going to implement the Reasonable Use of Tamil Act"—the one I quoted.

What is the difference? The difference is that in that particular statute Sinhala is clearly the official language; without prejudice to the use of Sinhala, for every one of those purposes Tamil may also be used. If you read Sections 4 and 5 carefully, you will see that there is no question of making Tamil the language of administration in the Northern and Eastern Provinces. All that they say is that, for certain specified purposes—Section 4 refers to correspondence between persons educated in Tamil in the Northern and Eastern Provinces and officials—you can use Tamil in addition to the official language which is, in any case, preserved without the "prejudice" clause.

Section 5 says that you have a certain prescribed purpose in addition—and you can prescribe the purpose—namely, that you will have Tamil, in addition to Sinhala, as a language that may be used. Am I correct, Mr. Parliamentary Secretary?

Now, there is a world of difference between saying that and saying that the language of the administration in the Northern and Eastern Provinces shall be Tamil. Our position, in the S.L.F.P., is very simple. I am certain that the Tamils have no problems. It is the Federal Party leadership that creates the difficulties; and if the Federal Party leadership will accept the position that future generations of children who are going to be born from today onwards will learn Sinhala, as far as we are concerned it matters little. If for another generation the administration is to be duplicated and every single official act were to be performed in Sinhala and Tamil in the Northern and Eastern Provinces, every single record were to be kept in Sinhala and Tamil, it will create no problem at all, because we have the assurance that we are going to have one language and are going to be one country in the future.

But that is not what our friends in the Federal Party are seeking. They tell us, "We are not prepared to be compelled to be a subject race"

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

—to use their own words. Nobody likes to be a subject race. I myself do not like to belong to a subject race. In fact, I realize now that I do belong to a subject race in this country. There is a school of thought that the Tamil people have never had it so good since the days of Elara as now. Now, Sir, if I may say so, with respect, we are today a subject people. A section of the Sinhala speaking people have sold our national rights. They have made the Tamils our rulers, and we as democrats accept it. We shall accept it in the spirit that we have no choice. Our processes are democratic; and we ourselves know that it is not permanent and that some day in the future, if these political settlements are wrongly entered into as on this occasion, a solution may come. Maybe it will take many years to come. But the problem will be resolved in the same way as wrong political settlements are resolved anywhere. If wrong political settlements had occurred between India and Pakistan in 1947—political settlements which did not take account of realities—they have led to a situation which, we know from history, has taken over 17 years to resolve itself in those countries. Make no mistake, Sir, any attempt to impose the will of a group on another will never succeed.

We are charged with having failed to settle a problem. I concede that. It requires goodwill on both sides to settle a problem. You can never settle a problem unilaterally, and we did not try to do so. What did the Sri Lanka Freedom Party do? It formulated three statutes—the “Sinhala Only” Act, the Tamil Language (Special Provision) Act, and the Language of the Courts Act.

අ. ආ. 3.30

We were told at that time that the three statutes were all wrong, that they must be repealed. The Federal Party told us that. They were not acceptable, they said. Today the United National Party says, “We accept these same three statutes, and we shall not alter them by a single

word, letter or comma.” The Federal Party now says that the United National Party and these three statutes are acceptable to them. All we can say is that we are grateful that the Federal Party accept these statutes. Whether you accept it from us or whether you accept it from the U.N.P. makes not the slightest difference. What is important is that you are accepting the three statutes. We maintain that these three statutes are correct, and as long as you accept them we are glad. You refused to accept them from us. That is all right. You are willing to accept them from the U.N.P. As far as we are concerned, it is not a question of individual political parties having a fight in this House. What is important is the ultimate destiny of a nation. Therefore, I do make a point that although you were unwilling to accept our settlement, we bear no malice. It does not matter. You told us that the Language of the Courts Act must be repealed. The Hon. Prime Minister, from 1961 onwards, when he was in the Opposition, had flatly refused to touch it. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary, speaking a little while ago said, “I am not going to alter the Language of the Courts Act.” I accept it and you accept it. That is important. We are very happy that you accept it. After all, we are making progress.

Now what is the question? You say, “We want to learn Sinhala voluntarily. We want it to be left to us and the future generations of Tamil-speaking people. We are not going to have the Sinhala language thrust down our throats, no, thank you. We will not learn it under compulsion; we will not learn it under threat, we will only learn it voluntarily.” I can understand that if the present generation of Tamil-speaking persons were under pressure; I can understand it if a Government, let it be any Government, tells the Tamil-speaking people: “You shall be thrown out of Government Service unless your children are taught Sinhala”. That is not the position. We are prepared to bargain with you; we

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[ඉ. ආර්. බයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.]

are prepared to negotiate with you; we are prepared to agree to any compromise to deal with the present generation and their problems for an assurance of the future. Of course, the Tamil-speaking peoples cannot learn Sinhala under pressure, I agree with you. We want you to agree to this as part of a settlement. We are telling you, the leaders of the Tamil-speaking peoples, we are not trying to take teachers to your schools and to force them to teach Tamil children Sinhalese; that has never been done. You charged the Sri Lanka Freedom Party with excesses of the worst order, but can you charge us with having forcibly sent Sinhala teachers to teach Tamil children Sinhala? Never. We are asking you for co-operation. We are asking you as a price of an overall settlement on the language question to agree to it, to give us your co-operation in ensuring that Tamil children will have the opportunity to learn Sinhala and not to stand against it. And, on our side, we say, we will co-operate with your United National Party, the great democratic capitalists whom you trust. We will co-operate with them if it means settling the language problem, and if it means an overall solution to the problem for all time.

What is the settlement we offer? We say, in the Northern and Eastern Provinces, even if it takes a generation we do not mind, if it is going to take time it does not matter—let it take time—state the settlement that you want. Now that you are in a position to rule this country, thanks to the United National Party and their squalid betrayal, you occupy, as I said before, a position that the Tamils have never occupied in this land from the time of Elara onwards. If you now wish to enjoy the position and to take advantage of it, then communal passions are now being raised not by the S.L.F.P. but by the Federal Party and their leaders. This is not, if I may say so, in any sense an indictment on the Tamil-speaking people. The Tamil-speaking people have no

share in it. They have their occupations; they have their economic problems just as much as their counterparts in the South. The farmers are concerned with their crops. The fishermen are concerned with their catches. Every one of us has to live in this country as a Ceylonese and this problem, as you say, shall not change. The political leaders say, "Thou shall not learn Sinhala on that promise." We are for ever divided.

The hon. Member for Nallur (Dr. E. M. V. Naganathan) tells us that the people of Sinhala *nadu* must rule themselves in the Sinhala language and the people of the Tamil *nadu* must rule themselves in the Tamil language. If that is the policy of the Federal Party, then, indeed, our rulers have doomed us to a very sorry state. They have doomed us to remain for ever divided. It is natural, I suppose, that people who think in terms of federalism want a division. It is natural, I suppose, that people who for ever talked about a Tamil *arasu*, a kingdom of their own, are now concerned with creating a kingdom out of the Northern and Eastern Provinces.

I said before, speaking on the Throne Speech, that I thought the Tamils had bartered their kingdom for a portfolio, but now I appreciate they have bartered the portfolio for a kingdom. Indeed the entire objective of the Federal Party is manifestly clear. The analogy of it through the Local Government Ministry makes it perfectly plain what is to be the mechanism of the colonization and exploitation which is to be inflicted by race upon race, by the Federal Party through their lackeys in the United National Party. What is going to happen to this country?

The Hon. Prime Minister, speaking in the Throne Speech Debate in 1960, made it plain to us that he could not agree to the regional councils proposals until he was very clear in regard to the distribution of powers. A document was presented to him at that time in 1960, at a time when the

United National Party was exploring possibilities of obtaining Federal Party support in order to form a government and, at that stage, it was manifestly clear that the distribution of powers envisaged by the Federal Party included in effect that all the functions now being performed by these different absent Gentlemen in the Front Bench would be delegated to the different regional councils or district councils. You would not have a Minister of Fisheries. His powers in each area, if there happens to be a sea coast, I suppose, would be vested in regional councils or district councils.

I referred to this matter myself in the course of the Throne Speech Debate this year. If I may be permitted to quote a passage of what I stated then—I quote from Column 932 of HANSARD of 22nd April 1965—this was what I stated:

“But what did the Hon. Prime Minister state? I am not going to read his speech now. You will find it in HANSARD of 26th August, 1960, columns 891, 892, 893, 896, 897. He made the position quite clear when he spoke in answer to the hon. Member for Nallur (Dr. Naganathan) and said that the question of district councils and regional councils depends on the distribution of powers between them. He said, ‘I am not prepared to talk about these councils until I know where we stand in this matter’. What does he do now? He asks us to accept blindfold a document in which he said, ‘Earnest consideration will be given to the establishment of District Councils which will function under the control and direction of the Central Government’. In regard to the distribution of powers, there is nothing. Under the four-point programme of Mr. Chelvanayakam, practically all the powers of these Gentlemen in the front row as well as of those in the Senate as Ministers are delegated to the regional council.”

The hon. Member for Vaddukoddai (Mr. Amirthalingam) interrupted me and said:

“That is a reproduction of the B-C Pact.”

I said:

“That is why it was torn up. They told us we should tear it up. The Hon. Minister of State started walking to Kandy and got obstructed by the hon. Member for Gampaha. The Hon. Prime Minister

started making speeches against us. We got into grave trouble. Finally what happened? Our Prime Minister, the late Prime Minister, bowed to the voice of public opinion. And that is what we will do; we will bow to the voice of public opinion.”

Mr. Chairman, what happens here now? To this day the distribution of powers is a secret, unless it constitutes part of the mysterious document which the Hon. Prime Minister under pressure admitted he signed with the Federal Party. In fact, I now begin to wonder whether it is the Federal Party that signed away their rights or whether it is the Hon. Prime Minister who sold out the rights of the Sinhalese people.

The demand for parity which the Federal Party makes now is not a new demand. It started as a demand for political parity by the hon. Member for Jaffna (Mr. Ponnambalam) when he started talking about fifty-fifty. Those were days, on behalf of the Tamil-speaking peoples, when a political weapon was forged out of it. They did not then talk about parity of status for long. They talked about parity in this House; they talked about parity of representation. And what happened then? Two stalwarts, both of the Sinhala-speaking people, the Hon. D. S. Senanayake, Prime Minister, and the late Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike, one of his lieutenants, stood against it, fought against the hon. Member for Jaffna and said that the Sinhalese-speaking people cannot accept a political settlement in which this country is to be divided not on the basis of population, not on the basis of areas, not on the basis of delimitation but on the basis of a political principle of parity between a number of representatives in this House. That was the first attempt to bring these divisions into our land, to bring division on the basis of race into this country, a demand which came up at the time of the Soulbury Commission. That demand was denied and the then Board of Ministers, including the late Mr. D. S. Senanayake, the late Mr. Bandaranaike, and others, who were

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[එෆ්. ආර්. බයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

later to be the nucleus of the U.N.P., formulated a Sri Lanka Freedom Bill, which later became the Minister's draft and on the basis of which our present Constitution was framed.

The Sri Lanka Freedom Bill was passed in this House against the will, against the votes, of the hon. Member for Jaffna (Mr. Ponnambalam) and his compatriots of that time, and the first victory of the Sinhalese-speaking people was won, which involved a definite negation and rejection of the principle of parity which no one in this country would possibly accept. The Tamil-speaking people themselves were not parties to this; the hon. Member for Jaffna who claimed to be their representative claimed to present this argument. But in point of fact he was arguing a brief, a brief not on behalf of those people but a brief for political power. Then Mr. Chairman, subsequently what happened? The Tamil-speaking Ministers joined the U. N. P. Government. To this date not a single one of us has the slightest objection to that; we welcome it. Even if they do not speak our language, and that creates difficulties for us to communicate with them, it does not matter. After all Tamils and Sinhalese are people of Ceylon and we all must live together. Why should they not be Ministers?

We had distinguished Ministers before Mr. Suntharalingam began his talk of *Eelam*; Mr. Sittampalam and Mr. Natesan were Ministers of the U. N. P. Government, all very distinguished gentlemen and leaders of the Tamil community in one sense or another. But they were not inspired by any motives of division, of attempts to create a kingdom of *Arasu* or *Eelam*. Those persons were genuinely concerned with the wish of the Sinhalese-speaking and Tamil-speaking people to live together as one nation for the future within the shores of our land. What has happened since?

Today what is the true position? The true position is that this is no longer a simple issue of a people

having a problem which they want to solve. If there is a problem and you want to solve it we have indicated to you the way in which we envisage a solution, the framework within which you can solve it, and we have assured you of our support. This is a problem that has to be taken above politics; political parties cannot bargain for ever on the basis of the numbers they get and say, "All right, we have got sixty-six; we want some more. Why do you not bargain with us?" We are not prepared to enter into that bargain; we are not prepared to bid against, but we say that we must bit together because what is involved is not a question of offering something which is not ours to give but the heritage of the Sinhalese people which is at stake in this matter. It is not for us to forfeit that or give it up. If it is a question of the right of the Tamil-speaking people with self-respect to live in this country as a part of our people, there is no argument about it. They must have it. There is no question of their being subject to disabilities; whether they know Sinhalese now or not is immaterial. Those of them who do not know Sinhalese must be able to live with self-respect as equal citizens in our country.

අ. ආ. 3.45

But what is more important is the future. Are you going to accept the principle that there are to be two nations, two languages, permanently enshrined? That is the major question that concerns us now. However much your Prime Minister, however much your Ministers, may seek to dodge the question which they imagine they have solved, our people of this country are the ultimate judges. A political settlement cannot be achieved if it is going to be entered into on a wrong principle. We do not want this country to pave the way for a civil war. If, in point of fact, our country is to be divided into two parts whether in consequence of the hopes and aspirations of an *Arasu* of the

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

Federal Party, or an attempt at compromise by the United National Party, the Sinhalese-speaking peoples will not accept it, and cannot accept it, for reasons which are very obvious. My good Friend, the hon. Member for Kekirawa (Mr. Lenawa) will agree with me that even from the very narrow angle of achievements of the Lands Ministry he spoke of a little while ago, from the angle of colonization, the elbow room that must exist for two nations in our land to expand, the amount of cultivable land that our people, the Sinhalese and Tamil-speaking peoples, can hope to expand is limited. Is it possible to mark it off and surrender it as part of a territory to another nation? These are not things that are possible.

So, while we want a compromise, while we want our language problem settled, while we want the relationship between the Sinhalese and Tamil-speaking people to be normalized and corrected, let me say this. King Elara in medieval history was never able to expand his authority and influence to the southern part of our country. Today, Mr. Tiruchelvam, the Honourable Minister, has achieved exactly that. His authority and influence today extends in a very real sense from Point Pedro to Dondra Head. He is in a position, through his regional councils whose powers have not been distributed and whose distribution of powers has not been disclosed to us, to take control of all the acts of government administration, of all the Gentlemen seated on the Front Bench,—or ought to be seated there—barring my good Friend, the Hon. Minister of Food. You will find that the Hon. Minister (Mr. M. Tiruchelvam) is today claiming all those powers.

If, after all, we are talking of local administration in the normal sense, may I ask a simple question? You are now giving local bodies minimum powers. They hardly have a grant sufficient to dig one miserable well or to undertake the construction of one little new road

every year. Most of them get a five figure income, and that is all. Hardly a single local authority I know of at village committee level can claim an income exceeding Rs. 14,000. What can they do with that? Very little. If it is a question of genuinely giving powers and not, may I say, engaging in a power struggle, although we might be a subject nation, a subject nation is never willing to accept subjection on that principle.

A wrong political settlement will not do. But if you really wish a genuine political settlement—we have given you one—even though you are accepting the very things we said at the time but which you rejected then, we do not mind it. Even if you accept the solution which the Federal Party did not accept in our time, but which they are now willing to accept from you in the name of democracy, capitalism or anything else, it is all right with us. So, I make the point that when you are dealing with the Votes of local administration and talking of the Minister's powers, of the Minister's authorities, it is not as simple as saying: we are dealing with village committee administration, we are dealing with the powers of the Local Government Service Commission with reference to municipal councils. I think there is a far greater range and reach here, and I think a very great responsibility is owned by the Central Government in this matter, especially when, on a delegation of powers, the whole country and its political future is placed in jeopardy by the tactics and anxiety of the U. N. P.-Federal Coalition to maintain itself in power.

ඉරන්තීමි මයා.

(திரு. இரத்தினம்)

(Mr. Ratnam)

தலைவர் அவர்களே, அரசுகளும் மொழியைப் பற்றி நிதி அமைச்சு ஆய்வின்போது பேசிய பின்னர் மொழிப் பிரச்சினை பற்றிய பேச்சு இச் சபையில் இனிமேல் நிகழாது என்று நினைத்திருந்தோம். என்றாலும் இந்த மொழிப் பிரச்சினையின் மீது இந்த நாட்டிலே ஓர் இரத்

விசேஷக் கலாச்சாரம் பற்றி, 1965-66

—கலை கலை

[ஒருநினைவு]

தக் களரியை உண்டாக்க, ஓர் உள்நாட்டுக் கலகத்தை உண்டாக்க முனைந்து கொண்டிருக்கின்ற சிலருடைய முயற்சியின் காரணமாக நான் மீண்டும் இந்த மொழிப் பிரச்சினையைப் பற்றிப் பேச வேண்டியவனாக இருக்கின்றேன்.

சென்ற ஒன்பது ஆண்டுகளாக தமிழ் மக்களின் பிரச்சினையை, தமிழ் மக்களின் மொழிப் பிரச்சினையைத் தீர்க்கிறோம் என்று கூறி, பல முறை உடன்படிக்கைகளை எழுதியும், பல முறை பேச்சுக்களை நடத்தியும் ஒன்றும் செய்ய முடியாது, தாங்கள் செய்த பிழைகளையே மீண்டும் மீண்டும் செய்து, அதன் பயனாகப் பதவியை இழந்து, எப்படி மீண்டும் இழந்த ஆட்சியைப் பெறலாம் என்ற குறுக்கு வழியைத் தேடிக்கொண்டிருக்கின்ற சிலர் இன்னும் தங்கள் போக்கை மாற்றிக்கொள்ளவில்லை என்பதைக் காணத் துக்கப்படவேண்டியிருக்கின்றது.

நான் இந்தச் சபையிலே பலமுறை சுட்டிக் காட்டியுள்ளேன். உண்மையிலேயே அவர்களுக்கு நான் கூற விரும்புகின்றேன், மீண்டும் ஆட்சிக்கு வரவேண்டுமென்றால் சிங்களம் மட்டும் சட்டத்தை வைத்துக்கொண்டோ, தமிழ் மக்களையும் சிங்கள மக்களையும் ஏமாற்றிக் கொண்டோ அவர்கள் இலங்கையில் எந்த நாளிலாவது ஆட்சிக்கு வரமுடியாது. சென்ற ஒன்பது ஆண்டுச் சரித்திரத்தை மறந்து, மீண்டும் அந்தக் குறுக்கு வழியில் இறங்கியவர்களுக்கு என்ன நடந்தது என்பதைச் சரித்திரம் காட்டுகின்றது.

சில வருடங்களுக்கு முன்னர் கௌரவ தொம்பேப் பிரதிநிதி (திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க) வாழ்ப்பாணத்துக்குச் சென்றபொழுது அவருக்கு நாங்கள் மரியாதையளித்து வரவேற்றோம். “நாங்கள் தந்த வாக்குறுதிகளை நிறைவேற்றித் தருவோம்” என்ற முறையிலே, அவர் கல்லூரிப் பரிசளிப்பு விழா ஒன்றிலே பேசும்பொழுது, சிங்கள மக்கள் தமிழும் தமிழ் மக்கள் சிங்களமும் படிக்க வேண்டுமென்று கூறினார். அவருடைய பேச்சுப் பத்திரிகைகளில் வெளிவந்தது. ஆனால் கொழும்புக்கு வந்தவுடன் நெருக்கடியின் காரணமாக—சில சிங்கள மக்களின் நெருக்கடி காரணமாக—“தாம் அவ்விதம் அங்கு பேசவில்லை” என்று கூறிப் பத்திரிகையிலே ஓர் அறிக்கையையும் விடுவித்தார். அன்றுதான்

இந்நாட்டிலே ஸ்ரீலங்கா சுதந்திரக் கட்சி தன் ஆட்சியை இழக்கின்ற ஒரு பிழையான வழியிலே காலெடுத்து வைத்தது. ஸ்ரீலங்கா சுதந்திரக் கட்சி இன்று இந்த நிலைக்குள்ளாவதற்கு தொம்பேப் பிரதிநிதி தான் காரணமென்று இங்கு கூற விரும்புகிறேன். அவர் அங்கு அப்போது வெளியிட்ட கருத்தை, அதாவது, சிங்கள மக்கள் தமிழும் தமிழ் மக்கள் சிங்களமும் படித்தால்தான் இந்த நாட்டிலே ஒற்றுமை உண்டாகும்—இந்த நாட்டிலே ஐக்கியம் நிலவும்—என்பதை அனைவரும் வரவேற்பார்கள். அது அவருக்கும் நன்றாகத் தெரியும். அதனால் தான் அவர் வாழ்ப்பாணத்திலே அப்படிக்கூறினார். ஆனால், இங்கு வந்தவுடன் அவர் அந்தக் கொள்கையை மாற்றினார்.

சிங்களம் மட்டும் சட்டத்தினால்தான் காலஞ்சென்ற திருவாளர் பண்டாரநாயக்க அவர்கள் இந்நாட்டின் ஆட்சி பீடத்தில் அமர்ந்தார். அவ்விதம் தாங்களும் செய்தால் மீண்டும் ஆட்சி பீடத்தைக் கைப்பற்றலாம் என்று இன்னும் சிலர் நினைக்கின்றபடியினால் தான் நாட்டில் வேறு எவ்வளவோ பிரச்சினைகள் இருக்கும் பொழுது இந்தத் தேவையற்ற பிரச்சினையைப் பற்றியே அவர்கள் மீண்டும் மீண்டும் பேசிக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள்.

தலைவர் அவர்களே, இந்தச் சபையிலே கௌரவ தொம்பேப் பிரதிநிதி மொழிப் பிரச்சினையைப் பற்றி ஐந்து அல்லது ஆறு முறை பேசியிருக்கிறார். இந்த ஐந்து அல்லது ஆறு முறைப் பேச்சையும் இன்று அவர் பேசிய பேச்சோடு இணைத்துப் பார்த்தால் அவர் எதையும் புதிதாகக் கூறவில்லை என்பது தெளிவாகின்றது. இன்னும் எத்தனை முறை அவர் இதனையே திருப்பித் திருப்பிக் கூறப்போகின்றாரோ எனக்குத் தெரியாது. ஆனால், பொருத்தமில்லாதவற்றை—சரித்திரம் கூறுவதற்கு மாறானவற்றை—மீண்டும் மீண்டும் அவர் திருப்பிச் சொன்னாலும் கூட, சில சிங்கள நண்பர்கள் கூறுவதுபோல், சிங்கள மக்களுக்காக—சிங்கள மொழிக்காக—அவர் ஆங்கிலத்தில் எவ்வளவு பரிந்து பேசினாலும் கூட, இந்நாட்டிலே சிங்கள மக்களும் தமிழ் மக்களும் ஒன்றாகத் தான் இருக்கப் போகிறார்கள், என்றும் ஒன்றாகத்தான் வாழப் போகின்றார்கள், ஒரு மொழி, ஓர் இனம், ஒரு மதம் என்று கற்பிக்கின்றவர்கள் இந்நாட்டிலிருந்து விரட்டி

விசேஷக் கைவெண்பன் பனை, 1965-66

—கைவெண்பன்

யடிக்கப்படத்தான் போகிறார்கள் என்பதை நான் ஆணித்தரமாகக் கூறிவைக்க விரும்புகின்றேன்.

ருஷ்யாவிலே என்ன நடந்தது என்பதை அவர்கள் ஆராய்ந்து பார்க்கவேண்டும். அவர்கள் இப்பொழுது சீர்ப் பக்கம் சேர்ந்திருந்தாலும் ருஷ்யாவைப் பற்றி மிகவும் அறிந்தவர்கள். அங்கு என்ன நடந்தது? சார் அரசாங்கம் என்ன செய்தது? சார் மன்னனின் கொடுமை எவ்விதம் நடந்தது என்பதை அவர்கள் ஆராய்ந்து பார்த்தல் நன்று. நாற்பது, நாற்பத்தைந்து மொழிகள் பேசப்படுகின்ற ருஷ்ய நாட்டிலே, ருஷ்ய மொழியைத் தனி மொழியாக, பாடசாலை மொழியாக, ஆட்சி மொழியாக சார் மன்னர்கள் ஆக்க முயன்றார்கள். ருஷ்யாவிலே புரட்சி நடந்தது. அதன்பின் ருஷ்யா சுதந்திரம் பெற்றதும் சிறுபான்மையினரின் மொழி உரிமை வழங்கப்பட்டது. நானும் ருஷ்யாவுக்குப் போயிருக்கிறேன்; இவைகளைக் கவனித்திருக்கிறேன். அங்குள்ள முறைகளை ஏன் பின்பற்றக் கூடாது? அல்லது சீனாவிலுள்ள முறையை ஏன் பின்பற்றக் கூடாது என்று நான் அந்தப் பக்கத்திலுள்ளவர்களைக் கேட்க விரும்புகின்றேன்.

தமிழ் மக்கள் தங்கள் பகுதிகளில் தமிழை ஆட்சி மொழியாகக் கைக் கொள்வதனால் இந்நாட்டுக்கு எதுவித துன்பமும் உண்டாகாது. ஒரு மொழி, ஓர் இனம் என்று சொல்கின்றவர்களின் கொள்கை எப்பொழுதும் நிலைத்தது இல்லை. கௌரவ எட்டியாந்தோட்டைப் பிரதிநிதி (கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா) 1956 ஆம் ஆண்டு சிங்களம் மட்டும் சட்டம் இந்தச் சபையிலே விவாதிக்கப்பட்ட பொழுது அதனை எதிர்த்து ஓர் அழகான உரையை நிகழ்த்தினார். அதனை அவர் இப்பொழுது மறந்திருக்க மாட்டார் என்று நினைக்கின்றேன். ஒரு மொழி என்று சொல்கின்றவர்கள், ஓர் இனம் என்று சொல்வார்கள். ஓர் இனம் என்று சொல்கின்றவர்கள் ஒரு சமயம் என்று சொல்வார்கள். ஒரு சமயம் என்று சொல்கின்றவர்கள் ஒரு குடும்பம் என்று சொல்வார்கள். எனவே, கடைசியாக அது ஒரு சிலருடைய ஆட்சியில் தான் போய்முடியுமென்று ஓர் உண்மையை அவர் அப்பொழுது கூறினார்.

கௌரவ தொம்பேப் பிரதிநிதி அவர்கள், “கொஞ்சம் சர்வாதிகாரம் வேண்டும்” என்று முன்பொருமுறை குறிப்பிட்டார். இன்று கூட அந்தக் கொள்கையை அவர் விட்டு விட்டார் என்று எண்ணுவதற்கு இடமில்லை. இன்று ஒரு மொழி என்று கூறுகின்றவர்கள் பின்னர் ஓர் இனம் என்று கூறுவதை மறுக்க முடியாது. ஓர் இனம் என்று கூறுகின்றவர்கள் பின்னர் ஒரு சமயம் என்று கூறுவதை மறுக்க முடியாது. ஒரு சமயம் என்று கூறுகின்றவர்கள் பின்னர் ஒரு குலம் என்று கூறுவதை மறுக்க முடியாது. ஒரு குலம் என்று கூறுகின்றவர்கள் பின்னர் ஒரு குடும்பம் என்று கூறுவதை மறுக்க முடியாது. கடைசியிலே இது ஒரு குடும்பத்தின் சர்வாதிகாரத்திலேதான் போய் முடியும். இது 18 ஆம் நூற்றாண்டின் காட்டுமிராண்டித்தனமான கொள்கையைத் தான் நாட்டிலே புகுத்தும். அவ்விதம் செய்தவர்கள் வேரும் வேடி மண்ணும் இல்லாமல் பல நாடுகளில் அழிக்கப்பட்டார்கள் என்பதை இங்கு ஞாபகமூட்ட விரும்புகின்றேன்.

இது சரித்திரங் கூறுகின்ற வரலாறு என்பதை நான் இங்கு நினைவூட்ட விரும்புகிறேன். இந்த அரசாங்கத்தின் அமைச்சர் சபையிலே ஒரு தமிழர் இடம் பெற்று இலங்கையின் தெற்குப் பகுதியிலே ஆட்சி செலுத்துகிறார் என்று அவர்கள் சொன்னார்கள். முன்னைய அரசாங்கங்களில் திருவாளர் சுந்தரலிங்கம், திருவாளர் சிற்றம்பலம், திருவாளர் நடேசன் ஆகியோர் அமைச்சராக இருந்தார்கள். அந்தக் காலத்தில் தமிழ் ஆட்சி எங்கும் இருந்தது என்ற கூக்குரல் கேட்கவில்லை. இன்று ஒரு வரை அமைச்சராகி விட்டால், ‘தமிழர் ஆட்சி இந்நாட்டிலே வந்துவிட்டது, தமிழர்கள் ஆளுகிறார்கள்’ என்று கூறப்படுகின்றது. நான் சிங்கள மக்களைக் குறை சொல்லவில்லை. அவர்கள் நல்லவர்கள். சிங்கள மக்களுக்குத் தலைவர்களாக இருப்பவர்களைத்தான் நான் குறிப்பிடுகிறேன். இந்நாட்டிலே தமிழ் ஆட்சி நடக்கிறதென்று கூறுவதற்கு எந்தவிதமான இடமுங் கிடையாது. உங்களுடைய மந்திரி சபையில் நீங்கள் ஒரு தமிழரைக் கூட நியமிக்க முடியாத இக்காட்டான நிலையில் இருந்தீர்கள் என்பதை நீங்கள் மறுக்க முடியாது. நீங்கள் சர்வ சிங்கள மந்திரி சபையை அமைத்திருந்தீர்கள். இனத்தை விற்றுப் பிழைக்கும் தமிழர்தாமும் உங்களுடைய மந்திரி சபையிலே மந்திரியாக வரப் பயந்து கொண்டிருக்கிறார்.

விசர்ச்சன கெடுபென் பனந, 1965-66

—காரக ஙலல

[ஓர்ந்நிதலி லல.]

ருந்த நிலை இருந்தது. மந்திரியாக வர நினைத் தவர்கள் தமிழ் அரசுக் கட்சிக்கு மட்டுமன்றி, தமிழ் இனத்துக்குமே பயந்து அவ்வாறு வர முடியாத நிலை இருந்தது. தமிழ் இனத்தைச் சேர்ந்த ஒருவரைத்தானும் உங்கள் மந்திரி சபையிலே நியமிக்க முடியாத நிலையில் நீங்கள் இருந்துவிட்டு, இன்று தேசிய அரசாங்கத்தின் மந்திரி சபையில் இடம்பெற்றுள்ள ஒரேயொரு தமிழ் மந்திரியைச் சுட்டிக்காட்டி “இலங்கை முழுவதும் தமிழர் ஆட்சி நடக்கிறது” என்று கூறுவதன் நியாயம் என்னவோ? அது பகுத்தறிவுக்குட்பட்டதா? இக்கொளவ சபையிலே பேசும்போது நீதியுடன், நியாயத்துடன், தர்க்க முறையிற் பேச வேண்டியது ஒவ்வொரு கொளவ அங்கத்தவரதும் கடமையாகும். திருப்பித் திருப்பிச் சொன்னவற்றைக் கூறிக் கொண்டிருப்பதில் எவ்வித பயனுமில்லை.

உலகில் பல இன மக்கள் வாழுகின்ற நாடுகளை எடுத்துப் பாருங்கள். பல மொழி பேசுகின்ற மக்கள் வாழுகின்ற, பல சமயத்தைப் பேணுகின்ற மக்கள் வாழுகின்ற நாடுகளை எடுத்துப் பாருங்கள். சுவிச்சலாந்து, பின்லந்து, ருஷ்யா போன்ற நாடுகளிலெல்லாம் பல மொழிகள் பேசுகின்ற மக்கள் சுமுகமாக சமாதானமாக வாழுகின்றார்கள் என்றால், ஒற்றுமையாக வாழுகின்றார்கள் என்றால் அதற்குக் காரணமென்ன? அந்நாடுகளில் ஒரு மொழி, ஒரு இனம் அதற்குரிய இடத்தைப் பெற்று, “எமது மொழிக்குரிய மதிப்புத் தரப்படுகின்றது; எமது இனத்துக்குரிய உரிமை தரப்படுகின்ற” தென்று அந்நாட்டு மக்கள் உணரக் கூடிய முறையில் ஆட்சி நடப்பதேயாகும். இன்று பௌத்தராக இருப்பவர் நாளை கிறித்தவ சமயத்துக்கு வந்துவிடலாம். இன்று இந்துவாக இருக்கும் நான் நாளை பௌத்த சமயத்துக்கு வந்துவிடலாம். ஆனால் மொழியை இலகுவில் மாற்ற முடியாது. இன்றைக்கு நான் பேசுகின்ற தமிழ் மொழியை மாற்றி நாளைக்குச் சிங்கள மொழியைப் பேசத் தொடங்கிவிட முடியாது. இந்நாட்டிலே கடந்த இரண்டாயிரம் ஆண்டு காலத்திலே தமிழ் மக்களும் சிங்கள மக்களும் ஒரு இனமாக மாறிவிடவில்லை.

நூற்றைம்பது ஆண்டுகளாக இலங்கையை ஆட்சி செய்த ஆங்கிலேயரின் மொழியை நாம் மாற்றித் தரக்கூடியவர்கள். அவ்வாறு மீட்டலுக்குக்

ரிக மொழியாக மக்கள் ஏற்றுக் கற்கத் தொடங்கினார்கள்; ஆங்கில முறையிலே வாழ முயன்றார்கள். அது அவர்களுடைய தாய் மொழியை அழித்துவிடவில்லை. ஆங்கிலேய ஆட்சிக்காலத்தில் கொழும்பு ஏழில் வாழ்ந்தவர்களுடைய வேலைக்காரர்கூட ஆங்கிலத்தைப் பேசக் கூடியவர்களாயிருந்தார்கள். இந்நாடு ஒரு குட்டி ஆங்கில நாடு என்று, தமிழ் மக்களும் சிங்கள மக்களும் அதன் நாகரிகத்தில் மயங்கிக் கிடந்த காலத்திலுங்கூட அவர்களால் வெள்ளைக்காரராக—கறுத்த ஆங்கிலேயராக—மாறிவிட முடியவில்லை. இது சரித்திரம் கூறும் ஒரு பெரிய உண்மை! உங்களுடைய மொழியை எங்கள் மீது திணித்து, எங்களை நீங்கள் அடக்கி ஆளலாம் என்று நீங்கள் நினைத்தால் அது இன்றோடு நின்று விட முடியாது. ஒரு வேளை இன்று எங்களுக்கு உங்களை எதிர்க்கும் சக்தி இல்லாமல் இருந்தாலும், வருகிற காலத்திலாவது இது பெரும் போராட்டமாகத்தானிருக்கும். எனவே, எனது மதிப்புக்குரிய சிங்களச் சகோதரர்களுக்கு நான் சொல்லுவதென்ன வென்றால், இந்நாடு நல்ல முறையிலே முன்னேறவேண்டுமானால், குறுக்கு வழியிலே தலைவர்களாக வர முயலுபவர்களை நீங்கள் ஒதுக்கித் தள்ளுங்கள் என்பதுதான். இதனை நான் பலமுறை சொல்லியிருக்கிறேன்.

இன்று நாங்கள் ஐக்கிய தேசியக் கட்சியோடு சேர்ந்திருக்கிறோம் என்று நீங்கள் சொல்லுகிறீர்கள். உண்மையிலே நாங்கள் உங்களுடன்தான் முதலில் சேர்ந்தோம். ஐக்கிய தேசியக் கட்சியோடு சேராமல் ஸ்ரீலங்கா சுதந்திரக் கட்சியோடு சேர்ந்ததற்கு எங்களைப் பலர் குறைகூறியும் இருக்கிறார்கள். நாங்கள் உங்களை மதித்துத்தான் சேர்ந்தோம். நீங்களும் எங்களை மதிப்பதாகச் சொன்னீர்கள். எங்கள் மொழிப் பிரச்சினையைத் தீர்ப்பதாகச் சொன்னீர்கள். இன்று இந்த மொழிப் பிரச்சினை தீர்க்கப்படவில்லையென்று சொல்லுகிறீர்கள். இப்பிரச்சினையைத் தீர்ப்பதற்கு நீங்கள் இரண்டு குழுக்களை நியமித்தீர்கள். அவற்றின் அறிக்கைகளைக்கூட நீங்கள் வெளியிடவில்லை. தமிழ்மொழி உபயோகச் சட்டத்தின்கீழ் பல பிரமாணங்களை ஆக்கி இச்சபையிற் சமர்ப்பித்தீர்கள். ஆனால் அவற்றை நீங்கள்

விசேஷ கைபிளன் பகை, 1965-66

—காரக கலா

காரணம் என்னவென்று நீங்கள் கூறவில்லை. அப்பிரமாணங்களை மீட்டதற்கும் சைனா கபே யிலே நடந்த சூழ்ச்சிக்கும் எவ்வளவு தொடர்பு இருந்தது என்பது எங்களுக்குத் தெரியும். நீங்கள் அதனை மறைக்க முயலலாம். எச்சூழ்ச்சியினாலும்—காட்டுமிராண்டித் தனத் தாலும்—ஒரு இனத்தை அடக்கி ஆளமுடியும் என்று நீங்கள் எண்ணுவது பெரும் பகற்கள வாக இருக்கும் என்று குறிப்பிட விரும்பு கிறேன்.

நீங்கள் வெளிநாடுகளை எடுத்துப் பாருங் கள். இந்தியாவில் பல மொழிகள் பேசப்படு கின்றன. இந்திய மக்கள் பல மொழிகளைப் பேசுகின்றனர். அவர்கள் தமது நாட்டில் ஒரு இனமாக வாழவில்லையா? பல மொழிகள் பேசுவதால் ஒரு சமுதாயம் உருவாக்கப்படாதா என்று நான் கேட்க விரும்புகிறேன். நாம் இங்கு பாகிஸ்தானை எடுத்துக் கொள்வோம். கிழக்குப் பாகிஸ்தான் மேற்குப் பாகிஸ்தான் ஆகிய இரண்டு பகுதிகளுக்கும் பொது மொழி யாக ஒரு மொழியைக் கொண்டுவர அங்கு முயற்சிகள் மேற்கொள்ளப்பட்டன. ஆனால் ஈற்றில் இரண்டு மொழிகளை அங்கு ஆட்சி மொழிகளாக வைக்க வேண்டியதாயிற்று. இன்று இரண்டு மொழிகளை ஆட்சி மொழிக ளாக வைத்தே பாகிஸ்தான் ஆளப்படுகின் றது. இரண்டு மொழிகள் ஆட்சி மொழிகளாக இருப்பதால் ஒரு நாட்டில் இன ஒற்றுமை ஏற்படாதென்று கூறுவது சரியான வாத மாக இருக்க முடியாது. ஒரு மொழியை ஒரு இனத்தின் மீது திணிப்பதால் இன ஒற்றுமை கெடும் என்பதைத்தான் உலக சரித்திரம் எமக்குக் காட்டுகின்றது. இதை நான் எமது எதிர்க் கட்சி நண்பர்களுக்குச் சுட்டிக்காட்ட விரும்புகிறேன். இந்த அடிப் படையை அவர்கள் ஏற்றுக்கொண்டால்தான் உண்மையான சனநாயகம் நாட்டில் நிலவும்.

டி. ஐ. 4

சுயேச்சு

(அக்கிராசனர்)

(The Chairman)

Order, please. There will be no suspension for tea today.

The hon. Appointed Member (Sir Razik Fareed) will now take the Chair.

அதன்பிறகு, குழுக்களின் உப அக்கிராசனர் அவர்கள் அக்கிராசனத்தினின்று நீங்கவே, ஸ்ரீமான் ருஷிக் பரீத், ஓ. பி. ஈ., நியமன அங்கத்தவர், அக்கிராசனத்திலமர்ந்தார்.

Whereupon Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES left the Chair, and SIR RAZIK FAREED, O.B.E. [APPOINTED MEMBER] took the Chair.

ஓர்நினைவி உடன.

(திரு. இரத்தினம்)

(Mr. Ratnam)

இரண்டு மொழிகளை அரசு கரும மொழிகள் ஆக்குவதால் ஒரு போதும் நாட்டின் ஒற்றுமை குலைய மாட்டாது. பல நாடுகள் கூறுகின்ற வரலாறு இதுதான். எதிர்க் கட்சியினர் இந்த அடிப்படையை உண்மையாக ஏற்றுக் கொண்டால்தான் இந்த நாட்டில் அவர்கள் கூறுகின்ற சம தர்மம் ஏற்பட முடியும். தமிழ் நூல்களில் மிகச் சிறந்த நூலாக இன்று விளங்குவது திருக்குறள் என்பதை நான் கூற வேண்டியதில்லை. உலகில் உள்ள நூல்களில் சம தர்மத்தைப் பற்றி மிகச் சிறப்பாகக் கூறுகின்ற நூல் திருக்குறளைப்போல் வேறெதுவும் இல்லை. கௌரவ கொழுப்பு தெற்கு அங்கத்தவர் (திரு. பேனாட் சொய்சா) இத்திருக்குறளிலிருந்து ஒரு குறளை எடுத்து இச்சபையில் விளக்கியுள்ளார். இத்திருக்குற ளைத் தமது மொழியில் மொழிபெயர்த்து சம தர்மத்தைப் போற்றுகின்ற ருஷ்ய மக்கள் கூடச் சிறப்பாகப் பாராட்டியிருக்கிறார்கள். இந்த நூலுக்குச் சொந்தமாக இருப்பவர்கள் தமிழ் மக்கள். ஆனால் எந்த ஒரு நாட்டிலும் வகுப்புவாதப் போராட்டம் இருக்கும் வரையும், ஒரு இனத்தை மற்றொரு இனம் அழிக்கும் நிலை இருக்கும் வரையும் சம தர்மம் நிலைக்க முடியாதென்பதை நான் எமது இடது சாரிக் கட்சியினருக்குச் சொல்ல ஆசைப்படு கிறேன். இந்த விடயம் உங்களுக்கும் தெரிந் ததுதான். எனவே கௌரவ எதிர்க் கட்சி யினர் தமது வகுப்புவாதப் போராட்டத்தைக் கைவிட்டுவிட வேண்டும். இலங்கையில் இன்று இனப் போராட்டம், மொழிப் போராட்டமாக மாறிக் கெண்டிருக்கிறது. அரசாங்கத்துடன் சிங்கள மக்கள் தமது கருமங்களைச் சிங்களத் தமிழ் மக்கள் தமது கருமங்களைத் தமிழ்

விசேஷக் கெடுபிழை பணை, 1965-66

—கூர்வை ஸ்தல

[ஓர்நீநிதை உல.]

ழிலும் செய்கின்ற வாய்ப்பை நல்கினால் இந்த நாட்டில் எந்த விதமான பிரச்சினைகளுக்குமே இடமிராது.

இன்று இலங்கையில் இருப்பவை இரண்டே இரண்டு பிரச்சினைகள்தாம். ஆனால் கௌரவ தம்பதெனியாப் பிரதிநிதி (திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனாநாயக்க) அவர்களுடைய பிரச்சினை யுடன் இந்த நாட்டை மூன்று பிரச்சினைகள் எதிர் நோக்கியுள்ளனவெனலாம். ஒன்று மொழிப் பிரச்சினை. இரண்டாவது சமயப் பிரச்சினை. மூன்றாவது கௌரவ தம்பதெனியாப் பிரதிநிதியுடைய இந்தியர் பிரச்சினை. இந்த மூன்று பிரச்சினைகளும் மனிதத் தன்மையோடு தீர்க்கப்படும் பொழுதுதான் இந்த நாட்டில் உண்மையாகச் சம தர்மம் தலை காட்ட முடியும். இந்த நாட்டில் சிறந்த முறையில் தமிழ் மக்களும் வாழ வேண்டும், சிங்கள மக்களும் வாழ வேண்டும். ஏன்? நாங்கள் மட்டுமல்ல உலகம் முழுவதும் சிறந்த முறையில் வாழ வேண்டுமென்பதுதான் தமிழ் மக்களுடைய கொள்கையாகும். சம தர்மக் கொள்கையை ஏற்க எப்பொழுதுமே தமிழ் இனம் ஆயத்தமாக இருக்கிறது. நான் எதிர்க்கட்சியினரைக் கேட்பது என்னவென்றால் ஐக்கிய தேசியக் கட்சியினர் மொழிப் பிரச்சினைக்குத் தீர்வு காண்கையில் அதை அவர்கள் குழப்பக் கூடாதென்பதுதான். யார் செய்தாலும் நல்லதைச் செய்ய வேண்டும்.

“ நல்லது செய்தல் ஆற்றீர் ஆயினும்

அல்லது செய்தல் ஒம்புமின் ” என்று பௌத்த நூல்கள் கூறுகின்றன. பௌத்த சமய நூலாகிய மணிமேகலை “ நல்லதைச் செய்யா விட்டாலும் தீமையைவாது செய்யாதிருங்கள் ” என்று கூறுகின்றது. இதைத்தான் நான் கௌரவ தொம்பே பிரதிநிதி (திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்கா) அவர்களுக்குச் சொல்ல விரும்புகிறேன். இதை விடுத்து மொழி, சமயம், இந்தியர் பிரச்சினைகளை ஏணிப்படிகளாக வைத்து நீங்கள் அதிகாரத்தைக் கைப்பற்ற முயன்றால் இந்த முயற்சியில் வெற்றிகாண மாட்டீர்கள். ஏனெனில் இவ்வித படிகள் வழக்கி வழக்கி எவரையும் வீழ்ந்து கின்ற படிகள் என்பதைத்தான் உலக சரித்திரம் காட்டுகின்றது. எனவே இவ்வித துவேஷப் படிகளில் ஏறி வழக்கி வழக்கி விழாதீர்கள் என்றுதான் எதிர்க்கட்சியினரை எச்சரிக்க விரும்புகிறேன்.

எந்த ஒரு நாட்டிலும் சட்டங்கள் மக்களுக்குக் காகவேயன்றித் சட்டங்களுக்காக மக்கள் இல்லை. எந்த நாட்டிலும் மக்களுக்குச் சேவை செய்கின்ற வகையில்தான் சட்டங்கள் ஆக்கப்பட வேண்டும். இந்தியாவில் கூட இந்தியை இந்திய துணை கண்டம் முழுவதற்கும் பொது மொழியாக ஆக்கினார்கள். இப்பொழுது அவர்கள் அதை மாற்றி அமைக்கவும் முன்வந்திருக்கிறார்கள். அங்கு உண்மையான ஜனநாயகத்திற்குத் தலை வணங்க மக்கள் ஆயத்தமாக இருக்கிறார்கள். இதை எதிர்க்கட்சித் தலைவர்களும், குறிப்பாக ஸ்ரீ லங்கா சுதந்திரக் கட்சித் தலைவர்களும் உணர்ந்து கொண்டால்—அவர்கள் இந்த நாட்டுப் பிரச்சினைகளுக்கேற்பத் தம்மை மாற்றிக்கொண்டால்—இந்த நாட்டில் பிரச்சினைகளே இருக்க முடியாது. எனவே, தமிழ் பேசும் மக்களின் சார்பில், இலங்கைத் தமிழரசுக் கட்சியின் சார்பில்—

இலங்கை உன்தீ

(தலைமை தாங்கும் அங்கத்தவர்)
(The Presiding Member)

கௌரவ கிளிநொச்சிப் பிரதிநிதி 15 நிமிடங்களுக்கு மேற் பேசிவிட்டார். இன்னும் இரண்டு நிமிடத்துக்குள் முடித்துக் கொள்ளும் படி கேட்டுக் கொள்கிறேன்.

ஓர்நீநிதை உல.

(திரு. இரத்தினம்)
(Mr. Ratnam)

—பகிரங்கமாக இந்தச் சபையிலே கூறுகின்றேன் : நாங்கள் சிங்கள மக்களோடு தோளோடு தோள் இணைந்து முன்னேற்றப் பாதையில் போக ஆயத்தமாக இருக்கிறோம். நீங்கள் எங்களை உங்களுக்கு—உங்கள் மொழிக்கு அடிமைகளாக்கக் கருத வேண்டாம். நாங்கள் உங்களுடைய மொழியைக் கற்க ஆயத்தமாக இருக்கிறோம். அது போல நீங்களும் எங்கள் மொழியைக் கற்க முன்வாருங்கள். நாங்கள் அனைவரும் ஒன்றுபட்டு வாழும் நிலைக்கு மாறாக இருக்கும் தலைவர்களை ஒரு புறத்தில் விரட்டி விட்டு, எங்கள் நாட்டைச் சிறந்த நாடாக—பௌத்தம் செழிக்கும் நாடாக—சிவபுரியாக—உலகத்திலேயே முன்மாதிரியான நாடாக மாற்றியமைப்போம்.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා. (දඹදෙනිය)

(ශ්‍රී. ඡුර්. ඡී. ජේනානායක—தம்படுதனிய)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake—Dambadeniya)

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, විශේෂයෙන් මේ යුගයේදී මේ අංශය සාකච්ඡාවට භාජන කරන්නට සිදුවීම ඉතා වැදගත් ලෙස කල්පනා කරන්නට අපට සිදු වී තිබෙනවා. මන්ද? මේ අංශයෙන් අනාගතයේ දී අපගේ රට දෙකට බෙදෙයිද නැද්ද යන ප්‍රශ්නය අනුව සිදු මේ විවාදය කරන්නට සිදු වී තිබෙන්නේ. රට සභා ක්‍රමය අනුව හෝ වේවා, දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා ක්‍රමය අනුව හෝ වේවා, රට දෙකට බෙදීමේ අදහසක් තිබෙනවා නම් ඒ වැඩ පිළිවෙල මේ පළමුවන අවුරුද්ද අවසාන වන විටම ඒ ආකාරයටම ක්‍රියාවේ යෙදුණොත් එය මේ රටේ සිදුවන විශාලම පාඩා දීමක් වන බව මම ඉතා කණගාටුවෙන් ප්‍රකාශ කර සිටිනවා.

මේ රට සභා නමැති ව්‍යාපාරයේ මූලික හේතුව මූලික අදහස කුමක්දැයි මා දන්නවා. එක්තරා අවස්ථාවකදී මාත් ඊට එකඟ වුණා. සුද්දන්ගේ පාලන ක්‍රමය මේ රටෙහි තිබෙන කාලයේදී කච්චේරි ක්‍රමය අපට පුරුදු වුණා. ඒ කච්චේරි ක්‍රමය අනුව නිලධාරීන්ගේ පාලනයක් ඇති වුණු නිසා ඒ කටයුතු සඳහා වෙන් කරන ලද මුදල් ඒ නිලධාරීන් විසින් නියම කාක්කුමක් උවමනාවක් ඇතිව වියදම් කරන්නට උත්සාහ නොකළ බව අවුරුද්දක් පාසාම අපට පෙනී ගියා. සෑම අවුරුද්දකම වෙන් කරන ලද මුදල් වලින් විශාල නොගයක් කච්චේරිවල රැඳී තිබුණා. අන්න එම නිසයි, පළාත් පාලනය මහජන නියෝජිතයින් මගින් විය යුතුය යන හැඟීම මුලදී මතු වුණේ. ඒ අවස්ථාවේදී පළාත් පාලනය මහජන නියෝජිතයින් මගින් කළ යුතු බවට හැඟීමක් මතු වුණු බව කවුරුත් පිළිගන්නවා.

නමුත්, අද පවතින විධියේ පරිසරයක දී එවැනි දෙයක් කළ යුතුද යන ප්‍රශ්නය මේ අවස්ථාවේදී ඉතා වැදගත් වෙනවා. සාමාන්‍ය වශයෙන් මහජන නියෝජිතයන් මගින් ප්‍රදේශ පාලනය කිරීම අවශ්‍ය දෙයක් බව අප කවුරුනුත් පිළිගන්නවා. ඒ අනුව පළාත් පාලන ක්‍රම බිහි වී තිබෙන බවද කවුරුත් දන්න කරුණක්. මහජන නියෝජිතයින් මගින් පාලනය කෙරෙන කිතු මිතු වී තිබෙන්නේ? මෙය මුලදීම

විට කච්චේරි නිලධාරීන් මගින් පාලනය වෙනවාට වඩා සෙනක් සහනයක් ජනතාවට ලැබෙන බවට අපේ විශ්වාසයක් තියෙනවා. නමුත් මා මේ අවස්ථාවේදී අහන ප්‍රශ්නය මේකයි. එවැනි වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්නට මේ පරිසරය ඔබිනවාද? මේ රට සභා ඉල්ලන සේෂාව ඇති කරන්නේ එක්තරා පිරිසක් පමණයි. එනම්, පෙබරල් පක්ෂය පමණයි. අනෙක් උදවිය ඒ ගැන කිසිම සේෂාවක් කරන්නේ නැ. පෙබරල් පක්ෂය මේ ඉල්ලීම කරන්නේ මහජන නියෝජිතයින් මගින් ප්‍රදේශ පාලනය කරන අදහසින් නොවෙයි. ප්‍රදේශ වෙන් කරගෙන ඒවා දෙමළෙන් පාලනය කරන්නට වුවමනා නිසයි, ඔවුන් මේ සේෂාව කරන්නේ. ඔවුන්ගේ පරමාර්ථය ඒකයි. භාෂා ප්‍රතිපත්තිය උඩ රට දෙකට බෙදීමේ පරමාර්ථයෙන් මේ ඉල්ලීම කරන බව අපට මේ අවස්ථාවේදී කල්පනා කරන්නට සිදු වී තිබෙනවා.

අපට නිදහස ලැබුණු කාලයේදී පණහට පණහේ සම තත්ත්වය පිළිබඳ ප්‍රශ්නය මතු වුණු අවස්ථාවේදී එවකට සිටි හී. එස්. සේනානායක අගමැති තුමා ඊට සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම විරුද්ධව එය ප්‍රතික්ෂේප කළ බව අප කවුරුත් දන්නවා. දොම්පෙ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාර නායක මයා.) ඒ පිළිබඳ විස්තරයක් එතුමාගේ කථාවේදී කළා. බල නල කොටස් කර සුළු ජාතීන්ට වෙනමත් මහ ජාතියට වෙනමත් බෙදා දෙන්නට බැරි බව ප්‍රකාශ කළ හී. එස්. සේනානායක අගමැති තුමා එදා පණහට පණහේ ප්‍රතිපත්තියට සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම විරුද්ධ වුණා. එදා එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ මූලික ප්‍රතිපත්තිය එයයි. මේ රටේ සෑම දෙනාම එකම අදහසක් අනුව, එකම ජාතික හැඟීමෙන් යුක්තව වැඩ කළ යුතු බව එදා කියා සිටි බව අප දන්නවා. හොඳයි, ඒ ප්‍රශ්නය එතැනින් නැති වුණාද? ඉන් පසුව නව ප්‍රශ්නයක් මතු වුණා. එක් ප්‍රදේශයක් සිංහලෙන්, අනික් ප්‍රදේශය දෙමළෙන් පාලනය කරන්නට වුවමනා යයි කියමින් රට දෙකට කරන්නට යෝජනාවක් ඉදිරිපත් වුණා. එදා ඉදිරිපත් වූ පණහට පණහේ යෝජනාව තේද මේ වෙනත් මුහුණුවර කිතු මිතු වී තිබෙන්නේ? මෙය මුලදීම

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා.]

ඇති වුණේ කොහොමද? මේ රට සිංහලෙන් හා දෙමළෙන් පාලනය කළ යුතු යයි මගේ මිත්‍ර ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මහතා විසින් ඉදිරිපත් කරන ලද යෝජනාවක් 1944 මැයි මාසයේදී රාජ්‍ය මන්ත්‍රණ සභාව විසින් සම්මත කරන්නට යෙදුණා. එදා එතුමා කළ කටාවෙන් කොටසක් මා කිය වන්නට කැමතියි.

“Language, Sir, is one of the most important characteristics of nationality. Without language a nation stands a chance of being absorbed or of losing its identity. With language it has a chance of living for centuries. It is because of our language that the Sinhalese race has existed for 2,400 years, and I think that, composed as we are in this House, on the eve of freedom as a free country, we should prepare for a national official language.”—[STATE COUNCIL DEBATES, 24th May 1944 ; Vol. 1, p. 748.]

අ. හා. 4.15

සිංහල ජාතිය අවුරුදු 2,500ක් පවතින්නට මූලික හේතුව සිංහල භාෂාව බව එතුමා ප්‍රකාශ කර තිබෙනවා. ජාතියක් අදහස ගන්නට තිබෙන ලකුණ ඒ ජාතියේ භාෂාවයි. ජර්මන් ජාතිය අදහන්නේ ජර්මන් භාෂාව නිසයි. ප්‍රංශ ජාතිය අදහන්නේ ප්‍රංශ භාෂාව නිසයි. ඉංග්‍රීසි ජාතිය අදහන්නේ ඉංග්‍රීසි භාෂාව නිසයි. කොටින්ම ජාතියක් ඇදින ගන්නා ප්‍රධාන ලකුණ භාෂාවයි. එදා ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මහතා සිංහල පමණක් රජයේ භාෂාව කිරීම සඳහා යෝජනා කරන විට සිංහල සහ දෙමළ රජයේ භාෂා විය යුතු යයි නල්ලියා මහතා ඊට අතුරු යෝජනාවක් ඉදිරිපත් කළා. ඒ අතුරු යෝජනාව පිළි ගන්නට යෙදුණු නිසා ඒ භාෂා දෙක රජයේ භාෂා විය යුතු බවට රාජ්‍ය මන්ත්‍රණ සභාව යෝජනා ස්ථිර කර ගත්තා. ඒ අතුරු යෝජනාව ගැන ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන මහතා මෙසේ සඳහන් කර තිබෙනවා.

“. . . but it seems to me that the Tamil community and also the Muslim community, who speak Tamil, wish that Tamil also should be included on equal terms with Sinhalese. The great fear I had was that Sinhalese being a language spoken by only 3,000,000 people in the whole world would suffer, or may be entirely lost in time to come, if Tamil is also placed on an equal footing with it in this country. The influence of Tamil

literature, a literature used in India by over 40,000,000 and the influence of Tamil films and Tamil culture in this country, I thought might be derimental to the future of the Sinhalese language; but if it is the desire of the Tamils, that Tamil also should be given an equal status with Sinhalese, I do not think we should bar it from attaining that position.”—[STATE COUNCIL DEBATES, 24th May 1944 : Vol. 1, p. 748.]

එතුමාගේ එක අදහසක් මා සම්පූර්ණ යෙන්ම අනුමත කරනවා. සිංහල ජාතිය අවුරුදු 2,500 ක් ජීවත් වුණේ මූලික වශයෙන් සිංහල භාෂාව නිසයි. දකුණු ඉන්දීයාවේ හාර කෝටියක දෙමළ ජනයා වාසය කරනවා. දෙමළ සාහිත්‍යයේත් භාෂාවෙන් තිබෙන බලවේගය නිසා සිංහලය මැකී යනවා. ඔව්, මේක අවංක හයක්. නමුත් මෙසේ කියන ගමන්ම දෙමළ පිරිසගේ හිත දිනා ගැනීම පිණිස දෙමළයටත් ඉඩ දෙමු යයි එතුමා ඊළඟට කියනවා. දැනුත් එතුමා අනුගමනය කරන්නේ ඒ ප්‍රතිපත්තියයි. භාෂාව නැති වෙනවා යයි විශ්වාස කරනවා නම් ජාතිය නැති වෙනවා යයි විශ්වාස කරනවා නම් එක් පිරිසකගේ හිත දිනා ගැනීම පිණිස මේ වගේ ප්‍රතිපත්තියක් අනුගමනය කළ යුතුද? හාර කෝටියක බලවේගය නිසා සිංහල භාෂාව නැති වී යන බව දැන දැනත් ද්‍රවිඩ මිත්‍රයන්ගේ හිත සතුටු කිරීමට ක්‍රියා කිරීම තදබල වරදක්. ජාතියට භාෂාවට වැඩ කරන්නා කියා පාර්ලිමේන්තුවට තේරී ඇවිත් ද්‍රවිඩ මන්ත්‍රීන් සමඟ මිත්‍රකම රැකගැනීම සඳහා වැඩ කරනවා නම් එය හරි ප්‍රතිපත්තියක්ද? නියම විදියට ජාතිය, භාෂාව රැක ගැනීමට උත්සාහ කරනවා නම් මිත්‍රකමට කුමක් වුවත් යුක්තිය ඉෂ්ට කරන්න වුවමනා නේද? 1944 දී මේ භාෂා දෙකටම සම තත්ත්වයක් දිය යුතුයයි පිළිගත්තා. එතැනින් මෙය අවසන් වූයේ නැහැ. රජය භාෂා දෙකක් පිළිගත්තා නම් ඒ අනුව ඊළඟ පියවරත් ගත යුතුයි. ළමයින්ට අධ්‍යාපනය දීමත් ඒ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය අනුව කළ යුතුයි. ඔන්න පටන් ගත්තා, දෙවන පියවර. මාධ්‍ය දෙකෙන්ම අධ්‍යාපනය දෙන්න පටන් ගත්තා. එක් කොටසකට දෙමළෙන් උගන්වන්න පටන් ගත්තා. තවත් කොටසකට සිංහලෙන් උගන්වන්න පටන් ගත්තා. රජයේ පාසල්වලත්, පෞද්ගලික පාසල්වලත් මේ විදියට උගන්වන්න පටන් ගත්තා.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

මේ අධ්‍යාපන ක්‍රමයෙන් කුඩා කාලයේදී ප්‍රශ්නයක් ඇති වූයේ නැහැ. හැබැයි, දෙමළ ලමයින්, සිංහල ලමයින් වෙන් වුණා. දැන් දෙමළ සිංහල කියන වචන පාසල්වලටත් ඇතුළු වී තිබෙනවා. බාලාංශ පන්තිවලදී ප්‍රශ්නයක් ඇති වූයේ නැහැ. ක්‍රම ක්‍රමයෙන් පන්තියෙන් පන්තිය මේ අධ්‍යාපනය දීම වැඩි වීගෙන ගොස් එක්දස නවසිය පනස් ගණනේදී අවසාන විභාග පවා මේ භාෂා දෙකෙන් පවත්වන්න පටන් ගත්තා. දෙමළ ලමයින් සඳහා දෙමළ ප්‍රශ්න පත්‍රත්, සිංහල ලමයින් සඳහා සිංහල ප්‍රශ්න පත්‍රත් දෙන්න පටන් ගත්තා. මෙසේ පටන්ගත් මේ භාෂා හේදය උඩ අපේ ජාතිය දෙකට බෙදුණා. කුඩා කාලයේදී නම් ලමයින්ට මේ හේදය නිසා ප්‍රශ්නයක් ඇති වූයේ නැහැ. නමුත් අවුරුදු 7 ක් 8 ක් එක් භාෂාවකින් ඉගෙන ගෙන ඊට පසුව වෙනත් භාෂාවකින් විභාග යනව පෙනී සිටීමට අමාරු වුණා. ඒ නිසා ඒ ලමයින් කියන්න පටන් ගත්තා, රජයේ සේවාවන් සඳහා පවත්වන විභාගවලටත් තමන් ඉගෙනගත් භාෂාවෙන්ම පිළිතුරු දීමට අවසර දෙන්නය කියා. තමන් ඉගෙන ගත් භාෂාවෙන්—දෙමළ භාෂාවෙන් ඉගෙන ගත් ලමයින්ට දෙමළෙන්, සිංහල භාෂාවෙන් ඉගෙනගත් ලමයින්ට සිංහලෙන්—පිළිතුරු ලිවීමට අවස්ථාව දිය යුතුයයි කියන්න පටන් ගත්තා.

මුල සිටම එක් භාෂාවකින් අධ්‍යාපනය දුන්නා නම් ඒ භාෂාවෙන්ම රජයේ සේවයට ඇතුළු වෙන්නත් ඉඩ දිය යුතුයයි කියන්න පටන් ගත්තා. 1952-53 හරියේදී ඒකත් සිද්ධ වුණා. එක විභාගය සඳහා භාෂා දෙකෙන් ඕනෑම භාෂාවකින් පිළිතුරු ලිවීමට අවසර දුන්න. දෙමළ භාෂාවෙන් කොටසකුත්, සිංහල භාෂාවෙන් කොටසකුත් එකම විභාගයට පෙනී සිටියා. ඒ විභාගවල ප්‍රතිඵල අනුව ඒ දෙකොටසින්ම රජයේ සේවයට බඳවා ගත්තා. මේ නිසා ඇති වුණු තත්ත්වය මොකක්ද? දෙමළ භාෂාවෙන් ඇතුළු වූ ලමයා සිංහල දන්නේ නැහැ. සිංහල භාෂාවෙන් ඇතුළු වූ ලමයා දෙමළ දන්නේ නැහැ. ඉංග්‍රීසි දන්නම දන්නේ නැහැ, ඒ භාෂාව ඉගැන්වුණේ නැති නිසා. මේ දෙකොටස එකම කන් තෝරුවට පත් වෙනවා. එතකොට මොකද වෙන්නේ? එක් කෙනෙක් කියන දේ

අනික් එක්කෙනා දන්නේ නැහැ. එක් කෙනෙක් දෙමළ දන්නේ නැහැ. අනික් එක්කෙනා සිංහල දන්නේ නැහැ.

මූලාසනාරූප මන්ත්‍රී
(தலைமை தாங்கும் அங்கத்தவர்)
(The Presiding Member)

The hon. Member has exceeded the fifteen minutes allowed to him.

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

No, Sir, I have been given thirty minutes.

මූලාසනාරූප මන්ත්‍රී
(தலைமை தாங்கும் அங்கத்தவர்)
(The Presiding Member)

I have to close the discussion at 5.30. I shall give you another five minutes.

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

I have with me a note here which says I have been allowed thirty minutes and I started on that basis.

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

What I want to point out is that the hon. Member is talking on a subject that does not come within this Vote. Language is not an item under this Vote.

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

Language is the basis on which the new rata sabha are going to be devised.

මූලාසනාරූප මන්ත්‍රී
(தலைமை தாங்கும் அங்கத்தவர்)
(The Presiding Member)

Please finish your speech in five minutes.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.

(ශ්‍රී. ශ්‍රේෂ්ඨතාණ්ඩු ඉයාසිඤ්ඤා)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

I will deal with that and also with the R. G. Senanayake line.

There is an organized attempt because we saw the line adopted by the hon. Member for Dompe. He said, "Now you are going to form regional councils and district councils. What Elara could not do, Tiruchelvam has done. From Point Pedro to Dondra Head Tiruchelvam sways power and his word is law." This is an unfair argument.

We are discussing the Votes of the Minister of Local Government and these Votes give no indication as yet of any regional councils or district councils to be formed under the Ministry of Local Government. I do not understand why the hon. Member for Dompe raises this question at this moment. It was, indeed, the last Government that discussed seriously the formation of district councils. The Members of the L. S. S. P., the Communist Party, and in fact Members of all parties raised this issue that the kachcheri system was not workable, that it was a left-over from the colonial times, and that it was not suited for modern administration. Therefore, all parties agreed that the kachcheri system should be done away with. The point was, how were we to replace the kachcheri system? I remember, the hon. Member for Yatiyantota spoke almost in detail regarding the formation of district councils.

Regional councils or district councils were envisaged long before the U. N. P. had any idea of forming a Government together with the Federal Party, and as a matter of fact, when the district councils were mooted there were negotiations between the Federal Party and the S.L.F.P. as to how the district councils were to be formed. We are not springing a surprise on the country in regard to the idea of district councils. Even earlier, there were discussions between the Federal Party and the Sri

Lanka Freedom Party as to the formation of district councils. Every party accepted in principle that the kachcheri system had to go and that some other unit should replace the kachcheri system. Greater powers and larger units working in the various spheres were envisaged when the idea of district councils was proposed. Nobody opposed the formation of district councils because it was a progressive move.

Now, the hon. Member for Dompe speaks as if the district councils have already been formed, as if power has been delegated to the Minister of Local Government. And, what is strange, this is the argument that is being taken into the country. I will show, Sir, what they are saying out in the country. I am sorry that the hon. Member for Dambadeniya is not here. What does he say? He tries to make out before the people of this country that the Hon. Mr. Tiruchelvam, Minister of Local Government, has undisputed power.

Sir, it must be clearly understood that however powerful a Minister may be, whoever may be the Minister, his powers are limited, his powers are curtailed by the very fact that there is cabinet responsibility. The Hon. Mr. Tiruchelvam cannot act in the way he wants to do on major issues. No, Sir. He is a part of the Cabinet and there is Cabinet responsibility. Even more than that, there is the Prime Minister himself who has a mind of his own. On certain matters the Prime Minister can take a stand quite opposed to the wishes of a Minister. That is well known. The hon. Member for Yatiyantota, the hon. Member for Dompe and the hon. Member for Dambadeniya have all been members of a Cabinet

Why are these hon. Members taking up this communal cry and trying to mislead the people? They tried to win by the bullet and failed and they tried to win by the ballot and failed. They hoped to raise the religious cry; that also failed miserably. They tried to raise a cry on the language issue and failed. Now what are they trying

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

to raise? They are now trying to raise the issue of regional councils. They are trying to make out that this country is going to be parcelled out and apportioned, a portion going to the Tamil-speaking people and a portion to the Sinhalese-speaking people.

No, Sir. This country will remain one and single for all the people who live in this country. Let there be no mistake about that. Once and for all this canard must be nailed to the counter. This type of vulgarity must not be tolerated. Otherwise something serious can happen. I will show you the extent to which these communal hate-mongers take this cry.

Look at the statement which the hon. Member for Dambadeniya has made and which has been reported in the "Observer" of the 13th instant. He says that the Sacred Tooth itself is not safe. This is the vicious type of propaganda that is being carried on, an insidious type of vulgarity. It is not worthy of the name he bears. F. R. Senanayake is a name revered among the Sinhalese people. What a father, what a son!

The only excuse I can make for such behaviour, I am sorry to say, is this: even in the best regulated families accidents can occur. That is all I have to say on that aspect of the matter. The dissemination of vicious propaganda of this type must be stopped once and for all. Look at the ideas that are taken before the people—that religion is not safe; the house you live in is not safe; the land you live on is not safe.

What is the statement which the hon. Member for Dambadeniya made just now? He said that unless you are a Sinhalese you cannot be a Buddhist. What an argument to come from the hon. Member for Dambadeniya! The only thing I can say, Sir, is that this also falls into line with the type of dangerous statements that are being made in this country now.

Sir, I explained to the House the position with regard to the proposal for regional and district councils. That was accepted and finished. It was not something proposed by us.

I must briefly outline the position. The proposal to establish district councils was brought in the time of the last Government. There were discussions between the Federal Party and the Sri Lanka Freedom Party. We approved of the formation of district councils because the kachcheri system had to be replaced. We wanted a working unit with wider powers. As I stated earlier, no Minister, whoever he may be, wherever he may come from, has absolute power. There is Cabinet responsibility, and in the end the final word will be that of the Prime Minister. Let there be no mistake about that.

To say, therefore, that Mr. Tiruchelvam holds sway from Point Pedro to Dondra is false. It is an unfair statement, particularly in reference to a Minister who is devoting all his time to serving the country, one who has sacrificed a good deal of his private and personal means for the sake of his office and for the sake of the country. I should like, at this stage, to pay a humble tribute to him and to say that he is one of the most hard-working Ministers in the Cabinet.

I must say that the House will be shocked at some of the things these communal rabble-rousers have said. The failure of their attempt to make use of the Poya holiday issue is an established fact. Here is a report in the "Observer" of the 13th September of what the hon. Member for Dambadeniya had said:

"The Christians should have by now realized that the U. N. P. had fooled them during the elections. They will be deprived of their day of prayer and rest. That will be only a start and in time to come more of their rights will be taken away."

I say boldly and categorically that under the leadership of the Hon. Prime Minister neither the Christians nor any other religious group will

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[පෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.]

lose any of their rights. We have known and worked with the Hon. Prime Minister long enough to realize that.

Coming to the language question, I must say that this Debate has gone completely outside the scope of local government. I am myself speaking on it merely to answer the treacherous lies that have been uttered on the Floor of this House. The hon. Member for Dambadeniya was one of those who raised the language issue. The policy on language has been very clearly enunciated by the Hon. Prime Minister. It is to be within the framework of the Sinhala only Act, the Language of the Courts Act, and the Tamil Language (Special Provisions) Act. The hon. Member for Dambadeniya said that even Mr. Bandaranaike had found that it was necessary to allow the reasonable use of Tamil. The argument he trotted out, however, was that language is the most vital thing for the Sinhala people, and that their culture had been preserved for 2,500 years on account of the Sinhala language. I agree. He also said that the Germans are known because of their language, that the French are known because of their language. I say that the Tamil people are also known because of their language. That must be admitted. A people who make a sacrifice of their language and of their religion for the sake of larger issues are a people to be admired. No respect that we pay them is too high. I myself belong to a minority religion. We are also prepared to make sacrifices for the sake of the country. So are the people from the Northern and Eastern Provinces. To them we say "Thank you".

අ. ආ. 4.45

The hon. Member for Dambadeniya harps on this cry of religion and language, division of the country, betraying the rights of the Sinhalese people. What are the arguments he adduced? Most wonderful arguments! He traced the religions of the various people and he said, "Why

cannot Buddhism and Hinduism which are almost akin join together? Why cannot the Sinhalese and the Tamils join together in spite of language differences? He says if you wish to be a Buddhist, you must then know Sinhala or, rather, unless you know Sinhala you cannot be a Buddhist.

රු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(කෙළරව අඟ්කත්තවර් ඉරුවර්)

(An hon. Member)

Have the Chinese studied Sinhala?

පෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.

(තිරු. ශෙල්තර්තන් ඉයසිඟ්ඟ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

To carry out this perfidious struggle of his, he is prepared to bring religion down to the lowest level and he is prepared to rouse in the people the most inhuman ideas. And what has he scored for himself? Coming from a distinguished family, which again I say is an accident, what has he scored for himself? What has he found for himself?

මුලසතාරුළ මන්ත්‍රී

(තලමම තාඟ්තරුම අඟ්කත්තවර්)

(The Presiding Member)

I cannot allow you to go on in that strain. Please withdraw that.

පෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා.

(තිරු. ශෙල්තර්තන් ඉයසිඟ්ඟ)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

I am sorry. I withdraw. I am also sorry to use such terms, but what can we do with a person like this? If you will read this paper, this is what it says:

"R. G. raises racial cry".

He goes to the people and says that the Tooth Relic is not safe because of the Tamil people. Is it a fair statement for a person to make? What is he trying to do? Has he not learnt the lesson of our blood bath of 1958?

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

I am sorry, we must offer our apologies to the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Local Government because we have not been able to say all that should have been said on this very important Ministry owing to the question raised by the hon. Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike) and the hon. Member for Dambadeniya (Mr. R. G. Senanayake). I hope that these two gentlemen, whatever their aspirations and desires may be for the future in the political field, will not use the political platform and their political status to once again bring bloodshed and strife to this country.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාநிති என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

On 14th May 1965, the Hon. Minister of Local Government made the following statement which appears in the "Ceylon Daily News" of that date :

"Local Government services needed immediate revolutionary changes."

That was a statement made by the Hon. Minister of Local Government. I was very happy to read that. I thought that in the Budget Debate at least we were going to be treated to a series of revolutionary changes in the whole set-up of local government. I patiently read the speech of the hon. Parliamentary Secretary in the Second Reading Debate but I found no reference to any of the revolutionary changes about which his Minister talked. In point of fact, it has been customary in this House in the Second Reading Debate for Hon. Ministers and those who represent the Ministers to, as briefly as possible, explain the policy of the departments concerned. Apart from meeting any arguments that had arisen in the course of the Debate, one expects from every Minister some reference to the policy that his departments and his Ministry intend to follow in the ensuing year. In

this respect, I regret to say that the hon. Parliamentary Secretary certainly failed in his duty. He gave us absolutely no inkling of the numerous problems that the local government set-up in this country has had to face.

I do not know why the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries should have laboured about regional councils. It is not a new thing.

ප්‍රේමදාස මයා.

(திரு. பிரேமதாச)

(Mr. Premadasa)

The Member for Dompe started it.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I was not here to listen to what he said. The regional councils idea really took shape with the Chelvanayakam-Bandaranaike pact. That is where it started. It started the ball rolling. The various ideas about it have been current for a long time. In other words, it is not a question of solving federalism or satisfying the Federal Party or solving the language issue. This is a continuation of the democratic process that we have had in this country. That is why we want the question of regional councils decided upon. It has nothing to do with all the other problems. We want to get rid of the kachcheri system. It is a monstrosity, it is an anachronism, that we should have in the midst of a democratic set-up a 16th century system called the kachcheri system.

To whom are these kachcheris responsible? We have side by side village committees with universal franchise dominated by utter bureaucrats who have no responsibility to anybody. The people are supposed to be their masters. They are elected by the people but they are ruled by bureaucrats in the kachcheris at every turn.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා]

I must say in fairness to the late Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike that he started the village committee system and developed it. We have had experience of this system for over thirty years. Surely it is time enough for us to change it. I was also a member of a Cabinet Sub-Committee which discussed this whole question. We could not finish it in time. But I expected some statement from the hon. Parliamentary Secretary, on behalf of his Minister, as to the present position with regard to this subject, how far they have progressed, what they intend to do, how power is to be delimited, what precisely they intend to give by way of power to regional councils.

There are also difficulties. There are various ideas in relation to direct elections and indirect elections. All those are matters that are raised under the subject of regional councils. Various ideas have been expressed in this matter and there is no finality. But nothing has been mentioned in this Budget Debate as to what they are proposing to do in the coming 12 months. We must know what this Ministry is going to do. Or is it the fact that my good Friend, the hon. Parliamentary Secretary, has no place in the Ministry, that the Ministry is run only by Mr. Tiruchelvam and a large number of clerks, some of whom were people who appeared in that famous case at Kegalla? There was a Tamil gentleman—I forget his name—who had a case against the administration.

ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(කෙළරඹ අභ්‍යන්තර ඉලක්කම්)

(An hon. Member)

Kodeeswaram.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාநிති என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

He is there now.

ප්‍රේමදාස මයා.

(திரு. பிரேமதாச)

(Mr. Premadasa)

No.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Why not? He is in the Ministry of Local Government.

ප්‍රේමදාස මයා.

(திரு. பிரேமதாச)

(Mr. Premadasa)

No.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

There are a number of other people of the same type.

ප්‍රේමදාස මයා.

(திரு. பிரேமதாச)

(Mr. Premadasa)

What is the name?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Kodeeswaram.

ප්‍රේමදාස මයා.

(திரு. பிரேமதாச)

(Mr. Premadasa)

No.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

If the hon. Parliamentary Secretary says, "No", I am prepared to accept it. But how can we accept the failure of the Minister's representative here? In the Second Reading Debate he spoke for half an hour. I read his speech carefully. But there is not a word about what they are going to do in the next 12 months. He will now get up and say, this is the policy. But where do we come in? We are

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කරක සභාව

not going to reply and start another debate on that? There are a number of important problems arising. There are many controversial issues connected with this question of regional councils. This is only one matter, and if you ask me, this is only a minor matter so far as I am concerned. The more important matter is how much democracy is going to be granted to these areas, how much autonomous powers are they going to get. There are a number of fundamental matters like that on this whole question of local government about which there is absolute silence.

On the question of demarcation, do you know that the village committees are still coming down from the *pattu* days and the *korale* days, when there was no transport, no proper road system, and so on. They are all utterly irrelevant to the present day set-up. There have been whole shifts of population that have taken place; new roads have been opened up; inaccessible areas too have been opened up. Surely, in such circumstances, the whole question of reallocating boundaries has to be gone into. These are problems about which we expected to hear some kind of solution from the hon. Parliamentary Secretary. We heard nothing. Then there is the question of financial relations between local government authorities and the Central Government. There is the Choksy Report, and there is the V. C. Jayasuriya Report. What is your attitude? Are you going to do nothing in the next twelve months?

I think the hon. Member for Dompe touched on this question. There was a Minister who started breaking up village committees. I was generally opposed to it. In my electorate one village committee has been broken up into four. Not one of them can do a job of work because their income is so small. Originally, the Ruwanwella Village Committee had an income of nearly two lakhs of rupees. This came second only to Ginigathena which had an annual income of three lakhs of rupees. This was mainly because of the existence of

estates in these two areas. We were able to do a reasonable amount of work, to put up bridges, to build roads, culverts, and so on.

There are a large number of roads built by the rural development societies. The village committees have not been consulted, and they are unable to take over those roads. What has happened? The poor fellows who did *shramadana* work in constructing them cannot use those roads because the roads are neglected. They have spent their time, energy and money, but they are unable to use the roads. The village committees say they have not the money to take them over. Those are problems we should have discussed. Why did we not discuss this question instead of wasting our time on all the other things?

Then, Sir, there are one or two minor matters. I do not want to take much time.

මූලාසනයේ මන්ත්‍රී

(தலைமை தாங்கும் அங்கத்தவர்)

(The Presiding Member)

Order, please. The discussion of this Vote has to be finished by 5.30 p.m. I am even prepared to go up to 6 o'clock. There are a number of Members wanting to speak, and I am afraid I might have to disappoint them. The hon. Parliamentary Secretary has to reply too.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I agree with you. I am trying to rush through as quickly as possible.

He has to give us his ideas. He has failed to do that in the past. If he had, then we would have had a very interesting discussion. We would have given him our ideas and if he was not agreeable to them, he could have said, "I have taken into consideration your point of view, and this is my feeling about the whole business". Now you are just talking in

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා]

What has the Hon. Minister to say to this? This is what appears in the editorial column of the "Ceylon Observer" of 13th May 1965:

"The country is sick and weary of politicians who use whatever device is available to keep themselves in positions of prestige and power—

This paper may not be your own. But it supports you one hundred per cent.

"The Municipal laws may permit them to get leave, but they use that opportunity to violate the spirit of democratic representation.....If this dedication to clean politics is sincere, it must see that the two Ministries and the Junior Minister should resign from the Colombo Municipality."

What have you got to say to that?

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

What about Vivienne?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You agree? Therefore, are you justifying their continuation as Ministers? In the case of the Parliamentary Secretary, I can at least understand.

You are following bad example. Is that what you are saying?

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Why did you allow it?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I was not the Prime Minister.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

She was your own party member.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

The Hon. Prime Minister should set a better example.—[*Interruption.*] I am not the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister is expected to set a better example. How can you justify having two Ministers who are also members of a municipality? You know that there was a case—the case of Mr. Goonesinha who was a Minister without Portfolio—[*Interruption.*]

ප්‍රේමදාස මයා.

(திரு. பிரேமதாச)

(Mr. Premadasa)

The law was amended.

අ. භා. 5

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

The law was not amended.

They have got six months' leave passed because they have a majority. Is that political honesty? You talk of corruption and so on in the case of other people. I remember the Hon. Minister of Local Government saying that the National Government will ensure public purity. Why cannot he insist on his own Colleagues clearing out of the Colombo Municipality? What I read was not from our newspaper. This is from the editorial of the "Ceylon Observer" on the whole question. Why does not the Parliamentary Secretary answer that?

ප්‍රේමදාස මයා.

(திரு. பிரேமதாச)

(Mr. Premadasa)

This is the first time you are raising this matter.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

These are things which you must do yourself. Have I to come here

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

and tell you what your duty is? I am raising it because you have not raised it yourself. Your Ministers do not know what is happening. This is like the Minister of Fisheries saying "I do not know what is happening." What sort of Ministers do we have? If they cannot do their job let them pack up and go.

There are one or two other small points. So far as the Central Government is concerned, as a result of one of my own decisions, a pensioner who has drawn his commuted pension can, after 12½ years, start to draw his full pension with no more deductions. Why is not that rule applied to local government pensioners? Will the hon. Parliamentary Secretary please consider applying that rule in the case of pensioners under the Commissioner of Local Government?

I do not want to speak at length though I have so many points to refer to. At least in future—next year—let all Hon. Ministers who participate in the Committee stage debate please give us some idea as to what their policies are so that we on the basis of that information will be able to put forward our point of view. I think that is only a fair thing to do. The Hon. Prime Minister is an old hand. He knows that this is the customary thing to do. He could have instructed his new-comers in the Ministries to do this.

I am thankful to you for giving me this extra time ; I am sorry I have taken 5 or 10 minutes more.

ජෝර්ජ් අබයගුණසේකර මයා. (හඟුරන්කෙත)

(திரு. ஜோர்ஜ் அபயகுணசேக்கர—ஹங்குரங்கெத்த)

(Mr. George Abeyagoonasekera—Hanguranketa)

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, නගර සභා සම්බන්ධවත් මහ නගර සභාවල පාලනය සම්බන්ධවත් යමක් කියන්න මා අදහස් කරන්නේ නැහැ. ගම්බද ප්‍රදේශයක් නියෝජනය කරන මන්ත්‍රීවරයකු වශයෙන් මේ අවස්ථාවේදී මා මතක් කරන්න යන්නේ පළාත් පාලන අමාත්‍යාංශයේ

යේ ඉතාම වැදගත්ම අංශයක් වන ගම් සභා ක්‍රමය ගැනයි. මේ ගම් සභා ක්‍රමය ලංකාවේ ඉතාම පැරණි පාලන ක්‍රමයක් බව මා නොකීවාව තමුන් තාන්සේ ලා දන්නවා ඇති. ගම් සභා ක්‍රමය සම්ප්‍රදායානුකූලව ඉතා විධිමත්ව—කිසිම රජ කෙනෙකුගේ හෝ කිසිම මධ්‍යම මණ්ඩලයක හෝ පාලනයක් ඇති නොවුණත්—ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදය අනුගමනය කරමින් එදා ක්‍රියාත්මක වූ බව අපි කවුරුන් දන්නවා. ගම් සභාවලින් පළාත් බදු මහජනතාව බලාපොරොත්තු වන සේවය ප්‍රාදේශීය බදු ක්‍රමයෙන් ලැබෙන මුදල් වලින් රජයෙන් ලැබෙන ආධාර මුදල් වලින් එමෙන්ම රජයෙන් ලබා ගන්නා ණය මුදල් වලින් කරන්නට සිදුවී තිබෙන බව අපට පෙනෙනව. එහෙත්, අපේ ගම් සභා කොමිටිවලින් මහජනයා බලාපොරොත්තු වන පහසුකම්—ජල සම්පාදනය, මංමාවත් සාදාදීම, විදුලි ආලෝකය ලබාදීම, නිවාස ප්‍රශ්නය විසඳීම, ග්‍රාමීය සනීපාරක්ෂාව යනාදී පහසුකම්—සේවයෙන්—බලාපොරොත්තු වන අයුරින් ලබාදීමට නොහැකි වී තිබෙන්නේ මුදල් ප්‍රශ්නය නිසයි. එම නිසා විශේෂයෙන්ම දුප්පත් කොවිසායයක් නියෝජනය කරන මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක් වශයෙන් මා ගරු ඇමතිතුමාගෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටින්නේ ගම් සභාවලට රජයෙන් දෙන දීමනාව නැත්නම් ආධාර මුදල දැනට වඩා වැඩි කොට, ප්‍රමාණවත් වන අන්දමට දෙන්නටය කියන එකයි. විශේෂයෙන්ම ගම් සභාවලින් මහජනතාවත් රජයත් අපේක්ෂා කරන සේවය නිසි සේ නොලැබීමට ඇති විශේෂ හේතුවක් නම්, මේ ආයතනවල මුදල් පරිහරණය ගැන සැලකිය යුතු පරීක්ෂණ යම් යම් කාලසීමාවල දී නො කිරීමයි. අද නොයෙක් ගම් සභා මුදල් හරිහැටි පරිහරණය කරන්න අසමත්වීම නිසා, නොයෙකුත් චංචාවන් ඇතිවී තිබෙන නිසා, ඒවායේ දියුණුවට බාධා ඇති වී තිබෙනව. ඒ නිසා මුදල් පරිහරණය සම්බන්ධව කෙරෙන ගිනුම් පරීක්ෂණ මීට වඩා සංවිධානාත්මකව කිරීමට කටයුතු කරනවා ඈත කියා මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනව.

ඊළඟට පළාත් පාලන ආයතනවල සේවකයින් මාරු කිරීම, පත් කිරීම, එමෙන්ම විනයානුකූල පරීක්ෂණ පැවැත්

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

[පෝර්ජ අබයගුණසේකර මයා.]

විම ආදී කටයුතු කිරීමට පළාත් පාලන සේවා කොමිෂන් සභාවක් තැත්නම් මධ්‍යගත ආයතනයක් තිබෙනව. නමුත් පළාත් පාලන ආයතනවලින් කෙළින්ම පත් කර ගන්නා සේවකයින් පිළිබඳව එවැනි ක්‍රමයක් ඇත්තේ නැහැ. දැන් තිබෙන ඒ විමධ්‍යගත ක්‍රමය නැති කර ඒ අය පිණිසත් යම්කිසි සේවා ක්‍රමයක් ඇති කළොත් එයින් විශාල සේවයක් සිදුවන බවට කිසිම සැකයක් නැහැ. මා එසේ කියන්නේ මේ නිසයි. සමහරවිට ගම්සභාවල සේවය කරන සේවකයින් ප්‍රධානීන්ගේ අප්‍රසාදයට භාජන වුණොත් ඔවුන්ගේ ගැලවීම තැත්නම් ආරක්ෂාව සඳහා යම් අභියාචනයක් කිරීමට පිලිවෙලක් ඔවුන්ට ඇත්තේ නැහැ.

සමහර පළාත් පාලන ආයතනවල යම් යම් දෝෂාරෝපන එල්ල විය යුතු සිද්ධීන් ඇති වී තිබෙන නමුත් මේ පළාත් පාලන ක්‍රමය ඇති කර අවුරුදු ගණනාවක් කටයුතු කර ගෙන ගොස් තිබෙන නිසා මධ්‍යම ආණ්ඩුවෙන් මිට වඩා වග කිය යුතු මිට වඩා බලතල ඇති ආයතන බවට මේ පළාත් පාලන ආයතන පරිවර්තනය කිරීම සුදුසු යයි මා කියනව. අපි කල්පනා කෙළේ, සමාජ සේවා දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවෙන් කෙරෙන වැඩ, විශේෂයෙන්ම සහනාධාර මුදල් දීම ආදී නොයෙක් රාජකාරි, මෙම ආයතනවලට පවරා දෙන්නට පුළුවන් වේවිය කියයි.

ඊ ලඟට මගේ කොට්ඨාශය ගැන කරුණු කීපයක් සඳහන් කරන්න ඕනැ. ගමන් පහසුවත් ප්‍රවාහන පහසුවත් නැති ජනාකීර්ණ ගම් රාශියකින් යුත් කඳුකර ප්‍රදේශයක් වූ ඒ ප්‍රදේශයට පළාත් පාලන ආයතනයෙන් කෙරෙන සේවය දැනට වඩා හොඳ සැලකිල්ලකින් කළ යුතුව තිබෙන බව මම සඳහන් කරන්න කැමතියි. ඒ සඳහා අද දවසේ සිටිනවාට වඩා වැඩි නිලධාරී සංඛ්‍යාවක් අවශ්‍ය වී තිබෙනව. විශේෂයෙන්ම සෞඛ්‍ය නිලධාරී මහත්වරුන් සහ විත්තලු සේවය සඳහා නිලධාරී සංඛ්‍යාවක් වැඩි වැඩියෙන් ඒ ප්‍රදේශයට පත් කරන්න ය කියා මම ඉල්ලා සිටිනව.

තවද, නුවරඑළියේ කොට්ඨාශයට පළාත් පාලන සහකාර කොමසාරිස්වරු

—කාරක සභාව

යකුගේ සේවය නැති කිරීම නිසා විශාල කරදර රාශියකට අද දවසේ මුහුණ පාන්නට සිදු වී තිබෙන නිසාත්, දැන් අවුරුදු කීපයක සිට නොයෙක් කරදර ඇති වී තිබෙන නිසාත්, එම පදවියට නිලධාරියකු පත් කරන ලෙස ඉල්ලීමට මෙය අවස්ථාවක් කර ගන්නව. ඒ වාගේම මම කියන්න කැමතියි, මෙම දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවේ ප්‍රාදේශීය කටයුතු කරන කොමසාරිස්තුමාත් වැඩ බලන කෙනෙක් නිසා මම හිතනව මේ දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවෙන් බලාපොරොත්තු වන සේවය නොලැබ යාම තවදුරටත් දිගටම පැවතගෙන යා විය කියා. මේ කාරණාවලට ගරු ඇමති තුමාගේ අවධානය යොමු කරන ලෙස ඉල්ලමින්, කාලය සීමා සහිත නිසාත්, නමුත් නාන්සේ සමග අමනාප වන්නට අකැමති නිසාත් මගේ කථාව අවසන් කරනව.

මූලාසනාරූප මන්ත්‍රී

(தலைமை தாங்கும் அங்கத்தவர்) (The Presiding Member)

The hon. Member for Divulapitiya (Mr. Lakshman Jayakody) has asked for just five minutes and I intend allowing him that time before the hon. Parliamentary Secretary replies.

ලක්ෂ්මන් ජයකොඩි මයා. (දිවුලපිටිය)

(திரு. லக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி—திவுலுபிட்டிய) (Mr. Lakshman Jayakody—Divulapitiya)

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, උදේ 9ට නම දුන් මට මේ අවස්ථාවේදීවත් වචන කීපයක් කථා කිරීමට අවස්ථාව සැලසීම ගැන නමුත් නාන්සේට ස්තූති වන්න වෙනව. මේ අවස්ථාවේදී මම විශේෂයෙන්ම පළාත් පාලන කටයුතු පිළිබඳ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමාගෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටින්නේ, රට සභා ක්‍රමය ගැන අනුගමනය කරන්නට යන ප්‍රතිපත්තිය මේ රටේ මහජනතාවට කලින් දැන්වීම සඳහා යම් වැඩපිලිවෙලක් යොදන්න ය කියයි. ඊට හේතුව මොකක් ද? නමුත් නාන්සේලා දන්නවා ඇති පසු ගිය ආණ්ඩුවෙන් කුඹුරු පණත ඉදිරිපත් කරන අවස්ථාවේදී ඒ කුඹුරු පණතෙහි ඇතුළත් කරුණු පිළිබඳ පැහැදිලි අවබෝධයක් මේ රටේ ජනතාවට මාස හයකට පමණ කලින් දැන ගන්නට පුළුවන් වුණ බව. ඉන් පසුවයි ඒ පණත මෙම ගරු සභාවේදී සම්මත කෙළේ. ඒ මොකද?

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පතන, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

රටක වැදගත් ප්‍රශ්නයක් පැන නැගුණ අවසාවකදී ඒ පිළිබඳව මහජන මතය දැන ගන්න ඕනෑ නිසයි. රට සභා ක්‍රමය ඇති කිරීම, එයට අදාළ වන භාෂා ප්‍රශ්නය, ගොවිකම් වැඩ, ඉඩම් ප්‍රශ්නය ආදිය සම්බන්ධයෙන් කුමක්ද සිදු වන්නේ කියා මහජනයා පැහැදිලි වශයෙන් දැනගන්න ඕනෑ. මේ වන තුරු මහජනයාට පැහැදිලි අවබෝධයක් දී නැහැ, රට සභා සම්බන්ධයෙන් මේ මේ විධියේ ප්‍රතිපත්තියක් අනුගමනය කරනවාය කියා. උදාහරණයක් වශයෙන් මම මෙහිදී එක්තරා ලිපි ගනු දෙනුවක් ඉදිරිපත් කරන්න කැමතියි සිංහල ප්‍රදේශවල මෙකක්ද වෙන්නේ කියා. දෙමළ ප්‍රදේශයක් සම්බන්ධයෙන් නම් මට කමක් නැහැ. මේ කියන්නේ සිංහල ප්‍රදේශයක් පිළිබඳවයි. කෙහෙල් ඇල්ලේ ගම් කාර්ය සභාවේ සභාපති කේ. එල්. සිරිසේන මහත්මයා එක්තරා පාරකට සම්බන්ධ අවහිරයක් ගැන සි. එස්. නාගලිංගම් නමැති දෙස්තර මහත්මයාකුට ලිපියක් යවා තිබෙනවා. ඒ ලිපිය මෙසේයි:

“ මහත්මයාණෙනි,

හල්පෙ හරස් පාර ගැනයි

ඉහත කී පාරට අවහිර වන ලෙස පස් බැම්මක් දමා ඇති බව ගම් සභා නියෝජිත මහතා මට දන්වා එවා ඇත. කරුණාකර මෙම පාරට අයිති ප්‍රමාණය ඉවත් කර කම්බි ගසා ගන්නා මෙන් දන්වමි.

මෙයට,
(අත්සන)

කෙහෙල් ඇල්ලේ ගම් සභාවේ සභාපති.

ගම්සභා කාර්යාලය,
දිසාගෙවත්ත,
කපාන, 7.7.65.”

මෙම ලිපිය යැවුණේ දෙමළ මහත්මයා කුටයි. මෙම ලිපිය ආපසු එවමින් ඒ මහතා මෙසේ ලිපියක් එවා තිබෙනවා:

Dr. C. S. Nagalingam
Medical Practitioner,
Nagalingam Pharmacy,
Dispensary, Ante-natal and
Children’s clinic, Katana.

The Chairman,
V. C.,
Kehelella,
Disagewatta, Katana.

Dear Sir,

I am herewith sending the letter dated 7.7.65 which was received by me only today since I am unable to comprehend the contents of the letter concerned because the language in which it has been written is quite alien to me.

If you are anxious to convey to me your ideas I would advise you to correspond in a language which I am able to understand viz., English or Tamil.

Thank you,
Yours Faithfully,
Sgd. C. S. Nagalingam.

මේ ලිපියටයිඒ ගහල නියෝජනේ කොළ පාටින්; මුලින්ම නියෝජන හරිය සට හන් කර නියෝජනේ කොළ පාටින්; අත්සන් කර නියෝජනේ කොළ පාටින්. ඒ ප්‍රදේශයේ එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ සභාපතිවරයා—

ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්
(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவரர் ஒருவர்)
(An hon. Member)
ආණ්ඩුවේ නිලධාරියෙක්?

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

මම කියන්නේ නැහැ, ආණ්ඩුවේ නිලධාරියෙක් කියල. [බාධා කිරීම] මොන භාෂාවෙන්ද එයා ලියන්න ඕන? ද්‍රවිඩ භාෂාවෙන්ද? අපේ ගම්කාර්ය සභාවල නීතියක් තියෙනවා, ඒ ඒ ගම්කාර්ය සභා තීරණය කළ භාෂාවෙන් කටයුතු කරනවා මිස වෙන භාෂාවලින් කටයුතු කරන්න බැරි හැටියට. මෙම ගම්කාර්ය සභාව තීරණය කර තිබෙන්නේ, සිංහලෙන් වැඩ කරන්නයි. දෙමළෙන් වැඩ කළාට කමක් නැද්ද? [බාධා කිරීම] ඊට පසුව උන්නා හේ ලිපියක් යවනවා, මේ විධියට:

“ මහත්මයාණෙනි,
16.7.65 දින දරණ ඔබගේ ලිපිය සම්බන්ධවයි මට එවූ ලිපිය ඔබට නොතේරෙන බව කියා එය දෙමළෙන් හෝ ඉංග්‍රීසියෙන් එවන ලෙස දන්වා ඇත. රාජ්‍ය භාෂාව සිංහල බැවින් ඔබේ ඉල්ලීමට මට එකඟ විය නොහැක. මගේ ලිපියේ ලිපිනය දැනගත් පිළිවෙලට ඉතිරි කරුණු ගැන සලකා බලනවා ඇතැයි මම බලාපොරොත්තු වෙමි.

මෙයට,
කෙහෙල් ඇල්ලේ ගම්සභාවේ සභාපතිතුන.

අ. භා. 5.15

සිංහල ගම්කාර්ය සභාවකින් සිංහලෙන් ලිපියක් ලිවීම, එවැනි ප්‍රදේශයක සිටින ද්‍රවිඩ අයකුට මේ විධියේ ලිපියක් ලියන්න

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[ජයකොඩි මයා.]

පුළුවන්ද? “මට මේ භාෂාව තේරෙන්නේ නැහැ; මා භාවිත කරන භාෂාව වන ඉංග්‍රීසියෙන් හෝ දෙමළෙන් මෙය ලියා එවන්න” කියා එවන්නෙක් ලිපියක් ලියා යැවූ විට මොකද කරන්නේ? ඔය ප්‍රශ්නය මෙම ප්‍රදේශයේ පැනනැගී තිබේ නව. දෙමළ ප්‍රදේශයක සිටින සිංහලයකුට වුණත් මෙම ප්‍රශ්නය නංවන්න පුළුවනි; මේ පිළිවෙළේම උත්තරයක් දෙන්න පුළුවනි. ඒ නිසයි, එක භාෂාවක් වුවමනාය කියන්නේ. රට සභා ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන විට, මෙම කාරණය සම්බන්ධයෙන් සැහෙන අවබෝධයක් ලබා දීම සඳහා වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් යොදන ලෙස මා ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා. ඒ සඳහා කාලයක් දෙන්න. අපට පුළුවනි, මහජන මතයක් ඇති කරන්න. මේ රජය අපට චෝදනා කරනවා, ජාති වාදය අවුස්සනවාය කියා. අපි ජාති වාදය අවුස්සන්නේ නැහැ. අපට වුවමනා කරන්නේ, මෙවැනි ප්‍රශ්න තීරා කරණය කර ගන්නයි.

බෝක්කු යොදා ඇති පාරවල් තියෙනවා. ඒව නඩත්තු කරන්න තරම් සල්ලි නැහැ ගම්කාරිය සභාවලට. ඒ බව ගරු පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමන් පිළිගන්නවා ඇති. එවැනි පාරවල් රජයේ වැඩ දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවට භාර ගැනීමේ වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් යොදන්න ඕනා. එමගින් රජයේ වැඩ දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවට අපහසුවක් වන්නේ නැහැ. මෙම කාරණය උඩ මන්ත්‍රී වරුන් වශයෙන් පෙනී සිටින අපට නොයෙකුත් ප්‍රශ්න ඉදිරිපත් වෙනවා. රජයේ වැඩ දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවට මේ පාර භාර ගන්න; අර පාර භාර ගන්න, තුන් වෙනි පාර භාර ගන්න; හතර වෙනි පාර භාර ගන්න” යනාදි වශයෙන් අපගෙන් ඉල්ලීම් කරනවා. එම නිසා මේ සම්බන්ධයෙන් කුමක් හෝ වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් යොදන්න ඕනා. ගම්කාරිය සභාපතිතුමා ගේ තීරණය අනුව ඒ ඒ පාරවල් භාර දෙන්නය කියා නියෝගයක් කොට යම් කිසි වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් යොදන්න ඕනා.

සංශෝධන පනත් ගැන ඊළඟට කියන්න ඕනා. මෙම සභාවේදී සංශෝධන පණත් ගණනාවක් සම්මත කර තිබෙනවා. ඒ වගේම වොක්සි වාර්තාව තියෙනවා. ඩී. සී. ජයසූරිය මහතාගේ වාර්තාව තියෙනවා. ඒ කිසිවක් සිංහලෙන් නැහැ. අපේ රටේ වැඩි වශයෙන් සිටින්නේ සිංහල දන්න සභා පතිවරුයි. එම නිසා මෙම වාර්තා දෙක සිංහලෙන් පිළියෙළ කරන්නය කියා මා ඉල්ලනවා. එසේ කළොත් ලොකු සේවයක් සිදු වෙනවා ඇති.

ඊළඟට කියන්න තියෙන්නේ, ඉඩම් බදු ගැනයි. ඉඩම්වලින් ගන්නා බදු මදි. මා කියා තිබෙනවා, තවත් වැඩි කරන්නය කියා, ඉඩම් බදු, අක්කර 25 න් වැඩි ඉඩම් වලින් අක්කරයකින් රුපියල් 10 ක් ගන්නත් කමක් නැහැ. රුපියල් 300 ක බයිසිකලයකින් රුපියලක් ගන්නවා. රුපියල් 250 ක් වටිනා කඩයක් හිමි කඩකාරයකුගෙන් රුපියල් 2.50 ක් ගන්නවා. නමුත් තුන් හාර දාහේ පොල් වතුකාරයින්ගෙන් අක්කරයකට රුපියලයි, දෙකයි ගන්නේ. එවැනි අයගෙන් අක්කරයකට රුපියල් 10 ක් ගන්නට කමක් නැහැ. අපේ ගම් කාරිය සභා සුදානම් වී සිටිනවා. එය කියාම යොදවන්න. හොඳයි, නමුත් නාන්

ගරු එම්. ඩී. බන්ධා
 (கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)
 (The Hon. M. D. Banda)
 තමුත්තාන්සෙල හුඟක් දේ කළා.

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

තමුත්තාන්සෙල අවසාවලේදී තමුත්තාන්සෙට කතා කරන්න පුළුවනි. එක අතකින් කල්පනා කරන විට අපි ජාති බේද අවුස්සනවා, සිංහල ජනතාවගේ ප්‍රයෝජනය සඳහා. අපි එසේ කරන්නේ, තමුත්තාන්සෙලගේ ප්‍රයෝජනයට නොවෙයි; සිංහලයන්ගේ අයිතිවාසිකම් ආරක්ෂා කරන්නයි. අනික් අතට මෙම ව්‍යාපාරය ජාති බේද ඇවිස්සීමක් හැටියට ගණන් ගන්න බැහැ. මෙම කරුණු ගැන සිංහලයන්ට කියා දීමට ගන්නා වැයමක් හැටියට මෙය සලකන්න පුළුවනි.

තව එක කාරණයක් ගැන කියන්න තිබෙනවා. එනම්, පාරවල් ගැනයි. ගම්බද පාරවල් සම්බන්ධයෙන් මොකක් හරි වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් යොදා ගන්න ඕනා. අද ගම් කාරිය සභාවලින් ගල් දමා, තීරා කරණය

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

සෛලගෙ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය ආරක්ෂා කරන්නන් එකක් අක්කර 50 න් එහා ඉඩම්වලින් වත් අක්කරයකට රුපියල් 10 ගණනෙ අය කරන්න. [බාධා කිරීමක්] අපි වැඩි කළා. තමුත්තාත්සෙල තව ටිකක් වැඩි කරන්න. එසේ කළොත් සැහෙන ආදාය මක් ලැබෙනව ඇති, ගම්කාරිය සභාවලට.

ප්‍රේමදාස මයා.
(ති. ශ්‍රී. ප්‍රි. රා. ම. ත. ෂ.)
(Mr. Premadasa)

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, මේ අවස්ථාවේ යටි යන්තොට ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා) මෙතන නොසිටීම ගැන මා කනගාටු වෙනව. විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම් පන පිළිබඳ දෙවන වර කියවීමේ විවාදය පැවති කාලයේදී ඊට සහභාගි වෙමින් මේ ගරු සභාවේ කථාවක් කළ මා පළාත් පාලන අමාත්‍යාංශය මගින් ඉදිරි ආදායම් වර්ෂය තුළ කරන්න යන වැඩ කටයුතු සම්බන්ධයෙන් තොරතුරු අඩංගු විස්තර යක් මේ ගරු සභාවට ඉදිරිපත් කළේ නැතැයි එතුමා මට විරුද්ධව චෝදනාවක් එල්ල කළ නිසයි ඊට පිළිතුරු දීම සඳහා මා නැගී සිටින අවස්ථාවේ එතුමා මෙහි නොසිටීම ගැන මා විශේෂයෙන් කනගාටු වන්නෙ. වර්තමාන ආණ්ඩුවේ අමාත්‍ය මණ්ඩලය අමාත්‍යවරුන් දහ හත් දෙනෙකුගෙන් සමන්විත වන නිසා එහි අමාත්‍යාංශ දහ හතක් තිබෙන බව තමුත් තාත්සෙ පිළිගන්නව. විසර්ජන පනත් කෙටුම්පත හා සම්බන්ධ දෙවන වර කියවීමේ විවාදයේදී ඔය එක් එක් අමාත්‍යාංශය වෙන් වෙන් වශයෙන් ගෙන ඒ එක එකක් මගින් ඉදිරි වර්ෂයේදී කිරීමට බලා පොරොත්තු වන වැඩ කටයුතු පිළිබඳ පැහැදිලි විස්තරයක් ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නට ගියා නම්, ඒ සඳහා කෙසි තරම් දීර්ඝ කාලයක් මිඩංගු කරන්න සිදු වන්න ඉඩ තිබුණාදැයි මා මේ අවස්ථාවේ අමතුවෙන් පැහැදිලි කරන්න වුවමනාවක් නැහැ.

ගැන විශාල බලාපොරොත්තු ඇති වන පරිදි එකිනර මෙන්ම පැහැදිලි ප්‍රකාශයන් මේ ගරු සභාවේදී කියවන්න නම් අපට පුළුවනි. එහෙත් වර්ෂයක් ගත වූ සැනෙ කින්ම අප කළ කථාවල අඩංගු වචනම නැවත අප වෙත එල්ල කර අපෙන් ප්‍රශ්න අහන්න අපේ විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්ට එයින් ඉඩ ලැබෙනව. එදා මෙන්න මේ විධියට තමුත්තාත් සේලා කිව්වෙ නැද්දැයි එතකොට අපෙන් අහන්න පුළුවන් වෙනව. ඒ නිසා කොයි විධියේ කාර්යයක් සම්බන්ධයෙන් වුවත් යම් යෝජනා ක්‍රමයක් ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්න ලැස්ති වන විට ඒ හා සම්බන්ධ කරුණු හැකි තාක් පැහැදිලි ලෙස මේ ගරු සභාව ඉදිරියේ තබා නියම අන්දමට ප්‍රකාශයන් කිරීම ප්‍රතිපත්තියක් හැටියට අප අනුගමනය කරන බව මේ අවස්ථාවේ ප්‍රකාශ කරන්න කැමතියි.

මා වෙත අද එල්ල කරන ලද චෝදනාව කොයි හැටි වෙතත්, අයවැය පනත දෙවන වර කියවීමේ විවාදයේදී මා කළ කථාව අවසන් කිරීමට මත්තෙන් මා සඳහන් කළ කරුණක් ගැන මේ අවස්ථාවේ මතක් කරන්න කැමතියි. මොන මොන බලාපොරොත්තු ඇතිව අප මේ රටේ පළාත් පාලනය හා සම්බන්ධ වැඩ පිළි වෙළ ගෙන යන්න අදහස් කරනවද යන්න එයින් පළ කර තිබෙනව. ඒ කොටස දැන් මා කියවනව :

“ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, අපේ රටේ සංවර්ධනය පිණිස පළාත් පාලන ආයතන මගින් විශේෂ සේවයක් සිදු විය යුතුව තිබෙන බව මගේ කථාව අවසාන කරන්නට මත්තෙන් මා කියන් තට කැමතියි. විශේෂයෙන් පළාත් පාලනය සම්බන්ධයෙන් සැහෙන ව්‍යාප්තියක් ඇති වීම පිණිස වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් ඇති වී නැති බව මේ සමාජ කාලය තුළදී—මේ මාස 5ක කාලය තුළදී—මට පෙනී ගොස් තිබෙනව. විශේෂයෙන්ම අපේ ගම්බද ග්‍රාමීය පාලනය භාරව තිබෙන ගම්කාරිය සභා, සුළු නගර සභා, පළාත් ආණ්ඩු සභා වැනි ආයතන වලට නියමිත මුදල්වලින් ඒ ප්‍රදේශවල සංවර්ධන වැඩ පිළිවෙළවල් ගෙන යන්නට පුළුවන්කමක් නැති බව අපට පැහැදිලිව පෙනී ගියා. විශේෂ යෙන්ම අපේ රට සාමූහිකව ගෙන, නැත්නම් පොදුවේ ගෙන, සංවර්ධනයක් ඇති කරන්න නම් අපේ පළාත් පාලන ආයතන මගින් ඒ සංවර්ධන වැඩ පිළිවෙළ සිදු කළ යුතුව තිබෙනව. ග්‍රාමීය කර්මාන්ත ව්‍යාප්තිය පිණිස යම් වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් ඇති කිරීමට ජලය සහ විදුලිය අවශ්‍ය බව තමුත් තාත්සෙ පිළිගන්නවා ඇති. අපේ රටේ කොතරම් ඇළ දොළ ගංගා ආදිය ගලා ගියත් අපේ රටේ වැසි

එහෙත් එක් කාරණයක් නම් මට මේ අවස්ථාවේ ඉතාමත් පැහැදිලි ලෙස සඳහන් කරන්න පුළුවනි. මේ ආණ්ඩුව වැඩ භාර ගෙන දැනට ගත වී තිබෙන්නේ සම්පූර්ණ ම ස පහක් පමණයි. ෧෯෮෦ කාලයේදී මේ ආණ්ඩුව මගින් ක්‍රියාත්මක කිරීමට බලාපොරොත්තු වන යෝජනා ආදිය

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[ප්‍රේමදස මයා.]

යන්ට පාවිච්චියට අවශ්‍ය පිරිසිදු ජලය තවමත් ලබා ගන්නට බැරි තරමට අමාරු තත්ත්වයක තිබෙන බව තමුන් තාන්සේ පිළිගන්නවා ඇති. විශේෂයෙන්ම අපේ ගම්වල දියුණුව උඩ රටේ දියුණුව රඳා පවතිනව. ගම් සංවර්ධනය කළ ප්‍රමාණයට අපේ රටේ පොදු දියුණුව රැඳී තිබෙන බව මේ රජය පිළිගෙන තිබෙනව. ඒ නිසා විදුලියත් ජලයත් පිළිබඳ පහසුකම් අපේ රට පුරාම ඇති කොට අපේ පළාත් පාලන ආයතන මාර්ගයෙන් ඒ සංවර්ධනය ඇති කරන්නට අපි වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් සකස් කර ගෙන යනවා. “—[නිල වාර්තාව, 1965 අගෝස්තු 24, කාණ්ඩය 61, තී. 1386]

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, එදා මේ අදහස මා විසින් පුළුල් ලෙස ප්‍රකාශ කරනු ලැබූ බව මෙයින් පෙනී යනු ඇතැයි මා කල්පනා කරනව. අපේ අමාත්‍යාංශය මගින් මොන මොන වැඩ පිළිවෙළවල් ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්න බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවද කියා මීට වඩා විස්තර සහිතව සඳහන් කරන්නට පුළුවන්කමක් මට ඒ අවස්ථාවේ තිබුණේ නැහැ. ඒ කොයි හැටි වෙතත් අවස්ථාවේ හැටියට හැකි තාක් පුළුල් ලෙස කාරණය පැහැදිලි කර තිබෙන බව පෙනී යනව.

යටියන්තොට ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා) ටිකක් තරහෙන් වගේ තමයි අද මේ වැය ශීර්ෂය යටතේ එතුමගේ කථාව කළේ. ඒ බව ඔබ තුමාටත් පෙනෙන්න ඇති. වැඩියෙන්ම තරහ යන්න ඇත්තේ, සමහර විට, දඹ දෙනියේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා.) කළ කථාව නිසා වෙන්නට ඇති. මොකද, සමහර විට එතුමට පෙනී යන්නට ඇති එතුමා අනුමත නොකරන අදහස් පවා දඹදෙනියේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා විසින් ප්‍රකාශ කරනු ලැබූ බව. එවැනි අදහස් ප්‍රකාශ කරනු ලැබීමෙන් එතුමා හිටපු තත්ත්වය ටිකක් වෙනස් වී අමාරු තත්ත්වයකට වැටුණු බව එතුමට වැටහෙන්නත් ඇති. ඒ නිසා, සමහර විට, මොකක් හරි දඩ මීමා කරගෙන සැහෙන ප්‍රමාණයකට සෝෂා කළොත් අවස්ථාවේ හැටියට සුදුසු කියා කල්පනා කළා වෙන්න ඇති.

තවත් එකක් කියන්න කැමතියි. පළාත් පාලන අමාත්‍යාංශය සම්බන්ධයෙන් දැන ගන්න ඕනෑය කී කාරණයක් තිබෙනව. කීප විටක්ම එය සඳහන් කළා. ලංකාවේ පළාත් පාලන පිළිබඳ විශේෂ

පරිවර්තනයක් වැඩි කලක් යන්නට පෙර කරන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවය යනු වෙන් ගරු ඇමතිතුමා කීවාලු. ඒක සම්පූර්ණ ඇත්ත. එහෙත් ඒ පරිවර්තනය පිළිබඳ විස්තරයක් මා විසින් මේ අවස්ථාවේදී ඉදිරිපත් කළ යුතුය කියා යටියන්තොට ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනව. නමි, එය මේ අවස්ථාවේ කරන්න අපහසු බව එතුමට කියන්න සතුටුයි. මක් නිසාද? අමාත්‍යාංශයෙන් කරන යෝජනා පිළිබඳ අවසාන වශයෙන් තීරණයක් කරන තුරු මට ඒවා පිළිබඳව මේ ගරු සභාවේදී ප්‍රකාශ කරන්නට පුළුවන් කමක් නැහැ. මේ පසුගිය පස් මාසය ඇතුළත අපේ අමාත්‍යාංශය මගින් යෝජනා රාශියක් සකස් කර තිබෙනවා. ඒවා පිළිබඳව කැබිනට් වාර්තා පිළියෙළ කර තිබෙනවා. අපේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු සම්ප්‍රදාය අනුව ඒවා කැබිනට් මණ්ඩලයට ඉදිරිපත් කර ආණ්ඩුව තීරණයක් ගන්නා තුරු අපට පුළුවන්කමක් නැහැ අමාත්‍යාංශයේ ඒ වැඩ පිළිවෙළවල් සම්බන්ධයෙන් විස්තර වාර්තාවක් මේ ගරු සභාවට ඉදිරිපත් කරන්න. යටියන්තොට ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා එය පිළිගන්නවා ඇති. ලංකාවේ පළාත් පාලනය පිළිබඳ විශේෂ වෙනස්කමක් පිළිබඳව යථා කාලයේදී යටියන්තොට ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාට දැනගන්නට ලැබේවි. ඒ වෙනස්කම මහජනතාවගේ සුභසිද්ධිය සඳහාම කරන වෙනස්කමක් බව මා මේ අවස්ථාවේදී ප්‍රකාශ කරන්නට සතුටුයි.

මේ හැරත් රාජාසන කථාවේ අප සඳහන් කර තිබෙනවා යම් යම් කාරණා පිළිබඳව.

“කාර්යක්ෂමතාව දියුණු කරනු සඳහාද සෑම තරු තිරමේ පුරවැසියකුගේම සහයෝගය පාලන කටයුතු වලදී ලබාගන්නා අභිලාෂයෙන්ද මාගේ ආණ්ඩුව දැනට පවත්නා පළාත් පාලන ආයතන සම්බන්ධ පාලන තත්ත්වය පරීක්ෂා කරනු ඇත. මේ අදහස පෙරදැරිව මහ ආණ්ඩුවේ පාලනය හා උපදෙස් අනුව පැවැත්වෙන දිස්ත්‍රික් සභා ආරම්භ කිරීමට ඉමහත් සැලකිල්ලක් දක්වනු ඇත.”

රාජාසන කථාවේ මේ ප්‍රකාශ කර තිබෙන්නේ ප්‍රාදේශීය සභා සම්බන්ධවයි. දඹදෙනියේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාත්, දිවුලපිටියේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාත් (ලක්ෂ්මන් ජයකොඩි මයා.) කියා සිටියා මේ රට සභා අපට එල්ල වන තර්ජනයක්ය කියා. විශේෂයෙන්ම දඹදෙනියේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා කියා සිටියා රට සභා ක්‍රමය මහා

භයානක දෙයක්ය, එය ක්‍රියාත්මක කරන්නට එපාය කියා. නමුත් යටියන්තොට ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා කියා සිටියේ ඒවා සියල්ලම පිස්සු අදහස්ය, රට සභා ක්‍රමය වුවමනාය, කියයි. තමන්ගේම පෙළේ සිටින අනිත් ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාවන් තම අදහසට එකඟ කරවා ගන්න දඹ දෙනියෙ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාට බැරිවුණා නම් මේ පැත්තේ සිටින අප එතුමාගේ අදහසට එකඟ කරවා ගන්නේ කෙසේද කියා මා ප්‍රශ්න කරන්නට සතුටුයි. දඹදෙනියේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාගේ දුර්වලකම ඒකයි. හැම තිස්සේම තමන්ගේ කිට්ටුවෙන් පටන් ගන්නේ නැතිව බොහොම දුර්වලයි එතුමා වැඩ පටන් ගන්නේ.

දඹදෙනියේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාට මා එක් කාරණයක් පෙන්වා දෙන්න සතුටුයි. ප්‍රාදේශීය සභා ක්‍රමයක් ආරම්භ කරන්නට යනවාය, එයින් මේ රට බෙදීමේ ව්‍යාපාරයක් ආරම්භ කරගෙන යනවාය කියා පෙන්වා දෙන්න එතුමා බොහොම වැයම් කළා. නමුත් ප්‍රාදේශීය සභා ක්‍රමයක් ඇති කරනවාය කියා මේ රට බෙදෙන අන්දමට, ප්‍රාදේශීය සභාවලට සම්පූර්ණ බලතල දී, රටසභා දෙකකට එකක්වීමේ බලතල පවා දී, ප්‍රාදේශීය පාලනය පිළිබඳ සම්පූර්ණ සෛවරී බලතල දීමේ වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් ඉදිරිපත් වුණේ අර බණ්ඩාරනායක අගමැතිතුමාගේ කාලයේදී කඩුවෙන් කරන්නට බැරි දේ අපේ අගමැතිතුමා පැනෙන් කළාය කියමින් දඹදෙනියේ මන්ත්‍රීතුමා සඳහන් කළ වැඩ පිළිවෙළෙන් බව මා මේ අවස්ථාවේදී එතුමාට මතක් කරන්නට සතුටුයි.

ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා.

(*திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனநாயக்க*)
(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

සම්පූර්ණ ඇත්ත. නමුත් ඒ අවස්ථාවේදී අපේ අගමැතිතුමාට කරුණු පෙන්වාදී ඒ ගිවිසුම ඉරා දමන්නක් ඒවාගේම උපකාර වුණු බව මා මතක් කරන්නට සතුටුයි.

ප්‍රේමදාස මයා.

(*திரு. பிரேமதாச*)
(Mr. Premadasa)

දඹදෙනියේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාට තිබෙන අමාරුව මේ අවස්ථාව පිළිබඳව තිබෙන

අමාරුවයි. එහෙම අයට හොඳ සිංහල වචනායක් පාවිච්චි කරනව, අවස්ථාවාදියෝය කියා. මේකේ වැරද්ද ඒකයි. අවස්ථාවෙන් අවස්ථාවට තමන්ගේ ප්‍රතිපත්ති වෙනස් කරන්න යන කාටත් දඹදෙනියේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාට මුහුණ පාන්නට වී තිබෙන විපාකයට මුහුණ පාන්නට සිද්ධ වෙනව. ප්‍රතිපත්තියක් නැතිව යම් යම් වැඩ පිළිවෙළවල් අනුගමනය කරන්නට ගියාම කාටත් මේ අමාරුවට මුහුණ පාන්නට සිද්ධ වෙනව. දඹදෙනියේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා කියන ඔය භයානක තත්ත්වය ඇතිවුණේ එදා ඉදිරිපත් කළ ඒ වැඩ පිළිවෙළෙන්. ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, ප්‍රථම වරට ලංකාවේ, මේ ආණ්ඩුවට සම්බන්ධ සියලුම පක්ෂවල කැමැත්ත ඇතිව, ප්‍රාදේශීය සභා ක්‍රමය අප යෝජනා කර තිබෙන්නේ පළාත් පාලන සේවය පිණිස පමණයි. අද කවිවේදි මගින් යම් වැඩ පිළිවෙළක් කරගෙන යනවා නම් ඒ සේවය කරන්නට තෝරා පත් කර ගත් නියෝජිතයින්ගේ මාර්ගයෙන් මේ ප්‍රාදේශීය සභාවලට බලතල ලැබෙනවා ඇති. එසේ සුදුනම් කර තිබෙන්නේ මධ්‍යම ආණ්ඩුවේ පරිපාලනය යටතේයි. වැදගත් කරුණ ඒකයි. නමුත් නාන්සේලාගේ හවුල් ආණ්ඩුවේ රාජාසන කථාවෙහි සඳහන් වී තිබෙන්නේ කුමක්ද කියා එය කියවා බලන්න. ප්‍රදේශ පාලනය පිළිබඳව මධ්‍යම ආණ්ඩුවේ බලතල ඒ වැඩ පිළිවෙළට ඇතුළත් වී තිබුණාදැයි මම අහනවා.

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, ආරාමුලක් කරදරයක් නැතිව, හිරිහැරයක් නැතිව, වාදයක් හේදයක් නැතිව, කැමති කරවා ගත යුතු සියලුම දෙනා කැමති කරවාගෙන මේ වැඩ පිළිවෙළ ඇති කර ගන්නට අප විරිය කිරීම ගැන දඹදෙනියේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා.) අපට විශේෂයෙන් ප්‍රශංසා කළ යුතුයි. රාජාසන කථාවේ එම කොටස මා විසින් කියවන්නට යෙදුණා.

අ. භා. 5.30

දිවුලපිටියේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ලක්ෂ්මන් ජයකොඩි මයා.) භාෂා ප්‍රශ්නය ගැන සඳහන් කළා. කිසියම් පුද්ගලයෙක් ඔහු කැමති භාෂාවකින් ලියුමක් ලිවීම ඒ පුද්ගලයාගේ නිදහස අනුව කරන දෙයක්. දිවුලපිටියේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා දෙමළ භාෂා

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා.

(*ශ්‍රී. ජී. ජී. ජේනානායක*)
(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

සභාපතිතුමනි, අපි කිව්වේ, ඡන්ද කරන කාලයේදී අපි ඡන්ද කටයුතු කළේ පොහොස දින නිවාඩු කරනවා කියාගෙන ය, නමුත් එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂය පොහොස ගැන වචනයක්වත් කිව්වේ නැත, කියයි.

ප්‍රේමදාස මයා.

(*ශ්‍රී. පී. රේමදාස*)
(Mr. Premadasa)

ඇයි තැත්තේ? අපේ ප්‍රතිපත්ති ප්‍රකාශනය කියවන්නට. [බාධා කිරීම්]

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(*ගෞරව උඩ්ලි ජේනානායක*),
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

සම්පූර්ණ අසත්‍යයක්. පොහොස දින 4 ම නිවාඩු කරනවා කියා අපේ ප්‍රකාශනයේ තිබුණ. [බාධා කිරීම්] බොරුවෙන් වාද කරන්නට එන්නට එපා.

ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා.

(*ශ්‍රී. ජී. ජී. ජේනානායක*)
(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

එකම රැස්වීමකදීවත් ඒ ගැන කිව්වේ නැහැ. කොලයේ නම් තියෙන්නට ඇති. [බාධා කිරීම්] මොන සභාවේද කිව්වේ?

ප්‍රේමදාස මයා.

(*ශ්‍රී. පී. රේමදාස*)
(Mr. Premadasa)

හැම සභාවකම කිව්ව.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(*ගෞරව උඩ්ලි ජේනානායක*)
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

අපේ මහා මැතිවරණ ප්‍රකාශනය කියවන්න, කරුණාකරල. බොරු කියා වාද කරන්නට එන්නට එපා මෙතැන. [බාධා කිරීම්]

ප්‍රේමදාස මයා.

(*ශ්‍රී. පී. රේමදාස*)
(Mr. Premadasa)

සභාපතිතුමනි, අමාරුව මේකයි. එක බොරුවක් කිව්ව මනුස්සයට, එක ඇත්ත කරන්නට තව බොරු දාහක් කියන්නට සිද්ධ

වෙනව. තමුත්තාත්සේලා හැම පක්ෂයක ම මැතිවරණ ප්‍රකාශන කියෙව්වොත්, පොහොස දින නිවාඩුව පිළිබඳව පැහැදිලි ප්‍රකාශයක් කළේ එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂය පමණක් බව පෙනී යයි.

මේ ජාතික ප්‍රශ්නය ගැන දඹදෙනියේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා කැක්කුමක් ඇතුළු අවංක ලෙස වැඩ කරනව නම්, එතුමාට යුතුකමක් තිබෙනව, ඒ ප්‍රශ්න සාමදානයෙන් විසඳන්නට කුමන රජයක් හෝ කටයුතු කරනවා නම් ඊට ප්‍රශංසා කරන්න. එහෙම එකක් නැහැ. එතුමා කතෝලික ප්‍රදේශවලට ගිහින් එක ප්‍රකාශයක් කරනව; බෞද්ධ පළාත්වලට ගිහින් වෙනත් ප්‍රකාශයක් කරනව; බෞද්ධ-කතෝලික දෙහොල්ලම සිටින පළාත්වලට ගිහින් තවත් ප්‍රකාශයක් කරනව. ඒක සාධාරණද කියා මා එතුමාගෙන් අහන්නට කැමතියි. [බාධා කිරීම්] මේ විවාදයේදී මෙම ප්‍රශ්නය ඇදගෙන කපා කිරීම ගැන මා කනගාටු වෙනව. මා එකයි තමුත්තාත්සේගෙන් ඇසුවේ, තමුත්තාත්සේ කියන විධියට අපි වැඩ කළොත් තමුත්තාත්සේ අපට ප්‍රශංසා කරනවද කියා. නැහැ. එතකොට දුවිඩ ජනතාවට ගිහින් කියයි, ඔන්න සිංහල ජාතිය තමුත්තාත්සේලාව නැති කලා කියා. දැන් තමුත්තාත්සේලාගේ පත්‍ර කියන්නේ මොකක්ද? “ඇත්ත” පත්‍රය මොකක්ද කියන්නේ? “ඇත්ත” පත්‍රය කාදිනල්තුමාට මේ විධියට කියනව:

“අති උත්තම දේවධර්මාචාර්යාණි තෝමස් කුරේ කාදිනල්තුමනි,

දෙවියන් වහන්සේ දෙවා වදාළවූ දස පණත්වලින් තුන්වන පනතෙන් ඉරුදින නිවාඩු වලංගු කරවයි කියා අපට උගන්වා තිබේ. එය බොරුද, සැබෑද? පෙහොස දින නිවාඩු වලංගු කරවයි කියා දැන් ඔබ තුමා එම පනත වෙනස් කරන්නට කැමතිලු. ඔබතුමාට හෝ පාප්තුමාටවත් පුළුවන්ද, දේව චාක්‍ය වෙනස් කිරීමට?”

කාදිනල්තුමා හා කතෝලික ජනතාව මිට එකඟ වූණා කියා දැන් කාදිනල්තුමාටත් බණින්නට පටන්ගෙන තිබෙනව. යම් විධියකින් “දෙමළට කිසිම තැනක් දෙන්නේ නැත, සිංහල නොදන්න අය මුහුදට පැනල මැරෙන්නට ඕනෑ” කියා අද නියෝගයක් කළොත්, හෙට දඹදෙනියේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා තමයි, පෙබරල් පක්‍ෂයේ නායකයාටත් වඩා ඉක්මණින් යාපනයට

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[ප්‍රේමදාස මයා.]

යන්නේ. ගිහිත් කියයි, “ද්‍රවිඩ ජාතිය උතුම් ජාතියක්, උතුම් සංස්කෘතියක් තිබුණු ජාතියක්, අපි මෙතෙක් සහෝදර යන් වගේ හිටිය, ඔන්න එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂය තමුන් නාත්සේලාව නැති කළා” කියා. දඹදෙනියේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රී තුමාගේ දේශපාලන ජීවිතය ගැන දැන් නම් අපට කනගාටු වෙන්ටයි, සිදුවෙලා තිබෙන්නේ. එතුමාගේ ජීවිතය ඉතාමත්ම උනන්දුවෙන් මේ රට බලා සිටින දේශ පාලන ජීවිතයක්. එහෙත් ඒ බලාපොරොත්තු සියල්ලක්ම එතුමා කඩ කළා.

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, අපේ අමාත්‍යාංශය පිළිබඳ විවාදයේදී දොම්පේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රී තුමාගේ (එච්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.) සම්පූර්ණ කථාවම ඵල්ල වුණේ භාෂා පිළිබඳ ප්‍රශ්නයටයි. අමාත්‍යාංශයෙන් පිට ප්‍රශ්න ගැන මේ විවාදයේදී යම් යම් කථා ඇති වුණාට, යටියන්තොට ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා) බොහොම අමනාප වන්ට ඇති. දඹදෙනියේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා කථා කරන විට එතුමා කොයි තරම් අමාරුවකින්ද තම ආසනයේ සිටියේ කියා මා දන්නවා. නමුත් මා ඒ ප්‍රශ්නයට පිළිතුරු නොදුන්නොත් මා ඔගේ යතුකමක් ඉටු නොකළ බවට හැඟීමක් ඇති වන නිසා ඊට පිළිතුරු දෙන්නට අදහස් කරනවා. ගරු තීරුවෙල්වම් මහතා මේ ආණ්ඩුවේ පළාත් පාලන ඇමතිවරයා වශයෙන් පත් වී යාපනේ සිට දෙවුන්දර දක්වාත් කොළඹ සිට මඩකලපුව දක්වාත් ආඥා වක්‍රය පතුරුවන බවත්, එතුමා එළර රජුටත් කරන්නට බැරි වූ දෙයක් කර තිබෙන බවත් දොම්පේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා ප්‍රකාශ කළා. මෙය මේ රටේ සාමය පිළිබඳ හැඟීමක් ඇතිව කළ ප්‍රකාශයක්ද? මෙය මහජනයාට නියම තත්ත්වය පෙන්වා දීම සඳහා කළ ප්‍රකාශයක්ද? වත්තල ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා පැහැදිලි කළ අන්දමට මෙය කොයි තරම් අසාධාරණයක්දැයි අප දන්නවා. මා තීරුවෙල්වම් මහතා යටතේ එතුමාගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්වරයා හැටියට කටයුතු කරනවා. ඒ නිසා එතුමා රජයේ ප්‍රතිපත්ති අකුරටම පිළිපදිමින් ක්‍රියා කරන කෙනෙකු බව පමණක් නොව යම්කිසි බරපතල ප්‍රශ්නයක් මතු වූ සෑම අවස්ථාවකදීම රජයේ අදහස විමසා බලා වැඩ කරන්නට ලැස්ති වී සිටින ඇමතිවර

යකු බව ප්‍රකාශ කරන්නට පුළුවනි. [බාබා කීර්මක්] ඔය කාර් ලේබලයක් පෙන්වීමෙන් ඇති වැඩේ මොකක්ද? මොකක්ද ඔකෙ තිබෙන ලොකු වැදගත්කම?

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, යම්කිසි වැදගත් ප්‍රශ්නයක් මතු වූ සෑම අවස්ථාවකදීම රජයේ අදහස් විමසා බලා ක්‍රියා කරන ඇමති වරයකු හැටියට පළාත් පාලන ඇමතිතුමා හඳුන්වා දෙන්නට පුළුවනි. තීරුවෙල්වම් මහතා ඇමතිවරයකු වූ පමණින් එතුමා ද්‍රවිඩ රාජ්‍යයක් ඇති කරන්නට යනවා යයි චෝදනා කිරීම නුසුදුසුයි. එය අසාධාරණ චෝදනාවක්. විරුද්ධ පැත්තේ සිටින සමහර ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් එතුමාගේ කථා, ප්‍රවෘත්ති පත්‍රවලින් කියවා ඒ පිළිබඳව කරුණු පෙන්වා දීමට වැයම් කළා. නමුත් ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්ට විශ්වාසය තබන්නට පුළුවන් කථාවක් එතුමා කර තිබෙන බව මේ අවස්ථාවේදී මතක් කරන්නට කැමතියි. එතුමා ආණ්ඩුවේ නියෝජිතයකු හැටියට සෙනෙට් මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේදී කළ කථාවක් හැන්සාඩ් වාර්තාවේ පළ වී තිබෙනවා. ඒ කථාව ගැන මා ගරු මන්ත්‍රී වරුන්ගේ සැලකිල්ල යොමු කරවන්නට කැමතියි. මා මේ කියවන්නට යන්නේ 1965 අප්‍රේල් 30 වැනිදා සෙනෙට් හැන්සාඩ් වාර්තාවෙනුයි. එදා 1965 අප්‍රේල් 30 වැනිදා එතුමා කථා කරන්නට පෙර භාෂා ප්‍රශ්නය සම්බන්ධයෙන් බණ්ඩාරනායක මහතා විසින් 1957 අප්‍රේල් මාසයේ 25 වැනිදා කරන ලද කථාවක් ගැන මතක් කර එය සම්බන්ධකර ගනිමිනුයි, එතුමා කථා කෙළේ. මේ ගරු සභාවට අද දින නොපැමිණ සිටින ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්ගේද ප්‍රයෝජනය සඳහා එතුමාගේ ඒ කථාවේ අදාළ කොටස සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම මෙහිදී සඳහන් කරන්නට කැමතියි.

“I refer to the statement of Mr. Bandaranaike on Regional Councils, Use of the Tamil Language, Fundamental Rights, etc., made in Parliament on 25th April, 1957.”

එතුමා ඊළඟට කියනවා බණ්ඩාරනායක මැතිතුමා කී දේ :

“The House knows that, under the proposal to establish regional councils, it is intended to effect a very reasonable and satisfactory measure of decentralization of the administration in this country in the regional councils which will function as local authorities. . . .”

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

බණ්ඩාරනායක අගමැතිතුමා කී දේ තීරුවෙල්වම් ඇමතිතුමා තව දුරටත් සඳහන් කර තිබෙනවා :

“...but with very wide administrative powers. The Bill in draft form is ready.

The other subject I wish to refer to is this. The House and the country know that it has always been the policy of the Government Party that, although the circumstances of the situation were such that the Sinhalese language had to be declared the official language of this country, there was no intention in fact to cause any undue hardship or injustice to those whose language is other than Sinhalese in the implementation of that Act.’”

තව දුරටත් බණ්ඩාරනායක අගමැතිතුමා මෙසේ කියා තිබෙනවා :

“We feel that at least in certain areas in the Northern and Eastern Provinces—I am speaking very generally now—it will be understood that subject to further closer consideration and discussion with others, the Northern and Eastern Provinces should have the option of doing the official part of their work also in Tamil if they so wish.’”

මා මේ කියෙව්වෙ බණ්ඩාරනායක මහතා කී කොටස. ඊට පසු තීරුවෙල්වම් මහතා මේ පිළිවෙලට කියනවා.

“Therefore, we find, if we examine the past historically, that Mr. Bandaranaike passed the Official Language Act for the purpose of making Sinhala the official language. With that I have no quarrel.”—

සිංහල පමණක් පනත—රාජ්‍ය භාෂා පනත—එතුමා පිළිගන්නවා.

—“As a Member of the National Government, I have no question to that. As a Member of the Federal Party I want to say this : our Government has no intention to undo the Official Language Act, at all. That is an assurance.”

මේ කරුණු පැහැදිලි ලෙස ප්‍රකාශ කරල තියෙනවා. ප්‍රචාරණීයත්වලින් එහෙත් මෙහෙත් වචනයක් අල්ලගෙන තමුත් නාත්සෙල මොන විධියේ ප්‍රකාශ කළත් ගරු පළාත් පාලන ඇමතිතුමා මේ කරුණු බොහොම පැහැදිලිව කියා තිබෙනවා. එපමණක් නොවෙයි, අපේ රාජ්‍යසභයේ කථාවෙන් අපි පැහැදිලි ලෙස කියා තිබෙනවා, සිංහල පමණක් පනත මේ රටේ රාජ්‍ය භාෂා පනත හැටියට අපි පිළිගන්නවාය, එසේම දෙමළ භාෂා විශේෂ විධිවිධාන පනතත්, උසාවි භාෂා පනතත් අපි පිළිගන්නවාය කියා. මේ ප්‍රතිපත්ති උඩ තමයි,

මේ රජයට සම්බන්ධ සෑම පක්ෂයක්ම අද ක්‍රියා කරන්නේ. ඒ නිසා ඒ ගැන කිසිම ප්‍රශ්නයක් නැති බව මම විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයට පැහැදිලි ලෙස කියන්න කැමතියි.

අ. භා. 5.45

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, මා මුලින් කී විධියට, ප්‍රදේශ පාලනය පිළිබඳව යම්කිසි වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් අපි ඇති කරනවා. තවමත් ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් විස්තර සහිත ප්‍රකාශයක් කරන්නට මට පුළුවන්කමක් නැහැ. දකුණු කොළඹ මන්ත්‍රීතුමාගේ කථාවෙදී මගෙන් අසන්නට යෙදුණා, ප්‍රදේශ පාලනය පිළිබඳ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය කුමක්ද කියා. කවිචේරිවලින් අද කෙරෙන පාලනය අපේ නියෝජිතයන්ගේ මාර්ගයෙන් කිරීමට යම් කිසි ආයතනයක් අවශ්‍ය බව අප පිළිගෙන තිබෙන බව ඒ මන්ත්‍රීතුමාට පිළිතුරු වශයෙන් මම කියන්නට සතුටුයි. යටියන්තොට ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමන් එය පැහැදිලි කළා. පසුගිය ආණ්ඩු කාලයේදී විශේෂ කාරක සභාවක් මගින් ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් වාර්තාවක් ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබුණා. ඒ වාර්තාවට පනත් කෙටුම්පතකුත් අත්තහිත වෙලා තිබුණා. පසුගිය රජය ඒ වාර්තාව පිළිගන්න. නමුත් පනත් කෙටුම්පත පිළිගත්තේ නැහැ. ඒ නිසා ඒ වාර්තාව අනුව පනත් කෙටුම්පතක් පිළියෙල කරන්නට අද අපට සිදු වී තිබෙනවා. අපේ අමාත්‍යාංශය ඒ පිළිබඳව වාර්තාවක් ඇමති මණ්ඩලය වෙත ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙනවා. වැඩි කල් යන්නට පෙර ප්‍රදේශ පාලන මණ්ඩල පිළිබඳ පනත් කෙටුම්පතක් මේ ගරු සභාව වෙත ඉදිරිපත් කිරීමට අප බලාපොරොත්තු වන බව මම ප්‍රකාශ කරන්න සතුටුයි. එය කිසිම ප්‍රදේශයක් කිසිම කොටසකට පාවා දෙන පනතක් නොවන බවත්, මෙතෙක් කවිචේරි මගින් ගෙන ගිය පාලනය අපේ නියෝජිතයන් අතට පත් කර පාලන යන්ත්‍රය දැනට වඩා විධිමත් අත්දැමින් ක්‍රියාත්මක කිරීම සඳහා සකස් වුණු පනතක් බවත්, එය ඉදිරිපත් කළ විට තමුත් නාත්සෙලාට වැටහෙන බව මම මතක් කරන්නට සතුටුයි.

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, පළාත් පාලන කොමිෂන් සභාව ප්‍රතිසංස්කරණය කිරීම පිළිබඳ ප්‍රශ්නය අපේ අමාත්‍යාංශයේ සැලකිල්ලට භාජන වී තිබෙන බව මම ප්‍රකාශ කරන්න

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[ප්‍රේමදාස මයා.]

කැමතියි. මේ සම්බන්ධයෙන් මීට පෙර ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නට යෙදුණු වාර්තා ගණනාවක්ම දැනට අපේ ඇමතිතුමාගේ සැලකිල්ලට භාජන වී තිබෙනව. වොක්සි කොමිෂන් සභා වාර්තාවත්, වි. සී. ජයසූරිය වාර්තාවත් ගැන සඳහන් කරන්නට යෙදුන. ඒ සමගම පළාත් පාලන ආයතන මගින් සහ වෘත්තීය සමිති මගින් ඉදිරිපත් කරන ලද, ඉතාමත් වැදගත් අදහස් උදහස් ඇතුළත් සන්දේශ ගණනාවක්ම අපට ලැබී තිබෙනව. ඒ වාර්තා ගැන සැලකිල්ලක් දක්වා අද අපේ අමාත්‍යාංශය ක්‍රියා කරගෙන යනවා. අපි කල්පනා කරගෙන යනවා, කුමන ආකාරයට මේ සංශෝධන ඇති කළ යුතුද කියා. මේ සම්බන්ධයෙන් කැබිනට් මණ්ඩලය තොරතුරු ඉදිරිපත් කොට යම් තීරණයක් ගන්නා තුරු මට ප්‍රකාශයක් කරන්න ඇති අපහසුව ගැන මම කනගාටු වෙනවා.

විශ්‍රාම වැටුප් පිළිබඳව හා පරිවර්තිත විශ්‍රාම වැටුප් ගැන සඳහන් කරන්නට යෙදුණා. ඒ කාරණා පිළිබඳව යම් වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් ඇති කිරීමට අපි ක්‍රියා කරගෙන යනවා. අපට ඇති එක් බාධාවක් නම් පළාත් පාලන ආයතනවල මුදල් තත්ත්වය පිළිබඳව තිබෙන දුර්වලතාවයි. එය ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම කනගාටුදායක දෙයක්. පළාත් පාලන ආයතනවලට යම් ආදායමක් ලබාගැනීම පිණිස යම් යම් මාර්ග ඇති කළ යුතුව තිබෙනවා.

අපි කොළඹ නගර සභාව ගැන කල්පනා කර බලමු. කොළඹ නගර සභාවට අද ලැබෙන ආදායම් මාර්ග ඉතාමත් සීමා සහිතයි. කොළඹ නගර සභාවට ලැබිය යුතු ආදායම් පවා මෙතෙක් ලැබුණේ නැහැ. කොළඹ නගර සභාවට වරායෙන් ලැබෙන්න තිබුණු විශාල මුදල් සම්භාරයක්—කෝට්ටි තුනක් පමණ—මෙතෙක් නොලැබුණු බව තමුන්තාන්සේ දන්නවා ඇති. මේ ලගදී ආණ්ඩුව තීරණය කළා, ඒ මුදල කොළඹ නගර සභාවට දීමට. දකුණු කොළඹ ගරා මන්ත්‍රීතුමා කීවාක් මෙන්, රථවාහන ලියාපදිංචි කිරීමේ ගාස්තුවලින් කොටසක් පමණයි, පළාත් පාලන ආයතනවලට ලැබෙන්නේ. ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන්ද යම් වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් ඇති කිරීම සඳහා, අපේ අමාත්‍යාංශයේ සැලකිල්ල යොමු වී

තිබෙනවා. පළාත් පාලන ආයතනවලටම එම ගාස්තු දීම ගැන දැන් පරීක්ෂා කරගෙන යනවා.

විදුලි බලය පිළිබඳවත් සඳහන් කරන්න යෙදුණා. දැනටමත් අපි මේ සම්බන්ධයෙන් විදුලි බලය පිළිබඳ ඇමතිතුමා සමඟ සාකච්ඡා කරගෙන යනවා. කොළඹ නගරයේ වීචි විදුලි ඵලියෙන් ආලෝකමත් කිරීම ගැන පමණක් නොව, කොළඹ නගර සභාවෙන් පාරිභෝගිකයින්ට විදුලිය බෙදා හැරීම සම්බන්ධයෙන්ද යම් වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් ඇති කිරීමට අපි බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. කොළඹ නගර සභාවට පමණක් නොව, අනික් පළාත් පාලන ආයතනවලට ද ඒ මගින් යම් ආදායමක් ලබා දීමට අපි විශේෂ උත්සාහයක් ගන්නවා.

ඒ වාගේම ඒ මන්ත්‍රීතුමා පළාත් පාලන සේවා කොමිෂන් සභාව පිළිබඳව කරුණු දක්වමින් කීවවා, ඒ කොමිෂන් සභාවට අද බොහොම බර උසුළන්නට සිදු වී තිබෙනවාය කියා. රාජ්‍ය සේවා කොමිෂන් සභාව මෙන් නොව, හැම කාරණයක්ම තමන් වෙත පවරාගෙන වැඩ ගොඩ කරගෙන තිබෙනවාය කීවවා. එය සම්පූර්ණ ඇත්ත. අපි එය පිළිගන්නවා. ඒ කරුණු, පළාත් පාලන සේවා කොමිෂන් සභාව සංස්කරණය කිරීමේදී අපේ විශේෂ සැලකිල්ලට භාජන වන බව මම එතුමාට මතක් කරන්න කැමතියි. එතුමා පැමිණිල්ලක් කළා, කොළඹ නගර සභාවේ සේවකයින්ගේ වෘත්තීය සමිතියක් පළාත් පාලන සේවා කොමිෂන් සභාව කෙරෙහි විශ්වාසයක් නැතැයි යෝජනාවක් සම්මත කරගත් නිසා ඒ වෘත්තීය සමිතියට කරුණු ඉදිරිපත් කිරීමටවත් අවස්ථාවක් දුන්නේ නැත කියා. මට ඒ කාරණය දැනගන්න ලැබුණු ප්‍රථම අවස්ථාව මෙයයි. එය කනගාටුදායක දෙයක්. මම විශ්වාස කරනවා, පළාත් පාලන සේවා කොමිෂන් සභාව නීතියක් හැටියට මෙය මින් ඉදිරියටවත් නොකරාවිය කියා. ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් කරුණු සොයා බලා ක්‍රියා කරන්න මම බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනව. ඒ වාගේම, දකුණු කොළඹ මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.) පළාත් පාලන ආයතන විසුරුවා හැරීම පිළිබඳව ඇමතිතුමාට තිබෙන බලතල ගැනත්, විශේෂයෙන්ම කොළඹ නගර සභාවේ තත්ත්වය උසස් කිරීමේ ප්‍රශ්නය

සම්බන්ධයෙනුත් සඳහන් කළා. නමුත් මම දන්නේ නැහැ, කොන්දේසි දෙකක් උඩ එහි තත්ත්වය උසස් කරන්න බලා පොරොන්තු වෙනවාය කියන පිළිතුරක් ඇමතිතුමාගෙන් එතුමාට ලැබුණේ කොහො මද කියා. අමාත්‍යාංශයෙන් එවැනි සන් දේශයක් කොළඹ නගර සභාවට තවම යවා නැහැ. නමුත් එක කාරණයක් ගැන කියන්න සතුටුයි. දැනට අමාත්‍යාංශයේ විශේෂ සැලකිල්ලට භාජනව තිබෙනවා, කොළඹ නගර සභාවේ තත්ත්වය මෙම ගත සංවත්සරය තිමිත්තෙන් උසස් කළ යුතුය යන කාරණය. නමට පමණක් කෝපරේෂන් නැත්නම් මහා සංඝභා වක්ය කියා නම් කරන්නේ නැතුව යම් යම් බලතල—සනීපරක්ෂාව, නිවාස, මේ ආදී නොයෙක් අවශ්‍ය මහජන පහසුකම් ඉක්මනින් හා පහසුවෙන් සපයා දීම සඳහා අවශ්‍ය වන බලතල—කොළඹ නගර සභාවට දීම සම්බන්ධයෙන් කරන්න පුළුවන් මොනවාද කියන කාරණය ගැන අමාත්‍යාංශයේ සැලකිල්ල දැනට යොමු වී තිබෙන බව මතක් කරන්න සතුටුයි.

ඒ වාගේම, සෞඛ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමාගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්, ගලිගමුවේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරිය (විමලා කන්නන්ගර මිය.) මතක් කරන්න යෙදුණා, පළාත් පාලන ආයතනවල සභාපතිවරුන් නොමිලයේ විශාල සේවයක් ඉටු කරනවාය කියා. එය සම්පූර්ණ ඇත්තක්. මෙය අපේ විශේෂ සැලකිල්ලට භාජන වී ඇති ප්‍රශ්නයක්. ගම්සභාපතිවරුන්ගේ සිට නගර සභාපති වරුන් දක්වාම මේ පිරිස කිසිම වැටුපක් නැතුව, කිසිම පාරිතෝෂික මුදලක් නැතුව, විශේෂ සේවයක් ඉටු කරනව. පළාත් පාලන ආයතන වලට පත්වන සහිකයන් සියලු දෙනාම වාගේ තමන්ගේ සම්පූර්ණ කාලය ඒ කටයුත්ත සඳහා යොදවනව. ඒ ගැන කිසිම සැකයක් නැහැ. එම නිසා, මේ ප්‍රශ්නය ගැනත් අපේ සැලකිල්ල දැන් යොමු වී තිබෙනව. විශේෂයෙන්ම මුදල් පිළිබඳව තිබෙන අපහසුකම් දැනට ඇති බාධාව මිස, ඒ පළාත් පාලන ආයතනවල සේවය කරන මහජන නියෝජිතයන්ට, තමන්ගේ සම්පූර්ණ කාලය සේවය සඳහා යොදවා ඇති ඒ නියෝජිත මහතුන්ට, යම් පාරි

තෝෂික මුදලක් දීම සම්බන්ධයෙන් අපේ කිසිම අකමැත්තක් නැති බව මේ අවස්ථා වේදී ප්‍රකාශ කරන්න සතුටුයි.

ඒ වගේම, පාරවල් සහ ජලය පිළිබඳව ප්‍රශ්නයක් මතු කරන්න යෙදුණා. ඔව්, තමුන්නාත්සේට කියන්න කණගාටුයි, ලංකාව මේ තරම් ජලාධාරාවක් ඇති රටක් වුණත් අපේ මහජනතාවගෙන් සියයට විස්සකට පමණයි පිරිසිදු ජලය තවමත් ලැබෙන්නේ. එය ඉතාමත් කණගාටුදායක දෙයක් බව තමුන්නාත්සේ වුණත් පිළි ගන්නවා ඇති. නමුත් අපට අද පුළුවන් කමක් ලැබී තිබෙනව—දැනට යම් යම් පරීක්ෂණ කරගෙන යනව—ජලය බෙදා හැරීම දැනට වඩා පුළුල් අන්දමින්, විධි මත් අන්දමින් කරගෙන යන්න. පවිත්‍ර ජලය රටේ ජනතාවට ලබාදීම පිණිස යම් වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් ආරම්භ කිරීම පිණිස විශේෂ ආධාර අපට ලැබී තිබෙනවා. එක්සත් ජාතීන්ගේ කාර්මික ආධාර අංශයෙන් දැනටමත් නියෝජිතයන් ගණනාවක් පැමිණ ඒ ගැන පරීක්ෂණ පවත්වා ගෙන යනව. ආදර්ශ යෝජනා ක්‍රමය සඳහා, මීගමුවේ සිට ගාල්ල දක්වා පවිත්‍ර ජලය නොලැබෙන ප්‍රදේශවලට ඒ ජලය ලබාදීමේ වැඩ පිළිවෙල සඳහා, විශේෂ ආධාර පවා ලැබීමේ අවකාශ තිබෙන බව මේ ගරු සභාවට වාර්තා කරන්න කැමතියි.

ඒ වාගේම තමුන්නාත්සේ පිළිගත් නවා ඇති, ප්‍රාදේශීය පාලනයේ තවත් අංගයක් තමයි විදුලි බලය. මුළු රටේම, හැම ප්‍රදේශයකටම වාගේ විදුලි බලය සපයන්න පුළුවන් වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් සකස් කරන්න හැකි නම්, එමගින් ගම්බද සහ අනිකුත් ප්‍රදේශවල ජනතාවට ඉතා අවශ්‍ය පහසුකමක් ලැබෙනවා පමණක් නොවෙයි, විදුලි බලය හේතුකොට ගෙන කාර්මාන්ත යුගයක් ඒ ප්‍රදේශවලද ඇති වීමෙන්, ඒ මාර්ගයෙන් අපේ පළාත් පාලන ආයතනවලට වුවත්, ආදායමක් ලැබෙන බව පිළිගත යුතුව තිබෙනව. ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙනුත් අපේ කල්පනාව යොමු වී තිබෙනව.

හබරාදුව ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.) මැතිවරණ නීති සම්බන්ධයෙනුත් අපේ අවධානය යොමු කළා. පාර්ලිමේන්තු මැතිවරණ නීති

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[ප්‍රේමදාස මය.]

පළාත් පාලන මැතිවරණවලටත් බලපාන අන්දමට පිළියෙළ කළ යුතු යයි එතුමා කීවේ. ඒ සම්බන්ධව අප ක්‍රියා කරගෙන යන බවත්, මුදල් ප්‍රශ්න පිළිබඳව යම් යම් කරුණු වගයක් භාණ්ඩාගාරය මගින් මතු කර තිබෙන නිසා මේ ප්‍රමාදය ඇති වී තිබෙන බවත් මා මතක් කරන්න කැමතියි. එමෙන්ම, ලගදී, එනම් තව මාස කීපයකින් ඇති වන පළාත් පාලන ආයතනවල මැතිවරණ සඳහා හැඳිනීම් පත් දෙන්නට පුළුවන්ද කියන ප්‍රශ්නයත් මගෙන් අසන්න යෙදුණා. කාලය කීට්ටු නිසාත්, ඒ සම්බන්ධව අවශ්‍ය විධිවිධාන යෙදීමට වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් රජය මගින් තවම සකස් කර නැති නිසාත්, මේ අවස්ථාවේදී ඒ ගැන පොරොන්දුවක් දෙන්නට මට අමාරුයි. ඒ හැර තම තමන් නියෝජනය කරන ප්‍රදේශ සම්බන්ධව ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් විසින් යම් යම් ප්‍රශ්න මතු කළා. ඒ හැම කරුණක්මත් අපේ සැලකිල්ලට යොමු වෙන බව මේ අවස්ථාවේදී මතක් කරන්න සතුටුයි.

මගේ කථාව අවසාන කරන්න කලින් පළාත් පාලන ආයතනවලට වාර්ෂිකව දෙන ආධාර මුදල සම්බන්ධයෙන් කරුණක් මතක් කළ යුතුයි. ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් හුඟ දෙනෙක් මේ ගැන කරුණු ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙනවා. එහෙත්, නියමිත ආධාර මුදල දෙන අතරම විශේෂ මුදලකුත් දෙන විට ඒ ඒ ප්‍රදේශවල ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරුන් සමගත් ඒ ඒ ප්‍රදේශවල පළාත් පාලන ආයතනවල සභාපතිවරුන් සමගත් සාකච්ඡා කර සාධාරණ ලෙස ඒ ආධාර මුදල දීමේ වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් ඇති කරන බව කියන්න කැමතියි. එසේ කිරීමට අපි ප්‍රතිපත්තියක් වශයෙන් තීරණය කර තිබෙනවා. [බඩා කිරීමක්] මට ලැබී තිබෙන අපේ ප්‍රතිපත්ති ප්‍රකාශනය දැක දෙතියේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාට (ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මය.) පෙන්වන්නම්.

මේ අවස්ථාවේ මීට වඩා කථා කරන්න තමුත්තාත්සේ මට අවකාශ දෙනවා ඇත කියා මා හිතන්නේ නැහැ. එහෙත්, යම් චන්ද්‍රිවරයෙක් සඳහන් කළ යම්කිසි කාරණාවක් ගැන මා සඳහන් නොකළා නම් එයින් අදහස් කරන්නේ එය අපේ සැලකිල්ලට භාජන නොවුණාය කියන

එක නොවෙයි. ඒ හැම කරුණක් ගැනම අපේ විශේෂ අවධානය යොමු කෙරෙන බව කියන්න සතුටුයි. අපට මේ අමාත්‍යාංශයේ වැඩ කටයුතු කරන්න ලැබුණේ මාස 5 ක් පමණයි. ඒ අමාත්‍යාංශයේත් ඒ අමාත්‍යාංශය යටතේ ඇති දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවලත් සහයෝගය සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම අපට ලැබෙන බව ප්‍රකාශ කරන්න කැමතියි. එමෙන්ම මේ අමාත්‍යාංශයේ කටයුතු විධිමත්ව කරන්න ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්ගේ අවවාද හා උපදෙස් අප තීරත්තරයෙන්ම බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. ඒ ආධාරය අපට ලැබේවා, කියා ප්‍රාර්ථනා කරමින් මගේ කථාව අවසාන කරනවා.

මතු පළ වන යෝජනාව සහාසම්මත විය :

திருமாளிக்கப்பல்து.

Resolved :

That the Vote be increased by Rs. 1,740 in respect of sub-head 1, item "34 Other Staff"—[මුදල් ඇමති වෙනුවට ගරු එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා.]

2 වන උප ශීර්ෂය.—ජීවන වියදම සහ විශේෂ ජීවනාධාර දීමනා, රු. 56,145

உப தலைப்பு 2.—வாழ்க்கைப்படியும், விசேடப்படயும் ரூ. 56,145

Sub-head 2.—Cost of Living and Special Living Allowances, Rs. 56,145

මතු පළ වන යෝජනාව සහාසම්මත විය :

திருமாளிக்கப்பல்து.

Resolved :

That the Vote be increased by Rs. 1,220 in respect of sub-head 2, item "Cost of Living Allowance".

That the Vote be increased by Rs. 210 in respect of sub-head 2, item "Special Living Allowance".—[මුදල් ඇමති වෙනුවට ගරු එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා.]

3 වන උප ශීර්ෂය.—අනිකුත් දීමනා, රු. 22,723

உப தலைப்பு 3.—பிறபடிகள், ரூபா 22,723

Sub-head 3.—Other allowances, Rs. 22,723

මතු පළ වන යෝජනාව සහාසම්මත විය :

திருமாளிக்கப்பல்து :

Resolved :

That the Vote be increased by Rs. 148 in respect of sub-head 3, item "(ii) Rent Allowance"—[මුදල් ඇමති වෙනුවට ගරු එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා.]

விசேஷ கமிட்டி உட்பட, 1965-66

—காரண சபை

“125 வன சீர்தரண 1 வன உய சமீபண சடின
ட. 2,27,484க உய கர்ன லே உடல லபலேவணச
டினனன் கல ஸுன,” ஸன லுநன விமண லேன்,
ஸனசமீபண வி.

125 வன சீர்தரண 1 வன உய சமீபண, ஸனலே
நகர்ணன், லபலேவணசேகி கலவணன் ஸுபல
நிவி ஸுனசகி நிணன் கர்ன லே.

“125 ஸும் தலைப்பு, 1 ஸும் வாக்லுப்பணம், அ
கரிக்கப்பட்ட லுபா 2,27,484, அட்டவணயிற் ஸேர்க்
கப்படுமாக ” ஸனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஸ்றுக்
கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

125 ஸும் தலைப்பு, 1 ஸும் வாக்லுப்பணம், திருத்த
ப்பட்டவாறு அட்டவணயில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the increased sum of
Rs. 227,484 for Head 125, Vote No. 1, be
inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed
to.

Head 125, Vote 1, as amended, ordered
to stand part of the Schedule.

2 வன சமீபண.—பலன ஸன்—புனரவர்கண
விசடி, ட. 73,739

வாக்லுப்பணம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலணச் செலவுகள்—
மீணலுரும் செலவு லு. 73,739

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—
Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 73,739

“125 வன சீர்தரண 2 வன சமீபண சடின
ட. 73,739க உடல லபலேவணச டினனன் கல
ஸுன” ஸன லுநன விமண லேன், ஸனசமீபண
வி.

125 வன சீர்தரண 2 வன சமீபண லபலேவ
ணசேகி கலவணன் ஸுபல நிவி ஸுனசகி
நிணன் கர்ன லே.

“125 ஸும் தலைப்பு, 2 ஸும் வாக்லுப்பணம்
லுபா 73,739 அட்டவணயிற் ஸேர்க்
கப்படுமாக ” ஸனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு
ஸ்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

125 ஸும் தலைப்பு, 2 ஸும் வாக்லுப்பணம் அட்ட
வணயில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 73,739
for Head 125, Vote No. 2, be inserted in
the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 125, Vote 2, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

126 வன சீர்தரண.—பலன பலன
கலவணன்

1 வன சமீபண.—காட லன் லே லேட
பலன வி ஸன டினனன் லே, ட. 17,64,818

தலைப்பு 126.—உள்ளுராட்சி ஸுணயாளர்
வாக்லுப்பணம் இல. 1.—பணியாளரின் ஸுன்குரிப
வேதணும் பிறபடினும், லுபா 17,64,818

HEAD 126.—COMMISSIONER OF LOCAL
GOVERNMENT

Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and
other allowances of staff, Rs. 1,764,818

“126 வன சீர்தரண 1 வன சமீபண சடின
ட. 17,64,818 க உடல லபலேவணச டினனன் கல
ஸுன” ஸன லுநன விமண லேன், ஸனசமீ
பண வி.

126 வன சீர்தரண 1 வன சமீபண லபலேவ
ணசேகி கலவணன் ஸுபல நிவி ஸுனசகி
நிணன் கர்ன லே.

“126 ஸும் தலைப்பு, 1 ஸும் வாக்லுப்பணம் லுபா
7,64,818 அட்டவணயிற் ஸேர்க்
கப்படுமாக ” ஸனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு
ஸ்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

126 ஸும் தலைப்பு, 1 ஸும் வாக்லுப்பணம் அட்ட
வணயில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 1,764,818
for Head 126, Vote No. 1, be inserted in
the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 126, Vote 1, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

2 வன சமீபண.—பலன ஸன்—புனரவர்கண
விசடி, ட. 3,95,96,110

வாக்லுப்பணம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலணச் செலவுகள்—
மீணலுரும் செலவு, லு. 3,95,96,110

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—
Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 39,596,110

“126 வன சீர்தரண 2 வன சமீபண சடின
ட. 3,95,96,110க உடல லபலேவணச டினனன் கல
ஸுன” ஸன லுநன விமண லேன், ஸனசமீ
பண வி.

126 வன சீர்தரண 2 வன சமீபண லபலேவ
ணசேகி கலவணன் ஸுபல நிவி ஸுனசகி
நிணன் கர்ன லே.

“126 ஸும் தலைப்பு, 2 ஸும் வாக்லுப்பணம் லுபா
3,95,96,110 அட்டவணயிற் ஸேர்க்
கப்படுமாக ” ஸனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு
ஸ்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

126 ஸும் தலைப்பு, 2 ஸும் வாக்லுப்பணம் அட்ட
வணயில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of
Rs. 39,596,110 for Head 126, Vote No. 2,
be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and
agreed to.

Head 126, Vote 2, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

வெக்சல கெடுதலன் பறற, 1965-66

—காரக ஸலாவ

4 வற ஸதமறய.—தெயர்தமேன் துவ வெவன் ஸபயற ஸேவா—புறரவர்தற வெடத, ரு. 11,17,500

7 வற ஸதமறய.—புர்தம ஸவர்தமறய—தூரமற வெடத, ரு. 3,00,000

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 4.—தூணக்களத்தால் அலிக் கப்பறம் சேவைகள் —மீண்டுவருஞ் செலவு ரூபா 11,17,500

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 7.—பொருளாதார அமிவிருத்தி —ஆக்கப்பொருட் செலவு, ரூபா 3,00,000

Vote No. 4.—Services provided by the Department—Recurrent Expenditure, Rs. 1,117,500.

Vote No. 7.—Economic Development—Capital Expenditure, Rs. 300,000

“126 வற கிதீயேகி 4 வற ஸதமறய ஸடலா ரு. 11,17,500 க இடல ரபலேநறயடு ஈதுலன் கடு ஸுதுய” ஸற புள்தறய வெஸற லேன், ஸலாஸதமற வெ.

“126 வற கிதீயேகி 7 வற ஸதமறய ஸடலா ரு. 3,00,000 க இடல ரபலேநறயடு ஈதுலன் கடு ஸுதுய” ஸற புள்தறய வெஸற லேன், ஸலாஸதமற வெ.

126 வற கிதீயேகி 4 வற ஸதமறய ரபலேநற யேகி கைடுஸன் ஸுவெடு திறிய ஸுதுயகி தியேள கர்ற லே.

126 வற கிதீயேகி 7 வற ஸதமறய ரபலேநற யேகி கைடுஸன் ஸுவெடு திறிய ஸுதுயகி தியேள கர்ற லே.

“126 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 4 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 11,17,500 அட்டவணையிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

“126 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 7 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 3,00,000 அட்டவணையிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

126 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 4 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணையில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

126 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 7 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணையில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 1,117,500 for Head 126, Vote No. 4, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 300,000 for Head 126, Vote No. 7, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 126, Vote 4, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Head 126, Vote 7, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

5 வற ஸதமறய.—தெயர்தமேன் துவ வெவன் ஸபயற ஸேவா—தூரமற வெடத, ரு. 93,00,000

127 வற கிதீய.—பலாத் பாலற ஸேவா கைடுதெடு

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 5.—தூணக்களத்தால் அலிக் கப்பறம் சேவைகள்,—ஆக்கப்பொருட்செலவு, ரூபா 93,00,000

1 வற ஸதமறய.—காரீய மனேவரெய யேர்தலகை பகிறகி ஸற ஈதிகன் தீமற, ரு. 3,57,213

Vote No. 5.—Services provided by the Department—Capital Expenditure, Rs. 9,300,000.

தலைப்பு 127.—உள்ளூராட்சிச் சேவை ஆணைக் குழு

“126 வற கிதீயேகி 5 வற ஸதமறய ஸடலா ரு. 93,00,000 க இடல ரபலேநறயடு ஈதுலன் கடு ஸுதுய”, ஸற புள்தறய வெஸற லேன், ஸலாஸதமற வெ.

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 1.—பணியாளரின் ஆளுக்குரிய வேதனமும் பிறபடிக்கும், ரூபா 3,57,213

126 வற கிதீயேகி 5 வற ஸதமறய ரபலேநற யேகி கைடுஸன் ஸுவெடு திறிய ஸுதுயகி தியேள கர்ற லே.

HEAD 127.—LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICE COMMISSION

“126 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 5 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 93,00,000 அட்டவணையிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and other allowances of staff, Rs. 357,213

126 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 5 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணையில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

“127 வற கிதீயேகி 1 வற ஸதமறய ஸடலா ரு. 3,57,213 க இடல ரபலேநறயடு ஈதுலன் கடு ஸுதுய” ஸற புள்தறய வெஸற லேன், ஸலாஸதமற வெ.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 9,300,000 for Head 126, Vote No. 5, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

127 வற கிதீயேகி 1 வற ஸதமறய ரபலேநற யேகி கைடுஸன் ஸுவெடு திறிய ஸுதுயகி தியேள கர்ற லே.

Head 126, Vote 5, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

“127 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா 3,57,213 அட்டவணையிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமாக” எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

Head 126, Vote 5, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

127 ஆம் தலைப்பு 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவணையில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 357,213 for Head 127, Vote 1, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 127, Vote 1, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

விசேஷ கமிட்டி பணம், 1965-66

—காரணம்

2 வது பகுதி.—பலகை வைத்து—புறவழி
வெலவு, ரூ. 2,05,390

Head 128, Vote 1, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலனைச் செலவுகள்—
மீளாபெறும் செலவு, ரூ. 2,05,390

2 வது பகுதி.—பலகை வைத்து—புறவழி
வெலவு, ரூ. 29,350

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—
Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 205,390

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலனைச் செலவுகள்—
மீளாபெறும் செலவு, ரூபா 29,350

“127 வது பகுதியில் 2 வது பகுதியை
ரூ. 2,05,390 க்கு உட்படுத்தியிருக்கிற அது
பற்றி” என புகார் விசேஷ கமிட்டி,
சபைக்கு
பி.

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—
Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 29,350

“128 வது பகுதியில் 2 வது பகுதியை
ரூ. 29,350 க்கு உட்படுத்தியிருக்கிற அது
பற்றி” என புகார் விசேஷ கமிட்டி,
சபைக்கு
பி.

127 வது பகுதியில் 2 வது பகுதியை
உட்படுத்தியிருக்கிற அது பற்றி
பி.

128 வது பகுதியில் 2 வது பகுதியை
உட்படுத்தியிருக்கிற அது பற்றி
பி.

“127 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம்
ரூபா 2,05,390 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமா”
எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

“128 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம்
ரூபா 29,350 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமா”
எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

127 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம்
அட்டவணியில் இணைப்பைப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

128 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம்
அட்டவணியில் இணைப்பைப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 205,390
for Head 127, Vote No. 2, be inserted in
the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 29,350
for Head 128, Vote No. 2, be inserted in
the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 127, Vote 2, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

128 வது பகுதி.—நகர சபை குடிசை
வெலவு

Head 128, Vote 2, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

1 வது பகுதி.—கூடுதல் பணியை
செய்யும் பணியை
ரூ. 4,04,011

5 வது பகுதி.—சேவைகள்—சேவை
வெலவு—உட்படுத்தியிருக்கிற
ரூ. 10,00,000

தலைப்பு 128.—நாடு, நகர் திட்டமிடல்
பி.

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 5.—திணைக்களத்தால் அளிக்கப்
பெறும் சேவைகள்—ஆக்கப்பெறும் செலவு, ரூபா
10,00,000

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 1.—பணியாளரின் ஆளுக்கூதிய
வெலவுகளும் பிறப்புகளும், ரூபா 4,04,011

HEAD 128.—DEPARTMENT OF TOWN AND
COUNTRY PLANNING

Vote No. 5.—Services provided by the
Department—Capital Expenditure,
Rs. 1,000,000.

Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and
other allowances of staff, Rs. 404,011

“128 வது பகுதியில் 1 வது பகுதியை
ரூ. 4,04,011 க்கு உட்படுத்தியிருக்கிற அது
பற்றி” என புகார் விசேஷ கமிட்டி,
சபைக்கு
பி.

“128 வது பகுதியில் 5 வது பகுதியை
ரூ. 10,00,000 க்கு உட்படுத்தியிருக்கிற அது
பற்றி” என புகார் விசேஷ கமிட்டி,
சபைக்கு
பி.

128 வது பகுதியில் 1 வது பகுதியை
உட்படுத்தியிருக்கிற அது பற்றி
பி.

128 வது பகுதியில் 5 வது பகுதியை
உட்படுத்தியிருக்கிற அது பற்றி
பி.

“128 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம்
ரூபா 4,04,011 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமா”
எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

“128 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 5 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம்
ரூபா 10,00,000 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமா”
எனும் வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

128 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம்
அட்டவணியில் இணைப்பைப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

128 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 5 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம்
அட்டவணியில் இணைப்பைப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 404,011
for Head 128, Vote No. 1, be inserted in
the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 1,000,000
for Head 128, Vote No. 5, be inserted in
the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 128, Vote 5, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

விசேஷ கெடுதல்கள் பற்றி, 1965-66

—காரண பணம்

6 வது பத்திரம்.—புதிதான பணிகளின்—புதுப்பிப்பு
பணம் ரூ. 41,000

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 6.—பொருளாதார அபி
விருத்தி, மீண்டுவருகின்ற செலவு, ரூபா 41,000

Vote No. 6.—Economic Development—
Recurrent Expenditure, Rs. 41,000

“128 வது கேள்வியில் 6 வது பத்திரம் பற்றி
ரூ. 41,000 க்கு உட்பட ரூபாயில் அடங்கியிருக்கின்ற
பணம்”, என புகார் விசேஷமாக கேள்வி, பதிலளித்த
பின்.

128 வது கேள்வியில் 6 வது பத்திரம் ரூப
யில் கையாண்டு வருவது பற்றி விசேஷமாக கேள்வி,
பதிலளித்த.

“128 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 6 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா
41,000 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமா” எனும்
வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

128 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 6 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவண
யில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 41,000
for Head 128, Vote No. 6, be inserted in
the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 128, Vote 6, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

129 வது கேள்வி.—புதிதான பணிகளின் பற்றி
புதுப்பிப்பு பற்றி

1 வது பத்திரம்.—கூடுதல் மின்தி மன்கிரெய
பற்றி பணம் ரூ. 6,98,080

தலைப்பு 129.—நீர் வழங்கல் வடிவாக்கம்
பற்றி

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 1.—பணியாளரின் ஆளுக்கிரம
பற்றி பணம் ரூ. 6,98,080

HEAD 129.—DEPARTMENT OF WATER SUPPLY
AND DRAINAGE

Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and
other allowances of staff, Rs. 698,080

“129 வது கேள்வியில் 1 வது பத்திரம் பற்றி
ரூ. 6,98,080 க்கு உட்பட ரூபாயில் அடங்கியிருக்கின்ற
பணம்”, என புகார் விசேஷமாக கேள்வி, பதிலளித்த
பின்.

129 வது கேள்வியில் 1 வது பத்திரம் ரூப
யில் கையாண்டு வருவது பற்றி விசேஷமாக கேள்வி,
பதிலளித்த.

“129 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம்
ரூபா 6,98,080 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமா” எனும்
வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

129 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 1 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவண
யில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 698,080
for Head 129, Vote No. 1, be inserted in
the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 129, Vote 1, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

2 வது பத்திரம்.—புதிதான பணிகளின்—
புதுப்பிப்பு பற்றி

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 2.—பரிபாலனைச் செலவுகள்—
மீண்டுவருகின்ற செலவு, ரூ. 95,775

Vote No. 2.—Administration charges—
Recurrent expenditure, Rs. 95,775

“129 வது கேள்வியில் 2 வது பத்திரம் பற்றி
ரூ. 95,775 க்கு உட்பட ரூபாயில் அடங்கியிருக்கின்ற
பணம்”, என புகார் விசேஷமாக கேள்வி, பதிலளித்த
பின்.

129 வது கேள்வியில் 2 வது பத்திரம் ரூப
யில் கையாண்டு வருவது பற்றி விசேஷமாக கேள்வி,
பதிலளித்த.

“129 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா
95,775 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமா” எனும்
வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

129 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 2 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவண
யில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 95,775
for Head 129, Vote No. 2, be inserted in
the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 129, Vote 2, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

3 வது பத்திரம்.—புதிதான பணிகளின்—
புதுப்பிப்பு பற்றி

வாக்குப்பணம் இல. 3.—பரிபாலனைச் செலவுகள்—
ஆக்கப்பொருட் செலவு, ரூபா 1,08,100

Vote No. 3.—Administration Charges—
Capital Expenditure, Rs. 108,100

“129 வது கேள்வியில் 3 வது பத்திரம் பற்றி
ரூ. 1,08,100 க்கு உட்பட ரூபாயில் அடங்கியிருக்கின்ற
பணம்”, என புகார் விசேஷமாக கேள்வி, பதிலளித்த
பின்.

129 வது கேள்வியில் 3 வது பத்திரம் ரூப
யில் கையாண்டு வருவது பற்றி விசேஷமாக கேள்வி,
பதிலளித்த.

129 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 3 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் ரூபா
1,08,100 அட்டவணியிற் சேர்க்கப்படுமா” எனும்
வினா விடுக்கப்பட்டு ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

129 ஆம் தலைப்பு, 3 ஆம் வாக்குப்பணம் அட்டவண
யில் இணையப் பணிக்கப்பட்டது.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 108,100
for Head 129, Vote No. 3, be inserted in
the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 129, Vote 3, ordered to stand part
of the Schedule.

2675

சிறீலங்கை மன்றத் தினாசிரியை, 1965-66

134 வகை சிறீலங்கை.—காரக கலாவி வகை
சிறீலங்கை

1 வகை சிறீலங்கை.—காரக கலாவி சிறீலங்கை
சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை, ரூ. 3,26,966

1 வகை சிறீலங்கை.—காரக கலாவி சிறீலங்கை
சிறீலங்கை, ரூ. 2,13,608

சிறீலங்கை 134.—காரக கலாவி, சிறீலங்கை
சிறீலங்கை

சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை 1.—சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை
சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை, ரூபா 3,26,966

சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை 1.—சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை
சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை, ரூபா 2,13,608

HEAD 134.—MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND
FOOD

Vote No. 1.—Personal emoluments and
other allowances of staff,
Rs. 326,966

Sub-head 1.—Cadre and Salaries,
Rs. 213,608

சிறீலங்கை 6

சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை

(சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை)
(The Presiding Member)

Order, please. The Deputy
Chairman of Committees will now
take the Chair.

சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை
சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை
சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை

சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை
சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை
சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை

Whereupon SIR RAZIK FAREED left the
Chair, and MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN OF
COMMITTEES took the Chair.

சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை
(சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை சிறீலங்கை)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I move,

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

Mr. Chairman, it is with great
pleasure on this occasion that I wish
to say a few words in the Committee
stage of the Budget Debate on the
Votes pertaining to the Ministry of
Agriculture and Food. Following the
precedent created, I think we are
agreed that we can speak on all the
subjects under the Head, Minister of
Agriculture and Food, in relation to
this Ministry.

Now, broadly speaking, I rather
think that there are some general
questions I can touch upon. The first
point I like to mention is that I
would like to congratulate the Hon.
Minister on the efforts he has made
in the course of the last few months
to run the Ministry of Agriculture
and Food as well as it was run in
the past before his time. I am glad,
in point of fact, to say that there are
only a few changes indeed to that of
his predecessor's policy. I have been
watching with great interest that
very desirable feature of the Hon.
Minister addressing trade union
gatherings and the like soon after he
assumed office. He had nothing but
praise for the previous period of
administration prior to his assump-
tion of office. Now, I take that to
mean not merely a personal thing;
I do not so regard it. When the Hon.
Minister, unlike so many of his
Colleagues who had a lot of nasty
things to say about their predeces-
sors with regard to the administra-
tion of the Ministries, took over this
Ministry he found the administration
was to his liking. He has made very
few changes and he is continuing the
administration for the basic purpose
of maintaining agriculture and the
food supplies of this country accord-
ing to the administrative set-up
already established in my time. All
I can say is that it seems to me that

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

the Government is beginning to move in a very sensible direction. Indeed changes in Government and changes in political leadership do not mean that there are going to be big changes as far as the day to day routine running of Government departments is concerned because Governments, in the sense of political leaders, may come and go but the administration of the country must proceed day to day without any break for the benefit of our people.

Indeed, in this regard, I think the Hon. Minister should be congratulated. I do not say that because it is a personal tribute to me or because I happened to be the immediate predecessor. That is unimportant. What is important is that the Ministry of Agriculture and Food constitutes a team, a team of people of which I shall perhaps be the least important. The most important thing is that it consists of a set of heads of departments from the Permanent Secretary downwards who tried to do a job of work according to a plan, according to a scheme, who made a conscious attempt to improve the administration as we went along day by day. I must say, in my frank opinion, I would like to pay a tribute to those officers who, from the middle of 1963 onwards, have done an extremely difficult job of work; a hard job of work, and a job of work, which, I think, sometimes does not bring many rewards. It does not sometimes attract public attention but when it does it is publicity of an undesirable type. With all these difficulties, in spite of the adverse weather conditions referred to by the Hon. Minister of Finance in his Budget speech, in spite of the cyclones, droughts and so on, still the department has maintained the food

supplies in this country. In these difficult conditions, if I may say so, the department has done an extremely good job of work.

I would particularly like to draw the attention of the Hon. Minister to one or two features in the administration which I think he himself would perhaps refer to when he winds up in this Debate. I refer to the number of changes effected during the last two years. I shall not go back very far but to the period in which I had an intimate knowledge of the working of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture commencing from end of May 1963. During this period for the first time an attempt was made to make agricultural credit available to the farmers. It was really, if I may say so, a pioneer effort. It is true there had been agricultural credit before that and small sums of money were made available through the co-operative societies and the Agrarian Services Advance Account Vote, but it was a negligible sum of money.

For the first time a concerted attempt was made by means of a propaganda organization through the Agrarian Services Department and the Co-operative Department to go out to the farmer and encourage him to become a member of a co-operative society, to take the credit that was made available to him for the purchase of the necessary equipment, fertilizer, seed paddy and other requirements of a farming life. Marketing credit was made available to him for the first time to make it possible for him to live during the period while his crop was growing on the land, to sustain himself and his family until the harvesting came. A conscious attempt was made for the

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

first time after 1963 to make it the effort of the Ministry to garner every single grain of paddy that was harvested, if possible, into the guaranteed price scheme.

Previous to that, the policy of the Government had been, if I may say so, to try to restrict the purchases of paddy, to try, as far as possible, to tell the farmers: we do not want to buy your paddy. The guaranteed price scheme is there; Rs. 12 is on offer for a bushel of paddy, but we personally have made the procedure so restrictive as to make it practically impossible for the farmer to sell his paddy for Rs. 12. If we sometimes complain that farmers used to sell their paddy to middlemen and to others, we should also remember that government policy also had a great deal to do with it, what with the machinery of crop lists, with the practical difficulties of the guaranteed price scheme and of the co-operative societies and the corruption which went with them. The Government made it impossible, sometimes, for the farmers, particularly of the heavy paddy producing areas in the Southern Province—the hon. Member for Beliatta will know that I am telling the truth on this matter, the hon. Member for Amparai will confirm what I say, the hon. Members from the North Central Province are fully aware of what I am talking about.

Up to 1962, the time when I, as Minister of Finance, ill-advisedly perhaps, introduced the proposal to reduce the rice ration, I became aware from the then Commissioner of Agrarian Services that it was the conscious policy of the Government at that time to try to restrict the purchases of paddy. I myself thought it was fantastic. I thought that commonsense would prevail upon us to make an attempt to harness every single grain of paddy grown in this country into the rationing scheme and thereby reduce our imports. On the other hand the experts and wizards of the Finance Ministry at that time thought otherwise, that it was a dangerous premise. The cost of the guaranteed

price scheme was so much higher than that of imported rice that it was felt that if Ceylon did attain anything like self-sufficiency in rice, the Treasury would go bankrupt! Well, that is a point of view, but I am glad to see that the present Government does not take that view and I congratulate the Hon. Minister for his vision and foresight.

His Prime Minister is now talking of self-sufficiency in paddy, something which he did not have the courage to do long ago when he was the Minister of Agriculture in place of my good Friend. But, now that you are talking in terms of self-sufficiency in rice, I hope and trust that there will not be a reversal of policy, notwithstanding whatever problems the Minister of Finance may have, but that you will sincerely and seriously make an attempt to keep up with our production and afford practical incentives for production, by maintaining—expanding if possible—agricultural credit given to the farmer and providing marketing facilities through the guaranteed price scheme.

In order that the guaranteed price scheme may work better certain other changes have to be made. For the first time in 1961 an attempt was made consciously to increase our storage. Storage in the rural areas is just a big problem. As far as marketing is concerned, in the *maha* season when the paddy starts coming in, the stores are full, the Agrarian Department stores are cramped to capacity, and when farmers keep on bringing their stocks of paddy for sale to the G. P. S. the storekeepers say, "We are very sorry, we cannot take them." The farmers have to go back with all their transport, carts loaded to capacity with paddy, and they have no alternative but to stop at the nearest place where anyone is willing to offer them Rs. 8 or Rs. 9.

අ. ආ. 6.15

In order to meet this problem, the first steps were taken in 1961 when I was Finance Minister. An attempt

was made to increase the storage capacity, along with the food stores that were built in Ratmalana and Welisara, on an extra-budgetary allocation. A definite programme was started. It was a small programme and I think Rs. 6½ million was set apart to build additional stores in the remote areas for the G. P. S. Year after year, while the S. L. F. P. was in office, money provision was increased to put up these stores. You may have seen, Mr. Chairman, in the course of your visits to different electorates during the elections in March, half completed stores in the Wannu District. The Hon. Minister of Finance is not here; I wish he were, because he would know more about it than anyone else. Additional stores were built in the N. W. P., Southern Province and in the Amparai District. These are matters well within the knowledge of Members of Parliament.

If we mean to make the Hon. Prime Minister's hopes of self-sufficiency in paddy a reality, it is absolutely imperative that this Government must maintain the attempt to increase our paddy storage capacity. So long as that bottleneck is there, it is absolutely impossible to make the G. P. S. a practical incentive for our farmers. Of course, administrative procedure must also be relaxed. Sometimes the stores of the Agrarian Services Department are so understaffed that we have seen queues and queues of lorries from co-operative societies waiting to deliver their paddy, to have it measured and mixed up with the coloured grains of rice, which is supposed to beat the racketeers but which does not. Sometimes they park outside the Agrarian Services Department stores nights on end hoping to get a place in the queue. These are things which tend to corruption among the storekeepers.

I do not know whether you are aware of it, but almost every co-operative society has complained to me at some time or other of the practical difficulty of having to pay

a levy to the Agrarian Service Department storekeepers. The levy usually consists of 50 cents per bag of rice. It is sufficient to make the storekeepers millionaires. I am personally aware of some storekeepers who did that: they have now ceased to be store-keepers after I paid them a few visits and measured their stocks. The storekeepers are still doing this, and I do think it is very important to maintain a check on it.

The methods we adopted, perhaps, are not the best. I myself as Minister conducted a few raids. It was not possible for me to undertake the job of a private detective and policeman all rolled into one. I trained, as far as possible, some assistant commissioners to do the task for me, and if I may pay them a tribute, they did their work extremely well.

Sometimes political problems arose. Some of those assistant commissioners who were assiduous in doing their task ran into difficulties at times and became a little unpopular by virtue of their extreme efficiency, but I may say that not a single officer who did his work well was ever made to feel that he was penalized or in trouble in consequence of his endeavours. May I express the hope that in this respect too the policy of the Ministry will not change, that the degree of alertness will continue notwithstanding political pressures which do come up, particularly when the co-operative societies are very closely connected with politicians in some areas. That is particularly true of the Eastern Province where the politicians treat the multi-purpose co-operative societies practically as private property. In some places this becomes a matter of particular concern and sometimes leads to grave problems. But if we wish to move ahead we must give thought to the problems of this department, from the point my good Friend the Hon. Minister of Industries and Fisheries started off. When he was Minister of Agriculture

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් විශේෂාචාර්යයක මය.]

he created the Agrarian Services Department, probably cut of recognition of the weaknesses of the Agriculture Department as it existed at that time. A new department consisting of energetic young officers was created and, I must say, although theirs is a forgotten service within the Ministry today, it is due to them that we can boast of the increase in paddy production year after year. I think in the Budget Debate of 1964 I gave a full statement of the figures. You will find that reported fully in the HANSARD and I shall not repeat it. The extent to which paddy production has increased and the per acreage yield which we have achieved is largely through the use of better strain paddy evolved by the Agriculture Department and the extended use of fertilizers through the Agrarian Services Department.

Fertilizer storage too is a matter which requires the attention of the Hon. Minister. The programme of construction is there. Due to lack of space sometimes it has become necessary to use part of the Agrarian Services stores for fertilizer storage. It is not a very satisfactory thing. I say it is not satisfactory because sometimes the very act of storing fertilizers and paddy together creates problems in regard to the purity of paddy itself. Sometimes I have found the pure line strain of paddy for distribution to farmers kept in the same stores as the fertilizers for lack of storage. But these are small matters. So long as it is recognized that these matters require attention and the policy is intended to be continued, I think we can say that we are on the right lines.

If I may now come to a few matters in regard to which, perhaps, I have a few criticisms to make, I hope and trust that the Hon. Minister will not regard it in the nature of brickbats: It is not so intended. I intend, in this instance, to make my contribution entirely on a constructive level and not with the object of creating any embarrassment to the Hon. Minister who I am

aware, in his strong, silent manner, is attempting to do something to build our country, and we from the Opposition wish him well.

I now wish to refer to the actual administration of the Ministry itself. If you look through the 1964 Budget Debates you will find contributions made by many persons from the Opposition who are now on your side of the House. You will find a particular contribution made by the then Member for Welimada, Mr. K. M. P. Rajaratna. He referred to the language in which the Ministry was being administered and he had occasion to refer to the fact that in his opinion the one Ministry that was really working 100 per cent. in Sinhala was the Ministry of Agriculture and Food. He paid us a tribute for it. I think he even paid a rather embarrassing compliment to the then Permanent Secretary who, he said, was unable to go to Jaffna thereafter. He himself was a Tamil and he was working 100 per cent. in Sinhala. Then—I am afraid it is a matter of regret—there has been a certain amount of backsliding. Today practically all the work in the Ministry has got back to the English language. I think perhaps it is a question of example. It is sometimes useful to maintain the degree of progress which has already been attempted and to make sure that for the sake of convenience one does not go backward.

I myself must confess, Mr. Chairman, that I found it much more convenient to transact business in English. Sometimes it took much more effort to make a minute in the Sinhala language than it would have taken to make a minute in the English language. I think all in all, from the point of view of Government administration, it is a matter of pride that where we had a staff partly English-speaking, partly Sinhala-speaking and partly Tamil-speaking, the work of the Ministry did not suffer. It is one of the most difficult items of work. Even the maintenance of accounts by Tamil

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

clerks was actually done in Sinhala. Of course, psychologically—one does not know—the impact of a National Government may be to take everything back to English. But I sincerely hope that, with the protestations of the National Government in regard to Sinhala, at least in this respect the Hon. Minister will see to it that the policy line followed in the past will be continued in the future; and I have no doubt that the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Home Affairs (Mrs. Kusuma Rajaratna) will have more to say on the subject in due course when perhaps the weight of the National Government will be less heavy upon her shoulders.

The next matter I would like to come to is the Agriculture Department itself. The Hon. Minister will appreciate that at least in the Agriculture Department, during the past period when I was there—I think one of his Senior Assistant Secretaries was then the Director of Agriculture—an attempt was made to formulate the policy of the department, to delineate its functions and to determine what exactly it tried to do.

I think we established then that it is not the function of the department to increase agricultural production in this country in a direct sense, in the sense of undertaking the actual production of food; that the function of the Agriculture Department was primarily one of extension by research, by the evaluation of new techniques and new methods and of new strains to be able to make the private farmer in this country capable of producing food in ever increasing degrees.

In many respects the Agriculture Department is a difficult one, because whenever scientists get together they have a knack of disagreeing. The amount of personal differences which scientists are sometimes capable of engendering is fantastic; they can quarrel over practically nothing at all, and the quarrels some

times tend to take a very bitter note. It requires great tact and patience on the part of a Minister to get the best out of a team of scientists under these conditions. But I am proud to state that during the period I was with them they did try and they did achieve a great deal; particularly by some of the younger men a great deal was achieved.

One achievement of the Ministry of Agriculture that stands out in my mind is the farms. A report was produced by a committee of persons appointed by the Hon. C. P. de Silva when he had been Minister of Agriculture and Lands, headed by Mr. P. H. Wickremesinghe, Chief Valuer, in regard to the future policy of farms, whether they should be maintained as they were, whether they should be reduced in size; what functions they should perform; and how they should be run. It is a very instructive document which was printed and circulated to all Members of Parliament.

In consequence of some of the recommendations of that report, a conscious attempt was made by me to deal with a few farms and to see whether it is really possible to run these farms efficiently and satisfactorily, considering the nature of the criticisms that used to be levelled at us generally.

If you asked anyone in the Agriculture Department those days, the tendency was to reply, "You cannot run these farms with financial regulations and administrative regulations and with government holidays. You will find the staff are not doing an eight-hour day. It is not possible with trade union conditions to run these farms properly," and the tendency used to be for the bureaucratic elements in the Agriculture Department to always lay the blame on the workers and maintain that you cannot work these farms economically for that reason.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මහ.]

My experience has showed me that that is not the whole story. It is not completely correct that you should lay the blame on the workers in the farms.

In one particular farm which I took as an example—the farm at Ambeputsa situated very close to the constituency of the Prime Minister—in the Western Province the conditions were chaotic when I visited it. There was a section that was supposed to be a farm school for fifty children who were being taught the elements of farming for a period of six months at a time by an assistant farm manager who did not even know how many eggs a hen could lay in a year. Each of these children was expected to farm a little plot of land rather like a flower bed in which they were expected to grow subsidiary fodstuffs, and as far as I could see they never grew any. The total extent of the farm was 187 acres of which 75 acres was expected to be under grass—“bracaria” I think it was called—for the purpose of feeding milk cattle. The “bracaria” I saw was more jungle than anything else. A certain section was supposed to be planted with plantains. They had been grown at irregular times, at irregular intervals—and were of varying heights—merely for the reason that some research experiment was supposed to be conducted to ascertain the best time for planting plantains—a matter of casual elementary research. The majority of the plantain trees were suffering from a disease called “bunchy-tops”.

අ. ම. 6.30

In the course of my administration I decided to take this farm and see what could be done with it. I put it under the administration of one of the Deputy Directors of Agriculture, namely, Dr. Terrence Seneviratne, about whom a Question was asked of the Hon. Minister of Finance by my good Friend the hon. Member for Kolonna (Mr. C. N. Mathew). Under Dr. Seneviratne's management, with a farm manager chosen by him I am

glad to say that the record of losses running over 13 years was converted into a very satisfactory profit, and practically every square inch of that land was planted and made practical use of.

Hon. Minister, I do not ask you to take my word for it. Ask your staff manager, ask the people who ran the Agricultural Department at the time, whether what I am saying is true or not. Proper records were maintained of the crop harvested in respect of every single item that was planted, whether it consisted of cucumber, *karavila* or other types of vegetables. Everything was grown there, from highland paddy down to every form of vegetable.

An animal husbandry section was started and is working with conspicuous success, or was when I last heard of it, and I do not think it has changed even though Dr. Seneviratne is no longer on your staff.

In other words, what is important to see is that the job is regarded as a challenge. It was costed properly; it was done on scientific lines and the necessary equipment and staff were supplied. As far as the staff was concerned, this was the best part of it. The staff which was considered excessive prior to this change of administration was found to be inadequate, and additional staff had to be recruited to work that farm which was thought incapable of being worked properly. And this is the criticism that was made: that there were too many people employed who were not able to work properly.

The same experiment was undertaken—I do not propose to go into details—in Pasyala in the Mirigama electorate. All I know is that your candidate, Mr. Wijebahu Wijesinghe, campaigned in the course of the elections almost entirely on the Ambeputsa and Mirigama farms, and made use of that experiment as one of his achievements for the purpose of his election campaign. So, perhaps that proves what I am saying. Far from being ashamed of it, he was in a position to base his campaign

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

Similar experiments were undertaken, but I am afraid I have the time only to make a beginning in mentioning them. The Kundasale farm is another farm which is capable of being developed similarly. There are farms consisting of lands which were acquired haphazardly by the Government of Ceylon, in days prior to 1956; and whenever the Government did not know what to do with a land, they said, "Let us hand it over to the Agriculture Department to start a farm". The net result is that we have a goat farm in Ambalantota. The latter was meant to be a cotton station, but when the cotton station failed it became a goat farm. I do not know, Mr. Minister, who the "goats" are who should have been put on this goat farm. But, I am afraid, it has not proved very much of a success even as a goat farm.

The animal husbandry endeavours of the Government are even weaker. Today we have got private sector enterprises proving the validity of hybrid strains in all kinds of poultry. We read about them every day in the newspapers. We see advertisements. They talk of "babcocks". There is a group of poultry breeders called the "Shetna Farms". We hear of "hi-line" birds. We hear of people running deep-litter poultry systems. Yet the Agriculture Department is selling day-old chicks from ancient pure-bred strains—Leghorns and Rhode Island Reds are still the most modern poultry it has ever heard of—at 15 cents and 20 cents; and purchasers of such chicks come back and complain that all the birds have died. Producers of hybrid strains are still able to do business selling them at Rs. 2.50 per day-old chick, and the rate of mortality of these birds is not even $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent.

ශ්‍රී ජීවරසේනි

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

Salmonella.

එස්. ආර්. ඩයස් ඩින් ඩාරනායක මහා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Of course, they are affected by salmonellosis, the real infection caused by salmonella. In other words, it is something to do with the feed. But may I say this? The birds in Ceylon produced by Shetna farms, the Babcock poultry, the Starcross variety, a Canadian type produced by, I think, the nephew of Mr. C. Suntharalingam, one of our former Members, who has got the franchise now, the Hi-line breed—these are given the same food, poonac and various coconut oil derivatives going into their feed also, but they are singularly free of salmonellosis. Why is it that salmonellosis should only affect birds in the animal husbandry section of the Department of Agriculture? These are matters worthy of consideration.

Why is it that the Department of Agriculture, which is capable, with its poultry breeders and its experts, of undertaking this kind of task and improving the stock line, is content to maintain the routine services? The animal husbandry section, I discovered, is trying to persuade the people in the North Western Province to take to the breeding of ducks, a variety called Khaki Campbell. I have seen these Khaki Campbells. They are growing older and older day by day; they are past the age of laying, past the age of being useful in any sense of the word. People are being persuaded to eat duck eggs in the North Western Province. I tried to find out the reason. The argument was that they can live off the fish in the tanks in the North Western Province. That was the reason for changing to ducks. They are too old to be culled, too old for the table, too old for any purpose at all, and the cost of feeding them exceeds the yield to the farms. This is the type of work that is going on in the Ministry of Agriculture. Of course, the Minister cannot keep in touch with everything. I myself found it a fantastic task. The cleaning up process is of an order the like of which, I think, we have never come across anywhere. When you wander around you will

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.]

find that it is a task which will make you practically shiver at the thought of setting it right. But it has to be done in the interests of the country. It has to be undertaken.

We are still importing, every year, a very large number of goats for mutton. The object of breeding goats in this country was the hope that we will some day be self-sufficient and will not have to import goats from India. A large amount of foreign exchange goes out in this way. The Hon. Minister must be aware of it. And yet what do we do? We keep on playing with these goats. Each of these goats is given an ear tag. They are supposed to be numbered and carefully watched in performance. And yet, to this day, we have not made any attempt either to provide an extension service to encourage other people to breed goats or to encourage the breeding of the indigenous goats which are capable of sustaining themselves in our mountainous areas on very little. We are trying to breed Jamnapuris. To what purpose, nobody knows.

Is the Hon. Minister aware that at Bogawantalawa we have got 100 sheep imported in the hope that they will be a success? And do you know that sheep have been practically equipped with boots to prevent them from getting foot rot owing to the wet conditions at Bogawantalawa? I can tell you that this is something fantastic. I have never heard the like of it.

පී. සී. ඉම්බුලාන මය. (කෘෂිකර්ම හා ආහාර ඇමතිගේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්)

(සී. ඊ. ජී. ඉම්බුලාන—විවෘත, උණවු අමෙස්ඡරීන් පාරාලුමන්රක් කාරියතරීගි)

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

What about socks?

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.

(සී. ඊ. ජී. ඉම්බුලාන—විවෘත, උණවු අමෙස්ඡරීන් පාරාලුමන්රක් කාරියතරීගි)

I did not see socks, but if there were socks I suppose they were woollen socks.

This is the sort of fantastic arrangement that is being made by the Ministry of which the Hon. Minister is in control. I ask you to work out for yourself the economics of the project, to work out the yield per acre of the land set apart at Bogawantalawa and Ambewela for milk production. You will be surprised. It is so low a return in rupees per acre that you will begin to wonder whether it is not more economic to put that land to some other use. Even if you put it under vegetables—those are areas where vegetables grow—you will find that the economic return is much larger than when you are attempting the impossible.

If we are going to turn over to milk production—I shall have more to say about milk and the Milk Board presently—the techniques of the Agricultural Department will have to be reversed very considerably. If I may be permitted to say it, old habits die hard. Sometimes officers who have got accustomed to doing things in a particular way as scientists find it very difficult to change. Sometimes they are almost irremovable as the rock of Gibraltar. And if you wish to move ahead you sometimes have to make very necessary changes in the interests of the country.

It is well and good to talk in terms of animal production. It is very good to talk in terms of animal health. But I do not see to this day how the vast efforts you are making for the diagnosis of raniket disease, coccidiosis and all manner of other diseases are seriously going to increase animal production. It is one thing for the vet in a local area to have a private practice curing the diseases of pet dogs and trying to run dog shows especially if it is in a town where dog shows are held occasionally. But if we wish to move in animal production, we have to think seriously in terms of taking modern scientific deductions down to the village, of helping the villager himself to undertake the task of animal production. As far as I can see, the veterinary surgeons' only function is to vaccinate animals against disease and to artificially

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

inseminate breeding cows. Once they have done that they have done everything.

නේ. තුරේරත්නම් මහ. (පේදුරු තුඩුව)

(සී. ජේ. ජයරත්නම්—පරුත්තිත්තූර)

(Mr. K. Thurairatnam—Point Pedro)

They have to carry out pregnancy tests also.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් ඩිස් බන්දාරනායක මහ.

(සී. ජේ. ජයරත්නම්—පරුත්තිත්තූර)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I do not know what tests they carry out. You ought to know what they are expected to do. In fact I have never seen them doing it when I visited a farm. In fact in one of them which is supposed to be an artificially inseminating centre I came across a stud bull, and I thought it was a contradiction in terms to have a stud bull in an artificial insemination centre. I really did not know for what it was and I did not make an inquiry and follow it up. But those of you who are aware of these things and are practically interested in them should tell the Minister of the National Government the things that his stud bulls are up to.

I was talking vaguely about the animal husbandry section in the Agricultural Department. I think it is really having a greater task, and it is high time that we took up the position of recognizing that veterinary surgeons are not the only people who can seriously get down to the job of merely declaring plagues or infected areas or that certain types of animals have got to be examined before slaughter. That is a very small part of their job. If we want to move into extension, the same principles which apply to agricultural extension must certainly be extended to animal production in every conceivable way.

One aspect of the Agricultural Department which has been constantly under review from the time you took over has been the Milk Board. Much has been said about the Milk Board in the newspapers and my information about what goes on in the Milk Board is largely derived from the newspapers. For instance, I read an article which appeared in the "Ceylon Daily News"—I do not propose to read the whole of it—on Tuesday, August 31 1965, where the headline reads, "Vitaspray stocks may last five years." It starts off like this:

"An examination of the stock position of Vitaspray at the Milk Board on April 24, this year disclosed a stock of 2,473,980 pounds. Based on sales figures for the preceding months this stock was likely to last approximately 5 years. It was also observed that the six-month period of guarantee by the manufacturers had expired in respect of a large quantity of this stock. Meanwhile another shipment of 446,808 pounds of Vitaspray was received by the Board in May 1965. This is the position revealed by the Auditor-General, Mr. B. L. W. Fernando, on an inspection made at the Board's premises.

The Milk Board undertook the importation and distribution of Vitaspray from May 1964. The distribution has been handed over to a private firm from July this year.

The Auditor-General had in these circumstances inquired from the Chairman the reason for purchasing large quantities of Vitaspray without due regard to monthly sales and the period of guarantee; and whether Board approval was obtained for these purchases. No reply to the query has been received to date."

The rest of the article relates to the accounts of the Milk Board prior to the year 1962, and since it does not fall within the period for which I can take any responsibility as the former Minister, I do not propose to refer to the rest of the article.

අ. ස. 6.45

In regard to the Auditor-General's comments in respect of the accounts of the Milk Board prior to the period commencing May 1963, I observed that there was on the 26th

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පතක, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් මණ්ඩරකයක මඟ.]

of June 1965 a press communique and a radio communique issued by the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, presumably on his authority as Minister, in reply to a news item published on the 22nd of June: "The Milky Way—down the drain". The official Ministry reply was:

"The 'Daily Mirror' of June 22nd 1965 carries a very prominent article and editorial on its front page, in which certain allegations are made regarding the imports of Vitaspray full cream powder by the Milk Board.

The main allegations made in this article and editorial are:

Firstly, that the Milk Board had over-ordered Vitaspray by ordering stocks sufficient to last 71 months and that some official has received a financial benefit as a result of this purchase; and

Secondly, that the bulk of the milk powder had become outdated and unfit for human consumption and that nearly 3,000,000 lb. of the milk powder would soon be thrown down the drain with a resultant loss to the Board.

These allegations are totally incorrect. The facts of this case are as follows:

The previous Minister of Finance, Dr. N. M. Perera, announced in his Budget speech last year that the Government proposed to progressively take over the import of milk foods. In pursuance of this policy the then Government decided that 50 per cent. of the imports of full cream milk powder should be handled by the Milk Board. The Island's total annual imports of full cream milk powder amount to approximately Rs. 22 million. The total quantity of full cream milk powder imported by the Milk Board is approximately Rs. 5 million, which amounts to roughly 5 months' supplies on the basis that 50 per cent. of the full cream milk powder market was to be reserved for the Milk Board and the import quotas of private importers were to be reduced correspondingly. It is completely incorrect to say, therefore, that the Milk Board ordered stocks of Vitaspray sufficient for 71 months.

The new Minister of Agriculture and Food decided that the Milk Board's entire stock of Vitaspray should be sold, for the following reasons:—

(i) because the Milk Board should concentrate on the processing and distribution of local milk rather than that of imported milk;

(ii) because the Milk Board did not have a suitable distribution organization for the rapid distribution of this milk and it would have taken some time to build up a suitable organization.

(iii) because private firms were prepared to purchase the entire stock of Vitaspray and sell it to the public at the same price as the Milk Board, which price was much lower than that of other comparable brands of full cream milk powder.

Two offers to purchase the Milk Board's entire stock of Vitaspray were received, one from Messrs. Ceylon Nutritional Foods Ltd. (who are the representatives of Nestle's in Ceylon) and the other from British Ceylon Corporation Ltd. The milk was sold to the B.C.C. because they made the highest offer, but after the sale, Messrs. Nestle's offered to purchase the entire stock at the same price as the B.C.C. This offer could not be accepted as by that time the Milk Board's stock of Vitaspray had already been sold to the B.C.C.

Both the B.C.C. and Nestle's made their offers to purchase the Board's entire stock of milk powder after examining the dates on which this milk powder had been imported. Practically all the milk powder had been imported during the last six months, and since full cream milk powder will remain in good condition for at least 18 months to 2 years, it is completely incorrect to say that the milk powder has become unfit for human consumption and will soon be thrown down the drain. It is hardly likely that a firm like Messrs. Nestle's with world-wide experience of milk marketing, would have offered to buy the entire stock of Vitaspray and sell this product to the public, if the milk was unfit for human consumption. The period of guarantee by the manufacturers referred to in your article has no relation whatever to the period during which the milk remains fit for consumption.

The 'Daily Mirror' article also refers to an "audit report" regarding the imports of Vitaspray by the Milk Board. The Auditor-General has made no report on this subject. He has addressed some routine audit queries to the Chairman of the Milk Board to which appropriate replies have been sent by the Chairman.

That was the Ministry communique. If you look at the Auditor-General's Report, which I have with me here, you will find at page 127 that the Ministry communique seems to have missed the mark very widely because the Auditor-General makes a point of it

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

in the course of his remarks. I refer to page 130 of Parliamentary Series No. 1 of the Sixth Parliament, ordered by the House of Representatives to be printed on August 18, 1965. It states as follows:—

“The Milk Board undertook as from May 1964 the importation and distribution of ‘Vitaspray’, a powdered milk food manufactured in Holland.

An examination of the stock position of Vitaspray on April 24, 1965, disclosed a stock of 2,473,980 lbs. Based on the sales figures for the preceding months, this stock was likely to last approximately 5 years. It was also observed that the 6 month period of guarantee by the manufacturers had expired in respect of a large quantity of this stock.

In the circumstances, I enquired of the Chairman—

- (i) the reason for purchasing large quantities without due regard to monthly sales and period of guarantee; and
- (ii) whether the Board's approval was obtained for the purchases.

I have not had a reply up to the date of this Report.”

The date of the report is 17th August 1965. Up to that date the Auditor-General had had no reply to any single inquiry he had addressed to the Milk Board. Your own Ministry communique says something different and that is the most remarkable part of it. The Ministry communique dated 26th June 1965 states that the Auditor-General has made no report on this subject except that he had addressed some routine audit queries to the Chairman of the Milk Board to which appropriate replies have been sent by the Chairman. The Auditor-General says that no reply has been sent. Is it that the Ministry is not aware of what the Chairman does? Is it that the right hand does not know what the left hand does? I do not understand this.

The Auditor-General makes claim that the Milk Board has over-ordered a stock of milk up to 71 months. He has also claimed that the guarantee period of 6 months had lapsed. The Ministry seeks to answer that and says this is all wrong, they have not ordered a 71 months stock. The Minis-

try contradicts it and denies the story of the guaranteed period. If you will look at the Vitaspray tin you will find no guarantee period marked on it. You will only find the date of manufacture. There is nothing on the tin to state that after a certain period the milk will become unfit for human consumption. The Ministry is perfectly correct in that regard. There is no guarantee period. Why does the Ministry take up one position to the public in issuing the communique and why does the Chairman—the new Chairman—whom you have subsequently appointed, refrain from replying to the Auditor-General's queries, which would lead the Auditor-General to draw the wrong inference that the substance of his queries is automatically confirmed by the Chairman's silence? And why, on top of it all, did the Ministry claim that appropriate replies had been sent to the Auditor-General? This is the kind of administration about which I complain.

The facts, as far as I know, are simple. The Ministry communique does not explain them. The story started with the decision of the Milk Board to import a new kind of milk product called ‘Vitaspray’. Vitaspray, the formula of which is identical with Nespray, was manufactured in Holland, and its price was very much lower than the corresponding Nespray product. It was started in competition with all the other milk food. Very small quantities were imported to start with. The Milk Board, in competition with other milk foods with established brand names imported small quantities of Vitaspray on an experimental basis and began to sell it at a lower price.

Subsequent to that, the Hon. Minister of Finance at that time, Dr. N. M. Perera, decided in his Budget Speech that 50 per cent. of the milk imports should be taken over by the Milk Board. This was announced in his 1964 Budget speech. The facts were that the total quantity of full cream powdered milk imported into Ceylon was 6,000 tons, the value of which was Rs. 22 million; I am speaking from memory. Immediately after this a

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

conference was called at which it was decided that 3,000 tons a year—50 per cent. imports means 3,000 tons—will have to be imported by the Milk Board, but the Milk Board did not wish to start on the imports immediately and create a dislocation of the supplies: they asked for a three-month period in which to make arrangements to step up their imports to the extent required by the Minister of Finance in order to conserve foreign exchange. They planned therefore to start their imports only from about October 1964, notwithstanding that the Budget was actually announced on 30th July 1964, by the Minister of Finance at that time. It was intended only to import from October 1964. For the first two months the Milk Board, in order to maintain a 3,000 tons a year target would have had to import approximately 250 tons a month, but I believe they decided to import only 150 tons a month for the first two months and, I think, 200 tons a month thereafter for the next three months; orders were accordingly placed for five months. That is the quantity which the Auditor-General now talks about as the 71 months' stock.

And how did it happen? All this, I think, was authorized by the Ministry; it was not a Milk Board decision. I think the Permanent Secretary is well aware of it. All these matters were discussed with him. He was personally aware of all these facts. Subsequent to this decision to import, it was decided to import these quantities of Vitaspray from the same source in Holland. Then came the elections and the defeat of the Government, and Nestles immediately created a shortage of Nestles full-cream dried milk powder products. It may be a political endeavour to help a particular political party, one does not know. But all we know is that there was immediately a threat of a shortage of full-cream milk powders with established brand names. The Caretaker Government at that time felt that it was too grave a risk to

put the people of this country into inconvenience on the basis of a Budget proposal of a Government that had been defeated in Parliament; therefore, further quotas were immediately offered to Messrs. Nestles to bring in Nespray full-cream powdered milk to tide over the alleged shortage. I believe, a quota of Rs. 5 million was given to them roundabout November 1964 and a further quota of Rs. 5 million roundabout February 1965 during the period of the Caretaker Government. In other words, in the course of four months Rs. 10 million was given as an additional quota to Messrs. Nestles in addition to all the other imports already authorized. When you consider that the entire Island's imports of full-cream dried milk powder a year is only Rs. 22 million, you will appreciate what it means—50 per cent. extra imports authorized to Messrs. Nestles during this period of four months. I am not saying it is a right decision or a wrong decision. That is what took place—an additional quota of Rs. 10 million for imports.

Immediately these imports came in, the rate at which Vitaspray was capable of selling against the established product fell. Naturally, it became impossible to maintain the rate at which Vitaspray was selling in competition with an established product. And if people were called upon to choose between Nespray and Vitaspray, their choice did not depend upon the formula used in the manufacture of the product; did not depend upon how good or how bad the milk powder was; rather it depended upon the brand name, as my hon. Friend the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries and Fisheries quite rightly pointed out.

In those circumstances, naturally, the sale of Vitaspray did not amount to more than a few tons a month. The stock of 150 tons of Vitaspray imported per month, in expectation of a 50 per cent. monopoly in these milk foods assured to the Milk Board, failed to move.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

All I can say is that it is most peculiar accounting procedure for the Auditor-General to take these figures, find out how much milk powder was actually sold in a month—say, five tons—and then report that provision has been made for thirty times that quantity by over-ordering imports. In other words, is this not the most peculiar method of auditing, of accounting? I do not think anybody would have heard of such a procedure. I say that the Auditor-General has been led into these mistakes by the failure of the Chairman of the Milk Board and the Ministry of Agriculture and Food to see to it that replies were sent to his queries. The replies contained in the communique issued to the public by the Ministry on 22nd June 1965 had not reached the Auditor-General up to the 17th of August 1965—the date of his report.

If this is no inefficiency, I would like to ask you, Mr. Minister, what else is? Is it an attempt to discredit the former administration of the Milk Board in some way or other by misrepresenting the facts? After all, I have placed the facts before you, you can verify and check them from the Permanent Secretary and other officials as to whether what I am stating is true or not. A campaign is deliberately being carried on by the newspapers to attack the administration of the Milk Board. Why? Merely because there happened to be certain individuals within the Milk Board who had their own reasons, their own ambitions, perhaps, to aspire to hold certain positions, this kind of argument has been presented. I think it is a very unfortunate thing that the public are being led to believe that these facts are true. Check the facts.

I had occasion to purchase a tin of Vitaspray in the course of last week. As a matter of interest I checked up on the manufacturer's date of what was being sold. Mind you, it is now being sold by the British Ceylon Corporation. It is advertised over the radio as a pure milk food. Your radio,

the Government radio, advertises it with little blurs and little sounds and tells little children that that will help to build up their muscles. This Vitaspray we are buying has still got the date on it. As far as I am aware, the stocks that were ordered were only up to the month of March 1965. The stocks that were there in October, November, December, January, February and March, were the stocks—the 71 months stocks—alleged by the Auditor-General to have been ordered by the Milk Board. I checked up the date. B. C. C. are now selling stocks manufactured in February 1965, which only goes to show that the stocks manufactured earlier than that have already been sold. If B. C. C. have come to the stage now—*[Interruption]*.

ජෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මය.

(*திரு. ஜெல்மற்றன் ஜயசிங்ஹ*)

(Mr. Shelton Jayasinghe)

They have almost sold out the whole stock.

එෆ්. ඩී. ඩයස් ඩිස් බාරනායක මය.

(*திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க*)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Exactly. They have almost sold out the whole stock now. And how have they been able to sell out the whole stock? Because your Government decided, very rightly, that until that stock was sold no further imports of full-cream milk powder would be permitted. In other words, you cannot sell against the established products. If our Caretaker Government made an error for the sake of public convenience of allowing two conflicting policy decisions to exist side by side, (1) the decision to import 50 per cent. of another milk powder (2) to give additional quotas for 50 per cent. to the private sector, well, you have rectified it; I do not mind your rectifying it; I do not mind your selling it. But what I want to know is, why did you permit the Auditor-General, on the 17th of August 1965, to mislead this House by your failure to reply to the audit queries, and specially when you yourself state in your Ministry communique that you

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

the Milk Board to maintain hygienic standards. Every ounce of milk sold by the Board is tested for quality before being put on the market. As a result of these increased in sales the Milk Board has been compelled to buy 450 to 500 more pints of milk a day than previously. The Milk Board has also reduced the cost of a pint of milk for school children from 25 cents to 20 cents."

I am grateful, Mr. Minister, that the price has been reduced for school children. I believe the fat content also has been reduced. But leaving that question aside may I say this. I do not mind their boosting and advertising the Milk Board by means of news items, but at least keep to the facts.

I have with me here a statement of the total intake of milk, the daily average, the total disposals of pasteurized milk products, daily average total disposals, on separated milk the quantity separated; every single feature is there. If you examine the figures you will find that the figures for April, May, June and July, far from representing an increase, represents less than the average figures for the past year.

ශ්‍රී ජී. ඩී. බන්දා

(කෙළරවු ආර්. ඩී. බන්දා)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

I must check up.

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බන්දාරනායක මය.

(ති. ආර්. ආර්. ඩයස් බන්දාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I will give you the figures. I will give you the statement. I am prepared to table it. This is a statement which I have got typed out from the figures given to me. Naturally my figures go up to February 1965. I do not have records going after February 1965. But if you compare them with the figures up to February 1965, you will find the "Daily News" story represents a sorry record; it is neither more nor less. You will find that there have been several periods in which the figures have exceeded. You will find that the story that they

are buying more milk is not even true. It is just a blurb by the officers of your department, by the officers of your Milk Board, to demonstrate their own efficiency by means of the press—and not a very efficient method, if I may say so.

It reminds me almost of how the Department of Agriculture tried to boost its beef stall in Kollupitiya on the basis of press reports and of press publicity at that time. Even today I see an item in the "Daily News", a story about how a buffalo escaped and ran amok in Kollupitiya, and how that was construed as an act of sabotage on the part of the Treasury. How the Treasury inspired a buffalo to run amok to this date remains a mystery to my mind. I agree buffaloes in the Treasury do run amok, but I have never seen them running amok along the Kollupitiya Road near the Agriculture Department meat stall.

This is the sort of problem that confronts the Hon. Minister. This is the kind of problem on which he has to consult and keep down to sane administration, not permitting officers who want to draw the wool over his eyes to get away with it.

I propose to leave the Milk Board and discuss some other matters.

සභාපතිතුමා

(අක්කිරාසනර්)

(The Chairman)

How long more is the hon. Member going to take?

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බන්දාරනායක මය.

(ති. ආර්. ආර්. ඩයස් බන්දාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

About 10 to 15 minutes.

සභාපතිතුමා

(අක්කිරාසනර්)

(The Chairman)

There is very little time left and there are a number of other speakers.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.
(ශ්‍රී. ආ. ජ්‍ය. ජ්‍ය. ජ්‍ය. පණ්ඩාරනායක)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I think lots of hon. Members on this side of the House have permitted me to take up their time, and we will make a corresponding adjustment. The time allotted for the Ministry Votes will not be exceeded in consequence of my speech.

සභාපතිතුමා

(අක්කිරාජනර්)

(The Chairman)

I mentioned it because there is a long list of speakers.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.
(ශ්‍රී. ආ. ජ්‍ය. ජ්‍ය. ජ්‍ය. පණ්ඩාරනායක)
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I appreciate that. Our people have agreed to make a corresponding reduction in the time allotted to them; you can see them nodding their heads. This has been done by agreement. Certainly, Sir, the Opposition is prepared to concede its time against my speech. I am not going to encroach on the Government time or exceed the maximum time for these Votes.

May I get on to the next aspect of the matter which pertains immediately to the Food Department and the Marketing Department. In the Food Department, if I may say so with great respect, your major problem relates to storage. I said this in the course of the Second Reading Debate and drew your attention to certain facts which you may have not known earlier. I am sure you had sufficient time to verify them and to ascertain whether what I said was correct or not. I also drew your attention to the fact that in 1955, when Mr. M. D. H. Jayawardena was the Minister of Finance, a sum of Rs. 20 million was provided for the construction of food stores on the vacant land belonging to the Port Commission round Beira Lake. Mr. Alvapillai, the then Food Commissioner, reported back to the Government with great pride at the

end of the year that he had saved the Government Rs. 20 million by not putting up the food stores. That is the money which you are now paying out year in year out as demurrage because you are using the bottoms and the hulls of liberty ships which constitute your food stores. I think this same point was taken up recently in the press by no less a person than the Deputy Chairman of the Port (Cargo) Corporation. He said that this problem has been with us for a decade—note the word “decade”—and the word “decade” carries you back to 1955. He referred to the fact that the hulls of ships are being used for food storage; and so long as this problem remains unresolved you have no hopes of tackling this question.

The Hon. Minister of Nationalized Services will make frantic endeavours to clear the line of ships, but he cannot succeed. It is a task beyond his capacity because this is the price we are paying for lack of storage. The extra storage put up in 1961/62 by extra budgetary allocation was just not adequate because of the expanding volume of public sector business during our period. It was intended originally as storage for subsidiary foodstuffs but, in actual practice, with the large volume of textiles, the large volume of C.W.E. goods, and the dried fish being taken over at that time, a large amount of storage had to be diverted for new purposes not contemplated when the original food stores were constructed. So, Mr. Minister, you have now got a special responsibility to the Government to solve this problem, and this problem cannot be solved, first of all, unless you put up the necessary stores.

Secondly, walk round the Chalmers Granaries and see for yourself the number of vehicles lying around. They have been abandoned and condemned as being incapable of being used. I think the Food Department is trying to run a fleet strength of something like a hundred and twenty-four vehicles to clear foodstuffs from lorries. Is it surprising

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

that you find it impossible to undertake a job when there is a special shortage? During my time I made efforts sometimes even to draw up military vehicles, army vehicles, Labour Department vehicles, and vehicles from other Government departments into the job of clearing food supplies. This is a very important task and I rather think, unless you do something about it, you are going to find yourself stuck with this major problem.

As far as the food stores are concerned, the granary itself has never been properly cleaned up or fumigated in the whole of its history. As I pointed out at the Second Reading Debate, the only achievement of the granaries has been over the last 150 years to breed new varieties of Albino cockroaches which have never seen the light of day—[*Interruption*]. They are there; you find new varieties which we have never seen before. They have gone completely white—white cockroaches—and you find them in the Chalmers Granaries. Ask your Food Commissioner; he has met one or two once or twice. Then there was a time when these food granaries were loaded with corruption. In the Manning Market itself, I remember, there was a time when individual thugs used to harass and frighten the workers who were organized into co-operative labour societies, and the approximate profits they were making were something of the order of Rs. 15,000 a day. Granaries not only store food; they also store hand-bombs. A reign of terror used to exist in those places until they were cleaned up somewhere towards the middle of 1963. I do not think the reign of terror has come back. I think, to a large extent, those places are still clean.

But that is not true of food stores everywhere. There are individuals—I believe they are still being looked for by the Income Tax Department—some of your storekeepers whose income,—

ශ්‍රී ඒම්. ඩී. බන්දා

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

Your storekeepers!

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බන්දාරනායක මහා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

They were my storekeepers until I conducted a few raids and drove them out. There are some of them still with you, and I must say that you owe a duty to the country to take some positive, perhaps unorthodox, action in this regard. Some of them are brilliant men. Their techniques of keeping books are perfect; it is absolutely impossible to find anything wrong. Some of them had a separate staff of their own; the official government staff had nothing to do with that aspect of the matter. There was a place very close to your constituency, and you know it. It is not peculiar to any one station.—[*Interruption*]. Really, these are practical problems which you should face up to.

අ. සා. 7.15

As far as the question of milling is concerned, you will have all manner of problems. The milling capacity is badly distributed. You must think in terms of practical methods of saving the Government money in having to transport paddy and rice from all over to the Southern Province where the excess milling capacity is. The re-siting of mills is an urgent task. How it fits in with your concept of private and public sectors, I do not know, but I do think that in the national interest, the re-siting of mills, the provision of effective machinery for milling purposes, the establishment of standards, the prevention of the rackets which go on in paddy day by day—all these are important, in spite of your coloured green grains. I suggest you change the colour to blue; it may help. But even with all the changes, even if you put in the rainbow colours on the ties of some of our public servants, I do not think you will succeed.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මහ.]

I think it is extremely important to make a practical effort in the correct direction. One consideration is that unless you make a practical attempt to remove from circulation the surplus coupons which are floating around in this country and are being trafficked in by co-operative managers, I think you will find it an extremely difficult task to achieve success.

One last word. I wish to pay a compliment to you, Mr. Minister, on the administration of the tea and rubber control departments. The tea and rubber control departments have done an excellent job over the years. Your Permanent Secretary, I believe, set them on rails. I must say they continue to be on rails notwithstanding his absence now. The tea and rubber industries are the mainstay of our economy. The Finance Minister would not be able to present his Budget without them. Maybe, it is fortunate in some ways that, while the whole country deploras the fighting between India and Pakistan, the tea industry alone is in a somewhat happy position—of course, that is a very materialistic way of looking at a neighbour's misfortune. But from a long term view, something practical has to be done to enhance the service that your department is performing. The biggest defaulters are the land owners. In regard to the services that are being performed, the theoretical argument that the cess is theirs is not hundred per cent. true. The cess represents a reduction made on export duties that might otherwise have been charged; to that extent, the Ceylon Government can legitimately lay claim to that cess. If you regard it as your money, as the Ceylon Government's money, I think you are entitled to demand that the larger estate proprietors live up to their responsibilities in the use of it.

If you examine your re-planting programmes, you will find that the large tea estates are the biggest defaulters as far as the target figures

are concerned. Something must be done in these matters. Something has to be done to ensure that the industry does pay. Frankly, I must say this: if your hopes are that they will expand, under whatever incentives you are able to give them, into growing subsidiary foodstuffs for you in the plains of Minipe or in the North-Central Province, I frankly have my doubts and I frankly express my scepticism. I say that not in the hope of wishing you ill. We like you to increase the production of subsidiary food crops, but any person who does not have any interest in making this country self-sufficient in foodstuffs will never succeed in doing so. I do not believe that a man would work contrary to his own interests. I do not believe that the Jafferjees and the Borahs to whom you are going to alienate land will grow subsidiary foodstuffs, because it is contrary to their basic interests.

ශ්‍රී ඒම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டார)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

Jafferjee went with one of your Ministers to the Middle East.

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මහ.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

As an importer. We never treated Jafferjee as a person to whom land should be alienated for the purpose of growing anything. I was certainly not interested in Jafferjee. I never was. I can assure you that we never asked Jafferjee to grow anything. Do you really think that man whose business it is to import subsidiary foodstuffs is going to grow those same foodstuffs here? Do you really think that a man whose business it is to import subsidiary foodstuffs is going to be interested in growing them here?—[Interruption]. I maintain that you will fail for no other reason than that that task must be entrusted to the person whose interest it is to increase production and who has the will to do it. And the person who

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

has the will to do it is the farmer. It is only the farmer who will really increase the production of subsidiary foodstuffs in a practical sense—it is not the Minister of Lands, it is not the public servant who will do so. The farmer is the man who works on the land and in the field. It is he who has done it, and he has done it in a very spectacular form. If you go to the little terraced paddy fields, particularly in the Kegalle District, you will find that the average yield per acre has increased.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(කෙළරඹු ආර්. ඩී. පණ්ඩා)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

The farmer has not been deprived of anything.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මහා.

(ශ්‍රී. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

If the farmer is going to be treated as a serf, a slave or a peasant, you will find that your schemes will not work. It was the Minister of Industries who gave the farmer some degree of independence and released him from the burden of his serfdom; it was then that the farmer became a producer in this country.

That is why I say your techniques and methods will fail. But we want this country to be self-sufficient. If you will look into the cost-of-living reports written by your Permanent Secretary in regard to subsidiary foodstuffs you will find theories on the production of foodstuffs, on the availability of irrigable land, and so on. But do you really think that persons who import foodstuffs are the best persons to produce them? Do you really think they will compete against themselves and destroy their own business?

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා

(කෙළරඹු ආර්. ඩී. පණ්ඩා)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

You are mentioning the names of one or two persons.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මහා.

(ශ්‍රී. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

If I take them as a symbol, does it mean I am wrong? When I take individuals, I am taking examples of the type of person who does not and should not constitute the private sector in this country. I am not objecting to any one individual. I am objecting to people whose interests run counter to the national interest of self-sufficiency. Surely, a man does not want to destroy his own business! I maintain for that reason that the Hon. Minister, in this instance, is at fault in regard to his policy. I do ask him to seriously consider whether his policy will really succeed. At the end of an year we shall be in a position to judge. After all, nothing is measured better than by performance and results. If the Minister is able to succeed in achieving the practical targets in the production of subsidiary foodstuffs, if he is able to make these people grow subsidiary foodstuffs, then we could say that his policy has been successful. I believe, in the case of certain subsidiary foodstuffs he can get these people to grow them—for instance, if he tells Moosajees, "You cannot import any more maize", perhaps, they might start growing maize here. But so long as you allow them to import maize from abroad they will not grow maize in this country, because it is in their own economic interests to import maize from a foreign country. You cannot get a person who does not want to go against his own economic interest, who has no sense of patriotism, to grow these subsidiary foodstuffs. For instance, if we wanted to increase the manufacture of biscuits in this country, would we have asked the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries to do so? If one is an importer of biscuits one would not wish to produce biscuits here. That is the argument I wish to raise. [Interruption]. I do say that you are capable of doing the job. The farming people can be organized to

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]
do the job of work. But I do say that the Minister should trust the people directly and place his confidence in the people of this country to raise our food production to the level of self-sufficiency.

I agree that the Minister, for all that, will be subject to two grave disadvantages : he will be dependent on the weather conditions and he will be dependent on external prices ; and if by the grace of providence he is blessed in both, then he will certainly have a chance to do something practical for the benefit of the people of this country.

එඩ්මන්ඩ් විජේසූරිය මයා. (මස්කෙලියා)
(*திரு. எட்மண்ட் விஜேசூரியா—மஸ்கெலியா*)
(Mr. Edmund Wijesuriya—Maskeliya)

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, මේ රටේ ජනතාවට කෘෂිකර්ම හා ආහාර අමාත්‍යාංශය තරම් එදිනෙදා ජීවිතය කෙරෙහි බෙහෙවින් බලපාන වෙනත් අමාත්‍යාංශයක් ඇතැයි මා කල්පනා නොකරන බව මගේ කථාවේ මුල් ආරම්භයේදීම කියන්න ඕනෑ. මේ රටේ ජනතාවගේ ජීවිත සැපවත් කරන්න බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනව නම් කළ යුත්තේ මේ ඉතාම වැදගත් අමාත්‍යාංශයේ කටයුතු හරි හැටි කරගෙන යාම බවත් මේ අවස්ථාවේ දී ඒ සමූහ ප්‍රකාශ කරන්න ඕනෑ. මෙතෙක් කල් මේ අමාත්‍යාංශයේ වැඩ කටයුතු හරි හැටි කෙරීගෙන ගොස් තිබෙනවය කියා අපට කියන්නවත් හිතන්නවත් පුළුවන්කමක් නැහැ. එහෙත් අපේ නව ඇමතිතුමා වැඩි සේෂාවක් නොකර, වැඩි ශබ්දයක් නැතිව තමන්ගේ භාරයේ තිබෙන රාජකාරිය හරි හැටි කරන්න පුළුවන් ඇමතිතුමකු බවට කිසිම සැකයක් නැති නිසා අපට සැහෙන ප්‍රමාණයක විශ්වාසයක් තබාගෙන බලාපොරොත්තුවක් ඇතිව බලාගෙන

ඉන්න පුළුවන් තත්ත්වයක් තිබෙන බව මට සන්තෝෂයෙන් ප්‍රකාශ කරන්න පුළුවනි.

මහවැලි ගඟ උතුරට හැරවීමේ ව්‍යාපාරය ආරම්භ කර කටයුතු කිරීමට බලාපොරොත්තුවෙන් සිටින බවත්, වලවේ ව්‍යාපාරය ආරම්භ කර කටයුතු කරගෙන යන බවත් අප දන්නවා. මේවා වුවමනා නැති දේවල්ය කියන්න මා තුළ බලාපොරොත්තුවක් නැහැ. එහෙත් මේවා හැකි තරම් වේගයෙන් කරගෙන යන අතර, ඊට වඩා ඉක්මනින් මේ රට සවයම් පෝෂිත කිරීම සඳහා අප විසින් කටයුතු කරනු ලැබිය යුතු බව සඳහන් කරන්න කැමතියි.

අපේ රට ගොවිතැනින් යැපෙන රටක් බව මූලිකම සඳහන් කළ යුතුව තිබෙනව. ඒ කාරණය පිළිගන්නවා නම් අප අඩු වශයෙන් අපට වුවමනා කරන ආහාර ටිකෙන්වත් ස්වයංපෝෂිත වන්න ඕනෑ. එංගලන්තය වැනි කාර්මික රටක් තමන්ට වුවමනා කරන ආහාර ටික පිරව්වත් ගෙන්වා ගන්නව නම් අපට එය තේරුම් ගන්න පුළුවනි. එහෙත් ගොවිතැනින් යැපෙන ලංකාව වැනි රටක් පිරව්වත් ආහාර ටිකත් ගෙන්වා ගන්නොත් එය එක් අතකින් කනගාටුදායක සිද්ධියක් හැටියට ගණන් ගත යුතු වන අතර, අනික් අතින් භයානක තත්ත්වයක් බව පිළිගත යුතු නිසා අප අපේ ආහාර ටිකෙන්වත් ස්වයංපෝෂිත වීමට කටයුතු කිරීම සඳහා දැඩි අධිෂ්ඨානයක් ඇති කර ගන්න ඕනෑ.

මේ රටේ කුඹුරු අක්කර නව ලක්ෂයක් පමණ තිබෙනව. මේ කුඹුරු ප්‍රමාණය හරි හැටි වගා කර ගත්තොත් අපට අවුරුදු දෙක තුනක් වැනි කෙටි කාල සීමාවක් ඇතුළත මේ රට හාල්වලින් ස්වයංපෝෂිත කර ගන්න පුළුවනැයි මා කියනව.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කරක සභාව

ජපානයේත් ඉතාලියේත් ගොවියාට අපේ ගොවියා අක්කරයකින් ලබා ගන්න වි අස්වනු ප්‍රමාණය මෙන් පස් ගුණයක අස්වැන්නක් ලබා ගන්න පුළුවන්කම තිබෙනව. ඒ නිසා අපත් අපේ වි ගොවි තැන ඒ තත්ත්වයට දියුණු කර ගන්නොත් අපටත් අපේ රට කිසිම සැකයක් නැතිව ස්වයංපෝෂිත කර ගන්න පුළුවන්කම තිබෙන බව කල්පනා වට ගත යුතුයි. අප අද අපේ රටේ නිපද වන වි ප්‍රමාණය මේ රටේ ජනතාවට අවශ්‍ය ප්‍රමාණයෙන් සියේට 56ක් තරම ඇතැයි මා කල්පනා කරනව. එතකොට අපට තිබෙන්නේ තවත් ඉතිරි සියේට 44 ක් වූ ප්‍රමාණය නිපදවා ගන්නයි. ඒ සඳහා අප විසින් කළ යුතු යම් යම් දේවල් තිබෙනව. අපේ අස්වනු ප්‍රමාණය වැඩි කිරීම සඳහා අප විසින් දැනට වඩා ක්‍රමවත් ලෙස කුඹුරුවලට පෝර දැමීම කළ යුතුව තිබෙනව. හොඳ බිත්තර වි සපයා ගත යුතුව තිබෙනව. ගොයම් පැළ සිටුවීමේ ක්‍රමය වඩ වඩාත් ජනප්‍රිය කළ යුතුව තිබෙනව. බොහෝ තැන්වල තවමත් කෙරෙන්නාක් මෙන් වි වපුරන්නේ නැතිව, බිත්තර වි වෙනම ස්ථානයක තවත් කර මදක් වැඩි ගියායින් පස්සේ තවතෙත් පැළ උදුරා ගෙනවිත් කුඹුරුවල ක්‍රමවත් ලෙස සිටුවීමේ වැඩ පිළිවෙළ යොදා ගත යුතුයි. එසේ කළොත් දැනට තිබෙන කුඹුරු ප්‍රමාණයෙන්ම අපට වුවමනා කරන වි ප්‍රමාණය ලබාගෙන හාල් අතින් අපට ස්වයංපෝෂිත විය හැකි බවට මා තුළ නම් කිසිම සැකයක් නැහැ. මෙතෙක් කිසිම කෙනෙක් මේ අක්කර තව ලක්‍ෂයෙන් මේ රට ස්වයංපෝෂිත කළ හැකියයි කල්පනා කළේ නැහැ. එහෙත් දැනට තිබෙන කුඹුරු අක්කර තව ලක්‍ෂයෙන්ම මේ රට ස්වයංපෝෂිත කරන්න පුළුවන් බව මා අපේ ගරු ඇමතිතුමාට කියන්න

කැමතියි. නියම විධියේ සැලැස්මක් උඩ ක්‍රියා කරගෙන ගියොත් අපට කිසිම සැකයක් නැතිව එසේ කරන්න පුළුවන් බව මගේ විශ්වාසයයි.

අ. හා, 7.30

මීට අවුරුදු 15 කට පමණ පෙර මේ රටේ අපට ලැබුණේ අද ලැබෙන තේ පලදාවෙන් භාගයක් පමණක් බව අපි දන්නව. එසේ පලදාව වැඩි වුනත් තේ අක්කර ප්‍රමාණය වැඩි වුණේ නැහැ. සැහෙන කාලයක් ඇතුළතදී එදා ලැබුණු තේ අස්වනු ප්‍රමාණය දෙගුණයක් කර ගන්න පුළුවන් වුණේ, දියුණු අළුත් ක්‍රම අනුව ඒ තේ වගාව කළ නිසා බව මම ප්‍රකාශ කරන්නට ඕනැ.

අද මේ රජය රුපියල් 12 ක් දී වි බ්‍රසලක් ගන්නව. මේ විධියේ ආධාරයක් ගොවියාට දෙන්නට එපාය කියා මම කියන්නේ නැහැ. නමුත් වි මිලට ගැනීමේ දී දෙන මේ ආධාරය අඩු කර ඒ වෙනුවට පොහොර හෝ බිත්තර වි සැපයීමට අපි කටයුතු කරන්නට ඕනැ. ඒ අන්දමින් ගොවිතැන කරන මුල් භාගයේදී අපේ ගොවියාට ආධාරයක් දීමට වැඩ පිළි වෙළක් සකස් කළොත් අපට මීට වඩා හොඳ ප්‍රතිඵල ලබා ගන්න පුළුවන් වේය කියා මම හිතනව. ඉංග්‍රීසියෙන් කියනව නම් මේ විධියට කියන්න පුළුවනි.

A food subsidy, or for a matter of that any subsidy, should be given at the producers' end and not for the finished product. If you want to get better results, the subsidy must be at the producers' end. අන්න ඒ නිසයි, මා කියන්නේ වි බ්‍රසල කට රුපියල් 12 බැගින් දීල වි ගන්නේ නැතුව ඒ රුපියල් 12 න් එක්තරා ප්‍රමාණයක් අඩු කරල ඒ ආධාරය පොහොරවලින් හා බිත්තර වි වලින් ගොවියාට දෙන්නය කියා. එසේ කළොත්, සෑම කුඹුරකටම පෝර දමන්නට ඕනැය කියා නීති ඊති

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[එඩ්මන්ඩ් විජේසූරිය මයා.]

පනවා හෝ අවශ්‍ය පෝර දැමීමට වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් සකස් කළොත්, ඒ ගොවීන්ට කරදරයක් නැතිව පෝර ලබා ගැනීමට ඉඩ සලසා කටයුතු කළොත්, අපට අපේ අදහස මුදුන්පත් කර ගැනීමට පුළුවන් වේය කියා මම අදහස් කරනවා.

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, ආහාර අතින් අප සවයංපෝෂිත වුනත් තවත් නොයෙකුත් ද්‍රව්‍ය අපට පිටරටින් ගෙන්වන්නට තිබෙනවා. අපට වුවමනා ද්‍රව්‍ය පිටරටින් ගෙන්වන්නට නම් අපේ විදේශ ධනය හොඳ තත්ත්වයක තියෙන්නට ඕනෑ. අද අපට නොයෙකුත් හිරිහැර කරදරවලට මුහුණ දෙන්නට සිදු වී තිබෙන්නේ අපේ විදේශ ධනය ඉතාමත් පහත් තත්ත්වයක තිබෙන නිසයි. අපේ විදේශ ධනය තර කර ගැනීමට උපකාරී වන එකම දේ අපේ රටේ නිෂ්පාදනය කරන තේ බව මම ප්‍රකාශ කරන්නට ඕනෑ. ඒ නිසා අපේ රටේ තේ නිෂ්පාදනය වැඩි කරන්නටත්, අපේ තේවලට වැඩි මිලක් ලබාගන්නටත් අපි පුළුවන් තරම් උත්සාහ දරන්නට ඕනෑ. 1959 දී දස අවුරුදු සැලැස්ම යටතේ තේ අක්කර 50,000 ක් නැවත වගා කිරීමේ වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් යෙදුව. එදා මුල් අවස්ථාවේදී තේ නැවත වගා කිරීම සඳහා අක්කරයකට ආධාර වශයෙන් දෙන්නට කටයුතු සලසා තිබුනේ රුපියල් 2,500ක් පමණයි. නමුත් ඒ ක්‍රමය යටතේ තේ නැවත වගා කිරීමට ඉදිරිපත් වූ සංඛ්‍යාව සතුටුදායක නොවූ නිසා 1962 දී, එවකට සිටි කෘෂිකර්ම හා ආහාර ඇමති තුමාට මම ඒ සම්බන්ධව සන්දේශයක් ඉදිරිපත් කළා. තේ අක්කරයක් නැවත වගා කිරීම සඳහා රුපියල් 4,500ක් හෝ 5,000ක් පමණ වුවමනා කරනවාය, ඒ නිසා තේවලින්ම ලබා ගන්නා ලාභ මුදලින් දැනට වඩා වැඩි මුදලක් එනම් රුපියල් 4,500ක් පමණ දෙන්නට ක්‍රියා

කරමුය, කියා මම ඒ සන්දේශයෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටියා. ඒ අනුව 1963 ජනවාරි මාසයේ සිට රුපියල් 3,750 ගණනේ දෙන්නට වැඩ කටයුතු කළා. එහි ප්‍රතිඵලයක් වශයෙන් අර පළමුවෙනි අවුරුදු තුනට වැඩියෙන්, නැවත වගා කිරීම සඳහා වතු හිමියන් ඉදිරිපත් වුණා. නමුත් අද දක්වා තවමත් එය සතුටුදායක නොවේය කියා මම ප්‍රකාශ කරන්න ඕනෑ. දැනට අවුරුදු 6 1/2ක් පමණ ගත වී තිබෙනවා. ඒ කියන්නේ නැවත වගා කිරීමේ ක්‍රමය ආරම්භ වුණේ 1959 සිටයි. අදට සම්පූර්ණ කර තිබෙන්නේ, තැන්තම් වගා කර තිබෙන්නේ අක්කර නම දාස් ගණනක් පමණයි. හැබැයි අක්කර 15,000ක් 16,000 ක් පමණ පරණ තේ ගලවා දැමූ කොටස් තිබෙනවා. අඩුම ගණනේ අවුරුදු 10කට අක්කර 50,000ක වත් වගාවක් වෙන්න ඕනෑ. එහෙත් දැනට අවුරුදු හතක් පමණ වූ දීර්ඝ කාලයක් ගත වී ඇතත්, ඒ ප්‍රමාණයෙන් භාගයක්වත් වගා කිරීමට බැරි වූ නිසාත්, අපට මේ සඳහා යෙදවීමට මුදල් තිබෙන නිසාත් මම කියනවා, අවුරුද්දකට කෝටි දෙකක් පමණ “ටී සෙස්” එකෙන් ලබා ගන්නා ය කියා. ඒ මුදල් අද පැත්තකට කර තැන්පත් කර තිබෙනවා. එයින් අදට විසදුම් කර ඇත්තේ රුපියල් තුන් කෝටි යක් පමණයි. 1964 දෙසැම්බර් මාසයේ අවසානය වන විට එසේ පැත්තකට කර ඇති තැන්පත් මුදල රුපියල් 6 කෝටි යක් පමණ වෙනවා. ඒ නිසා ඒ සා විශාල මුදලක් පැත්තකට කර තැබීම නොවෙයි කළ යුත්තේ. ඒ මුදල් ලබාගෙන මේ රටේ තේ වගාව වැඩිදියුණු කිරීමට කටයුතු කිරීමයි. ඒ නිසා මේ අවස්ථාවේදී මම ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා, දැනට ගෙවනු ලබන රුපියල් 3,750 රුපියල් 4,500 දක්වා වැඩි කරන්නා ය කියා.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

මගේ කථාව අවසන් කරන්නට කලින් තවත් එක කාරණයක් මතක් කරන්න කැමතියි. රුපියල් 3,750 බැගින් දෙන්න පටන් ගත්තේ 1963 සිටයි. එතකොට එයින් අපි කල්පනා කෙළේ ඒ සඳහා රුපියල් 2,750ක් ප්‍රමාණවත් නොවන බවයි. එහෙම නම් 1959, 1960, 1961 සහ 1962 වර්ෂවල තේ නැවත වගා කිරීමට ඉදිරිපත් වුණ කොටසටත් 1963 දී වැඩි කළ ඒ මුදලේ වෙනස ගෙවන්නේ නැත්තේ මන්ද කියා මම ප්‍රශ්න කරන්න කැමතියි. මම හිතනවා, යම් කිසි මුදලක් ඉතුරුව තිබෙනවා නම් ඒ උදවියටත් ඒ මුදල ගෙවීම ඉතාමත් සාධාරණය කියා. එම නිසා ඒ කොටස්වලටත් ඒ මුදල ගෙවන්නේ නම් ඒ අයට සහනයක් ලැබෙන නිසා ඒ ගැන සාධාරණව කල්පනා කර බලන ලෙස මම ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා.

මේ ගැන සලකා බලා සුදුසු පියවරක් ගන්නය කියා මා ගරු ඇමතිතුමාගෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා. මා මීට වඩා කාලය ගත කරන්න අදහස් කරන්නේ නැහැ. මේ රටේ ජීවත්වන ජනතාවගේ ජීවිත සැපවත් කරවීම සඳහා මෙම අමාත්‍යාංශයේ වැඩ කටයුතු හොඳින් කර ගෙන යාමට මෙතුමාට සෑම ධෛර්යයක්ම ලැබේවැ කියා පාර්ලිමේන්තය කරමින් මගේ වචන සවිලස අවසාන කරනවා.

ආර්. පී. විජේසිරි මයා. (කුණ්ඩසාලේ)
 (කි.ප්‍ර. ජ්‍ය. පී. බිලීගිනි—කුණ්ඩසාලේ)
 (Mr. R. P. Wijesiri—Kundasale)

ආහාර සහ වෙළඳ අමාත්‍යාංශයේ වැය ගිණිය යටතේ වචන සවිලසක් කථා කරන්න මා අදහස් කරනවා. මා ප්‍රථම යෙන්ම කැමතියි, කෘෂිකර්ම අංශය ගැන වචන සවිලසක් කථා කරන්න. ගියවර ආණ්ඩුවේ ආහාර සහ කෘෂිකර්ම ඇමතිතුමා

වශයෙන් සිටි දොම්පෙ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.) දීර්ඝ කථාවක් කරන්නට යෙදුනු බව අපි දන්නවා. තමන් එම ඇමති පදවියේ සිටිය දී යම් යම් දූෂණ මැඩ පවත්වන්නට ගන්නා ලද උත්සාහය පිළිබඳ විස්තරත් වෙනත් කරුණුත් ඇතුළත්කොට එතුමා විසින් පවත්වන්නට යෙදුණු කථාව තමුත්තාත් සේලා අසා සිටින්නට ඇති.

මාද මීට ප්‍රථමයෙන් කෘෂිකර්ම අංශයේ කටයුතු කළ කෙනෙක්. මා මෝල් හිමියකු වශයෙන් වි මෝල් ව්‍යාපාරයේ යෙදී සිටි කෙනෙක්. එදා දවසේ දොම්පෙ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා කෘෂිකර්ම අංශය දියුණු කිරීමට කියා යම් පියවරක් ගන්නා නම් ඒ මගින් මහජනතාවටවත් රටටවත් කිසි ප්‍රයෝජනයක් ලැබුණේ නැහැ; නොයෙකුත් දූෂණයන් මැඩ පැවැත්වීමට ඒ මගින් හැකිකමක් ලැබුණේ නැහැ.

නියමිත මිල යෝජනා ක්‍රමය යටතේ ඇති වූ දූෂණ නැති කිරීම සඳහා එතුමා ගන්නා ලද පියවරවල් සැහෙන තරමකට සතුවූ දයක වුණත්, එතුමා ඒ කටයුතු කළේ සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම එම දූෂණ නැති කිරීමේ අදහසින් නොවන බව මතක් කරන්න ඕනැ. මට ඒ සඳහා නිදහිතයක් පෙන්වන්නට පුළුවනි. ඒ අවස්ථාවේදී එතුමා විසින් රජයේ සහල් ගබඩා කරුවකුගෙන්, සහල් මිල යෝජනා ක්‍රමය යටතේ තිබෙන වි ගබඩාවක ගබඩා කරුවකුගෙන් වැඩ තහනම් කර, පසුව ඒ අය රක්ෂාවෙන්ද තෙරපා දැමීම සඳහා ක්‍රියා කළ බව සත්‍යයක්. නමුත් එවකට සිටි රජයේ ඇමති වරුන්ගේ බලපෑම් නිසා මොකද වුණේ?

කැගල්ලේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාගේ (පී. බී. ජී. කළුගල්ල මයා.) මස්සිනා සහල් ගබඩාවක උප ගබඩාකරුවකු වශයෙන් සිටියත්, ඔහු දන්ඩුවට සිට කටුගස්තොට සහල්

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

[විපේෂිත මය.]

ගබඩාව දක්වා යන්නේ එන්නේ කාරේ කෙත්. ඔහුට ලැබෙන පඩිය දන්නව නම්, කාරයකින් තබා බස් එකකින්වත් ඒ ගමන යාමට පුළුවන් වේවිද කියා සැකයි. කොත්මලේ හිටපු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාගේ මස්සිනා වීශාල වංචාවකට අසු වුණා. එම වංචාවේ ප්‍රමාණය රුපියල් 80 දහසක්ද කොහේද කියා මා සිතනව. ඔහු තවමත් රක්ෂාවේ යෙදී සිටින බව මතක් කරන්න ඕනෑ. ඒ අන්දමට බලන විට, දොම්පේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා ඇමති ධුරය දරණ කාලයේදී අවංක සේවයක් කිරීමේ අදහසින් ඒ පුද්ගලයන් දෙදෙනාගේ වැඩ තහනම් කළාය කියා අපට පිළිගන්නට බැරි බව මා මතක් කරනවා.

අ. භා. 7.45

සභල් ගබඩා කරුවන්ගේ දූෂණත්, වී ගබඩාකරුවන්ගේ දූෂණත් සමුපකාර සමිතිවල කළමනාකරුවන්ගේ දූෂණත් තිබෙන තුරු සහතික මිල යෝජනා ක්‍රමයෙන් මේ රටේ ගොවිතැන දියුණු කිරීම අපහසු බව මා ප්‍රකාශ කරනවා. දුප්පත් ගොවියා කොයි විධියට වී ගොවි තැන දියුණු කරන්නට උත්සාහ කළත් ඔහු ලගින්ම ආශ්‍රය කරන ගමේ විවිධ සේවා සමුපකාර සමිතියේ කළමනාකරු උත්සාහ කරන්නේ ඒ ගොවියා අධෛර්ය කර ඒ වෙනුවට වෙන විධියකින්, අස්වනු ලේඛන මාගියෙන්, නිකම් කඩදාසිවලින් පමණක්, වී ලබාගන්නාය කියා පෙන්වා මුදල් වංචා කරන්නයි. සහතික මිල යෝජනා ක්‍රමය යටතේ ගම්වල තිබෙන විවිධ සේවා සමුපකාර සමිතිවලින් බලා පොරොත්තුවන්නේ ගොවියා නිෂ්පාදනය කරන වී පික ඒ සහතික මිල ක්‍රමය යටතේ ලබාගෙන රජයේ වී ගබඩාවලට භාරදීමයි. නමුත් අද දින වැඩි වශයෙන්ම සිදුවන්නේ සහතික මිලට වී ලබා ගැනීමක් නොව

නිකම් කඩදාසි හුවමාරුවක් පමණක් බව මා නමුත්තාත්සේට මතක් කරන්නට සතුටුයි.

ඒ ඒ ගම්වල තිබෙන විවිධ සේවා සමුපකාර සමිතිවලට නියමකර තිබෙනවා. කන්න අනුව අස්වනු ලේඛන මගින් එක්තරා වී ප්‍රමාණයක් ලබාගැනීමට. නමුත් ඒ නියම කර තිබෙන වී ප්‍රමාණය ඒ ගමේ තිබුණොත් විවිධ සේවා සමුපකාර සමිතියේ කළමනාකරුවන් රජයේ වී ගබඩාවේ ගබඩා කරුවන් ප්‍රයෝජනයක් නොවන නිසා විශේෂයෙන්ම විවිධ සේවා සමුපකාර සමිතියේ කළමනාකරු බලාපොරොත්තුවන්නේ ගොවියාට හිරිහැර කර වී නිෂ්පාදනය හරි යාකාර නොකෙරෙන විධියට ගොවියා අධෛර්ය කිරීමටයි. එසේ කර නිකම් ඉලක්කම්වලින් පමණක්, පැත්ත තුඩින් නැත්නම් පැත්සල් තුඩින් පමණක්, කඩදාසි හුවමාරුවක් කර වී ලබාගත් බව පෙන්වා මුදල් වංචා කිරීමයි අද සිදුවන්නේ. සහතික මිල යෝජනා ක්‍රමය යටතේ විවිධ සේවා සමුපකාර සමිතියේ කළමනාකරුන් රජයේ වී ගබඩාවේ ගබඩාකරුන් වී මෝල් හිමියනුත් එකතුවී ඒ විධියට මුදල් වංචා කරන බව මා ප්‍රකාශ කරනවා. මා එය තවදුරටත් විස්තර කරන්නට සතුටුයි. විවිධ සේවා සමුපකාර සමිතියේ කළමනාකරුන් වී මෝල් හිමියනුත් “ක්‍රෙඩිට් සේල්ස් ඉන්වොයිස්”, “ඩිලිවරි ඕවර්” කියන කඩදාසි අරන් එනවා. ඒ දෙගොල්ල රජයේ වී ගබඩාකරුන් සමග එකතුවී කඩදාසි හුවමාරු කර ගන්නවා. ඒ මගින් ගබඩාකරුට රුපියලකුත් විවිධ සේවා සමුපකාර සමිතියේ කළමනාකරුට රුපියලකුත් ලබා ගන්නවා. ඒ අනුව කඩ දාසියෙන් පමණයි විවිධ සේවා සමුපකාර සමිතිය රජයේ වී ගබඩාවට වී භාර දෙන්නේ. නමුත් ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම වී ගෙන

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

යන්නේවත් ගෙනෙන්නෙවත් නැහැ. මේ තත්ත්වය නිසා පසුගිය කාලය තුළ වි නිෂ්පාදනයේ වැඩිවීමක් ඇති වී තිබෙන වා නම් එය නිකම් කඩදාසියෙන් පමණක් වැඩි වී තිබෙන ප්‍රමාණයක් පමණක් බව මා ප්‍රකාශ කරනවා.

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, මේ රටේ නිෂ්පාදන ය කරන සහල්වල තත්ත්වයන් ඉතාමත් අසතුටුදායක බව මා තවුන්තාන්සෙට මතක් කරන්නට සතුටුයි. කැකුළෙන් කොටන සහල්වත් තම්බා කොටන සහල් වත් රජය බලාපොරොත්තු වන තත්ත්වය ව සහල් මෝල් හිමියන් සපයන්නේ නැති බව මා මතක් කරනවා. රජය බලා පොරොත්තු වන අන්දමට සියයට 75ක් පොලිෂ් සහඳුන් සියයට 12 කට නොවැඩි වන සේ කැඩිවීවී සහඳුන් තිබෙන ආකාරයට වී මෝල් හිමියන් රජයේ ගබඩා වලට සහල් සපයන්නේ නැහැ. ඒ වෙනුවට ඒ අය කරන්නේ, ඉතාමත් නරක, ගදගහන විධියේ, සියයට 30 කට 35 කටත් වඩා කැඩිවීවී හාල් මහජනයාට දීමයි. එය කවුරුත් දන්න කරුණක්. එසේ බාර දීමෙන් ඒ අය බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ, සලාක ක්‍රමය යටතේ සහල් ලබා ගන්නා සලාක හිමියා ඒ සහල්වලින් ප්‍රයෝජන නොගෙන නැවත වරක් ඒවා කඩකාරයාට ම හෝ කඩකාරයාගේ මාර්ගයෙන් මෝල් හිමියාටම හෝ දීමයි. මෙය මෝල් හිමියන් කඩකාරයන් සමුපකාර සමිතීන් අතරේ කෙරෙන ව්‍යාපාරයක් මිස පාරිභෝගිකයාට ප්‍රයෝජනයක් වන විධියේ වැඩක් නො වන බව පෙනේවා දෙන්නට සතුටුයි. සහති ක මිල යෝජනා ක්‍රමය යටතේ පවතින මේ ක්‍රමය අනුව දෙනුලබන සලාක හාල් මහ ජනයාගේ ප්‍රයෝජනයට කිසිසේත්ම පිදුපු නැහැ.

සභාපතිතුමා
(அக்கிராசனார்)
(The Chairman)
වෙලාව අවසානයයි.

විජේසිරි මයා.
(திரு. விஜேசிரி)
(Mr. Wijesiri)

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, වෙලාව ගත වූ බව මා පිළිගන්නවා. සහතික මිල යෝජනා ක්‍රමය යටතේ පවතින දූෂණ කෙරෙහි ගරු ඇමතිතුමාගේ අවධානය යොමු කරවීම පිණිසත් ඒ මගින් මේ රටේ ගොවි ජන තාවට සහනයක් ලබාදීමට මග පෑදීම පිණිසත් මගේ අදහස් මෙම ගරු සභාව ඉදිරියේ තබා ඒ ගැන ගරු ඇමතිතුමාගේ සැලකිල්ල යොමු කරවීමට තවත් විනාඩි දෙකක්වත් දෙන මෙන් මම ඉතා ඕනෑ කමින් තවුන්තාන්සේගෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා. නියමිත මිල යෝජනා ක්‍රමය යටතේ පවතින මේ දූෂණ විවිධ සේවා සමුපකාර සමිතිවලත් රජයේ ගබඩා වලත් පවතින අතර රජය ගොවියාට කොයිතරම් ආධාර දුන්නත් මේ දූෂණ නිසා ගොවීන් උනන්දුවෙන් කටයුතු නොකරන බව මා විශේෂයෙන් මතක් කරන්නට ඕනෑ. ගොවියා සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම අධෛර්යාව පත් කරන මේ අංශ තුන නිසා ගොවියා ගේ නිෂ්පාදනය අඩුවන හෙයින් මෙහි තිබෙන දූෂණ මැඩ පැවැත්වීමට කටයුතු කරන මෙන් ඉතා ඕනෑකමින් ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා.

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, මෙම දෙපාර්තමේන් තුවේ ඉතාමත් අවංක නිලධාරීන්ද සිටිනවා. මීට අවුරුදු දෙකකට පමණ උඩ දී උනම්බුව තමින් උප කොමසාරිස් මහත්මයෙක් සිටියා. ඒ මහතා සිටින කාලයේ ඒ පළාතේ මෝල්වලින් ලැබුණු හාල්වල තත්ත්වයන් අද ලැබෙන හාල් වල තත්ත්වයන් සංසන්දනය කර බැලූ වොත් ඒ මහතා සිටින කාලයේදී ඒ පලා තටත් ගොවියාටත් කොයිතරම් අවංක සේවයක් සැලසුණාද යන වග තේරුම් ගන්නට පුලුවනි. 1963 වර්ෂයේදී මහ නුවර දිස්ත්‍රික්කයේ, මා නියෝජනය කරන කුණ්ඩසාලේ ප්‍රදේශයේ “පිල්ඩි මඩියා” කෙනකු, වී බාර ගැනීමේ නියෝ

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—කාරක සභාව

රදයක්ව තිබෙනව. ඒ නිසා ඒ ප්‍රශ්නය ගැන කෘෂිකම් ඇමතිතුමාගේ අවධානය යොමු කරවමින් මා ඉල්ලා සිටිනව, මේ අවුල් සහිත තත්ත්වය වහාම විසඳා දීමට ක්‍රියා කරන්නට කියා.

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, අපේ ප්‍රදේශයේ වී ගොවිතැනට එකම බාධාව වී තිබෙන්නේ, වාරිමාලී හරියාකාර අළුත්වැඩියා නොකිරීමයි. මා මගේ ආසනයේ අළුත්වැඩියා කළ යුතු හා අළුතෙන් සකස් කළ යුතු වාරිමාලී පිළිබඳ ලැයිස්තුවක් ඒ ඒ නිලධාරීන් වෙත ඉදිරිපත් කර තිබෙනව. මා ගරු ඇමති තුමාගෙන් මේ අවස්ථාවේදී ඉල්ලා සිටිනව, මිල මුදල් නැත නොකියා, අපේ ප්‍රදේශ වල වී ගොවිතැන් කටයුතු දියුණු කරන්නට කැමති නම්, අවශ්‍ය මුදල් නිලධාරීන්ට වෙන් කර දී ඒ යෝජනා කර තිබෙන වාරිමාලී කටයුතු ඉක්මණින් සම්පූර්ණ කර දෙන්නට කියා.

ඊළඟට තමුන්නාන්සේ දන්නවා ඇති, තරුණ ගොවි සමාජ නමින් සංවිධාන වග යක් අපේ රටේ තිබෙන බව. ඒවාට බැඳී සිටින සාමාජික තරුණ-තරුණියන්ට දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව මීට වඩා ආධාර කරනවා නම් ඔවුන්ගේ මාලියෙන් මේ ගොවිතැන් කටයුතු දියුණු කර ගැනීමට පුළුවන් වෙනවා ඇති. ඔවුන්ගේ කටයුතු කරගෙන යෑම සඳහා දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව විසින් දෙන ලද නීති පද්ධතිය යල් පැන ඇති බව මතක් කරන්නට කැමතියි. ඔවුන්ගේ අදහස් ගෙන මේ ව්‍යවස්ථා පන්තිය සංශෝධනය කරන ලෙස නොයෙක් වර ඉල්ලා තිබෙනවා. ගාලු කඩවත් සතරේ ගොවි සමිතියේ නියෝජිත පිරිසක් මේ පිළිබඳව ගරු ඇමතිතුමා හමු වීමට වුව මනා බව ගරු ඇමතිතුමාට දන්නවා ඇතත් තවම ඒ පිළිබඳව ලිපියක් ලැබී නැහැ. ඒ තරුණයන්ගේ මොලවලත් වටිනා අදහස් තිබෙන්නට පුළුවනි. ඒ වගේම මේ නීති සංශෝධනය කර ගැනීම සඳහා ගරු ඇමති තුමාට ඔවුන්ගේ උදව්ව ලබා ගන්නට පුළුවනි. මට ලැබී තිබෙන කාලය අනුව මීට වඩා කපා කරන්නට වෙලාවක් නොමැති හෙයින් මගේ කපාව මෙයින් අවසන් කරනවා.

බී. වයි. තුඩාවේ මයා. (මාතර)
(කීරු. පී. ආ. ගා. ග්‍රා. ගා. — මා. ත. ක. ක. ක.)
(Mr. B. Y. Tudawe—Matara)

ගරු සභාපතිතුමනි, ආහාර අමාත්‍යාංශය යටතේ වචන ස්වල්පයක් කපා කිරීමට අවස්ථාව ලැබීම ගැන සතුටු වෙනවා. මා පළමුවෙන්ම කපා කරන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ කුඹුරු පනත ගැනයි. 1956 ජනතා ජයග්‍රහණයෙන් පසුව මේ රටේ ගොවි ජනතාවගේ ආරක්ෂාව සඳහා ගොවියා කුඹුරු හිමියාගේ වහලකු වූ යුගය අවසන් කිරීමෙන් ගොවියාට මනුෂ්‍යයකු වශයෙන් ජීවත් වීමට ඉඩ සලසා දීමෙන් කුඹුරුවල අස්වැන්න වැඩි කර මේ රට ස්වයංපෝෂිත කිරීමෙන් අභිලාෂය ඇතිව පනවන ලද කුඹුරු පනත ක්‍රියාත්මක වේද නොවේද යන සැකය නිසා ඇති වූ හිතියක් අද ගොවි ජනතාව තුළ තිබෙනවා. ගොවි ජනතාව හා මහජනතාව දන්නා පරිදි එක් සන් ජාතික පක්ෂයත්, රේපබ්ලික් පක්ෂයත් කුඹුරු පනතට විරුද්ධව ව්‍යාපාරයක් ගෙන ගියා. කුඹුරු පනතට විරුද්ධව පෙළපාලි ගිය, කුඹුරු පනතට විරුද්ධව සටන් කළ එම පක්ෂ දෙක බලයට පත් වී තිබෙන මේ අවධියේ දී මහජනයාට ප්‍රයෝජනවත් වන අන්දමට කුඹුරු පනත ක්‍රියාත්මක වේදෝ කියන සැකය ඇති වීම ස්වභාවිකයි. එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේත් රේපබ්ලික් පක්ෂයේත් සමහර මැති ඇමතිවරුන් ඒ කාලයේදී කුඹුරු පනත ගැන සැලකිල්ලක් නොදක්වා අද ගොවීන් කුඹුරුවලින් අස් කර තිබෙන නිසා, ඔවුන්ට අද අයිතිය නොදී තිබෙන නිසා, එබඳු අයගෙන් මේ ප්‍රශ්නය විසඳේදැයි ගොවීන් සැක හිතනවා. අද දින කුඹුරු වලින් අස් කරන ලද අද ගොවීන් 30,000 ක් පමණ සිටිනවා. ඔවුන් තමන්ගේ අයිතිය අද හෝ හෙට හෝ ලැබෙනැයි සිතමින් සිටියත් දැන් පෙනෙන අන්දමට ඔවුන්ට මේ ආත්මයේදීවත් එම අයිතිය නොලැබෙන තත්ත්වයක් උදා වී තිබෙනවා. මේ තත්ත්වය පහළ වී තිබෙන්නේ නීතියේ ඇති දුර්වලකම් නිසා බව අපට දැන ගන්නට තිබෙනවා. එහෙත් මේ රජය දැනට ආරම්භ කර ඇති ප්‍රගතිශීලී පියවරවල් ඉදිරියට ගෙන යන්නට පොරොන්දු වී සිටින නිසා ආත්තෙන්ම ඒ පියවරවල් සාර්ථක අන්දමින් කරගෙන යන්නට අදහස් කරනවා නම් කුඹුරු

පරිපූරක මුදල

පරිපූරක මුදල

[තුඩාවේ මයා.]

පහත නියම අත්දැමින් ක්‍රියාත්මක කිරීමට මේ රජය ක්‍රියා කරනවා ඇතැයි අප විශ්වාස කරනවා.

එක්ලි වේලාව අ. හා. 8 වූයෙන්, මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයට ප්‍රගතිය වාර්තා කරනු පිණිස සහපති තුමා මූලාසනයෙන් ඉවත් විය.

සාරක සභාව ප්‍රගතිය වාර්තා කරයි; නැවත රැස්වීම සැප්තැම්බර් 14 වන අඟහරුවාදා.

நேரம் பி. ப. 8 மணியாகிவிட்டவே, குழுவின் பரிசீலனை பற்றி சபைக்கு அறிவிக்கும் பொருட்டு அக்கிராசனர், அக்கிராசனத்திலிருந்து நீங்கினார்.

குழவினது பரிசீலனை அறிவிக்கப்பட்டது; மீண்டும் கூடுவது, செவ்வாய்க்கிழமை 14, செப்டெம்பர் 1965.

It being 8 P.M., the Chairman left the Chair to report Progress.

Committee report Progress; to sit again on Tuesday, 14th September 1965.

කිසිවකුණක්
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

Are there any non-controversial matters that can be taken up now ?

පරිපූරක මුදල :
අධ්‍යාපන දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව :
ගුරු වැටුප්

குறைநிரப்புத் தொகை : கல்வித் திணைக்களம் : ஆசிரியருக்குச் சம்பளம்

SUPPLEMENTARY SUPPLY : DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION : SALARIES TO TEACHERS

ශ්‍රී ඊරියගොල්ල
(கௌரவ ஈரியகொல்ல)
(The Hon. Iriyagolle)

I move,

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rupees Seven million five hundred and nine thousand nine hundred and fifty-five (Rs. 7,509,955) be payable out of the Consolidated Fund of Ceylon, or any other fund or moneys of, or at the disposal of, the Government of Ceylon,

or from the proceeds of any loans obtained by the Government of Ceylon, for the service of the financial year beginning on 1st October 1964, and ending on 30th September 1965, and that the said sum may be expended as specified in the Schedule hereto :—

Schedule
Rs.

Head 141—Education Department.	
Vote No. 4—Services provided by the Department—Recurrent Expenditure ..	7,509,955 "

ප්‍රශ්නය සහතිමුව කරන ලදී.
வினா எடுத்தியம்பப்பெற்றது.

Question proposed.

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

We have no objection, Sir, to this Supplementary Estimate being taken up but there is one observation which I should like to make. We do not want to stand in the way of the payment of salaries to teachers, subject to the condition that we have a full debate on this question when the Education Department Votes come up tomorrow and the day after.

කිසිවකුණක්
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

There will be no objection to that.

ප්‍රශ්නය විමසන ලදින්, සහ සම්මත විය.
வினா விடுவிக்கப்பெற்று ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.
Question put, and agreed to.

කිසිවකුණක්
(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)
(Mr. Speaker)

Then there are a few items—items 9 to 16—certain Food Control Orders by the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

பரிபூரண இடம்

சுற்றுலா அமைச்சர்

சுற்றுலா அமைச்சர்

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டார)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

These are very formal items. I sent them to the hon. Member for Yatiyantota and he said they were all right.

சுற்றுலா அமைச்சர்

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I think the last time when these Food Control Orders came up some hon. Members objected to them.

சுற்றுலா அமைச்சர்

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டார)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

Nobody objected. In fact nobody sought to move these. If my hon. Friend reads the Motions, he will find that these were gazetted on the 21st January 1964, during the time of the last Government. It is necessary, as a matter of formality, to present these to the House now.

சுற்றுலா அமைச்சர்

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

What are these?

சுற்றுலா அமைச்சர்

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டார)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

Food Control Orders.

சுற்றுலா அமைச்சர்

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

About transport of certain commodities from one place to another?

சுற்றுலா அமைச்சர்

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டார)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

Yes.

சுற்றுலா அமைச்சர்

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You are not pulling a fast one on us? All right, Sir, we agree to pass those items up to item 16.

சுற்றுலா அமைச்சர்

(சுற்றுலா அமைச்சர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

The Hon. Minister might move them.

சுற்றுலா அமைச்சர்

உணவுக் கட்டுப்பாட்டுக் கட்டளைகள்

FOOD CONTROL ORDERS

இது பத்திரிகை செய்திக்குரிய பத்திரிகை செய்தி :

பின்வரும் பிரேரணை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது :

Resolved :

"That the Food Control Order No. 215 of 20.1.64, 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. 13,930 of 21.1.64, which was presented on September 1, 1965, be approved."—[சுற்றுலா அமைச்சர்]

இது பத்திரிகை செய்திக்குரிய பத்திரிகை செய்தி :

பின்வரும் பிரேரணை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது :

Resolved :

"That the Food Control Order No. 216 of 27.6.64, 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. 14,087 of 30.6.64, which was presented on September 1, 1965, be approved."—[சுற்றுலா அமைச்சர்]

இது பத்திரிகை செய்திக்குரிய பத்திரிகை செய்தி :

பின்வரும் பிரேரணை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது :

Resolved :

"That the Food Control Order No. 217 of 9.7.64, 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. 14,103 of 10.7.64, which was presented on September 1, 1965, be approved."—[சுற்றுலா அமைச்சர்]

இது பத்திரிகை செய்திக்குரிய பத்திரிகை செய்தி :

பின்வரும் பிரேரணை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது :

Resolved :

"That the Food Control Order No. 218 of 9.7.64, 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

ආහාර පාලන නියෝග

කල් තැබීම

No. 14,103 of 10.7.64, which was presented on September 1, 1965, be approved.”—
[ගරු එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා]

කල් තැබීම

ඉத்தිවෛච්චු

ADJOURNMENT

මතු පළවන යෝජනාව සහාසම්මත විය :

பின்வரும் பிரேரணை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது :

Resolved :

“That the Food Control Order No. 219 of 9.7.64, 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. 14,103 of 10.7.64, which was presented on September 1, 1965, be approved.”—
[ගරු එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා]

යෝජනාව ඉදිරිපත් කරන දිනේ ප්‍රශ්නය සහාසිලීව කරන දේ :

“මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලය දැන් කල් තැබිය යුතුය.”—
[ගරු ඩී. පී. ද සිල්වා].

பிரேரணை பிரேரிக்கப்பட்டு, வினா எடுத்தியம்பப் பெற்றது :

“சபை இப்பொழுது ஐத்திவைக்கப்பெறுமாக”
[கௌரவ சி. பி. டி. சிலவா]

Motion made, and Question proposed, “That the House do now adjourn”.—
[Hon. C. P. de Silva].

මතු පළවන යෝජනාව සහාසම්මත විය :

பின்வரும் பிரேரணை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது :

Resolved :

“That the Food Control Order No. 220 of 9.7.64, 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. 14,103 of 10.7.64, which was presented on September 1, 1965, be approved.”—
[ගරු එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා]

අ. හා. 8.9

ජයකොඩි මයා.

(ශ්‍රී. ඉ. ජයකොඩි)

(Mr. Jayakody)

ගරු කපානයකතුමනි, මට ප්‍රශ්න දෙකක් ඇසීමට තිබෙනවා. එක් ප්‍රශ්න යක් ස්වදේශ කටයුතු භාර ඇමතිතුමා ගෙනුයි, ඇසීමට තිබෙන්නේ. එතුමා මෙහි නොමැති නිසා එය එතුමාට දන වන මෙන් මම සහානායකතුමාගෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටි තවා. මගේ කොට්ඨාශයේ—දිවුලපිටියේ—බොහෝ දෙනෙක් රැකෙන්නේ පේශ කාර්මාන්ත මධ්‍යස්ථාන මිනිනුයි. රජයේ හා පෞද්ගලික පේශ කාර්මාන්ත මධ්‍යස්ථාන රාශියක් එහි තිබෙනවා. මේ අළුත් ආණ්ඩුව පත් වුවාට පසුව ශ්‍රාම සංවර්ධන හා කුඩා කාර්මාන්ත දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවේ අධ්‍යක්ෂතුමා එක්තරා වකු ලේඛනයක් නිකුත් කර තිබෙනවා, සමුපකාර පේශ කාර්මාන්ත මධ්‍යස්ථානවලින් අය කළ යුතු ලාභය පැහැදිලි වශයෙන් සඳහන් කර. ඒ අනුව “ලක්සැල” ගන්නා සරෝමි, සාරි ආදිය විකුණන විට සියයට 20 ක ලාභයක් ගත යුතුයි. සමුපකාර සංගම් හෝ සමුපකාර පේශ කාර්මාන්ත මධ්‍යස්ථාන මගින් විකුණන විට සියයට 15 ක ලාභයක් ගත යුතු යි. මේ නිසා වෙනත් උදවිය සමග, විශේෂ යෙන්ම පෞද්ගලික වෙළෙඳුන් සමග, මේ ආයතනවලට ලොකු තරඟයක් කරන්නට සිදු වී තිබෙනවා. දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව නියම කර ඇති ලාභය ගෙන මේ ආයතන ඒ රෙදි විකුණන විට පෞද්ගලික වෙළෙඳුන් දැන් සියයට 5 ක් පමණ ගෙන විකුණනවා.

මතු පළවන යෝජනාව සහාසම්මත විය :

பின்வரும் பிரேரணை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது :

Resolved :

“That the Food Control Order No. 221 of 9.7.64, 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. 14,103 of 10.7.64, which was presented on September 1, 1965, be approved.”—
[ගරු එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා]

මතු පළවන යෝජනාව සහාසම්මත විය :

பின்வரும் பிரேரணை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது :

Resolved :

“That the Food Control Order No. 222 of 3.8.64, 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. 14,134 of 4.8.64, which was presented on September 1, 1965, be approved.”—
[ගරු එම්. ඩී. බණ්ඩා]

කල් තැබීම

කල් තැබීම

සමුපකාර සංගම් සියයට 15 කුත් “ලක් සල” සියයට 20 කුත් ගෙන විකුණන අතර පෞද්ගලික වෙළෙන්දා සියයට 5 ක් පමණක් ගෙන විකුණන විට අර ආයතනවලට ලොකු තරඟයක් කරන්නට සිදු වෙනවා. “ලක්සල” පාඩුවට ගෙනයාම වැළැක්වීම සඳහා ඒ තරම් ලාභයක් ගත යුතු යයි නියම කරන්න ඇති. නමුත් එයින් වෙන් වෙන් කුමක්ද? පාරිභෝගිකයා බලන්නේ මිලයි. ලක්සලේ මිල වැඩියි. සමුපකාර සමිතියේ මිල වැඩියි. ඉතින් කාටද, එයින් ප්‍රයෝජන වන්නේ? පෞද්ගලික වෙළෙන්දාටයි. ඒ නිසා අපේ රටේ නිපදවන සරෝම්, සාරි ආදී ද්‍රව්‍ය විකිණීමේදී ඒ විදියේ ලාභයක් ගත යුතුයයි නියම කර වකු ලේඛනයක් යවා තිබෙනවා නම් කරුණාකර එය ඉවත් කරගන්නා මෙන් මම ඇමතිතුමාගෙන් ඉල්ලා සිටිනවා.

දෙවන කාරණය පිළිබඳව මම ගරු ඇමති තුමාට දැනුම් දී තිබෙනවා. අපේ රටට ආසන්න ඉන්දියාවත් පකිස්ථානයත් අතර විශාල අරගලයක් තිබෙන බව අපි දන්නවා. මීට පෙර ඉන්දියාවත් චීනයත් අතර එවැනි අරගලයක් තිබුණු අවස්ථාවේදී අපේ රටේ විශාල ජාවාරමක්—සල්ලි එකතු කිරීමේ ජාවාරමක්—ගෙන ගියා. මේ රටේ සිටින ඉන්දියානු ජනතාවගෙන් සල්ලි එකතු කර ඉන්දියාවට යැවීමට උත්සාහ ගන්නා. නමුත් එදා තිබුණු ආණ්ඩුව එය අපේ විදේශ විනිමය වැය කිරීමක් වන නිසා ඒ මුදල් යැවීමට අවසර දුන්නේ නැහැ. මේ ආණ්ඩුවත් එසේ මුදල් එකතු කර යැවීමේ ව්‍යාපාරයක් තිබෙනවා නම් ඊට ඉඩ නොදේයයි මම විශ්වාස කරනවා. සල්ලි නිකම්ම යවන්න බැරි බව අපි දන්නවා. එසේ වුවත් දැන් රටේ එක්තරා ව්‍යාපාරයක් කරගෙන යනවා. මේ රටේ සිටින ඉන්දියානු කම් කරුවන්ගෙන් හා වෙළෙන්දන්ගෙන්, බෞද්ධයින්ගෙන් හා සිංහලයින්ගෙන් යුද්ධාධාර සඳහායයි කියා එක්තරා කණ්ඩායමක් මුදල් එකතු කිරීමේ ජාවාරමක් ගෙන යනවා. අන්න ඒ නිසා එවැනි ජාවාරමක් ගෙන යන්න කොයි යම් පක්ෂයකින් හෝ වේවා උත්සාහ දරනවා නම් එවැනි ජාවාරම් ගැන සොයා බලා, ඒ අයට විරුද්ධ නීති මගින් කටයුතු කිරීම පිණිස පොලීසියට නියෝග කරන ලෙස මේ අවස්ථාවේදී මතක් කර සිටිනවා.

අ. හා. 8.15

තුඩාවේ මයා.

(කීරු. ශ්‍රී ලාංක)

(Mr. Tudawe)

අධ්‍යාපන හා සංස්කෘතික ඇමතිතුමාගේ අවධානය යොමු කිරීමට කැමති ප්‍රශ්නයක් තිබෙනවා. පසුගිය කාලයේදී අධ්‍යාපන අධ්‍යක්ෂවරයා විසින් සියලුම පාඨශාලා වලට වකු ලේඛයක් නිකුත් කර තිබෙනවා පාඨශාලාවල කියවීම් ශාලා ඇති කිරීමේ වැදගත් කම ගැන. ඒ වකු ලේඛයේම සඳහන් වෙනවා, ඒ කියවීම් ශාලා වලට අඩු ගණනේ එකම ප්‍රවෘත්ති පත්‍රයක් වත් ඇතුළත් කළ යුතුය කියා. ඒ වාගේ ම එම වකු ලේඛයේ තවදුරටත් සඳහන් වෙනවා, දේශපාලන පක්ෂවලට අයත් ප්‍රවෘත්ති පත්‍ර එම කියවීම් ශාලාවල ශිෂ්‍යයන්ගේ කියවීම් සඳහා ප්‍රයෝජනයට නොගන්නා ලෙස. නමුත් එම වකු ලේඛයේ සඳහන් වෙන්නේ නැහැ, දේශපාලන පක්ෂවලට අයත් පුවත්පත් මොනවා ද කියා. මෙය ගුරුවරුන්ට ලොකු ප්‍රශ්නයක්. එම නිසා මා දැනගන්න කැමති ඇමති තුමා නියම කරනවාද දේශපාලන පක්ෂ වලට අයත් පුවත් පත් මේවාය, මේවා කියවීම සඳහා ගන්න එපාය; මෙන්න මේ පුවත්පත් පමණක් කියවීම් ශාලාවල ප්‍රයෝජනය සඳහා ගන්නය කියා.

ගරු ඊරියගොල්ල

(கௌரவ ஈரியகொல்ல)

(The Hon. Iriyagolle)

ඒ තරම් සාමාන්‍ය දැනීම නැති ගුරුවරු අපේ පාඨශාලාවල නැහැ. දේශපාලන පක්ෂවලින් නිකුත් කරන පත්‍ර මොනවා ද කියා සියලු දෙනාම දන්නවා.

කථානායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

There are two other questions to be answered. The Hon. Minister of Home Affairs is not here. He has a question to answer.

கல் தனிம

கல் தனிம

ஸ்ரீ. சி. டி. டி. டி. (ஹெல், லாபிஸ்ட்
ஹி விஜிஸ்ட் ஹெல் ஹி ஹி)

(கௌரவ சி. பி. டி. சில்வா—காணி, நீர்ப்
பாசன, மின்விசை அமைச்சரும் சபை முதல்
வரும்)

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

As no notice has been given of that
question, I am sorry he is not avail-
able. I shall convey to the Minister
concerned what has been raised.

கலாநாயகர்

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

There is another question which
has to be answered by the Hon. Prime
Minister; that is, about collecting
money.

ஸ்ரீ. சி. டி. டி. டி.

(கௌரவ சி. பி. டி. சில்வா)

(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

No notice has been given—

சீ. சீ. சீ. சீ.

(சீ. சீ. சீ. சீ.)

(Mr. Jayakody)

Why not? It was handed to the
Clerk to be given to the Hon. Prime
Minister.

ஸ்ரீ. சி. டி. டி. டி.

(சீ. சீ. சீ. சீ.)

(Mr. Premadasa)

At what time?

சீ. சீ. சீ. சீ.

(சீ. சீ. சீ. சீ.)

(Mr. Jayakody)

Sir, we like to have a clarification
of, or a Ruling on, this matter. The
practice has been to inform the parti-
cular Minister of any matter we pro-
pose to raise during the Adjournment.
I have done that, and I am sorry to
find it being said that no notice has
been given in time. What is the pro-
cedure you lay down, Sir?

ஸ்ரீ. சி. டி. டி. டி.

(சீ. சீ. சீ. சீ.)

(Mr. Premadasa)

The procedure that has been
followed in the past—and this was
explained the other day when the
hon. Member for Dambadeniya (Mr.
R. G. Senanayake) raised the matter
—is that by 4 P.M. notice should be
given to the Minister concerned that
a particular Member is going to raise
a particular question. In this case
my hon. Friend has not done that. If
he had done that, the Hon. Prime
Minister would have been here.

சீ. சீ. சீ. சீ.

(சீ. சீ. சீ. சீ.)

(Mr. Jayakody)

Have I to meet the Prime Minister
personally and give notice? We
would like to know to whom notice
should be given. Have I got to go and
meet the Prime Minister and give
him notice or have I got to give notice
through you, Sir?

கலாநாயகர்

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

The procedure that has been
followed in the past, and which I am
now repeating and laying down again,
is that whenever an hon. Member
desires to raise a question during the
Adjournment, he must directly give
notice to the Minister concerned by
4 P.M.

ஸ்ரீ. சி. டி. டி. டி.

(சீ. சீ. சீ. சீ.)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

How are we to know where a
Minister is available? Our duty is to
inform the House.

கலாநாயகர்

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

I cannot go in search of Ministers.
The earlier the notice is given the
better.

கல் துறை

பீ. ஜெ. கி. மெ.

(திரு. ஜெ. கி. மெ.)

(Mr. Jayakody)

In that case the procedure is absurd.—[Interruption].

கலாநாயகர்

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please!

பீ. ஜெ. கி. மெ.

(திரு. ஜெ. கி. மெ.)

(Mr. Jayakody)

The Minister concerned must be here. There must be sense in the whole matter. He must be here during the Adjournment.

கெ. எம். டி. பாண்டா

(கெ. எம். டி. பாண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

The Hon. Prime Minister was here earlier. If the hon. Member had told the Hon. Prime Minister, he would have been here. After the Hon. Prime Minister has left, the hon. Member sends a chit to somebody else.

கலாநாயகர்

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Please understand that I have made my Order. I have given my Ruling and I am not going to alter it. If I have made a wrong Order, hon. Members have their remedy: they can bring forward a Motion of No Confidence in me, and if it is passed I shall get up from this Chair and go home. As a human being I may make a mistake, but once I make my Order it must be accepted.

Notice must be given direct by the Member to the Minister concerned. He might very well leave it in the office of the Minister or with his Private Secretary. He might adopt some method by which the Minister will get notice in time so that he may be present here to answer the question.

கல் துறை

கெ. சி. பி. டி. சில்வா

(கெ. சி. பி. டி. சில்வா)

(The Hon. C. P. de Silva)

May I point out, Sir, that 4 P.M. is a little too late? Shall we make it 3 P.M.? We must remember that offices close at 4.30 P.M.

பீ. ஜெ. கி. மெ.

(திரு. ஜெ. கி. மெ.)

(Mr. Jayakody)

Make it 12 noon. We will be happier, so long as the Minister is present and answers the question.

கலாநாயகர்

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

The limit is 4 P.M. but if you can give notice earlier, so much the better.

கெ. சூ. சாதாசா

(கெ. சூ. சாதாசா)

(The Hon. Sugathadasa)

Sir, may I point out that if notice is given at 4 P.M., it would be difficult for a Minister to answer the question raised, because when he receives notice at 4 P.M. he would have to send for the papers to the office and at that time the particular subject clerk should be available, and we know that offices close at 4.30 P.M. Therefore, if the question is to be answered, I suggest that notice be given by at least 2 P.M.

கலாநாயகர்

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

I know it is rather difficult to answer questions at such short notice. There is no harm in an hon. Member giving notice even the day before, but the latest is 4 P.M. of that particular day.

கெ. சூ. சாதாசா

(கெ. சூ. சாதாசா)

(The Hon. Sugathadasa)

If notice is given late, then, sometimes, the answer can be given only on the next day.

கல துலில

கல துலில

(சுபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Yes, if notice is given at 4 P.M. I appreciate it would be rather difficult for the Minister to answer the question, because it might be necessary for him to consult his Permanent Secretary or other officials and get information. So, the earlier the notice is given the better. If notice is given at 4 P.M. and the Minister cannot give the answer on that day, he can ask for time. It is best to give notice early.

பார். சீ. சனாயகி மல.

(திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சனாயகி)

(Mr. R. G. Senanayake)

Sir, I am not questioning your Order. I only want to show the inconvenience of it all. If an hon. Member has two questions to ask of two separate Ministers, he will have to go in search of the two Ministers. Even hon. Members on the Government side will admit that. Will you allow us, Sir, to hand our questions to the Hon. Leader of the House?

கல துலில

கல துலில

(சுபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

You may hand them over at the Office of the Leader of the House.

புன்தல விமனல லுன் கல கலில வி.

வின விடுக்கப்பெற்று ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது.

Question put, and agreed to.

மன்தி மன்கிலல டில லுலில
 ல. க. 8.18 ட 1965 கல துலில 8 ல
 லு கல கலில லுல 1965
 கல துலில 14 ல லுலில
 ல. க. 10 ல லுல கல கலில.

அதன்படி சபை, அதனது 1965, செப்
 ரெம்பர் 8 ஆம் தேதிய தீர்மானத்துக்
 கிணங்க பி.ப. 8.18 க்கு, 1965, செப்ரெம்
 பர் 14 செவ்வாய்க்கிழமை மு. ப. 10
 மணிவரை ஒத்திவைக்கப்பெற்றது.

Adjourned accordingly at
 8.18 P.M. until 10 A.M. on Tues-
 day, 14th September 1965,
 pursuant to the Resolution of
 the House of 8th September
 1965.

දයක මුදල් : මුදල් ගෙවන දිනෙන් පසුව ඇරඹෙන මාසයේ සිට මාස 12ක් සඳහා රු. 32.00යි. අශෝඛිත පිටපත් සඳහා නම් රු. 35.00යි. මාස 6 කට භාග්‍යවෙන් අඩකි. පිටපතක් ගත 30යි. කැපලෙන් ගත 45යි. මුදල්, කොළඹ හාලු මුවදොර, මහලේ කම් කාර්යාලයේ රජයේ ප්‍රකාශන කාර්යාංශයේ අධිකාරී වෙත කලින් එවිය යුතුය.

1965

සන්නා : පணම කොටුදානන තේතියා යඹුද්තුවරුම මාතම තොඳකකම 12 මාතද්තකුරු රුපා 32.00 (තිරුද්තප්පඳාත පිරතිකුණු රුපා 35.00). 6 මාතද්තකුරු අරාකකද්දනම : තනිප්පිරති ජතම 30, තපාල්මුලම 45 ජතම, මුර්පනමාක අරාකක වෙවිඃද්ද අලුවලක අද්තිඃජරිඳම (ත. පෙ. 500, අරාකක කරුමකම, කොමුමපු 1) ජෙලුද්දතම.

1965

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

1965