

61 වන කාණ්ඩය

8 වන කලාපය

බහස්පතින්ද

1965 අගෝස්තු 26



# පාර්ලිමේන්තු විවාද

(හැන්සාඩ්)

නියෝජිත මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩලයේ

තිල වාර්තාව

අන්තර්ගත ප්‍රධාන කරුණු

ප්‍රශ්නවලට වෘත්තික පිළිතුරු [නි. 1718]

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පණත, 1965-66 [හත්වන වෙන් කළ දිනය]  
[නි. 1743] :

දෙවන වර කියවීම—විවාදය අවසන් කරන ලදී.

කෙටුම්පත් පණත පූර්ණ මන්ත්‍රී මණ්ඩල කාරක සභාවකට පවරන ලදී.

# பாராளுமன்ற விவாதங்கள்

(ஹன்சார்ட்)

பிரதிநிதிகள் சபை

அதிகாரபூர்வமான அறிக்கை

பிரதான உள்ளடக்கம்

வினாக்களுக்கு வாய்முல விடைகள் [ப. 1718]

ஒதுக்கீட்டு மசோதா, 1965-66 [ஒதுக்கப்பட்ட ஏழாம் நாள்] [ப. 1743] :

இரண்டாம் மதிப்பு—விவாதம் முடிவுற்றது

மசோதா முழுச்சபைக் குழுவுக்குச் சாட்டப்பட்டது

Volume 61

No. 8

Thursday,

26th August 1965

## PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OFFICIAL REPORT

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 1718]

APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965-66 [Seventh Allotted Day] [Col. 1743] :

Second Reading—Debate Concluded.

Bill Committed to Committee of Whole House













வாசக பிழைகள்

வாசக பிழைகள்

கனடாவுக்குக் காணாமல் போன பணத்தைப் பற்றி அறியுமா? (அ) ஆம் எனில், அது எவ்வளவு? (ஆ) இல்லாவிட்டால், அதற்குக் காரணம் என்ன? (இ) அது எவ்வளவு நேரம் காலமாக காணாமல் போனது? (ஈ) அது எவ்வளவு நேரம் காலமாக காணாமல் போனது? (ஊ) அது எவ்வளவு நேரம் காலமாக காணாமல் போனது?

காணி, நீர்ப்பாசன, மின்சக்தி அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா: (அ) பிபிஐத் தொகுதிக்கு ஸ்ரீ லங்கா சுதந்திரக் கட்சி அபேட்சகரான திரு. ரென்னி டி. மெல் இங்கினியாகலயிலுள்ள கல்லோயா அபிவிருத்திச் சபைக்குச் சொந்தமான கட்டடம் ஒன்றை அவருடைய தேர்தல் வேலைக்குரிய அலுவலகமாக உபயோகித்தார் என்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஆ) இக்கட்டடம் எத்தனைவகைகாகக் கட்டப்பட்டது? (இ) திரு. மெல்லினுடைய தேர்தல் வேலைக்குரிய அலுவலகமாக உபயோகிப்பதற்கென இக்கட்டடம் அவருக்குக் கொடுக்கப்பட்டுள்ளதா? (ஈ) ஆமெனில், யாரால், எப்பொழுது அவ்வனுமதி வழங்கப்பட்டது? (உ) திரு. மெல்லிற்கு இக்கட்டடத்தை வழங்கியதன் மூலம் தவறியமைக்கப்பட்டுள்ளமையால் பொறுப்புடைய உத்தியோகத்தார்களுக்கு எதிராக அவர் ஒழுங்கு நடவடிக்கை எடுப்பாரா?

asked the Minister of Land, Irrigation and Power: (a) Is he aware that Mr. Ronnie de Mel, the Sri Lanka Freedom Party candidate for Bibile, used a building at Inginiyagala, belonging to the Gal Oya Development Board as an office for his election work? (b) For what purpose has this building been constructed? (c) Had this been given over to Mr. de Mel to use it as an office for his election work? (d) If so, by whom has this permission been given and when? (e) In view of the fact that an irregularity has been done in giving this building to Mr. de Mel, will he take disciplinary action against the officers responsible?

செனேவிரத்ன மஹா. (திரு. செனேவிரத்ன) (Mr. Seneviratne) (அ) தோடித்தி. (ஆ) இலங்கை சமூககார ஸ்தலவகைக் கட்டடம் கட்டி அதை கனடாவுக்குக் காணாமல் போனது. (இ) அது எவ்வளவு நேரம் காலமாக காணாமல் போனது? (ஈ) அது எவ்வளவு நேரம் காலமாக காணாமல் போனது? (ஊ) அது எவ்வளவு நேரம் காலமாக காணாமல் போனது?

**செனேவிரத்ன மஹா. : 1 வது பத்திரிகைப் பக்கம்**

திரு. போ. ச. எழுதுவீனார் சேவை: முதல் வகுப்புக்குப் பதவியுயர்வு C.T.B. CLERICAL SERVICE: PROMOTIONS TO CLASS I

12. ஸ்தலவகை உயர்வு. உயர்வு. செனேவிரத்ன (செனேவிரத்ன) (கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா—யட்டியாந்தோட்டை) (Dr. N. M. Perera—Yatiantota)

சனகம் சேவா அமைதிக்கான அடிப்படை பணம்: (அ) செனேவிரத்ன மஹா. சேவையின் 1 வது பத்திரிகைப் பக்கம் கட்டடம் கட்டி அதை கனடாவுக்குக் காணாமல் போனது. (ஆ) அது எவ்வளவு நேரம் காலமாக காணாமல் போனது? (இ) அது எவ்வளவு நேரம் காலமாக காணாமல் போனது? (ஈ) அது எவ்வளவு நேரம் காலமாக காணாமல் போனது? (ஊ) அது எவ்வளவு நேரம் காலமாக காணாமல் போனது?



லாவிக பிழைப்பு

லாவிக பிழைப்பு

வர்த்தக, வியாபார அமைச்சரின் பாராளுமன்றக் காரியதரிசியைக் கேட்ட வினா: (அ) 1965 ஆம் ஆண்டின் இரண்டாம் அரை வருடத்திற்குரிய துணிக் கூப்பன்கள் இன்னமும் வெளிப்படுத்தப்படவில்லை என்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஆ) இதனை வெளிப்படுத்துவதிலுள்ள தாமதத்திற்கான காரணமென்ன? (இ) இதனை நிவர்த்தி செய்வதற்கு அவர் உடனடியாக நடவடிக்கைகள் மேற்கொள்வாரா?

asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Commerce and Trade: (a) Is he aware that the textile coupons for the second half of 1965 have not yet been declared? (b) What is the reason for the delay in this declaration? (c) Would he take immediate steps to rectify this?

එස්. ඒ. පීරිස් මයා. (ලාංකීය හා වෙළඳ ආමතියේ පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්)

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

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

(a) Rice ration book coupon No. 108 was valid till 31st July 1965 for issue of textiles. From 1st August 1965 coupon No. 105 has been validated for issue of textiles. (b) No delay. (c) Does not arise.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

My complaint is that you cancelled the validity of coupon No. 108 by telegram. So, the people who held the coupon were unable to use the coupon. Normally, a fortnight's time is given before a coupon is invalidated. Why did you not do that?

එස්. ඒ. පීරිස් මයා.

(திரு. எஸ். ஏ. பிரிஸ்)

(Mr. S. A. Peeris)

Coupon No. 108 was valid up to 31st July 1965. We cancelled coupon No. 107 because most of the traders had collected coupon No. 107 before it was valid. That is why No. 107 was cancelled.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Has the Hon. Minister now validated an additional coupon?

එස්. ඒ. පීරිස් මයා.

(திரு. எஸ். ஏ. பிரிஸ்)

(Mr. S. A. Peeris)

Not yet, but we propose to do so. It will be known very soon.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

What is the number?

එස්. ඒ. පීරිස් මයා.

(திரு. எஸ். ஏ. பிரிஸ்)

(Mr. S. A. Peeris)

I do not propose to disclose the number now.

නක්කාවිට රජයේ පාසැල

நக்காவிற்ற அரசாங்க பாடசாலை

NAKKAWITA GOVERNMENT SCHOOL

1. ලෙස්ලී ගුනවර්ධන මයා. (පානදුර—ඩී. පී. ආර්. වීරසේකර මයා.—දෙහිඔවිට—වෙනුවට)

(திரு. லெஸ்லி குணவர்தன—பாணந்துறை—திரு. டி. பி. ஆர். வீரசேக்கர—தெகிபோ விற்ற—சார்பில்)

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

අධ්‍යයන හා සංස්කෘතික කටයුතු ඇමති ගෙන් ඇසූ ප්‍රශ්නය: (අ) නක්කාවිට රජයේ පාසැලේ ශිෂ්‍යයින් 352 දෙනෙකුගේ දිනපතා පැමිණීමක් තිබෙන බව එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ආ) මෙම පාසැලේ ගුරු මණ්ඩලයේ ගුරුවරුන් එකලොස් දෙනෙකු සිටින බව එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ඉ) මේ පාසැල සඳහා ඇත්තේ තාවකාලික වහලක් ඇති අඩි 80×20ක ගොඩනැගිල්ලක් පමණක් බව එතුමා දන්නවාද? (ඊ) මේ පාසැල සඳහා අඩි 100×20ක ගොඩනැගිල්ලක් ඉදිකිරීමට පසු ගිය රජය රුපියල් 8,000 මුදලක් අනුමත කළ බව එතුමා දන්නවාද? (උ) ග්‍රාම සංවර්ධන



වාචික පිළිතුරු

වාචික පිළිතුරු

තනතුර සඳහා පුද්ගලයෙකු තෝරා ගැනීමට විභාගයක් පවත්වන ලද්දේද? (ඉ) එසේ නම්, ඉල්ලුම්කරුවන් කී දෙනෙක් සිටියේද? (ඊ) තෝරා ගන්නා ලද ඉල්ලුම්කරුවාගේ නම කුමක්ද? (උ) තෝරා ගන්නා ලද අපේක්ෂකයා ග්‍රාම සේවක විභාගයෙන් සමත් වී තිබේද? (ඌ) තෝරා ගත් අපේක්ෂකයා කලින් සිටි ගම්මුලාදානියෙක්ද? (එ) ඔහුට ඉතා ඉක්මණින් මෙම පත්වීම දීම සඳහා කටයුතු කර ඇත්තේ මන්ද?

உள்ளாட்டு விவகார அமைச்சரைக் கேட்ட வினா : (அ) தெஹியோவிற்பற்த் தேர்தல் தொகுதியிலுள்ள அல்கொட வசமவிற்கு கிராம சேவகர் ஒருவரை நியமிப்பதற்கு நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கப்பட்டுள்ளதா? (ஆ) இப்பதவிக்கு ஒருவரைத் தெரிவு செய்வதற்கென பரீட்சை ஒன்று நடாத்தப்பட்டுள்ளதா? (இ) ஆமெனில், விண்ணப்பதாரர்களின் எண்ணிக்கை என்ன? (ஈ) தெரிவு செய்யப்பட்ட விண்ணப்பதாரரின் பெயர் என்ன? (உ) தெரிவு செய்யப்பட்ட பரீட்சார்த்தி கிராம சேவகர் பரீட்சையில் சித்தியெய்துள்ளாரா? (ஊ) தெரிவு செய்யப்பட்ட பரீட்சார்த்தி ஒரு முன்னாள் கிராம விதானையா? (எ) அவருக்கு இந்நியமனத்தை மிக விரைவாக வழங்குவதற்கு நடவடிக்கைகள் எடுக்கப்பட்டுள்ளதற்குரிய காரணங்கள் என்ன?

asked the Minister of Home Affairs :  
 (a) Has action been taken to appoint a Grama Sevaka to the Algoda Wasama in the Dehiowita electorate?  
 (b) Has an examination been held to select a person for this post? (c) If so, how many applicants were there?  
 (d) What is the name of the selected applicant? (e) Has the selected candidate passed the Grama Sevaka examination? (f) Has the selected candidate been an ex-Village Headman? (g) Why have steps been taken to give him this appointment very quickly?

ගරු ආචාර්ය බබිලිවි. දහනායක (සවදේශ කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමති)

(கௌரவ கலாநிதி டபிள்யூ. தகநாயக்க—உள்ளாட்டு விவகார அமைச்சர்)

(The Hon. Dr. W. Dahanayake—Minister of Home Affairs)

(a) to (g) An acting arrangement has now been made in the Algoda Wasama in the Kegalla District. A retired village headman, Mr. M. M. Jayawardene Banda, has been appointed to act. A permanent grama-sevaka will be appointed when the new batch of grama-sevakas are recruited. An examination for grama-sevakas was held in January this year and the results will shortly be published after interviews are conducted in the various districts. Eighty-five candidates have taken up the examination for the vacancies in the D. R. O's division in which Algoda Wasama is situated. The only vacancy in this division is at Algoda.

ලේස්ලි ගුනවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. லெஸ்லி குணவர்தன) (Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

The Hon. Minister stated that the examination for the appointment of grama-sevakas took place in January. It is now August. What is the reason for the delay in the selection of the candidates for these vacancies?

ගරු ආචාර්ය දහනායක

(கௌரவ கலாநிதி தகநாயக்க) (The Hon. Dr. Dahanayake)

The reason for the delay is that the Examinations Department has not been able to finish their work. That is the only reason. We are waiting for the results which have to be sent to us by the department. I have kept on reminding them time and again and they are doing their best to speed up matters.

ලේස්ලි ගුනවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. லெஸ்லி குணவர்தன) (Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

Is it not true that the real reason for the delay in making these appointments or getting the results of the

வாஸீக பிஃரீதுர்

வாஸீக பிஃரீதுர்

[ரெஸீலீ ஓனவரீவன மயா.]

examination is that neither the Minister nor the Department of Examinations has been able to make up his or its mind as to how to hold the *viva voce* test ?

ஈபுரூமெ கைரலே ஈபுமலீகநீட  
பீதபடய : ஓம ஈவரீவன ஈமீநீய பவநீ  
னீ பாஈரூ

அதுளுகம் கோரணீ ஈபுமலீகநீதக் குடியேற்றம் :  
கிராமாபிவிருத்தி ஈங்கம் ஆரம்பித்த பாடசாலை

SAPUMALKANDA COLONY IN ATULUGAM  
KORALE : SCHOOL STARTED BY R. D. S.

ஓர் ஈவரீய டஹநாயக

(கௌரவ கலாநிதி தகநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dr. Dahanayake)

We have made up our minds as to how to hold the *viva voce* test, and I can assure the hon. Member that at our end we have been trying our best to expedite matters. There is no reason whatever why we should delay making the appointments. We are awaiting reminder and tell them that the hon. Member and various other Members have made representations on this question. I myself agree with them.

3. ரெஸீலீ ஓனவரீவன மயா. (ஈ. பி.  
ஈர். வீரசேக்கர மயா.வெதுவடு)

(திரு. லெஸ்லீ குணவரீதன—திரு. ம. பீ.  
ஆர். வீரசேக்கர சார்பில்)

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

ஈயாபன ஓ ஈஈக்காநீக கடுயு ஈமீநீ  
கை ஈஈ பூநீய : (ஈ) ஈபுரூமெ  
கைரலே ஈபுமலீகநீட பீதபடயே ஓம  
ஈவரீவன ஈமீநீய 1964 டேஈலீலீர் மஈ 9  
வநீ டீந பாஈரூன் பவநீ னீ லவ ஈதும  
டீநவாட? (ஈ) மெம பாஈரூ ஈஈய  
ஈநீ 45 டேநெகுகனே டீநபயா பூமீனீமீ  
நீலெந லவ ஈதும டீநவாட? (ஓ) மெம  
பாஈரூ ஓர் மனீவரெயே ஓர்வரீயநீ  
துநீ டேநெகுக ஈபீந லவ ஈதும, டீந  
வாட? (ஈ) டீநவ ஈபீந ஓர் மனீவரெயநீ  
ஈமெ மெம பாஈரூ பவரூ ஈநீமடு ஈதும  
ஓகீமனீநீ கடுயு கரவாட? (ஈ)  
ஈசே நமீ, ஈீ கவடாட? நைஈசே நமீ,  
ஈீ மனீட?

ரெஸீலீ ஓனவரீவன மயா.

(திரு. லெஸ்லீ குணவரீதன)

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

Since I have had occasion to make personal representations on this matter both to the Hon. Minister and his Permanent Secretary about two or three months ago, will the Hon. Minister consider this to be a vitally important matter and somehow get the Department of Examinations moving in order to make these appointments ?

கல்வி, கலாச்சாா விவகார அமைச்சரைக்  
கேட்ட வினா : (அ) அதுளுகம் கோறனையைச்  
சேர்ந்த ஈபுமலீகநீதக் குடியேற்றத்திலுள்ள  
கிராமாபிவிருத்தி ஈங்கம் 1964, டிசெம்பர் 9  
ஆம் தேதி பாடசாலையொன்றை ஆரம்பித்த  
தென்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஆ) இப்பாட  
சாலையின் தினசரி வரவு 45 என்பதை அவர்  
அறிவாரா? (இ) இப்பாடசாலையில் மூன்று  
பெண் ஆசிரியைகள் கடமையாற்றுகின்றன  
ரென்பதை அவர் அறிவாரா? (ஈ) தற்போ  
துள்ள ஆசிரியர்களுடன் இப்பாடசாலையைப்  
பொறுப்பேற்பதற்கு அவர் விரைவாக நட  
வடிக்கைகள் எடுப்பாரா? (உ) அவ்வாறாயின்,  
எப்பொழுது? அன்றேல், ஏன்?

ஓர் ஈவரீய டஹநாயக

(கௌரவ கலாநிதி தகநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dr. Dahanayake)

I shall do that.

asked the Minister of Education and  
Cultural Affairs: (a) Is he aware  
that the Rural Development Society  
of the Sapumalkanda Colony in the  
Atulugam Korale started a school on  
9th December, 1964? (b) Is he

මාචික පිළිතුරු

මාචික පිළිතුරු

aware that there is a daily attendance of 45 pupils in this school? (c) Is he aware that there are three lady teachers on the staff of this school? (d) Will he take early steps to take over this school with the present staff? (e) If so, when and if not, why?

ජයසූරිය මයා.

(කිතු. ඉයාසුරිය)  
(Mr. Jayasuriya)

(අ) එසේය, (ආ) එසේය, (ඉ) එසේය, (ඊ) නැත. (උ) ගොඩනැගිලි නාවකාලික හෙයින් එය පවරා ගත නොහැක. 1961. 2. 15 දිනට පසුව පාසැල ආරම්භ කර ඇති හෙයින්, දැනට පවත්නා රෙගුලාසි අනුව ගුරුවරුන්ට රජයේ පත්වීම් දිය නොහැක.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා  
(කලාත්ති ආචාර්ය. ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)  
(Dr. N. M. Perera)

ඉස්කෝලය රජයට අරගෙන තිබෙන විද?

ජයසූරිය මයා.

(කිතු. ඉයාසුරිය)  
(Mr. Jayasuriya)

නැහැ.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා  
(කලාත්ති ආචාර්ය. ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)  
(Dr. N. M. Perera)

ඇයි?

ජයසූරිය මයා.

(කිතු. ඉයාසුරිය)  
(Mr. Jayasuriya)

නිබෙන්තෙ නාවකාලික ගොඩනැගිල්ලක්. එතන ගොඩනැගිලි නැහැ. රජයේ අවසර අරගෙන තිබෙන එකක් නොවෙයි.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා  
(කලාත්ති ආචාර්ය. ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)  
(Dr. N. M. Perera)

මේ ගොඩනැගිලි පමණක් නොවෙයි නාවකාලික ගොඩනැගිලි වශයෙන් තිබෙන්නේ. නාවකාලික ගොඩනැගිලි තිබෙන පාඨශාලා ඕනෑ තරම් බාරගෙන තිබෙනව. මේ පාසැලට පමණක් විශේෂයක් ඇයි?

ජයසූරිය මයා.

(කිතු. ඉයාසුරිය)  
(Mr. Jayasuriya)

මේ පාසැල සම්බන්ධයෙන් පමණක් නොවෙයි, රෙගුලාසියේ හැටියට නාවකාලිකව ගොඩනැගිලි පවරා ගන්නට ඉඩක් නැහැ, රක්ෂාවල් දීම සඳහා.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාත්ති ආචාර්ය. ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)  
(Dr. N. M. Perera)

රක්ෂාවල් වශයෙන් නොවෙයි.

ජයසූරිය මයා.

(කිතු. ඉයාසුරිය)  
(Mr. Jayasuriya)

අවට තිබෙන අනික් පාසැල් ගත සොයා බලා අවශ්‍යතාවයක් තිබෙනවා නම් ගන්න පුළුවන්.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාත්ති ආචාර්ය. ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)  
(Dr. N. M. Perera)

පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්තුමා දැනගන්න ඕනෑ අවසරයක් තැනිව පාසැලක් පවත් ගන්නේ නැති බව. නාවකාලික අවසරයක් ගන්නව. රිජිස්ටර් කරන්න අධ්‍යාපන දෙපාර්තමේන්තුව බැඳී නැහැ. නමුත් ලමයින් 45 ක් පමණ සිටිනව නම් බාර ගන්නේ නැත්තේ ඇයි? ඔබට වඩා අබලන් ගොඩනැගිලි බාරගෙන තිබෙනව.

පර්සි වික්‍රමසිංහ මයා. (කඹුරුපිටිය)

(කිතු. පෝර්නි බික්‍රමසිංහ—කම්පුරුපිටිය)  
(Mr. Percy Wickremasinghe—Kam-

burupitiya)

ගරු කථානායකතුමනි, මටත් අතුරු ප්‍රශ්නයක් අහන්න තිබෙනව.

කථානායකතුමා

(අපාඤ්ඤා ආචාර්ය)  
(Mr. Speaker)

අතුරු ප්‍රශ්න තුනක් අහලා ඉවරයි. ඉඩ දෙන්න බැහැ.

விசர்சன கெடுதலின் பரிசு, 1965-66

—தேவநகர கிளையிலே

மன்றத் தினாசரியின் கருவியு

அ. கா. 10.20

சபை அலுவலர்

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

பி. சி. வி. கையாண்டு மொ. (மூட கையாண்டு துன்பம் மன்றத் தினாசரி)

மறு படிவம் மன்றத்தின் பரிசுசேர்த்தல் விசு :

(திரு. பி. ஜி. பி. கையாண்டு—கொழும்பு மத்திய மூன்றாம் அங்கத்தவர்)

பின்வரும் பிரேரணை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது :

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

Resolved :

“That Tuesday, 31st August; Wednesday, 1st September; Thursday, 2nd September; and Friday, 3rd September, 1965; be Allotted Days for the consideration of the Appropriation Bill, 1965-66.”— [அ. சி. பி. 4 கிளையிலே]

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the Hon. Minister of Finance is not here at the moment. Debating the Budget speech in his absence is rather like staging a performance of Hamlet without the grave-digger. Nevertheless, my Hon. Friend has successfully introduced the first Budget of the so-called National Government. I should like straightway, to thank him for doing so. He has done the country an injury, but he has done the Opposition a service.

மன்றத் தினாசரியின் சிபிசேர்த்தல்

சபை அலுவலர்

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

My Hon. Friend has a reputation for being a modest man. If I may borrow a phrase of Winston Churchill, I should like to say that this Budget shows that the Minister of Finance has a great deal to be modest about. Hon. Members opposite repeatedly told us that the Hon. Minister of Finance is not a man with a golden brain. We thank them for that confirmation. They told us that the Hon. Minister of Finance is a simple man from the Wannai, a leader of such simple men, a man who prefers on all occasions to use his commonsense rather than his brains.

மறு படிவம் மன்றத்தின் பரிசுசேர்த்தல் விசு :

பின்வரும் பிரேரணை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது :

Resolved :

“That this House at its rising this day do adjourn until 10 A.M. on Friday, 27th August 1965.”— [அ. சி. பி. 4 கிளையிலே]

விசர்சன கெடுதலின் பரிசு

1965-66

ஒதுக்கீட்டு மசோதா, 1965-66

APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965-66

கல் தகவல் துடி விவாதம் தவ் துடிவன் பவன்வது பிண்பிசு நியோசன கிளையிலே துடி. சிவ் துடிவல் பவன்வது [தயோசன 9.]

I must protest against this slander of my Friend the Hon. Minister of Finance. His speech was certainly pitched in a modest and minor key. It was refreshingly free from the bombast and the flights of poetic fancy that characterized the Budget speeches of the two Jayewardenes in the days of the old U. N. P. Government. No doubt, that deficiency will be made up by my hon. Friend from Jaffna.

“கெடுதலின் பரிசுசேர்த்தல் துடி தேவநகர கிளையிலே பவன்வது”—[அ. சி. பி. 4 கிளையிலே]

பவன்வது பவன்வது பவன்வது பவன்வது

வினா மீதான ஒத்திவைக்கப்பெற்ற விவாதம் மீள ஆரம்பிப்பதற்கான கட்டுரை வாசிக்கப்பட்டது.

“மசோதா இப்பொழுது இரண்டாம் முறை மதிக்கப்படுமா” —[கையாண்டு வன்னிநாயக்க]

வினா மீண்டும் எடுத்தியம்பப் பெற்றது.

Order read for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question.—[9th August].

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

Question again proposed.

But the fact is that the Hon. U. B. Wanninayake, that simple and modest exponent of commonsense from the Wannai, has shown in this Budget that

he is in every respect as determined a defender—and in many respects a more honest defender—of imperialist and big capitalist interests in this country as any of his U. N. P. predecessors.

I thank him most sincerely on behalf of the Opposition for presenting this Budget. He has revealed, with startling clarity and frankness, the true nature and class character of the so-called National Government as the representative of foreign vested interests and big Ceylonese capitalism, the instrument of their domination over this country, the agency of neo-colonialist penetration of Ceylon's economy. It is no mean achievement to have done that after only five months in office. That is why Sir, I thank and congratulate the Hon. Minister of Finance.

It is characteristic of this Government that this Budget Debate had to be postponed twice. Despite the Prime Minister's illness and absence from work, the Estimates were ready and tabled on the due date. But the *hath hawula* was not sure exactly how much money the consortium of imperialist and capitalist nations, to whom they had appealed for aid, was ready to spare to bail them out.

It is a very big word—consortium. The newspapers call them the "Aid Ceylon Club." I intend to call them the "Aid U. N. P. Club" because I do not wish to use the big word "consortium" right throughout my speech.

What a sorry comment on the independence and capacity of this Government that it did not have the strength to start a Budget Debate until it knew how much foreign "aid" it was going to get from the Aid U. N. P. Club, from the imperialist and capitalist world. This shows their utter dependence on foreign imperialism and justifies the comment made by the hon. member for Agalawatta (Mr. Anil Moonesinghe) that this Budget was "made in the U. S. A."

I shall show later in my speech that the seemingly low key in which the

Budget speech was pitched is due less to the allegedly modest character of the Minister of Finance than to the fact that the Aid U. N. P. Club did not rise to the expectations or justify the hopes which my hon. Friends placed in it.

Mr. Speaker, as this is the first Budget of a new Government one would have thought that the main emphasis would have been on how far forward this Budget will take us. Instead, and significantly enough, one of the dominant themes of this Debate has been how far backwards the National Government has gone in this Budget.

The speeches of Hon. Ministers—the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Health and the Minister of State in particular—showed quite patently that although they serve the same cause they do not see eye to eye on the best way how it can be put over.

The Minister of State, for instance, singled out the Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) as the real villain of the piece. The Minister of Health, on the other hand, referred to Mr. T. B. Ilangaratne in these terms.

"... he is the person who is responsible for bringing the country to doom." —[OFFICIAL REPORT, 19th August 1965; Vol. 61, c. 657.]

It is not often in fiction and horror stories that you get such a generous choice of villains.

The Hon. Ministers could not even agree on the question of how far back this Budget takes us.

The central theme of the speeches of the Hon. Minister of Health and the Hon. Minister of Finance was that the *hath hawula* was wiping the slate clean of all the accumulated mess from April 1956 to April 1965 and starting afresh from where the U. N. P. Governments left off.

The Hon. Minister of State took up a different position. He argued that all that this Budget does is to wipe the slate clean of the horrors of what

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[කෙනෙත් මය.]

he called "expropriation by taxation" introduced by the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) in the 1964-65 Budget. The Hon. Minister of State said that this Budget was really going back to 1963-64, the last Budget of what he called the "pure S. L. F. P.", and that this Budget was actually going further forward by soaking the rich more than the "pure S. L. F. P." had done.

I shall deal with the speech of the Hon. Minister of State a little later. All I would like to say at this moment is this. The Hon. Minister of State had been a long time in politics; but, apparently, he has still to realize that while it is sometimes dangerous in politics to be clever, it is nearly always fatal to be too clever by half.

The hon. Member for Yatiyantota also touched on this theme in the course of his speech. I refer to the theme on how far back this Budget takes us. When he opened the Debate on behalf of the Opposition, the hon. Member for Yatiyantota said that Mr. D. S. Senanayake abolished the death duties, had any Ceylonese Government made such open, unashamed and sweeping concessions to the capitalist class as this Government has done. The hon. Member for Yatiyantota is right. This Budget is the biggest sell-out to the foreign and local vested interests by any Ceylonese Government in a living memory, including the U. N. P. Governments from 1947 to 1956.

In some respects this Budget is even more reactionary than the notorious "hartal Budget" of 1953. In 1953 the U. N. P. Government hit the masses in the stomach by the withdrawal of the rice subsidy and similar measures. But even then they did not take steps to relieve the capitalist class of the taxation which they had then to pay. In this Budget they have put the entire country in pawn to the foreign and local vested interests.

The main feature of the Budget has already been mentioned by the

previous speakers. The main feature is that the Government gives about 25,000 top people a bonus of around Rs. 60 million in tax concessions of one type or another. The first point I want to make about this—this point has been mentioned and I would like to establish it in some detail—is that the principal beneficiaries from the abolition and reduction of taxes in this Budget introduced by the simple and modest Minister of the Wann, as well as from the other economic measures that this Government has taken since it assumed office, are the foreign companies and businessmen in Ceylon.

The National Government, whose main concern is to serve foreign business, has given these people a bonus. It is worth recapitulating the benefits that these foreign capitalists have received both as a separate group and as part of the general capitalist structure of Ceylon.

First, even before the Budget was introduced, the Government, hurriedly and contrary to the law for which they themselves voted, agreed to pay the three American and British Oil Companies a sum of Rs. 58.7 million.

ඉරු ඩිවිලි සේනානායක (අලුමානා සහ ආරක්ෂක හා විදේශ කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමති සහ ක්‍රම සම්පාදක හා ආර්ථික කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ඇමති)

(කෙරෙහි උද්ගාර ජනාධිපති—පිරිසිදු අමෙසරුම පාලනාදාය, වෙළුම් විවකාර අමෙසරුම තිද්ද අමෙසරුම, පොලුලාතාර විවකාර අමෙසරුම)

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

We will discuss that tomorrow.

කෙනෙත් මය.  
(තිලු. කෙසමන්)  
(Mr. Keuneman)

Sir, this is what they have done. Whether they are trying to write a postscript to it tomorrow or not, does not concern me.

This sum is almost twice what the assets of the oil companies are worth. The officials set up to value these

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

assets by the previous Government valued them at Rs. 30 million—  
[Interruption.] I know my hon. Friends opposite are very uncomfortable when I mention this.

ශ්‍රී සුගතදාස

(கௌரவ சுகததாச)

(The Hon. Sugathadasa)

No, not at all.

කේනමන් මයා.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I am not discussing the details of the deal, Sir. I am only trying to show the extent of their treachery. This sum is going to be paid to the oil companies in sterling and dollars. I want to draw your attention to the sum concerned. It is more than the total vote for capital expenditure on economic development of the Ministry of Land, Irrigation and Power in this Budget, which is Rs. 55.5 million. Three oil companies are getting this, to start with, even before the Budget. This sum is even more than the total credit of Rs. 55 million which this Government is going to allow commercial banks to grant to the private sector for the whole of the next year. It is not small change that they are doling out.

I shall establish this in greater detail when the debate starts tomorrow. I shall only say this now: as this payment is to be free of all Ceylon taxes, it is tantamount to giving these people about Rs. 80 million or more. After all they asked for only Rs. 100 million. That was one of this Government's first acts in the economic field.

Secondly, the prohibition on Ceylonese opening new bank accounts in foreign commercial banks will be withdrawn. This is the only meaning of the Minister of Finance's statement at column 122 that the Government will "repeal the restriction imposed on foreign banks by the 1961 Finance Act." There is no other meaning.

You will recall what happened in the Debate on the Finance Act of 1961. There was a big demand in

the country that the foreign banks should be nationalized. I recall that the Hon. Minister of Industries in those days used to make very good speeches on this question. It was even suggested that, if the foreign banks could not be nationalized, Ceylonese should be prohibited from having accounts in banks other than the Bank of Ceylon and the People's Bank. Well, Sir, the then Government decided to take a step forward. I, personally on that occasion, said that it did not go far enough, but it took the important step of prohibiting Ceylonese from opening new accounts in foreign banks. My hon. Friend the Minister of Finance rescinds this. Why? Have the foreign commercial banks helped in economic development? It was only after the S. L. F. P. prohibited the opening of new accounts in foreign commercial banks and gave weightage to the State banks that we began to find the State banks in a position to help to finance industrial development. The history of foreign commercial banks here has been one of short-term financing of the import-export trade. These people who talk about economic development now say, "Let us even cancel the small step forward that was taken in 1961". They will now restore the foreign commercial banks to their original power and glory and give them the power to undermine the State banks and undermine the economy of this country as well.

Thirdly, the moratorium on the export of profits, dividends and interest by foreign firms which was introduced by the hon. Member for Yatiyantota, when he was Minister of Finance, is to be withdrawn. This is not a small concession. My Hon. Friend the Minister of Finance said that this month he was going to allow them to remit Rs. 2 million. This was a one year moratorium. At the end of the one year period there will be no moratorium.

This is not a small gift that my modest Friend, who is just coming in, has given. In 1963, before the moratorium was imposed—we cannot take 1964 for the moratorium

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[කෙතමන් මය.]

was imposed in the middle of that year—remittance on this account amounted to Rs. 53 million. It is no small change that they are giving—[Interruption]. I do not blame you if you do not remember the speech of your Minister. You have my sympathy.

These foreign firms do not even have to pay the foreign exchange tax hereafter (Rs. 5 million). The company tax on foreign firms has been reduced by 7 per cent. which gives them Rs. 9.7 million more to distribute among their shareholders abroad. It is a loss to revenue and a gain to their shareholders. They do not even have to pay the visa tax. I see that the hon. Appointed Member (Mr. Thondaman) is here; he has spoken a lot about it. He opposed the visa tax. These gentlemen—the U. N. P. gentlemen—all supported it! I think the visa tax brought in about Rs. 3 million. About 7,500 people paid it; about 300 of them were U. K. citizens and the rest were largely citizens of our great neighbour.

I do not want to go into details about how foreign capitalists will gain from the reductions in the capital gains tax, the wealth tax and income tax. But there are also other benefits which this class of capitalists receive to which attention has not been drawn.

Speakers before me, principally the hon. Member for Yatiyantota, have shown that the so-called relief to consumers by the abolition of customs' duties on certain food items is so small that it cannot be passed on to the consumer. In practice, a person will have to purchase 5 pounds of onions, 2 pounds of potatoes, 2 pounds of dhal and one pound of chillies to get one cent relief on each item. If the abolition of customs' duties on certain food items cannot be passed on to the consumers, it means, in practice, a relief of tax to food importers to the tune of about Rs. 10 million! And who imports these food items? My hon. Friend the Member for Yatiyantota, when

he was Minister gave some interesting information about this matter. There is an association situated in my constituency called the Food Importers' Association. This association imports all these food items. It has 52 members, 51 of whom are Borah and Sindhi merchants and many of whom the United National Party made distinguished citizens of this country. Only one of them is a citizen by descent. Most of the distinguished citizenships were granted during the time of the U. N. P.

This is another matter to which other hon. Members have referred. It is a matter to which reference will be made very often. Foreign companies in Ceylon, for the first time since the notorious Waste Land Ordinance of the Colonial days, are to be allowed the lease of Crown land for the production of subsidiary foodstuffs on a capitalist plantation basis of large units of several hundreds of acres on a long-term lease of 25 years. This is a fundamental and retrograde departure from the past policies of land alienation. It is bad enough to give State lands to big capitalist firms but it is worse when you include foreign capitalist firms too.

Sir, you know that non-Ceylonese are prohibited under the law from getting land under colonization schemes or village expansion schemes. It was only a few weeks ago that this Government accepted the Motion of the hon. fair Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike) asking that non-Ceylonese be legally prohibited from acquiring any further land or immovable property in Ceylon. My hon. Friends opposite voted for it, but obviously they did so with their tongues in their cheeks because at that very moment their Minister of Land was negotiating with a number of companies, including foreign companies, like Messrs. Carson Cumberbatch, and so on, to give thousands of acres of land on long-term leases to grow foodstuffs.

Look at some of the people who will now replace the landless peasants of this country as recipients of Crown land.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

In this connection, I should like to refer you to an article in "The Times of Ceylon" of Friday the 20th August 1965, which is very interesting. I quote :

*"Food drive under way  
Private Firms Start With Vegetables—"*

It is a series of quotations from various worthy gentlemen about how much they appreciate the confidence that the Members of the National Government have placed in them. To quote :

"Spokesmen of big firms and agency houses today gave. "The Times of Ceylon" this picture of the progress made so far and of plans for the immediate future :—

Mr. G. I. de Glanville, Director of Carson Cumberbatch & Co., Ltd., a pioneer of the private sector food project, told "The Times of Ceylon" yesterday that his firm would be shortly floating a company to undertake the production of subsidiary foodstuffs such as onions, chillies and maize, in the dry zone under artificial irrigation.

The Government, he said, had already made provisional allotment of 200 acres of Crown land in the zone and they hoped to go into production in the coming monsoon.

The same company proposed to set up a chain of marketing stores . . . ."

Then Mr. I. L. Ferdinands on behalf of Mackwoods Estate and Agencies Ltd., says :

"They also proposed to get about 1,000 acres of Crown land, possibly at Alutnuwara, for the production of subsidiary foodstuffs. A representative of the company was now there to survey the soil conditions and production possibilities for this project."

Another old friend of ours, Mr. S. H. Moosajee, Managing Director of Moosajees Ltd., says :

"That his firm had already taken steps to clear 1,000 acres of Crown land allotted by Government at Aluthrama, near Mahiyangana, for the growing of maize, groundnuts and chillies. Fifty acres had already been cleared."

Then another old friend :

"A spokesman for Messrs. Jafferjees said that they proposed to obtain about 1,000 acres of Crown land in the North-Western Province for the growing of subsidiary food crops . . . ."

"Mr. M. E. Wijesinghe, Chairman of the board of directors of Ceylon Cold Stores Ltd., said that they proposed sponsoring a public company for the establishment of a large animal husbandry farm . . . ."

"The British Ceylon Corporation Limited—"

The hon. Appointed Member (Mr. Singleton-Salmon—is not here—

"The British Ceylon Corporation Limited and Baur & Company Limited among other companies, have indicated their interest in such a project . . . ."

James Finlay & Company Limited have also asked their estates to produce food . . . ."

We have ourselves questioned the economic value of continuing to give out further Crown land under colonization schemes on a small individual peasant basis. The remedy we suggested was to encourage, with strict respect for the voluntary principle, steps towards more co-operative forms of agricultural production. We can argue about whether the time has come for this or not, but no one before this ever suggested leasing out large tracts of Crown land to private capitalist companies, including foreign companies, to grow food crops. The hon. Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike) made a speech in which he said—

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන (රාජ්‍ය ආමනි සහ අලාමානාතුමාගේන් රාජ්‍යාරක්ෂක හා විදේශ කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ආමනිගේන් පාර්ලිමේන්තු ලේකම්)

(කෙළරව ශ්‍රේ. ඥර. ඉයවර්තන—ඉරාඉරාඃක අමෙඃඃරුම පිරතම අමෙඃඃරුම පරාඉු කාර්පු වෙඃඃඃඃකර අමෙඃඃරුම පරාරාඃඃරුම කාරියතරිඃ)

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

Budget speech.

කෙතමන් මග.

(ඃරු. කෙතමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

—that he was thinking of giving out land on a similar basis ; but he never did it. That was a Budget

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[කෙනමන් මය.]

speech in which he made the suggestion which he, very wisely, did not proceed with. But this Government is proceeding to implement it in a big way. This is the *hath hawula* version of the Waste Lands Ordinance by which the imperialists robbed the up-country peasants of their ancestral land and the State of its land. I tell my hon. Friends across that this is one of the worst proposals in your Budget. We will oppose it tooth and nail.

I must say one thing for this Government. I do not want to be unfair; so I shall say this. This Government certainly remembers its friends. Unfortunately, it is only its big and influential friends that it seems to remember. They are the people who are being rewarded in the Budget. As far as the poor people who were duped into voting for the U. N. P.—[*Interruption.*] I am not insulting the people. I am complimenting you on your duplicity. As far as the people who were led astray to vote for the U. N. P. are concerned, some of them got a green shirt in the election—and all of them have got *hulang* in the Budget. Of course, their big supporters are being appointed to the boards of corporations, to the L. G. S. C., to the P. S. C., and some of them even to the judiciary as Commissioners of Assize.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාநிති என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

They were the people who objected to political appointments.

කෙනමන් මය.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I am not outraged by all this; I quite expected them to give jobs for the "boys". I was only saying that they are very generous towards the big people who supported them.

But the trouble is that the economic policy of the country is involved in this business. They have given big jobs to their defeated candidates. But—what is worse—they are giving big bonuses in the form of tax concessions to foreign and local capitalists, most of whom supported them.

Is the hon. Appointed Member (Mr. Singleton-Salmon) here? I am sorry he is not here. I should have liked to congratulate him: he is a very lucky man. The Appointed Member's vote proved decisive in the defeat of the Coalition Government on the 3rd of December 1964. The hon. Appointed Member is also the Chairman of B. C. C. Ltd. B. C. C. Ltd. is just one company in Ceylon, but my hon. Friends opposite have not forgotten it. First of all, they handed over to B. C. C. the distribution of Vita-spray.

ගුරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Nobody took it.

කෙනමන් මය.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

They took it without a tender! I bet you that in a short time they will add a few lakhs to their coffers. It is one of the few powdered milks available in the market.

ගුරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

Who ordered it?

කෙනමන් මය.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

This Government and all previous Governments have been able to distribute rice, flour, sugar, and many other things, but they cannot distribute Vitaspray. They have had to

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පතන, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

call for the assistance of B.C.C. Ltd. Never mind, B.C.C. has come to the rescue, and the hon. Appointed Member (Mr. Singleton-Salmon) is in luck's way.

Not only this. You remember that the hon. Appointed Member was one of the most consistent spokesmen in this House demanding the abolition of the bank debits tax. He has made many speeches against this tax demanding that it should be done away with. I am not surprised. I see from his speech as Chairman of B.C.C. to the meeting of shareholders in 1963, that B.C.C. Ltd. had to pay Rs. 59,000 as bank debits tax in that year. But now, Sir, good luck has come its way, thanks to the National Government. Happy days are here again! Rs. 10 shares of B.C.C. Ltd. which were selling before the Budget at Rs. 13 have now gone up to Rs. 16.

My good Friends opposite strenuously denied the charge that this Budget is designed to help the foreign and local capitalists. They should take a look at how the share market prices have been rocketing upwards

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන

(කෙළරාව ශ්‍රේ. මුර. ඉපාවර්තන)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

Confidence.

කේනමන් මයා.

(තිරු. කෙනමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

—since this Budget was announced.

One of the things I do for purely theoretical relaxation is to read the report of the share markets. It gives one a very good indication of what is going on in the business world. Share prices have been shooting upwards since this Budget was announced. The only other prices that have been shooting upwards in the same way after the Budget are the prices of fish and vegetables. That is another story.

Let me give you the figures—sterling companies have not thought of selling their shares in Ceylon yet—of foreign companies here, the companies registered in Ceylon, as well as the others. I have a long list here, but I do not want to take up the time of the House.

Take Chemical Industries, Colombo, successors to I.C.I. The Rs. 10 share which was selling at Rs. 16 before the Budget has shot up to Rs. 25. Take another, the Ceylon Nutritional Foods Ltd., which took over the Nestles' interests; the Rs. 10 shares which were selling at Rs. 10.25 before the Budget sell now at Rs. 16. J. L. Morrison and Co. Ltd., drug importers; a Rs. 10 share which was selling at par before the Budget has now shot up to Rs. 15. Ceylon Silks Limited—N. U. Jayawardene's combine; their Rs. 10 share which was selling at Rs. 11 has now gone up to Rs. 16.

In point of fact, if one wants to summarize this trend on the share market one will find that share prices here appreciated something like 20 to 25 per cent. in value in the three odd weeks after the Budget and as a result of the Budget.

In the case of companies, to answer my hon. Friend from Jaffna, which were formed to take over or to give Ceylon registration to what are essentially foreign companies, like Chemical Industries (Ceylon) Ltd., and so on, the share prices have appreciated as much as 50 per cent. during the three weeks after the Budget.

My Hon. Friend the Minister of State told us: "We are going forward to democratic socialism. We are soaking the rich more than the "pure" S.L.F.P. did." This is the first time I have heard of prices of company shares going up when the rich were being soaked. Naturally, when the company tax is reduced by 7 per cent. the wealth tax is reduced, and when they do not even have to pay the bank debits tax, all that money goes to the shareholders and share-prices go up.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[කෙනමත් මය.]

What have you done? You have not helped Ceylon but you have pushed up the share prices of the foreign and local companies. That is what you have done by this Budget. You have created a paradise for share market speculation.

Hon. speakers opposite, the whole lot of them and especially the Hon. Ministers of Finance, Health and State, sought to weave diverse economic theories to justify the unprecedented and substantial concessions they have given to the foreign and local capitalists in this Budget.

They all harped on the theme that the private companies were being "discouraged", as some put it, "suffocated" as others put it, or even "strangled" as still others put it, by the high rates of taxation under the S.L.F.P. and Coalition Governments. From the grim picture that was painted one wondered how these companies managed to survive at all during these nine years. Is this picture the truth?

Take the case of the sterling companies. How did they fare in 1963 and 1964 when they were allegedly breathing their last strangled by the taxation of the S.L.F.P. and Coalition Governments? I often quote from a special source and I do not mind doing it again. This is the "Manual of Tea Production Companies", compiled by de Zoete & Gorton. It is one of my bibles. I read it constantly because it clearly shows what the foreign companies are doing. It consists of information supplied by the foreign companies and circulated in the London Stock Exchange. They tell the truth because they want people in London to buy their shares. I do not want to take up time by reading all details. In fact, I should like to put this in as an appendix to my speech. I have extracted from this manual the profits of 52 sterling estate companies that operate solely in Ceylon. They made a combined profit of £4,024,567 or over Rs. 50 million in this period 1963-64. I can read the details but it will take time. I also

found, for instance, that Messrs. Brooke Bond (Ceylon) Ltd., which is not a direct estate company and which is not included in this list, sent a complaint that owing to the moratorium of the hon. Member for Yatiyartota it could not transmit £21,060 in 1964, which were its profits.

If these sterling companies are suffocating with only Rs. 50 million profit, how much profit do they need in order to breathe? This is something that my hon. Friends opposite must tell us. A lot of people will not mind suffocating on Rs. 50 million a Year. There are worse things than that.

There is another curious feature about the assertion of hon. Members opposite that foreign and local capitalists were so strangled by the taxation of the S. L. F. P. and Coalition Governments that it was necessary for this *hath hawula* to give them direct artificial respiration to the value of between Rs. 51 million and Rs. 60 million in various tax concessions. One would think from their speeches that this was a gigantic artificial respiration operation. These capitalists were apparently breathing their last with only Rs. 50 million—the foreigners alone—and up comes the *hath hawula* and pumps in another Rs. 50 million to Rs. 60 million of artificial respiration. Why? Because they were being strangled!

My hon. Friends should really read their own reports. I refer them to Table 20 in Appendix II of the Central Bank Report for 1964. This table shows that the revenue from taxes on income, profits, and personal expenditure was, curiously enough, slightly higher in 1955-56, the last financial year of the U. N. P. rule, than in 1963-64. The figures for 1964-65 are not there except in the form of estimates because the Finance Bill for 1964-65 could not be passed and the laws could not take effect. The respective figures are Rs. 299.7 million in 1955-56 and Rs. 295.2 million in 1963-64.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

Of course, the Budget for 1963-64 excluded several persons in the lower brackets from paying income tax at all. That was one of the features of Mr. T. B. Illangaratne's Budget. But the total loss to revenue, even by this complete exclusion of the lower slabs, was Rs. 9 million. So, there is not very much difference in the total amount of tax in those two years. On that showing the revenue from taxes on income, various forms of earned income, and profits was practically the same at the end of the U. N. P. period as at the end of the Coalition period if that Government had not been defeated on the 3rd of December.

ශ්‍රී එම්. ඩී. එම්. ජයවර්ධන (සෞඛ්‍ය ඇමති)

(கௌரவ எம். டி. எச். ஜயவர்தன்—சுகாதார அமைச்சர்)

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

The estimate was less.

කෙනෙත් මිය.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

You cannot say, because nothing happened. Let us go by facts and not by surmises.

How were these income taxpayers, therefore, suffocating from 1956 to 1965 and breathing freely up to 1955-56 while paying about the same? In point of fact, the revenue yields from such taxation were slightly less in all the years of S. L. F. P. rule than in 1955-56. Therefore, if they going to criticize the S. L. F. P. they could have criticized them for not taxing the capitalist enough and not for suffocating and strangling them.

You can see what my hon. Friends opposite are really getting at when you examine the figures in the same Table 20 relating to revenue from death duties, wealth tax, and gifts tax. This is where the shoe pinches. What do we see here? In 1955-56, that is, in the last year of U. N. P. rule, the revenue from these sources was only Rs. 6.4 million. On the average, during the entire period of U. N. P. rule, it was between Rs. 7 and 8 million per year. In 1963-64 it was

Rs. 23.9 million.—[Interruption]. That is 400 per cent. as my hon. Friend from Jaffna opposite who knows all about these taxes andresents them reminds me. It would have gone up to Rs. 41 million in 1964-65 if the Coalition Government had not been defeated.

In other words, the main burden of the complaint of hon. Members opposite and of their near and dear supporters is not that persons with an earned income have had to pay taxes too great to bear, but that the S. L. F. P. and the Coalition Governments have had the bad form—I repeat, bad form—to step up taxation on unearned incomes, property and wealth—as much as 400 per cent.

I agree with the hon. Member for Yatiyantota that it is amazing that arguments such as these should be seriously trotted out in this House in the second half of the twentieth century.

The Minister of Finance, the Minister of Health and the Minister of State in seeking to justify these tax concessions all agreed on this point, but they took somewhat different positions in their second line of defence on this question.

To the Minister of Health, the National Government was undoing a policy of senseless and sadistic revenge pursued by the previous S. L. F. P. and Coalition Governments against persons of substance and wealth. Having heard the speech of the Minister of Health, I am profoundly grateful to the Prime Minister that he did not appoint Mr. M. D. H. Jayawardena as Minister of Finance once again. It was a speech of amazing economic conversatism and backwardness beside which even the speech of the Minister of State was definitely revolutionary.

I have not the time to deal with all the economic assumptions of the Minister of Health or with his nostalgic yearnings for the good old colonial days of the Board of Currency Commissioners and the gold standard. He

[කෙනමත් මය.]

wants to go back to the nineteenth century. I have not met a man who resented the twentieth century so much as the Minister of Health. He cannot stand the sight of the twentieth century.

ශ්‍රී ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන

(කෙරුම ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

He is in the twenty-first century!

කෙනමත් මය.

(ශ්‍රී ඩී. කෙනමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I do not want to deal with his equally fatuous argument that the international value of the rupee has come down to 8 or 12 cents. He spoke about this matter as if the purchasing power of the rupee had come down to 8 or 12 cents. That is how the newspapers apparently understood him and, perhaps that is how he wanted them to understand him. But actually looking at his argument what he was trying to establish was that in the S. L. F. P. period the international value of the rupee had come down to 8 or 12 cents.

If he really thinks that the index of the financial stability of a country's currency is the percentage that its currency and demand liabilities bear to its international reserves, he must surely be amazed that sterling continues to be the basis of currency negotiations of nearly 1/3rd of the world when the total international debts of the United Kingdom, for instance, are five times more than its foreign reserves. I thought the economists had got away from that kind of thinking since the gold standard was abolished; abolished by Winston Churchill, the arch reactionary. Apparently, only two distinguished world figures still think on these lines, the Hon. Minister of Health and General de Gaulle. Both are tall and awkward—other things which they share in common.

What is the main charge made by the Hon. Minister of Health. I refer to column 654 of HANSARD of 19th

August. This is what he says in regard to the taxes of the previous Government:

"I will refer to their taxes in detail, but their taxation principle was based on one, and only one principle, namely, a sadistic pleasure in trying to hurt people. That was the only basis upon which they imposed their taxes on people."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 19th August 1965; Vol. 61, c. 654.]

Lest anybody should have missed the point, the Hon. Minister of Health, again says this at column 662:

"All their taxation proposals were motivated by one desire; if they saw some person with some money they wanted to get hold of it."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 19th August 1965; Vol. 61, c. 662.]

You can see how he is trying to justify taxation relief.

According to the Hon. Minister of Health, a relief of 50 to 60 million rupees in direct taxation to the rich is a question of undoing a wrong. It is rescuing these unfortunate people from the nasty sadism, avarice and revenge of the S. L. F. P. and Coalition Government. According to him when the previous Government saw someone with a little money they immediately wanted to get hold of it. So, what does he do? His Government introduces the principle that as soon as they see a person with a lot of money they immediately give him more! That is the entire principle of their Budget. To him that hath more shall be given and to him that hath not shall be given a kick in the teeth and also on other parts of the anatomy!

The Hon. Minister of Finance gave a different but not dissimilar explanation of the tax concessions to the rich. His argument was much closer to the Hon. Minister of Health than to that of the Hon. Minister of State. The argument of the Hon. Minister of Finance was that the greater the number of taxes, the greater the evasion and default. This is his

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

You find, Sir, at column 128 when he speaks about what he calls the "multiplicity of taxes and the high incidence of taxation in Ceylon" he says, and I quote :

"These taxes have also resulted in the growth of tax evasion to a substantial degree, and the increase in the arrears of tax collectible by the Inland Revenue Department, as well as the appeals which are outstanding."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 9th August 1965 ; Vol. 61, c. 128.]

He goes on to say that the arrears of tax are somewhere about Rs. 203 million.

What does my Hon. Friend, the Minister of Finance propose to do? He tells us that his Special Branch—not his Special Branch, but the Special Branch set up by the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera)—has discovered an additional income of Rs. 30.6 million undeclared and recovered Rs. 14.3 million in taxes. Why does he not tell us, Sir, that no sooner the National Government had come to power, the work of the Special Branch, especially its raids on suspected tax evaders, was suspended, and that even now it has not been fully resumed?

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව්. ඩබ්ලිව්. වන්නිනායක (මුදල් ඇමති)

(කෙළරව ජු. පී. වන්නිනායක—**නීති**  
**අමාත්‍යවරයා**)

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

False, false!

කෙනමත් මයා.

(**ශ්‍රී** **ඊ. කෙළරව**)

(Mr. Keuneman)

No, Sir, it is not false. I know some of the people who were there and they were called off for two months or more.

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව්. ඩබ්ලිව්. වන්නිනායක

(කෙළරව ඩබ්ලිව්. ඩබ්ලිව්. වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

It is a wrong impression.

ශ්‍රී වන්නිනායක

(කෙළරව වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

In fact, we have strengthened the branch.

කෙනමත් මයා.

(**ශ්‍රී** **ඊ. කෙළරව**)

(Mr. Keuneman)

For two months you did not do anything about this branch. You took them out to do some other work. The Hon. Prime Minister seems to be more touchy about this matter than the Hon. Minister of Finance.

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව්. ඩබ්ලිව්. වන්නිනායක

(කෙළරව ඩබ්ලිව්. ඩබ්ලිව්. වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Certainly not. I have never been a tax evader. One of the chaps there—an audit man—is a Communist Party man.

කෙනමත් මයා.

(**ශ්‍රී** **ඊ. කෙළරව**)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I hope he puts the screw on you.

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව්. ඩබ්ලිව්. වන්නිනායක

(කෙළරව ඩබ්ලිව්. ඩබ්ලිව්. වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Diyandas.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලානිති ආර්ය. ආර්ය. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

He is not a Communist.

කෙනමත් මයා.

(**ශ්‍රී** **ඊ. කෙළරව**)

(Mr. Keuneman)

My Hon. Friend proposes to give a second amnesty to tax dodgers. The father of this amnesty is the hon. Member for Yatiyantota. Amnesties are all right once but if amnesties become a habit it really will not be worthwhile paying taxes at all. It is far better to keep quiet, wait for the next amnesty, make a declaration and pay the reduced compulsory levy.

I want to ask my Hon. Friend this. He kept on referring in his speech to a sum of Rs. 203 million which is arrears of tax in default. What is he going to do about it? The only thing he has done is to give a promise that

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[කෙතමන් මඟ.]

he will streamline the process of collection. What are his proposals for the re-organization of the whole department? He referred to quite unnecessary matters which are already in the Central Bank report and did not need repetition. Tell us about your plans for re-organization. Have you made up your mind whether evasion of taxes is intensive or extensive? Where are you going to put your finger? No conclusions have been reached yet. The hon. Member for Nuwara Eliya (Mr. Donald Ranaweera) is not here. I understand that he has a little trouble about arrears of income tax himself. No wonder he hails this Budget as "an oasis in the desert".

From his very analysis the Hon. Minister of Finance should have drawn the conclusion that foreign and local Capitalists are an untrustworthy lot who break laws and avoid paying taxes at the drop of a hat. He says that the more taxes there are, the more evasion there will be. Surely, then, these are hardly the type of persons on whom the country can depend for economic development?

Strangely enough, my Hon. Friend the Minister of Finance comes to a different conclusion. His argument is that the more you tax the capitalists the more they will evade. What is his remedy? The way to reduce evasion is to abolish taxes, or to reduce taxes! This is exactly like the logic of those who argue, for instance, that the only way to stop transgressions of the law against prostitution is to legalize brothels!

One thing I must say for the Hon. Minister of State. He is not called "Tricky Dicky" for nothing. He does not get himself caught up in these arguments. He shifted his ground. He is obviously somewhat embarrassed at the forthrightness of his Ministerial Colleagues who had obviously forgotten that the U. N. P. had declared before the elections that it is no longer a party of imperialism and capitalism but a new party of "democratic socialism". The Hon. Minister of State had even to read

this U. N. P. declaration back to his Colleagues. The Minister of State was also frank in a way. At column 305 of HANSARD of 18th August, 1965, the Hon. Minister of State frankly tells us:

"... we are really groping in the dark."

They are not only groping in the dark but they are groping in the people's pockets! My Hon. Friend, the Minister of State, is trying to argue it both ways. What is his line of argument? At column 298 of the HANSARD of 18th August 1965, he said that for purposes of tax relief in the Budget "... we had to make concessions in the lower income tax groups". As an example of this so-called "lower" income tax group he cited the family budget of some poor man with an income of Rs. 36,000 per year, or Rs. 3,000 per month! From the point of view of the Hon. Minister of State this is a man in the "lower" income tax bracket. I am sorry that I, like 95 per cent. of the people of Ceylon, have not yet been able to rise to the level of this "lower" income tax bracket. I do not know how he will describe me then. The Hon. Minister of State painted a terrible picture, a gloomy picture, of the sufferings of this poor fellow, of this family struggling, to make ends meet on an income of Rs. 36,000, a year. It was terribly moving. You can see how the Minister's heart bleeds for the poor—provided they earn Rs. 3,000 a month. At column 298 he says:

"We found that the lower income tax groups were not only unable to save but were unable to pay their tax.

I will give you one example of a family—a Ceylonese married family with two children:

Rent Rs. 6,000 a year".

That is almost what a Member of Parliament gets for a whole year—

"Electricity and gas: Rs. 960 a year."—

That is almost what an unskilled worker gets a year—

"Servants, cook, gardener and ayahs: Rs. 2,160."—

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

Obviously he does not pay his servants very well—

“Food—seven persons with servants : Rs. 10,800.”—

I hope the servants get enough food—

“Clothes, medical expenses, insurance, Rs. 1,800. Travelling : Rs. 2,100.”—

Practically the same amount he pays to the servants—

“Children’s expenses other than food : Rs. 1,800. Entertainment, drinks, tobacco, holiday, recreation : Rs. 1,800.”—

Almost what he pays the servants.

Then the Minister of State goes on to tell us that this is a poor man struggling to make ends meet and that is why it was necessary for the Government to come to his rescue by administering artificial respiration in the shape of tax reliefs. This is the type of person that they regard as being in the “lower income” bracket. The hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) made a charge which was proved by the very list of figures which the Hon. Minister of State himself tabled—namely, that this Government has given those above the Rs. 40,000 assessable income limit a *santhosam* reduction of Rs. 2,000 a year. My hon. Friend, the Member for Akuressa (Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe) also drew attention to the fact that the very lowest slab of income taxpayers—those in the Rs. 5,000 slab—do not get any relief at all, not one single cent. If you are giving relief, do not start from the top but start from the bottom. But the Hon. Minister of State and his Government stand everything on its head. The Wanninayake “reforms”, as far as the real lower middle class is concerned, are nothing at all.

My hon. Friend, the Minister of State, was not completely frank with us when he based himself on this “poor” man struggling to exist on an annual income of Rs. 36,000. The Minister of State actually developed

a political thesis from this person. He said that the National Government was really going back to 1963-64, the last Budget of what he called the “pure S. L. F. P.”, and even argued that although the Wanninayake taxes are less than the N. M. Perera taxes, (which, he said, were intended to expropriate, and to establish a dictatorship) the same Wanninayake taxes are in fact greater than the Ilangara’ne “pure S. L. F. P.” taxes of 1963-64. Therefore, he continued, it can be seen that the National Government, true to its “democratic socialism” has proved that it is soaking the rich even more than the “pure” S. L. F. P. did in 1963-64.

The Minister of State was very shrewd to have based his argument only on the man whose income is Rs. 36,000 a year. He tabled a list, but he did not mention any other class of taxpayer. His argument that the rate of taxation under the Wanninayake reform is higher than under the “pure” S. L. F. P. of 1963-64 does not hold good either in the lower brackets or in the higher brackets. It is only in the Rs. 30,000 to Rs. 40,000 bracket that it holds good.

I do not want to quote a lot of details, but my Hon. Friend is not correct. Here is a document of the Income Tax Department in which instructions are given to its assessors on how to assess the new taxes. According to this—

ඉබ් මන් ත්‍රිවරයෙක්

(කෙළරව අඞ්කත්තවර් ඉරුවර්)

(An hon. Member)

From where did you get that ?

කෙතමන් මයා.

(තිරු. කෙතමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

From my own sources.

ඉබ් ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරව ඊඩ්ලි සේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

You must read what the Hon. Minister of State tabled.

தீர்மானம் கையெழுத்துப் பணம், 1965-66

—தேவநகர கிணத்தி

ஊயாபீய் லீன். லீ. பீரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Why cannot he read his own document?

ஊயாபீய் லீன். லீ. பீரேரா

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனானாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

But he cannot read it as the Minister of State's document.

கே. கே. லீன்.

(திரு. கே. கே. லீன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

This is an internal circular of the Income Tax Department explaining to its officials what taxes should be charged under the Wanninayake scheme for various slabs of income taxpayers.

ஊயாபீய் லீன். லீ. பீரேரா

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

Are you tabling that?

கே. கே. லீன்.

(திரு. கே. கே. லீன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

This is an official document. I am ready to table it.

According to this document, in the case of the same family unit of four with an income of Rs. 20,000 a year, for 1963-64 their tax was Rs. 2,875. Under the Wanninayake scheme it is Rs. 2,475. It is less, not more.

In the case of the same family unit with an income of Rs. 24,000 a year or Rs. 2,000 a month, in 1963-64 the tax was Rs. 3,937; in 1965-66 it will be Rs. 3,650.—[Interruption]. I am reading the same thing. It is the same document.

கே. கே. லீன். லீ. பீரேரா (யாழ்ப்பாணம்)

(திரு. ஜி. ஜி. பொன்னம்பலம்—யாழ்ப்பாணம்)

(Mr. G. G. Ponnambalam—Jaffna)

Look at those slabs beyond Rs. 30,000.

கே. கே. லீன்.

(திரு. கே. கே. லீன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I will take those beyond Rs. 30,000. Look at the figures for the Rs. 50,000 slabs. In the case of the same family unit with Rs. 50,000 a year as assessable income, the figure for 1963-64 was Rs. 15,175.

கே. கே. லீன்.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

That is right.

கே. கே. லீன்.

(திரு. கே. கே. லீன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

In 1965-66, it is Rs. 14,875. Less, not more and—

கே. கே. லீன்.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

Rs. 16,665.

கே. கே. லீன்.

(திரு. கே. கே. லீன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

My document says Rs. 14,875. It is the same document you have. My hon. Friends are completely misleading us. It is the same document.

கே. கே. லீன்.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

Will you table it?

கே. கே. லீன்.

(திரு. கே. கே. லீன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I will table it.

கே. கே. லீன்.

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Are you going to table that document?

விசேஷக் கௌரவப் பதவி, 1965-66

—தேவநல்லூர் கி.வி.

கேள்விகள் மூலம்.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

When I finish with it I shall certainly table it. You will find that the Hon. Minister argues—

கேள்விகள் மூலம்.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

What is the tax on Rs. 200,000 ?

கேள்விகள் மூலம்.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Mr. hon. Friend wants me to educate him on figures. I can do it some other time. I have got only a limited time at my disposal. Is Rs. 200,000 his slab ?

கேள்விகள் மூலம்.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

I am not trying to educate him. I merely want to get the figures right. If my hon. Friend does not want to get his figures right, then I cannot help him.

கவனம் ஈடுபடுத்துதல்

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Please do not interrupt.

கேள்விகள் மூலம்.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Though my hon. Friends, and particularly these three Ministers, have given three sets of reasons and, apparently, three sets of figures to justify their concessions to the capitalists, they all agree with the argument that these concessions are necessary to stimulate the private sector to take part in the task of economic development. That is a central theme of their arguments.

Now, a great part of the Debate has been devoted to arguments about whether this is likely to happen or

not. Members before me have quoted each other's speeches. They quoted the melancholy admission made in the last days of the U. N. P. Government by the Hon. Minister of State, the then Finance Minister. His speech, Sir, admitted that his hopes in the private sector were belied. All that was quoted. In spite of the concessions the United National Party and the Minister of State gave them when he was Minister of Finance, private capitalists did not take part in economic development. In the case of foreign capitalists, they preferred to export their capital and profits. In the case of the Ceylon capitalists, they preferred to spend their extra income from these concessions in speculation in real estate and on the share market, or else on conspicuous consumption.

This *hath hawula* has to face the uncomfortable fact that, despite their charge that under the Sri Lanka Freedom Party Government, the private sector was being strangled, in point of fact an industrial private sector has begun to emerge in the last four years ; something which had not happened when the United National Party was in power—the Government which spoke on behalf of the capitalist class. Of course, it is perfectly true that there was some overlapping in this industrial development. Sometimes, priorities were not of the best. We made such criticisms then. We do not withdraw what we said. But it does not change the fact that a private sector devoted to industry and manufacture did emerge under the last Government, something which did not happen in the U. N. P. times when the private sector mainly confined itself to plantations and trade.

My hon. Friends have to explain this phenomenon ; they have to account for this undisputed fact. A number of hon. Members opposite have sought to argue that this development was purely fortuitous, that it was mainly due to import curbs which were introduced in 1962-63.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[කෙනමත් මයා.]

They said that all this happened because the adverse foreign exchange situation compelled the S. L. F. P. Government to step in and impose import curbs. I should like to ask hon. Members opposite, why did not the United National Party think of bringing in such import curbs when its Government was faced with a foreign exchange crisis in 1953? The reason is that import curbs would have cut into the position of the comprador trading section of the capitalist class which is one of the main social bases of the United National Party. So they preferred to withdraw the rice subsidy and hit the people. Of course, the import curbs did protect and create markets for local manufacture. But this is not the whole story. There are also other policy decisions of the S. L. F. P. Government—tax holidays, the creation of industrial estates and so on—which also helped this development.

I should like to remind the Minister of Finance that one of the most important factors which helped this rise of a private sector industrial development in the last four years was the part played by the State banks in financing this development. My Hon. Friend's speech itself gives the figures. Bank assistance for industrial development rose from Rs. 43 million in 1963 to Rs. 72 million in 1964. In other words, at the end of the S. L. F. P. period, 9.2 per cent. of the total bank advances to the private sector was for industrial development.

I must say that the People's Bank in particular played a notable part in this process, and we should express our appreciation to those in charge of the bank. They may have made some mistakes, but I think they played a notable part in helping to finance private sector industrial development.

What have my Friends opposite done? They speak so much about their belief in the private sector. They have not only made bank credit more expensive by raising the bank

rate, but they also propose to limit bank credits to a total of Rs. 55 million this year. This can only mean that some branches of the private sector development that have already begun will go to the wall, particularly the smaller people, the ones without the influence to be able to get priority, the ones without the magic touch, like those engaged in fabric, printing, dairy and poultry, farming, manufacture of jams and squashes, about a lakh of women who are doing weaving and textile printing of one form or another; all these people will go to the wall. May I remind my hon. Friends that these people are also the private sector, but they are not like Moosajee or the others, who are the only private sector you know. You are refusing to finance them and you are not accepting their goods—

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

The C. W. E. has refused to accept any goods from this category.

කෙනමත් මයා.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

If the Hon. Minister of Finance thinks that he will be any more successful than his predecessors in stimulating private sector development purely by tax concessions and development rebates, I am afraid he is due for a big disappointment.

In point of fact, all the theories of my hon. Friends opposite are, if I may put it politely, just eyewash. This Government did not decide on substantial concessions to the foreign and local capitalists in order to establish or prove any economic theory. It is only trying to invent a theory to cover up a practical jam in which it finds itself. If you look at the history of what has happened, you will see what I mean.

When this Government came into power it had high hopes that its American, British, and other capitalist friends would bail it out. Speaking in the last Budget Debate on 6th

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

August 1964, the Hon. Minister of State even advised the Coalition Government of the day that it had only to agree to the demands of the United States Government regarding compensation to the oil companies for all Ceylon's problems to be solved.

ශ්‍රී ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන

(කෙළරව ශ්‍රී. ජයවර්ධන)  
(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

Quote my actual words.

කෙනමත් මයා.

(ශ්‍රී. කෙනමන්)  
(Mr. Keuneman)

This is what he said :

"If you settle the compensation problem with Shell Co. and Caltex, the whole deficit will be met by America and we will have no budgetary problem at all." —[OFFICIAL REPORT, 6th August 1964; Vol. 56, c. 1745.]

The Government opened negotiations to settle the compensation question and the Hon. Prime Minister made a public appeal, which they circulated abroad, for a consortium of powers to aid the National Government in its distress. Some light is thrown on what has happened behind the scenes in the secret letter from the Government to the I. M. F. that was quoted by the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) in his speech. Incidentally, the Government has not denied the authenticity of that letter.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරව ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක)  
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

How can it be secret ?

කෙනමත් මයා.

(ශ්‍රී. කෙනමන්)  
(Mr. Keuneman)

It was secret, but some people got hold of it and it was published in the Opposition press.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරව ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක)  
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

That letter was available to every Government.

කෙනමත් මයා.

(ශ්‍රී. කෙනමන්)  
(Mr. Keuneman)

Anyway, the Government has now admitted the authenticity of the letter. Not a single of the so-called national newspapers has chosen to publish it. That letter reveals that this Government not only asked the I. M. F. for an accommodation of 30 million U. S. dollars in June 1965, but in its discussions here with a Mr. Cargill representing the I.M.F.—

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරව ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක)  
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Cargill had nothing to do with the I. M. F.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාතිඨි ආර්ය. එම්. පෙරේරා)  
(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Surely the Hon. Prime Minister knows that the World Bank and the I. M. F. work together.

කෙනමත් මයා.

(ශ්‍රී. කෙනමන්)  
(Mr. Keuneman)

They put forward a request for a "soft loan" of about Rs. 1,350 million to be repaid in a 25-year period. The World Bank, the I. M. F. and all these people ran true to form. As the correspondence shows, they immediately raised the question of the food subsidy. The Government's reply is on record—that they cannot reduce the food subsidy because it is politically difficult to do so "at this stage."

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරව ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක)  
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Please mention what is actually in the letter. Read the actual words.

விசேஷக் கமிட்டியின் பணம், 1965-66

—தேவநகர கிளப்பி

கைமென் மொ.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

It is in HANSARD. The hon. Member for Yatiyantota read it. The point I wish to make is that the Government definitely stated that it could not take any action to reduce the rice subsidy "at this stage" because there were political difficulties. That is in the letter.

சுரு. டி. டி. லி. சேனாயக்க

(கெளரவ டி. டி. லி. சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Does it say when it does do it, how it will do it?

கைமென் மொ.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I can see my Friends are now discussing means of doing it and not whether to do it. That is clear from the Prime Minister's statement.

The Government said, "Look here. Don't ask us to cut subsidies. We will get into a political mess." So they sought other ways of appeasing the imperialists. They rushed through the negotiations with the oil companies and came to an illegal agreement with them—[Interruption]. Having settled the question of compensation to the oil companies, they expected that everything would now be all right but in fact that did not happen.

The "Aid U. N. P. Club" met. First of all, the Government got rather a shock. They expected ten people to participate but only five turned up as direct members of the Aid U. N. P. Club.

சுரு. டி. டி. லி. சேனாயக்க

(கெளரவ டி. டி. லி. சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Who expected ten?

கைமென் மொ.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

There is an official communique that was issued on this matter which appeared in the "Daily News" of the

31st June 1965. According to this communique, the participants as full active members were the U.S.A., Britain, Japan, Canada and Australia, "West Germany, India and the I. M. F. were represented by observers, France and New Zealand who were among the original list of countries expected to take part did not attend."

What happened? Instead of Rs. 1,350 million they expected, all the Government was promised was Rs. 250 million to be negotiated bilaterally with the five countries concerned.

சுரு. டி. டி. லி. சேனாயக்க

(கெளரவ டி. டி. லி. சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

The Government did not ask for any more.

கைமென் மொ.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Did you not ask for a soft loan of Rs. 1,350 million?

சுரு. டி. டி. லி. சேனாயக்க

(கெளரவ டி. டி. லி. சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Soft loans are coming—Rs. 250 million for the half year.

கைமென் மொ.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Did you not make an appeal for Rs. 1,350 million? You did.—[Interruption.]

The point I wish to make is this. After such an experience, any sensible person would have come to the conclusion that they had been led up the garden path by the I. M. F. and the "Aid U. N. P. Club"—

சுரு. டி. டி. லி. சேனாயக்க

(கெளரவ டி. டி. லி. சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

No.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

කෙනෙහි මයා.

(*திரு. கௌமன்*)

(Mr. Keuneman)

—and that it would have been better to pull out and cut their losses. But my hon. Friends came to a different conclusion. They decided on still greater appeasement of these friends of theirs.

They immediately gave wide-scale concessions to the foreign capitalists, and, of course, threw in similar concessions to the Ceylonese capitalists as well.

That is why you really gave those concessions. You hoped to soften up and sweeten the people abroad from whom you had begged Rs. 1,350 million. You are worried because they are asking you to reduce the food subsidy. You think it is political dynamite to do something about this now. I see the Hon. Minister nodding.

First of all, you settled the question of compensation to the oil companies. You found that this was not enough, that your friends were not satisfied, and you rushed in and gave them greater concessions; and I want to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that that is not the end of these concessions.

My hon. Friend, the Minister of State, quite definitely and categorically told us that it may be that they will have to make even greater concessions next year. Therefore, Sir, you will see, and the House will see, that what this Government is seeking to establish is not a political or economic theory. What is really happening? This is what the Hon. Minister of State said:

“It may be that we have to give more concessions next year.”—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 18th August 1965; Vol. 61, c. 318.]

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, do you not think that the Government has given too much for the little it has received? Firstly, the Rs. 250 million accommodation from the “Big Five” is only Rs. 50 million more than what the last Government negotiated with one small socialist

country, the German Democratic Republic: a credit which the Hon. Minister of Finance does not mention let alone promise to use, lest he might offend the West German Government who were one of the observers at the “Aid-U. N. P. Club.”

Secondly, to get Rs. 250 million from abroad, the Government has agreed to allow foreign companies to send out nearly Rs. 110 million from Ceylon. Actual aid, including the lines of goods available and the rates of interest are still to be negotiated with them. In most instances, it will be a case of those countries unloading their unsaleable surplus goods on us rather than a case of their helping us.

Sir, my Hon. Friends are trying to disguise a sell out to imperialism as an economic theory. That is the sum and substance of all their arguments.

Another central theme in the speeches of the hon. Members opposite was that this Budget will reduce the cost of living and increase the rate of economic growth. That is one of their central themes in defence of their Budget. How much truth is there in this contention?

I have already dealt with the fact that the abolition of Customs duties on food items cannot and will not be passed on to the consumer. I remember that when the Hon. Minister of State was the Minister of Finance—I think it was in 1953—he suddenly decided to abolish Customs duties on infant and invalid foods, which he did, and at that time he said it was a boon to the infants and invalids. But in practice, what happened? Prices of infant and invalid foods continued to go higher in spite of the abolition of the insignificant Customs duties. This was due to the planned market rigging by the importers of infant and invalid foods into this country. One of the importers boasted to me how they rigged the market, and kept prices up.

Apart from this, the Hon. Minister of Finance devoted quite a chunk of his speech to the measures the

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[කෙනමත් මො.]

Government intends to take in regard to the high cost of living. Right throughout this section, my Hon. Friend never spoke about *reducing* the cost of living but about *restraining* it. He speaks of stopping the cost of living from going any higher than it is. Similarly, he never refers to profits right through his speech but only to savings.

The Minister of Finance wants to “restrain” the cost of living, but even in this matter he was out of luck. The introduction of a Budget to “restrain” the cost of living was immediately followed by a phenomenal rise in the prices of fish and vegetables. And, in the case of fish, Sir, this was due, as even the monopolist press admitted, to the manipulation of U. N. P. fish *mudalalis* in their fight against the attempts of the Fisheries Corporation to stick its finger into their monopoly of distribution.

The Minister wanted to restrain the cost of living, but what happened? Apparently, the U.N.P. *mudalalis* won the day! The Minister of Industries and Fisheries had to enter a nursing home for a check-up and the price of fish was higher than ever before! I want to ask the Hon. Minister how he can restrain the cost of living when he cannot even restrain the U.N.P. fish *mudalalis*. Unless you restrain them first, you cannot start to restrain prices.

They have got together some Colombo seven ladies, formed what are called “People’s Committees” and asked them all to be very vigilant and stop prices from rising. Very good. They are alternatively pleading with and threatening the *mudalalis*, the U.N.P. importers and wholesalers, to curb their appetites and not to let the side down too much.

The Hon. Minister has three proposals to restrain the cost of living: first, to reduce the money supply in the country; second, to increase the volume of imports, financed by foreign aid; and thirdly,

to shift production of subsidiary foodstuffs from peasant cultivation to large scale capitalist farming.

I must say that I have never been much impressed by the wailings of the Central Bank *pundits*—and their Little Sir Echoes in the National Government like the Hon. Minister of Health—about the increase in the money supply as a major factor of inflation. I should have thought that these gentlemen would have learnt a long time ago even from so eminent an economist of monopoly capitalism as J. M. Keynes that in underdeveloped countries inflation is not in any basic sense a monetary phenomenon, but a real problem that can be tackled only by increasing the supply of goods.

This is not the place for a theoretical discussion about the meaning of money and the role that the money supply plays in the organization and direction of economic affairs. But the contention of the Hon. Minister of Finance and his “side-kick”, the Hon. Minister of Health, that inflation has been mainly due to what they call “creating too much money” is somewhat curious. It is true that the money supply has increased. But look at this more closely. You will see that the annual accretion of cash in circulation each year has more or less kept pace with the annual accretion of the national product. Otherwise we will not have the situation that we have today where even though the price level is high, it is considerably lower than the price level in a large number of countries in Asia close to us. But to hear my Hon. Friends talk—particularly the Hon. Minister of Health—one would imagine that we are in a state of galloping inflation. He spoke as though we are all going about with large suit cases containing bank notes to purchase a box of matches, a situation that existed in Kuomintang China.

My Hon. Friend not only believes some of these theories but he also acts on them. That is the trouble. In point of fact you will find that the

various measures announced by the Hon. Minister of Finance for curbing the money supply will have very little effect on curbing inflation, restraining the cost of living and increasing the purchasing power of the Ceylon rupee.

On the one hand, the Hon. Minister of Finance seeks to curb the money supply through raising the bank rate and freezing bank credit at Rs. 55 million for the next year. On the other hand, he has increased the money supply by putting over Rs. 60 million, formerly paid in income tax, back into the hands of various capitalists through his tax concessions, hoping that they will give it back in investment on development. You have a fat hope if you think that they will put this extra money into the new account in the Central Bank you have created. They will put it into circulation or into their pockets.

It will be soon evident that all that the Hon. Minister of Finance will achieve by his measures to restrict the money supply is to curb consumption and to disrupt economic development. That is what is likely to be the result of his measures to curb the money supply.

But I must give this credit to the Hon. Minister of Finance. Unlike the Hon. Minister of Health he seems to have understood that the short supply of goods is the crux of the problem of inflation. I will give that credit to him. The Hon. Minister of Health thinks that the over-supply of money is the root of all evil.

Sir, the Hon. Minister of Finance hopes to make an impression on the cost of living by increasing imports, financed by foreign aid. Rs. 250 million has been promised as foreign aid. The Hon. Minister of Finance knows as well as I do that even by increasing imports with the help of foreign aid, he cannot hope to make a serious impact on the problem. To start

with, nearly one-third of the Rs. 250 million will be paid on freight. Pakistan, the great friend of America, has complained that America swindled them by taking 40 cents of every Pakistani rupee given as aid back as freight charges.

My Hon. Friend said that freight is an item which affects the cost of living. He boasted that the Government was able to get a reduction of the freight surcharge imposed by the shipping lines. I think it is much more important for the Hon. Minister of Finance to go into this question more deeply and find out the proportion of freight charges in respect of our trade.

You will find that when it comes to exports we are in one situation and when it comes to imports we are in a different situation and both work against us.

Exports like tea cost us about 5 per cent. of the f.o.b. value as freight. In regard to rubber it is difficult to give the percentage of freight charges because most of it is exported on a barter basis. On coconuts we pay 10 per cent of the f.o.b. value as freight. Those are the average freight charges.

What is the position in relation to imports? For instance, take a few typical items like potatoes, wheat, cement and fertilizers. Freight on potatoes cost us 35 per cent. of the c.i.f. value—check it up and you will find it to be so; 25 per cent. of the c.i.f. value of wheat is paid as freight; for cement the percentage is 50 per cent. of the c.i.f. value and for fertilizers it is 25 per cent. of the c.i.f. value.

You will thus see that on an average we have to pay 25 to 30 per cent as freight charges alone on imports. You can start reducing your Rs. 250 million by at least 30 per cent. Thirty per cent. of this sum will be freight charges and not goods you can put on the market. The fact that the aid U.N.P. Club has promised to give you credit to the extent of Rs. 250 million does not mean that you will get Rs. 250 million worth of goods to put

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[කෙනමත් මයා.]

on the market. The Hon. Minister also knows that, owing to the sharp reduction of imports over the past four years, there has been an accumulated and deferred consumer demand with sufficient purchasing power to back it. The Hon. Minister knows that in order to make an impact on the cost of living situation by increasing imports, he will have to dump about Rs. 1,350 million worth of imports on the market within a comparatively short time to make up for this accumulated and deferred demand! Your Rs. 250 million worth of imports, or even that part of it which will actually reach us in the form of goods, will simply be swallowed up without any appreciable effect on the price level. In fact, the price level might even go up as a result.

All the Ministers who spoke on the problem of the cost of living were cautious enough to warn us not to expect any early reduction in the cost of living. Every one said, "We are going to restrain the cost of living, but do not hope for it immediately." Why do you not tell the people the truth. The Hon. Minister knows the truth; the officials know the truth.

The cost of living will go up and up and up. Right up to the end of this year there will be a continuous rise. You know your goods situation. Your newspapers cannot reduce the cost of living. I tell my Hon. Friends opposite that it is a verifiable fact that prices are going to increase further however much you may have promised in your U. N. P. election manifesto to bring down prices. Tell the people the truth.

As regards economic development, the Prime Minister tells the country that this is a development Budget different from all other Budgets. The Hon. Minister of Finance also, in a rather half-hearted way, took up this theme. His argument was that the expenditure on capital investment in this Budget is Rs. 577 million, as compared with the

estimate of Rs. 558 million in Dr. N. M. Perera's Budget, and, therefore, that greater emphasis is being laid on development, that they are more for development than even the Coalition Government was.

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

We are making use of both sectors.

කෙනමත් මයා.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

What is the use of talking about the private sector? You do not even know what they are going to do.

In this connection—I do not have the time to go into details of development—I intend to make one or two main points only. This Government is mainly continuing to finance the capital investment projects started under the last Government. The main difference is the Rs. 39 million voted for the Fisheries Corporation, out of which Rs. 11 million is assets taken over from the Fisheries Department. That is the only new development investment, even though the Minister of Industries admitted that this is not his baby but somebody else's baby. That is the difference. It is Rs. 39 million. They do not still know what they are going to do with the money, but they are allocating it.—[Interruption]. Yes, they are waiting to be told, and they probably want to know what Davith Singho and others in the fish market have to say. Eventually the Fisheries plan will be written in the St. John's Fish Market. It will not be written in your Ministry. That is where the Fisheries Plan will be drawn up.

Secondly, expenditure on what I call "bricks and mortar" and infra-structural items of capital investment continues to be extremely high. If you look into the details—there is a long list of items—you will find the following items classified as capital investment, namely, charges for dismantling and removing apparatus and machinery from one place to another—the Pugoda Textile Mill and

விசேஷக் கௌடுமீஸன் பண, 1965-66

—தேவநலர் கிசீலி

so on and so forth. That is also development! The Minister of State is removing some cables for his radio station from one place to another. That expenditure is also under capital investment. The "Freedom from hunger" campaign is included as capital investment! Tourist publicity abroad, purchase of air conditioners, all these are 'capital investment'. There is a very high percentage of things which do not immediately lead to production. If you have the money to spare, put it into direct production; do not put it into purchasing air conditioners or on infra-structural work which is not immediately necessary for development.

After all the boasting from Members opposite, let us come down to realities. After all their proposed investment in the public sector—Rs. 557 million; after the investment which the Minister expects the corporations to carry out from their own funds—about Rs. 80 million; and after the private sector's still unknown investment on development, after all this, what is the rate of economic growth he hopes for? That is the key question. This is what the Hon. Minister of Finance tells us. At Column 119 he confesses that "the increase of real output is unlikely to exceed 5 to 6 per cent. in the next twelve months".

All the capital investment he contemplates will only increase real output from 4½ per cent. to 5 per cent! According to the Central Bank Report the rate of increase in real output in 1964, about which the Minister of Finance sneered, was 4.5 per cent,—[*Interruption*]. All his efforts will increase the rate of economic growth by half of one per cent!

Is this anything to boast of? They go round the country and boasts: "We are not like the Coalition and the S. L. F. P. Governments, squandering resources. We are ploughing them back into industrial development." In the end all that will happen will be that there will be an increase of 0.5 per cent. or a half per cent in the rate of economic growth.

கலாநாயகருடைய

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

I should like to remind the hon. Member that he has another half hour. There will be no lunch interval today.

கேனமன் மஃ.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

The hon. Leader of the Opposition has very kindly given me a little of her time.

கலாநாயகருடைய

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

That is how you have another half hour.

கேனமன் மஃ.

(திரு. கெனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

We will keep to time.

A much more important question regarding economic development remains unanswered explicitly in the Minister of Finance's speech even though it is adequately answered by implication. The question is what is the perspective, the goal, of your economic development? Along what path do you intend to develop? You speak of development as though it is something in itself. What do you want to develop into? These are some fundamental questions on development which you should have answered.

Everybody knows that the world today is divided between two contending socio-economic systems—capitalism and socialism. In the days before 1917, when capitalism was the universal and all-embracing world system, countries that won political independence had no alternative except to take the slow and painful road of capitalist development in order to build up their economy.

But the situation has changed with the crisis and decline of capitalism, with the virtual collapse of the infamous colonial system,

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[කෙනමත් මය.]

with the emergence, consolidation, and growing strength of the world socialist system. There is therefore a real possibility for countries like Ceylon which have recently secured their political independence, not only to go ahead to the next stage of economic independence, but also to take a non-capitalist path of development, a path of development that can lay the foundations for an eventual socialist society without passing through the agonies and exploitation associated with the maturing of capitalist society.

Whatever differences there may be on questions of ideology, tempo, and on practical matters too, between the three parties in the Opposition, the S. L. F. P., the L. S. S. P. and the C. P., they all try to see economic development in terms of such a perspective. Socialism was the common perspective and common aim, although there may have been differences about how to get there and the speed with which to get there. They were all trying to see development in terms of a development goal, the goal of socialism, and trying to avoid having to go through mature capitalism, trying to find some type of non-capitalist path.

This is only natural. Quite apart from the agonies involved in the capitalist road of development, its rate of growth is so slow that it will take us between 200 to 300 years even to reach the level of the advanced capitalist countries today.

Despite all the tall talk of the Minister of State about the Government's acceptance of "democratic socialism" and a "mixed economy", this Government has quite clearly a different perspective. In this matter they are not groping in the dark; they know where they are going. This Budget shows that the National Government has not only taken the first step towards a decisive turn around to a road of basically capitalist development, but also that it has given the green light for the further neo-colonialist penetration of Ceylon's economy.

We see this in the freezing of the public sector development; we see this in the fact that the main reliance for economic development in the future is shifted on to the private sector; we see it in the fact that the first steps have been taken to supplant peasant production with large-scale capitalist farming; we see this in the gradual handing back of the public sector trade to the private sector. Why, even the resthouses are to be given to the private sector!

The importance of this central issue becomes more clear if we examine dispassionately what has been another central theme of this Budget Debate, namely, what have been the relative achievements of the United National Party regime of 1947 to 1956 and of the Sri Lanka Freedom Party and Coalition regimes of 1956 to 1965 in terms of the economy? It has been one of the main themes of the Debate.

I have criticized more than once the shortcomings and mistakes in the economic field during the period 1956 to 1965. But can anyone accept as anything other than a gross distortion and caricature the descriptions given by the Ministers of Health and Industries, by the Minister of Finance in his opening remarks, and by most of the Members opposite, about the results and achievements of the period when the Sri Lanka Freedom Party was in charge of the direction of the national economy? These Members spoke as though all that happened in the past nine years was a run down of external assets, galloping inflation, and utter chaos.

Of course, there are minuses in the economic picture, but there are also a number of pluses or achievements which were not visible in the days of the United National Party Governments and to be objective one must look at both the pluses and minuses.

If we want to make an objective assessment of what happened in the economy in the 9-9½ years of S.L.F.P. rule, we must start with the fact that the population increased by nearly 2½ million in this period. That

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

is the first thing that we should remember. This was a staggering increase by any standards.

Although there were 2½ million more mouths to feed, the S.L.F.P. Government was able to supply everyone with two measures of rice a week at 25 cents a measure for the entire period—something that the U. N. P. Government was not able to do with a population of 2½ million less. Please remember that also.

Secondly, as the Central Bank "Survey of consumer finances" brings out, this increased population is somewhat better fed and considerably better educated than it was ten years ago. I refer hon. Members to the relevant tables in the Central Bank Report. Table 74 shows that the percentage that purely energy-giving items, like starches, occupy in mass diets has decreased, while the consumption of more nutritious foods, like milk, milk products, vegetable oils, fish, eggs, and meat, has gone up in spite of the increase of 2½ million in the population. That means that this population is better fed than it was when the U. N. P. left off.

It is better educated, too. The percentage of illiteracy has gone down. The percentage that even people with primary education occupied in relation to educated people as a whole has also gone down. The percentage of the population with a secondary education has increased from 9.8 per cent. to 19.6 per cent. The percentage of those who have passed the G. C. E. and the S. S. C. has increased from 0.9 per cent. to 3.4 per cent., and of those with higher and technical education, although not great, from 0.9 per cent. to 1.1 per cent. So, the people are better educated and better fed than they were in the U. N. P. days.

There are no statistics on the matter, but the people are definitely better clothed, too. You have only to go to an "At Home" or social function where ordinary people meet to know that they are better clothed. My Hon. Friend is now keen to import more nylons, and he states that nylons are a staple item of dress

now. That was not so in my Hon. Friend's days, when they were ruling before 1956. The people are better dressed to-day. This, mind you, with a population of 2½ million more! Even in the Wannu they are better dressed. Perhaps, the Hon. Minister of Finance is the worst dressed man in the Wannu!

I do not want to mention the greater social equalization of the past ten years. It is a fact admitted by all, even by those who deplore it.

What are the other changes of direction during the last decade that distinguished it from the U. N. P. period? Firstly, a great deal has been said about the development of private sector industry in the last four years; but a much more solid achievement was the expansion of the public sector in general, and the public sector in industry in particular, with the help of aid from the U. S. S. R. and other socialist countries. Of course, there were many mistakes made—mistakes in planning, in economic management especially, and in other spheres. There was resistance and sabotage from reactionary officials and from reactionaries in the Government itself—persons like the Hon. Leader of the House who has now crossed over. But the fact remains that, in spite of all these difficulties, there is today a public sector in industry, banking, and trade to an extent that did not exist in the U. N. P. days.

There is another matter. The production of tea has increased from 380 million pounds in 1955 to 482 million pounds in 1964.

රු මොන් වෙලු ජයවික්‍රම (රජයේ වැඩ,  
නැපුලේ හා විදුලි සන්දේශ ඇමති)

(කෙළරව මොණ්ඩෙලු ඉයවිකරම—ඉර  
සාහකුකු කටුවෙලි, තපාල්, තනුතිප් පොකු  
වරත්තු අමෙසුසර)

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

Nothing to do with the Govern-

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

කෙනමත් මයා.

(තිரு. කෙනමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

The production of rubber increased from 210 million pounds to 246 million pounds.

ලරු මොන්ටේලු ජයවික්‍රම

(කෙළරාව මොණ්ටේලු ඉයවික්‍රම)

(The Hon. Montague Jayewickreme)

Nothing to do with the Government.

කෙනමත් මයා.

(තිரு. කෙනමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

The production of coconuts increased from 1,531 million nuts to 1,618 million nuts. Revenue from Government enterprises rose to Rs. 177.3 million, an index of the new role played by the public sector in earning revenue. Many nationalized ventures have made handsome profits. Fish production is going up at the rate of 16 per cent. per year. It is no longer necessary to import eggs.—[*Interruption.*] Of course, the situation about eggs has changed since *the hath hawula*. These are facts.

The pattern of external trade has been diversified. For the first time goods manufactured in Ceylon are being exported. These are all important developments and changes of direction in the economic field during the past decade, however much my hon. Friends opposite may want to close their eyes to them.

Of course, the question of unemployment was not solved nor was the question of housing.

About unemployment I want to say this. I quote, and everyone has quoted, the Central Bank's Survey of Consumer Finances for 1963. This survey estimates that unemployment and under-employment is round about five lakhs.—[*Interruption.*] Undoubtedly, there are a large number of persons who should be found jobs who have not been found jobs. I think the figure was 457,730 persons.

I remember that in 1953 there was an I. L. O. Man-power Survey of Ceylon. The figures given in that man-power survey for 1953 is 540,000 persons unemployed and under-employed.—[*Interruption.*] It looks as though at the end of the U. N. P. period and at the end of the S. L. F. P. period there were about five lakhs of unemployed, even though there has been a 2½ million increase of population! But that is no consolation to the unemployed.

About the housing problem, how are you going to solve it by stopping housing loans? You are stopping housing loans being granted by the People's Bank. How is that going to solve the housing problem? You cannot get a housing loan from the People's Bank now. Are you going to build the houses? If so, where is the money in the Budget?

During the elections the U. N. P. in particular promised the people a land flowing with milk and honey. What have they done up to date? This is what the Minister of Health said in his speech :

“We will sweat and, in the words of Churchill, we can offer nothing but ‘blood, sweat and tears.’”—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 19th August 1965; Vol. 61; c. 675.]

You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that he does not offer “toil.” He dare not, for the unemployed may take him up on that offer!

I cannot conclude without at least a brief reference to the churlish speech made by the Minister of Industries and Fisheries (Hon. D. P. R. Gunawardena.) He told us that he had decided to break a five-month silence. It was a great mistake. If he had kept his mouth shut, some people might have thought that he still had something valuable to say.

He has confessed to us that he is fond of children. So am I, Mr. Speaker. But I like them in their first childhood, not in their second—a stage into which the hon. Minister seems to have entered.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

What has happened to this old lion? Even if he cannot bite, we thought he could still roar. But his speech, when he was not reading a report from some University economist, was nothing more than the hollow hisses and last gasps of a once powerful volcano now rapidly sinking into extinction.

The Minister's contribution to the Debate was to tell us that he had nothing to do with the fish distribution scheme, to tell us that socialism means getting things done, and to call the fair Leader of the Opposition, a "heavy-footed Kandyan dancer." That was his main contribution.

Instead of lecturing us on the need to deliver the goods, cannot the Hon. Minister of Industries and Fisheries deliver us some fish at a reasonable price, a small job of work which we will appreciate.

The only thing the Hon. Minister of Industries seems to have got done in the five months he was in office is to appoint Mr. Lakshman Rajapakse as Chairman of the National Textile Corporation. Even if he could not help the country by this, at least he cleared the way for the cross-over of the hon. Member for Tissamaharama (Mr. Edirisuriya). Incidentally, was that not a lot of angling you put in to get this small

හාල් මැස්සා?

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උඩුගි ජෙනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

He is a senior politician.

ශ්‍රී මොන්ටේගු ජයවික්‍රම

(කෙළරාව මොන්ටේගු ජයවික්‍රම)

(The Hon. Montague Jayewickreme)

There will be many more cross-overs.

කෙනමන් මයා.

(ශ්‍රී උ. කෙනමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

The Hon. Minister of Industries rebuked the Lanka Sama Samaja Party and the Communist Party for accepting as a leader, what he called, "an

old feudal lady, politically illiterate." No doubt he is disappointed that we did not prefer an old Boralu-goda lion who has now been metamorphosed into a canary in a gilded U. N. P. cage. I remember, Sir, that in 1963 the Hon. Minister of Industries was not slow in falling at the "heavy feet" of this feudal lady. He tried twice to enter her Cabinet, once on his own and on another occasion together with the U. L. F. It is amazing, Sir, how a portfolio or the absence of a portfolio can change the political assessments of the Hon. Minister of Industries.

ශ්‍රී ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන

(කෙළරාව ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන)

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

I hope you will live long enough to understand that.

කෙනමන් මයා.

(ශ්‍රී උ. කෙනමන්)

(Mr. Keuneman)

I remember that the Hon. Minister of Industries once said in this House that he would join hands with the devil or even the devil's grandmother to oppose the U. N. P. But he now sits snugly in the same U. N. P. led Cabinet.

He is the person who called the Hon. Minister of Home Affairs a "lombaya"; the Hon. Minister of State a "murderer," an "arch conspirator" and a "stooge of imperialism"; and the Hon. Leader of the House—I do not like to use the exact words—"a reactionary". They are all his colleagues now. I do hope he finds his seat comfortable.

He wants to know what we of the Left movement have achieved in the past 30 years. I will give him only one example. It is due to the impact made by the Left movement during the last 30 years that the U. N. P. thinks it worthwhile to pay him a sum of Rs. 1,500 a month and to keep him as a Minister in their Government, even though he is the only representative



විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

අ. ආ. 12.40

පොත් කමිලලම් මයා.

(කීරු. පොන්නම්පලම්)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

I could hardly have imagined that as I got up there would be such a violent interlude between quondam friends. However, I was going in fact to thank my hon. Friend the Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) because his back-handed compliment actually persuaded me to intervene in this Debate. I might have hoped at least that he would have waited and listened; but I do not think that this House would lose very much by his absence.

Before I deal with the hon. Member for Yatiyantota and the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central (Mr. Keuneman), may I be permitted to make certain observations in regard to the Budget my Hon. Friend the Minister of Finance has presented to this House. I should like to say that it is not an empty platitude on my part when I congratulate him upon the presentation of the first Budget of the National Government under circumstances of unparalleled difficulty. I think that any praise or any congratulation that has been offered to him has been most well deserved.

Now I will pass on to the Debate proper. Hon. Members on the other side of the House should not forget that this Budget represents the economic plan of parties that faced the hustings and were returned to power by the free will of the democratic people of this country. We came into power—if I may say so—pledged to uphold the democratic way of life and to establish a socialist pattern of society. It would be my endeavour within the brief time that has been placed at my disposal to show that the undertakings given by the leaders of parties on this side of the House are today being implemented through this Budget.

In this connection it would be appropriate for me to refer to two matters that were highlighted in the

Throne Speech. One was the determination of the Government to introduce monetary and financial stability; and, the second, to step up development. May I in passing only say this, that unless the Leaders and Members of this Government are guilty of crass idiocy, I cannot understand, Mr. Speaker, the observation made by my good Friend the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central when he said, referring to the Hon. Minister of Finance, that he had done an injury to the country whilst doing a service to himself and his party. That expression, that sentiment, can be interpreted in one of two ways; one is that the interests of the party represented by the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central are fundamentally different from the national interest, or that this party, the National Government, which had successfully wooed and won the majority of the votes of the people of this country are deliberately dissipating the goodwill and the support they have had from the people as recently as March this year. I think the veriest tyro must concede that no democratic party would willingly surrender, would willingly abdicate from the position which they had ensured to the people and which the people have entrusted to them.

When the heat and the dust of this Debate is forgotten the people will be in a position to judge whether the promises given to them at the hustings interpreted into economic terms are found to be satisfactory; whether we have lived up to our promises.

I notice that not one speaker on the side of the Opposition has really endeavoured to present a true picture of the economy whether it has either progressed or receded in the period after 1955; that is, from the year 1956 to December 1964. There was a nine-year period in which there were two Governments of one party, namely of the S. L. F. P., except for a few months where they had the accession of strength—a somewhat dubious accession of strength—brought about by the coalition. I think it would not be unfair—it would be quite fair—

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[පොත් නම්බලම් මය.]

for this House to examine the way in which the finances and the budgetary management of the finances of this country took place over that period of nine years. If I may summarize it, this nine-year period, will go down to history particularly for a number of reasons, such as a series of unbalanced Budgets, leaving large deficits, resulting in an expansion of credit by the creation of money by the Central Bank, concurrently, perhaps partly consequently, of the running down of the external assets of this country leading to a severe restriction as late as 1962-63, in the import of consumer goods resulting in heavy pressures on the price level and thereby raising inordinately the cost of living of the ordinary man in this country, and, to complete the circle once again, financing succeeding deficits by the creation of Central Bank credit. That is, if I may say so, a summary of the position of the finances, of the monetary instability and financial instability of this country during this nine-year period.

Let me, very briefly—I dislike taxing the House by quoting figures and I shall be very brief—go into this question of the finances of the country. Till the end of 1955, I would be correct in saying that Government finances were in over-all balance. Let us consider what took place in this nine-year period. The revenue of the country increased by nearly Rs. 500 million in these nine years. Rs. 500 million would mean something over 40 per cent. of the revenue that was coming to the last U. N. P. Government in 1955. As against that, recurrent expenditure—I do not think it will be necessary for me to explain what recurrent expenditure is—went up by Rs. 800 million. That represents an 80 per cent. increase and this is what we complain about. Whilst recurrent expenditure went up by Rs. 800 million, the capital expenditure went up only by Rs. 185 million. Before I proceed further, I would like to say that upon a correct break-up and analysis of this figure, I found that the annual increase in real capital outlay over this nine-year

period was something of the order of Rs. 72 million—only Rs. 72 million, representing an increase of just over 17 per cent. in the capital outlay.

I wish my hon. Friend, the Third Member for Colombo Central who ended his speech with a peroration on the achievements of the S. L. F. P. Government, had been here to hear this.

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

He is coming.

පොත් නම්බලම් මය.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

I am glad he is coming.

I shall repeat what I said very briefly. In this nine-year period, the recurrent expenditure of the last Government to which he paid a very high compliment, went up by Rs. 800 million, which represents, as I said, 80 per cent. more than the recurrent expenditure of the last U. N. P. Government. Your capital outlay, properly worked out, was no more than the miserable sum of Rs. 72 million over a nine-year period, representing only an increase of 17 per cent.

Let us take the current account that was left by the U. N. P. Government when it went out of power in 1956. There was a substantial surplus when the U. N. P. went out of power. This surplus was converted year by year into large current account deficits. In other words, the S. L. F. P. Government, the two regimes of the S. L. F. P., found it necessary to borrow money to meet recurrent expenditure every year in this nine-year period—in fairness to them—barring one year 1961-62. Is that an achievement? Does my hon. Friend who normally makes a good contribution, a usually outstanding contribution on economic affairs, consider it an achievement that, starting from a big current account surplus, year by year the country lived beyond its means and had to borrow money to balance its current expenditure Budget?

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

Sir, let us look at the net cash surplus of the Government. When the United National Party went out of power there was a sum of Rs. 128 million which was a net cash surplus. What happened? Year by year this surplus changed into a deficit. And without wearying the House I would like to say that when the economic pundit from Yatiyantota took over the financial affairs of this country, the net cash deficit was Rs. 463 million in 1964. How did this Government meet these deficits, the current cash deficits? Has it not raided—I ask them the question—the institutional savings that have come into being in this country? What has happened to the contributions to the Employees Provident Fund? Every cent that was not being utilized by that fund was raided by that Government in order to meet its deficits. What has happened to the Insurance Corporation funds? Whatever money was available to them has been raided and utilized to meet their deficits, and is it not the case—I do not want to again multiply these instances—that the savings of every national institution have been utilized by the Government to meet their current needs and their deficits? If that is an achievement they are welcome to it.

අ. හා. 1

කයානායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please! The Deputy Speaker will now take the Chair.

අනතුරුව කයානායකතුමා මූලාසනයෙන් ඉවත් මුසෙන්, නියෝජ්‍ය කයානායක තැන්පත් සී. එස්. ෂර්ලි කෝරියා මයා. මූලාසනාරුව විය.

அதன்பிறகு, சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள் அகதிராசனத்திலின்று நீங்கவே, உபசபாநாயகர் [திரு. சி. எஸ். ஷேர்லி கொறியா] அகதிராசனத்தமர்ந்தார்.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER [Mr. C. S. SHIRLEY COREA] took the Chair.

පොන්නම්බලම් මයා.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I now pass on to another aspect of these deficits. In

this period of nine years, the net cash operating deficit totalled Rs. 3,023 million, and of this more than 45 per cent. has been met by inflationary borrowings. My hon. Friend, the Third Member for Colombo Central thought that my Hon. Friend the Minister of Health was orthodox.—[Interruption]. I do not know whether you quoted Keynes right.

May I say this: no sound economist can possibly advance the proposition that in under-developed countries you can go in for inflationary borrowing with a view to achieving any end. No, Sir, I venture to think that Lord Keynes who was once my lecturer could never have given expression to such a fallacy. What has been happening in this country, as I have already pointed out, is that nearly Rs. 1,500 million has come into circulation, to put it kindly, because of the printing of notes by the Central Bank at the request of the Government. I fail to see how this can be anything but a most unhealthy and a most deplorable state of affairs in the finances of this country.

I think I had better deal with this question. There has been so much talk as to when or to what extent a country can go in for inflationary financing. When, for instance, within very narrow limits a country which is verging upon a very heavy programme of capital development produces enough goods and then finds it has got to finance a fraction of its capital development by Central Bank credit, that would be a matter that may be accepted as proper.

Let us take the case of India. Over successive five years' plans what has been happening? There has been a certain amount of deficit financing. But the difference in the deficit financing that has been going on in India as against ours over the last decade or more is that there was more creation of capital assets—steel factories and the like. But here, you have been running down your external assets. You have been making the country bankrupt purely for consumption purposes. You have been flooding the country not merely with cheap money but money which was

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[පොත් නම්බලම් මය.]

getting debased purely for consumption purposes. That is the fundamental difference. In the last resort India can very well justify the fact that she ran down her external assets abroad because she has today three of the finest steel mills in Asia. And although steel ingots are not nearly as expensive as gold ingots, yet, even in the unmanufactured form they are exportable and can be converted into external assets. That is the fundamental difference.

Perhaps, I may take this opportunity to make a certain observation. I have no doubt that my hon. Friend the Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike) might possibly say that they have full authority to raise money on Treasury Bills. May I be permitted to make this observation? The limit to which Treasury Bills may be issued is only a permissible limit. But when a Budget is presented as there has been talk by the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) about financial honesty and integrity, may I say this?—there is even something more fundamental involved—the sovereignty of Parliament. Budgets have been presented with unbridged gaps. Budgets have been presented with a statement that there will be deficit financing only up to a particular level. Thereafter—I pose this question to the Opposition—have not successive Governments utilized conveniently the machinery of the Central Bank to make them issue Treasury Bills far in excess of what is contemplated or needed when the Budget was introduced? And I say this, that it is highly improper for any Government to deny the sovereignty of this House, to go outside this House after a Budget has been passed and obtain Treasury Bills from the Central Bank to get over difficulties. And if I may be permitted to make this statement—I hope I am not doing anything wrong—the Central Bank must refuse, unless Parliamentary sanction has been obtained to issue Treasury Bills, to make money available which has not been sanctioned or in respect of

which permission has not been obtained from this House in the Budget.

What has been the result? Does my hon. Friend dispute the fact that there has been—I do not say galloping inflation—pronounced inflation in this country as a result of this inflationary borrowing? And as a result of this inflation, has not a lot of cheap money run after a decreasing quantity of goods, the result being that there has been an inordinate increase in prices and a demand for imports? What did the Government—the S. L. F. P. Government—do? For some years it met the demand for goods, but not by producing them locally. You talk of an emergent industrial production centre. What are the consumer goods that have been produced? For a number of years the S. L. F. P. Government ran down the external assets of this country purely to import into the country a large volume of consumer goods. If that is an achievement, they are welcome to it. When, however, in the year 1962-63 they found that the external assets were being run down so inordinately, the Minister of Finance then, somewhat belatedly, began to impose drastic import restrictions. Drastic import restrictions, cheap money, debased money, circulating in the country with an inordinately increased money supply—what was the result? There was terrific pressure for a limited quantity of goods, a rise in the price level, and an increase in the cost of living. My Friend, the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central, predicted that the cost of living will rise and go on rising. He knows to what extent in these nine years pressures have been built up and price levels increased, so that it will take some time certainly to produce a correct and heavy enough impact to reverse the processes that have been going on for the last nine years. I am amazed that he wishes to make a forensic triumph from the ills which have been perpetrated by the S.L.F.P. Government upon the people of this country.

He spoke of the development that has been achieved by the S. L. F. P. Government. Does my Friend seriously mean that? Let us examine the position. I propose, for the purpose of considering capital expenditure, to take it in two parts—the real capital outlay on capital goods, and the maintenance of capital goods. Let us take the second part first, namely, the maintenance of the economic overheads or, in other words, the maintenance of the capital assets of this country in the form of roads, buildings, etc. Mr. Deputy Speaker, what did the S. L. F. P. inherit in 1955 and what was the state in which roads, Government buildings and other institutions were left after their nine-year period in office?

Their outlay on capital maintenance steadily declined from 1956 to 1964. It declines by Rs. 50 million. If you want the figures roughly it declined from Rs. 75 million a year to Rs. 50 million.

Let us now look at the other half of the picture. What is the real capital outlay in factual terms? I invite my hon. Friends to appreciate that the real capital outlay in actual terms in 1955, the last year of the U. N. P. Government, was Rs. 431 million. This Rs. 431 million after a nine-year period increased to Rs. 503 million with the golden brains of these two parties combined in 1964. From Rs. 431 million to Rs. 503 million is an increase of Rs. 72 million, after the lapse of nine years. This means, Mr. Deputy Speaker, an increase of only 17 per cent.

I am sorry the Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) is not here. What was the percentage of under-expenditure in his Budget as contemplated by him? It has been variously computed as between 21 and 30 per cent. or more. This is the contribution that the previous Governments over a period of nine years has made to the capital development of this country.

At this point may I go on to the sources from which the last two Governments financed their capital outlay. When the U. N. P. went out of power the current account surplus in 1955 stood at Rs. 395 million. From that year, year after year, the surplus decreased and became a deficit in 1963-64.

In other words, the capital outlay which had been traditionally financed by surpluses on the current account could no longer be financed by current account. And what happened? First of all, there was a lot of talk about going with the begging bowl asking for loans. Let us see who set the example for the bankruptcy that has been followed by the last two Governments.

In 1955-56 the foreign loans were a miserable Rs. 5 million only. This reached a peak of Rs. 65 million in 1963-64. My hon. Friend, the Third Member for Colombo Central, (Mr. Keuneman) talks of the "Aid Ceylon Club" bailing out Ceylon. Who set the example, my Friend? Bailing out Ceylon or the government or a party—it does not matter. We stand for the country. Who started it? Foreign aid, which was hardly anything, reached a peak of Rs. 32 million in 1963-64. With all this they were unable to appreciably finance any real outlay in this country for purposes of development in the public sector. All of you who are beating your breasts about the public sector, please tell us your chapter of achievement in the public sector in the last nine years. What have you done?

Sir, another way of examining the situation would be to find out what proportion of the national income has been utilized for capital development. In other words, how much of the national income, by way of revenue and so on, has been set apart towards capital formation, and how much capital formation has been diverted to capital development? In 1959 16.9 per cent. of the national income represented capital formation. Will it surprise my hon. Friend when I tell him—or will he deny it—that from that point onwards right up to 196

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[පොත් නම්බලම් මයා.]

capital formation has decreased till it reached a miserable 13.5 per cent. in 1964? That is another bit of achievement on the part of the S.L.F.P. Government. What does this mean, Mr. Deputy Speaker? Bread and circuses for the people? There is no question of capital development but only an emphasis on consumer goods. And, that is all that the S.L.F.P. Government can speak for.

That is in regard to the first point I referred to with reference to the Throne Speech, namely, on the question of monetary and financial stability. Now, let us look at the performance of Finance Ministers in the management of the monetary policy of this country.

Very hard words have been used by the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) who, I find, in recent times has been extremely free with words. He does not hesitate to use the harshest possible words. I believe I am right in saying that he charged the Hon. Minister of Finance with suppressing facts and the like. May I ask him, how he justifies what he did in the Budget of 1964-65 when there was a gap of Rs. 60 million? He said there will be revenue from other sources totalling Rs. 60 million. This economic purist and pundit never condescended to take this House into his confidence up to the time he left the Finance Ministry, to tell us what the other sources were from which he hoped to get this revenue of Rs. 60 million. A gentleman with that performance, I would respectfully say, has no right to come here and use words unguardedly and loosely.

Apart from that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in every single Budget, I think, I will be right in saying that there has been an under-statement in regard to anticipated expenditure and an over-statement—there may be an exception in a year or two—in regard to anticipated revenue, with the result that the actual sums which emerged bore no semblance whatsoever in actuality to the figures that were anticipated by the Finance Ministers.

I am very glad that the Leader of

the Sri Lanka Freedom Party is in this House now. I would tell her that with their majority, when they were in power, they were prepared to allow Budgets to be passed with acknowledged unbridged deficits as was done in 1962-63. Yes, acknowledged unbridged deficits. Once again in 1958-59, before the time of the hon. fair Leader of the Opposition, during the previous regime, the then Minister of Finance got the House to pass a Budget without disclosing the sources of revenue which would meet a deficit of Rs. 200 million. Surely they must hesitate before they come along and charge the Minister of Finance of this Government with lack of financial integrity in the presentation of the Budget?

Having dealt with expenditure, capital formation, capital development and so on, now I will come to the next aspect of this Budget. I will now turn to taxation. Let us examine the revenue from taxation—and this is specially for the ear of my hon. Friend the Third Member for Colombo Central. He quoted certain figures. I would like him to check up on the figures which I now give.

The revenue recovered in 1955-56 was of the order of Rs. 300 million. In 1963-64 it had come down to Rs. 295 million and in 1964-65 the anticipated revenue by the hon. Member for Yatiyantota was only Rs. 234 million. I was amazed to listen to a submission made by my hon. Friend who is usually a clear thinker and more often than not astute. Whether he had not prepared his brief or was pulling a fast one on us I do not know. I know he is capable of doing that on occasion. But I was truly amazed that he could have advanced this extraordinary proposition: How can you charge the S. L. F. P. Government with soaking the rich when the total yield by way of revenue by taxation on incomes and profits was if anything a bit less in 1963-64 as compared with 1955-56—less by Rs. 5 million. He did not venture upon the fact that the “golden brains”—the hon. Member for Yatiyantota—who had stepped up rates of taxation to penal limits, to confiscatory limits

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

in fact had anticipated a sum like Rs. 234 million. From this my hon. Friend wanted this House to infer that really the S. L. F. P. Government—my hon. Friend is turning a deaf ear to all this—has got not merely an avuncular but a paternal interest in the rich?

Before inveighing about all this, why does he not take the price level over these years into consideration? Revenue and taxes collected are only as a fraction or a proportion of gross incomes. Where is the arithmetic of his arguments? The rising rates of taxation after 1956 with the introduction of the Kaldor system put a top limit on incomes at 60 per cent. This was raised in two successive years by surcharges of 10 and 20 per cent. How does my hon. Friend reconcile the facts as revealed from those figures? What he does not understand or completely fails to understand—I hope I am not ungenerous to put it that way—is that as a result of the politics followed by the S. L. F. P. Government the real incomes of the private sector were going down; and whatever taxes you increased the yields from those taxes were beginning to decrease. I go further and say that by the year 1964, with the introduction of the fiscal measures of the Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera), this country had reached the point of diminishing returns in regard to tax levels.

Sir, may I make this observation. When you appreciate and realize the full implications of his tax structure which yielded eventually a quantum of revenue which was less than what the country had in the past, what was the next-step of the Government except expropriation? The penal levels of taxation reached can only be consistent with the policies and the gospel of the Marxists, namely, utilizing every measure you have to establish a Marxist dictatorship. In spite of progressively increasing the rates and taxes to double what they were the revenue from incomes and profits did not increase but indeed diminished to a point of no return. How

did this Government then manage to get the revenue necessary to run the country? It is also the legacy that we have inherited, namely, progressively increasing the import duties.

Let us look at the figures: in 1955-56, the revenue collected from import duties was Rs. 286 million; in 1963-64 the last S. L. F. P. Budget—it increased to Rs. 482 million; the estimated yield from import duties in the Budget of the Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) was Rs. 520 million. Apart from that, there has been an increase of 80 per cent. in revenue from import duties as between 1955-56 and 1964. It is also a significant fact that the total revenue from import duties has gone up in spite of severe restrictions on the quantum and nature of imports into this country. So, in respect of indirect taxation, we had reached the point where directly the policies of the last Government had brought about a permanent increase in the price structure which, obviously, in itself had inevitable repercussions and an impact on the cost of living.

Now—again I am sorry that the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central is not here—in regard to the incidence of taxation, the weight of these taxes, for instance, on the people; what is it that we are charged with? We are charged with supporting the private sector, of spoon-feeding the local and foreign capitalists. Let us look at what they did in the years gone by. Tax incidence on personal incomes and profits imposed by the S. L. F. P. Government up to the year 1964 from the year 1952-59—I will exemplify it by taking the lower income bracket—was in the case of people drawing an assessable income of Rs. 10,000 up by 300 per cent. Progressively, in the case of people who had an income of Rs. 20,000, the tax rate went up by 100 per cent; those drawing Rs. 30,000 the tax rate went up by 86 per cent and those drawing Rs. 40,000 the tax rate went up by 74 per cent.

I will not weary the House with the rest of the figures except to say that gradually the incidence lessens and

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[පොත් කමලම් මය.]

does not increase. Now, where are the protestations? How are they exemplified by the S. L. F. P. Government in regard to their attitude to the private sector, the capitalist, and so on.

I come to the next point of my hon. Friend, the Third Member for Colombo Central. He inventorized a number of items with which he charged this Government with having helped the capitalists, both local and foreign. One is the company tax. I am surprised that a man of such an international outlook does not know one or two simple matters. First of all, a company is a corporate body. It need not, and usually does not, represent high capital in respect of any single shareholder. It is a co-operative effort of thousands of small shareholders, so that, any relief in corporate taxation is not necessarily a relief to capitalists. But, that apart, does my hon. Friend know that a company tax is higher in Ceylon, or has been higher, and, even after it has been reduced from 57 per cent. to 50 per cent, would be higher in Ceylon than in the U. K., the U. S. A., or in any other progressive country of Western Europe?

We are supposed to have gone out of our way to make a present by the reduction of the company tax to these companies. May I, before I proceed further, bring this to the notice of this House? If anybody had examined, had taken the trouble to examine, the accounts of companies that own estates in this country, whether the companies be local or foreign, may I tell him this: that starting from cesses export duties, corporate taxes and so on, they reached the level of over 91 to 93 per cent., in some cases, of the gross profits of a concern. I think, I can say that without being challenged. In other words, you are left with less than 10 per cent. of the gross profits of a company to be distributed thereafter. You are also subject, thereafter, to a refundable tax of 33 1/3 per cent. on dividends. What has been the result? May I say this? This is not the view of

anybody who becomes a special pleader for the private sector; but those who have examined this position, both in Ceylon in the Public Service and from outside Ceylon, have come to the conclusion—and this cannot be controverted—that over the last few years the actual maintenance of capital assets of estates, like factories and other equipment, has run down merely because the profits are not enough to maintain capital equipment at a proper level. I know I will be charged with being entirely reactionary. I venture to think that even a 50 per cent. company tax is too high and what was recommended by Kaldor—I believe it was 45 per cent.—must sooner or later be given effect to.

Next we come to the capital gains tax. Once again the charge is made by my hon. Friend the Third Member for Colombo Central that in reducing the tax on capital gains from 45 per cent. to 25 per cent. we were making another present to the capitalists. I am surprised that a dynamic personality should have such a static mind. The inflation that has set in in this country, with the debasing of the rupee, with values both of movable and immovable property going up five, six and seven times, is amazing. Sir, can you treat capital gains in pure arithmetical or absolute terms as a real capital gain? In other words, the property, or some other object, which fetched a particular price ten years back may today fetch five and six times that price, but in truth it does not represent a capital gain if you take into consideration the state of your monetary stability, the real worth of the rupee. In those circumstances one has got to consider whether a country, an underdeveloped country, can possibly afford the luxury of a high capital gains tax. As I understand it, the capital gains tax which is about to be introduced in England this year is only to be placed at 30 per cent. The capital gains tax for far more developed countries like America is 25 per cent.

Let us take the wealth tax. I think the hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa) referred to the wealth tax and felt that the reduction in the rate of the wealth tax could not be defended. May I commend this for his consideration: the wealth tax is not intended to be dissipated from year to year. Supposing there is real property which yields an income, wealth tax on that property is expected to be paid from the income of that property. I will give you one example. Suppose a man owns a house worth one lakh. That is part of the wealth he possesses. He has got to pay wealth tax. You will also imagine that he has other wealth and this one lakh worth of house property attracts your highest rate of wealth tax. Now, what is your income from house property? At the highest, I imagine, it should be no more than ten per cent. Generally the yield from house property is five or six per cent. If in point of fact you have a wealth tax of five per cent., it works out to something like 50 per cent. of the income. And that is why, quite rightly in my submission, the wealth tax has been reduced. Incidentally, this wealth tax has increased from 1958-59 to date, and the incidence of tax avoidance has nearly doubled in these few years.

I will also make this observation. The Government had a wide field of choice. Since 1956, it has indulged in a multiplicity of taxes and at a certain stage it introduced the Kaldor system—during the first regime of the S. L. F. P. Government. I would only say this. The Kaldor system as introduced in the first S. L. F. P. era crystallized the vices of both Kaldor and the Ceylonese Finance Minister; it combined the vices of both people and the virtues of neither. Actually, I think, Kaldor made the observation that after Ceylon had dealt with his recommendations in regard to the integrated system of taxation he would find it difficult to advance his pet theories in regard to taxation in any other country of the world.

In regard to the Kaldor proposals, I must confess that speaking in this House I became a critic of those proposals. If you go fairly fully and deeply into the proposals of Kaldor I think it may conceivably be an answer to Keynes. Kaldor's fundamental objective appears to be this: the compulsory savings of the people of a country must be obtained from taxation and directed towards development. He discourages ostentatious living by the expenditure tax but insists that incentives to earn income must be given by taxing the highest income bracket at 45 per cent.

This Government, apparently after reconsidering the position, has decided to accept most of the principles of the Kaldor proposals. Now a complaint has been made by my hon. Friends opposite, and particularly by the pandit from Yatiyantota, that the Kaldor proposals cannot be expected to work unless the expenditure tax is introduced. I can only say I feel sorry that the hon. Member shoots his mouth before he really addresses his mind to the question. That has been manifest in him since this House met in March this year.

An expenditure tax is a means to an end. It is not an end in itself. What happened in this country? There are about 100,000 taxpayers in Ceylon. The number of people who had to pay an expenditure tax, I believe, was not more than three or four thousand. As a matter of experience, not only here but in India too, the expenditure tax can be the cause of a great deal of irritation to the taxpayer and become a great nuisance to the collecting authority. I repeat, an expenditure tax is only a means to an end. Their contention is that, with the expenditure tax integrated along with the rest, evasion could be arrested.

Our submission to this House and to the country is that in the proposals of the Hon. Minister of Finance in his Budget there is, in place of an expenditure tax, a more potent, more powerful weapon, namely, surtax in two slabs over the 45 per cent. limit.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[පොත් කම්බලම් මය.]

We have adhered to the principle underlying Kaldor's recommendation in regard to direct taxation by placing the real maximum of tax on income and profits at 45 per cent.; but that is not to say that we are making a present of something that might otherwise come to the revenue of this country. The 45 per cent. income tax would apply to a slab that ends with about Rs. 40,000—I am speaking from memory. After an assessable income of Rs. 40,000 what happens? Up to about Rs. 55,000, that is, an increase of Rs. 15,000 on the assessable income if there is no saving there will be an increase in the tax rate from 45 per cent. to 65 per cent.—in other words, 20 per cent. more on the slab from Rs. 40,000 to Rs. 55,000. All that this Government says is that if, between your income of Rs. 40,000 and Rs. 55,000, that is, over an increase of Rs. 15,000, you save that Rs. 15,000, you will be allowed a rebate of Rs. 5,000. In other words, in your taxes you will make a saving of Rs. 5,000. I am sorry the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central is not here. I am not complaining, because what I say will go on record. His submission was that this was going to be a present to the capitalists and the private sector, and he accused some of us of not reading or understanding the speech of the Hon. Minister of Finance. The Rs. 5,000 rebate out of an additional Rs. 15,000 will accrue to the assessee only if he does one of four or five things which have been stated in the Budget speech, namely, invest it in Government securities, deposit it in the Central Bank to the credit of a special fund, premia on insurance, and provident fund payments in excess of the limits fixed. What happens to these moneys? These moneys are not going back into the pockets of the rich and the capitalists. Please do not misunderstand the position or mislead the people by saying that these rebates and the decrease in the rates of income tax are gifts or bribes to the capitalists and the private sector. The whole of this sum will be placed under the control and direction of

those in charge of the financial destinies of this country in this Government. That will be the nucleus for the starting of development in the private sector. Please understand that.

I go on from there to the next slab—those who are in receipt of an assessable income from Rs. 55,000 upwards. All income above Rs. 55,000 will normally attract a tax rate of 80 per cent. I will take the case of a person with an assessable income of Rs. 100,000. Over the Rs. 55,000 we have a slab of Rs. 45,000. If he spends that Rs. 45,000 he will also have to pay 80 per cent. of that by way of tax. But the difference is this. If he saves that Rs. 45,000, which normally attracts an 80 per cent. tax, he would be exempted from tax equal to 50 per cent. of his savings. In other words, Rs. 22,500 out of the Rs. 45,000 could be diverted by way of rebate, once again not into his pockets, but into the Central Bank for the creation of a fund under the control of this Government for the industrial and other development of this country. That is really the answer.

May I also say this, and I say it earnestly. There is a lot of misconception in this country in regard to who is rich and who is poor. It is not the money that one saves that makes one rich. It is the money that a person spends that makes him rich. It is the money that person spends, as opposed to somebody who is not able to spend, that brings about the disparity.

May I put it in figures? Where one person is in receipt of an income of Rs. 1,000 per month and another is in receipt of an income of Rs. 3,000 per month, if in point of fact both bodies can be made to restrict their expenditure to Rs. 750 a month, the person who earns Rs. 1,000 a month will save Rs. 250 and the person who earns Rs. 3,000 a month will save Rs. 2,250. In so far as their expenditure of Rs. 750 is concerned, in social status, in the enjoyment of consumer goods, the two are equal.

It would be my submission, Mr Deputy Speaker, that the basis and foundation of the rebate system

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

which has been introduced by this Government is that, if you restrict the expending capacity of people, you bring about a greater and a more speedy equality than by merely drawing money by penal taxes and putting it into the Government coffers.

Will somebody please send for some water?

බරු මන්ත්‍රීවරු

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர்கள்)

(Hon Members)

Water! Water!

නීල් ද අල්විස් මයා. (බද්දේගම)

(திரு. நீல் டி. அல்விஸ்—பத்தேகம)

(Mr. Neal de Alwis—Baddegama)

சிகி விஜூர்!

පොන්නම්බලම් මයා.

(திரு. பொன்னம்பலம்)

(Mr. Ponnambalam)

There is a well-known maxim, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which I would commend to the pseudo-economists on the other side. A State does not proceed to erode and destroy the sources of its revenue. It is a maxim that they must really try and understand. You can go about eroding and killing the very sources that have provided the revenue to the country. You can do it, but you cannot do it twice. You can erode and erase the sources that give you the revenue but you cannot touch them again.

What this Government proposes to do is to sustain the income-earning groups in this country, to assist them, indeed to persuade them, and if necessary to compel them, to save; not for them to use up those savings but to divert those savings into channels and canals of public utility under the control and management of the State in a controlled economy where the priorities will be determined by us.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what happens? This position is so completely misunderstood by my hon. Friend the economic pundit from Yatiyantota. I am sorry he is not

present here now. I do not therefore propose to go into these figures. But I say this, standing on the Floor of this House, that every single—I do not say he did it deliberately—calculation he put before this House was wrong both factually and arithmetically. That is a fact. I do not therefore wish now to weary this House, and for the purpose of my own delectation to destroy my hon. Friend. I wish to give him credit for wishful thinking. He goes on contorting and distorting facts and comes out with figures which are totally and utterly indefensible.

Sir, he is again wrong when he talks of inducements and rebates that exist now. For instance, in regard to development of agricultural enterprises, you have a once and for all development rebate of 80 per cent. in some cases and somewhat less in other cases, granted by the last Government. That continues, but it has nothing to do with the investment rebates contemplated under the fiscal policy of this Government.

Then, I think, you had a 40 per cent. development rebate in regard to certain purchases of equipment and so on required by agricultural or industrial concerns. That continues as it did under the last Government. May I say that that has nothing to do with the investment rebate we propose here.

Now the question may well be asked, what is the position of a man whose income is below the Rs. 40,000 mark? May I now deal with the Rs. 40,000 downward cases. When a person is in receipt—I am speaking from memory—of Rs. 40,000 income, the normal tax that would apply to him would be actually Rs. 10,000. Now,—just to convince this House that we really had the expenditure tax at the back of our proposals—if from Rs. 40,000 you deduct Rs. 10,000, you have Rs. 30,000. Rs. 30,000 is Rs. 2,500 a month, and that was originally the sum of money above which, if any expenditure was undertaken, tax had to be paid. Even in that class, the position is that if you save Rs. 10,000 you get a rebate now: in

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[හොත් නම්බලම් මයා.]

the highest income bracket you get 50 per cent, in the intermediate bracket you get 33 1/3 per cent., and in the Rs. 40,000 group and below you get a 25 per cent. rebate. In other words, if you save completely Rs. 10,000, and spend only Rs. 30,000, you get a rebate of Rs. 2,500 again to be diverted to the Central Bank and to be utilized by the Government. The question may well be asked, what part does the poor man play in this scheme of investment and rebates? All I can say is this. At all levels it encourages maximum savings, for which a rebate will be allowed of one-fourth; the reduction in tax will be one-fourth.

One charge made is by asking what part the lowest, the poorest man, the day labourer, will play in this picture. My submission to that is this. The savings institutions and banking institutions that will be necessary to utilize the monies are not brought out fully in this Budget speech of the Hon. Minister of Finance. But I dare say that it will be essential to have a Development Savings Bank and institutions of a like nature which would be able to draw in the savings of the poor man.

The question will be asked, "How does the poor man save?" The House must be aware that during the war under the advice of John Maynard Keynes there were deferred payments in respect of salaries amounting really to compulsory savings in England. It is not inconceivable. It will be a very difficult thing for some time, I agree. It is not inconceivable if in respect of every rise in wages of all wage earners—the agricultural labourer and the industrial worker in this country—a certain sum or a certain proportion of the increased wages can be siphoned off as savings. Then you have the beginnings of a real development of the private sector in this country. Before I conclude may I say this? That would be our answer to those who wish to monopolize the means of production, distribution and exchange!

Every party represented on this side of the House went before the hustings and opposed Marxism in every shape and form. We are unrepentant opponents of Marxism. May I say this? Our Marxist friends can promise almost anything, particularly from the Opposition. But there is one thing they cannot and dare not promise the worker and the peasant and this is a diffused ownership of property by a robust peasantry. This Government, I venture to think, by the implementation of the savings and investment plan will be able to create in this country a robust layer of the peasantry. That will be the first stage which will give the quietus to our Marxist friends.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I thank you very much for the time you placed at my disposal and I thank the House for the patient hearing given me.

අ. හා. 2.4

සිරිමාවෝ ආර්. ඩී. බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.  
(අත්තනලේල)

(திருமதி சிறிமாவோ ஆர். டி. பண்டார நாயக்க—அத்தனகல்ல)

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

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මේ ගරු සභාවේ මා කථා කළ පළමුවන අවසාන වේ මා ප්‍රකාශ කළේ ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයේ නායිකාව වශයෙන් මේ රටේ පොදු ජනතාවගේ සුභසිද්ධිය සඳහා මේ රජය මගින් කවර ප්‍රගතිශීලී වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් හෝ ක්‍රියාවේ යොදන්න අදහස් කරනවා නම් අපේ පක්ෂයේ සහයෝගය ඒ සෑම අවස්ථාවකදීම දෙන බවයි. ඒ බව ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්ට මතක ඇතැයි මා කල්පනා කරනව. ඒ වගේම මේ රටේ සිටින සුළු පිරිසකගේ ඕනෑකම් උඩ හෝ වේවා, විදේශීන්ගේ ධනය ආරක්ෂා කිරීමට හෝ වේවා, ඒවා තව තවත් තහවුරු කිරීමට හෝ වේවා, යම්කිසි ප්‍රතිශාමී වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් ගෙන යාමට උත්සාහ කරනවා නම් අප එයට සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම අපගේ විරුද්ධතාව පළ කරන බවත්, එසින් නොනැවතී සෑම අවස්ථාවකදීම ඒවැනි ක්‍රියා මාර්ගයකට විරුද්ධව ක්‍රියා කරන

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

බවත් එදා මා සඳහන් කළා. ඒ බවත් ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරුන්ට මතක ඇති. මා එදා දුන් ඒ ප්‍රතිඥාව අනුවයි අද මේ අයවැය විවාදයට සහභාගි වෙමින් මගේ අදහස් ප්‍රකාශ කරන්න බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ.

ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා ඇතුළු එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂය පසුගිය මහා මැතිවරණයේ දී කියා සිටියා, මේ රටේ ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදී සමාජවාදය අනුව ආණ්ඩුවක් ඇති කරන වාය යනුවෙන්. ඒ කියමන අනුව යමින් මෙන් මේ ආණ්ඩුවේ පළමුවන රාජ්‍යසභා කථාව ඉදිරිපත් කළ අවස්ථාවේදීත් ඒ පොරොන්දුවම දුන්නා. ඒ කොයි හැටි වෙතත්, ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා ඉදිරිපත් කළ මේ අයවැය ලේඛනයේ හැඩහුරුකම් නිසා සමාජවාදය යන වචනය නම් පාවිච්චි කරන්න එතුමට පුළුවන්කමක් තිබී නැහැ. එහෙත් එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ සමාජ වාදය ගැනත්, ඒ ස්වරූපය ගැනත් ඉතා සියුම් ලෙසත් ඉතා දක්ෂ ලෙසත් ඉතා පැහැදිලි ලෙසත් මේ අයවැය ලේඛනය ඉදිරිපත් කරමින් කරුණු සඳහන් කර දීම ගැන ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාට අප ප්‍රසංශා කළ යුතුයි. රාජ්‍ය කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ගරු ඇමතිතුමා වෙත එල්ල කරන ලද ඒකාධි පතිත්වයක් හා සම්බන්ධ වෝදනාවට එතුමාගේ නිදහසට කී කරුණු ගැනත්, ප්‍රජාතන්ත්‍රවාදයේ ආරක්ෂකයන් හැටියට මේ රජය මහජනයට පෙන්වුම් කරන්නට සූදනම් වන හැටි ගැනත්, මා මේ අවස්ථාවේදී කථා කරන්න බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නෙ නැහැ. ඒ වගේම අප විසින් ආණ්ඩුව කරගෙන ගිය කාලයේදී විශේෂ යෙන්ම පොලීසියේ පහළ පෙළේ නිල ධාරීන් උසස් කිරීමේදී අප විසින් කරන්නට යෙදුණා යයි කියන අයුතු පත්‍රිමි ගැනත් රාජ්‍ය කටයුතු පිළිබඳ ගරු ඇමති තුමා එතුමගේ කථාවේදී කියා සිටියා. මා ඒ ගැනත් මේ අවස්ථාවේදී පිළිතුරු දෙන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නෙ නැහැ. ත්‍රිවිධ හමුදාව, පොලීසිය ආදියේ වැය ශීර්ෂ ගැන කාරක සභාවේ සාකච්ඡා කරන අවස්ථාවේදී මා ඒ ගැන සඳහන් කරන්න බලා පොරොත්තු වන නිසයි දැන් ඒ ගැන සඳහන් නොකරන්නෙ.

ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාගේ අයවැය කථාව ආරම්භයේදී එතුමා කියා සිටියා, ඩබ්ලි ජේනානායක මැතිතුමාගේ ප්‍රධානත්ව යෙන් පිහිටුවා තිබෙන ජාතික ආණ්ඩුවේ පළමුවන අයවැය කථාව එතුමට ඉදිරිපත් කරන්න ලැබීම එතුමගේ භාග්‍යයක් ය යනුවෙන්. ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, ඔබතුමාට මතක ඇති, මේ රටේ එක කාලයක සිටියා අගමැතිවරයෙක්, ඩබ්ලි ජේනානායක නමින්. ඒ අගමැතිතුමාට යම්කිසි දේශපාලන පක්ෂයක නායකයෙක් වන පිලිප් ගුණවර්ධන මහත්මයා යෝජනා කළා ජාතික ආණ්ඩුවක් පිහිටුවන්න ය කියා. ඒ අවස්ථාවේදී ඩබ්ලි ජේනානායක නමැති අගමැතිතුමා කියා සිටියා, සහතික වශයෙන්ම ජාතික ආණ්ඩුවක් පිහිටුවිය හැක්කේ ප්‍රධාන පක්ෂ සියල්ලම එකතු වීමෙන් පමණක් ය කියා. 1960 අප්‍රේල් මාසයේ හැන්සාඩ් වාර්තාවේ අපට එය දක්නට ලැබෙනවා. ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම එතුමාගේ ඒ කියමන මමත් සම්පූර්ණ යෙන්ම අනුමත කරනවා. ඒ නිසා අද මේ පිහිටුවා තිබෙන රජය ජාතික ආණ්ඩුවක් ය යනුවෙන් හඳුන්වන්නට පුළුවන්කමක් නැහැ.

රීලඟට, මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාගේ අයවැය කථාවෙහි සඳහන් කර තිබෙනවා, මේ ආණ්ඩුව පිහිටුවන්නට යෙදුණේ උග්‍ර ආර්ථික අර්බුදයකින් ඊට පෙළෙමින් සිටි අවස්ථාවකදීය, ඒ වාගේම මේ රටේ නිෂ්පාදනයේ වැඩිවීම ඉතාම අඩු අවස්ථාවකදීය කියා. ඒ සමගම මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා කියා සිටියා, මේ රටේ ඉතාම වැදගත් ආර්ථික අංශයට ගැණෙන නේ නිෂ්පාදනය සියයට 26 කිනුත් රබර් නිෂ්පාදනය සියයට 20 කිනුත් පොල් නිෂ්පාදනය සියයට 41 කිනුත් වැඩිවී තිබෙන වාය කියා. මේ ආකාරයට ඒ තේ, පොල්, රබර් නිෂ්පාදනය වැඩිවී තිබෙන්නේ 1954 සිට 1964 දක්වා වූ කාලසීමාව තුළයි. ඒ නිසා මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා සඳහන් කර තිබෙන මේ කාරණය සම්බන්ධයෙන් අප සන්තෝෂ වෙනවා. තේ වගාව මේ අන්දමින් වැඩිවී තිබෙන්නේ 1957 සිට ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයේ ආණ්ඩුව තේ වතු හිමියන්ට දුන් ආධාර නිසයි. ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයේ ආණ්ඩුව විශාල තේ වතු හිමියන්ගේ නිසරු ඉඩම්වල නැවත වරක් තේ සිටුවීමට

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.]

ආධාර දුන්නා වාගේම සුළු තේ වතු හිමියන්ට ඊටත් වඩා විශාල ආධාර දී තිබෙනවා. තේ වගාවේ දියුණුවට මේ අන්දමින් කටයුතු කර තිබෙන නිසයි මේ තරම් තේ නිෂ්පාදනය වැඩිවී තිබෙන්නේ.

1956 ට පෙර එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ ආණ්ඩුව රබර් වගාවට ආධාර දුන්නා. 1956 සිට අපේ ආණ්ඩුවත් ඒ වාගේම රබර් වගාවට ආධාර දීමේ වැඩ පිළිවෙල අනුගමනය කරගෙන ගියා. ඒ වාගේම 1956 සිට පොල් වගාව දියුණු කිරීමටත් පොල් වතු හිමියන්ට අප ආධාර දුන්නා. විශාල පොල් වතු හිමියන්ට වාගේම සුළු පොල් වතු හිමියන්ටත් අප ආධාර දුන් නිසයි පොල් නිෂ්පාදනයත් ඒ විධියට වැඩිවී ගෙන ගියේ.

ඊළඟට මේ රටේ ලාංකිකයන්ට ඉතාමත් වැදගත් වූ ආර්ථික අංශය වන වී නිෂ්පාදනය සම්බන්ධයෙන්, මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා වී නිෂ්පාදනය වැඩි වී තිබෙනවාය කියා අය වැය ලේඛනයේ සඳහන් කළා මිස ඒ ප්‍රමාණය සියයට කීයකින් වැඩිවුණාද කියා සඳහන් කළේ නැහැ. 1956 සිට 1964 දක්වා වූ කාලසීමාව තුළ මේ රටේ වී නිෂ්පාදනය බ්‍රසල් කෝටි 3.13 සිට කෝටි 5.5 දක්වා වැඩිවී තිබෙනවා. ඒ අනුව වී නිෂ්පාදනය සියයට 60 කින් වැඩිවී තිබෙන බව අපට පෙනී යනවා. මේකත් මේ ආකාරයට වැඩි වුණේ, වී නිෂ්පාදනය කරන ගොවීන්ට ලැබුණු ආධාර නිසයි. ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා මේ කාරණය ගැන සඳහන් නොකළේ මන්ද කියා මා දන්නේ නැහැ. වී වගාව පිළිබඳ විස්තරය මා මෙම අවස්ථාවේදී කළේ, එම කටයුත්ත මෙම අංශයට ඉතාම අවශ්‍ය නිසයි. එක්සත් ජාතීන්ගේ සංවර්ධන යුගයේදී මේ රට මෙතරම් හෙමින්සුරේ දියුණු වීම ගැන ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා කතාහැටු වන බව කීව. ඒ විධියට කල්පනා කරනව නම්, 1956 න් පෙර තිබුණු එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂ ආණ්ඩු කාලේ මේ රටේ තේ, රබර්, පොල් සහ වී වගාවන්ගේ වැඩිවීමක්, දියුණුවක් ඒ තරම් දුරට තැනිවීම ගැනත් රටේ දියුණුවක් තැනි වීම ගැනත් සිතා අපේ රටවැසියන් පොළොවේ හැපෙමින් හඬන්ට ඕනා.

දැන් තිබෙන්නේ 1956 න් පෙර තිබුණු විධියේ එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයට අයිති යුගයක් නොවන බවත්, ජාතික ආණ්ඩුවක

යුගයක් බවත් කියමින් එය අපට විශ්වාස කරන ලෙස කියනවා. මෙම ජාතික ආණ්ඩුවට අයත් යුගය තුළදී මේ රට දියුණු කිරීමට අදහස් කරන්නේ කුමන ආකාරයකටද යන්න ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාගේ අයවැය ලේඛන කථාවෙන් පෙන්වුම් කළා. මන්තාරම, යාපනය, වවුනියාව සහ මඩකලපුව යන දිස්ත්‍රික්කවල කපු වැවීම සඳහා අක්කර 30,000ක් පමණ බෙදා දීමට යන බව කියනවා. කපු වැවීම වැනි ව්‍යාපාරයක් ගෙන යන්න ඒ දිස්ත්‍රික්කවල කම්කරු හිඟයක් තිබෙන බව අප අසා තිබෙනවා. එසේ නම් මේ දිස්ත්‍රික්කවල කපු වැවීම සඳහා කම්කරුවන් ලබා ගන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ කොහෙන්ද කියා මා ප්‍රශ්න කරනවා. මන්තාරම, යාපනය, වවුනියාව සහ මඩකලපුව වැනි දිස්ත්‍රික්කවල විශාල වශයෙන් කල්ලතෝනීන් ගොවිතැන්වල යෙදී සිටිනවාය යන්න අපි කවුරුත් දන්නා කාරණයක්. එම නිසා මේ කපු වැවීම සඳහා කල්ලතෝනීන් තව තවත් අපේ රටට එන්න උත්සාහ කරන්න පුළුවනි. අපි කියන්නේ නැහැ, රජය ඊට ආධාර දෙනවාය කියා. මන්තාරම වැනි දිස්ත්‍රික්කවල කල්ලතෝනීන් සිටින බව අපි හොඳින් දන්න නිසා, මේ රටට කල්ලතෝනීන් එන අන්දම ගැන කල්පනා කර බලා අපි මෙම රජයට කියා සිටිනවා, මෙම කපු වැවීම සඳහා කල්ලතෝනීන්ගේ ඒම වලක්වන්නාය කියා. එය එසේ සිදු වීමට පුළුවනකම තිබෙන නිසයි, මා මෙම අවස්ථාවේදී ඒ ගැන සඳහන් කළේ.

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

ඇයි, ඉස්සර ඒක වැලක්කුවේ තැන්නේ?

සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.  
(சிரிமாவோ பண்டாரநாயக்க)  
(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)

එය වලක්වන්න අපි නොයෙකුත් ක්‍රියා මාර්ග ගන්න. මේ රට දියුණු කිරීම සඳහා විශේෂයෙන් මේ රටේ ආහාර නිෂ්පාදනය වැඩි දියුණු කිරීම සඳහා මෙම රජය ගන්න බලාපොරොත්තු වන ක්‍රියා මාර්ග මොන වදා දියදු ගලික අංශය කොමිෂනාරියන්

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

ටත්, විදේශිකයින්ටත්, සම්මාන පුරවැසි භාවය ලබා සිටින අයටත්, රජයේ ඉඩම් අක්කර දහස් ගණනින් දෙන්ට සුදුනම් වන බව පෙනව, වගා කිරීම පිණිස. ඔවුන්ට බදු නිදහසත් යන්ත්‍රෝපකරණ ගෙන්වීමේ පහසුවත් ලබා දෙන්ට යන බව සඳහන් කර තිබෙනව. දැනටමත් මෙම ඉඩම් ලබා ගැනීම සඳහා ඉල්ලුම්කරුවන් වශයෙන්, එජන්සි හවුස් එකකුත්, සම්මාන පුරවැසි භාවය ලැබූ කොමිෂනි කාරයකුත්, වෙනත් කීප දෙනෙකුත් ඉදිරිපත් වී සිටින බව පත්‍ර මාගීයෙන් දැනගන්න ලැබුණ. මුසාජී නමැති මහත්මයකු —ඒ මහත්මය, සම්මාන පුරවැසි භාවය ලබා සිටින කෙනෙක්—දැනටමත් ඉඩම් ලබාගෙන ඒ ඉඩම්වල කැලෑ කපන බව පෙන්වුම් කරමින් එක්තරා මහත්මයෙක් “ටෙමිස්” පත්‍රයට ලිපියක් ලියා තිබෙනව. ඒ ලිපිය සම්බන්ධයෙන් “ටෙමිස්” පත්‍රය මෙසේ කියනව :

“Last Saturday we published a letter from a correspondent who signed himself ‘Puzzled’ because he could not reconcile two newspaper reports.

One was a paragraph in the ‘Observer’ of August 18th which said two Colombo firms had been allocated large extents of land for food production and one of them, Moosajees, was already clearing the jungle.

The other newspaper cited was ‘The Times of Ceylon’ of August 19th which reported that the Special Land Leases Board had met for the first time that very morning and the first of its decisions was ‘to entertain and consider applications for land.’

‘Puzzled’ quite rightly asked how some firms could have got land before applications were called for and considered. Was there, he asked, some political authority making private allocations ?

Today we publish on page 4 a long letter by Mr. S. H. Moosajee who concludes his submissions by saying ‘We hope we have answered the queries of “Puzzled” satisfactorily.’ Quite frankly, he has not. He has only made the puzzle more intriguing.

He says a great deal about how his firm proposes to save the country foreign exchange ; he explains that the firm has a band of bold and eager workers ; he declares they are keen to show that the confidence placed in the private sector is reciprocated by quick and efficient action.

All this is admirable. But what ‘Puzzled’ really wanted to know is how and why some firms were actually allowed to select large areas of Crown land even before the Special Land Leases Board had its inaugural meeting and decided that its first action would be ‘to entertain and consider applications for land.’

We share our correspondent’s bewilderment on this point. As the Ministry of Land, Irrigation and Power should have been aware, a very considerable number of firms and groups in the private sector displayed keen interest in the crash food production idea ever since the Government made its first announcement. They eagerly awaited the clarification of policy and procedure by the Ministry. But even before the proper authority, the Special Leases Board, could hold its first meeting, large extents of land had already been disposed of to a few.

This is the kind of thing that gives even the best intentioned policies of the Government a bad odour, and we hope the publicity we have given this issue will make the authorities realise that they must be scrupulously fair and reasonable in dealing with projects of this nature, where not only patriotism but profit as well is involved. And not only must they be scrupulously fair and reasonable, they must appear to be so.

It simply will not do to jump the gun in the matter of land allocation, or import licences, or anything else connected with this important national project.

මුසාජී මහත්මයාගේ ලිපියත් මා මේ අවස්ථාවේදී කියවන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනව. මක්නිසාද? ඒ ලිපියෙන් ඔප්පු වෙනව, බෝඩ් එකෙන් ඉඩම් වෙන් කරන්නටත් පෙර ඉඩම්වල තිබෙන ගස් කපාගෙන යන බව. ඒ ලිපිය මෙන්න :

“With refernce to the article under the caption ‘How come this land was given away’ appearing under ‘Letters to the Editor’ in your issue of Saturday, 21st August, 1965, and signed ‘Puzzled’, Colombo, I have the pleasure to state that this is first time in history that our Government has invited the private sector to cultivate land in order to assist the economy of the country.

The Cabinet had taken a decision on this matter and we were given authority by the Ministry of Agriculture, Land, Irrigation and Power for the cultivation of an initial extent of 200 acres of jungle land pending the sanction of the Special Leases Board.

We have a band of bold and eager workers and we were anxious not to lose time during the clearing and burning

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[සිව්මාවේ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.]

season. We were particularly keen to show that the confidence placed in the private sector is reciprocated by quick and efficient action.

We have commenced operations in good faith, but if by some chance the Special Leases Board does not approve our application, we stand to lose the money invested for clearing the jungle. We have undertaken this task of growing maize in order to save the country approximately Rs. 1,500,000 annually which is spent by way of foreign exchange in importing maize.

We have to make this a model plantation, and we hope to succeed in our venture so that others too may start cultivating as a few thousand acres alone would not solve the problems of the country. Therefore, everyone in the private sector should show enthusiasm for this type of work and make plantation schemes a success so that Ceylon can be made the Granary of the East which it used to be in the years gone by.

We hope we have answered the queries of "Puzzled" satisfactorily.

S. H. M.,  
Governing Director,  
Moosajees Limited."

එයින් පෙනී යනව, ඉඩම් දෙපාර්තමේන්තුවෙන් ඉඩම් බෙදා දෙන්නන් කලින් යම් යම් පුද්ගලයින් ඒවා අයිති කරගෙන කැලෑ කපන බව. ඊයේ කෘෂිකම් ඇමතිතුමා එතුමාගේ කථාවේදී කියා තිබුණ, රජය මගින් බෙදා දෙන්නට අදහස් කරන ඉඩම්වල තිබෙන වටිනා ලී වර්ග ඒ පුද්ගලයන්ට කපාගෙන යන්නට ඉඩ නොදෙන බව. ඒ ගැන අපි එතුමාට ස්තූති කරනවා.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මේ රටේ ප්‍රධාන ආර්ථික අංශයක් වන කම්බන්ත සංවර්ධනය ගැන අපේ ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයේ ආණ්ඩුව අනුගමනය කළ ක්‍රියා මාර්ගය ගැන මා මේ අවස්ථාවේදී විස්තර කරන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වෙන්නෙ නැහැ. මන්ද? හිටපු කර්මාන්ත ඇමති මොහොමඩ් පාල සේනානායක මහත්මයාගේ කථාවෙනුත්, විරුද්ධ පාර්ශ්වයේ අනිකුත් ගරු මන්ත්‍රීන්ගේ කථාවලින් ඒ පිළිබඳ විස්තර කිය වුණු නිසා. එහෙත් නොකියාම බැරි කරුණක් තිබෙනව. 1948 සිට 1956 දක්වා එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ ප්‍රතිපත්තියත් කාලයේදී පෞද්ගලික අංශයේ කර්මාන්ත

සඳහා යොදවා තිබුණේ ඉතා ස්වල්ප මුදලක් පමණයි. ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයේ ආණ්ඩු කාලයේ විශේෂයෙන්ම 1962 සිට 1965 දක්වා කාලය තුළ, පෞද්ගලික අංශයේ කර්මාන්ත වෙනුවෙන් රුපියල් කෝටි 35ක් පමණ යොදවා තිබෙනව. අපේ ඉලක්කයව තිබුණේ ඒ අවුරුදු 2 තුළ කෝටි 12ක් පමණ යොදවන්නටයි. මේ අවුරුදු 2-3 ඇතුළත කර්මාන්ත 400 ක් පමණ ආරම්භ කර තිබෙන බව මතක් කරන්නට කැමතියි. මට ප්‍රථමයෙන් කථා කළ විරුඬ පාර්ශ්වයේ මන්ත්‍රීන්ගෙන් මේ පිළිබඳව විස්තර සහිතව කරුණු ඉදිරිපත් වී තිබෙන නිසා මා ඒ ගැන කියන්නේ එපමණයි. 1956 ට පෙර තිබුණු එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ ආණ්ඩුව මෙන්ම අපගේ ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයේ ආණ්ඩුව විසින් තේ, රබර්, පොල් වගාව දියුණු කිරීමට විශාල වශයෙන් ආධාර මුදල් දුන්නා. වී වගා කරන ගොවීන්ටත් අපි විශාල වශයෙන් ආධාර මුදල් දුන්නා. ආහාර ද්‍රව්‍ය නිෂ්පාදනය වැඩි කිරීමට අපි ආධාර දුන්නා. නමුත් මේ ආණ්ඩුව මේ රටේ සිටින ගොවීන් කෙරෙහි විශ්වාසයක් නොතබන බව අයවැය වාර්තාවෙන් අපට පෙනී යනවා. ඉඩම් අක්කර දහස් ගණන් "ඒජන්සි හවුස්" වලටත් ඒවගේම සම්මාන පුරවැසිකම් ලබා සිටින විදේශීය කොමිෂනරියන්ටත් ආහාර නිෂ්පාදනය සඳහා පවරා දෙන්නට මෙම ආණ්ඩුව තීරණය කර තිබෙන්නේ ගොවිජනතාව කෙරෙහි ආණ්ඩුව විශ්වාසයක් නොතබන නිසා බව අපට පෙනෙනවා.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මේ රජය මිශ්‍ර ආර්ථික ක්‍රමයක් ඇති කිරීමටත් තහවුරු කිරීමටත් ක්‍රියා කරන බව ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාගේ කථාවෙන් පෙන්වා තිබෙනවා. ඒ මිශ්‍ර ආර්ථික ක්‍රමය ගැන විස්තරයක් රාජ්‍ය කටයුතු භාර ගරු ඇමතිතුමා විසින් කරන්නට යෙදුණා. මිශ්‍ර ආර්ථික ක්‍රමය තහවුරු කිරීම සඳහා මේ රටේ පොදු අංශයන් පෞද්ගලික අංශයන් අතර විවාහ මංගල්‍යයක් ඇති කිරීමෙන්—ඒ අංශ දෙක කසාද බැන්දවීමෙන්—වැඩ පිළිවෙලක් ඇති කොට ඒ මගින් මේ රට දියුණුව කරා ගෙන යා හැකි යයි එතුමා කිවුවා. එදත් අදත් කවදත් අප ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයේ ප්‍රතිපත්තියත් මේ මිශ්‍ර ආර්ථික ක්‍රමයම බව මේ අවස්ථාවේදී මා

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

විසින් පෙන්වා දිය යුතුව තියෙනවා. නමුත් එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ මිශ්‍ර ආර්ථික ක්‍රමයෙන් ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයේ මිශ්‍ර ආර්ථික ක්‍රමයෙන් විශාල වෙනසක් තිබෙනවා. මේ පක්ෂ දෙකේ ප්‍රතිපත්ති අනුව මිශ්‍ර ආර්ථික ක්‍රමයක් යටතේ පොදු අංශයන් පෞද්ගලික අංශයන් දියුණු කරන්නට යන්නේ මොන ආකාරයකටද යන වග මේ අවස්ථාවේදී අප විකක් දුරට සොයා බැලිය යුතුයි.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කපානායකතුමනි, ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂයේ ප්‍රතිපත්තිය පොදු අංශයන් පෞද්ගලික අංශයන් එකින් එක පෝෂ්‍ය කිරීමයි. එසේ පෝෂ්‍ය කරන ගමන්ම රට දියුණුව කරා ගෙනයාමයි. නමුත් එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂය බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ පොදු අංශයන් පෞද්ගලික අංශයන් කසාදා බැන්දවීමෙන්—

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

(கௌரவ எம். எச். முகம்மது—தொழில், தொழில் காண், வீடமைப்பு அமைச்சர்)

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

එක අවශ්‍ය දෙයක්.

**සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.**

(திருமதி சிறிமாவோ பண்டாரநாயக்க) (Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)

කා එක්කද කසාදය බිදින්නට යන්නේ? ඒකයි අපි අහන ප්‍රශ්නය. මේ අංශ දෙක මිශ්‍ර කරන්නට අදහස් කරන්නේ මොන ආකාරයටද යන කරුණ අප මේ අවස්ථාවේදී කල්පනාවට භාජනය කරන්නට මින.

එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ මේ නව රජය බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ විදේශීය කොමිෂනරියන්, සම්මාන පුරවැසි කම් ලබාගත් උදවියන්, බෝරාකාරයන්, වෙනත් ධනපතියන් සමඟ මේ විවාහය කරගන්නයි. ඒකයි, අපේ ප්‍රතිපත්ති දෙකේ තිබෙන වෙනස. මෙයින් අපට බියක් ඇති වී තිබෙනවා, නැවත වරක් අපේ රටේ ධනය පිටරට ආදායන යාමට අවස්ථාවක් ලැබිය කියා.

මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා කියා සිටියා, අපේ ශ්‍රී ලංකා නිදහස් පක්ෂ ආණ්ඩු කාලයේදී මේ රට එන්න එන්නම ණය බරින් ගිලී ගියාය කියා. ඒ අතර එතුමා බොහොම ආඩම්බරයෙන් කියා සිටියා විදේශීය රට වලින් විශාල වශයෙන් මේ අවුරුද්දේ ආධාර ලැබුණු බවත්, ඉදිරි කාලයේදී තවත් ආධාර ලබන බවත්. මේ රජය මහජනයා අතර විශාල සෝෂාවක් කරනවා, මේ රජයට පමණක් විදේශීය රට වල් ආධාර දෙන්න සුදානම්ය කියා. මේ ආධාර වශයෙන් ලැබුණේ පොලී සහිත ණය මුදලක් බව අපි කවුරුත් දන්නවා. මේ පොලී සහිත ණය මුදල ගෙවන්න යන විට අපේ රට තව තවත් ණය බරින් ගිලෙන්නේ නැද්දැයි මම මුදල් ඇමති තුමාගෙන් අහන්න කැමතියි.

අපේ රජය තිබුණු කාලයේදී අපත් විදේශීය රටවලින් ආධාර ලබා ගත්තා. අප ඒවා ලබා ගැනීමේදී ඉතාමත් කල්පනාකාරීවයි, ලබා ගත්තේ. ධනපති රට වලින් ආධාර ලබාගන්නාක මෙන් සමාජවාදී රටවලින්ද ඉතාම අඩු පොලියට ආධාර ලබාගත්තා. මේ රජය විශේෂයෙන්ම ධනපති රටවලින් ආධාර ලබාගැනීමට බලාපොරොත්තු වන බව බොහොම සෝෂාකරමින් කියනවා. මෙයින් අපේ රට විශේෂයෙන්ම ඇමරිකාව වැනි ධනපති රටවලට ගැනි වෙනවා. ඒ රට පාලනය කරන ලෝක බැංකුවෙන් ආධාර ලබාගෙන තිබෙන බව මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා කියා තිබෙනවා.

**ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන**  
(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன) (The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)  
පළමුවෙන් ආධාර ගිවිසුම අත්සන් කළේ පුරුෂයා.

**සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.**

(திருமதி சிறிமாவோ பண்டாரநாயக்க) (Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)

අපි නැතෙයි කියන්නේ නැහැ. අපි දෙපැත්තෙම රටවලින් ගත්තා. [බාධා කිරීමක්] මේ රජය ආධාර ලබාගන්නා ක්‍රමයට අපේ රට විශාල බලවේගයන්ට ආර්ථික වශයෙන් පමණක් නොව, දේශපාලන වශයෙන්ද යටත් විමට ඉඩ තිබෙන්නවා. මම කියන්නේ නැහැ, යටත්

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පතන, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.]

වෙනම කියා. නමුත් යටත් වෙන් න ඉඩ තිබෙනවා. මේ රජය විදේශික අංශයේත්, පෞද්ගලික අංශයේත් දියුණුව සැලසීමේ අදහසින් ආධාර කරනවා.

ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාගේ අයවැය කථාව අනුව පෙනී යන්නේ විදේශීය කොමිපැනි කාරයන්ට ධනපතියන්ට හා විජාතික යන්ට බදු අඩු කර ඇති බවයි. එසේ කිරීමෙන් ඒ අය තව තවත් පොහොසත් කිරීමට ඉඩ සැලසීම නිසා ඇමෙරිකා එක්සත් ජනපදයේ ප්‍රතිපත්තිවලට අනුව කටයුතු කරගෙන යන බව පෙනී යනවා.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මාසයකට රුපියල් 3000 ක් ආදායම් ලබන අය පිළිබඳව ගරු රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා ලොකු අනුකම්පාවක් දක්වා කථා කළා. ඒ විධියේ ආදායමක් ලබන කෙනකුට මෝටර් රථයකුත්, එය ධාවනය කිරීමට රියදුරකුත්, කෝකියකුත්, ආයා කෙනකුත්, මල් වත්තේ වැඩ කිරීමට කුලී කාරයකුත් සැහෙන කුලී ගෙයකුත් වුවමනා බවත් එසේ හෙයින් එවැනි පවුලකට සහන සැලසීම අවශ්‍ය බවත් ඒ නිසාම බදු සහන සැලසූ බවත් ගරු රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා ප්‍රකාශ කළා. නමුත් රුපියල් 150 ක් නැත්නම් රුපියල් 300 ක් මාසයකට ආදායම් ලබන පවුල් ගැන එතුමාට අනුකම්පාවක් ඇති වුණේ නැද්ද? ඒ විධියේ අඩු ආදායම් ලබන අයට ලැබී තිබෙන සහන මොනවාද? අල, එනු, පරිප්පු, බුම් තෙල්, කපු රෙදි හා අලවංගුවල තීරු බදු අඩු කිරීම පමණයි.

**ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්**  
(*ශ්‍රී ජයරාම ආචාර්යවරයා*)  
(An hon. Member)  
එසේ කිරීම තරකද?

**සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.**  
(*ශ්‍රී ජයරාම සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක*)  
(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)  
හොඳයි, නමුත් ප්‍රමාණවත් නැහැ. ඉහත කී දේ සඳහා තීරු ගාස්තු අඩු කිරීමෙන් ආණ්ඩුවට පාඩු වන්නේ රුපියල් එක් කෝටි අට ලක්ෂයක් පමණයි. ඒ ප්‍රමාණය මේ රටේ ජනතාව අතර බෙදා හැරියහොත් එක් අයෙකුට අවුරුද්දකට රුපියල් 1.50 ක වාසියක් ලැබෙනවා. [බාධා කිරීමක්]

**නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා**  
(*උප සභානායක ආචාර්යවරයා*)  
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)  
Please do not interrupt.

**සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.**  
(*ශ්‍රී ජයරාම සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක*)  
(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)

අපට ඔවා පුරුදුයි. අපේ රැස්වීම්වලදීත් ඔය වගේ බාධා ඇති වෙනවා. නමුත් එවැනි බාධාවලින් අප අධ්‍යයනයට පත් කරන්නට බැහැ. පසුගියදා මහනුවරදීත් යම් යම් සිද්ධි වගයක් ඇති වුණා. බාධා වලින් මා අධ්‍යයනය නොවන බව මතක් කරන්නට කැමතියි.

ඉතින් ඉහත කී පරිදි අවුරුද්දට ලැබෙන වාසිය දවසකට නම් ගත භාගයක් පමණයි. අපේ රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා රුපියල් 300 න් පහළ මාසික ආදායමක් ලබන අයට දුන් සහනය එපමණයි. කොමිපැනි කාරයන්ටත්, ධනපතියන්ටත්, සම්මාන පුරවැසිකම් ලැබූ අයටත් ලැබෙන සහන නම් සුළු නැහැ. ඒ ගැන මම මේ අවස්ථාවේදී විස්තර කරන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නෙ නැහැ. මට ප්‍රථම කථා කළ මැද කොළඹ තෙවන ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (කෙන මන් මයා.) ඒ ගැන විස්තරයක් කළා. මේ විවාදයේදී විරුද්ධ පක්ෂය වෙනුවෙන් පළමුවෙන්ම කථා කළ යටියන්තොට ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාත් මේ ගැන විශාල විස්තරයක් කළා. දොම්පේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමන් මේ ගැන විස්තර කරාවියයි මම බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. ඒ නිසා මම ඒ ගැන වැඩි දුර විස්තර කරන්නට යන්නෙ නැහැ. නමුත් මේ බදු ක්‍රමය වෙනස් කිරීමෙන් ධනවතුන්ට විශාල සහන දී තිබෙන බව අප කාටත් දැන් පැහැදිලි වී අවසානයයි.

මේ අවස්ථාවේදී එක බද්දක් ගැන පමණක් මට නොකියා බැහැ. එනම් විසා බද්ද ගැනයි. යම් කිසි විදේශිකයෙක් මේ රටේ මාස 3 කට වැඩි කාලයක් ඉන්නව නම් එවැනි කෙනකුගෙන් අවුරුද්දකට රුපියල් 400 ක් අය කිරීමටයි, 1963 දී එවකට සිටි අපේ මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා මේ විසා බද්ද ඉදිරිපත් කළේ. 1963 දී ඉන්දියානුන් 10,768 දෙනෙකුත්, පාකිස්තානින් 1801 දෙනෙකුත් මේ විසා බද්ද ගෙවූ බව අපට

දැන ගන්නට ලැබී තිබෙනවා. මේ විසා බද්ද අය කිරීමේ යෝජනාව 1963 දී පාර්ලි මේන්තුවට ඉදිරිපත් කළ අවස්ථාවේදී එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයත්, අනික් පක්ෂයත් එ සම්බන්ධයෙන් අපට සහයෝගය දුන්න. දැනට රජයේ වැඩ පිළිබඳ ඇමති වැලිගම මන්ත්‍රීතුමාත්, දැනට මේ ගරු සභාවේ නැති කලින් සිටි මාකන් මාකර් මන්ත්‍රීතුමන් ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් අපට සහයෝගය දෙන බව ඒ අවස්ථාවේදී ප්‍රකාශ කළා. මෙයට විරුද්ධ වුනේ එකම එක මන්ත්‍රී කෙනකු පමණයි. එනම් තොන් ඩමන් මන්ත්‍රීතුමායි. එදා මේ බද්ද අය කිරීමට එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයත් අනික් පක්ෂයත් අපට සහයෝගය දී අද එය අස් කරන්නට හේතුව කුමක්ද කියා අපි දැන ගන්නට කැමතියි. එසේ කරන්නේ අර එදා විරුද්ධ වූ මන්ත්‍රීතුමාගේ ඉල්ලීම අනුවද, ඒ මන්ත්‍රීතුමාගේ බලපෑම උඩද කියා අපට ලොකු සැකයක් තියෙනවා.

ගරු රාජ්‍ය ඇමතිතුමා කියා තිබුන, මේ විසා බද්ද අස් කළේ මේ රටට එන විදේශ සංචාරකයින්ගේ ගණන වැඩි කර ගැනීමටය කියා. අප දන්නා හැටියට මාස 3කට වැඩි කාලයක් විදේශිකයෙක් යම් කිසි රටක ඉන්නේ ඉතාමත් කලාතුරකින්. වැඩි වුනොත් සති දෙකක්, තුනක් පමණයි, විදේශිකයෙක් යම් කිසි රටක නවතින්නේ. ඉතාමත් කලාතුරකින් කෙනෙක් තමයි, මාස 3 කට වැඩි කාලයක් නව තින්නේ. ඒ නිසා ඒ අයට මෙයින් සහනයක් ලැබෙන්නේ නැහැ. විසා බද්ද අස් කළේ ඒ හේතුව නිසාය කියා අපට විශ්වාස කරන්නට බැහැ.

1961 දී අපේ රජයේ සිටි මුදල් ඇමති තුමා ඉදිරිපත් කළ මුදල් පනත සංශෝධනය කරන්නට යන බව ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමා ප්‍රකාශ කළා. එය සංශෝධනය කරන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වන්නේ මේ රටේ තිබෙන විදේශීය බැංකුවල, ස්වදේශිකයන්ට මුදල් තැන්පත් කිරීමට නැවත වරක් ඉඩ ලබා දීමටය කියා සඳහන් කළා. ලාංකීකයන්ගේ මුදල් මේ බැංකුවල විශාල වශයෙන් තැන්පත් කිරීම නිසා විදේශ බැංකුවලට විශාල ලාභ ලැබුණා.

ඒ ලාභ මේ රටින් පිටරට ගෙන යාමටත් ඉඩ ලැබුණා. මෙය සීමා කිරීමටයි, 1961 දී අපි ඒ මුදල් පනත ඉදිරිපත් කළේ. දැන් එය ඉවත් කිරීමට හේතුව, මේ රජයට ආධාර දෙන ධනපති රටවල ඉල්ලීමය කියා අප විශ්වාස කරනවා. අප ඒ මුදල් පනත ඉදිරිපත් කළ අවස්ථාවේදී සමහර බටහිර රටවල් ඒ ගැන අපට විරුද්ධත්වය පළ කළා. ඒ නිසයි අපි විශ්වාස කරන්නේ මේ පනත සංශෝධනය කරන්න බලාපොරොත්තු වෙන්නේ ඒ අයගේ ඉල්ලීම අනුවයි කියා. මේ රටේ කර්මාන්ත ආදිය දියුණු කර රට සංවර්ධනය කිරීමට විදේශිකයින් විදේශීය ආයතනත් විශාල වශයෙන් මේ රටේ මුදල් යොදවනවා ඇත කියා මේ රජය බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවාලු. ඒ අන්දමට විදේශිකයින් විශාල වශයෙන් මේ රටේ මුදල් තැන්පත් කළත් එයින් ඒතරම් ප්‍රයෝජනයක් වෙන්නේ නැහැ. ඒ කොමි පැනිවල සේවය සඳහා විදේශීය විශේෂඥයින් ආදීන් ලංකාවට එන්නට පුළුවන් නිසාත්, ඔවුන්ට ලැබෙන පඩි නඩි ආදිය පිටරට ගෙන යන්නට ඔවුන්ට අවසර ලැබෙනු ඇත කියා විශ්වාස කරන නිසාත්, ඒ තැන්පත් කරන මුදලත් ඒවායින් ලැබෙන ලාභයත් ලංකාවට ප්‍රයෝජනයක් වෙයි හිතන්න අමාරුයි. එවිට එයින් මේ රටට ලැබෙන ලාභ ප්‍රයෝජනය මොකක්ද? රට සංවර්ධනය කරන්නට මුදල් යෙදවීමට විදේශිකයන්ට අවසර දුන්නත්, ඒ මුදලත් ඒ මුදල් තැන්පත් කිරීමෙන් ලැබෙන ලාභ ප්‍රයෝජනත් පිට රට ගෙන යන්න දෙනවා නම්, එයින් මේ රටට ඇති ප්‍රයෝජනය කුමක්ද කියා අපි ප්‍රශ්න කරනවා.

1949 ත් 1956 ත් අතර වූ එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයේ පාලන යුගයේදී මේ රටේ සිටි විදේශිකයන් විසින් කෝටි 21.7 ක ලාභ ප්‍රයෝජන මේ රටින් පිට ගෙන ගොස් තිබෙනවා. එමෙන්ම මේ රටේ විදේශික කොම්පැනිකාරයින් විසින් ලාභ ප්‍රයෝජන වශයෙන් කෝටි 63.2 ක් මේ රටින් පිටරට ගෙන ගොස් තිබෙනවා. මේ රටට ගෙන්වන බඩු ආහාර ද්‍රව්‍ය ආදිය ගෙන්වීමේදී “ඕවර්ලෝප් ඔප් ඉන්වොලොප්” කියන ක්‍රමයෙන් අපේ මුදල් විශාල වශයෙන් පිටරට යනවා. එමෙන්ම

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවන වර කියවීම

[සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.]

මේ රටින් පිට රටට බඩු යැවීමේදී මේ බඩු යවන අය විසින් කරනු ලබන වංචා නිසාත්, මුදල් පිටරට යනවා. ඒ කියන්නේ ඒ බඩුවල වටිනාකම අඩුවෙන් දැමීමෙනුයි. ඒ කුමයෙන් මුදල් රාශියක් පිටරට යැවීමට ඉඩ තිබෙනවා. එය ඒ කාලයේත් වුණා ; දැනත් වෙනවා. ඒ නිසා අපේ මුදල් පිටරට යෑමට අපේ කාලයේ දීට වඩා මේ කාලයේදී ඉඩ ලැබෙන බව අපට මෙයින් පෙනී යනවා.

ගරු නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමනි, මේ ගරු මුදල් ඇමතිතුමාගේ අය-වය ලේඛනයේ තිබෙන සමහර කරුණු ගැන මා දැන් කෙටියෙන් විස්තරයක් කළා. ධීවර කර්මාන්තය ගැන මා වැඩි විස්තරයක් කරන්න බලාපොරොත්තු වෙන්නෙ නැහැ. ධීවර අංශය භාරව සිටි ඇමතිවරයෙක් හැටියට දෙවිනුවර ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමා (පී. එච්. ඩබ්ලිව්. ද සිල්වා මයා.) ඒ පිළිබඳව දීර්ඝ විස්තරයක් කළා. ඒ නිසා ඒ ගැන යමක් කියන්න මා බලාපොරොත්තු වෙන්නෙ නැහැ. මා විශ්වාස කරනවා දොම්පෙ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමන් (එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාර නායක මයා.) ඒ ගැන කථා කරන්න බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා කියලා. අප ආණ්ඩුව කරගෙන ගිය කාලයේ ධීවර කටයුතු භාර ඇමති හැටියට එතුමා කලක් සේවය කළ නිසා එතුමා ඒ ගැන විස්තර කරන්න බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. ඒ ගැන කථා කරමින් මේ ගරු සභාවේ කාලය ගත කරන්න මා බලාපොරොත්තු නොවන්නෙ ඒ නිසයි.

මට සඳහන් කරන්න අමතක වුණා සම්මාන පුරවැසි භාවය ලබා සිටින අය ගැන. එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයට සෑම අවස්ථාවකදීම පාහේ සහයෝගය දුන් ප්‍රවෘත්ති පත්‍ර කොටසක් මේ රටේ තිබෙනවා. ලේක් හවුස්, ටයිම්ස් සමාගම, ගුණසේන කොමිෂනරිය ආදියයි ඒ පත්තරකාරයෝ. එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයටත්, ඒ වගේම එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂයට සහයෝගය දෙන සෑම පක්ෂවලටත්, පුද්ගලයන්ටත්, සෑම අවස්ථාවකදීම මෙමතිය, කරුණාව සහ මුදිතාව දක්වමින් ක්‍රියා කරන මේ පත්‍ර කියා තිබෙන දෙයක් මේ අවස්ථාවේදී මා කියවන්න කැමතියි. එය සම්මාන පුරවැසි භාවය ලබා සිටින අය ගැනයි.

මැතිව මයා.

(කීරු. මැතිපු)  
(Mr. Mathew)

ඔය සම්මාන පුරවැසිකම් පහාවට දීපු ඒවද?

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා  
(කලාඛිති ආණ. ආර්. ටෙරොරා)  
(Dr. N. M. Perera)

පහාවට තමුසෙල තමයි දන්නෙ. ඒක මතක තියා ගන්නව.

මැතිව මයා.

(කීරු. මැතිපු)  
(Mr. Mathew)

ඇයි, තමුසෙ මැණික්වලට පහාව ගන්න නේද?

කෙනමන් මයා.

(කීරු. කෙනමන්)  
(Mr. Keuneman)

තාත්තගෙ අඩි පාරේද යන්නෙ කොළොන්නෙ මන්ත්‍රීතුමා?

Is he following in his father's footsteps?

සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.

(කීරුමති සිඛිඛාමා ටෙරොරා පණ්ඩාරනායක)  
(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)

1965 ජූනි මාසයේ 29 වැනිදා 'බබ්සර්වර්' පත්‍රයේ තිබුණු ප්‍රකාශයක් දැන් මා කියවන්න බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවා. මෙන්න එය :

INSIDE INFORMATION

It is time the Government took steps to protect the nationals of Ceylon from these anti-national money-making, anti-social, and so called 'Distinguished' citizens whose left foot only is in Ceylon. Their right foot, heart and gold from loaded and overloaded invoices are firmly set in Bombay.

The local authorities too should take steps to bring to the notice of the rent-paying public that they should appeal to the Ruinous Building Section at once against such victimization as non-repairs. The only thing non-national about them is that these sharks have given up their golden caps for nylon slacks and terrylen shirts.

සම්මාන පුරවැසි භාවය ලබා ගත් අය ගැන "බබ්සර්වර්" පත්‍රයේ සඳහන් කර තිබුණු දෙයක් මා දැන් කියෙව්වෙ. මමවැනි

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

අයටයි දැන් අපේ රටේ අක්කර දහස් ගණන් වගා කිරීමට—ආහාර නිෂ්පාදනය කිරීම සඳහා—දෙන්නට යන්නේ.

අය-වැය ලේඛනයට සම්බන්ධ නොවූවත් මා ඒ කාරණය ගැන සඳහන් කළෙහුයි. ඒ මක්නිසාද? අප මේ රටේ ජාතිවාදය අවුස්සන්න උත්සාහ කරනවාය කියා අපට විරුද්ධව චෝදනා කරන නිසයි. පළමු වෙන්ම මේ රටේ ජාති වාදය ඇවිස්සුවේ කවිද කියා මා නොකීවාට මේ රටේ කුඩා දරුවකු පවා දන්නවා. 1957-58 කාලයේදී මේ රටේ ඇති වූ ජාතිවාදී කොලාහල ඇති කිරීමට මූලික වශයෙන් ක්‍රියා කළේ මේ රටේ ධනපති ප්‍රවෘත්ති පත්‍රයි. එය පැහැ දිලිව පුවත්පත් කොමිෂන් සභා වාර්තාවේ සඳහන් වෙනවා. පුවත්පත් කොමිෂන් සභාව ඉදිරියේ සාක්ෂි දුන් ද්‍රවිඩ මහතූන් දෙදෙනෙකු කියා තිබෙන දේවල් දැන් මා මේ ගරු සභාවට ඉදිරිපත් කරන්නට සතුටුයි. අප ජාතිවාදය අවුස්සනවාය කියා ලේක්හවුස් ප්‍රවෘත්ති පත්‍ර චෝදනා කරනත් මෙන්න පුවත්පත් කොමිෂන් සභා වාර්තාවේ ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් සඳහන් කර තිබෙන හැටි :

“1958 වසරේදී ඇතිවූ ජාතිභේදවාදී කෝලාහල වලට වගකිව යුත්තේ පුවත්පත් බව රාජසිංහම් මහතාගේ සාක්ෂ්‍යවලින් පැවසුනේය. අප වෙත සන්දේශයක් එවූ ඇස්. ඊ. ආර්. පෙරිමපනායගම් මහතාගේ අදහස වූයේද එයමයි. කැරලි කෝලාහල පැවති සමයේ පුවත්පත් ඒ සම්බන්ධයෙන් පළ කල ආරංචි කෙබඳු වීද යත්, ජාතිභේද කලහ පිළිබඳ සියලුම ආරංචි පාලනය කරන්නට පවා ආණ්ඩුවට සිදුවිය. කලිකලහ තවතවත් පැතිරී යාමට අනුබල ලැබෙන අයුරින් ක්‍රියා කරන ලෙස එක්තරා පුවත් පතක කර්තෘ මණ්ඩලයට උපදෙස් ලැබී තිබුණු බව රහස් සාක්ෂ්‍ය දුන් තැනැත්තෙක් අප සමග පැවසීය. එහෙත් ආණ්ඩුව නිසි වේලාවට පුවත්පත් පාලනයක් පැනවීම නිසා එම පුවත් පතේ කුරිරු කුරුමානම වැරදි ගියේය.”

එහෙමයි පුවත්පත් කොමිෂන් සභා වාර්තාවේ සඳහන් කර තිබෙන්නේ. මේ රජයේ මැතිඇමතිවරුන් ජාති වාදය අවුස්සනවාය කියා අපට චෝදනා කරනවා. මා සිතනවා, දොමිපේ ගරු මන්ත්‍රීතුමාත් ඒ ගැන සඳහන් කරන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වෙනවාය කියා. මට පෙනෙනවා එතුමා හැත්සාඩ් වාර්තා රාශියකුත් තබාගෙන සුදුනමින් සිටින බව. ඒ නිසා මා ඒ ගැන

වැඩි විස්තරයක් කරන්නට යන්නේ නැහැ. නමුත් ජාති වාදය අවුස්සනවාය කියා අද අපට චෝදනා කරන්නේ මක් නිසාද කියා අපි බලමු.

මේ රටේ අවුරුදු හාරසියක් පන්සියක් මුළුල්ලේ යටපත් වී තිබුණු සිංහල භාෂා වට නියම තැන ලැබුණේ 1956ත් පසුව බව කවුරුත් දන්නවා. ඒ ලබාගත් අයිති වාසිකම් නැතිවේගෙන යන බවට ලකුණු පෙනෙන නිසා අප එය මහජනයාට පෙන් නුම් කළා. ඇත්ත වශයෙන්ම සුළු ජාතීන්ට ඔවුන්ගේ අයිතිවාසිකම් දෙන වාට අප කිසිසේත් විරුද්ධ නැහැ. සුළු ජාතීන්ගේ අයිතිවාසිකම් ලබා දීමට අපත් සහයෝගය දෙන්න ලැස්තියි. නමුත් සිංහල ජනතාව ලබා ගෙන තිබෙන අයිති වාසිකම් කිසිම විධියකින්වත් පාවා දී සුළු ජාතිකයන්ට අයිතිවාසිකම් ලබා දෙන්න යනවා නම් ඊට අපි විරුද්ධ වෙනවා. ඒක ජාතිවාදය ඇවිස්සීමක් නොවෙයි. 1957, 1958 කාලයේ එක්සත් ජාතික පක්ෂය ජාතිවාදය ඇවිස්සීමට උත්සාහ ගත් හැටි මා මේ අවස්ථාවේදී කියන්නට වුවමනාවක් නැහැ. මුළු රටත්, මේ ගරු සභාවේ සියලු දෙනාමත් ඒ ගැන දන්නවා ඇති. ඒ නිසා මා ඒ ගැන වැඩි විස්තරයක් කරන්නට බලාපොරොත්තු වෙන්නේ නැහැ. පත්‍ර කාරයින් හැමදාම කරන්නේ අප කරන කථා සම්පූර්ණයෙන්ම අනිත් පැත්තට පෙරළා පළ කිරීමයි. සමහර විට මේ මන්ත්‍රී වරුන් අහන්න පුළුවනි, එහෙම වැරදි තිබෙනව නම් ඇයි ඒව හරිගස්සා දමන්නේ නැත්තේ කියා. හැමදාම පත්‍රවල අපි කියන දේවල් වැරදි විධියටයි පළ කරන්නේ. හැමදාම මේවට විරුද්ධව ලියා ලියා ඉන්න තරම් කාල වෙලාවක් අපට නැහැ. යම් විධියකින් ලියා යැව්වත් ඒව හරියට පළ කරන්නේ නැති නිසා අපි දැන් එසේ ලියා යැවීම නතර කරලයි තියෙන්නේ. ඊයේ පෙරේද මා නුවරඑළියේදී කළ කථාවක් පත්‍රවල පළ කර තිබුණ. කල්ල තෝනින් මේ රටට පැමිණීම ගැන මෙම රජය කිසිවක් කරන්නේ නැතැයි කියා මා ප්‍රකාශ කර තිබෙන බවක් පළ වී තිබුණ. මා එහෙම දෙයක් කීවේ නැහැ. සමහරවිට ගරු අගමැතිතුමා අහන්න පුළුවනි, ඇයි එහෙනම් පත්‍රවලට ඒ බව ප්‍රකාශ නොකළේ පත්‍රවලට යවල වැඩක් නැහැ. අප කරන කතා හරියාකාර පත්‍රවල සඳහන්

பிசுரீதன கெடுதலுடன் பதன, 1965-66

—தேவநெடு கியலி

[பிசுரீதலுடன் வன்மொருகையக மிய.]

தொகிரீத நியகி, அடி தே ரதே லுவி னரியகர் அசுமலிய அகி வீ நிகெந்நெ கியா தெம அலசுலாவேடி புரியக கரந்ந மிய.

தா தேடு வலா யமகர் கியந்ந லொ பாரேந்நு வந்நெ நயக. நல ரு அமநிவரு தேதேநெகந்ந மந்நிவரயகந்ந கநா கிரீமடு கிபிந நியா மகெ கலாவ தெநெகிந்ந அலசுந்ந கிரீமடுகி லொ பாரேந்நு தெந்நெ. அநாமி அய லுதெந்ந தெதெந்ந அநுமி படி கிவந்ந, அபி லீலடு மூதூந்ந டுந்ந. தெபமந்ந தேலா மகெ கலாவ கர கெந யாமடு அலகாக டீம கநா கித மகெ கலாவடு கிவந்ந டீம கநா நமூந்ந நாத்நகெடுந்ந ரு மந்நிவருந்நடுந்ந ஸ்நுநிவந்ந தெதீந்ந மகெ கலாவ அலசுந்ந கரநல.

also referred to a certain marriage and posed the question as to the other party to this marriage. That is a question, I must confess, I cannot reply to because I have been singularly unfortunate in my endeavours in that direction.

பீ.பீ. டா.பீ. வியசு லென்மொருகையக மிய. (தேலிபே)

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க—தொம்பே)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike—Dompe) Never say die!

நியோஜீத கலாயகயகநும

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

The Prime Minister need have no fear. This is not a leap year.

அ. கா. 3.4

ரு. லிபிடி ஸேநாயக

(கெளரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is the first Budget Debate of the Sixth Parliament of this country. Many hon. Members of this House have taken part in this Debate for the first time. Listening to them, and having read some of those speeches one had not the opportunity to listen to, I must, at the outset, congratulate all those Members on both sides of the House for the high standard of Debate set on this occasion. I am emboldened by the fact of that high standard to say it is a happy augury for the future deliberations of this House. The hon. fair Leader of the Opposition—

ரு. லிபிடி ஸேநாயக

(கெளரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have leapt over many a leap year.

கெநமந்ந மிய.

(திரு. கெநமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

He has been very fortunate to have escaped.

ரு. லிபிடி ஸேநாயக

(கெளரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Coming to the Budget, Mr. Deputy Speaker, listening to some of the speeches from across the Floor one wondered whether the hon. Members across expected us to implement their policies. The whole gist of their criticism was, "Why do you not do this, and why do you not do that, which they have espoused for 30-odd years?" But, surely we went to the polls on an entirely different footing. When we went to the country we told the people of this country that you were all wrong, that your policies were wrong. So we told the people who had suffered for nine

ரு. மந்நிவரயசுந்ந

(கெளரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

Very fair.

ரு. லிபிடி ஸேநாயக

(கெளரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

—who has just preceded me made many points. During the course of my speech I shall endeavour to meet some of them. The hon. fair Member

விசேஷக் கைத்தொழில் சபை, 1965-66

—தேவநகர கிளையிலே

years under those policies, "Return us to undo all this." The people accepted our word. That is why we are here. We are not here to carry out your policies, we are here to carry out our policies as we promised the people, and they will judge us by that.

**ஓர் உறுப்பினர்**

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

What about the Federal Party?

**ஓர் உறுப்பினர்**

(கௌரவ டட்லி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Oh, yes, the Federal Party will also be helping us to carry out those very policies.—[Interruption]

**ஓர் உறுப்பினர்**

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

The Federal Party is not cheering.

**ஓர் உறுப்பினர்**

(கௌரவ டட்லி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

First, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we adumbrated some of these policies in the Throne Speech. We had a Debate about those. We are trying to put into effect as much as could be put into effect of those policies through the medium of the Budget. So if you criticize us on the score that we promised the people something and we did not carry it out that would be quite valid, but here you are criticizing us for not carrying out what you promised the people. We have been sent here to carry out what we promised the people; that is the reason why we are here.

Now, what should the Budget endeavour to do? It should meet the situation, particularly, financially and economically, that confronts the country today. I was amazed at a seasoned Member like the hon. Member for Yatiyantota, so well versed in economics, telling us that there is no crisis. If I heard him right when he was speaking, what he said was that it was wrong for us to say that

there is a crisis. I know no economics, but yet I can say that there is a crisis. Surely, the crisis is there in regard to our external assets; the crisis is that the country finds itself in a position where it cannot pay for a few days imports. Surely that is a critical situation for any country to face. Can the hon. Member for Yatiyantota deny the fact that the exchequer we took over was in such a parlous situation as far as the external assets were concerned? This country, Sir, was placed in a position where it could not have financed a few days' imports. He cannot deny that. That is a fact.—[Interruption]. You said "crisis".

**ஓர் உறுப்பினர்**

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You are using the wrong word. I do not deny that you are in difficulties. As a matter of fact, in my Budget speech I said that we were in a difficult position. I did not say that there was no crisis.

**ஓர் உறுப்பினர்**

(கௌரவ டட்லி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I have never used the word "bankruptcy", but I have always used the word "crisis". As to when a country is going bankrupt is not an easy thing to say; it is not an easy thing to say that at such and such a point the country would become bankrupt. You can say that I could go bankrupt at such and such a point, but at what point the country would go bankrupt is not such an easy thing to say. But the fact remains that we are in a critical financial situation and that is a fact I want hon. Members to realize. You handed over to us a critical financial situation. That is what I want you and the country to realize.—[Interruption].

You and your predecessors—all of them. That is what you have been doing for the last so many years. When you handed over, the financial position was such that we could not

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙමනවර කියවීම

[හැරු බිඳිලි සේනානායක]

finance a few days' imports for the country. That is where we took over, and that is the crisis we had to meet. Now, let us start from that position.

I do not want to go into the causes of that critical situation. The hon. Member for Jaffna (Mr. Ponnambalam) who preceded me and I myself on previous occasions in this House and even the hon. Member for Yatiyantota himself, when he was in the Opposition, have given this House very adequately detailed information as to why we are in this situation.

එස්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(ශ්‍රී ලං. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

That was those days.

හැරු බිඳිලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උඩුනි ජෙනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

We are also talking of those days. Why are we in this situation? Then you were not sparing in your words in pointing to the cause of this terrible financial situation, but, unfortunately, you did not improve matters yourself when you went there. You cannot claim to have improved matters by your Budget.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාතිඨි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Only three months!

හැරු බිඳිලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරාව උඩුනි ජෙනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I am not trying to criticize you. The biggest criticism I can make of you is that you ever consented to join them.

Now, starting from the point that we are in that critical external assets situation—a critical external assets situation is a serious matter for a country like Ceylon because our economy is an open one unlike some closed economies like India, for instance, where a serious external assets situation will not have the same

impact as on our economy which is heavily weighted in the import-export sector. Therefore, a reasonable size of external assets is a first essential for our economy.

I think the hon. Member for Dompe who is speaking after me, at one time in his first year as Finance Minister, had different ideas about external assets. He said unlike the United National Party we are not going to keep them in other countries. [Interruption]. So what did you do? You emptied them. There is a vast difference between stockpiling and emptying the assets completely. We are suffering because of your process of emptying them. But it would be harsh to blame the hon. Member for Dompe. The emptying was done by his predecessor as well. He had to face a difficult situation when he became Minister of Finance.

Now, I shall quote from some of the authoritative statements to prove my point, because not only the hon. Member for Yatiyantota but very many other hon. Members said, including the hon. Member for Medawachchiya (Mr. Maithripala Senanayake): "We did not want to keep our external assets outside. We used them." The extent and the manner in which they were used, I shall not refer to now. The hon. Member for Jaffna dealt with it, how the major portion was run down, not for development, but for other purposes. In my earlier speeches too on the Second Reading Debate on the Appropriation Bill in the last Parliament, I dealt with that aspect.

In passing I might read—because the hon. Leader of the Opposition spoke about the great strides made in regard to development—what is stated in the opening paragraphs of the Central Bank Report. It gives us a good idea of the great development that has taken place.

"In terms of Ceylon's Gross National Product"—

and this report is, of course, quoted by both sides of the House with authority; I have used it many times,

பிசுப்பன் கெடுதலின் பணம், 1965-66

—தேவதர கியூபி

and the hon. Member for Yatiyantota has used it many times, and I do not think the figures are contested. The conclusion may be put differently.

—“1964 was a considerably better year than 1963. In 1963, Gross National Product in real terms increased by only 1.9 per cent. whilst real product per capita actually declined by 0.6 per cent.”

The main point is that in 1963 the per capita income actually declined by 0.6 per cent. Madam, that is progress.

“In 1964, on the other hand, Gross National Product in real terms is estimated to have risen by 4.5 per cent. and real product per capita by 2.1 per cent.

கேள்விகள் மூலம்.

(திரு. கெனமன்)  
(Mr. Keuneman)

4.5 is real output!

சுரு. டி. சேனாயக்க

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

But when you relate it to the increase of population, the real increase is 2.1 per cent.

கேள்விகள் மூலம்.

(திரு. கெனமன்)  
(Mr. Keuneman)

You are talking of per capita output. I am talking of real output.

சுரு. டி. சேனாயக்க

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

The per capita and real product per capita is 2.1 per cent. In one year the per capita income declined; in another year you had a meagre increase; and it is estimated that we can never make any advance unless we at least have an increase of 5 per cent. annually.

சுரு. டி. சேனாயக்க

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)  
(Dr. N. M. Perera)

In real output.

சுரு. டி. சேனாயக்க

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

Yes. And, did they reach that figure at any time during their time?

சுரு. டி. சேனாயக்க

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)  
(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Did you reach?

சுரு. டி. சேனாயக்க

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

Oh, yes.

சுரு. டி. சேனாயக்க

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)  
(Dr. N. M. Perera)

From 1949 to 1956?

சுரு. டி. சேனாயக்க

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

There may have been years. However, the real point is this. What is our situation today? As stated here, at page 1 of the Central Bank Report for 1964:

“Foreign exchange difficulties have begun to limit Ceylon's ability to meet her full requirements of raw materials, machinery and spares, not only for accelerating development, but also for the fullest exploitation of existing capacity.”

That is the sorry pass we have come to. You talk of development of the country. You have brought this country to the state when the country had not the money to import spare parts and machinery to maintain the existing capacity for development, leave alone new development. That was the external assets position. Then again, on the same page, the remedy is also hinted at.

“Ceylon's policy objective at present should aim at reducing the disequilibrium in the monetary field and at strengthening her external payments position through increased exports, greater import substitution where feasible, and an augmented flow of external capital resources.”

I want the hon. Members to bear in mind those three points. The hon. Member for Yatiyantota agrees with the remedy. What is the remedy?

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක]

“Ceylon's policy objective at present should aim at reducing the disequilibrium in the monetary field—”

That is adjusting the Budget deficit—

“—and at strengthening her external payments position through increased exports, greater import substitution where feasible, and an augmented flow of external capital resources.”

I can understand the grouse of the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central. He says that you must only have the inflow of capital from a certain section; from only a certain camp must the capital come to Ceylon. But I am glad the hon. fair Leader of the Opposition and the others of her way of thinking do not think so. They have in fact, got their capital from both sources, but the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central will continue to criticize any Government that does not exclusively get its aid from one particular camp.

කෙනමන් මයා.

(තිரு. කෙනමන්)  
(Mr. Keuneman)

I have never said that you should not get aid from any other source. But I am opposed to American and West German aid because it has strings attached to it. I did not oppose Canadian aid.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරව උඩ්ලි ජෙලානායක)  
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Perhaps, the hon. Member will enlighten me privately if he cannot speak publicly about those strings.

කෙනමන් මයා.

(තිரு. කෙනමන්)  
(Mr. Keuneman)

I will do it here and now. West Germany cut off their aid because my hon. Friends in the S.L.F.P. raised the status of the German Democratic Republic here. America cut off their aid because we took the step of nationalizing the oil companies and because we did not agree with their views on compensation. Are these not an indication that there are political strings attached to their aid?

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරව උඩ්ලි ජෙලානායක)  
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

But the point is that if a country imposes certain conditions then the other country is at liberty to refuse that aid. Supposing any of these countries were to impose conditions with which we do not agree, then we can refuse that aid.—[Interruption]. About the oil compensation matter we will thrash it out tomorrow, because there is a specific Motion on the Order Paper. We are perfectly content with the conditions on which they are giving us aid.

කෙනමන් මයා.

(තිரு. කෙනමන්)  
(Mr. Keuneman)

They have not resumed it yet.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරව උඩ්ලි ජෙලානායක)  
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I suppose before long they will. They have already indicated that they will be resuming aid.

The hon. fair Leader of the Opposition spoke about our paying interest. I would like to enlighten her that some of these countries are giving us huge sums as loans without a cent's interest. The hon. Leader of the Opposition spoke of low rates of interest. Some of these countries are giving us loans with no interest at all. The loan is repayable within twenty-five years, and there will be no payment in the first few years.

සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(තිරුමති සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක)  
(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)

Why did you not say that earlier?

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරව උඩ්ලි ජෙලානායක)  
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

We will tell you all this when the time comes, when the whole thing is finalized. There are certain countries with whom we have still to negotiate—

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

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

You are talking about the I.B.R.D. loans?

**ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක**  
(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)  
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)  
Bilateral negotiations.

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

Why be secretive about this?

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

It is fairer to announce all together. There are some countries that have indicated the amount of the loans and the terms. There are others who have still to indicate what it is going to be. In a very short time when we are in a position to announce we will do so. There is not going to be any secret about it.

I intend quoting now from another document to prove the parlous situation of the country.—*[Interruption]*. There too the same position is brought out, and that is, that even to maintain the present productive capacity, for importation of spare parts, fertilizers, machinery—this is the report of the World Bank Team, the report of the Consortium of Nations—we need 50 million dollars for the balance of this year and at the rate of 100 million dollars extra a year for some more years to bolster up our external assets position to a satisfactory level. That was the situation we were faced with. Hon. Members of the Opposition have themselves accepted the remedial measures suggested by the Central Bank. They are: stepping up exports, substitution for imports, and flow of external capital. Flow of external capital is essential. The hon. Member for Yatiyantota himself

accepts that position. Now, faced with that situation, what did the Government do next?

**එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා**  
(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)  
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)  
Kept up the flow?

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

Of course. The hon. Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike) had done that much earlier.

**එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා**  
(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)  
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)  
My flow dried up!

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

As regards the export sector, the speech of the hon. fair Leader of the Opposition was full of praise for the productive capacity and the expansion of the export sector in the last few years. She went on to give the figures in regard to tea, rubber, coconut, and so on.

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

The Hon. Minister of Finance mentioned those figures, and I was quoting them.

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

She was quoting them as a great achievement. I do not think that she was decrying them. What is this sector? Is it not the private sector that did all this?

**සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.**  
(திருமதி சிறிமாவோ பண்டாரநாயக்க)  
(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)  
We are not denying it.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

**ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක**

(කෙළරව උඩ්ගි ජෙනෙරායායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

The private sector made a tremendous contribution towards the development that you boasted about in your time, and your Minister of Finance of yesteryear tried to liquidate the private sector. The hon. Member for Devinuwara (Mr. P. H. W. de Silva), if I read his speech correctly, was himself for a mixed economy. If you are for a mixed economy, why are you out to destroy the private sector?

**එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා**

(ශ්‍රී. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Certainly not.

**ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක**

(කෙළරව උඩ්ගි ජෙනෙරායායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

But the hon. Member for Yatiyantota is. We agree with the hon. Member for Devinuwara, but the trouble is that he is over there and not on this side. On your left are Members who are out to destroy the private sector. They have been quite frank about it. They make no secret of it. According to them, the last Budget was the first step towards liquidating the private sector. We have not come here to liquidate the private sector. We have come here to get the private sector to play its part in the development of this country. We told the people that from our political platforms during the election campaign. We did not hide that fact. In fact, I wonder why the hon. Member for Devinuwara contested us? I think he could have subscribed to our policy. Impliedly, the hon. Member for Yatiyantota too supported that position. His speech contained a list showing industrialization by the private sector. He read it out from a book.

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(කලාතිථි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Your own book.

**ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක**

(කෙළරව උඩ්ගි ජෙනෙරායායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

You read it out as a great achievement. Why are you criticizing us for not trying to liquidate the private sector?

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(කලාතිථි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You must define your private sector. You yourself supported the liquidation of estates.

**ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක**

(කෙළරව උඩ්ගි ජෙනෙරායායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Hon. Members of the L. S. S. P. went to various countries to find pegs to hang their policies on. First they ran to Trotsky, then to Yugoslavia. At a certain time I think they halted in the U. A. R. Here is an enunciation of socialism in the U. A. R.

“Therefore a socialist economy is usually divided into three sectors....”

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(කලාතිථි ආර්. ආර්. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

From what are you reading?

**ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක**

(කෙළරව උඩ්ගි ජෙනෙරායායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

From a bulletin of the United Arab Republic. If the hon. Member has any doubts, I shall hand it over to him.

“Therefore a socialist economy is usually divided into three sectors: the public sector, the private sector and the co-operative sector....”

You are following the socialism of the U. A. R. Even there, there are three sectors. They are not out to demolish the private sector, lock, stock and barrel.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

වෛද්‍යාචාර්ය එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ (අකු  
රැස්ස)

(දොக்டර් எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ—அக்  
குறஸ்ஸ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe—Akuressa)

By painless surgery it has been  
gradually reduced to 50 per cent.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

What is the date ?

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I cannot trace the date but I shall  
hand it over to you to find the date.

“The private sector, under socialism,  
comprises all capitalists, businessmen,  
small and large, as well as craftsmen and  
professionals....”

This is the U. A. R. Minister of  
Supply, Dr. Kamal Ramzi Stino. Of  
course, he is not a double doctor!  
He is a single doctor and his learning  
must be somewhat lacking therefore.  
But this is what he says :

“...capitalists, businessmen, small and  
large, as well as craftsmen and profes-  
sionals, who play a big role in developing  
production needed by the nation. The  
difference between socialism in under-  
developed countries and socialism in  
advanced countries is that in the former  
it is a matter of production and distribu-  
tion, whereas in the latter it is a matter of  
distribution only.”

Being an under-developed country  
our emphasis is on production.

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන

(கௌரவ ஜே. ஆர். ஜயவர்தன)

(The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene)

It is a bulletin issued in November  
1962.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

They have since taken over all  
private enterprise. Very little is left.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Under our Budget the principal  
objective, which is the objective of  
increasing exports, can be made possi-  
ble only by aid from foreign  
countries. I want hon. Members to  
realize that. To maintain even our  
present productive capacity, to pre-  
vent further deterioration and  
depreciation of capital, to import  
fertilizers for improving the yields  
in the export sector—to do all that  
we must have assistance.

In fact, the World Bank Report  
deals with that.

“In brief, the facts of the crisis are as  
follows: if the level of consumption  
reached in 1964—the last year of office  
of the previous Government—were to be  
maintained in 1965, imports of foodstuffs  
and basic consumer goods would absorb  
over 70 per cent. of Ceylon’s import  
capacity excluding foreign aid or a  
further deterioration of the reserve posi-  
tion. The remainder, some Rs. 500  
million, would be less than two-thirds of  
imports of intermediate and capital goods  
at recent, inadequate levels. It would  
be grossly insufficient to keep the  
economy functioning,”

—not to speak of development—

“let alone provide for even the most  
urgent needs of maintaining existing  
capital stock or for growth in output.”

Now, that is the situation. In these  
circumstances, unless we are going to  
starve our people, starve their pro-  
ductivity, —economic productivity—  
or even to be able to maintain the  
present level, this foreign assistance  
is absolutely essential.

Now, the next step was the produc-  
tion of substitutes for our imports.  
Here I want to mention to the hon.  
Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M.  
Perera) who levelled the charge  
against me that I always place  
emphasis on agricultural develop-  
ment, that if he analyse our  
situation today he will realize that  
development in the agricultural  
sector is absolutely essential to  
improve our payments position.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාநிති என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I do not deny that but not to the exclusion.—[Interruption].

ගුරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I never said, "to the exclusion", I said, "must receive prime importance"—prime consideration.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

That is a matter of emphasis.

ගුරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Emphasis must be definitely there. Look at the amount of exchange we lose on food imports. Therefore, we must have a substitution for those food imports. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is essential that there must be a tremendous increase in the production of food in Ceylon. I think, that should receive first priority in any scheme for the development of Ceylon. I always thought so and I still think so.

And, as I said earlier, where is your base for industrialization? Where can you get your industrial goods if you have got to use all your exchange on importing food? Where are you going to get your machinery? Where are you going to get your spare parts from? Who is going to buy your goods unless you are going to export them? That is the importance of agriculture.

Now, I am glad to be able to say I have never used the words "self-sufficiency in rice" ever before. Even when I was the Minister of Agriculture I never used those words. But I am using them now. I have seen certain reports of experts who have come out here and carried out experiments—manurial experiments—

and, I think, an increase of over 40 per cent. is possible if we are able to carry out this manuring programme over the next few years.—[Interruption]. Sixty per cent., says the Minister.

කෙනමන් මයා.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Within what period?

ගුරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

In a few years. I will not say that we will be able to get an increase of 100 per cent. but we will be able to get an increase of 60 per cent.

කෙනමන් මයා.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

If you use in rice production half the amount of tea fertilizer you will get a better yield.

ගුරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you use tea fertilizer for paddy, the paddy will die. One has to be very careful about the use of fertilizer. Nitrogen, potash and phosphate are the three main elements of fertilizers. They have carried out experiments on the effects of each one of these. Nitrogen gives the biggest increase. Potash comes next. The phosphate does not give an increased yield but it is necessary to strengthen the stalk of the paddy plant to prevent it from lodging and thereby lose a certain amount of the crop. The same mixture cannot be applied to all paddy fields; it depends on the soil. If we try to use the manure used on tea in our paddy fields—

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

It is simple.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

**ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක**

(කෙළරව උද්ග්නි ජේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Yes, but I had to explain the simple!

Therefore, I have proved to hon. Members of this House that we were facing a critical situation and a three-pronged attack is necessary to pull us out of this situation. What is the three-pronged attack? Stepping up exports, substituting for imports and external aid. That was to be the three-pronged attack—the hon. Member for Yatiyantota also nods in acceptance. Are we not trying to fulfil those objectives in this Budget? Then we come to the question of the blocking of external aid. Up to now certain sources of aid were closed to us for particular reasons—the oil dispute. I do not want to go into details about that now; tomorrow we will go into it. Suffice it to say that there is a case before the courts complaining that something illegal has been done; but you are the first person who tried to do the illegal!

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(කලාඛිති ආණ. ආණ. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

No, I do not want you to mislead the House.

**ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක**

(කෙළරව උද්ග්නි ජේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I am not misleading the House.

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(කලාඛිති ආණ. ආණ. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Then why did you make that statement?

**ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක**

(කෙළරව උද්ග්නි ජේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Did you not negotiate with the oil companies?

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(කලාඛිති ආණ. ආණ. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

That does not mean that it was illegal.

**ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක**

(කෙළරව උද්ග්නි ජේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

That is the point.

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(කලාඛිති ආණ. ආණ. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Payment was illegal, not the negotiation.

**ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක**

(කෙළරව උද්ග්නි ජේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Of course, negotiations were illegal.

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(කලාඛිති ආණ. ආණ. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

No, Sir.

**නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා**

(උප සභානායකර් අමාත්‍යවරුන්)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Order, please! The hon. Member for Yatiyantota must sit down. When the Speaker gets up in his seat hon. Members on their feet must sit down.

**ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක**

(කෙළරව උද්ග්නි ජේනානායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I will give way.

**ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා**

(කලාඛිති ආණ. ආණ. පෙරේරා)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Mr. T. B. Ilangaratne came to the House and made a statement to the effect that there were negotiations going on and that he would come to the House with the results of the negotiations. I only carried on from there. Payment would be illegal

பிசுபீசன கெடுதலின்பு பனத, 1965-66

—தேவநலர் கியலித

[ஊலாபீய லிந். லி. பைரேரா]

because at the end of the negotiations we would have to come to the House again and go to the tribunal.

லு லிபிலி சேனாயாக

(கெளரவ டட்ளி சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

The law lays down the principles on which the payment has to be made. You decided to go outside the law. You yourself said just now that you were going to come and change the law after negotiation. We will thrash that matter out tomorrow.

ஊலாபீய லிந். லி. பைரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You are going on the statement made by Byrnell. You prefer to accept Byrnell's version.

லு லிபிலி சேனாயாக

(கெளரவ டட்ளி சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

That was one of the obstacles. We had to get rid of that obstacle first.

You may disagree with us as regards the quantum of compensation. That is a matter for disagreement. You may think we paid too much. You may think you could have settled for less, but the fact is, you did not settle, you failed to settle.

ஊலாபீய லிந். லி. பைரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Because they were demanding too much.

லு மன்திரிவரகை

(கெளரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

We were not prepared to pay blood money.

லு லிபிலி சேனாயாக

(கெளரவ டட்ளி சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

What we are getting as aid is so many times more than this amount we have paid

ஊலாபீய லிந். லி. பைரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

No, no!

லு லிபிலி சேனாயாக

(கெளரவ டட்ளி சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

What are you talking, it is a matter of giving a small amount and getting much more.

லேடூலாபீய லி. லி. விசுவசிங்

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

Insulting the honour of the whole country?

லு டி. லி. வி. ஹூரூல் (புலாசன ஊலி)

(கெளரவ ஈ. எல். பி. ஹூரூல்—பொக்கு வரத்து அமைச்சர்)

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

Same old tune.

லு லிபிலி சேனாயாக

(கெளரவ டட்ளி சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

If we ran to some other country that you follow, then we would not be insulting the honour of our country?

லேடூலாபீய லி. லி. விசுவசிங்

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

You have sacrificed the right for us to determine the quantum of payment.

லு லிபிலி சேனாயாக

(கெளரவ டட்ளி சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

That first step was taken and taken successfully and if we are to consider the net advantage to this country, well, I am glad, in the interest of this country, we have been able to settle that oil question.

உபநிஷத கௌரவப் பதவி, 1965-66

—தேவநல்லூர் கிண்பி

What was the next step? You yourself had invited the World Bank team. So we did that. You tried to negotiate the question of oil compensation, you did that unsuccessfully, while we did it successfully.

சென்ட்ரல் மெம்பர்

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

That is their grouse.

சென்ட்ரல் மெம்பர்

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

You yourself invited the I. M. F. team and the World Bank team. They came and went and they came again. This is the next batch we have. We have been following some of your policies and I am beginning to doubt the wisdom of your policies as a result of that.

The I. M. F. team came and they assessed the situation. As you know, the I. M. F. team is there to give help to countries which have got into temporary balance of payment difficulties. But, of course, they must be convinced that that country is making a genuine attempt to get out of that difficulty. After all, assistance will not be forthcoming just to be poured down the drain. The I. M. F. must be convinced that this is only a temporary difficulty; that the Government of the time is making every endeavour to pull the country out of the difficulty. We are glad that we have been able to satisfy the I. M. F. as regards the steps we are taking and intend taking in the future. That was the next step we had to take.

The other step was the visit of the World Bank team that came out here. They had discussed matters with our officials and submitted this report from which I quoted. It is very interesting reading. I do not think it will be published. If hon. Members want it tabled, I will table it. I have no objection to tabling it. In any case,

they will publish in their newspapers a photostat copy of it, so I might as well table it now.

சென்ட்ரல் மெம்பர் (கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பண்டா—விவசாய, உணவு அமைச்சர்)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda—Minister of Agriculture and Food)

Better get the correct version in.

சென்ட்ரல் மெம்பர்

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

But this is worth reading, hon. fair Leader of the Opposition; it is a terrible indictment of the nine years. —[Interruption]. You have not read it. How can you say no to it?

சென்ட்ரல் மெம்பர். சென்ட்ரல் மெம்பர்

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Shall I tell you? Will you give way? I have discussed with them.

சென்ட்ரல் மெம்பர்

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

The hon. Member spoke for four hours and he still wants to speak.

சென்ட்ரல் மெம்பர். சென்ட்ரல் மெம்பர்

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

When I spoke, they continued to do the same thing to me.

சென்ட்ரல் மெம்பர்

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

No.

சென்ட்ரல் மெம்பர். சென்ட்ரல் மெம்பர்

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You only want to listen to them—

சென்ட்ரல் மெம்பர்

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Will you please accept my Order?

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I will accept your Order.

නියෝජ්‍ය කලානායකතුමා

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

There is a limit.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I know my limits; I have my limits, and you have your limits.

නියෝජ්‍ය කලානායකතුමා

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Order, please! You are continuing with your interruptions.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I am not prepared to be ordered as you like.

ද සොයිසා සිරිවර්ධන මයා.

(திரு. டி. சொய்சா சிறிவர்தன)

(Mr. de Zoysa Siriwardena)

The Hon. Prime Minister is asking questions of him and that is why he is replying.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You cannot treat me like a *podian*.

රු. ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන

(கௌரவ டி. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)

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

Sit down! What is this? This is wasting time.

නියෝජ්‍ය කලානායකතුමා

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Order, please!

රු. ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Can I go on?

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Carry on regardless!

රු. ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I would like this to be passed on to the hon. fair Leader of the Opposition because it deals very well with the record of those great nine years.

As a result of the visit of that team, there was a discussion held in America with the representatives of some other countries; and, as I said earlier, I am glad that many countries, realizing the legacy handed to us by them and adequately proved by facts and figures, by those reports, accepted the position that an extraordinary kind of aid is absolutely essential for Ceylon. Hitherto the aid given to us had been tied to projects, and that alone was not sufficient to pull us out of the situation. That is why the consortium of nations thought it was necessary to give us an extraordinary type of aid, and I am glad to be able to say that the response was most satisfactory indeed. Therefore, I wish to express the gratitude of this country to those nations for coming to our aid, the full details of which will be made available when the finalized figures are available.

Now, Sir, in the course of my speech I proved the situation we were in when we took over. I showed what the remedies are. I said that a three-pronged attack was necessary to pull us out of the situation, and I referred to the drawbacks and hindrances as regards external aid which is one of the prongs of the attack. I also mentioned the steps

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

taken by the Government to remove those obstacles. I now come to the taxation measures. The hon. Member for Devinuwara—I am glad he has come close; I wish he would come a little closer—and I agree that the private sector must be utilized.

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(තිரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Hear, hear!

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

You are saying "Hear, hear!" We all agree, except those on your right. But the trouble with the hon. Member for Dompe is that he always agreed with us and yet continued to kill the private sector. That is the only difference between ourselves and the hon. Member for Dompe. However, if you are going to utilize the private sector—and even the hon. Member for Yatiyantota tells us that the private sector has performed very well under the regime of the Sri Lanka Freedom Party Government—then it is your duty to give every encouragement and inducement to the private sector to perform its function. Surely it is logical. Where is the logic when you go on your platforms and say that we are helping the rich? The hon. fair Leader of the Opposition spoke about the great achievements of the private sector during her regime. Tea exports increased tremendously; rubber production went up; coconut production went up. They failed to realize that the rehabilitation schemes were started by the United National Party Government.

සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(திருமதி சிறிமாவோ பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)

I said so. We always give the devil his due.

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Whatever it is, whether it is your Government or our Government, you cannot find fault with the private sector. It performed a very valuable function. I am not trying to draw a comparison, but I must say it performed better than the public sector. So, why kill it? If you are not going to kill it, if accelerated production is your objective, then let us give inducements for the sake of achieving that production. That is what we have done.

Now, the hon. Member for Colombo South (Mr. Bernard Soysa) stated in his speech the value of the Kaldor system, if I heard him right.

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා. (දකුණු කොළඹ)

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சாய்சா—கொழும்பு தெற்கு)

(Mr. Bernard Soysa—Colombo South)

I said I am not an admirer of Kaldor. But Kaldor had a certain aim and a direction for which he adopted certain means, which you have not adopted.

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Whether it achieved that objective or not, I think you will agree with me when I say that the Kaldor system of taxation was devised to make the private sector more productive. That is all. It was quite mistakenly called a socialist system of taxation. However, if you accept that the private sector must be made more productive, then the objective of the Kaldor system should be followed. You must accept that. The hon. Member for Yatiyantota does not accept that the private sector should be made more productive, but these gentlemen and the Lady opposite must accept it. If you want to make the private sector more productive, then the objective of the Kaldor system must be pursued. What was the objective? Prevention of

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක]

expenditure on a large scale by an expenditure tax, prevention of hoarding of capital by a wealth tax, compelling thereby the diversion of capital into productive channels.

Well, we had it here. The experience of the department was that the expenditure tax was a difficult tax to work. The hon. Member for Jaffna (Mr. G. G. Ponnambalam) dealt with it in his speech. Moreover, you yourself said that there were all kinds of evasion. You know, people started dealing in cash to try and hide their expenditure items. There was a considerable amount of evasion. It may have been caught up later, but the evasion was taking place and there were difficulties of working this tax. So, we had to see how we could achieve that same objective in a different way, and that is why we worked out this system of a rebate on investment. What you want is to channel money into investment and development. Instead of the expenditure tax which had its drawbacks and difficulties, you achieve the same objective by substituting for it this inducement scheme. So one step follows the other. Logically, this is what one has to do.

Much has been said about this land policy. I am sorry, at the crucial moment the hon. Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike), who is following me, has disappeared.

ද සොයිසා සිරිවර්ධන මයා.

(ශ්‍රී. ඩී. සොය්සා සිරිවර්ධන)  
(Mr. de Zoysa Siriwardena)

Notes are being taken down.

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක

(කෙළරව උඩ්ගි ජෙනෙරායායක)  
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Notes are being taken down? But, take this down. In the Budget speech of 1961-62 what did the hon. Member for Dompe say?

"Even as much as we are prepared to encourage every form of genuine industrial enterprise with favourable

incentives, we shall give every encouragement to large investors who are prepared to open farms or new lands under paddy and other subsidiary crops."

I think he has taken that down. You go on public platforms and say that we are giving land to the rich. What is this? We are not going to give the rich paddy land. You were prepared to give even paddy land. That was in the Budget speech of the hon. Member for Dompe in 1961-62.

ද සොයිසා සිරිවර්ධන මයා.

(ශ්‍රී. ඩී. සොය්සා සිරිවර්ධන)  
(Mr. de Zoysa Siriwardena)

Under the Paddy Lands' Act you cannot give land like that.

ශ්‍රී ඩබ්ලිව් සේනානායක

(කෙළරව උඩ්ගි ජෙනෙරායායක)  
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Please explain that to your Colleague, not to me.

I heard from the Opposition—I was wondering whether I was dreaming—praise of the late Mr. D. S. Senanayake's plan. Thank God, Mr. D. S. Senanayake was cremated and not buried! Otherwise, he would have been turning in his grave and straining himself unnecessarily after hearing all this praise. I think the hon. Member for Medawachchiya (Mr. Maithripala Senanayake), the hon. Member for Balapitiya (Mr. L. C. de Silva) and also, I think, the hon. Member for Devinuwara (Mr. P. H. W. de Silva) spoke about the great land policies of Mr. D. S. Senanayake. Yes, I am proud to be able to say that in the early 1930s that was one of the most progressive land policies brought before the legislature. And, Madam, as you say you will not go against your husband's policies, I will not go against my father's policies.

සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.

(ශ්‍රී. ඩී. සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක)  
(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)

I am very glad to hear that.

විසජ්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

I carry out my father's policies with great appreciation. Let me assure hon. Members of the House, on both sides of the House, that what we propose to do here is to lease out land only for a brief period without interfering with the rights of the peasantry.

කෙනමන් මයා.

(திரு. கௌமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

For 25 years!

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

You must have an agricultural crop for a certain number of years. Take a plantation like cadju; how many years do you think it will take from the time of planting before you can pluck cadju? We want to utilize the capital of the capitalists to open up land without interfering with the rights of the peasantry, we will take it over without a cent. expended from the Government funds, and distribute the land to the peasantry. What is wrong with that scheme? If capital is available, what is wrong in handing over land for development, giving these people a reasonable opportunity for receiving certain benefits and profits from it? The lease is terminable after a certain number of years. What do you think we are going to do after that?

බර්නාඩ් සොයිසා මයා.

(திரு. பெர்னாட் சொய்சா)

(Mr. Benard Soysa)

You will not be here to see it.

වෙව්දොමාර්ස් එස්. ඒ. වික්‍රමසිංහ

(டொக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விக்ரமசிங்ஹ)

(Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe)

The U.N.P. will be wiped out in 25 years.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

The hon. Member for Akuressa (Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe) says that the U.N.P. will be wiped out in 25 years. I do not belong to the class that says, "I have come here on Divine right to stay for good". I never say that. I am ready to go even tomorrow. I know what democracy is; I know it very well. I have never said that we have come here for so many years. I think the hon. fair Leader of the Opposition said so and learnt a lesson.

සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.

(திருமதி சிறிமாவோ பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)

I did not say so. Your papers are saying it.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

The hon. fair Leader of the Opposition made much of the fact that I had said in the last Parliament that in eighteen months that Government would fall. She goes about the country saying that in three months this Government will fall.

සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.

(திருமதி சிறிமாவோ பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)

I never said that. Your capitalist press said that.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Then how long will it take?  
—[Interruption].

They spoke of this country being sold to foreigners. What did the pundit from Dompe say in the course of his 1960-61 Budget speech?

"It is the view of our Government that participation of foreign capital would be welcome in the following conditions."—  
[OFFICIAL REPORT, 15th September, 1960; Vol. 39, c. 1635.]

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[ශ්‍රී ලංකා විපක්ෂ නායකයා]

He went on to lay down the conditions for inviting foreign capital. We are doing the same. I should like to tell the hon. fair Leader of the Opposition that in a way we are following her late husband's policies. So, what is this great charge that we are selling this country to foreigners, that we are handing over the rights of the peasantry to the capitalists? We inherited a critical financial situation. There are certain remedies that must be effected—the remedies I mentioned. External aid was essential in the circumstances. We jumped over the barriers in regard to external aid. We are going ahead to apply the remedy. What is wrong in that?

I am glad the hon. fair Leader of the Opposition spoke about communalism. Some of these Members went to Jaffna—I think, the hon. Member for Agalawatta (Mr. Anil Moonesinghe) and the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central (Mr. Keuneman). What did they go and tell the people there?

කෙනමන් මයා.

(ශ්‍රී ලංකා විපක්ෂ නායකයා)  
(Mr. Keuneman)

I told them that the U.N.P. and the Federal Party have joined together jointly to deceive both the Sinhalese and the Tamils.

ශ්‍රී ලංකා විපක්ෂ නායකයා

(කෙළරව ධර්මනී ජයවර්ධන)  
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

No. You said that, but what did you say in your "Aththa" to the people here? What you said in your "Aththa" paper to the Sinhalese public was that we have sold the Sinhalese to the Tamils.

කෙනමන් මයා.

(ශ්‍රී ලංකා විපක්ෂ නායකයා)  
(Mr. Keuneman)

Please produce it.

ශ්‍රී ලංකා විපක්ෂ නායකයා

(කෙළරව ධර්මනී ජයවර්ධන)  
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Will you resign if I produce it?

කෙනමන් මයා.

(ශ්‍රී ලංකා විපක්ෂ නායකයා)  
(Mr. Keuneman)

I am not aware of it.

ශ්‍රී ලංකා විපක්ෂ නායකයා

(කෙළරව මොන්ටගු ජයවර්ධන)  
(The Hon. Montague Jayewickreme)

You are the editor of the "Aththa".

ශ්‍රී ලංකා විපක්ෂ නායකයා

(කෙළරව ධර්මනී ජයවර්ධන)  
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

This is what is going on in this country. They say to the Tamils, "The U.N.P. Government is selling you to the Sinhalese". And to the Sinhalese they say, "The U.N.P. Government is selling you to the Tamils".

කෙනමන් මයා.

(ශ්‍රී ලංකා විපක්ෂ නායකයා)  
(Mr. Keuneman)

Are you saying that is what I said?

ශ්‍රී ලංකා විපක්ෂ නායකයා

(කෙළරව ධර්මනී ජයවර්ධන)  
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Your "Aththa" paper.

කෙනමන් මයා.

(ශ්‍රී ලංකා විපක්ෂ නායකයා)  
(Mr. Keuneman)

That is not true.

ශ්‍රී ලංකා විපක්ෂ නායකයා

(කෙළරව ධර්මනී ජයවර්ධන)  
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

As for the hon. Member for Dambadeniya (Mr. R. G. Senanayake), he has only one story. At least, he is consistent in his lunacy.

ආර්. ජී. සේනානායක මයා. (දඹදෙනිය)

(ශ්‍රී ලංකා විපක්ෂ නායකයා—දඹදෙනිය)  
(The Hon. R. G. Senanayake—Dambadeniya)

Traitor!

ශ්‍රී ලංකා විපක්ෂ නායකයා

(කෙළරව ධර්මනී ජයවර්ධන)  
(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Time will tell who the traitor was.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනவர கியலி

These are the different things that these people are saying in different parts of this country. But what of the hon. fair Leader of the Opposition? She goes about saying, "We want communal harmony".

As a matter of fact, Madam, I get verbatim reports of your speeches. I am aware of what you say on public platforms.

සිරිමාවෝ බණ්ඩාරනායක මිය.

(திருமதி சிறிமாவோ பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike)

From the C.I.D. ?

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Just as much as you got my speeches, I get yours.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is this great claim often made by them? The claim is that they represent the Buddhists and we represent the minorities. Am I to give you the figures to prove that we are a real and genuine National Government? I have the figures in regard to all the electorates. I have the percentages. I will give you the figures :

90-100 per cent. Buddhist majority seats.

Kottawa  
Homagama  
Galagedera  
Ambalangoda  
Bentota-Elpitiya  
Hiniduma  
Hakmana  
Akmeemana  
Weligama  
Beliatta  
Yapahuwa  
Hiriyala  
Wariyapola  
Polgahawela  
Bibile  
Dedigama

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

Horawupotana also.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

We must not take too much for granted.

What I have given are between 90 and 100 per cent. Buddhist seats won by the U.N.P. alone. With our partners in the National Government we have Minneriya and Ratgama as well.

Then, between 80 and 90 per cent. :

Yatinuwara  
Kundasale  
Deniyaya  
Bingiriya  
Kuliyapitiya  
Kurunegala  
Mawatagama  
Horowapotana  
Galigomuwa  
Ratnapura  
Kalawana  
Kolonne

With our other partners—Rambukkana, Kekirawa and Avissawella.

Then, between 70 and 80 per cent. :

Dehiwela-Mt. Lavinia  
Udunuwara  
Hanguranketa  
Mahiyangana  
Mawanella  
Ruwanwella  
Rakwana  
Akurana

With our other partners—Galle and Uva-Paranagama.

Then, between 60 and 70 per cent. :

Borella  
Beruwala  
Laggala  
Matale  
Senkadagala



Sometimes, there have been occasions when, perhaps, reasons of solidarity constrained me to speak with a certain amount of reserve in regard to particular aspects of the economy, their performance and their problems, but I have no such restraint now and I shall, therefore, take the opportunity to explain very concretely the point of view of the S. L. F. P. in regard to every single Budget speech that has been made on behalf of this composite Government.

In point of fact, there are four Budget speeches. Some of the others might think that their speeches were contributions to a Budget Debate, but they were not. I shall start with the speech of the Hon. Wanninayake, Finance Minister, and I too should like to pay him a handsome tribute very warmly for the Budget which he presented. I am sorry I was not able to be present owing to an attack of "National Government fever" at the time but, fortunately, I had the privilege of reading his Budget speech and I must certainly say that it is a far, far, better Budget speech than that made by me when I tried to make a Budget speech on behalf of our Government in 1960 and, I think, it is possibly one of the best speeches ever made at a first attempt by any Finance Minister in this country.

சென்ட்ரல்

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தினர்கள்)

(Hon. Members)

Hear, hear!

ஃப். ஃப். டியஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க

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

On the other hand, besides his Budget speech we had three other Budget speeches: the Hon. Minister of State made another Budget speech in which he took away the whole effect of what the Hon. Finance Minister said. And then we find the Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena, Minister of Health, making another Budget speech. I shall deal with that one too. And then last of all we found a complete refutation of all these three

Budget speeches when the Hon. Prime Minister spoke and gave us the final Budget speech now. So I shall try in the course of my speech to reply to all these four Budget speeches.

The Hon. Minister of Industries did not make a Budget speech. He made a completely different type of speech. I shall have something to say about that too. But I rather think that before we get that far I should start with the Budget proper; and I should like to pay the Hon. Minister of Finance the tribute that his Budget speech certainly merits consideration. It certainly is an attempt, which we all admire, to deal with the financial and economic problems of the country. And if I have occasion to be critical, I should like to assure him that the criticism is not offered in any spirit of obstruction but in the spirit of a person with a little experience who knows that "the best-laid plans o' mice an' men gang aft a-gley" in the hands of the Hon. Minister of Lands.

So before I come to the actual analysis of his Budget, may I pause here to tell you that like practically all the Budgets we have had since Independence, the Hon. Finance Minister started by talking about the weather. I think it has been customary for Finance Ministers to tell us about the weather. Practically every Budget speech starts with the weather. Let us look at the Hon. Finance Minister's Budget speech to start with.

There are 17 references in the course of the first five pages of his Budget speech—I am quoting from HANSARD—where he tells us about weather conditions. He tells us about droughts, about cyclones, about tidal waves, about favourable weather conditions, about adverse weather conditions. Again he reverts back to favourable weather conditions and then back to adverse weather conditions. In column 53 he talks about the failure of the north-east monsoon twice. He talks about the tanks in the dry zone not being filled by the north-east monsoon rains. He again refers to the drought, cyclone, tidal waves. He comes back to

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[එෆ්. ආර්. බයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

the cyclone at column 57. And at column 57 he gets on to weather conditions abroad. He talks about the severe winter of 1962-63 and ends up with hurricane "Flora".

Now, it is a good thing that the Hon. Finance Minister should have talked of the weather because in actual fact the state of Ceylon's economy depends on weather conditions both in Ceylon and abroad. As a matter of fact, you will find Finance Minister after Finance Minister in this country getting up on the Floor of this House and telling the country: "We have had a bumper harvest; weather conditions were good; rainfall was excellent" or you will find them telling us, "There was a drought. Our production has declined. The tea flush was no good. The private sector is screaming." So you will find ultimately that the state of Ceylon's economy which Finance Ministers on the Floor of this House talk to us about always depends upon the weather. So the Finance Minister has given the first place in his Budget speech to the correct thing, namely the weather.

And what does he tell us? He tells us that all the disastrous things that have happened to Ceylon's economy over the previous two years are due to the weather either at home or abroad. He tells us that if the paddy crops failed, it was due to the weather; if production had gone down, it was due to the weather; and he hopes quite rightly that weather conditions will improve.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we find the Hon. Minister of Finance telling us what is wrong with the economy. And what does he tell us? He tells us very solemnly that there is an economic crisis in the throes of which the so-called National Government assumed office. He says, "We assumed office in the throes of a financial crisis." He tells us that production is increasing at a very sluggish rate, at a rate of a little over 3 per cent. That is true. I agree that 3 per cent. is not perhaps an excellent performance. It is

better than 2 per cent. It is not as good as 4 per cent. Three per cent. is 3 per cent. But in point of fact, if you examine the matter over the years, you will find that last year's performance was 4.5 per cent. You will find that there have been years when the performance was as low as 1 per cent. or very nearly 1 per cent. Why? Whose fault is this?

Ultimately we get back to the same analysis. It is due to weather conditions. It is due to the fact that the rainfall failed; it is due to the fact that floods came; it is due to the fact that the Hon. C. P. de Silva was spending his time repairing tanks. From 1957 he is still repairing tanks. You will find that the entire gross national product has got diverted to repair the ravages of the weather.

He starts with cyclones; we have tidal waves; we have heavy rainfalls; we have failures of the north-east monsoon. All these things contribute to the sluggish rate of our development. And having read this meteorological report, can the Minister of Finance tell us please, what the weather conditions will be next year? No, he cannot; not even with the able assistance of the Meteorological Department can he really help us out of this problem.

He says, "I hope we are going to have good weather conditions next year." So do we. We hope the rainfalls will not worry you. We hope your problems will solve themselves. But, ultimately, what have we got to show for it? External factors determine the state of Ceylon's economy, the Minister of Finance tells us.

Having told us all that, he goes on to tell us that prices are not so good. He tells us that prices are declining and he thinks they are going to continue to decline. He says the tea prices, coconut prices and rubber prices on which Ceylon's economy depend are not going to move upwards but they are going to move downwards. I am not reading the Budget speech but I am summarizing it.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

He then asks, "What can we do?" He says external prices are another cause.

And what does he tell us about next year? There is not much hope. The Minister of Finance is very honest about it. He tells us, "I cannot predict the weather. I do not know what is going to happen next year and I cannot tell you how prices are going to stand."

Then may I ask you in God's name how can you tell the country in your Budget speech what the economic prospects are for next year? How can you say what the economic prospects are for next year if you do not know what we are going to get? You do not know what your crop is going to be, whether it is going to be good or bad. If you cannot set a money value on it, then what on earth are you talking about?

You say 3 per cent. is a sluggish rate. True. But the fact is that we maintained that rate of 3 per cent. during the last nine years of what you have been pleased to describe as S. L. F. P. misrule. With all the adverse weather conditions, with all the decline in terms of trade which the Prime Minister talked about, the S. L. F. P. Government, rightly or wrongly, maintained that slow rate of growth, that moderate rate of growth.

What does the Minister of Finance tell us? He tells us that compared with our rate of growth of 4.5 per cent. last year, he is going to do better. As a Ceylonese, as a person living in this country, I can assure him that it is the hope of every one of us that he will succeed; but it looks as if he is going to succeed not by his own efforts but by the good acts of providence which is going to give a good rainfall and things of that sort.

Why does he promise us 5 per cent., a half per cent. better than we did, and on what does he base his promise? Nothing at all. He cannot

predict the weather. He foresees that prices are going to decline, and he says, "I am going to give a half per cent. more than you were able to give us." He has no basis for it at all. Not even the Central Bank. Not even the wisdom of the doctorates you have got in the Central Bank can answer this question for you.

And what more does the Minister of Finance tell us? He says, "We are going to develop this country. We are going to harness the private sector in a manner in which you people never did. You killed the private sector. You destroyed the private sector." With the private sector given all the land they want, with the cultivation of subsidiary foodstuffs, with all the miracle-cures contained in this Budget, the Hon. Minister of Finance can tell us, "Only a half per cent. more", and we are expected to stand back and cheer. We are expected to say, "The millennium has arrived; Ceylon is going to be a new world, the promised land; and even the hon. Member for Devinuwarra (Mr. P. H. W. de Silva) may cross the Floor.

Although their witch-craft, state-craft and tyre-craft may have combined to effect the cross-over of the hon. Member for Tissamaharama (Mr. Edirisuriya)—who like the ancient mariner stood here yesterday and showed us a dehydrated but nonetheless ancient bird—I can assure you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that that will be the limit of the success of the Wanninayake Budget.

I do not know how on earth one is going to talk in terms of a rapid economic development. I am not going to talk theoretical economics. I am not going to talk about the gross national product. I am not going to talk about terms of trade. I am going to tell you in plain language that the economy of this country is rather like a cork tossing on stormy waters, completely at the mercy of the elements, and not even the private sector conscious Prime Minister is going to be able to change that situation.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.]

I do not know what the World Bank reported to the consortium. I do not know what has been the World Bank's advice to the Hon. Prime Minister. He did not give us the book in time. That was only part of the fourth Budget speech, and it was never circulated. So I shall not deal with it. But certainly, if we are told that this miraculous Budget is going to transform the economy of this country from the wretchedness and inefficiency and incompetence of S. L. F. P. times, I can tell you that the Hon. Minister of Finance is doomed to failure.

We did certain things, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am not defending a single thing that we did. My budgets have all been bad budgets. They have all been rejected. I do not know about the Budget of the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera). My Budget was just no good. This House rejected it.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

We accepted it.

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

No, Sir, they rejected it. I left this House. I went away having presented my Budget in 1962. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not saying that my Budgets were any good. I am not asking you to accept the prescriptions I gave. I recognized the hopelessness of the situation unless we were prepared to be the masters of our own destiny, unless we were prepared to be proud of the fact that we are Sinhalese, that we are Ceylonese people living in this country, having a stake in it, and were willing to make sacrifices in order to keep our self-respect and independence intact.

I am not saying a word against foreign aid. I say, foreign aid is very good. I have supported it. I shall say more about foreign aid in a moment. I shall demonstrate to you that I am not against your receiving

foreign aid from a consortium of nations. You tried ten, and you got five. Very good. Even in the parable there were only five foolish virgins. So it does not matter. If you can get even that five, I say, "Thank God for it." Let us be happy about it. If there are five countries prepared to give us money, we, the Sri Lanka Freedom Party, do not ask you not to accept it. Take it; take it with both hands and hope that it will cushion you against all the problems of the weather, against tidal waves and cyclones, and keep the wolf from the door, rather than being at the mercy of the elements and the Hon. Minister of Lands.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not against your trying to get foreign aid. Get it if you can and develop the country. I do not think that any one of the last few budget speeches was bad as a statement of intentions. They are very good intentions. They promise all sorts of things. I think the Hon. Minister of Lands promised that all the potato lands which could not be planted with potatoes would be planted with vegetables. That was in 1962. They have still not planted anything either with potatoes or vegetables.

The Hon. Minister of Industries and Fisheries, when he was Minister of Agriculture before that, solemnly promised this country in his Agricultural Plan that we would be self-sufficient in potatoes by 1961. But unfortunately the Hon. Minister of Lands succeeded him and proceeded to appoint commissions to show exactly where his Agricultural Plan was wrong, and that took a long time.

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

What about your succeeding events?

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I shall come to my succeeding events and what I did also. I shall

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

certainly demonstrate that I am not experienced in planting anything, not even grass. But I can at least be proud of what I did from 1963 onwards to counteract the miserable failures of the earlier years. That is a matter on which even the hon. Member for Avissawella (Mr. D. P. R. Gunawardena), as he then was, commented in previous speeches. Whatever he thinks of me now, he is at least bound by what he said earlier. I have a lot of HANSARDS which I shall be quoting one by one as I develop my arguments in the course of the speech.

The Hon. Minister of Industries and Fisheries now circulates a Fisheries Plan. He tells us it is an illegitimate baby that had been fathered on him. I do not know, but if he is trying to tell me that it is mine, I shall certainly accept paternity without question because it is a good plan; it is an excellent plan. Only, one problem for the Hon. Minister of Industries and Fisheries is that the concept of this plan cannot co-exist with your *mudalalis*. Now that you have taken your *mudalalis* to your bosom, naturally you have no room for this illegitimate child. I see your problem.

ගරු මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(කෙළරව අභිකත්තවර් ඉරුවර්)

(An hon. Member)

The M. P. for Devinuwara (Mr. P. H. W. de Silva) has differed from you.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(තිලු. ආර්. ආර්. ධයස් පණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

There is no difference. We all agree that the figures in the plan might require modification. The hon. Member for Avissawella, the Minister of Industries and Fisheries, himself says, "Well, there are changes that will have to be made as we go along." But, basically, that plan is a public sector plan. The plan is not capable of being converted into your cocktail economy. It is not capable of being adjusted in that way.

ගරු ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන

(කෙළරව ධ. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන)

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

It has pride of ancestry, but very little prospect of posterity!

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(තිලු. ආර්. ආර්. ධයස් පණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I agree. In the hands of this foster father that plan is bound to be murdered. It seems very clear to me that he is determined to do to the Fisheries Plan what his Colleague, the Minister of Lands, did to his Agricultural Plan.

So if it is a question of saying "What are we going to do?" I have no objection to all the statements made in the Budget speech, to all the good intentions of the Hon. Mr. Wanninayake. He represents, no doubt, the hopes and aspirations of the peasantry in the North-Western Province. I sincerely hope, for his sake, that the peasantry in the North-Western Province will be able to say at the end of the year, "Our hero from Maliyadeva College, with his students from Maliyadeva College who wrote it for him, has delivered the goods." But I have a feeling that the students of Maliyadeva College will have to change the colour of their ties—

ගරු මොන්ටේගු ජයවික්‍රම

(කෙළරව මොන්ටේගු ඉයවිකර්ම)

(The Hon. Montague Jayewickreme)

He is from St. Thomas' College.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(තිලු. ආර්. ආර්. ධයස් පණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

—I am not referring to the Hon. Minister, I am referring to his students—again to a rainbow transformation, first blue, then red and now green. And ultimately when they write about the economic chaos and the crisis, one cannot help thinking, "My God, there sits the author of the

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පතක, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.]  
crisis!" If we have a crisis now, it is because of the same people who misled past Finance Ministers and created the crisis for us.

So now, what is wrong with this Budget? To put it in plain language, this is not going to achieve anything. It is fine, you can alienate all the lands: you want to give them to your companies, tell them to grow onions, potatoes, chillies, whatever strikes the fancy of the Hon. Minister of Lands at any given moment. Sometimes it is calculated to allow a little time to afford extensions to the sweet potato plantation to feed the bandicoots of Ratmalana. He might plant anything but unfortunately the things he plants never seem to come right except in Minneriya—there, of course, he has been planting populations! I do not know whether the national product will benefit by this.

I shall come to the detailed analysis of the Budget. I do not propose to gloss over it in any way. We are told, "Now the private sector has its chance. We are going to reduce taxation for the private sector to employ their surplus money for investment. We are going to reduce duties on kerosene oil and various other things." Very good! But ultimately you can see that the Hon. Minister of Finance himself is not really very hopeful. He hopes to do better than us only by  $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. But let me assure him that if the downward trend in the terms of trade were to continue, assuming tea prices fall by 5 cents, he is not going to have his  $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. increased but it will practically cancel out the 3 per cent. we already find in national economic development. It is not his fault. There is nothing he can do about it. You will give your subsidies to the private sector as we gave them too when we were there in the Government in your unenviable position now.

I remember that we raised the subsidies for tea replanting. True, it was started by the Hon. Minister of Industries. He gave a subsidy we increased it more and more. It is now

Rs. 3,750 per acre for replanting and yet only the relatively smaller owners are replanting. The defaulters in maintaining the programme are the very large sterling company estates in this country. Rs. 3,750 an acre is not sufficient as a subsidy to attract them. There you see your most economic and efficient tea producers in this country! But our small people holding 100 or 200 acres are still able to replant an acre or two of tea with Rs. 3,750 as a subsidy when the big plantation proprietors holding over 1,000 acres are finding it extremely difficult to replant with a subsidy of Rs. 3,750.

What is the moral that I am pointing out? It is very simple: that with your hopes in the private sector you talk about you are going to find that results are going to fall far short of your expectations and hopes. After all, as a Christian, I too am entitled to speak in terms of faith, hope and charity; but if you place your faith in the private sector in the hope that they will show results, not all the charity that you expend on them is going to pay you dividends.

We are told about the crippling taxation imposed by the S. L. F. P. I do not know about my predecessor, the Hon. Stanley de Zoysa. I have heard a lot about him, but I am afraid it is all hearsay. I was not in Parliament with him. I did not have the pleasure of calling him "pottaya" and "lombaya" or anything else like some others in this House. Nor did I have the privilege of seeing his taxation proposals being adopted by the U. N. P. as they seem to have done in praise of Nicholas Kaldor, God bless him!

On the other hand, I had imposed hard measures of taxation most of which had the U. N. P. screaming all the time. They told me that every single tax measure I proposed was a bad one. Naturally, even I had to pay those taxes and I can assure you that the present proposals of the Hon. Minister of Finance are much kinder to me than my own taxes! But in the last analysis, having told us that

all our taxes are wrong, may I quote from his own little Blue Book which is published with a green binding this year ?

You will find immediately after the index, under the term estimates and revenue for 1965-66, a tabulated statement of revenue for each of the financial years from 1954-55 onwards. An analysis of these figures can be very revealing. Every single one of the proposals I made those days—and I produced quite a number of them—had been subject to your criticism. I admit they are bad ; I admit they should be removed from the statute, but I am not defending a single proposal of mine, I am only drawing your attention to them. You will find that the total revenue in the year 1954-55 was Rs. 1,158 million ; 1955-56 Rs. 1,257 million, 1956-57 Rs. 1,260 million ; 1957-58 Rs. 1,279 million ; and 1958-59, Rs. 1,330 million. In other words, an increase of revenue during the period of my predecessor, the Hon. Mr. Stanley de Zoysa, was approximately Rs. 150 million over a period of five financial years from Rs. 1,158 million to Rs. 1,330 million. In 1959-60, the revenue was Rs. 1,403 million.

Then comes my Budget, the very bad Budget, the Budget that increased taxation, against which the U.N.P. and the so-called private sector were screaming. In 1960-61, the first of the bad Budgets—my year—the revenue was Rs. 1,513 million, an increase approximately of Rs. 110 million in one single year, an increase obtained by means of direct taxation which were no doubt very severe and were very difficult for the private sector. That was the taxation that I imposed. In 1961-62, it was Rs. 1,627 million, a further increase of approximately Rs. 113 million. In 1962-63, the year I ceased to be the Finance Minister there was a fall. The revenue in 1962-63 was Rs. 1,578 million. My Budget proposals were not implemented. In 1963-64, the year of the Hon. Mr. Jangaratne, it was Rs. 1,757

million, an increase of approximately Rs. 125 million. The original estimate of the hon. Member for Yatiyantota, when he was Minister of Finance was Rs. 1,821 million which on a revised estimate brought a further increase of approximately Rs. 100 million.

Now, Sir, if you study and examine what has happened from 1960 onwards, the rate of increase through taxation, you will see that a conscious attempt has been made to increase the revenue of the country as a means to bridge the deficit of approximately Rs. 100 million, taking it at a round figure, as against Rs. 150 million over the five years. Now, if the Hon. Minister of Finance is really sincere in saying that our fiscal policy is wrong, that the S. L. F. P. period of the hon. Member for Yatiyantota is wrong, what should he do ? He should logically take away the burdens that have been imposed on the private sector because it is the private sector that pays this tax and not the ordinary man who is called upon to pay the Rs. 100 million a year. It was the private sector that paid it. You talk of reducing taxation, of giving incentives to the private sector, then, surely, if you say that we are wrong, that all the things what we have been doing for the last so many years were wrong, you should at least take it back and reduce the increase in taxation to the point where it was.

But what did he do ? In the present Estimates of Rs. 1,883 million, he gives us a break-down in the Budget ; he gives relief, he reduces taxes directly and indirectly by about Rs. 69 million ; he imposes taxes to the tune of Rs. 80 million and gives relief to the ordinary man up to Rs. 18 million. This is how you revive the private sector. You claim that you have done a great deal of good by giving the private sector concrete reliefs. No doubt, you have given reliefs to individuals who are in the Rs. 50,000 bracket, as mentioned by the hon. Member for Jaffna. He probably only knows of people who earn Rs. 50,000 a year ; he probably does not have the acquaintance of

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[ඒෆ්. ආර්. බසස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]  
 others who earn less. He waxed eloquent about the hardships of people who earn Rs. 50,000 a year. The Hon. Minister of State was very anxious to deal with those in the Rs. 2,500 a month income bracket and who find it difficult to pay the cook appu and the ayah a living wage. Of course, for that class of people, no doubt, this Budget is very helpful. The Minister of State actually gave us the monthly expenses of such persons.

But, as far as the vast mass of people are concerned, as far as the private sector is concerned, what have you done? You claimed that you are going to allow the private sector to live again. You maintained that the private sector, like Zorro, will ride again in this country. But the Minister of State tells us a different story. He claims very proudly: We say that Mr. Wanninayake has taxed the people of this country at the highest rate next to the hon. Member for Yatiyantota. Compared with every other Minister of Finance, Mr. Wanninayake's taxes are the highest. And, he is proud of it. I am in the shade. I thought that my taxes were top; I thought that my taxes ruined the private sector. But what does the Minister of State say? He says: No, all your taxes are nothing. The only man whose taxes were higher was the hon. Member for Yatiyantota. He was a Marxist; he wants to expropriate; and that is the only reason why his taxes are bad. Even then, what has he done? He has reduced them by Rs. 18 million.

Surely, you must decide. If you want to make the private sector live again, you cannot have it both ways. The Minister of State cannot brag about how high the U.N.P. taxation is and at the same time say that he is going to revive the private sector. If you want to revive the private sector, even if you want to use a watering can you must have water. You cannot simply flap a handkerchief and hope that it will revive of its own accord. You see the problem you have got.

The Minister of State says in his speech—the second Budget speech—

that these tax incentives and rebates are not enough. Very logically, he says, we shall have to give more rebates; we have to keep reducing taxation year after year—a very logical approach if you believe in the political philosophy of the Minister of Finance. But, can a person who loves the peasantry, the poor people of the Wannu, take that view? Is that your view, Mr. Minister of Finance? I do not think so. I think, you believe that the private sector must co-exist with the public sector. So do I, frankly. But there is a difference between us, nonetheless. It is not enough for you to say that the hon. Member for Devinuwara talked of a mixed economy. Of course, he did. I too still do, and believe in a mixed economy. I have never believed in anything else. It is not clever of you to read speeches I made when I was the Minister of Finance. My views have never been different and never shall be. But it seems to us that there is a difference between us, and the difference lies in the proportions of the mixture. You, with your cocktail economy, believe in certain proportions. We believe also in certain proportions, but it seems that there is a great difference in the respective proportions we believe in.

You tell us that we have achieved nothing over the last nine years. Mr. Bandaranaike, you say, ruined the country, and Mrs. Bandaranaike made things worse. That is your case. We maintain, on the other hand, that Mr. Bandaranaike made a constructive effort to move in a certain direction in spite of all the obstacles you put in his way, in spite of all the difficulties, politically, that you made for him. He nationalized certain ventures. With every nationalization what were we told? This is a wrong thing you are doing. Do not do this, that or the other. Do not nationalize the port; do not nationalize the bus services; do not nationalize the oil companies; do not nationalize insurance. Every one of those things was wrong. Do not take over schools, you will make a mess of it. You will never be able to make profits from these ventures.

On the nationalization of the bus services, what did they say? Only the *mudalalis* can do it. They can run it at a profit. They will pay income tax. But if you try to run it, there will be heavy losses. Every year, the bus services are run at a loss! You may remember that year after year we were told: Do not nationalize. You are ruining the country.

Then about the transport services. The transport services are carrying the load for the country, according to the Minister of Industries and Fisheries. According to his own definition of socialism, they were even delivering the goods—like City Carriers.

So you see you have got a new concept of nationalization. The United National Party places every single obstacle not only as a political group, but through their supporters, their fellow travellers and well-wishers.

What did the bus *mudalalis* do? They denuded the buses. They smashed up the fleet six months prior to the 1st of January 1958, the day of nationalization. We got skeleton buses. We got a fleet that was virtually worthless. We got the *humbas*. We were told year after year from 1960, when I assumed office as Finance Minister, both by the Prime Minister and the Minister of State that we were running the C.T.B. at a loss. They said, you will never run this efficiently. You are the Government. You do not know how to do this. Nationalized services will never be run at a profit.

Now what were the facts? It is perfectly true there were Rs. 18 million losses every year. The bus services were run at a loss, I will admit. But they said, it cannot be done by this inept, incompetent S.L.F.P. Government". What has happened? In 1961-62 the losses became Rs. 1½ million. In 1962-63 we had a Rs. 12 million profit. For 1963-64 the profit was Rs. 20 million, and by 1964-65 the United National Party gave up all

ideas of denationalization. How did this miracle happen? Not because of any great efficiency or great perseverance on our part—I am not claiming that—nor was there any magic touch on our part, or by the hon. Member for Minuwangoda (Mr. M. P. de Zoysa Siriwardena), or by the hon. Member for Agalawatta (Mr. Anil Moonesinghe). They all did an excellent job, I grant, but the profitability of the venture was inherent in the scheme of nationalization. And I will tell you how?

The moment you put more capital into the venture, the moment you gave them effective and efficient buses, the equipment with which to run, the necessary new fleets, new engines, new equipment, the C.T.B. showed a profit. I can assure you that that was what the S.L.F.P. ran its Budget for. I am not ashamed to say that in 1960-61 our replacement of buses a year was approximately 700. The C.T.B. bus—in case you do not know it—has an approximate life of 300,000 miles in between major overhauls, and you will find it runs that 300,000 miles in one year. So, if you want to replace the 365 buses you will have to bring them at the rate of one new bus every day. May I ask the Hon. Minister of Finance how much money he has provided? If he wants to keep the C.T.B. running profitably, he has to do it. But whether the Government wants to run the C.T.B. profitably, one does not know. We believe that nationalization can be made a success. It can be made far more profitable and far more successful as a business venture. I am talking of the private sector now. And yet the argument of losses was trotted out to us year after year in order to try and break this nationalized service, in order to prevent the buses continuing under a nationalized management.

I now come to the port. The Hon. Minister of Finance makes a big point of it. He says there were ships in queues. Yes, there were ships in queues and there will continue to be ships in queues from time to time in the Port of Colombo. You clear them

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.]

up one day—you say to yourself there are no ships outside the harbour today—but you will find them queuing up once again in a few days time. And I will tell you why. The Hon. Minister is a good man. He likes to clear up queues. The fault goes far further back. Let me tell him how it happened if he does not know it. I think he was Parliamentary Secretary at the time—I cannot remember—in the Ministry of Finance, when his Colleague the Minister of Health was Minister of Finance. In 1955, you will find there was provision for Rs. 20 million, provided in the Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena's Budget, for the construction of food stores on Port Commission land round the Beira lake. Mr. K. Alvapillai was then the Food Commissioner. At that time, it was necessary to carry our food stocks in the ancient granaries put up in the 19th century, which have now succeeded in breeding a new type of albino cockroaches which have never seen the light of day. The Chalmers Granaries and Manning Market were constructed to deal with our supplies in this country. Rs. 20 million was provided in 1955. What did the Minister of Finance of that day do?

Mr. K. Alvapillai, the then Food Commissioner, suddenly reported back to his Minister, who was the Hon. Minister of State. What did he tell the Minister? "I have done a wonderful job. I have saved Rs. 20 million in the estimates by not putting up the food stores. I have saved money for this country." And please remember, that when you pay demurrage every day now you are paying that as the price for the brilliance of your Ministers in 1955, in not spending Rs. 20 million. Look it up in the Estimates and see for yourself whether what I say is right or wrong.

ශ්‍රී මොන්ටේගු ජයවික්‍රම

(කෙළරව මොණ්ඩේතු ඉයවික්‍රම)

(The Hon. Montague Jayewickreme)

Why did you not do it after you came into power?

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.

(ශ්‍රී. ආ. ජය. මුර්. ධයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I will tell you. We did put up stores. We spent Rs. 14 million in 1960-61, as an extra budgeting amount allocated for putting up stores partly at Welisara and partly at Ratmalana. They were the only sites available to me. But with the expanding volume of the public sector business, by the C.W.E. and the Food Department, I will warrant that we have still not caught up with that backlog. We have not stopped building food stores. We have not stopped increasing storage. You may ask the hon. Member for Wattala, the hon. Parliamentary Secretary. He knows how those stores came to be constructed, the efforts that went into them and the circumstances in which they were built. They were not sited in S.L.F.P. territory either.

What is happening today is that you are using the holds of ships, the rotten "Liberty" ships the Food Commissioner charters today, and this is the storage capacity the U. N. P. Government failed to build for us in 1955. The money that Mr. Alvapillai saved for you in 1955 is what you have been paying out as a recurrent demurrage bill ever since. Be proud of your achievements!

You talk about the nationalization of the port. It is not the efficiency or inefficiency of nationalization. Make a capital investment that is required, put it into the port, put up the storage that is required, and I can guarantee that this nationalized service will prove as profitable indeed as the C. T. B. and make us undertake more. Already, with all its difficulties it has proved its worth.

Our labourer is paid a decent living wage in the nationalized ventures. No one need to be ashamed of it. The C. T. B. bus driver can live without having to be assaulted by Sir Cyril de Zoysa. A man can work in the port as a decent human being. Those things were not possible then. Those are new

conditions and these are the nationalized ventures which the United National Party likes to keep down to a minimum at the base of its cocktail.

We find other nationalized ventures. When the schools were taken over—that after all is a kind of nationalization too—it meant that the Government felt that we should educate our children in our own educational institutions and not leave it in the hands of private religious institutions. I am a Christian myself. I make no bones about it. I still feel, to this day, that by the Government taking over all schools we have seen to it that children in the village areas had an honest and square deal and not left it as a monopoly for children in particular urban areas with an imbalance in education to enjoy the fruits of the Peradeniya University. It is a great change.

Graduate teachers who were never seen in rural areas now occupy positions of prominence until, I suppose, they are transferred by the Hon. Minister of Education. Most of the good teachers unfortunately hold political opinions different from his. Most of the competent teachers do not agree with the Hon. Minister. The result is that they are being transferred. Fortunately for us, they are being transferred from one S. L. F. P. constituency to another S. L. F. P. constituency. So, our constituencies are still benefiting from the best teachers. We are not really complaining too much.

When we took over the schools what happened? The U. N. P. made no end of a fuss in Parliament against director-management of schools. Actually, director-management was all that was required at that time. Unfortunately, the Catholics were inspired to resist it—I do not know by whom. The Hon. Minister of Industries and Fisheries seemed to think they were very good friends of the U. N. P. at that time, and he said so. He told us—I shall quote him if necessary—that the Catholics

were very good friends of the U. N. P. and were inspired to resist the take-over. He even saw a connection between the Vatican and the U. N. P. at “Sri Kotha.” If that is correct, see what they did, what a national disaster they inflicted on this country by trying to hold it up. Schools were not vested in the Government; the school building programme could not keep pace; vesting orders were delayed. And if we complain today that our schools are not as good as they might have been, let the U.N.P. think to itself, “These are the consequences of how we fought a crusade against nationalization”.

Life insurance was taken over. What happens today? The Hon. Minister of Finance is financing the Budget with the profits from the Insurance Corporation. One of his principal sources of revenue from which he is going to channel domestic borrowing is the Insurance Corporation—the Insurance Corporation that should, according to the U. N. P., have been left in the hands of the private sector. How would you have told the private sector, “Please channel your investments and give them to the Government of Ceylon”? How would you have told them, “These are profits which represent the savings of Ceylonese people in this country, not the savings of foreigners. Release this money, money which has been invested day by day, month by month, year by year, as domestic savings. What is there wrong in channelling it?” Now that you have formed the Government, you have realized the truth of what we were saying. There was a time when they were permitted remittability. But, apart from remittability, how much better it is that the profits of such an enterprise as this, arising from Ceylonese savings, should be harnessed for the benefit of Ceylon. You wanted to give it to foreign countries.

In regard to general insurance, do you remember when Mr. Justin Kotelawala's Ceylon Insurance Company was being run out of business?

සියර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[ඊෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරතුංග මයා.]

He had his revenge, of course, at Hewaneta. We accept that. The entire resources of the Ceylon Insurance building went to Hewaneta to fight against Mr. T. B. Ilangaratne, and succeeded. We are not complaining. Mr. Ilangaratne will come back to this Parliament in the fulness of time by a democratic process. But why do you not even now, if you believe in what you argued then, give back to Justin Kotelawala what is Justin Kotelawala's? If you really believe that, why do you not give Justin Kotelawala the right to transact insurance business? It is unfortunately true that you have now got to accept the fact that the nationalization of insurance has produced a great deal of good in this country, and you are now constrained to accept the success of nationalization.

The Hon. Minister of Finance has talked in his Budget speech of ending one nationalization project in a way. I am not talking of the People's Bank or the Bank of Ceylon which have been nationalized. He wants to repeal a section of the Finance Act of 1961. He said so. That was a section which I introduced in my Budget in 1961, a Budget proposal by which I declared that Ceylonese depositors could not open accounts in foreign banks. It was enacted as law by this Parliament, and I think even the United National Party, if you look up the records, did not vote against it. They spoke against it. They always grumble about nationalization ventures. I would have gone further but for the fact that some of my Colleagues were a little anxious not to go too fast in this matter. I would have preferred then to prohibit the making of any deposits whatever. But my Colleagues thought, no, we should leave it at restricting the opening of new accounts, and we compromised on that.

I remember the Hon. Minister of Industries was one of those persons who thought that I had not gone far enough and that I should logically stop Ceylonese depositors making any

deposits whatsoever even in existing accounts with foreign commercial banks. That was his view.

Now, what has happened here? The Hon. Minister tells us "I am going to remove these restrictions. I believe that Ceylonese depositors should be permitted to deposit their money in foreign exchange banks," and he gave his reasons.

What are his reasons? To enable the foreign commercial banks to play a greater part in national economic development—the resurgence of the private sector. Let them also play a part. Give them the money, that is, the Hongkong and Shanghai Bank, State Bank of India, Chartered Bank, National and Grindlays—give them the money. Let our Ceylonese go to these foreign banks, open new accounts and deposit their money there. Those banks will then be able to rise to their full stature and play their role in national economic development.

A good proposition, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but may I ask the Hon. Minister of Finance to please tell us what precisely did these banks do towards national economic development, as you talk, prior to 1961? What did they do at the time when Ceylonese persons were permitted to make those deposits? Just what contribution exactly did they make? What did they finance? They financed the Nadars and the Borahs on trust receipts against goods. Tell me how many Ceylonese persons or Ceylonese enterprises did these commercial banks ever finance out of Ceylonese money? You may yourself remember. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you had occasion to go for an overdraft to any of those exchange banks, how the situation stood.

The only bankers who helped us—Ceylonese—were the Bank of Ceylon at that time, and even they were pretty choosy. You must have been all right, Sir, but some of the ordinary people among us had our difficulties.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

නියෝජ්‍ය කථානායකතුමා

(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

And you were also, perhaps, during your time.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I am still all right, Sir. I have been all right whether the U. N. P. was in office or the S. L. F. P. was in office. In fact, sometimes, I think, I am better off when the U. N. P. is in office.

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

You can practise.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I can practise.

So you see, Sir, the point I am trying to make is this : what is this great contribution that the foreign exchange banks made at the time they were allowed to harness the Ceylonese depositor? Nothing, absolutely nothing. They helped to finance Indian merchants—[Interruption.] Not only the Habeeb Bank and the Indian Overseas Bank, I am talking of all the other foreign exchange banks in this country. They never financed Ceylonese persons.

And what is there wrong in our telling them, "If you want, bring your monies from abroad. Bring your reserves from abroad." After all, they are getting a lot of foreign aid. Why do you not tell the foreign banks, "Please act as the repositories for the foreign aid deposits." After all, monies are coming from London, New York, West Germany, from Berlin—from all over the world monies are coming to you now. Is there not enough money to bank in the foreign exchange banks without having to take the monies of our poor Ceylonese

depositors for the benefit of foreigners? That is the question I would like to ask. Tell me what were these economic development undertakings financed by the foreign banks prior to 1961? It is because they did not live up to those expectations that the Hon. Minister of Industries quite rightly supported me at that time and said, "What you are doing is correct; use this money".

Of course, the Hon. Minister of Industries is in a difficulty now. I see the problem—political circumstances alter cases. That, of course, remains and I appreciate his embarrassment and difficulties, but I will not embarrass him on that question.

But I ask you seriously, I ask all of you : Are you going to agree to seeing that Ceylonese money—your money, my money, the money of our constituents, the little savings they have got—should be handed over to foreign banks for them to misuse for the benefit of foreign investors?

There lies the difficulty. This Government believes in it, that is their credo, with which I disagree and to which we most strongly object, although we too are believers in a mixed economy. We do not disagree with the theory of the private sector for one single moment but we do not agree with your premise that it is only foreigners who know the art of developing our country. We do not agree with it.

The trouble with you is that you are living in a neo-colonial atmosphere. The trouble with you is that you still believe that this country was never so well governed as when it was under British rule. The trouble with you is that you want to go back to those days. Although you talk about the late Mr. D. S. Senanayake having won Independence for us in 1947, that is your greatest regret. Your Independence is just something you can shout about on 4th of February but, in practice, you believe in your heart of hearts that the finest period for this country was when it was well and efficiently governed under British rule.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් ඛනි ඛාර්තායක මය.]

There is something in that. The British certainly knew how to administer this country and administered it well as administrators, from their point of view, for purposes for which they wanted it. I must say no one can criticize their administration. They were colonial administrators. They were concerned with colonial objectives. They were not concerned with Ceylonese people rising to their full stature. They wanted a few persons who would, no doubt, do well under British patronage—a few people would get rich, a few people would prosper under British rule.

The British companies did extremely well. Their profits and dividends were repatriated abroad. Having repatriated them as, I think the former Member for Wattagama, Mr. A. Ratnayake, once said, “the native would be happy and contented”. The object was to keep the native happy and contented. Once in a while there were a few rebellious persons like the father of the present Hon. Minister of Industries.

The Hon. Minister of Industries told us how the British overlords treated his family then. He told us how the British made the mistake of assuming that the Senanayake campaign against toddy was a movement towards independence. He talked then about the somebods and nobodys.

Here is a situation where really the underlying premise of the U.N.P. is to bring foreign capital back as the only hope of this country. You do not believe in a private sector in this country. What was the private sector from 1947 onwards? The British plantations here: the tea estates, rubber plantations—some of them owned by Ceylonese, a handful of them; coconut estates. What was the private sector? Merchant importers—almost entirely in the hands of Indians. Exporters—almost entirely in the hands of British

shipping companies, British merchants. That was your private sector. That is the word you have elevated to a divine concept.

ලෙස්ලී ගුනවර්ධන මය.

(තිரு. ලෙස්ලී ගුනවර්ධන)

(Mr. Leslie Goonewardene)

What about the *kasippu mudalalis* ?

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් ඛනි ඛාර්තායක මය.

(තිரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

There were no *kasippu mudalalis* in 1947; even blackmarketeers came after that. I am now talking about the private sector when we acquired independence. Since then what has happened? A few estates have changed hands. In spite of all the inducements that you gave to this private sector, your British capital, what has happened? From 1947 to 1955 we found an export of British capital in this country the like of which has never been seen before or after. The British capitalists whom you thought would take you to their hearts were very pleased with the new brown, handsome, Englishman D. S. Senanayake. We think his resemblance to Jomo Kenyatta is too great. The British capitalists thought, “We should still take our capital and go away.” What did they do? A name strikes me. I remember C. T. Rust, one of the more enterprising people in the private sector, an Englishman in Ceylon. What did he do? He promptly proceeded to buy estates, fragment them, sell them in smallholdings at rates approximately Rs. 3,000 an acre and remitted the entire profit—there was no capital gains tax in those days under the U. N. P., there was no exchange control. They were the pre-zero days, and I can assure you that Ceylon’s capital position would certainly have gone to zero if we continued that U. N. P. practice.

That is how the British reacted to you. British capital did not want to stay here. British capital fled. The money realized from selling these

properties was put into investment in East Africa. The Uganda and Kenya tea plantations were financed by Ceylon, our money. And these gentlemen here are talking of the private sector. Do you realize what you did in those days? Our money, Ceylon's hard-earned money, which should have gone into the development of Ceylon's economy was remitted abroad for plantations in foreign countries. This was your exchange policy. And, of course, the Government only had a regulatory function in the matter.

The budgets of those days also talked of weather conditions. The Budgets of those days talked of Gross National Product, of the Korean War bringing about good prices. While the Koreans were slaughtering each other at Panmunjong, you people slaughter-tapped our rubber. And so you see that ultimately under cover of this private sector which you talked about, the private sector consisting of British capital kicked you in the teeth and wanted to run away. They did not want to stay here. Ceylon was not a worthwhile place until British rule came back again.

The same thing happened practically in every new independent country. Look at Kenya. Jomo Kenyatta invited British capital to stay in Kenya. In spite of all his efforts they are going away. Now what is happening?

அ. ஊ. 6.2

கிண்பிண கலாணகலு  
(உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)  
(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Order, please! The Hon. Speaker will now take the Chair.

ஊதுருவ கிண்பிண கலாணகலு இலகண கென் ஓவன் இகென், கலாணகலு இலகண ருதி கிண.

அதன் பிறகு உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள் அக்கிரா னைத்திலிருந்து நீங்கவே, சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள் தலைமை தாங்கினார்.

[Whereupon Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER left the Chair, and Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.]

ஓர்ஓ. ஊர். கிண்பிண கிண்பிணகலு கிண.  
(கிரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)  
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Mr. Speaker, I was talking about the main objective of this Budget which is really to bring back British rule into this country. I was saying how the endeavours of the United National Party from 1947 to attract British capital have failed, and I pointed out how in spite of their blandishments, British capital kept going away.

In 1957, for the first time, I think my predecessor, the Hon. Stanley de Zoysa, realized what was happening and put a stop to it but not before Mr. N. S. O. Mendis had invested a great deal of money in London under the inspired leadership of a former Governor-General who told him that it would be a good idea to conduct a private nationalization of his own of estate companies.

கெ. கி. கி. ஊர். கிண்பிணகலு  
(கெளரவ ம. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)  
(The Hon. D. P. R. Gunawardena)

But you did not do anything to stop it.

ஓர்ஓ. ஊர். கிண்பிண கிண்பிணகலு கிண.  
(கிரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)  
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

In 1957 we tried to stop the flow of further money. Certain action was taken, I think, a little belatedly even as the Hon. Minister of Industries was not quick enough on the draw. He should have been a six-gun toter if he was determined to stop it, but, unfortunately, those were the days when he was commenting on the facial appearance of his other Colleagues.

கெ. கி. கி. ஊர். கிண்பிணகலு  
(கெளரவ ம. பி. ஆர். குணவர்தன)  
(The Hon. D. P. R. Gunawardena)

Sometimes it cannot be helped.

ஓர்ஓ. ஊர். கிண்பிண கிண்பிணகலு கிண.  
(கிரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)  
(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I do not blame him. He has got his lovable buddies with him now.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[ඊෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරතුංග මහ.]

From 1957 what happened? This country took a different direction from that of the United National Party. A complete change of direction occurred. You say that we did not like the private sector. That is false. We certainly tried to build a type of private sector different to the type of private sector you were talking about. We were trying to build a national private sector and to give them a new stature, a status and a stake in this country.

You talk of developing a robust peasantry. The hon. Member for Jaffna talks about a robust peasantry. I would like to tell him that the robust peasantry we talked about in those days were the peasants of Kilinochchi. The entire onion industry came into being in the hands of these people, the robust peasantry the hon. Member for Jaffna represents. But he is now talking about the Moosajees. This is the type of private sector he is talking about. Asker Moosajee, Jafferjee, and so on, are their private sector. Our private sector consisted of little men. How did we do it? How did we build this private sector afresh? I shall tell you Mr. Minister of Finance how it was done. It was done by means of making bank credit available to people who had a good idea but who lacked the means to put it into execution.

The People's Bank and the Bank of Ceylon were the principal instruments by which we believed that Ceylonese persons with a little money, with the brains, with the capacity, could be helped to do a job.

As one of the features in our economic picture you tell us:

"The economy was in the grip of inflationary pressures created by large-scale deficit financing and unrestricted commercial bank credit expansion. The expansionary impact of the Budget was on the average about Rs. 162 million per year; bank credit to the private sector was increasing at about 18 per cent. per

annum and the money supply was increasing at the rate of about 10 per cent." —[OFFICIAL REPORT, 9th August 1965; Vol. 61; c. 49.]

Bank credit to the private sector was increasing at about 18 per cent. per annum, I agree. It is a bad thing from your point of view, Mr. Minister of Finance, that bank credit should increase because your foreign overlords and masters will not like it. I appreciate that.

But as far as the national private sector is concerned, the Ceylonese people whom we are thinking about, the expansion of bank credit is the only method by which you can really build a truly national private sector. And you propose in this Budget to restrict bank credit expansion to Rs. 55 million for the year.

But when it comes to foreign banks, you give them our money. You are giving them our money in deposits. You are giving them Ceylonese depositors' money. You will not reserve them for foreign aid; you will not reserve them for the money that is coming from there.

I shall not liken the Minister of Health to Charles de Gaulle. de Gaulle, at least, knew where he was going. As far as the Minister of Health is concerned, he also made a Budget speech, a third Budget speech, which again differs from the premise of the Minister of Finance.

The Minister of Health says, "I have two things to offer you, two things to two different people in this country." To the private sector, particularly to the foreign private sector, he says, "We are offering you in this Budget a promise that we shall go back to the gold standard, back to the Currency Board." He has even devalued the golden brains of the predecessor of the present Minister of Finance. He says to them, "We shall give you incentives, development rebates,"—all manner of things. That is what he says to the rich.

But to the poor man, unlike de Gaulle but like Winston Churchill, he says, "I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears and sweat."

It seems to me that that perhaps is the crux of this Budget, namely, that you are offering different people different things, and that is precisely what we object to. Why should the Ceylonese people be fed on a diet of blood, toil, tears and sweat, while the Moosajees and the Jafferjees never had it so good? That is our complaint.

You tell us that your brilliant economist, the great brains of N. U. Jayawardena, are going to solve the problem. May I ask you, why then did you kick him out of the Central Bank in your time? The great economist.

May I ask you, is the Development Savings Bank of Loganathan going to solve the problem? I see him up in the Distinguished Visitors Gallery. It will not help. I have read three separate copies of his book which he presented me on three separate occasions. On each occasion I tried to hide it somewhere but he sent me another one.

What is in that booklet? The poor man is told, "Out of every rupee you earn, plough back 10 cents even in the form of development." His money, he finds, is hardly enough to eat with, the cost of living being what it is. Even the Minister of Industries and Fisheries (Hon. D. P. R. Gunawardena) cannot give us fish. Loganathan tells us that his plan is the panacea for all evils, that is, save, save, and save again. Put your money back; plough it back.

What do you say to the rich man? "Your taxes are being reduced; the Government is giving you back money", and to the poor man, "please put your money back into savings." It seems to me that there is a basic contradiction in all this. The Hon. Minister of State feels that the Hon. Minister of Finance is taxing this

country, the highest ever next to the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera). He is proud of the level of taxation. The Hon. Minister of Health is proud of the rebates that are being offered. Where is the consistency in this? What is your objective if it is not the basic colonial objective of bringing us under foreign rule? Now, that is what we object to.

We object to the Moosajees and Jafferjees having their problems solved for them, while the peasants, whether they be of Avissawella, Dompe or Jaffna, are not having their problems solved one little bit. And, so, Mr. Speaker, there you have the real problem.

We were asked about our attitude towards foreign aid. I am not speaking for the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central (Mr. Keuneman), nor for the hon. Member for Yatiyantota. I think the hon. Member for Yatiyantota and I have similar views on this. As for the hon. Member for Colombo Central, I think he too has similar views but he does not like, naturally, to have aid with strings attached. The Hon. Prime Minister took him up at once and asked "what is this question of aid with strings?" And the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central gave what I think was an extremely honest and straightforward reply as to where the strings were.

May I say this, and I would like to quote from the HANSARD of 22nd February 1963—long ago during the last Parliament—where during the course of the Petroleum Corporation debate, the Hon. Minister of State made a contribution. This is a statement made by him on what he thought of foreign aid when he was in the Opposition. It is amazing to see how transformations occur when people shift from the Opposition to the Government. Our attitudes remain the same when we shift from the Government side to the

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මහ.]

I quote :

“DR. COLVIN R. DE SILVA : Marshall Aid in Europe for development? It is best known for its political objectives since the war.

MR. J. R. JAYEWARDENE : All aid is political, not only Marshall Aid.”—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 22nd February, 1963 ; Vol. 50, c. 2042.]

In other words, he started from the premise that all aid was indeed aid, as the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central described it, with strings attached. Having said that he proceeded to enlarge on this and this is what he said :

“The principle on which our Government looked at aid was that it was necessary if we want to have a rapid pace of economic development; but we never made foreign aid a part of our Budget. That is an important divergence from our budgeting and this Government’s budgeting. We had budgetary deficits; we did believe one must have a budgetary deficit if the country wished to advance economically;”—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 22nd February 1963 ; Vol. 50, cs. 2046-47.]

He also said that he did not want to make foreign aid, something given by somebody else, as part of his Budget. That was then. This is what he said :

“...but we did not want to make foreign aid, something given by somebody else, as part of our Budget, particularly to finance a deficit. Not only is it wrong, it is dangerous as you see today”—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 22nd February 1963 ; Vol. 50, c. 2047.]

Now he is asking us why we are objecting to foreign aid being used to finance their Budget. Our answer is, “because the Hon. Minister of State said so.” That is our answer. You not only received United States aid first, you went further and lived dangerously. You made it an essential part of the Budget. Aid is a portion of the component which goes to meet the Budget deficit.

The Hon. Minister of State himself has a lot of experience in finance. He has dealt with the problems of the country. He told us “Foreign aid certainly for development, but not as part of your Budget. You cannot

depend on it. You must not depend on it Why? All aid has strings attached to it.” That was the reason. That is not my reason, that was his reason. He confessed that all aid including American aid has political strings attached to it.

The Hon. Prime Minister turned round and asked the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central (Mr. Keuneman) : “Why are you complaining about the aid having strings attached?” Now, it is difficult for us in this Parliament to remember all the inconsistent statements you have made earlier. The reason is that sometimes members of the United National Party do not say the things they really think or mean. They say the things that are convenient for attaining their objectives and the objectives of their foreign overlords.

The Hon. Minister of State is not only attuned to the rhythm of the universe, he is also dancing to the tune of his foreign masters. That is the problem. You will see, Mr. Speaker, the real problems, the real difficulties with which you are faced in this Debate. Economically, what does the Hon. Minister of State tell us? You will see that statement running through the length and breadth of his Budget speech on the 18th of August, 1965. At column 305 he made a confession. He said :

“We are really groping in the dark”.

I do not think he ever said a truer word. “We are groping in the dark”. They are groping in the dark, the whole lot of them. At column 320 he said again :

“We are experimenting, we are probing.”

Sir, this is the age of experiments. The trouble with him is that he is conducting his experiments also in the dark. Having groped in the dark, having conducted his experiments in the dark, what does he tell us at the end? He says, “The Hon. U. B. Wanninayake, Minister of Finance, is the

great king of taxation next to N. M. Perera." He says, "Of the large number of Finance Ministers who graced that Bench, not one has raised the rate of taxation as much as the Hon. U. B. Wanninayake, except the Marxist Finance Minister." So, is it a good thing or a bad thing? The Hon. Minister of State says, "No, you must reduce taxes some more." He is right. If he wants to please the foreigners, if he wants this country to be run as it used to be run in British times, that is the thing to do. But please do not forget the poor peasants in the Wannu; they would not be happy with what you are doing. They would not be pleased with the interests you are serving.

After all, Mr. Speaker, budgets are strange things. It is a good thing to say that the people of this country do not understand what budgets are all about. They have not a cue; they do not understand a thing. I do not know how it is in Nattandiya, but that is how it is in Dompe. Those people are not concerned. When budgets are announced—they think to themselves—if the Finance Minister imposes any immediate burden, well, that is not so good. If he does not do anything very serious in the form of imposing a burden effecting the price of everyday commodities, well, the Budget is probably all right, nothing to worry about anyway, and so they let it go.

It is also a curious thing that Governments always introduce budgets of this kind when they are weak. Governments always try to avoid touching anything that really solves the problem when they feel they are not stable. I can tell you that this Budget is a very good index of the *hath hawula*. It is stable in regard to the reduction of the price of kerosene. You will find that in fact this Budget has not solved a single problem. You say that you are going to increase agricultural production in this country. The Hon. Prime Minister talks of self-sufficiency in rice, a thing he never talked of before! For the first time he is saying that. That is

why I said this is the fourth Budget because even the Hon. Minister of Finance does not talk of self-sufficiency in rice. It is a new proposal. No money provision is being made even for the fertilizer subsidies.

ශ්‍රී ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක

(කෙළරව දැනී ජෙනෙරායක)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Why, the increase in the Advance Account?

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බන්දාරනායක මය.

(ශ්‍රී. ආර්. ඩයස් බන්දාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

The increase in the Advance Account does not provide for self-sufficiency in fertilizers. I looked it up during the 15 minutes tea interval, but I could not discover anything like your promise of self-sufficiency. We all want self-sufficiency. We all want to be self-sufficient in paddy. The S. L. F. P. will give you every support to achieve this. We too wanted to increase agricultural production. I too wanted to produce subsidiary food-stuffs. I could not care less whether rich people with thousands of acres or little people do it. But you will not succeed not only because they are not interested in planting subsidiary food-stuffs—they will grow a little bit and take over the acreage you give them—but because their real objective will be to sweeten you sufficiently to allow them to repatriate their money. The British companies will be quite willing to take thousands of acres, but their ultimate objective is to take their money back home.

In any case, why will you not succeed? Because you are making the same mistake that we made. I do not know whether it is the Bandaranaike policy, but you have appointed the Hon. C. P. de Silva as Minister of Land! If that is the Bandaranaike policy, all I can say is, "For God's sake do not follow the Bandaranaike policy". That is the crucial mistake you have made as far as developing agriculture in this country. Ask the Hon. Minister of Industries and he

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.]  
will tell you in plain language that the one person who really and truly stands in the way of economic development in this country is the Hon. Minister of Land.

This idea of growing subsidiary foodstuffs in this country is not new. I remember a speech made by the Hon. C. P. de Silva himself on the 15th December, 1961, in this House. It is reported in HANSARD. There he talks about how he had the bright idea of growing onions, potatoes and chillies in the electoral farms. He talks of a pioneer corps then and he talks of a pioneer corps now. The hon. Members of the U. N. P. were opposed to it then; why are they supporting it now? He wanted to live as a free man among free men. Let him live as a free man among free men, but not in the Ministry of Land. Let him live somewhere else; take him out of the Land Ministry and put him in some place where he will not be able to bedevil all of us.

ශ්‍රී ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන

(කෙළරව ම. ජී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන)

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

What about the paddy fields in Grandpass?

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.

(ති. ඉ. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

It was done by the then First Member for Colombo Central (Sir Razik Fareed) now the hon. Appointed Member.

ශ්‍රී ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන

(කෙළරව ම. ජී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන)

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

The hon. fair Leader of the Opposition harvested the paddy!

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.

(ති. ඉ. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

The hon. Appointed Member (Sir Razik Fareed) gave a golden sickle to her to harvest the paddy crop

which he had planted under the bridges of Grandpass, under the inspiration of the Minister of Land.

ශ්‍රී ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන

(කෙළරව ම. ජී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන)

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

What happened to the golden sickle?

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.

(ති. ඉ. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I think he melted it down; probably he gave it to the Hon. Minister of Land to compensate him for the lack of "golden brains".

The Hon. Minister of Industries was himself the most strong critic of the stupidities inflicted on this country by the Minister of Land—his attempt to grow potatoes, his attempt to re-write his agricultural plan and his failure in paddy production. I am not claiming to have been a very competent Minister of Agriculture, but at least I am glad that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture referred to the things that we have achieved over the last few years. I am quite content to leave it at that because I think it is a complete and correct statement of the facts.

We have achieved something. I am not saying that we have achieved everything. I am not claiming that we have done wonders; but we certainly have reversed a lot of mistakes of the Hon. Minister of Land, whom you have now brought back. If the Hon. Minister of Finance hopes that the Wannu will be irrigated he will go on hoping so long as the Hon. Minister of Land is there. If he expects a transformation from major irrigation schemes to minor ones, he will have to wait a long time. I also have been living in hope from the time of the Short-Term Implementation Programme, but the water still continues to flow between the same old banks. The Hon. Minister will talk of diverting the Mahaveli Ganga to Jaffna, but although he might hope to irrigate Jaffna and create new

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

friendship, cement new friendship, with the people in the Northern Province, hoping thereby to dispel the image of him as the mass murderer of Padaviya in 1958, may I say this: if he continues to make these same mistakes, well, we do not mind. It is a national tragedy, and from the point of view of a political party it will be a gain for us because your popularity will decline and, in due time, say five to ten years hence as the Hon. Minister of State said, our turn will come.

But that is not really what we want. We of the S. L. F. P. want our country to develop. We are not talking with our tongues in our cheeks in order to bring you down, but we believe that there are a lot of wrong ideas in your heads. There is that Brown Sahib complex at the back of your minds, and a lot of it has to be knocked off particularly from the Minister of Public Works, Posts and Telecommunications.—*[Interruption]*. You cannot develop this country through the private sector in the "80 Club" or through your cocktail economy. When we talk of the development of the country what we mean is that there is a job of work to be done, and we certainly will give every support to attain that objective.

We also like to live as free men among free people; we certainly would like to live as free men among free people, but not with the Hon. C. P. de Silva there in the Ministry of Lands. Put him somewhere else. Give him the Ministry of Education, if you like; that does not matter because he cannot possibly make education any worse than it is already. Our complaint is that you cannot do this for the benefit of foreign capitalists. That precisely is our complaint against this Government. If you are going to run this country to give the Ceylonese people a break, encourage the building of a real nation; no one here would be willing to give you greater support than we.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of questions which I could deal with, but I do not want to take up unnecessary time on matters of detail. There is, however, one question that I must talk of. I cannot leave it out because it is important. That is the question of the relationship between the Sinhalese and the Tamil people in our country. It is an important question. Some people call it communalism, but I cannot see anything communal in discussing the relationship that should exist and will exist between the Sinhalese and the Tamil people of this country. The U. N. P. hates the Tamils when it is convenient for them; they make most rude remarks about them, they call them names, they call those who associate with them "betrayers"; but when it suits them and when they are hard pressed they remember national unity as a great objective. When the U. N. P. finds things difficult because of them, they condemn them and decry them; when the U. N. P. cannot survive without their help, the highest motives of national unity begin to inspire the Hon. Prime Minister.

I shall start by saying this: the fact that there is a problem between the Sinhalese and the Tamil people is true; you cannot hide it. You yourselves, by entering into your little secret arrangements which you do not want to show to anybody—documents you have signed with them—make your own efforts to solve the problem. We do not mind it. There is a problem and that problem has to be solved. That is the problem that we also want to solve, but we do not want to have it solved in the wrong way. I would like to make that clear here and now since you are developing the habit of raising the argument that we are raising the communal cry. I will tell you how we see the problem, how we see the solution, whether you accept it or not. The question now is not for us to deal with. We are not governing the country; we have been rejected at the polls and we accept the situation. It is for you to solve

விசேஷ கௌரவ உறுப்பினர், 1965-66

—தேவநகர கிணர்

[ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ.]

the problem. But at least you might take into account our views, knowing what we think, knowing what we feel, and realizing, please, that we are not trying to perpetuate the problem as you did in order to gain some little political advantage in the days gone by, your secret pacts with the Federal Party! Your little books with a print of the Island of Lanka! This is how the U. N. P. demonstrated against the Bandaranaike-Chelvanayakam Pact. This was the book on which you conducted your march to Kandy. The Minister of State is feeling shy.

ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ.

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தினர்)

(Hon. Members)

Table that.

ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ.

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

We do not publish, if I may say so, in our journals the kind of things which the U. N. P. did. Now at least they acknowledge that it is their journal; those days they were ashamed and they used to deny that "Siyarata" was their official journal.

I remember a speech I made on the 4th of November 1960, in the course of the Budget Debate that year, in which I quoted the late Mr. Bandaranaike. But, so far, I have not quoted from any of my speeches here, and so, may I be permitted to quote in this instance from a speech made by the then Prime Minister, the late Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike in 1958. In the HANSARD of 4th July 1958, at column 940 this is what he said:

"It might interest my hon. Friend, the Member for Maturata, who is a representative of the United National Party—I am sure he will forgive me—

The voracious Horatius!

"When he comes and mouths his pious inanities, to know that I have got some here published in the official paper of the United National Party, the "Siyarata". These are not anonymous, they are very interesting."

Now, I think the Prime Minister acknowledges that "Siyarata" is the official party organ.

"There was one verse—here it is. This is an extract from an article by one T. B. Ehelapola in the "Siyarata" of 3rd January. I have got the Sinhalese version of it but in order that hon. Members may be able to follow me, I shall merely read a sentence in English. This is what it says:

'Therefore, the whole nation should rise up and demand in one voice that he—

that is I—

'should liberate this country from the Tamils.'

There is much more to come. Then there is another, of 16th May, 'Prime Minister in seven Provinces' by Gunadasa M. Seneviratne. We are coming close to the date and very close. I have got an interesting verse, the Hon. Minister of Health might read it out for me. This is what it says:

'The struggle should be waged by all Sinhalese to call upon Mr. Bandaranaike to resign with his henchmen in order to protect the country and save our freedom. Now the struggle should be concentrated on that. If it is not done, we shall be subjugated by the Tamils and shall live as slaves. Sinhalese awaken, rise and march forward.'

That is in the U. N. P. official paper; the hon. Member for Maturata might know.

I am giving you the dates. Now here are verses in the 'Siyarata' of 16th May, 1958, by H. Wimal de Silva of Modera, one of their youth leaders, entitled, 'Sinhalese youth, rise'. Almost in every line there is the exhortation to kill the Tamils."

And, on the 28th of May, they butchered Tamils, poured petrol on them and set fire.

ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ.

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

Who did that?

ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ. ஈ.

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

The people who were incited. May I continue? I am reading the inciting passages.

"Do not permit it' that is, the country to be overrun, for the sake of the nation let no one think of life, kill as many and when you cannot do so, kill yourself."

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පතන, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

The Hon. P. H. W. de Silva interrupted at this moment and said, "That is the Japanese style". The Hon. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike continued :

"In Sinhalese, it says :

"මරණී, පුළුවන් කරමි මරණී"

Then it goes on with these verses—

'My present Mother Lanka,  
Stop weeping and console yourself for  
a while  
the youth front is on the march  
to protect the country soon.'

And the last of the quatrain—there are four verses—

'Sinhalese, let us rise,  
look and march in front'—

March forward, I should say—

'without fear  
in the name of our nation  
hasten and do not idle but kill.'

In Sinhalese, again it is—

'නොසිටිවි, මරණී, දුවවි, නොසිටිවි, මරණී''

There was a prosecution on this, and, of course, the person who was prosecuted took up the position that he knew nothing about what was in the "Siyarata", which is, I think, the position taken up by persons responsible for the "Siyarata" publications. That is all right. But this was the attitude expressed in official organs, in the newspapers of the United National Party—මරණී.

These are the people who now come forward with a pious holier-than-thou attitude and talk of national unity, persons who published material, whoever wrote it inciting people to murder! You cannot get past it. Now they turn round and tell us that we are inciting people to murder. All I can say is this. If under the law I say anything wrong, and I am prepared to repeat my speech outside, let me be prosecuted. I have no problems. If I have committed sedition, I am prepared to commit sedition again and again in defence of what I believe to be true. But we are not anxious to perpetuate the problem of the Tamil-speaking people. We

want a settlement of the problem. This is not our solution. We do not publish this kind of disgraceful map. We have not tried to divide the country into two parts for the sake of an election. In the way Gaul was divided into three parts, the Hon. Prime Minister has divided the whole of Ceylon into two parts.

Our problem is this, and let us face it. The language problem as we see it is a very simple one. We believe that this country must have one language as a unifying language permanently enshrined for all time.

එස්. එම්. රසමානිකම් මයා. (පද්දී  
පිප්පු)

(திரு. எஸ். எம். இராசமாணிக்கம்—பட்டி  
குப்பு)

(Mr. S. M. Rasamanickam—Paddiruppu  
Whom are you going to unify ?

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

We believe that the people of Ceylon, Tamils and Sinhalese, must be one nation.

රසමානිකම් මයා.

(திரு. இராசமாணிக்கம்)

(Mr. Rasamanickam)

It can never be.

ඒ. අමිර්තලිංගම් මයා. (වඩ්ඩුක්කො  
වෙයි)

(திரு. ஏ. அமிர்தலிங்கம்—வட்டுக்கோட்டை)

(Mr. A. Amirthalingam—Vadduk:  
koddai)

Why did you not say that in March 1960 ?

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

I will come to that in a moment. Why not listen to me a bit ? You can also express your point of view.

விசேஷக் கௌரவப் பதவி, 1965-66

—தேவநகர கிணர்

[ஃபீ. ஃபீ. டியஸ் டிண்டர்நாயக்க மஃ.]

We believe there must be one nation. We believe their must be one language to achieve that objective. We must also appreciate the problem that there are many Tamil-speaking people in this country who do not know Sinhala and on whom it would be a great hardship to impose the Sinhala language now. That is true. There are heaps and heaps of Tamil-speaking persons who are either brought up in English or in Tamil who have never had occasion to study Sinhala or who are not acquainted with the language, and it would create enormous hardship for them to have to work in the Sinhala medium. And if a way could be found by which the Tamil-speaking people would be prepared to accept Sinhala, if we were even guaranteed that children born today would learn Sinhala in the future so that we can have only one language, I can assure you that the Sri Lanka Freedom Party will not stand in the way of concessions being made for those who do not know Sinhala now.

வி. டிண்டர்நாயக்க மஃ. (ஃபீ. ஃபீ.)

(திரு. வி. தர்மலிங்கம்—உடுவில்)

(Mr. V. Dharmalingam—Uduvil)

Why did you not say that in March 1960 ?

ஃபீ. ஃபீ. டியஸ் டிண்டர்நாயக்க மஃ.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

We said it then, and we are saying it now.

ஃபீ. ஃபீ. டியஸ் டிண்டர்நாயக்க மஃ.

(திரு. அமிர்தலிங்கம்)

(Mr. Amirthalingam)

You never said it. You are talking with your tongue in your cheek !

ஃபீ. ஃபீ. டியஸ் டிண்டர்நாயக்க மஃ.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I will tell you their problem. Their problem is, they are not prepared to accept that position. My saying it does not make any difference. The Federal Party, and I believe the Tamil Congress also, do not want that. What they want is something

else. They want the Tamil language to be enshrined permanently in the Northern and Eastern Provinces. They do not want their children to learn Sinhala even in the future. They want the Tamil language to be the language of administration there for ever. And I can assure them that we of the Sri Lanka Freedom Party do not agree with that view.

ராசமணிக்கம் மஃ.

(திரு. இராசமணிக்கம்)

(Mr. Rasamanickam)

You said something else on the 3rd of December 1964 ?—[Interruption]

ஃபீ. ஃபீ. டியஸ் டிண்டர்நாயக்க மஃ.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

No.—[Interruption.]

கலாநாயக்கம்

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please !

ஃபீ. ஃபீ. டியஸ் டிண்டர்நாயக்க மஃ.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

If they do not agree with what I am saying what does it matter?

ராசமணிக்கம் மஃ.

(திரு. இராசமணிக்கம்)

(Mr. Rasamanickam)

You are lying !

ஃபீ. ஃபீ. டியஸ் டிண்டர்நாயக்க மஃ.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

What am I lying? I am only talking of my view.

ஃபீ. ஃபீ. டியஸ் டிண்டர்நாயக்க மஃ.

(திரு. அமிர்தலிங்கம்)

(Mr. Amirthalingam)

You are trying to go back on what you promised in March, 1960—[Interruption].

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

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

Mr. Speaker, these are purely our points of view. I see that none of them will accept our views. We are not part of the *hath hawula*, and we do not want to be. We are not called upon to solve your problems. We are not part of your National Government, thank God! We are talking about our attitude to the language problem. We believe in one language as the unifying language and we believe this tradition must be established.

කේ. තුරේසිරත්නම් මයා.

(திரு. கே. துரைசீரநம்)  
(Mr. K. Thurairatnam)

You do not want the problem solved.—[*Interruption*].

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

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

I am not talking to you, Mister. You can shut up!—[*Interruption*].

කථානායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)  
(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please! Hon. Members, do not blame me if I send out one or two Members. Today, is the day of voting and I do not want to send out Members. But if they behave in this manner I will have to send out some of the Members not only on this side of the House but even on the other side.

We have come to the end of the Debate and we have been carrying on very well all this time. This is the seventh day. We have kept up a very high standard of debate. Let us stick to that.

Please do not disturb because there is very little time left. I am going to be very strict. Do not blame me.

Hon. Members will have another chance of speaking at the Committee stage of the Budget. Therefore please do not interrupt.

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

I was on the question of the problem between the Sinhalese and the Tamils. That problem is a real one because, however much we may want one language in this country, the fact is there are the Tamil-speaking people who do not know the Sinhalese language and who are confronted with a very real problem when it comes down to a sudden change in the language of administration. The shift from English to Sinhala is not something that can possibly be achieved without a great deal of difficulty as far as they are concerned, and it is most harsh and unreal and unreasonable to expect any such transformation to take place without a great deal of goodwill on the part of both the Sinhalese and the Tamils. And that degree of goodwill must be there, and must be created if we can. Unfortunately, politically it has not been possible to achieve that because, so long as the Tamil people are determined to insist upon what the hon. Member for Jaffna (Mr. Ponnambalam) calls parity and what the hon. Member for Kankasanturai (Mr. Chelvanayakam) calls federalism, we find in one form or another a determination to entrench two languages in the administration of the country as a permanent feature. They call it unification, we say it is division. You can put it whichever way you like.

The fact remains that we are speaking for the S. L. F. P. and for the Opposition. We maintain that there must be one language enshrined permanently. For the sake of achieving that, we certainly say that the Sri Lanka Freedom Party is not standing in the way of any compromise which can reasonably be entered into, with that as the objective, by the United National Party as part of its promises under the *hath hawula*. If you can get the support of the Federal Party for that objective, and if you can get the support of the Tamil Congress for that objective, fair enough, and

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[ඊෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

though we do not know the premises of your settlement we shall still support it. But if your objective is to entrench the two languages in this country permanently as a feature of the administration, if you are going to say that the language of administration in the Northern and Eastern Provinces is going to be Tamil for all time, then we shall resist you, we shall not accept that settlement, and we shall do our level best to set aside that settlement some day when we come back into power. —[Interruption]. I am not a prophet. I am talking of what will happen. And make no mistake about it, there is no party that I know of in this country that can govern this country without the co-operation of the Opposition.

They are holding out attractions to foreign capitalists in their Budget. But please tell me this. Who is the foreign capitalist who is going to invest a single cent in this country if he thinks that his venture is going to be nationalized by a subsequent Government? He has to know that we are supporting it. Who is the foreign capitalist in his right mind who is going to bring in any money into this country if he thinks that the succeeding Government, maybe five years later or ten years later, is going to take it over? It is absurd. If you want to bring foreign capital, we must co-operate with you and help you to achieve that objective. And make no mistake, if you take our views into account—that is what we are here for, to express our views—we shall certainly co-operate with you and we shall certainly give every guarantee to the capitalist who serves the national interest.

You are in power today. The job of governing is yours. Govern as best as you can. We are telling you our views so that you can take them into account. That is why we are telling you, not because you are bound to follow us, not because you are bound to accept what we say.

We are telling you these things so that you may know where you stand and where we stand. We are not here

merely to tell you that any settlement that you arrive at on the language problem is unacceptable to us. We are telling you the framework within which the language problem can be solved and within which we shall be happy to see a solution.

But if, on the other hand, as the price of political expediency and in order to solve the little problems of remaining in power, you think that you can arrive at a settlement that is going to result in two languages being entrenched for all time in this country, that is not merely a gross violation of every single promise you made to the electorate at election time, when you promised that Sinhala will be the unifying language. We do not want lip service to Sinhala only in the Northern and Eastern Provinces. We want some reasonable assurance that we are really going to have one country. Give all the guarantees you want to the Tamil language. Let it be studied; let it be learnt; do not destroy the Tamil culture; keep it. But ensure that Sinhala will be taught to the Tamil people, at least to the children who are to be born from now onwards. If you can achieve that, you will arrive at a permanent and lasting solution.

We are not trying to use the question of the Tamil language in order to create any problems of a communal character for anybody. This is not something new. This is something that your leader, the Prime Minister, said in his manifesto. I read it out in the course of the Throne Speech Debate. I am not stating anything different to what he said. You will remember the terms of the U. N. P. manifesto. I have no doubt that the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Local Government will confirm what I say. Sinhala must be the unifying language and within that framework certainly every adjustment required for a peaceful and smooth transition may be worked out.

Today, in answer to questions that we ask in Parliament, we are told that there is an agreement, a deal,

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

between the Federal Party and the U. N. P.—only, it cannot be disclosed now, it is too dangerous, it is politically hot. Then, when we ask about the statements made by the hon. Member for Kankesanturai (Mr. Chelvanayakam)—for example, his statement at Maviddapuram in the Vanniasingham Square—the answer given is, “Yes, we are going to make Tamil the language of administration in the Northern and Eastern Provinces to the extent necessary to implement the Reasonable Use of Tamil Act.” Does that mean that for a period of time—it may be 25 years; it may be 50 years; I do not care—Tamil will be the language of administration in those provinces? Or does it mean that you are going to have it as the language of administration for ever? If it means that it is going to be the language of administration for ever, make no mistake, the Sri Lanka Freedom Party cannot accept it. But if, on the other hand, we are told that for a period of time you want to make Tamil the language of administration there, we may be willing to accept that.

This is not a question of saying that we do not want a settlement, but certainly we are not prepared to accept an unprincipled settlement, a settlement that is going to destroy the very objectives of Sinhala only.

The Federal Party preaches to us that federalism is something that unifies, not something that divides. I have known of two or more countries federating together under a federal constitution to become one country, but I have never come across a country which enjoyed a unitary constitution becoming two countries by a federal division, like an amoeba. If you have two different administration in this country, what will happen? In the Northern and Eastern Provinces you can say that Sinhala is the official language. There is no one there to use it. There are no Sinhalese people there, so far as we are concerned, to administer it. But if we once entrench Tamil as the

language of administration in the Northern and Eastern Provinces, for all practical purposes we are laying the foundation, much as the hon. Member for Jaffna (Mr. Ponnambalam) may like to deny it, for two countries, for a federal state on a pattern envisaged by the hon. Member for Kankesanturai.

I agree with the hon. Member for Jaffna in regard to methods. I do not agree with him in regard to objectives. I agree with him that this problem cannot be settled unilaterally on the basis of a deal between the two political parties. It is a problem which affects two whole people of a country. It affects the Sinhalese-speaking people and the Tamil-speaking people and it is something that goes far beyond party loyalties or party considerations.

I am not saying this from a narrow party angle in order to create a problem. If a settlement can be arrived at by the Hon. Prime Minister, whether with or without our help that conforms to these ideas, to the general idea of having one country and one nation, then we in the S. L. F. P. shall never, never stand against it—whether we are consulted or not.

It is not a question of our bargaining for any particular position arising from this. We have never incited people to murder, we have never incited people to arson. We have never incited anybody to cause hurt or disaffection among nations.

But if you think that we, out of our anxiety for peace, will accept an unprincipled settlement by which our country is going to be permanently divided into two and by which Sinhala is not going to be the one unifying language in this country you are making a mistake. We shall not accept it.

I know that sometimes our attitude has been misrepresented. The newspapers try to show us as a bunch of communalists. I know that we are

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.]

being termed that. I remember the time when the Hon. Minister of Industries said exactly the same thing that I am saying now.

They adopted tactics and methods which I have never adopted. I have never talked in terms of drawing footprints on the map of Lanka. I have never tried to show Lanka in flames. I have never said “*Marau, marau*”. Those are not our words.

But we shall never agree to this country being permanently divided into two on the basis of the entrenchment of the Tamil language in the Northern and Eastern Provinces in the manner contemplated. But as long as it is necessary and as far as we are concerned—a few years in the history of Lanka, a history of 2,500 years is a small period—we want to achieve Sinhala, but it does not matter making a compromise in regard to time. But we cannot possibly agree to losing a part of our heritage, losing a part of our country on the basis of a permanent division.

If you want our co-operation it is always available to discuss matters. You may not agree with our point of view, but it is useful that you should know it. It is useful that foreign capitalists should know our own attitude to these questions, because when they are called upon to invest they are going to ask you about the political stability of our country.

You think you are stable. We thought we were stable with 75 seats. You think you are stable with 66; fair enough. But your stability is never permanent. Nothing is liable to be regarded as permanent in this country. The Hon. Minister of State foresaw a period of office for him up to 1979, and the Hon. Prime Minister said that he is prepared to go away today or tomorrow.

I sincerely hope he does not because if he does the Hon. Minister of State will be there until 1979. So that, looked at from all points of view—I like the Hon. Minister of State; he and I enjoy a debate against each

other—the only problem is that he and I seem to have minds that run on parallel lines and sometimes running on parallel lines can be dangerous specially when we have objectives so different. I know the station to which his mind will run on those lines while my mind will run to a completely different station.

My objectives still, basically, are socialist. My objectives are to benefit the poor people of this country without having regard to the rich men in the “Eighty Club” who drink with the Hon. Minister of Posts.—[*Interruption*].

කථානායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please! Please do not interrupt.

ලරු මොන්ටේගු ජයවික්‍රම

(கௌரவ மொண்டேகு ஜயவிக்ரம)

(The Hon. Montague Jayewickreme)

No, Sir. I must object. This man goes to the “Eighty Club” and drinks damn hard.

කථානායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Will you please sit down?—[*Interruption*]. Silence please. I want to make my Order. The hon. Member for Dompe, you asked for it and you got it. So you are quits.

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මය.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I have no objection at all to be told that I drink at the “Eighty Club” although I do not drink at the “Eighty Club”. It does not worry me at all.

May I say this, Sir? If you want to solve a problem that problem has got to be solved in the correct way.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

ශ්‍රී මොන්ටේගු ජයවික්‍රම

(කෙළරව මොණ්ඩේලු ඉයවික්‍රම)

(The Hon. Montague Jayewickreme)

He is personal and vicious. That is what he is.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් ඩන්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(ති. ඉ. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

I can see his difficulties.

ශ්‍රී මොන්ටේගු ජයවික්‍රම

(කෙළරව මොණ්ඩේලු ඉයවික්‍රම)

(The Hon. Montague Jayewickreme)

I can see your difficulties.

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් ඩන්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(ති. ඉ. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

The truth hurts.

ශ්‍රී මොන්ටේගු ජයවික්‍රම

(කෙළරව මොණ්ඩේලු ඉයවික්‍රම)

(The Hon. Montague Jayewickreme)

Vicious liar !

ශ්‍රී මන්ත්‍රීවරු

(කෙළරව අඟුණකොටු මන්ත්‍රීවරු)

(Hon. Members)

Withdraw !

කථානායකතුමා

(ආරාධනාකරු මන්ත්‍රීවරු)

(Mr. Speaker)

I think Hon. Ministers, more than others, should behave better.

ශ්‍රී මොන්ටේගු ජයවික්‍රම

(කෙළරව මොණ්ඩේලු ඉයවික්‍රම)

(The Hon. Montague Jayewickreme)

I withdraw the word "liar".

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් ඩන්ඩාරනායක මයා.

(ති. ඉ. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to take any more time except to say this, that this Budget of the National Government has not really solved any problems. Industrial production, we

were told, was wrongly developed. But I can assure you that I know of no reason—much as the Hon. Minister of Industries may be having a problem—to condemn the new private sector development that took place under the S. L. F. P. Government. We are proud of the expansion of bank credit that achieved that objective. If you are so worried about the chocolate industry, may I ask what is wrong in producing for export chocolates out of the cocoa we ourselves produce? The world's best cocoa is produced in Ceylon. Why should we not plan for an export market? Are you thinking in terms of feeding the children of this country only or are you thinking of creating an export industry? Why then do you not restrict your rubber tyres production only to the cars that run on the streets of Colombo? Why are you thinking in terms of rubber for export? What is wrong in producing chocolates for export? This kind of argument coming from the Hon. Minister of Industries is just not good enough.

We appreciate that the predecessor of the previous Minister of Industries made a substantial contribution notwithstanding the fact that he himself admitted that during his period the industries did not really get off the ground, but he was fair enough to admit that his successor, Mr. Maithripala Senanayake, succeeded in achieving just that

Let it be said just now that the private sector to which you have now hitched your wagon will fail and will let you down and will not permit you to develop industries. Let it be quite clear. I shall not say anything further except to congratulate the Hon. Minister of Finance once again and to express the hope, even though I am frankly sceptical, that your Budget will keep to the rails, that the weather conditions will favour you. I hope that you will not have difficulties with the monsoons. I hope that the tanks will not burst their bunds creating further problems for you with the Hon. Minister of Land. I hope the Hon. Minister of Land will cultivate your land

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.]

for you. I hope he will irrigate the Wannu by improving minor irrigation works. I sincerely hope that his pump will pump harder and pump far enough with all the tax rebates you have given him. And if, indeed, by bringing in foreign aid, you are able to improve the economy of this country, even by accident, it will be a great achievement and we shall be happy to see you succeed. At every stage we shall give you constructive help and co-operation. If you think that our comments are unhelpful, you can disregard them. But it is a clear indication to you of what our attitude is going to be at some stage if and when democracy turns her fortunes politically in a different direction.

Have I got half an hour, Mr. Speaker?

කමානායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)  
(Mr. Speaker)

Fifteen minutes more.

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

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

I do not really need it, but I can talk for another fifteen minutes.

කමානායකතුමා

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)  
(Mr. Speaker)

I think the hon. Member has almost completed his speech. It is nearly 7 o'clock. But he has 15 minutes more.

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

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

I have got plenty more to say. I have got a whole lot of HANSARD to read, but I shall in conclusion only say that it would be a very good thing if we on both sides of the House could come to a better understanding than when we were the Government and you were the Opposition. If we failed to achieve as much as we could

have achieved during our period of office as a Government, it was largely because of you and your obstruction.

රො. ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන

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

How?

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.

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

I can assure you that there will be no obstruction from us. I can assure you that if you are ever confronted with a coup, we shall do our level best to defeat the coup. You can have our assurances that we shall never keep you debating for hours and hours and hours before you are able to take a single step that you want to take. If you believe that giving the country over to the private sector interests that you are talking about is the best way of developing the country, then you can do so and try your luck. I can tell you plainly that if we do not agree with you we shall do our best to reverse it when we come back into power. If, on the other hand, we do agree with you, we shall tell you also clearly that you can hold out whatever promises you want and the private sector from abroad will be able to act with the safe assurance that they will not be denationalized or nationalized later on.

So that we shall give you the kind of co-operation which you denied to us, and you shall have it. I am not saying this in any spirit of carping criticism. I mean it quite sincerely. And you seem to imagine that we are dangerous to the Marxists. Frankly, I can assure you that I am no Marxist. We in the Sri Lanka Freedom Party are not Marxists. And frankly, quite apart from political philosophy, I can assure you that the policies that were adopted and practised by the Sri Lanka Freedom Party and their associates, the Lanka Sama Samaja Party and the Communist Party, are not Marxist policies either. We wanted our country to develop.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

We do not believe that there is going to be much development under the kind of regime which you are now planning, not even though you have one or two ex-Marxists who have come your way in the polarization.

There has been a polarization certainly of the Marxist forces in this country. Some have got polarized our way, some have got polarized your way. But that polarization of Marxist forces in this country does not really make a substantial difference. And I do not think any of them really are Marxists either.

ශ්‍රී. මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(කෙළරව අங்கදත්තවර් ඉරුවර්)

(An hon. Member)

What about Charlie ?

ඒෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බන්ධාරනායක මය.

(ති. ආ. ආර්. ඩයස් බන්ධාරනායක)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

No, I shall not say anything about our ancient mariner or the ancient bird that he showed us yesterday, but we are telling you these things in all honesty, in all sincerity so that you may be able to lead this country, whose destinies have been handed over to you, in the best possible way and develop it to the fullest in the period of time ahead of you. You shall have our co-operation. We shall certainly criticize you, we shall certainly tell you where we think you are wrong. But make no mistake about it, that that degree of co-operation we extend to you in a very friendly way and we shall certainly hope that the Minister of Finance, even by the accidents of good weather, will be able to deliver the goods.

අ. ආ. 7.5

ශ්‍රී. මන්ත්‍රීවරයෙක්

(කෙළරව වන්නිනායක)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Mr. Speaker, I should like first of all to thank all hon. Members on this side of the House as well as on the

other side for the contributions they made to this Debate. As is to be expected, all the contributions made were not of the same type. Where some were constructive and full of suggestions, others were not so constructive. Some of them from the Opposition were full of bitterness and they tended to pedal their own little pet philosophies. I thank all hon. Members for their contributions to the Debate, and if in the course of my reply I do not refer to all the criticisms that have been made, I wish to state that it is not because I have not made a note of such criticisms but because I have not the time to reply to them.

I wish to make a preliminary observation about some of the criticisms made by some of the hon. Members opposite. Most of the hon. Members in the Opposition formed their impressions of the Budget in the same way in which some blind men formed their impressions of an elephant. Sir, there were some blind men who had heard about the animal called the elephant and they decided to find out what the elephant was like. One blind man felt the elephant's trunk and exclaimed, "The elephant is like the trunk of a tree!" Another blind man touched the tail and said, "The elephant is like a broom!" Another blind man felt one of the ears and said, "The elephant is like a winnow!" Another blind man touched one of the legs and explained, "What nonsense! The elephant is like a mortar!" Each of the blind men formed a different idea of the elephant. Now, if any of them had touched any other organ of the elephant he would have got yet another impression of what the elephant looked like.

In the same way, Sir, it seems to me that some hon. Members, having looked at one aspect of the Budget, have formed an impression of the Budget as a whole. If they had considered the Budget in all its aspects, then they would have seen the real U.N.P. elephant in the Budget.

விசேஷக் கெடுபென் பதன, 1965-66

—தேவதர் கியலி

சுரு மிமிலி சேநாயக

(கௌரவ டட்ளி சேனாநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Dudley Senanayake)

It is an elephantine Budget.

சுவாசிய உன். உ. பரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Elephantiasis!

சுரு உன்நிநாயக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

To get a realistic and complete picture of the Budget, you cannot just examine one or two proposals. You must consider all of them.

Criticism has been levelled that the reduction or the complete abolition of import duties is not sufficient. But it must be remembered that a large number of items used by the common man have come in for these concessions. And who are these people who say that this is not enough? The very people who raised the duty on these items? I have with me a list of such items.

In 1961 the postage was increased to 10 cents. Then in 1961-62 the import duty on tobacco and manufactured cigarettes was increased, adding two cents to the cost of a cigarette. Then import duties on motor spares and certain other sundry items were increased. The price of sugar and flour was raised by five cents a pound—[*Interruption*].

சுரு மன்திவரு

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தினர்கள்)

(Hon. Members)

Shame! Shame!

சுரு உன்நிநாயக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

He is the man who is trying to say that I have let down the Wannian man—yes, he raised the price of sugar by 5 cents a pound—[*Interruption*].

சுரு மன்திவரு

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தினர்கள்)

(Hon. Members)

Shame! Shame!

கலாயகனது

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please!

சுரு உன்நிநாயக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Then, Sir, he levied a national development tax of four per cent. from all wage earners whose monthly income was over Rs. 300—[*Interruption*].

Then, in 1962-63, what happened? The import duty on cement was increased by 50 cents a hundredweight—[*Interruption*].

சுரு மன்திவரு

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தினர்கள்)

(Hon. Members)

Shame! Shame!

சுரு உன்நிநாயக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Import duty on sarees by 10 per cent.—[*Interruption*.] I do not mind the increase in the import duty provided there are enough sarees produced locally as otherwise it will lead to a lot of trouble!

The import duty on sarongs was increased by 20 per cent.—[*Interruption*]. That is not all, Sir.—[*Interruption*].

சுரு மன்திவரு

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தினர்கள்)

(Hon. Members)

Shame! Shame!

சுரு உன்நிநாயக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

The duty on kerosene oil was increased by 6½ cents a gallon. And, that is the man who is telling me that I have no feelings for the Wanniman.—[Interruption]. There was a 25 per cent. increase of duty on radio spare parts. I do not mind that. This is a long list, Sir. I will take a long time to read all the items on this list.

Then, the duty on iron and steel was increased by 10 per cent. and these are items which our village blacksmiths use to make *kathies* and *alavangoes* and that kind of thing. Having increased the duty by 10 per cent. he is finding fault with me for having reduced it, saying that I am not thinking of the Wanniman. This is a fine kind of logic, Sir!—[Interruption]. The fees under the Motor Traffic Act in respect of driving licences—poor drivers!—were increased.—[Interruption].

சுரு உன்நிநலர்

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தினர்கள்)

(Hon. Members)

Shame! Shame!

கலாயகனதும

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

Order, please! Will hon. Members please allow the Hon. Minister of Finance to go on? It is difficult for the Reporters to record the proceedings. Will hon. Members please understand that? Let the Hon. Minister of Finance go on calmly and hon. Members might listen patiently. That will be more effective than what they are trying to do. Please do not disturb him.

சுரு உன்நிநாயக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

There was a sales tax of 7½ per cent. imposed which was soon withdrawn. There was a general 20 per cent. surcharge on import duties

I have imposed a surcharge myself but I have excluded a number of items. They say mine is a capitalist Budget while theirs is a socialist Budget! What I say is that you must not take just one or two proposals. They are all inter-connected. You must take all the proposals together.

I am told that I did not sufficiently reduce the import duties in respect of chillies, onions, and so on. In fact, I have abolished the import duty on them.—[Interruption]. Wait till I tell you. How can I abolish in a larger measure an import duty which is not there?

I am taking a theoretical figure. If some of these articles fetch only a duty of 10 per cent., I cannot abolish 20 per cent., I can abolish only 10 per cent. I have abolished the import duty that is being charged. I cannot abolish 20 per cent. when the duty is 10 per cent. Perhaps the hon Member for Dompe might have done that, but I cannot do that. What I say is that every Government hitherto, including the past U. N. P. Governments, charged import duty on these articles that are in common use. For the first time this Government is not charging a cent on such articles. That is the principle I want to establish. Well, let the common man know that if the prices of these articles are still high in the market, it is not because of any duty charged by the Government but because the prices are high in the countries of production. You must take that with the incentives I have given for the production of food.

சுரு உன்நிநலர்சென்

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

To Moosajee.

சுரு மோன்மேலு சீயவிக்ரம

(கௌரவ மொண்டேரு ஜயவிக்ரம)

(The Hon. Montague Jayewickreme)

To U. K. Edmund to produce beer!

விசேஷக் கௌரவப் பதவி, 1965-66

—தேவநகர கிளப்பி

சுரு வந்தியாயக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

If the prices are still high, the only thing for us to do is to produce them in our own country at a lower price.

ஸ்டான்லி திலேகரத்னே மஹா. (கோட்டை)

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலேகரத்னே—கோட்டை)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne—Kotte)

A blunt reply.

சுரு பி. டி. பாண்டா

(கௌரவ எம். டி. பாண்டா)

(The Hon. M. D. Banda)

You are too clever.

சுரு வந்தியாயக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I have made certain changes in the tax structure. You must not refer to those changes in the structure in an isolated way, you have to take them along with the rebates given for investment and the surtax. You will find they fall into line.

Then all these changes must be connected up with the idea of profit-sharing. That is another point. We had a number of socialist Governments in this country. For the first time in the history of this country the employees are going to get a share of the profits. We had Dompe socialism, we had Tumpane socialism and all other kinds of socialism, but for the first time in the history of this country the employees are going to get a share of the profits of the concerns in which they are employed.

கேனமன் மஹா.

(திரு. கேனமன்)

(Mr. Keuneman)

Re. 1 is enough. That is what the workers are asking.

சுரு வந்தியாயக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I was asked, "Are you not having sufficient faith in the public sector? Why do you concentrate on the private sector?" That would not do. What I feel is, either they have not read the Budget speech or they do not care to understand it, or they deliberately misunderstand it. I have allotted more funds for the public sector next year than was done this year, very much more than this year. I am hoping to add to that in the course of next year. Whilst doing that I am giving these incentives to the private sector to engage in urgent economic development activities. Still they say I am going to switch over from the public sector to the private sector.

The hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) in the course of his reply paid me a few compliments. Of course, he threw a number of brickbats as well. I will come to them later. I would first refer to the compliments he paid me. He said that I was a very lucky man. I have been wondering why he called me a lucky man. Now I know one reason why he regarded me as a lucky man.

சுரு மந்திரிமன்றம்

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

Because he had been unlucky.

டாக்டர் என். எம். பெரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

What a discovery!

சுரு வந்தியாயக

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Here I am, Sir, charged with the responsibility of replying to so many speeches from the Opposition. My task has been so much lightened by the very valuable contributions and replies made by my Ministerial Colleagues, the Hon. Prime Minister and the back-benchers on this side.

பிசுரீகன கெடுமீசன் சனா, 1965-66

—தேவனலர கிசீமீ

சுரு மன்திரிவரசேகர்

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

The Ginger Group!

சுரு வன்னிநாயகன்

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

After their speeches there is very little that I have to reply to. I have almost nothing to reply to except to the comments of the hon. Member for Dompe. On that point I consider him also rather lucky today because he had to deliver his speech at the tail end of the Debate just before I started mine. He delivered a long speech full of untruths—it had some truths too—half-truths, inaccuracies and digressions. He is lucky that my Ministerial Colleagues and the back-benchers did not have time to reply to him. The hon. Member for Yatiyantota, my predecessor, paid me another compliment. He said that I have produced a U. N. P. Budget. Of all the compliments paid me in connection with this Budget, I consider that compliment to be the highest. I remember, somewhere in 1947, some Members of the old State Council met in a room upstairs and formed this U. N. P.

சுருவாசீசன் உன். எம். பெரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Not in 1947. In 1947 you fought the elections.

சுரு வன்னிநாயகன்

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I was one of the founder members of the U.N.P. I have been in it during all its ups and downs—I must say there were more “ups” than downs. I have been in it right through and I do not think that any higher compliment can be paid to me than to say that I have produced a U.N.P. Budget.

I have neither the dexterity nor the flexibility nor even the plausibility required to produce a non-

U. N. P. Budget while being a U. N. P. man. My hon. Friend the Member for Yatiyantota can produce any kind of Budget. While continuing to be one hundred per cent. L. S. S. P. he can produce a 100 per cent. S.L.F.P. Budget! And he talks of intellectual honesty, and so on, to us! Everybody knows that my hon. Friend can play many parts, perhaps conflicting parts at the same time with equal plausibility. We know that he can play the role of a capitalist very much better than any capitalist anywhere in the world; we also know that he can play the role of a socialist better than most of the socialists anywhere in the world. That is not strange; there are many people who can do that. What is strange about him is that he can play both these roles simultaneously.

Sir, now I must refer to the U. L. F. that was formed. The U. L. F. was formed with much fanfare, processions, and the formulation of the 21 demands. All manner of enthusiasm was shown both inside the Parliament and outside and they all thought that at last they had the machinery to bring about the millennium they were hoping for. What happened? I can quote what the hon. Member for Yatiyantota (Dr. N. M. Perera) and the then hon. Member for Dehiwala-Mt. Lavinia (Dr. Colvin R. de Silva) said on that occasion from the HANSARD. They, in fact, said that there was nothing to fear, that once the U. L. F. was formed everything would be all right.

ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்னே

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்னே)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

We lost our Leader to your side.

சுரு வன்னிநாயகன்

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Even before the U. L. F. started functioning the hon. Member for Yatiyantota started secret discussions with the S.L.F.P.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාநிති என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

No, no! If he does not mind, all that I am saying is that I am quite prepared to accept any criticism, but I do not want you to twist facts if you do not know the facts. My starting discussions is quite different, but do not come out with things which you do not know, and which are not true. That is all that I want to say.

ශ්‍රී මන්තීනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Anyhow discussions were started in Nuwara Eliya with cricket and all manner of games going on, but to the surprise of everybody the U. L. F. did not start. It was a non-starter.

ස්ටැන්ලි තිලෙරත්න මයා.

(திரு. ஸ்டான்லி திலக்கரத்ன)

(Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne)

You took our leader away.

ශ්‍රී මන්තීනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

The hon. Member for Yatiyantota then joined the S.L.F.P.. The match-maker of this union is not here today. What happens to all match-makers has happened to him. We do not mind these things, but when the hon. Member accuses me of, "intellectual dishonesty and suppression of facts", I too feel like coming out with a few of these things.

The other criticism levelled against me is that I had not even mentioned anything about socialism in my Budget. I am glad that I did not do so because there are various brands of socialism on that side starting from the hon. Member for Dambadeniya (Mr. R. G. Senanayake). His socialism has its emphasis on racialism or communalism, will its emphasis on agriculture as against industry.

Then we come to the Communist Party's brand of socialism with its emphasis on industry as against agriculture, and nationalization of all properties belonging to people excepting, perhaps, certain articles of personal wear, like underwear, tooth paste, tooth brushes and so on.

Again we have the L.S.S.P. brand of socialism. There also we find two divisions—[Interruption].

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

We are now holding our committee meetings in the Lake House!

ශ්‍රී මන්තීනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

The L. S. S. P. brand of socialism is no doubt different from the Communist brand.

Then we have the S.L.F.P. brand of socialism, particularly the Dompe brand, and we also have the socialism of the late Mr. Bandaranaike. So that, in this welter of various brands of socialism, I thought it was better to leave it to the people to find out for themselves which really is the socialist party in Ceylon. I think, they made the decision once in March this year that the United National Party is the real socialist party.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Federal Party also?

ශ්‍රී මන්තීනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

They have joined a very democratic front.

விசேஷக் கமிட்டி உரை, 1965-66

—தேவநகர கிளப்பி

சுரு உத்தரவுகள்

(கௌரவ அங்கத்தவர் ஒருவர்)

(An hon. Member)

And, what is wrong in that ?

ஊவாசிய உத்தரவு. டி. பி. பெரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

That is communal socialism.

சுரு உத்தரவுகள்

(கௌரவ வன்னினாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

May I say this: that in the fair name of democratic socialism, what most of these so-called socialists are trying to do is to ram down the throats of our people State capitalism. And I think that if the people of this country know what you are going to give them, they will not have it from you.—[Interruption].

Another grievance that the hon. Member for Yatiyantota had against me was that I did not carry out the proposals in his Budget—

ஊவாசிய உத்தரவு. டி. பி. பெரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

My Budget ?

சுரு உத்தரவுகள்

(கௌரவ வன்னினாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Yes, your Budget. His grievance was that I did not carry out the proposals in his Budget, including the toddy proposal. How can I do that ? How can I place any faith in his Budget proposals when some of his Coalition partners had no faith in them and allowed the Coalition to be defeated in Parliament.

ஊவாசிய உத்தரவு. டி. பி. பெரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Was it on the Budget that the Government was defeated ?

சுரு உத்தரவுகள்

(கௌரவ வன்னினாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

If they had so much faith in your Budget, if they thought that your Budget was going to solve all the economic difficulties of the country, surely, they would not have left you and allowed the Government to be defeated in Parliament. Then, what happened in March this year ? If the country had so much faith in your Budget and if the country thought that it was going to cure all the economic ills of the country, surely, the country would have returned you to power to implement your proposals. No, Sir. Some of your Coalition partners had no faith in your Budget, the country had no faith in your Budget, and you want me to have faith in your Budget ?

Then we come to private industrial production. Well, my hon. Friend, the Member for Yatiyantota, condemned all these industries the previous year before he became the Minister of Finance. He called them *seeni-bola* industries.

ஊவாசிய உத்தரவு. டி. பி. பெரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I did not. I said there were some defects.

சுரு உத்தரவுகள்

(கௌரவ வன்னினாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Once you said you had no faith in them. I will read out from column 2753 of HANSARD of 20th August, 1963 :

“That is not all. I have already indicated to you that when you talk about a high proportion or the satisfactory increase of the industrial share of the gross national product, you must also bear in mind that you have invested not less than Rs. 100 million in various corporations for which we are getting absolutely no return. In the Minerals Corporation you have invested Rs. 8 million for which you have nothing to show by way of an end-product. In the Small Industries Corporation you have invested Rs. 1.8 million and you have nothing to show by way of an end-product. In the Eastern Paper Mills you have invested Rs. 29

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[ශ්‍රී ලන්කීයයක]

million, and the accumulated losses of the Eastern Paper Mills are Rs. 8 million. You have invested Rs. 15.7 million on Paranthan Chemicals but what is the return for that?"

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(කලාநிති என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

What are you reading from?

ශ්‍රී ලන්කීයයක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

HANSARD of 20th August 1963.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

That is not my Budget.

ශ්‍රී ලන්කීයයක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Not your Budget. This is what you said in 1963. To continue:

"In the Kantalai Sugar Corporation you have invested Rs. 28.9 million so far. You have produced a few hundred tons at an enormous cost to the taxpayers of this country.....

You started three years back, and fine beginning this is! In the Plywoods Corporation you have invested Rs. 2.8 million and you still continue not to show any profits. In the Bus Corporation—apart from nearly Rs. 80 million spent—our accumulated losses come to Rs. 28 million. The total is well over Rs. 100 million, entirely due to bad management, bad planning, inefficiency, incompetence, and corruption, worst of all corruption."

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

You were also here.

ශ්‍රී ලන්කීයයක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

That is right. I agree with you. I am in whole-hearted agreement with you.

You cannot now talk in the same strain because you have got to please your S. L. F. P. friends also. Otherwise, the coalition cannot function. But this was the idea that you had at that time.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I am of that opinion even today.

ශ්‍රී ලන්කීයයක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

The only thing is this time you try to say that the private sector has responded and that kind of thing.

And, Sir, about private industrial production, I made a point of it by saying that as a result of not having foreign exchange, private sector production was to some extent hampered. Obstacles were put in their way and they were not able to import sufficient machinery, raw materials, spare parts, etc. You took up the position that all the requirements of the private sector were met, whereas numerous complaints have been coming to us that they are not in a position to produce to the fullest capacity.

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

I did not say that. You had only one complaint.

ශ්‍රී ලන්කීයයක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

There is ample evidence here to show that there has been a shrinking of the private industrial sector. It increased by 20 per cent. in 1963, but showed only a small increase of about 11 per cent. in 1964.

විසර්ජන කෙවුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

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

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

Eleven per cent. is a very big increase.

They refused to give on credit because there was a shortage of fertilizer.

ශ්‍රී මන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)  
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

Earlier it was 20 per cent.

ශ්‍රී මන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)  
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

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

You cannot expect a 20 per cent. increase every year.

With regard to foreign aid we have been criticized for obtaining aid. After all we must understand that it was the previous Government that reduced us to this plight. We did not go for foreign aid when our Government was in power earlier. We did not get aid from any country. This business started after the last U. N. P. Government gave up office. We had no need for foreign aid. We had about Rs. 1,250 million worth of foreign exchange with us.

ශ්‍රී මන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)  
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

This is private industrial production.

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

What is the development ?

ශ්‍රී මන්නිනායක

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)  
(The Hon. Wanninayake)

I shall give you another example which shows that there was a shrinkage. According to the Ministry estimates, the foreign exchange requirement in 1965 for both sectors, private and public, was Rs. 350 million, but the Foreign Exchange Committee was not able to allocate that sum because there was no foreign exchange to that tune. They were able to allocate only Rs. 235 million. What I am trying to point out is that, as a result of the lack of sufficient foreign exchange, there was a shrinkage in production in the private sector. This was so for lorry transport and tractors for the plantation sector and even for fertilizer. I think the hon. Member for Yatiyantota himself tried to get some fertilizer on credit when he went to Japan for talks there. I do not want to labour that point.

I am talking of foreign aid ; the desirability or otherwise of getting foreign aid. It was the previous Government that started getting foreign aid from America and the other countries and now they are blaming us for obtaining this aid. They are accusing us of having talks with the I. M. F. and the World Bank. Surely, we are members of those organizations. They too had talks with the I. M. F. and the World Bank last year. In fact, the secretary of the party of the hon. Member for Yatiyantota said, "Why are you having talks with all these people of America ?", and he found fault with us.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

[ගරු මන්තිකායක]

The previous Government has put us into this plight. I will tell you what the plight is in the words of the hon. Member for Yatiyantota. This was the plight in which he was left when he took over. He said, "When I was Minister of Finance I spent sleepless nights and my heart missed beats every time there were changes in world prices". That was the position when he took over. When I came the position was much worse. We had just sufficient foreign exchange to import our essential requirements for four or five days and not more. You can imagine the plight of a Finance Minister in that position.

We had to arrange a number of credit payments, deferred credit and all manner of things to meet a difficult situation. And we had to go to the I. M. F. It is not a foreign body. We are members, we had discussions with them and I arranged for a stand-by agreement. After that the World Bank carried on negotiations with us. They held a meeting among those consortium countries, and some offer of help has been made, the details of which are being worked out.

You leave a country to us with insufficient foreign exchange, just sufficient to import four or five days' essential requirements, and turn round and say, "Why do you go and borrow money from various people?" If you read my speech you will see that we do not want to depend on foreign aid for ever. We want to tide over a difficult time. Thereafter we want to find the necessary money as soon as possible within the country for our purposes. I have said so in my Budget speech.

I have been criticized for proposing to alienate Crown land. This was the main opposition to my Budget proposals. This proposal is clearly stated in my Budget speech. It was made clear by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and by many hon. Members on this side of the House. They

all stated that what you say is not true. They said that land is not going to be given on the basis on which, according to you, it is to be given. Members of the Opposition have suddenly developed a fondness for Mr. D. S. Senanayake. They alleged that his policy is to be reversed by this Government, aided by all of us. What do I say in my Budget speech? Although this point has been explained several times, I must read out what I said once again.

"The Government proposes to supplement....."

The word used is "supplement". We are trying to help in a venture that is being run by the peasantry.

"The Government proposes to supplement the present land alienation to peasantry with measures to enable Crown land to be leased for periods not exceeding 25 years to local private enterprises for the cultivation of subsidiary foodstuffs, on the strict understanding that such alienation will not affect the present and future interests of local villagers in particular, and the requirements for land by the landless peasantry in general."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 9th August 1965; Vol. 61, c. 98.]

How much clearer can we make it?

Then again :

"While the Government unwaveringly maintains the principle that in the alienation of land the predominant consideration must always be the interests of the peasantry, it believes that there is a case at the present time for considering the grant of Crown land under suitable lease conditions to private individuals and companies....."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 9th August 1965; Vol. 61, c. 99.]

Surely, we have made it perfectly clear. I come from a rural area. I will certainly not be a party to the alienation of land, which is earmarked for village expansion, to private companies for development. That is not the intention of these proposals.

I must say a word or two about the criticisms made by the hon. Member for Dompe (Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike). The hon. Member for Yatiyantota found fault with us for





விசேஷக் கைமுடிபன் பதன, 1965-66

—தேவநல்லூர் கிளப்பி

செ. வந்தினாயகை

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

What did the hon. Member for Dompe say? He told us, "My Budget failed. I agree. My proposals failed. I agree." But he went on to prove that his proposals and his Budget only could have saved the country.—[*Interruption*].

எஃப். ஃப். டியஸ் டிண்டர்நாயக்கை உயா.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் டிண்டர்நாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

No.

செ. வந்தினாயகை

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

And the other attitude he adopted was this: "Where I failed, nobody else could succeed."—[*Interruption*].

எஃப். ஃப். டியஸ் டிண்டர்நாயக்கை உயா.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் டிண்டர்நாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

No. Weather conditions! [*Interruption*].

கிணாயகை

(சபாநாயகர் அவர்கள்)

(Mr. Speaker)

When I tell hon. Members seriously to keep Order, please, they must listen. The Hon. Minister has only ten minutes more, let him finish his speech. I have allowed a certain amount of latitude to hon. Members because we have gone on for seven days without such latitude.

செ. வந்தினாயகை

(கௌரவ வன்னிநாயக்க)

(The Hon. Wanninayake)

The hon. Members of the Opposition seem to be tired. I think I should wind up. I must once again thank all hon. Members who participated in this Debate. All their criticisms and comments will be taken note of and given the fullest consideration.

Already, I understand that two hon. Members of the Opposition have decided to vote for the Budget. I would appeal to some more hon. Members on that side, particularly those among the progressives—we believe that there are some progressives on that side—to vote for this Budget.

Then I must say that we welcome very much the offer of co-operation which the hon. Member for Dompe promised to give. We hope that all hon. Members will give us their co-operation to implement the Budget proposals which are intended to speed up economic development and to solve the unemployment problem.

எஃப். ஃப். டியஸ் டிண்டர்நாயக்கை உயா.

(திரு. எப். ஆர். டயஸ் டிண்டர்நாயக்க)

(Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike)

And entrench British capitalism.

கைமுடிபன் பதன "தன் தேவநல்லூர் கிளப்பி யுறு" யை முடிக்க வேண்டுகிறேன்.

"மசோதா இப்பொழுது இரண்டாம் முறை மதிப்பிடப்படுமா" எனும் வினா எடுத்தியம்பப்பெற்றது.

Question put, "That the Bill be now read a Second time."

கிணாயகை தனது "பை" வந்தினாயக்கை உயா கிணாயகை, விசேஷக் கைமுடிபன் பதன.

குரல்களில்படி "ஆம்" என்பவர்களுக்கு வெற்றி யெனச் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களால் பிரகடனப்படுத்தப்பட்டது.

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

ஃபாடீய உன். உதி. பெரேரா

(கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா)

(Dr. N. M. Perera)

Divide!

வந்தினாயக்கை உயா உறு பதன தன்முடி—  
பை 98; விடீய 55; யுறுவன்—கைமுடிபன்.

சபை பிரிந்தது : சார்பாக 98 ; எதிராக 55.

පයඹ

ඡාර්පාක

AYES

ගරු ඩඩ්ලි සේනානායක  
 කෙළරඹ උඩ්ලි ජිනෙතායක  
 The Hon. Dudley Senanayake

ගරු අයි. එම්. ආර්. ඒ. ඊරියගොල්ල  
 කෙළරඹ ඉ. එම්. ආර්. ඒ. ඊරියගොල්ල  
 The Hon. I. M. R. A. Iriyagolle

ගරු එන්. එම්. ඒ. එම්. කරුණාරත්න  
 කෙළරඹ එන්. එම්. ඒ. එම්. කරුණාරත්න  
 The Hon. N. H. A. M. Karunaratne

ගරු ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන  
 කෙළරඹ ඩී. පී. ආර්. ගුණවර්ධන  
 The Hon. D. P. R. Gunawardena

ගරු ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන  
 කෙළරඹ ජේ. ආර්. ජයවර්ධන  
 The Hon. J. R. Jayewardene

ගරු එම්. ඩී. එම්. ජයවර්ධන  
 කෙළරඹ එම්. ඩී. එම්. ජයවර්ධන  
 The Hon. M. D. H. Jayawardena

ගරු මොන්ටේගු ජයවික්‍රම  
 කෙළරඹ මොන්ටේගු ජයවික්‍රම  
 The Hon. Montague Jayewickreme

ගරු සී. පී. ද සිල්වා  
 කෙළරඹ සී. පී. ද සිල්වා  
 The Hon. C. P. de Silva

ගරු ආචාර්ය ඩබ්ලිව්. දහනායක  
 කෙළරඹ ආචාර්ය ඩබ්ලිව්. දහනායක  
 The Hon. Dr. W. Dahanayake

ගරු එම්. ඩී. බන්ඩා  
 කෙළරඹ එම්. ඩී. බන්ඩා  
 The Hon. M. D. Banda

ගරු එම්. එම්. මොහමඩ්  
 කෙළරඹ එම්. එම්. මොහමඩ්  
 The Hon. M. H. Mohamed

ගරු යූ. බී. වන්නිනායක  
 කෙළරඹ යූ. බී. වන්නිනායක  
 The Hon. U. B. Wanninayake

ගරු වී. ඒ. සුගතදාස, එම්.බී.ඊ.  
 කෙළරඹ වී. ඒ. සුගතදාස, එම්.බී.ඊ.  
 The Hon. V. A. Sugathadasa, M.B.E.

ගරු ඊ. එල්. බී. හුරුල්ල  
 කෙළරඹ ඊ. එල්. බී. හුරුල්ල  
 The Hon. E. L. B. Hurulle

ඩී. පී. අනපත්තු මයා,  
 ත්‍රි. ඩී. ඒ. අනපත්තු  
 Mr. D. P. Atapattu

පී. සී. ඉම්බුලාන මයා,  
 ත්‍රි. පී. සී. ඉම්බුලාන  
 Mr. P. C. Imbulana

විමලා කන්නන්ගර මයා, එම්.බී.ඊ.  
 ත්‍රි. ම. විමලා කන්නන්ගර, එම්.බී.ඊ.  
 Mrs. Wimala Kannangara, M.B.E.

ඩී. ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ මයා,  
 ත්‍රි. ඩී. ෂෙල්ටන් ජයසිංහ  
 Mr. D. Shelton Jayasinghe

ලාමනී ජයසූරිය මයා,  
 ත්‍රි. ලාමනී ජයසූරිය  
 Mr. Gamani Jayasuriya

එල්. බී. දසනායක මයා,  
 ත්‍රි. එල්. බී. දසනායක  
 Mr. L. B. Dassanayake

එම්. එම්. එම්. නයිනා මරිකාර් මයා,  
 ඉ. එම්. එම්. නයිනා මරිකාර්  
 Mr. M. H. M. Naina Marikar

එස්. ඒ. පීරිස් මයා, එම්.බී.ඊ.  
 ත්‍රි. එස්. ඒ. පීරිස්, එම්.බී.ඊ.  
 Mr. S. A. Peeris, O.B.E.

ආර්. ප්‍රේමදාස මයා,  
 ත්‍රි. ආර්. ප්‍රේමදාස  
 Mr. R. Premadasa

සී. ආර්. බෙලිගමන මයා,  
 ත්‍රි. සී. ආර්. බෙලිගමන  
 Mr. C. R. Beligammana

එම්. එම්. මුස්තාෆා මයා,  
 ඉ. එම්. එම්. මුස්තාෆා  
 Mr. M. M. Mustapha

විජයපාල මෝඩිස් මයා,  
 ත්‍රි. විජයපාල මෝඩිස්  
 Mr. Wijayapala Mendis

පකෂව

ආර්ථික

AYES

කුසුමා රාජරත්න මිය.  
திருமதி குஸுமா இராஜரத்ன  
Mrs. Kusuma Rajaratna

ඇලික් අලුවිහාරේ මිය.  
திரு. அலிக் அலுவிகாரை  
Mr. Alick Aluvihare

එන්. විමලසේන මිය.  
திரு. என். விமலசேன  
Mr. N. Wimalasena

ඩී. පී. ආට්ටිගල මිය.  
திரு. டி. பி. ஆட்டிகல  
Mr. D. P. Attygalle

ඩී. බී. වෙලගෙදර මිය.  
திரு. டி. பி. வெலகெதர  
Mr. D. B. Welagedara

වී. අන්නාමලෙයි මිය.  
திரு. வீ. அண்ணாமலை  
Mr. V. Annamalay

සී. පී. ජේ. සෙනෙවිරත්න මිය.  
திரு. சி. பி. ஜே. செனவிரத்ன  
Mr. C. P. J. Seneviratne

සී. එෆ්. ඩබ්ලිව්. එදිරිසූරිය මිය.  
திரு. சி. எவ். டபிள்யூ. எதிரிசூரிய  
Mr. C. F. W. Edirisuriya

එම්. ෆලිල් අබ්දුල් කාෆෆර් මිය., එම්.බී.ඊ.  
ஐனப் எம். பல்ல அப்துல் காபூர், எம்.பி.ஈ.  
Mr. M. Falil Abdul Caffoor, M.B.E.

එච්. බී. ඒකනායක මිය.  
திரு. எச். பி. ஏக்கநாயக்க  
Mr. H. B. Ekanayake

එම්. අබ්දුල් බකීර් මාර්කාර් මිය.  
ஐனப் எம். அப்துல் பக்கீர் மாக்கார்  
Mr. M. Abdul Bakeer Markar

එස්. කදිරවේලුපිල්ලේ මිය.  
திரு. எஸ். கதிரவேலுப்பிள்ளை  
Mr. S. Kathiravelupillai

එම්. ඒ. අබ්දුල් මජීඩ් මිය.  
ஐனப் எம். ஏ. அப்துல் மஜீது  
Mr. M. A. Abdul Majeed

සී. එන්. කන්නන්ගර මිය.  
திரு. சி. என். கன்னங்கர  
Mr. C. N. Kannangara

ජෝර්ජ් අබයගුණසේකර මිය.  
திரு. ஜோர்ஜ் அபயகுணசேகர  
Mr. George Abeygoonasekera

චන්ද්‍රා කරුණාරත්න මිය.  
திரு. சந்திரா கருணரத்ன  
Mr. Chandra Karunaratne

එස්. එස්. අබේසුන්දර මිය.  
திரு. எஸ். எஸ். அபேசுந்தர  
Mr. S. S. Abeysondera

වාසල මුදලි එම්. එස්. කාරියප්පර්.  
கேட் முதலியார் எம். எஸ். காரியப்பர்  
Gate Mudaliyar M. S. Kariapper

එම්. එස්. අමරසිරි මිය.  
திரு. எம். எஸ். அமரசிரி  
Mr. M. S. Amarasiri

එච්. කුලරත්න මිය.  
திரு. எச். குலரத்ன  
Mr. H. Kularatne

ඒ. අමිර්තලිංගම් මිය.  
திரு. ஏ. அமிர்தலிங்கம்  
Mr. A. Amirthalingam

සී. එස්. ෂර්ලි කෝරියා මිය.  
திரு. ஷேர்லி கொறையா  
Mr. C. S. Shirley Corea

වී. ඒ. අලෙගාකෝන් මිය.  
திரு. வீ. ஏ. அழகக்கோன்  
Mr. V. A. Alegacone

රාජනීතිඤ එස්. ජේ. වි. චෙල්වනායකම් මිය.  
திரு. எஸ். ஜே. வி. செல்வநாயகம், சியூ. லி.  
Mr. S. J V. Chelvanayakam, Q.C.

එස්. ද එස්. ජයසිංහ මිය. ඩී. බී. ඊ.  
திரு. எஸ். த எஸ். ஜயசிங்க, ஓ. பி. ஈ.,  
Mr. S. de S. Jayasingha, O.B.E.

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

පණුව  
ආර්ථක  
AYES

රාජනීතිඥ වර්තන් ජොන් ක්ලස් මයා.  
திரு. வேணன் ஜொங்கிளாஸ், கியூ. லி.  
Mr. Vernon Jonklaas, Q.C.

එ. පිලපිටිය මයා.  
திரு. ஏ. பிலப்பிற்றிய  
Mr. A. Pilapitiya

එම්. එ. ඩැනියෙල් මයා.  
திரு. எம். ஏ. டானியல்  
Mr. M. A. Daniel

ෆිස්ටස් පෙරේරා මයා.  
திரு. பெஸ்ரஸ் பெரேரா  
Mr. Festus Perera

ඩී. ඊ. තිලකරත්න මයා.  
திரு. டி. எ. திலகரத்ன  
Mr. D. E. Tillekeratne

ජී. ජේ. පාරිස් පෙරේරා මයා.  
திரு. ஜி. ஜே. பாரிஸ் பெரேரா  
Mr. G. J. Paris Perera

කේ. තුරේසිරත්නම් මයා.  
திரு. கே. துரைத்தினம்  
Mr. K. Thurairatnam

රාජනීතිඥ ජී. ජී. පොන්නම්බලම් මයා.  
திரு. ஜி. ஜி. பொன்னம்பலம், கி.டி.லி.  
Mr. G. G. Ponnambalam, Q.C.

එස්. තොන්ඩමාන් මයා.  
திரு. எஸ். தொண்டமான்  
Mr. S. Thondaman

එම්. රස්කින් ප්‍රනාන්දු මයා.  
திரு. எம். ரஸ்கின் பெர்னண்டோ  
Mr. M. Ruskin Fernando

ඒ. ඩී. එස්. ද සිල්වා මයා.  
திரு. ஏ. டி. எஸ். த சில்வா  
Mr. A. D. S. de Silva

ටී. ක්වෙන්ටින් ප්‍රනාන්දු මයා.  
திரு. டி. குவின்றின் பெர்னண்டோ  
Mr. T. Quentin Fernando

කේ. ඩබ්ලිව්. දේවනායගම් මයා.  
திரு. கே. டபிள்யூ. தேவநாயகம்  
Mr. K. W. Devanayagam

ඩබ්ලිව්. එම්. ජී. ටී. බණ්ඩා මයා.  
திரு. டபிள்யூ. எம். ஜி. டி. பண்டா  
Mr. W. M. G. T. Banda

ආර්. එම්. ධර්මදාස බණ්ඩා මයා.  
திரு. ஆர். எம். தர்மதாஸ் பண்டா  
Mr. R. M. Dharmadasa Banda

ඩී. එම්. ටී. බණ්ඩාර මයා.  
திரு. டி. எம். டி. பண்டார  
Mr. D. M. T. Bandara

වී. ධර්මලිංගම් මයා.  
திரு. வி. தர்மலிங்கம்  
Mr. V. Dharmalingam

එස්. එම්. මානික්කරාජා මයා.  
திரு. எஸ். எம். மாணிக்கராசா  
Mr. S. M. Manickarajah

වී. නවරත්නම් මයා.  
திரு. வி. நவரத்தினம்  
Mr. V. Navaratnam

සී. එන්. මැතිව් මයා.  
திரு. சி. என். மத்தியூ  
Mr. C. N. Mathew

වී. එන්. නවරත්නම් මයා.  
திரு. வி. என். நவரத்தினம்  
Mr. V. N. Navaratnam

පී. ජී. මුත්තූබණ්ඩා මයා.  
திரு. பி. ஜி. முத்துபண்டா  
Mr. P. G. Muthubanda

ශ්‍රීමත් රසික් ෆරේඩ්, ඩී.බී.ඊ.  
சேர் ராசிக் பரீத், ஓ.பி.எ.  
Sir Razik Fareed, O.B.E.

එම්. ඊ. එච්. මොහමඩ් අලී මයා.  
ஜனப். எம். எ. எச். முகம்மது அலி  
Mr. M. E. H. Mohamed Ali

පකෂව

ආර්ථික

AYES

ඩී. බී. රත්නංග මයා,  
திரு. டி. பி. ரணத்தங்க  
Mr. D. B. Ranatunga

වෛද්‍යවාර්ෂ එම්. එච්. සද්ධාසේන  
டொக்டர் எம். எச். சத்தாசேன  
Dr. M. H. Saddhasena

ඩොනල්ඩ් ජේ. රත්නවීර මයා, එම්.බී.ඊ.  
திரு. டொனால்ட் ஜே. ரணவீர, எம்.பி.ஈ.  
Mr. Donald J. Ranaweera, M.B.E.

ආර්. ජී. සමරනායක මයා,  
திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சமரநாயக்க  
Mr. R. G. Samaranayake

වෛද්‍යවාර්ෂී එ. රත්නපාල  
டொக்டர் எ. இரத்தனபால  
Dr. A. Ratnapala

පර්සි සමරවීර මයා,  
திரு. பேர்ஸி சமரவீர  
Mr. Percy Samaraweera

කේ. පො. රත්නතිලක මයා,  
திரு. கா. பொ. இரத்தினம்  
Mr. K. P. Ratnara

ඒ. ලතිෆ් සින්නලෙබ්බේ මයා,  
ஜனாப் எ. லத்தீவ் சின்ன லெப்பை  
Mr. A. Latiff Sinnalebbe

සී. රාජදුරෙයි මයා,  
திரு. சி. இராசதுரை  
Mr. C. Rajadurai

ජේ. එල්. සිරිසේන මයා,  
திரு. ஜே. எஸ். சிறிசேன  
Mr. J. L. Sirisena

එස්. එම්. රසමානිකම් මයා,  
திரு. எஸ். எம். இராசமாணிக்கம்  
Mr. S. M. Rasamanickam

එම්. සිවසිතම්පරම් මයා,  
திரு. எம். சிவசிதம்பரம்  
Mr. M. Sivasithamparam

එස්. බී. ලේනව මයා,  
திரு. எஸ். பி. லேனவ  
Mr. S B. Lenawa

ටී. සිවසිතම්පරම් මයා,  
திரு. டී. சிவசிதம்பரம்  
Mr. T. Sivasithamparam

ඩී. බී. විජේතුංග මයා,  
திரு. டி. பி. விஜேதுங்க  
Mr. D. B. Wijetunga

ආර්. සිංගල්ටන්-සැමන් මයා, සී.බී.ඊ.  
திரு. ஆர். சிங்கிள்ரன்-சமன், சி.பி.ஈ.  
Mr. R. Singleton-Salmon, C.B.E.

ආර්. පී. විජේසිරි මයා,  
திரு. ஆர். பி. விஜேசிறி  
Mr. R. P. Wijesiri

ඊ. එල්. සේනානායක මයා,  
திரு. ஈ. எல். சேனநாயக்க  
Mr. E. L. Senanayake

එඩ්මන්ඩ් විජේසූරිය මයා,  
திரு. எட்மண்ட் விஜயசூரிய  
Mr. Edmund Wijesuriya

ඒ. සී. එස්. හමීඩ් මයා,  
ஜனாப். எ. சி. எஸ். ஹமீத்  
Mr. A. C. S. Hameed

පී. බී. ඒ. වීරකෝන් මයා,  
திரு. பி. பி. ஏ. வீரக்கோன்  
Mr. P. B. A. Weerakoon

එස්. හෙට්ටිගේ මයා,  
திரு. எஸ். ஹெற்றிகே  
Mr. S. Hettige

එස්. බී. හේරත් මයා,  
திரு. எஸ். பி. ஹேரத்  
Mr. S. B. Herat

විසර්ජන කෙටුම්පත් පනත, 1965-66

—දෙවනවර කියවීම

විපක්ෂ

எதிராக

NOES

ඒ. එල්. අබ්දුල් මජීඩ් මයා.  
ജനാബ്. എ. എ. അ. അ. അ. അ.  
Mr. A. L. Abdul Majeed

බබ්ලිවි. පී. ජී. ආරියදාස මයා.  
திரு. டபிள்யூ. பி. ஜி. ஆரியதாஸ  
Mr. W. P. G. Ariyadasa

ජේ. පී. ඔබෙයෙකර මයා.  
திருமதி ஜே. பி. ஓபயசேக்கர  
Mrs. J. P. Obeyesekere

බබ්ලිවි. ඒ. කරුණාසේන මයා.  
திரு. டபிள்யூ. ஏ. கருணசேன  
Mr. W. A. Karunasena

පී. බී. ජී. කලුගල්ල මයා.  
திரு. பி. பி. ஜி. கலுகல்ல  
Mr. P. B. G. Kalugalla

රජා කුලතිලක මයා.  
திரு. இராஜா குலத்திலக  
Mr. Raja Kulatilake

පී. ජී. බී. කෙනමන් මයා.  
திரு. பி. ஜி. பி. கெனமன்  
Mr. P. G. B. Keuneman

චමලි ගුණවර්ධන මයා.  
திரு. சம்ஸி குணவர்த்தன  
Mr. Cholmondeley Goonewardene

ලෙස්ලි ගුණවර්ධන මයා.  
திரு. லெஸ்லி குணவர்தன  
Mr. Leslie Goonewardene

ජේ. ජී. ගුණසේකර මයා.  
திரு. ஜே. ஜி. குணசேக்கர  
Mr. J. G. Gunasekera

ප්‍රින්ස් ගුණසේකර මයා.  
திரு. பிறின்ஸ் குணசேக்கர  
Mr. Prins Gunasekera

සෝමවීර චන්ද්‍රසිරි මයා.  
திரு. சோமவீர சந்திரசிறி  
Mr. Somaweera Chandrasiri

ලක්ෂ්මන් ජයකොඩි මයා.  
திரு. இலக்ஷ்மன் ஜயக்கொடி  
Mr. Lakshman Jayakody

එෆ්. ආර්. ඩයස් බණ්ඩාරනායක මයා.  
திரு. எவ். ஆர். டயஸ் பண்டாரநாயக்க  
Mr. F. R. Dias Bandaranaike

ස්ටැන්ලි තිලකරත්න මයා.  
திரு. ஸ்ரான்லி திலகரத்ன  
Mr. Stanley Tillekeratne

බී. ඩබ්. තුඩාවෙ මයා.  
திரு. பி. வை. துடாவே  
Mr. B. Y. Tudawe

එම්. තේනකෝන් මයා.  
திரு. எம். தென்னக்கோன்  
Mr. M. Tennakoon

පී. එම්. ටේ. තේනකෝන් මයා.  
திரு. பி. எம். கே. தென்னக்கோன்  
Mr. P. M. K. Tennekoon

ටී. බී. තේනකෝන් මයා.  
திரு. டී. பி. தென்னக்கோன்  
Mr. T. B. Tennakoon

නීල් ද අල්විස් මයා.  
திரு. நீல் த அல்விஸ்  
Mr. Neal de Alwis

එල්. සී. ද සිල්වා මයා.  
திரு. எல். சி. த சில்வா  
Mr. L. C. de Silva

පී. එච්. ඩබ්ලිව්. ද සිල්වා මයා.  
திரு. பி. எச். டபிள்யூ. த சில்வா  
Mr. P. H. W. de Silva

එම්. පී. ද සොයිසා සිරිවර්ධන මයා.  
திரு. எம். பி. த சாய்சா சிறிவர்தன  
Mr. M. P. de Zoysa Siriwardena

එච්. එම්. නවරත්න මයා.  
திரு. எச். எம். நவரத்ன  
Mr. H. M. Nawaratna

ඩී. ටී. පස්කුවල් මයා.  
திரு. டி. டி. பஸ்குவல்  
Mr. D. T. Pasqual

කේ. ඩී. ඩී. පෙරේරා මයා.  
திரு. கே. டி. டி. பெரேரா  
Mr. K. D. D. Perera

ආචාර්ය එන්. එම්. පෙරේරා  
கலாநிதி என். எம். பெரேரா  
Dr. N M. Ferera

ආර්. එස්. පෙරේරා මයා.  
திரு. ஆர். எஸ். பெரேரா  
Mr. R. S. Ferera

விசுவம்

எதிராக

NOES

நி. பி. லக்ஷ்மிநாதன் மகா.

திரு. பி. எச். பண்டார

Mr. B. H. Bandara

பி. டி. லக்ஷ்மிநாதன் மகா.

திரு. எஸ். டி. பண்டாரநாயக்க

Mr. S D. Bandaranayake

சிரிமாவோ டி. டி. லக்ஷ்மிநாதன் மகா.

திருமதி சிறிமாவோ ஆர். டி. பண்டாரநாயக்க

Mrs. Sirimavo R. D. Bandaranaike

அனில் மூனிசிங்க மகா.

திரு. அனில் முனிசிங்க

Mr. Anil Moonesinghe

மங்கல மூனிசிங்க மகா.

திரு. மங்கல முனிசிங்க

Mr. Mangala Moonesinghe

பி. எஸ். யாலேகமா மகா.

திரு. எஸ். பி. யாலேகமா

Mr. S. B. Yalagama

ரா. பி. ரத்னமலல மகா.

திரு. ஆர். பி. இரத்தினமலல

Mr. R. B. Ratnamalala

கே. பி. ரத்னாயக்க மகா.

திரு. கே. பி. இரத்தினாயக்க

Mr. K. B. Ratnayake

சி. எஸ். ரத்னவத்த மகா.

திரு. சி. எஸ். இரத்தினவத்த

Mr. C. S. Ratwatte

ஜார்ஜ் ராஜபக்ஷ மகா.

திரு. ஜார்ஜ் இராஜபக்ஷ

Mr. George Rajapaksa

ரா. ரா. வி. ராஜபக்ஷ மகா.

திரு. ஆர். ஆர். டபிள்யூ. இராஜபக்ஷ

Mr. R. R. W. Rajapaksa

ரத்னசிரி விசுவநாதன் மகா.

திரு. இரத்தினசிரி விசுவநாதன்

Mr. Ratnasiri Wickramanayake

பெர்சி விசுவநாதன் மகா.

திரு. பெர்சி விசுவநாதன்

Mr. Percy Wickremasinghe

தேவநேர கியவீதம் பி. டி. விசுவநாதன்

திரு. டாக்டர் எஸ். ஏ. விசுவநாதன்

Dr. S. A. Wickremasinghe

கே. யு. பி. விசுவநாதன் மகா.

திரு. கே. எம். விசுவநாதன் பண்டார

Mr. K. Y. M. Wijeratne Banda

லீலரத்ன விசுவநாதன் மகா.

திரு. லீலரத்ன விசுவநாதன்

Mr. Leelaratne Wijesinghe

பி. பி. விசுவநாதன் மகா.

திரு. பி. பி. விசுவநாதன்

Mr. P. B. Wijesundara

ரா. வெலேகமா மகா.

திரு. இராஜா வெலேகமா

Mr. Raja Welegama

டி. எஸ். சாமரசிங்க மகா.

திரு. டி. எஸ். சாமரசிங்க

Mr. D. S. Samarasinghe

ஹேமச்சந்திர சிரிசேனா மகா.

திரு. ஹேமச்சந்திர சிரிசேனா

Mr. Hemachandra Sirisena

டி. பி. சபசிங்க மகா.

திரு. டி. பி. சபசிங்க

Mr. T. B. Subasinghe

சோமரத்ன சேனரத்ன மகா.

திரு. சோமரத்ன சேனரத்ன

Mr. Somaratne Senarath

மேதிரிபால சேனாயக்க மகா.

திரு. மேதிரிபால சேனாயக்க

Mr. Maithripala Senanayake

ரா. ஜி. சேனாயக்க மகா.

திரு. ஆர். ஜி. சேனாயக்க

Mr. R. G. Senanayake

பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸ் மகா.

திரு. பெர்னாட் சோய்ஸ்

Mr. Bernard Soysa

டி. எஃப். ஹெட்டியாச்சி மகா.

திரு. டி. எஃப். ஹெட்டியாச்சி

Mr. D F. Hettiaratchchi

டி. பி. எம். ஹேரத் மகா.

திரு. டி. பி. எம். ஹேரத்

Mr. T. B. M. Herath

விசேஷக் கெடுதலின் பணம், 1965-66  
—தேவநலர் கியலி

கெடுதலின் பணம் 30 அதுகூலம் தேவநலர்  
கியலம் லே.

கெடுதலின் பணம், அண் 57 டர்ஷ் ஸ்தலர்  
நியோசீத யலனே, லெந அலகர்லாடி பவந்லந  
பூர்ஷ் மன்றி மன்றி காரக ஸலலம் பவந்ல லே.

இதன்படி, மசோதா இரண்டாம் முறையாக மதிப்  
பிடப்பெற்றது.

நிலையந் கட்டளை இல. 57 இன்படி மசோதா எதிர்  
வரும் செவ்வாய்க்கிழமை நடைபெறும் முழுச் சபைக்  
குழுவிற்குச் சாட்டப்பட்டது.

*Bill accordingly read a Second time.*

*Bill committed to a Committee of the  
Whole House under Standing Order No. 57  
for Tuesday next.*

கல்நலி

கல்நலி

ஒத்திவைப்பு

ADJOURNMENT

மது பல்லவம் யோசனாவ ஸலஸ்திமெந்ல விச:

“மன்றி மன்றி லுந் கல்நலி யுது.”—  
[லர். ஸி. பி. டி. ஸில்லா.]

“சபை, இப்பொழுது ஒத்திவைக்கப்படுமாக” எனும்  
பிரேரணை நிறைவேறியது.— [கெளரவ லி. பி. டி.  
ஸில்லா].

*Resolved:*

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

மன்றி மன்றி 30 அதுகூலம்  
அ. ஸ. 8.15 ல், அடி டின ஸலஸ்திமெந்ல  
அது, 1965 அயோசீது 27 லந ஸிலுர்டி  
பி. ஸ. 10 லந நென் கல்நலி லெய்ல.

அதன்படி பி. ப. 8.15 க்கு சபை, இன்  
றைய அதனது தீர்மானத்துக்கியைய 1965  
ஆகஸ்ட் 27 ஆம் தேதி வெள்ளிக்கிழமை  
மு. ப. 10 மணிவரை ஒத்திவைக்கப்  
பெற்றது.

*Adjourned accordingly at  
8.15 P.M. until 10 A.M. on  
Friday, 27th August, 1965,  
pursuant to the Resolution of  
the House this Day.*



දායක මුදල් : මුදල් ගෙවන දිනෙන් පසුව ඇරඹෙන මාසයේ සිට මාස 12ක් සඳහා රු. 32.00යි. අශේධිත පිටපත් සඳහා නම් රු. 35.00යි. මාස 6 කට භාණ්ඩුවෙන් අඩකි. පිටපතක් ගත 30යි. කැපැලෙන් ගත 45යි. මුදල්, කොළඹ භාග්‍ර මුවදොර, මහලේකම් කාර්යාලයේ රජයේ ප්‍රකාශන කාර්යාලයේ අධිකාරි වෙත කලින් එවිය යුතුය.

1965

சந்தா : பணம் கொடுத்த தேதியை யடுத்துவரும் மாதம் தொடக்கம் 12 மாதத்துக்கு ரூபா 32.00 (திருத்தப்படாத பிரதிகள் ரூபா 35.00). 6 மாதத்துக்கு அரைக்கட்டணம் : தனிப்பிரதி சதம் 30, தபால்மூலம் 45 சதம், முற்பணமாக அரசாங்க வெளியீட்டு அலுவலக அத்தியட்சரிடம் (த. பெ. 500, அரசாங்க கருமகம், கொழும்பு 1) செலுத்தலாம்.

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